The vote in May was "We have a motion on the floor Approved: Make a standing committee for part-time faculty which continues to further the work of the ACCEPT Task Force."

Here is where the process broke down. Standing Committees are in our bylaws, thus, making any committee a standing committee means changing the bylaws.

- Changing the bylaws (as prescribed by article X) need to have prior notice and needs 2/3 majority. That notice did not happen
- Furthermore it 'when drafting the published notice, it is important to be specific as to whether the notice is given for amendments or a revision”.
- “The proposed amendment are placed under General Orders just before new business”
- “When three or more alternatives for an amendment are presented, the least inclusive amendment is presented first and the most inclusive amendment last.”

There was never a notice of amendment of the bylaws; never a specification of what the amendment is and henceforth taking a vote in the May meeting on " make a standing Committee for part-time faculty which continues to further the work of the ACCEPT Task Force." was procedurally incorrect.

Furthermore, According to Roberts Rules Article VIII, Committees need clear definition as to Name, number of members, manner of selection, duties, etc. and that was not specified thus the committee (even if we ignore the incorrect vote) Cannot be a standing committee.

The problem we have is simply a breakdown of the process. At the May meeting there should have been a vote to make the committee an "Ad Hoc" committee workgroup to work on clarifying the goals of this new committee and simultaneously work on proposed changes to the by-laws. Meanwhile we can work to identify other issues and goals, proposed number of members, etc. The motion could also put a time certain for the work of the Ad hoc committee.

If the decision (after the time of the ad hoc committee is over) is to push for it to be a standing committee in the bylaws, then, a second vote should be schedule and notice given and text published before the vote occurs. This second vote will be on changing/amending the bylaws and on making this new committee a standing committee of the EAC. This vote needs naturally to get 2/3 majority.

---

1 Moved…to make a standing committee for part time faculty which continues to further the work of the ACCEPT Task Force. ♔ Is there a second? ♔ Second ♔ Further discussion? ♔ Discussion…chair would appoint a committee to make this happen because there is language to be written, a title to be developed, and other details to we worked out. ♔ Discussion… One of major concerns is not to have impetus of the task force lost. Then the question is where to house this committee ♔ I have been impressed with month to month work of the standing committees. ♔ We already have a structure in place to make sure it does not become some orphan ♔ (from Sylvia’s notes of the May meeting)
As the vote happened (in May-2016) it was putting the cart before the horse and hamstringing the process and the bylaws into something that is contradictory (there was a clarification of that in the minutes of the June meeting). We tried to bring this to the attention of the chair so we can introduce an elegant solution of how to remedy the breakdown in the process. This is not a technical glitch, but a violation of the core of the process.

I personally do not think that to invalidate the process is right for us to do. The process is our friend; it is good for Part time faculty as well as full time faculty and it keeps things moving smoothly, structurally and legally. Sometimes, the process is unfortunately not time efficient, and things take their slower course, which is due to the depth of exploration and inclusion of the numerous voices. If we rush things we neglect paying attention to people or details and to due process.

So we have a problem of violation of procedure, where we took one vote (in May) that negated two steps by amalgamating them in one (not to repeat the other procedural requirements).

➢ The question is how we are going to resolve it.

The most obvious solution is to bring it back (to the EAC) for reconsideration and vote on the committee to be an Ad Hoc committee for a time certain, where it will be clarified as to goals and purpose, as well as proposals for changing the bylaws.

Henceforth, after the specified time elapses it will be brought back to a vote that proposes changes to the bylaws with the due notice, publication of text, and the 2/3 majority requirement. If that vote gains the required majority, then the changes of the bylaws to make the committee permanent becomes effective.

These are the proposed steps for consideration:

1. Bring back to the EAC a motion to reconsider the vote of May.
2. Propose different language as to an Ad Hoc committee or a workgroup to work on the issue of identification and clarification of porpoise and a proposal. This would be with a specified time frame.
3. Once the time is over the Ad Hoc committee will present its finding and a proposal for change of the bylaws will be presented.
4. A notice will be sent to the EAC as to the proposal of the amendment to the by-laws which requires a two-thirds vote for the bylaws change.
5. The proposed amendments are placed on the agenda under general orders just before new business.
6. If there are alternative amendments they will also be part of the discussion and vote according to the rules.