A Report on Governance

From the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance

Community College of Philadelphia

May 24, 2006

Members of the Committee

Frank Bartell
Nancy Carr
Ivory Coleman
Claudette Dia-Taylor
LaTanya Jones
Carline Rucker
Aram Terzian
Susan Tobia
Theresa Tsai

John Howe, Committee Chairman

A Report on Governance

From the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance

Community College of Philadelphia

Part One: Background to this Report

When the Community College of Philadelphia celebrated its 40th Anniversary, the College President formed an ad hoc committee to examine and evaluate the present governance structures in order to clarify decision making and improve governance processes. The need for such an evaluation derives from three sources:

A. the Middle States Self-Study which suggested clarification of the structure for making decisions at Community College of Philadelphia;

B. the Middle States peer evaluators who reviewed college documentation about governance and recommended that we review our governance process and consider other models of governance;

C. the strategic planning process which has led to an examination of governance, especially in the area of "restructuring for the future."

The Ad Hoc Committee on Governance was charged with the writing of a report to include a set of recommendations. This is the report of that committee.

<div align="center">

� ornament⋖

</div>

To consider the issue of governance at Community College of Philadelphia and make appropriate recommendations, the committee decided to study shared governance in higher educational institutions in general, and to engage in information gathering phases, both internal and external, prior to turning our attention to governance at Community College of Philadelphia. We have reviewed literature on college governance, members of the committee contacted four comparative community colleges, and the committee surveyed the opinions of faculty, administrators and staff at Community College of Philadelphia through individual interviews and focus groups.

We considered Standard Four (Middle States) on Leadership and Governance as the baseline text.

> The primary goal of governance is to enable an educational entity to realize fully its stated mission and goals and to achieve these in the most effective and efficient manner that benefits the institution and its students. Institutional governance provides the means through which authority and responsibility are assigned, delegated and shared in a climate of mutual respect.
>
> > Middle States, "Standard Four: Leadership and Governance" (see Appendix C)

A. Information Gathering: External

For external information gathering, we looked at papers, reports, studies and articles (see bibliography) and comparative models (see Part III: list of site visits to other community colleges).

B. Information Gathering: Internal.

We reviewed the College's Strategic Plan, especially Part III (Restructuring for the Future, see Appendix D), relevant Middle States' documents, the union contracts, and current documents and charts related to the present organization of the College.

The committee conducted discussion forums on governance for classified employees, students, faculty, department heads, and administrators. In addition, the committee conducted individual interviews with the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, the Vice-Presidents, Deans, the current and former union Co-Presidents, and some senior faculty members.

❧❧

Part Two: What We Learned From A Review of the Literature

A. Governance

Governance is the process by which policy decisions are made. We take this to mean the structures and processes an academic institution uses to carry out the activities that advance its purpose: the education of students and the orderly regulation of the institution's interests.

We make a distinction between *governance* and *administration* or *management*. We see governance as the process by which decisions are made. We regard management as the execution of policies.

Governance is "the process or art with which scholars, students, teachers, administrators and trustees associated together in a college... establish and carry out the rules and regulations that minimize conflict, facilitate their collaboration, and preserve essential individual freedom." (Corson, p.13)

We accept the Statement by the American Federation of Teachers on "Shared Governance" that "Shared governance is the set of practices under which college faculty and staff participate in significant decisions concerning the operation of their institutions. Colleges and Universities are very special types of institutions with a unique mission: the creation and dissemination of ideas. For that reason they have created

particular arrangements to serve that mission best." (American Federation of Teachers, p.4)

Throughout the literature and in our discussions with faculty, staff, administrators and students, and within our committee we found ourselves frequently considering the special character of colleges, the professional standing of the faculty, and the need to provide independence for those who teach and learn. In addition, we believe that because the central fact of existence for a college is the freedom to teach, it is critical that the faculty share in institutional governance.

Governance structures that seem most successful are those which clarify processes, not obscure them. When governance is obscure, trust and confidence erode, morale declines. As we learned, there is no single formula for collegiate governance; vastly different kinds of structures worked well at very different colleges. Likewise, excellent structures could not succeed in institutions where trust and integrity were low.

We, therefore, think of "shared governance" as "shared responsibility" by the constituent groups and/or their representatives, which make up the college community. The Board of Trustees may delegate its responsibilities to its administration to comply with state regulations, to negotiate with a union, to finance and conduct corporate operations; the Board must also accommodate the prerogatives and

responsibility of the faculty in matters related to the academic enterprise.

We understand that as institutions become more complex, everyone has to accommodate change: trustees, faculty and administrators. As change drives institutions, models of governance and administrative models also, expectedly and of necessity, will change.

Governance varies greatly among academic institutions. No single structure appears to be the answer to good governance, although most institutions have an independent deliberative faculty body, standing committees which receive proposals and make recommendations, organizational structures (academic departments or divisions) and clear lines of leadership and responsibility (department heads, deans, senior administrators, president).

Governance forms may vary according to the influence of trustees, accrediting agencies and the role of collective bargaining. Colleges develop their governance forms out of their institutional histories, the evolution of their rules and regulations, the mission of the institution and the influence of unique circumstances.

We recognize that all organizations, and especially publicly supported institutions, must have effective bureaucracies that manage the requirements of law and internal rules and regulations. We also point out the special nature of colleges, usually made of four constituent groups:

the students, the faculty and staff, the administration and the trustees. In most colleges, the trustees share their authority with others. There is recognized community interest among the constituents and some means for decision making that takes into account the various interests of each group.

The rise of centralized administrative control of higher education in the nineteenth century in the United States shifted the historic control of colleges and universities from the faculty to professional managers. These managers typically came from the faculty with newly assigned responsibilities for effecting the administrative affairs of their institutions. As time has passed, the roles of the college president, the administrators and the faculty have taken on distinct functions. The administration handles business, legal and supervisory (budget, personnel) matters; faculty through their academic departments typically are responsible for faculty evaluation, tenure decisions, curriculum and instruction. Within departments, courses are scheduled, faculty are hired and assigned, support services are provided, and records are kept, thus making the academic department the core of academic governance.

In our review of varieties of collegiate governing structures, especially in public institutions, we note that these differ widely depending on the role, control and influence of state legislation. For the purposes of this report, we recognize the extent and potential increase of state-level control in

Pennsylvania, but we consider only the current institutional situation of Community College of Philadelphia.

The typical organizational structure of community colleges includes a Board of Trustees, usually elected or appointed by local governments, to establish policies for the institution. The trustees, in turn, appoint a chief executive or a president to carry out those policies. Reporting to the college president are vice-presidents or other officers in charge of student affairs, academic affairs, business affairs, and technological affairs. Most faculties are organized around academic departments with department heads that report to either deans, provosts or academic vice-presidents. As institutions expand to branch campuses, branch campus administrative structures develop which at times evolve into multi-campus community college "districts."

B. Collective Bargaining

Most documents we read described models of college governance in which the specific academic interests of faculty and their academic departments are expressed through organizations distinct from their unions. The community colleges we visited had Faculty Senates and committees with roles in governance structures or other representative assemblies co-existing with unions.

The American Federation of Teachers in "The Truth About Unions and Shared Governance" states that "Unions

and collective bargaining should not replace effective shared governance structures." (AFT, p.5) In their paper "Shared Governance in Colleges and Universities," the Higher Education Program and Policy Council of the AFT also states that "All college and university employees should have a guaranteed voice in decision making, a role in shaping policy in the areas of their expertise." (AFT, p.8)

Every collective bargaining agreement defines the parties to the negotiation. In all the collective bargaining agreements at Community College of Philadelphia, the rights of the Board of Trustees are clearly pronounced: "The Board, at its discretion, shall exercise the right, in accordance with applicable laws, to manage all operations including the direction of employees and facilities and property of the College, except as modified by this agreement." All governance is essentially, legally, vested in the Board and modified as a result of collective bargaining.

> The union and its contract(s) is one form of governance. It is in particular a way to strengthen governance by incorporating governance structures into contracts that clearly delineate an active role for faculty… (AFT "Statement on Shared Governance," p.9)
> Higher education unions provide employees with a legally protected role in shared governance. (AFT publication "The Truth About Unions and Shared Governance," p.6)

The provisions of collective bargaining agreements usually are subject to grievance procedures for the resolution of conflicts or disagreements.

With the arrival of collective bargaining, in most community colleges, the academic department heads were designated as administrators and thus not included in the faculty bargaining unit. However, this distinction is not universal and even where it seems to be in place, department heads govern their departments as members of the faculty. Some studies of the department head role have identified over 50 specified responsibilities. These include personnel evaluation and promotion, curricular objectives, evaluating instructional materials, scheduling, resolution of staff and student complaints, budget supervision, and tenure decisions.

In the 1970s, as collective bargaining gained influence in American colleges and universities, department heads who used to hire and fire instructors found their prerogatives abridged as collective bargaining brought more shared governance to faculties negotiating their working conditions directly with administrators. [See Lombardi in Cohen and Brawer, p.130 ff.]

Contracts may cover areas such as the rights of the bargaining agents, hiring procedures, evaluation procedures, grievance processes, class size, working conditions (office space, parking, etc.) and academic matters such as scheduling, committee assignments, curriculum decision making and the responsibilities of various institutional officers such as department heads, deans and vice-presidents. Once collective bargaining entered these areas of institutional

management, all relations and regulations could be negotiated between the parties to collective bargaining.

> Collective bargaining drew a legal line between members of the bargaining unit and those outside it ---- between faculty, on the one side, and administrators and trustees, on the other. It also expanded the number of detailed rules of procedure. It prevented administrators from making ad hoc decisions about class size or scheduling, faculty assignments, department structures, budget allocations, funding of special projects, and a myriad of other matters, great and small. It forced a more formalized, impersonal pattern of interaction, denying whatever vestige of collegiality the staff in community colleges might have valued. It brought the role of the legal expert to the fore and magnified the number of people who must be consulted each time a decision is considered.
> (Cohen and Brawer, p.134)

C. Leadership

The success of governance at any institution seems to depend significantly on the collegiality and cooperation of the constituent members. Trust, cooperation and good-will can result in good governance even when structures are unwieldy and complex. Trust and cooperation seem to vanish when structures are obscure, ignored, thwarted and unresponsive. Even good structures, well-designed committee systems, assemblies and councils, fail when relations among the members are hostile, uncooperative and motivated by individual self-interest.

Meta-studies of collegiate governance have consistently shown that access to information, clear structures and lines of responsibility, and participation among "stake-holders"

contribute to perceptions of adequacy with respect to college governance. The findings of these studies, however, indicate that there is, at best, only a weak relationship between the kinds of governance structures adopted and the results observed on campuses. (Kaplan, p. 27) "It is not, then, structures such as the faculty senate that give voice to the faculty. Rather, it is a commitment on the part of administrators and boards to hear the voice of the faculty." (Kaplan, p. 32)

As successful collegiate governance depends on cooperation among participants, it also is significantly dependent on institutional leadership.

> Why are some colleges consistently more successful than others in effecting student learning, sustaining staff morale, presenting a positive public image, managing growth, raising funds, and answering every challenge promptly and efficiently? According to many commentators, leadership is the answer. The successful colleges are blessed with the proper leaders: people who know how to guide their colleagues, stimulating each to put forth the maximum effort toward attaining the proper goals...
>
> In an institution where the product --- human learning --- is infinite and the lines of authority are not clearly demarcated, one does not issue orders and expect them to be obeyed pro forma. The astute leader knows that delivering broadsides, memoranda, newsletters and the like has little influence on the way decisions are made or people behave. Face-to-face contact, small group meetings and one-on-one explanations are the dominant influences. Administrators who exercise leadership interact with the people involved. They personally negotiate among warring factions and talk with those who are instrumental in implementing new methods or procedures. They do not take everyone's advice or

> imply that they are going to, but they do ask
> questions, listen to answers, and take them into
> account when it is time to make decisions.
> (Cohen and Brawer, p. 135 ff)

Obviously, the definition of the effective leader, here imagined as the administrator, could just as easily be applied to any of the loci of power in a school: the department heads, the affective and instrumental leaders of the faculty, the members of committees, the teachers in the classroom.

D. What Is Good Governance?

Middle States Standard Four answers this question (see Appendix C). Given that the legally defined, actual governing body is the Board of Trustees, Middle States Standard Four sets specific expectations for the governance characteristics of an accredited institution. These include:

1. a well-defined system of collegial governance including written policies which are readily available to all;

2. written governing documents such as by-laws, charters, or other documents that delineate the governance structure, assign authority, and provide for the involvement of appropriate institutional constituencies and for the selection of members;

3. some opportunity for student influence regarding decisions that affect them;

4. governing groups which are capable of reflecting constituent interests and whose members have sufficient expertise to assure that the group's responsibilities can be fulfilled.

Studies of collegiate governance focus as much on effectiveness as on structure. When constituents perceive governance as effective it is because they recognize that "Effectiveness is the value of achieving a quality decision and that it is based on competence." (Schuster, 1994, p. 87) Equally, "Effectiveness is a match between the expectations of constituents and how the process and outcomes evolve." (Birnbaum, p.7)

The impulse to reform governance often concentrates on aspects of the structure with the supposition that changing structures can improve efficiency and efficacy. "The majority [of the research] suggests that structure has an impact on efficiency, but does little to improve effectiveness." (Kezar, p.38)

It appears from the literature that attempts to require shared governance or to "reform" governance to broaden participation result in no improvement in the quality of committee meetings or in the level of trust between faculty and administrators. Some researchers found that shared governance slowed down decision making and polarized constituents. In colleges, most of the literature assumes, as do campus leaders, that the benefits of improved campus

communications, understanding of the issues and higher levels of participation clearly off-set the burden of some inefficiency which is the price of community involvement in governance. (Dykes, p. 10)

> The effectiveness of institutions is not based on efficiency and speed, but on reliability and trust, and any process that makes it possible to make good decisions more quickly also makes it possible to make bad decisions more quickly. Faculty involvement in shared governance may slow down the decision-making process, but it also assures more thorough discussion and provides the institution with a sense of order and stability.
>
> (Kerr, p.187)

E. Faculty

It is universally recognized that faculty have specific professional interests which are vital to the success of colleges. Faculty place great value on collegiality; colleges recognize that faculty are the source of expertise in teaching, academic content, and in academic decision making for courses, programs, standards. Faculty have unique interests in academic freedom and intellectual property rights, and in curriculum development and educational quality. These are all related to instruction, the core function of a collegiate institution. At most colleges and universities in the United States, institutional governance is shared with the faculty.

ক্রও

Part Three: What We Learned From Other Colleges

Brookdale Community College	LaGuardia Community College
Peter F. Burnham, President	*Gail O. Mellow, President*
Burlington County College	Camden County College
Robert C. Messina, Jr., President	*Phyllis Della Vecchia, President*

The committee contacted four neighboring and similarly situated community colleges. Based on our interviews with the presidents of three of these institutions, we discern several general characteristics.

When governance is considered successful, the governance processes are honest and participants are able to put self-interest aside. Most members of the community have a clear understanding of governance processes. Important attributes of good governance are good communication and trust. Minutes are shared and widely distributed to everyone. Policy decisions are shared via published documents, e-mail and web sites. A cooperative environment is an essential requirement in which governance groups share information, use good data and solve problems together.

Every college we contacted has some form of Faculty Senate, or academic forum whose members are faculty. We found that some effort is made to include classified employees and students, but in none of the colleges we visited did these groups have central or determining roles.

Faculty unions participate in governance through collective bargaining. In the colleges we visited, the functions of academic governance, and the professional rights and responsibilities of the faculty, are distinct from the contracts which result from collective bargaining. In these community colleges, collective bargaining produced contracts as a result of negotiations on wages, hours, and working conditions only - nothing academic.

We observed that it is typical for the Faculty Senate to receive proposals, usually after standing committees or deans approve. The Faculty Senate will approve or amend the proposals, which then go to the President for implementation.

Committees govern every college. Committees of different types, forms, functions and size operate on every campus we visited or read about. Typically, significant governing committees include representation from academic and student affairs divisions. They cover matters related to academic policies, student life, facilities and programs, support services, athletics, counseling, library services, advising, curriculum development and faculty professional development.

All colleges seem to face similar problems related to governance. It is difficult to encourage high participation in committees and in faculty senates. Student representation is deemed desirable by all, and rarely is effective.

A common concern seems to be that members of the institutional community have less than desirable awareness of

the structure and functions of governance. Keeping everyone fully informed about decision making appears to be a critical and often neglected function of leadership.

When governance is successful, it is always associated with clear and timely communications and structures with precise organizational rules or by-laws. Each organizational structure has a constitution or set of by-laws which contains a preamble, and definitions of membership, voting procedures, officers, and rules for the conduct of meetings and means for adopting changes to the organization. Notification of meetings, the agendas for meetings and the minutes of meetings are widely distributed.

> Governance clarifies the areas of faculty responsibility in decision making and separates this from labor negotiations and contract maintenance. By insisting on a written constitution and by-laws for [governance structures], I hope to ensure system integrity and build trust that the Board and the President value consultation and advice.
> Dr. Phyllis Della Vecchia, President
> Camden County College

At one institution consulted by members of this committee, governance is given its own committee to oversee the governance structure and to insure adequate dissemination of information.

<p style="text-align:center">∾∾∾</p>

Part Four: What We Learned from Focus Groups and Interviews at Community College of Philadelphia

A. Perceptions of Governance at the College

The Committee met with many faculty, administrators and students to understand the perceptions of governance at Community College of Philadelphia.

What emerged from these meetings and interviews were mixed impressions of governance at the College. Most found the process remote, unwieldy and obscure. Yet, those reporting such perceptions were those least likely to be interested in personally participating in governance. The more a person's perception was that governance was not clear, or that decisions were not communicated, the more likely it would be that that person had not and did not participate in any form of governance.

There were those who did perceive the governance structure clearly and who found it workable. These tended to be the individuals who are the high participators and those with particular roles and interests. For a significant number of those to whom we spoke, perception of governance efficacy was directly related to the individual's satisfaction with the results of governance.

Yet, overall, it is clear that a majority of our community believes that governance structure is not clear, that participation is not broad, that decisions are made without

adequate preparation and communication, that policy changes do not receive sufficient attention by those affected.

Some respondents told us that they believed the administration did not communicate its intentions nor welcome the involvement of faculty. Many respondents believe that the faculty and staff union is the only venue for faculty participation in governance, and that the union's vested interests impede appropriate and necessary academic deliberations and policy action.

The focus groups and interviews revealed these particular and widely-held perceptions:

- <u>The system has a traditional structure that is no longer suited to the dynamic and community-sensitive nature of community colleges</u>.

    There were a number of complaints both by administrators and faculty that it takes too long to get things done, thereby interfering with our ability to be agile in this competitive educational economy. Some believe that the problem is not that there is not sufficient broad-based governance, but too much. While universal participation may be desirable, the College may be in a situation where nothing can be done until everyone is in agreement. This situation almost guarantees that decision making will be slow, burdensome, even exhausting for participants.

- **The administration, in its efforts to be responsive to the marketplace, has been disregarding governance procedures.**

A number of people seem to feel that the faculty is being cut out of decisions that involve faculty. Middle level administrators are also feeling left out of the decision-making process. The Faculty and Staff Federation reacts to efforts to respond to marketplace demands on the part of the administration by filing a number of grievances. Conversely, administrators feel that the Faculty and Staff Federation is being too rigid in defending the contract.

- **There is a need for an independent faculty voice.**

Many faculty members feel they have been left out of the governance equation, or feel that its domination by the Faculty and Staff Federation is hindering their ability to participate. These voices call for some type of Faculty Senate selected independently of the administration and the union, but having a legitimate voice in governance.

- **Too few faculty participate in the governance system.**

The number of faculty who get involved with governance activities is relatively small and insufficient. The efforts of the Faculty and Staff Federation to get faculty to participate does not seem to be as fruitful as it should be. Mid-level administrators made it very clear

that their assigned responsibilities substantially limit the time they have available for participation in governance activities.

- **The level of distrust at the College is making us a dysfunctional organization when it comes to collegial governance.**

This is a major complaint. Unilateral actions on the part of the administration only serve to intensify this distrust. In addition, actions by the Faculty and Staff Federation leadership have also created an atmosphere of distrust and alienation among some of the faculty and classified staff. Efforts by the union to resist actions initiated by the administration inhibit change and progress. Classified staff members feel they are completely left out of the governance system when their voices are not heard about day-to-day activities that affect them. While it is common for such a large organization to have a certain level of distrust, respondents felt that what is happening at this College is far above acceptable levels and needs to be addressed.

- **Effective communication on matters related to governance is inadequate.**

There were complaints by various administrators, faculty and classified staff that they do not know what is going on. They feel "out of the loop." They believe that

there is a strong top-down management approach that
excludes their input.

This committee has found few examples of administrative
directives without appropriate faculty influence. Standing
Committees are active. A number of new programs, curricula
and courses have reshaped the academic profile of the College
significantly. Regulations regarding everything from smoking
on campus, to security, to the uses of educational technology
have all been implemented with broad governance
participation by all constituent groups. The Department Heads
have formed a Department Heads' Council which meets
regularly. The Faculty and Staff Federation have formed a
Faculty Council on Education which meets regularly. The
Academic Affairs Council (also called the Deans' Council)
meets regularly with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs.
The staff of the Vice-President for Student Affairs functions as
a Student Affairs Council. The College President regularly
holds meetings with faculty, staff and students in open
forums. A failure, therefore, may be that our governance is
not well communicated.

B. Governance and the Classified Staff

The situation of the classified staff at Community College
of Philadelphia requires special attention. The responsibilities
of classified staff are established in the specific job

descriptions for the positions they hold. As staff, members of the classified staff bargaining unit are instrumental for the adequate functioning of the institution. Classified staff operationalize the corporate functions of the College. The effectiveness of the classified staff depends on the fair, appropriate and considerate relationships between supervisors and employees.

The classified staff bargaining unit at Community College of Philadelphia is a separate bargaining unit from the Full-time faculty and the Adjunct faculty. The classified contract contains provisions related to wages, hours and the working conditions of employment. The terms of the contract are subject to a grievance procedure.

Classified staff have strongly indicated to this committee their desire to more fully participate in decision making in their areas of responsibility. It is a common perception among classified staff that the line relationship between decision-makers who instruct supervisors who then in turn instruct employees is largely a one-way street. The classified staff are organized in a hierarchical structure which is not responsive to the influence of those in the lower elements of that structure. Employees find that only when they can move up in the hierarchy do they have a chance to influence decisions, and that such upward mobility is difficult to achieve.

Classified staff have access to institutional governance through the Faculty and Staff Federation and in their

representation of the Faculty and Staff Federation when they are appointed to institutional committees.

C. Governance and the Students

It is an ideal in most academic institutions to invite the participation of students. Students are central to the very idea of a college and their involvement in the college is generally perceived to be in both their educational interest as well as that of the institution.

There is a direct relationship between student participation in governance and student involvement in the life of the institution. That is, the more intimate, consistent and extensive a student's relationship with the school and the faculty, the greater the likelihood of that student's participation in institutional life. Four-year, private, liberal arts colleges are therefore more likely to exhibit student participation in governance which is closer to the ideal.

We find in our review that governance in community colleges tend to favor faculty and staff rights and status over student participation. "That students have, in reality, any meaningful role in the governance at community colleges seems hardly even debatable." (Cohen and Brawer, p.105)

Community colleges, in general, do not foster close relationships among the students or between the students and the college itself. Commuter students tend to "use" the college, rather than "belong" to it. Students have needs and desires;

they can, do and should express their preferences regarding how the institution functions and how it meets their needs. But commuter students are less likely to be interested in, or committed to, life within the institution.

Students want an institution that provides clear admissions and registration processes, competent instruction, adequate facilities, appropriate guidance and achievable standards. To the extent that an institution does not meet these needs, some students may be sufficiently motivated to join the governance process to effect change. We think that many students, however, simply endure institutional inadequacies by finding compensatory means for "getting through" their programs. Students rarely have institutional improvement as one of their goals. The students come to an institution to further personal and individual objectives which are consequent to the acquisition of a degree.

It is commonplace to refer to the special concerns of commuter students in large cities. Students are, just like the professional staff, members of families, caretakers of parents and children, often employed and bearers of other responsibilities which affect their educational plans. But we must recognize that for many students their institutional relationship with their college is little different from the relationship of passengers in a flight lounge to the airport itself. Passengers are trying to get somewhere else. They want the airport to work, be acceptably comfortable (or at least not

harmful), for equipment to function as advertised and for the processes to achieve the desired aims. But they are not likely to want to get involved in the inner workings of the airport, its internal issues and employee relationships, its "governance," unless failures in those areas disrupt or inhibit their plans and needs.

The College must consider, however, not only whether the students "need" access to the governance structure, but also whether the college itself "needs" student involvement. Because of the nature of the educational enterprise, it would be foolish to exclude or ignore the benefits to the institution from student participation.

Even in a large, urban, commuter institution such as Community College of Philadelphia, it would be both unwise and, perhaps, unfair to those students who are interested in institutional governance not to provide some effective means for their participation.

<div style="text-align:center">∽∾</div>

Part Five: Community College of Philadelphia: The Current Governance Structure

The labor contracts are the principal written agreements we have, to date, about shared governance at Community College of Philadelphia. The primary contract, that of the Full-time Faculty, specifies full-time faculty workload, scheduling, hiring, academic rank, faculty evaluation, the condition of tenure, class size, the college calendar, agreement on academic freedom, maintenance of personnel records, involvement in changes to institutional structure and a grievance procedure. Through the Full-time Faculty Contract, with the establishment of standing committees and a governance procedure leading to policy implementation, the Board has recognized the rights and responsibilities of the faculty in the governance of the college.

In ways not specified in the contract, yet consistent with it, the faculty may also act through their academic departments or through shared governance structures which have developed. There is no contractual limitation on the rights of the College to recognize various committees and councils as units of governance.

The current governance of the College that is defined and delineated in the Full-time Faculty Contract calls for three standing committees to parallel the Standing Committees of the Board of Trustees: Academic Affairs, Business Affairs and

Student Affairs. A fourth, the Technology Coordinating Committee is also established by contract. The Academic Affairs Standing Committee has evolved into two subcommittees, one on curriculum and the other on academic support. All the Standing Committees report to an Institution-Wide Committee (hereinafter called the IWC). The IWC is the committee which receives reports and recommendations from the Standing Committees and, in turn, makes its recommendations on policy and procedures to the College President.

Other structures also exist. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs holds monthly meetings of the General Faculty. She also meets regularly with the academic division deans and other administrators. This body has been termed the Deans' Council or the Academic Affairs Council. The Vice-President for Student Affairs meets regularly with senior staff, the Student Affairs Council. The department heads have formed a Department Heads' Council and the Faculty and Staff Federation (the union) has formed a Faculty Council on Education.

This Committee does not find governance at Community College of Philadelphia to be ineffective and unresponsive. Examples of effective institutional responsiveness are too numerous to list, but they certainly can be found in areas such as utilization of technology, raising funds, establishing joint business and industry programs, offering new courses,

degree programs and certificates. The College discharges its management responsibilities with regard to facilities, administrative services, human resources, and payroll and finances and similar aspects of institutional management which are not delineated in the collective bargaining agreements.

Our college governance, however, exists in a context. The effectiveness of our institutional governance is not as apparent as it should be. An unacceptably high proportion of members of this community feel uninformed. It is likely that the College is not flexible enough to respond optimally to current conditions. Independent institutional governance and academic prerogative are being eroded by forces external to the college, such as those affecting funding.

If there is to be change, it must be at least as much in the area of the institutional culture as in specific areas for structural change. The social aspect of shared governance cannot be underestimated; likewise people's perceptions of legitimacy and fairness. Governance without following the procedures accepted by the faculty will very likely be considered unfair and therefore unacceptable. To maximize cooperation and mutual respect, the status and importance of the faculty role are critical.

Governance at Community College of Philadelphia is modeled on traditional educational institutions that give priority to teaching and learning. We prize academic freedom

and open discussion of proposals and ideas. That the present governance can be criticized for being slow, even frustrating, is largely because we respect the participation of those affected by decisions and because we value full and careful review before actions are taken.

Shared governance, as we understand it, is cumbersome, but essential. Shared governance which can tolerate the frustrations which come with the academic style may even be a luxury, one for which we might one day, regrettably, be nostalgic. "As institutions become less academic, governance is less likely to be shared, and as governance is less shared, institutions are likely to become less academic." (Birnbaum, p.11) Various market forces, we are warned, will "attempt to make academic institutions into something else, so much so that [those institutions are] no longer recognizable and identified as the entity [they were] supposed to be." (Gumport, p.85)

∞∞

Part Six: Critical Issues

Based on our review of governance at Community College of Philadelphia, we have identified five critical issues.

1. Communication: Improved communication within the institution is as important as any structural reform. We believe that we must create the means to improve communication and supply everyone with all the necessary information regarding decision making. This will require an investment of persons and resources. We believe that clarification of the governance structure is exceptionally important.

2. Participation: Low participation in governance is disruptive and impedes decision making. Participation must be meaningful and in some ways rewarding.

3. Structure: The structure of governance, to be effective, must allow some degree of continuity from one level to the next. Discussions of policy proposals should evolve as a "continuing conversation," rather than beginning entirely anew at each level of governance. The organization and the process of moving proposals to implementation need to be transparent.

4. Institutional Culture: Our institutional culture does not foster or promote trust and confidence. To the extent possible, the adversarial stance between faculty and administration must be ameliorated.

5. Agility: The College is in a competitive educational environment that requires our ability to develop courses and programs in a timely manner. It is important that we have an appropriate governance structure to support these efforts to assure what we do is educationally sound and in keeping with our mission.

❧❧❧

Part Seven: Recommendations

Our recommendations are consistent with the following basic principles for the governance of academic institutions.

1. Governance requires that those directly affected by or who are responsible for implementing a policy are involved in the formulation of that policy to the extent reasonably possible. Employees have an interest in matters such as planning, budgeting and hiring of faculty, staff and administrators.

2. Effective college governance requires extensive and open communication between and among the members and constituencies of the college community.

3. Management has specific responsibilities to operate the institution effectively.

4. Faculty have a primary role in academic matters, such as programs, curriculum, instruction, and educational policy and standards.

5. Governance must take into account the institutional mission and the interests of students.

We offer the following recommendations for the improvement, clarification and effectiveness of shared institutional governance at Community College of Philadelphia. We have resisted the temptation to proffer an entirely new design for governance. We do, instead, propose modifying the present governance system to insure that most

of those essential features of academic governance are included.

The recommendations are modest, staying within the forms codified in the collective bargaining agreements and in current practice. All the recommendations are well within the capacity of current governance to accommodate. Some, however, will require the incorporation of these recommendations as proposals to the negotiating teams for inclusion in the relevant collective bargaining agreements.

☼

I. The first set of recommendations addresses improvements in communication of governance processes.

    1. All deliberative bodies with a role in college governance (union, departments, standing committees and councils, etc.) shall establish regular, announced and publicized meetings, announce their agendas, their meeting times and locations, and shall also make available copies of their minutes to all members of the college community.

    2. The College shall provide a Manual on Governance with thorough descriptions of the governance units of the College, the responsibilities of each, an organization chart, and information to help every member of the community understand the procedures for moving proposals to resolution and implementation. This manual should be very specific.

    3. The College shall appoint a Special Assistant for Governance who would coordinate governance procedures, communicate information related to governance, schedule and announce meetings as needed, and provide for the distribution to the community at large all materials related to governance. The Special Assistant for Governance shall not make policy or recommend policy changes, but will coordinate the operations of the governance structure.

The Special Assistant will keep records of the agendas and minutes of the several Standing Committees, the General Faculty, and the Councils, and will ensure that this information is widely circulated.

When it is not clear to which committee a proposal should be referred, the Special Assistant will decide to which committee it will be referred.

The Special Assistant should operate to bring efficiency and order to the governance structure. Such a Special Assistant, operating as a coordinator of the governance system, could link the Standing Committees to a college-wide agenda.

☼

II. These recommendations identify governance bodies and standing committees. They provide for meetings of the General Faculty, for five Standing Committees and for a Special Committee for Innovative Projects.

1. Meetings of the General Faculty shall be chaired by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and shall serve as a faculty forum for the dissemination of information, and for discussion of issues and concerns.

2. The proposed Governance Manual (see I, 2) shall identify the areas of responsibility of the Standing Committees as follows:

a. The Standing Committee on Student Affairs shall receive all proposals related to Student Services, Student Judicial affairs, Admissions and Enrollment, Financial Aid, Student Activities, Co-curricular Activities, Athletics, Student Cultural Activities, etc.

b. The Standing Committee on Business Affairs shall receive all proposals related to facilities, service contracts, administrative operations, business planning, corporate affairs, calendar, etc.

c. The Standing Committee on Academic Affairs shall receive all proposals related to academic policy matters such as courses, programs, curricula, academic standing, academic procedures, etc.

d. The Standing Committee on Academic Support Services shall receive all proposals related to Academic

Advising, Library, Educational Support Services, Counseling, Learning Lab, etc.

e. The Technology Coordinating Committee shall receive all proposals related to college-wide guidelines, standards, and planning for all aspects of information technology.

f. There shall be a Special Committee on Innovative Projects. (See Item V, below.)

3. There shall be written by-laws or procedural rules for each governance committee or council. Such documents shall contain a preamble, definitions of membership, voting procedures, officers, and rules for the conduct of meetings and a means for adopting changes to the organization. All governance groups should adopt a minimum standard of parliamentary processes for decision making. (See Appendix E, or similar.)

4. Standing Committees do not make recommendations directly to the President.

5. Recommendations approved by Standing Committees must go to the IWC.

6. Any member of the community --- students, staff, faculty or administrators, or the Councils --- may make proposals to a Standing Committee.

☼

III. These recommendations will support improvement in standing committee functioning and composition.

1. The most important factor in selecting committee members should be their interest in the area of the committee's purview. Members should also have the skills and perspective to contribute to institutional governance.

2. New members of Standing Committees should receive orientation to the work of the committee to which the new member is appointed.

3. The Standing Committees on Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, Academic Support, and the Technology Coordinating Committee should have 12 members, six full-time faculty members appointed by the Union and six members appointed by the Administration. These members should be appointed for staggered two-year terms.

4. The Standing Committee on Student Affairs should provide for student voting representation. This committee shall have four full-time faculty members appointed by the union, four administrators appointed by the President, and four student representatives appointed by the Student Government Association.

☼

IV. This recommendation proposes a training program for new Department Heads.

    1. Considering that much of the responsibility of a department head involves some aspect of college governance, and given that many department heads are not trained for their positions as administrators, we recommend that a training program be conducted for all new department heads to provide orientation to their management role.

☼

V. This recommendation will provide the institution with needed flexibility to respond rapidly to fluctuations in the external environment, which may have an impact on the College.

    1. The College shall establish a Special Committee on Innovative Projects which can, and only at the request of the College President, exempt proposals from the review of other Standing Committees and/or the IWC. The members of the Special Committee for Innovative Projects shall have four members: two members of the Union Executive Committee and two senior administrators.

☼

VI. This recommendation proposes reconstituting the membership of the Institution-Wide Committee.

    1. The IWC shall be composed of the Co-Presidents of the Faculty and Staff Federation, one Dean appointed by the College President, the Chairs of the Standing Committees and Chairs of the Councils. The IWC shall review recommendations of Standing Committees for amendment or approval to be forwarded to the president for implementation.

☼

VII. To improve access to information for classified employees, and to provide a forum for their participation in decisions which affect them, we propose the creation of a Classified Employees Council.

    1. The Classified Employees Council shall be open to all members of the Classified Employees bargaining unit. The Council will provide an open forum for classified employees to consider issues, debate them and make recommendations to supervisors, and the Standing Committees.

☼

VIII. This recommendation proposes the creation of a Student Council to provide a forum for student involvement in college governance.

　　1. We recommend the replacement of student representation on the Standing Committees on Academic Affairs, Academic Support and Business Affairs with a Student Council made up of the Student Government Association officers and members, and open to broad student participation. Student voting representation shall be provided for in the composition of the Standing Committee on Student Affairs.

　　2. The Dean of Students in collaboration with the Student Government Association shall create a Student Council organized and chaired by members of the Student Government Association. As with other Councils, the Student Council may submit proposals and make recommendations to the Standing Committees. (See IX, following.)

☼

IX. These recommendations consider the roles of ad hoc governance structures: the Academic Affairs Council (sometimes called the Deans' Council), the Student Affairs Council (the staff of the Vice-President for Student Affairs), the Department Heads' Council, the Faculty Council on Education, the Classified Employees Council (see VII, above), and the Student Council (see VIII, above).

    1. Councils may act as forums for their constituent members, providing opportunity for discussion of issues and concerns specific to the constituent group.

    2. Councils may make recommendations to the Standing Committees.

<div align="center">⋙⋘</div>

Part Eight: Summary

The recommendations of this committee preserve the essential structure of governance at Community College of Philadelphia. That structure is based on the role of Standing Committees to consider policies and procedures and to forward recommendations to an Institution-Wide Committee which in turn makes recommendations to the College President for implementation.

We believe that certain changes should be effected. In our recommendations, we suggest insuring that governance information be widely circulated. The College must provide a Manual on Governance outlining the structure and function of elements of shared governance. We recommend that a Special Assistant be appointed whose function should be to coordinate governance activities and publicize them.

We recommend that the two sub-committees of the current Standing Committee on Academic Affairs be each identified as Standing Committees, one as the Standing Committee on Academic Affairs and the other as the Standing Committee on Academic Support.

We recommend changes in the membership of the Standing Committees for Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, Academic Support and the Technology Coordinating Committee such that committee membership shall be six members of the faculty appointed by the Faculty and Staff Federation and six members appointed by the administration,

each to serve for staggered two-year terms. We believe these committees should not include students as voting members.

We also propose the creation of a Special Committee for Innovative Projects to consider those as yet unforeseen situations which might require a rapid response to special circumstances.

We recommend the continuance of the IWC as the senior committee to receive proposals from the Standing Committees and Councils. We propose that the membership should be such that the IWC can function in a more "senatorial" role. Specifically, we propose that IWC membership include a spectrum of institutional members which will insure continuity in the discussion of the various proposals before the IWC. We therefore identify the members of the IWC not by their source of appointment, but by institutional function. Broad participation is assured by increasing the size of the IWC with the inclusion of the chairs of the several Standing Committees and the chairs of the Councils.

We support the opportunities that the creation of the several Councils provides. Taken with the Standing Committees, the Councils provide each constituent group with access to the governance structure. Through the Councils, all community members have access to forums where issues may be discussed and debated and from which proposals may be forwarded to the relevant standing committee for further action. The current Councils are the Academic Affairs Council,

the Student Affairs Council, the Department Heads' Council and the Faculty Council on Education.

We propose the creation of a Classified Employees Council to provide a forum for all classified employees to discuss and consider various issues of concern and through this council to have access to standing committees.

We believe student participation is in the interest of both students and the institution. We have proposed recommendations which insure student participation through a Student Council and through voting membership on both the Standing Committee on Student Affairs and on the IWC.

These recommendations are refinements of the general outline of governance at Community College of Philadelphia and we offer them in the hope that they will lead to more focused governance while providing a high degree of opportunity for participation by those who may wish to do so.

It is our hope that the changes recommended would engender increased commitment to and trust in the governance process for the ultimate purpose of fulfilling the mission of Community College of Philadelphia.

આ⁓

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfred, Richard L. "Shared Governance in Community College." Center for Community College Policy, Education Commission of the States. Denver, 1999.

American Federation of Teachers. "Shared Governance in Colleges and Universities." A Statement by the Higher Education Program and Policy Council, Item no. 36-0696, n.d.

American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association. "The Truth About Unions." A Joint Publication of the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association, Item no. 36-0705, n.d.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). "Statement on Collective Bargaining." Washington, D.C., AAUP, 1984.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). "Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities, 1967." Policy Documents and Reports, 9th ed. Washington, D.C., AAUP, 2001.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. AGB Statement on Institutional Governance and Governing in the Public Trust: External Influences on Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C., AGB, 2001.

Birnbaum, Robert. "The End of Shared Governance." New Directions for Higher Education, No. 3, Fall, 2004.

Baldridge, J. Victor (Ed.) Academic Governance. Berkeley, McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1971.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. <u>The Control of the Campus</u>. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1982.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. "Governance and Administration – Managing the Contemporary College." <u>The American Community College</u>, 4th ed. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Corson, John J. <u>Governance of Colleges and Universities</u>. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Dykes, Arthur R. <u>Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making</u>. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1968.

Fryer, Thomas W. "An Overarching Purpose for Institutional Governance." <u>Leadership Abstracts</u>, Vol. 1, no. 11, June, 1988.

Fryer, Thomas W. Jr., and John Lovas. "Leadership in Governance." <u>Leadership Abstracts</u>, Vol. 4, no. 2, February, 1991.

Gumport, Patricia J. "Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives." <u>Higher Education</u>, no. 39, (2000) 67-91.

Kaplan, Gabriel E. "Do Governance Structures Matter?" <u>New Directions for Higher Education</u>, No. 127, Fall, 2004.

Kerr, Clark. "Governance and Functions, <u>Daedalus</u>, Vol. 99, no. 1, (1970) 108-121.

Kerr, Clark. <u>The Uses of the University</u>. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1963.

Kezar, Adrianna. "What is More Important to Effective Governance: Relationships, Trust and Leadership, or Structures and Formal Processes?" <u>New Directions for Higher Education</u>, No. 127, Fall, 2004.

Lechuga, Vicente M. "Exploring Current Issues on Shared Governance." <u>New Directions for Higher Education</u>, No. 127, Fall, 2004.

Meyer, Heinz-Dieter, and Alain E. Kaloyeros. "What Campuses Can Do to Pick Up the Pace of Decision Making." <u>The Chronicle of Higher Education</u>, Vol. 51, no. 40, June 10, 2005, B16.

Mitchell, Grace N., Ann B. Grant and Marilyn Rossa. "Shared Governance: Keys to a Successful Process." Middle States, Standard Four: "Leadership and Governance." <u>Leadership Abstracts</u>, Vol. 5, no. 10, December, 1992.

Palmer, Susanne. "A Brief History of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education," Widener University, Chester, PA, 1999.

Schuetz, Pam. "Shared Governance in Community Colleges." ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, Los Angeles, 1999, ED433077.

Schuster, Jack H. <u>Strategic Governance: How to Make Big Decisions Better</u>. ACE/Oryx, 1994.

Schuster, Jack H., Lynn H. Miller, and Associates. <u>Governing Tomorrow's Campus: Perspectives and Agendas</u>. New York, American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989.

Tierney, William G., and Vicente M. Lechuga (Eds.) "Restructuring Shared Governance in Higher Education." <u>New Directions for Higher Education</u>, No. 127, Fall 2004.

Yamada, Myrtle. "Joint Big Decision Committees and University Governance," in <u>Faculty in Governance: The Role of Senates and Joint Committees in Academic Decision Making.</u> R. Birnbaum (Ed.) New Directions for Higher Education, No. 75, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Appendix A

A Chart of Governance
As Proposed

The Administrative Organization Chart

Appendix B

The AGB Statement on Institutional Governance

Appendix C

The Middle States Standard Four: Leadership and Governance

Appendix D

Community College of Philadelphia
Strategic Plan, Part III
"Restructuring for the Future"

Appendix E

A Model for Parliamentary Procedures for Use by Committees and Councils

By-Laws for the XYZ Committee/Council

Article 1.
Meetings of the Committee

1.1   Business Meetings

A. The business of the Committee requiring approval of the members of the Committee shall be conducted at scheduled meetings, the agenda for which are announced in advance.

B. The Head of the Committee shall chair meetings except that in the absence of the Committee Head, or, that if the Committee Head shall choose to pass the gavel for the duration of a particular motion and subsequent debate, the members present may elect a president pro tempore by simple majority vote who shall then conduct the meeting.

1.1.2 Regular Committee Meetings

A. Regular Committee meetings shall be held at least once during each Fall and Spring semester of the academic year.

1.1.3 Special Meetings

A. The Head of the Committee may call special meetings and shall announce the time, place and agenda for such meeting.

1.1.4 Inservice Meetings

A. The Committee shall meet during the week before the beginning of classes in both the Fall Semester and the Spring Semester of each academic year.

1.2   Minutes

A. Minutes shall be kept for each meeting of the Committee.

B. Minutes of previous meetings will be distributed prior to the following meeting and shall be approved by an ordinary motion as each meeting's first order of business.

Article 2
Rules for the Conduct of Committee Meetings

2.1   Quorum

A. A number equaling **X** % of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for a meeting at which a vote is to be taken.

2.2   Voting at Meetings

A. Voting at meetings shall be in accordance with the definitions of voting rights set forth in article I, section 1.2 of these By-laws.

B. Voting at meetings may be either by voice, by show of hands or by secret ballot.

C. Motions for a secret ballot shall be entertained without debate at a meeting at which a vote is to be taken and must receive the affirmation of a majority of those eligible voters present.

D. Ordinary motions made at meetings shall require a majority of those eligible voters present for passage.

2.3   The Use of Parliamentary Procedures

A. The parliamentary procedures herein set forth shall be used in the conduct of Committee meetings.

2.4   Substantive Motions

A. Issues, ideas or proposals must be framed into position statements called main motions. A motion must be seconded before it can be debated. There must be a motion "on the floor" in order for debate to occur and only one motion can be considered at a time.

B. A main motion may be debated or amended.

C. A main motion requires a majority affirmation for passage.

D. A main motion may be amended by a motion to amend the main motion. This shall be called a "first-degree" amendment.

E. A motion to amend may either be debated or amended. A motion to amend a motion to amend a main motion shall be called a "second degree" amendment. The second-degree amendment must be seconded, debated and voted upon before the first-degree amendment can be considered. The second-degree amendment may not be further amended.

F. A motion to amend a main motion must be debated and voted upon before the main motion may be considered. A motion to amend a main motion requires a majority affirmation for passage.

G. Amendments to a main motion must be debated and voted upon before a main motion as amended can be considered.

2.5   Procedural Motions

A. Procedural motions are made in the course of debate. These motions allow participants to limit debate, put the motion being debated aside, clarify procedure, ask a question, make a personal observation, or call for a re-vote on an issue.

B. Allowable Procedural Motions

1. A motion to limit debate, requires a second, is amendable but not debatable, and shall require a two-thirds vote for passage.

2. A motion to call the question asks for a vote, requires a second, is not debatable or amendable and shall require a two-thirds vote for passage.

3. A motion for adjournment requires a second, is not debatable or amendable, and shall require a majority vote for passage.

4. A motion to table a motion shall postpone debate until the motion is recalled. A motion to table a motion may specify a time for the original motion to be recalled. A motion to table requires a second, is neither debatable nor amendable, and shall require a majority vote for passage.

C. Points of Procedure

1. A participant may interrupt debate to call a point of order. A point of order questions whether correct procedure is being followed. There is no second, no debate and no vote on a point of order.

2. A participant may interrupt debate to call a point of information. A point of information asks a question about a specific

matter germane to the motion being considered the answer to which is factual. There is no second, no debate and no vote on a point of information.

3. A participant may interrupt debate to call a point of clarification. A point of clarification answers a question by providing factual information about a specific matter germane to the motion being considered. There is no second, no debate and no vote on a point of clarification.

4. A participant may interrupt debate to call a point of personal privilege. A point of personal privilege is not germane to the motion being considered, but allows the speaker to assert personal information or refute personal references. There is no second, no debate and no vote on a point of personal privilege.

2.5   Rulings from the Chair

A. The person conducting the meeting may make rulings from the chair to declare the results of voice votes, to determine which motions are in order or the relevance of points of procedure.

B. A ruling from the chair may be overturned by a motion from the floor.

C. A motion to overturn a ruling of the chair shall take precedence over other motions, shall not be debatable or amendable and shall require a two-thirds affirmative majority for passage.

2.6   Other Procedural Matters

A. Any report or position statement issued by a Committee member or members which claims to represent the Committee and which is intended for circulation outside the Committee must be submitted to the Committee for review and approval prior to its distribution. The Head of the Committee shall be exempted when implementing Committee duties.

Article 3
Adoption of and Amendments to These By-laws

3.1   Adoption of These By-laws

A. Adoption of these By-laws shall be by referendum among the voting members of the Committee.

B. Adoption of these By-laws shall require affirmation by a majority of the votes cast.

3.2   Amendments to These By-laws

A. Amendments to these By-laws shall be by referendum.

B. A motion to send a proposed amendment to referendum shall be made at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee and shall require a two-thirds majority of those voting.

3.3   Requirements for Approval of Resolutions for Amendment

A. Amendment of these By-laws shall require affirmation by referendum of a majority of the votes cast.