

## **Proposed Changes to the Cañada College Council Bylaws**

Sections I and II:	May 4, 2006
Section III:	November 2, 2006
Section IV:	November 16, 2006 and December 7, 2006
Section V:	December 7, 2006

This is a compilation of the changes that have been proposed. New or modified text appears in *italics*. Some of the changes are followed by an explanation, or by pros and cons. No changes have been approved or adopted yet.

At the December 7, 2006 meeting, the College Council agreed to put “Revision to the College Council By-laws” on the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007 agenda as an ACTION item.

### **Section I: Philosophy**

Add a statement of commitment to the mission of the college at the end of the last sentence of the third paragraph (addition in *italics*):

“Collegial consultation embraces the basic objective that all key parties of interest should be given the opportunity to participate in jointly developing recommendations and priorities for the well-being of the institution *in accordance with its mission.*”

### **Section II: Purpose of the College Council**

This is the proposed new text for the entire section II:

*The College Council is advisory to the President on college-wide issues regarding*

- 1. College and District policies and procedures*
- 2. Institutional planning and evaluation: short and long term planning (such as college master planning and strategic planning), institutional staffing*
- 3. college facilities, maintenance and operations*
- 4. accreditation*
- 5. the consultation process as outlined in the Cañada Planning and Budget process*
- 6. campus climate*
- 7. any other issues affecting the well-being of the college at large*

### **Section 3: Organization of College Council**

#### **1. Composition**

Proposal: reduce the membership of the College Council to the following:

*4 Students*

*4 Faculty*

*4 Classified*

*2 Administrators*

*College President – ex-officio*

(14 voting members instead of the current 20, 1 ex-officio instead of the current 2)

Pros	Cons
Fewer members would allow people to join other important committees	Less representational body
Allow us to deliberate more efficiently	May not be inclusive enough
Members may feel more committed	Larger group may diffuse responsibility
Discussions of topics could happen at Senates and be brought forward	
Larger group means that at least some representatives show up	

## 2. Selection

Proposal: replace current language with:

*Each college constituent (Academic Senate, Classified Senate, ASCC, Administration) will appoint its council members. Student representatives may appoint a voting alternate to attend a meeting.*

Why change?

- replace “Student Government” by “ASCC” at the request of students.
- Current language is not clear about “alternates” (i.e., do they have voting rights?). In practice, we have not had alternates. It was noted that continuity of attendance at college council meetings is important, so, in general, it makes more sense NOT to have alternates. However, for students, it is challenging to send enough representatives to a college council meeting; thus, if they were allowed to appoint alternates as needed, student participation may improve.

## 3. Terms:

**a.** Currently, college council members serve two year terms. This would continue.

The last sentence in this paragraph states “One additional year may be added to a term by mutual consent of member and appointing body.”

Proposal: take out the last sentence quoted above.

Why?

Since we have no term limits, nothing precludes a council member from serving more than two years. Current language is confusing and unnecessary.

**b.** Proposal:

*Students will be appointed in August.*

Why?

Currently, bylaws state that students are appointed in June. This does not allow them to appoint new students that come in the Fall. Students would prefer to be able to consider new students as potential college council members.

## 4. Chair & Vice Chair

Proposal: to replace the entire text of this section 4 (both a and b) with:

*At the first College Council meeting of each academic year, the Council will select one Faculty and one Classified member from its current membership to serve as Co-chairs for one year. Each Co-chair may be re-appointed for a maximum of 3 consecutive years.*

Why?

- Currently, the College Council has a Chair and a Vice-chair, selected from Faculty and Classified members of the College Council. It was suggested that the College Council have Co-Chairs instead, a model that has been adopted by the Planning and Budget Committee.

In this proposal, the last sentence in 4.a. is taken out: “Recognition and appropriate support for the Chair will be provided”.

Why?

There is currently no institutional recognition for the Chair of the College Council; “support” is already mentioned in the next section (“clerical support”)

Due to the proposed restructuring to Co-Chairs, this section would be re-named “Co-Chairs” and it would not have sub-sections “a” and “b”.

## **5. Clerical Support**

## **6. Orientation**

These two remain un-changed.

## **IV.Meetings**

### **1. Rules of Procedure for Conduct of Meetings**

#### **a. Consensus Method**

The manner in which the College Council operates remains unchanged: primarily by consensus, with voting if consensus is not reached. The value of consensus as a way to reach a recommendation was acknowledged by College Council members during discussion.

The following changes were proposed in order to avoid unnecessary repetition and to clarify what consensus means:

- Delete the second half of this paragraph, since the second half will be included later, under “b. Recommendations”.
- Since consensus is not a method used as widely as voting, including what we understand by “consensus” in the bylaws would be very helpful.

The proposed text for “a. Consensus” is:

*As the President relies upon the advice and judgment of the college council, the consensus method relies upon general agreement of opinion based on reports, data and information presented. When considering a recommendation, college council members’ positions may range from a. to e. as described below:*

- a. I can say an unqualified “yes” to the recommendation.*
- b. I find the recommendation perfectly acceptable.*
- c. I can live with the recommendation; however, I am not enthusiastic about it*

- d. *I do not fully agree and need to register my view; however, I do not choose to block the recommendation overtly or covertly. I am willing to support the recommendation.*
- e. *I cannot support the recommendation.*

*Consensus is reached if no members are at level e. as noted above.*

### **b. Recommendations:**

Add a reference to Robert's Rules or Order. Proposed text:

*Recommendations will be made by consensus. If consensus is not reached, Robert's Rules of Order will be followed in order to reach a decision by conducting a vote. A motion will be made, seconded and passed by the majority of voting members in attendance. Tied votes fail.*

### **c. Quorum:**

Delete the text at the end of this section that reads: "with, ideally, at least one member from each of the four governance constituencies present".

Why?

- Because "ideally" is not enforceable, so it really doesn't mean anything.
- College Council members considered the option of taking out only the word "ideally", thus leaving "with at least one member from each of the four governance constituencies present".

Pro: it ensures representation for each constituency.

Con: if all members from one (or more) constituency are absent (coincidentally or on purpose), then the College Council cannot make any decisions. College Council members felt that this would not be a good situation. They also noted that since every constituency has more than one member, they should make every effort to guarantee adequate representation, since they have assumed the responsibility to represent others by becoming members of the College Council

After considering pros and cons, College Council members decided against this option.

## **2. Actions**

After the two sentences in this section, add the following:

*"If the President does not follow the recommendation of the College Council, s/he must explain to the College Council her/his position"*

Why?

Because although the College Council makes recommendations to the President, the President is the one who ultimately makes a decision. So, the President has the authority to go against the recommendation of the College Council. However, because the College Council members invest time and effort in making recommendations to the best of their ability and in the best interest of the college, they would like the President to explain the rationale behind decisions that do not follow College Council recommendations. This addition would make Presidents more accountable to the college community for their decisions.

## **3. Agenda**

If the proposal to change from "Chair and Vice-Chair" to "Co-Chairs" is approved (III.

Organization, 4. Chair and Vice-Chair), language in this section will automatically be changed to reflect that, i.e., every reference to "Chair" will be replaced by "Co-chairs".

We're considering some reference to the Brown Act, either as a whole, or specific parts of it. President Mohr will check with district legal council whether the College Council is covered by the Brown Act.

**V. Bylaws Changes**

No changes to this section.