

**Rationale for Proposed Changes to Governing Documents
Structures and Processes Working Group
CCCC EC, 2020-2021**

Change 1: Constitutional Language Establishing CCCC Values: Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity CfC March Report

Change 2: Composition of Executive Committee and Additional Committee Category

Change 3: Changes to Nominations Processes and Responsibilities of Nominating Committee

Change 4: Revisions to Election Processes/Procedures

“...rules that are unbiased on their face actually produce deep social inequalities, but rules can also remedy the inequality people bring with them into deliberation. Who deliberates matters, because it creates norms of social interaction and ways of talking, but deliberators are not trapped in the constraints society imposes on them.” (p 31)

The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation, and Institutions, Karpowitz and Mendelberg

“Systems of negotiated opportunities are deeply inequitable, because institutions prepare, reward, and punish people for asking in unequal ways (racist, sexist, classist, ableist, etc.). That's especially true when there's ambiguity around what can be negotiated or how to ask.”

[Sociologist](#) Jess Calarco, Twitter, 2021.

Background:

Persistent criticism of the CCCC's Executive Committee has focused on clarity, transparency, accountability, and representation. Recently, the Committee for Change (CfC) collaborated with members of the EC Governance task force to bring forward the following proposal. This proposal represents a first step toward rethinking organizational approaches to representation at a structural level and reimagining the ways the governing body can incorporate this careful rethinking.

In this document we outline recommendations for restructuring the EC. We describe comparable/similar organizations within NCTE, and incorporate potential models that move from a majority to a large-election model. This shift in the election model is structured with the intent to align the needs of members with a voice on the EC. We describe principles and potential models, and provide recommendations and structural changes that exemplify the shift in thinking that we describe.

Beginning in January 2021, the CCCC chair and associate chair organized working groups of the CCCC, following a tradition initiated in the last several years of leadership to organize

subgroups of the elected CCCC EC members to tackle specific projects, issues, or recommendations. The Structures and Processes working group met regularly between January 2021 and August 2021, coordinating with the chair of the Committee for Change which has been charged with making recommendations for structural changes to the organization to support equity, diversity, and inclusion. The group drew from a large number of prior reports and documents that have made recommendations on these topics. We include links to those documents below.

All changes to the Constitution Bylaws (which are described below) can be viewed in the two separate documents: Constitution Revisions and Bylaws Revisions which include in-line documentation of the deletions, additions, and revisions.

1. [Report from Subcommittee on Organizational Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice](#): Jan 2016
2. [NCTE/CCCC Relationship TF Report](#): Sep 2020
3. [Task Force on Whiteness Report](#): Nov 2020
4. [Recommendations from the Report from Graduate Students](#): Oct 2014
5. [Member Engagement Subcommittee Report and Analysis of 2019 CCCC Post-Convention Survey](#)
 - a. Question: Which conference activities (panels, workshops, committee meetings, caucus meetings, SIGs, social events, mentoring and networking opportunities, etc.) had the most significant impact on your convention experience? Which experiences were most memorable and would influence your decision to attend future conventions?
6. [CCCC Research Committee Recommendations](#): Mar 2019
7. [CCCC Committee for Change](#): Oct 2020
8. [Statement of Professional Guidance for Mentoring Graduate Students](#): Nov 2019
9. [CCCC Committee for Change Meeting Report](#): May 2019
10. [Nominating Committee 2021 Recommendations to EC](#): Mar 2021
11. [CCCC Committee for Change](#): Mar 2021

NCTE undertook substantial revisions to its foundational governance documents over a two-year period that led to a revised NCTE Constitution in November 2021 after member engagement and a presentation at the NCTE Annual Business Meeting. In addition to the involvement of two NCTE Executive Committees and staff, NCTE also benefitted from the counsel of an attorney specializing in nonprofit and association governance. The attorney has been involved in most, if not all, governance documents for the members of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS).

The obligations of and risks to nonprofit organizations have greatly escalated in the last few years. Just as NCTE's governance work has updated its foundational documents to speak to modern times, so do the governance documents of the corresponding conferences and the association within NCTE. As such groups revise their governance documents, NCTE will add this information to each conference and association. Doing so provides consistency, saves time, and protects all involved, including the volunteers serving on various executive committees.

Changes to these documents include naming when each group was originally chartered by NCTE to form an operational conference or association. Another is providing clarity by explicitly identifying the process for updating governance documents. In the context of the current revision to the CCCC Constitution, this update explicates the process for any changes to the

CCCC Constitution coming before the NCTE Executive Committee for review and approval. Ultimately, it is the NCTE Executive Committee that is responsible for individual conferences and the one association. These changes do not amend any relationship or structure. Rather, the language addition names the process for such updates. The governance counsel providing input on the proposed CCCC Constitution has specifically addressed all of these areas.

It is our expectation that the hard work endeavored by CCCC's volunteers alongside others involved in this process updates the governance documents in ways that provide efficiency, clarity, and other benefits moving forward.

Change 1: Constitutional Language Establishing CCCC Values: Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity

The proposed changes in this section were drafted by the [CCCC Committee for Change](#), who was charged specifically with the following:

1. Research and come up with proposals for up to 4 structural changes to CCCC (e.g., policies, practices, guidelines, changes to the constitution or bylaws that affect either the organization and/or its annual convention) that address white supremacy and other social justice problems in the organization and its annual convention
2. Develop a set of guidelines for ethical engagement at CCCC annual convention, which might also be used in other spaces that members congregate
3. Provide the EC with two reports w/proposals each year for discussion/decisions at the NCTE EC meeting and the CCCC EC meeting

We propose an amendment of Article I, Section 2 that adds the word "equitable" to the organization's objective; with the change, this section shall read as follows:

"CCCC, as a conference of NCTE, supports and promotes the teaching and study of college composition and communication by 1) sponsoring meetings and publishing scholarly materials for the exchange of knowledge about composition, composition pedagogy, and rhetoric; 2) supporting a wide range of research on composition, communication, and rhetoric; 3) working to enhance the conditions for learning and teaching college composition and to promote professional development; and 4) acting as an advocate for equitable language and literacy education nationally and internationally.

a. Recommendation #2: Adopt the suggested amendment to Article I of the CCCC Constitution

We propose an amendment of Article I of the Constitution that adds all new language to address the organization's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The newly added Article I, Section 3 shall read as follows:

"As an organization, CCCC is dedicated to diversity, equity, and inclusion and strives toward these ideals in its practice and its promotion of the teaching and study of college composition and communication. For organizational purposes, we employ these terms as defined here, but we commit to deeper explorations of these concepts - and we call upon our members to do the same, both in our organizational spaces and in all educational spaces in post-secondary composition and communication.

- Diversity: The organization supports the heterogeneity of its membership and

- ensures that its work reflects that heterogeneity.
- Equity: The organization strives to minimize or remove obstructions to access to tangible and intangible resources in order to eliminate imbalances in power and participation among its members.
- Inclusion: The organization engages and supports all communities represented by the members and commits to the growth and change that such support and engagement demand.

b. Recommendation #3: Adopt the suggested amendment to Article IV, Section 1B of the CCCC Constitution

We propose an amendment of Article IV, Section 1b that adds the word “identities” to detail how diversity is represented within the EC; with the change, this section shall read as follows:

“So far as practicable, the membership of the Committee (including ex officio members) will be evenly distributed geographically, and will be drawn from universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges, and will represent the range of **identities and** professional interests addressed by the Conference. In addition, at the time of election, one of the twenty elected Executive Committee members will be a graduate student and one will be a contingent, adjunct, or part-time faculty member.”

These recommended changes are reflected in the red-line version of the Constitution.

Change 2: Composition of Executive Committee and Additional Committee Category

Our review of reports and documents, minutes, conversations, experiences about or from the executive committee members highlighted a number of ways current structures and procedures create bottlenecks within the organization, and as the proposal notes the Executive Committee’s structure contributes to these bottlenecks.

1. The current election is a process that mystifies much of the Nominating Committee procedures for composing a ballot. Due to the current process by which nominations are solicited and filtered through the Nominations Committee (which includes 5 elected members and 2 past CCCC Officers), a narrow group of individuals determines: 1) who is selected to participate in the election process; 2) how those nominees are organized to compete against each other in head-to-head matches without clear alignment between member values or identities. This approach necessarily limits how votes are made and who can be elected.
2. There is no direct alignment between member-formed groups and the representative-elected governance structure of the EC, resulting in reliance on informal and indirect modes of communication between member groups and the governing body that makes decisions. The overuse of “personal networks” or the “who you know” model of solicitation often provides an uneven representation of membership concerns (see the [NCTE/CCCC Relationship TF Report](#): Nov 2020 for some discussion of this issue). Additionally, because there is no formal position elected members might fill (for at-large members and officers) for addressing specific concerns and ideas, members bring them to whomever they are familiar with, or do not raise those issues at all. The goal of this restructuring is to provide a number of identity caucuses and standing group members with more direct pathways for participating in the organization’s governance and leadership.

Because of this lack of synchronization between membership and leadership, we are proposing a restructuring of the Executive Committee composition that implements a great number of voting “ex officio” seats, which are themselves determined through nominations, elections, or established governance processes used by **member groups**. Below, we include the current language from the constitution, the proposed revision, and a documentation of our treatment of possible modes of aligning communications between members and leaders, including the thinking that has underpinned our final set of recommendations for the Executive Committees’ composition.

Current Language from the Constitution

There will be an Executive Committee consisting of twenty members, exclusive of the ex officio members later to be enumerated. This committee will be the policy-making body of the organization.

b. So far as practicable, the membership of the Committee (including ex officio members) will be evenly distributed geographically, and will be drawn from universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges, and will represent the range of professional interests addressed by the Conference. In addition, at the time of election, one of the twenty elected Executive Committee members will be a graduate student and one will be a contingent, adjunct, or part-time faculty member.

All elected officers of CCCC will be ex officio voting members of the Executive Committee and will function as officers of the Executive Committee.

g. The three elected officers of the Two-Year College English Association will be ex officio voting members of the Executive Committee. All CCCC editors and the *TETYC* editor will be ex officio nonvoting members of the Executive Committee.

Proposed Restructure:

Section 1. The Executive Committee

- **Responsibilities and Duties**
 - Within the rules of NCTE and the limits set by this Constitution, the Executive Committee will enact Bylaws for the operation of the Conference, set dues, and monitor expenses.
- **Membership**
 - 5 members of the Officers Committee will be ex officio, voting members
 - 3 Two-Year College English Association officers will be ex officio voting members
 - 4 editors will be ex officio, non-voting members.
 - a. *College Composition and Communication*
 - b. *Series in Writing and Rhetoric*
 - c. *Teaching English in Two-Year College*
 - d. *Forum*
 - Parliamentarian, ex officio, non-voting appointed as spelled out in the Bylaws

- 5 members put forward by the following CCCC Cultural Identity Caucuses to be elected and appointed in a manner determined by governing documents of that caucus will be voting members¹²
 - a. American Indian Caucus
 - b. Asian/American Caucus
 - c. Black Caucus
 - d. Latinx Caucus
 - e. Queer Caucus
- 1 Member of the current Committee on Disability Issues in College Composition³ will be a voting member determined by the committee
- 1 Member of the current the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee will be a voting member determined by the committee
- 2 Graduate Student representatives drawn from Graduate Student Standing Group
- 6 members put forward by any CCCC active Standing Group and TYCA regions will be voting members
- 6 at-large seats to be selected from a pool of at-large nominations in accordance with the processes outlined in Article VII, 2 of which must be non-tenure-track positions
- **Terms of Office.**
 - The term of all Executive Committee members will commence thirty days after the NCTE Annual Convention following the election, except that officers appointed to fill a vacancy (Article VII, Sections 5 and 6) will take office upon their acceptance.
 - No member may serve more than two consecutive terms on the EC or serve in the same consecutive role on the EC.
 - Any Executive Committee member may be removed from office for sufficient cause upon unanimous recommendation of the other officers and two-thirds vote of the Executive Committee members present at any scheduled meeting.
 - Nomination, election, and filling of vacancies will be specified in Article VII.
- **Meetings**
 - Regular meetings of the Executive Committee will be held at least twice annually, generally in conjunction with the conventions of CCCC and NCTE. Additionally, meetings may be held through remote means to address business at other points in the year.
 - 15 members of the Executive Committee, exclusive of ex officio non-voting members, present at any regularly authorized meeting of the Executive Committee will constitute a quorum.

¹ Changes to Caucus names will automatically result in changes to this Constitution with no further amended necessary.

² We describe the process for a Cultural Identity Caucus to apply for an ex officio seat on the EC later in this document and it will also be outlined in the governing documents. The Jewish Caucus is currently a standing group of NCTE but not CCCC (but can pursue SG status after they convene for 5 years at the convention, so 2023). The two other groups with Caucus in their name (Feminist Caucus and Labor Caucus) are not accurately describe as cultural identity rroups (they are standing groups) and will be eligible to forward their nominations through the Standing Group nominations processes for the 8 member seats describe above.

³ This may change as we work with CDICC to discuss what the scope and focus of this group is. They are discussing amongst themselves.

Our proposed restructured Executive Committee is drawn from our review of similar governing bodies in NCTE, including TYCA and the NCTE EC itself, while reflecting the unique needs of CCCC as a conference of NCTE that focuses on college composition and communication and its own history as a group.

Current Seats Retained

The restructured EC retains several current features. Officers are elected as they are now, through open nominations that are vetted and put forward by the Nominations Committee; the TYCA officers (whose membership is defined in their own Bylaws), and the ex officio representation of NCTE editors is also retained.

Executive Committee Elections handled by the Nominations Committee:

We are proposing to reduce the number of “at-large” members from 20 to 5; An additional eight seats will be elected from a pool of nominations put forward by active Standing Groups. Standing Groups are member-organized/initiated groups who, once they are formally recognized by the organization through the established process, are eligible to put forward 2 nominees (if they want) for the Executive Committee; the Nominations Committee will review and create a final slate (much as they do now through the ‘at large’ process) from the nominations received.

Two members of those elected from this pool (at-large nominations) must be contingent faculty.

Ex Officio Voting Seats

The other seats will be ex officio; that is, seated by virtue of their position within the organization, with guaranteed seats that for five Cultural Identity Caucuses (American Indian Caucus, Asian/Asian-American Caucus, Black Caucus, Latinx Caucus, and Queer Caucus). The Standing Group on Graduate Students will also put forward 2 representatives to hold seats on the EC. These will be seated by the process spelled out in the Graduate Student Standing Group bylaws (as required by Standing Group Guidelines).

We are adding **two new administrative structures** (DEI Committee and CDICC), each of which has a dedicated seat (determined by the group itself) on the Executive Committee. This reflects an organizational commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and access. Processes for electing members to these two groups are outlined in the redline version of the Constitution, and create an opportunity for an additional 18 elected seats (elected on a staggered basis) at the level of national governance.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (proposes a new committee)

The creation of this new committee as an administrative committee (aka part of the operations in governance in a permanent way, much like EC, Officers, and Nominating Committee are), accomplishes several things. First, it responds to the Committee for Changes recommendation for a standing body or person who prioritizes and centers their work on this topic. The group itself has responsibilities that have been drafted by CfC in consultation with our work, and derived from the issues raised in ongoing reports linked at the outset of this document. In other words, that group is a standing body who takes up and attends to these issues in a shared way with the EC and with other groups. Through their ex-officio voting member on the EC, there is a channel of communication between the EC and this committee, and it firmly establishes decision-making authority around DEI, integrating groups with expertise and experience related to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion into the decision-making processes and bodies.

Committee on Disability Issues in College Composition (conversion from what is currently a special committee with a recurring charge but not codified in the Constitution or Bylaws).

The creation of this new committee as an administrative committee (aka part of the operations in governance in a permanent way, much like EC, Officers, and Nominating Committee are), accomplishes several things. First, it ensures representation of disability issues and access at the highest level of the organization; the standing seat (ex officio, nonvoting) on the EC creates a standing channel of communication between groups with expertise and experience related to disability and access AND links that group levers of decision-making.

Benefits

- Creates a stronger and more direct line of representation between member-driven constituent groups (see the [process for establishing Standing Group Status](#))
- Removes the bottleneck that emerges from the elections process taking place on an ad hoc level or through the CCCC liaison and the Nominations Committee. When the member groups do not have input into the nominations (and nominations come directly from the membership, to the NCTE staff, and then are filtered to the Nominations committee—itsself a small group of 7 members, two of whom are ex officio)—the ability of constituent groups to reflect their values and will around decision-making at the Executive level remains ad hoc, and unable to have transparent and substantive input from those groups.) Ultimately, the nominations Committee (which is selected from an open pool of at large nominees) has one year appointments (meaning they see in limited ways the consequence of the ballot they have produced), and is chaired by the 2 past CCCC chairs, who themselves will hold a great sway over the group which can vary in terms of its composition in terms of balance of late and [early career members](#). In other words, the establishment leadership in the organization has an extreme level of influence over who ultimately is placed on the subsequent ballots. This means that powerful people and structures continually reproduce themselves.
- EC members who are elected on the basis of affiliation with one or more member groups (Caucuses/SGs) will have a clearer pathway toward representation within the organizations governance structure, and by building in ex officio positions for the Cultural Identity Caucuses, DEI committee, CDICC, and Graduate Student Standing Group, members who fill those seats can reflect the needs of a constituency, somewhat (but not entirely) like the TYCA ex officio members represent the needs of 2YC.
- Candidate eligibility that is in part at least derived from an individual's engagement with and involvement in the organization
- It directly aligns an investment in member-driven groups (standing groups) with the decision-making structures of the organization
- Provides member groups with direct and transparent pathways for addressing concerns about structures, policies, and processes through voting, elections, and strengthened communications with representative organizational groups.
- Empowers the Caucuses through a self-directed process for selecting representation, allowing flexibility, and diversity in who is given an opportunity to serve.
- May create greater member engagement from standing groups and SIGS, as the organizational culture evolves to recognize these interest groups as useful pathways to nomination and service (versus nominations or self-nominations that seem to depend heavily on whether someone is already acquainted with a person who is highly visible and active in the organization)

- Increases the transparency and integrity of CCCC by making explicit what the relationships are between decision-making bodies and the member priorities and interests.
- Increases accountability of SG-Chairs to its membership via active recruitment and discussion of the executive committee seats
- Increases accountability among individual members and SG
- The new process ensures that BIPOC's and other voices have a seat on the EC and strengthens communication between the EC and the Caucuses and SGs.

Limitations

- There may be potential difficulty in identifying which groups may have a standing seat and which run for open, rotating seat terms
- A major change from the current approach/language in the Constitution (and what has been historically the structure of the organization)
- The gradual approach of the timeline for the new model means a slow transition in implementing the new model. However, the transition honors all at-large EC members elected under the old Constitution until the transition is complete.

Other Models Considered

We include here an overview of the different types of representative structures that we might identify and organize the governance body around, to show our thinking and what different models were considered.

Possible Structures for Election and Representation	Benefits	Limitations
Institution Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would aim to have diversity in terms of the types of institutions of higher education that members work (four-year, R1/R2, HBCU, 2YC, SLAC), etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This may not be the primary way that members identify their professional identities • People often change institutions • The ability to “represent” the type of institution one works at hinges largely on the amount of time and depth of involvement (and therefore, their knowledge of the priorities) of that institution type
Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TYCA is structured this way--there is an existing model • Would have national representation in a structured way, therefore potentially reflecting the interests of a range of members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This may not be the primary way that members identify their professional identities • It’s possible this works better for TYCA because it a) was initially structured as seven regions, and b) the 2YC market is more regional than national in comparison with university positions • Because of the mobility of the national job market, many members do not identify with the region where they work
Employment Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize around the kinds of employment type that members have; represent, for example, the concerns of tenure-line faculty, contingent faculty (or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a category that is probably most likely to change in an ongoing way, and not be part of how people identify themselves as a constituent/member of

	NTT/lecturer/adjunct, etc.)	the organization
Cluster/Area of Interest (as determined by the area clusters of the annual convention)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NCTE EC is partly organized in this way, a balance of ex-officio seats and then members elected as representative of their Section (elementary, middle, secondary, college); • This would have the balance of reflecting the professional areas of interest/research/teaching that members have 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The clusters, as they are currently codified in the organization, are under the complete purview of the CCCC Associate Chair (program chair) to determine/change annually (they are not encoded anywhere) • We may not <i>want</i> to encode them anywhere simply because new areas of scholarly and pedagogical interest emerge regularly and there would need to be a regular process for determining them, if they are codified. New areas of interest evolve to meet disciplinary knowledge and we want some flexibility here. Building an EC composition structure around this would require a) codification of the clusters, b) a process for regularly updating them, c) some mechanism for candidates to identify their primary area of interest, which could require continuous updating of the constitution • Most people identify more than one area of interest for their teaching, research, and professional service
	Benefits	Limitations

Other Significant Structural Changes

The Constitution Currently allows for the following governance bodies:

COMMITTEES: Executive Committee, Nominating Committee, Officers' Committee, and Special Committees.

Our revised structure looks as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

- Executive
- Officers
- Nominating
- Committee on Disability Issues in College Composition
- Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committees

STANDING COMMITTEES

- Groups with recurring charges that do not need to be regularly reconstituted (we currently have groups that operate like this: resolutions, newcomers, awards); by creating a category for these, we will add those groups that are evolving, have evolved or would like to evolve in this way (Research Committee, Language Policy Committee, Webinar Committee); we include an accompany discussion of how Standing Committees are created (or how special committees could become standing committees) in the Bylaws.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

- We maintain the category of Special Committees, which are constituted for a period of 3 years with specific charges that are determined by the EC or Officers' committees. Current examples include Committee for Change, nextGEN special committee, and the Wikipedia Initiative Committee).

Change 3: Changes to Nominations Processes and Responsibilities of Nominating Committee

The Problems: There are two key problems with the current nominations process: 1. A relatively small number of people are in charge of preparing the ballot and 2. The process of ballot preparation is largely mystified.

The Nominating Committee—which is elected, but is a very small group and 2 of 7 members are the past 2 CCCC chairs, has a tremendous level of influence over who ultimately ends up on the ballot, thus constraining the degree to which members are actually driving the leadership selection process. Additionally, the process and rationale by which ballots are prepared is opaque.

Proposed Solutions: For the EC, reduce the number of at-large, elected positions from 20 to 12 to ensure designated seats for the Cultural Identity Caucuses and the CDICC, DEI, and graduate student positions occupy the EC. (See below “Transition Plan” for implementation.) Of the 12 elected EC seats, 6 seats are to be elected from SG nominations, 2 seats are to be elected at-large from NTT member nominations, and 4 seats are to be elected at-large.

For the Nominating Committee, replace one of the Past CCCC Chairs with the Chair or Immediate Past Chair of TYCA. The Nominating Committee will now consist of the following:

- Immediate Past Chair of CCCC
- Chair or Immediate Past Chair of TYCA
- 5 elected, at-large candidates

A minimum of double the number of elected seats will be on the ballot, per our current practice.

At present, there are not substantive written guidelines for the Nominating Committee. We plan to add detail to the bylaws about the procedures for the NC as well as recommend creating a publicly available and detailed set of guidelines for the committee.

Nominating Committee: Two-year college instructors teach roughly 45% of all college students, yet, on several occasions, no two-year college candidates have been included on the Cs ballot. Because of this, Cs is missing out on a critical perspective that is vital to the organization. To help ensure that two-year college representation will always be included on the Cs ballots, the Chair or Immediate Past Chair of TYCA (or a representative from TYCA if neither is available) will sit on the Nominating Committee with the Past Chair of CCCC.

At-large positions: Increase the number of NTT at-large positions from 1 to 2, leaving 4 at-large positions that will be selected from a pool of at-large nominations in accordance with the processes outlined in Article VII. We are continuing to revise, develop, and refine the guidelines that are used for the Nominations Committee in assembling ballots and the accompanying election processes.

Standing Groups: Elect 6 of the 29 EC members from nominations put forth by active SGs and the 7 TYCA regions. These 6 seats will be limited to “active” SG candidates (as defined in the bylaws) at the time of candidacy and TYCA candidates.

Because there are so many SGs and because SGs may go from active to inactive status (and vice versa), SGs will not enter a standard rotation, like the Cultural Identity Caucuses. Instead, all active SGs who do not have a seated SG EC member will have the opportunity each year to nominate candidates for the available number of SG EC seats for the next election cycle. These candidate names will go to the Nominating Committee, who will consider all the nominations in conjunction with SG members already seated on the EC and will ensure the candidates they put forth will “be evenly distributed geographically, and will be drawn from universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges, and will represent the range of professional interests addressed by the Conference” (see the language in the Constitution).

Visual Depiction of the New EC Structure Balanced between Different Avenues to Service

Ex Officio Voting: Cultural Identity Caucus representatives; TYCA Leadership; graduate student standing group	At-Large (Nominations and Self-Nominations Submitted by Individuals)	A member-group nominated pool of nominees, with ballot created by the Nominating Committee	Ex Officio, (Non- Voting seats)
<p>5 CIC seats are designated according to the election process spelled out in the CIC bylaws;</p> <p>3 TYCA seats are determined by the process spelled out in the TYCA bylaws;</p> <p>2 graduate student representatives named by the GSSG</p> <p>1 member of the CDICC (which itself is at-large nominations)</p> <p>1 member of the DEI committee (at-large nominations)</p>	<p>1 Officer (new assistant chair elected annually); secretary, elected every 4 years,</p> <p>6 seats elected, including 2 of contingent faculty</p>	<p>6 seats that are elected from a pool of nominees forwarded by any of the Standing Groups and TYCA regionals who are active and in good standing with the organization;</p> <p>Nominating Committee assembles a ballot of 2-3 candidates for each open seat</p>	<p>Editors of the CCCC/NCTE publications (SWR, CCC, TETYC, Forum)</p> <p>These roles are not elected but rather appointed by a committee that is selected by the chairs of the respective organizations</p> <p>Parliamentarian</p>

The TYCA bylaws require each region to submit nominations for all Cs elections.

This structure does not ensure that each SG or TYCA region will be guaranteed a candidate on the EC; rather, this increases the odds that SG and TYCA members will be selected for the ballot and, therefore, elected to the EC. However, SGs that already have a seated member on the EC who was elected through the SG election process cannot submit another nomination

until the election year for which their SG EC member rolls off. While we recognize members have multiple identities, to ensure SG seats are rotated, and to help future nominating committees select candidates for the ballot, elected SG EC members will be listed on the ballot/EC roster as “Name (Council of Basic Writers SG)” or “Name (Online Writing Instruction SG).”

Benefits (Taken from above)

- Creates a stronger and more direct line of representation between member-driven constituent groups (see the [process for establishing Standing Group Status](#))
- Removes the bias that emerges from the elections process taking place on an ad hoc/individual level and one that is administered through the CCCC liaison and the Nominations Committee (in other words, there is a bottleneck of strong influence in terms of the shape of the slate that takes place at the Nominations Committee level_
- EC members who are elected on the basis of affiliation with one or more member groups (Caucuses/SGs) provide clearer paths of communication between the EC and constituent groups
- Candidate eligibility that is in part at least derived from an individual's engagement with and involvement in the organization allows candidates to demonstrate their areas of scholarly and pedagogical interest/expertise
- It directly aligns the investment of member-driven groups (standing groups) with the decision-making structures of the organization
- Member groups have a direct and ‘legitimate’ line of authority for suggesting changes to structures, policy, and processes
- May create greater engagement in standing groups and SIGs on the part of members
- Increases integrity of CCCC by aligning the leadership and decision-making of the organization with member-driven priorities and interests
- Increases accountability of SG-Chairs to its membership via active recruitment and engagement
- Increases accountability among individual members and SG.
- The new process connects EC and SG members more directly.
- Invites nominations and candidates who have an investment in the leadership, decision-making and outcomes of decisions to the organization and challenges the “national service CV line” practice.

Specific Constitution Changes:

- 6 members put forward by any CCCC active Standing Group and TYCA regions will be voting members
- 6 at-large seats to be selected from a pool of at-large nominations in accordance with the processes outlined in Article VII, 2 of which must be non-tenure-track positions

However, if at any time the Cs EC decides to add a new Cultural Identity Caucus to the rotation, the following plan is in place:

- 2 future Cultural Identity Caucuses can replace 1 of the 6 SG/TYCA regions member seats and 1 at-large position (not a NTT position).
- Adding a Cultural Identity Caucus will require a change to the Constitution.

(Note: If more than 2 Cultural Identity Caucuses are formed, please see “To Add Future Cultural Identity Caucuses to the Rotation” in the [“Proposed Timeline for Full Implementation, 2022–2024”](#).)

Change 4: Revisions to Election Processes and Ballot Construction

Though nominations and elections components of the organization are interconnected, we address here some of the concerns that have been raised about how ballots are constructed and voted on, and how the governance restructure will address some of those concerns.

Problem 1: Ineffective dissemination of leadership opportunities and explanation of responsibilities; survey advertising and distribution;

Problem 2: Lack of transparency about how ballots are constructed

Problem 3: Ballots have been constructed in a “Pick One” model in which candidates with similar professional profiles or scholarly positionalities are pitted against each other

Problem 4: Ballot construction and subsequent election process does not have structured mechanism for ensuring particular representation (candidates of color, two-year college instructors, contingent faculty)

Proposed Solutions

1. Restructure will help ensure more direct line between member groups and elected leadership (allowing for greater communication)
2. Restructure will reduce the at-large (and therefore greater levels of variability, inconsistency, and nontransparency) components of nominations and elections and fewer seats will be determined through the Nominations Committee (the position of assistant chair, and 6 at-large seats rather than 20)
3. The 2021 elections include groups of 8 in which the Nominating Committee used a different approach than past years. We would suggest continuing to use this approach based on feedback from the Nominations Committee and CCCC liaison to report back on how the 2021 version has gone (is there a way to assess/get information about whether the grouped candidates model worked as compared with the ‘choose one of 2’ model).
4. Marginalized groups and their accompanying member group have agency to select their own EC committee member representatives or put forward names for election; TYCA Chair or Immediate Past Chair (or designee) given seat on the Nominations Committee to facilitate and encourage 2YC nominations

Timeline: Amendments/Language in the Constitution

- August-September 2021: Rationale document prepared and circulated to officers, EC, caucuses/standing group leaders
 - Changes to Constitution
 - Changes to Bylaws
- November 2022: Discussion and approval vote at Nov EC meeting
- February 2022 Rationale and changes appear in February CCC
- March 2022: Discussion at the business meeting
- March and April: 30-days notice given; 30 days for voting provided
- May 2022 prepare for transition in process, pending successful approval vote. See the Timeline below which maps out a 2-year transition process.

Other Language Changes:

- We are recommending updates to outdated language, and suggest making it clear that participation in meetings and other activities linked to a position can occur virtually, and that remote access will be made available. A major barrier to attracting nominees for open positions is the outlay of resources (time, money) required (including, for many, having a stable academic position that supports and rewards this activity). Remote participation will encourage a much more diverse group of candidates to participate in the elections process.