

To: CoADE Memebers

From: Aaron Leff, President CoADE

Date 12.29.2015

Re: Comments on CoADE Constitutional Remedy:

Dear Colleagues:

On December 4, 2015 I sent you an e-mail regarding the current make-up of the Executive Board. As noted in the e-mail (which can be viewed at www.coade-colorado.or/news), we have three sitting members on the Executive Board which is violation of Article V of the CoADE Constitution. In order to remedy this issue, we offered three different potential ways to fix this issue. Before we put the potential remedies, we opened a comment period from December 4, 2015 – December 11, 2015 to solicit your feedback on possible solutions. We received nine responses. You can read them below. We will be sending an e-mail the second week of January with voting instructions on the potential remedy.

Thank you for your dedication to our profession and students.

Sincerely,

Aaron Leff

CoADE President

- 1. I vote for option two (the one year exemption) since all of these folks are psyched to participate and we didn't know we would be in violation of the policy. Moving forward, we can be sure not to repeat that mistake*
- 2. Ask the membership by popular vote to allow for a one-year, non-precedent setting exception to the rule that would allow the current board to remain intact. This will give time to revisit the reasoning for the provision in the constitution and allow for time to reconsider it or keep it the same.*
- 3. I am fine with both option 1 and 2, but do not like the idea of option 3. As we have witnessed, it is sometimes difficult to find volunteers to serve on this important organization. I want the people who are willing to lead to help us navigate the changes we see happening in Dev. Additionally, it seems that having two representatives from the same college could be quite beneficial. For instance, the same campus allows for more formal and informal opportunities to collaborate and discuss issues.*
- 4. I think #2 seems reasonable to me. I don't think it's necessary to amend the Constitution, and asking someone to resign would be a shame when everyone from PPCC is ready and willing to serve.*
- 5. Thanks for including me on this message. I think that your group's constitution should be both ideal and realistic. If your members elected those new candidates knowing that two were from the same college, and nobody had a problem with it at the time, then I suppose that it's not really a problem. Rather than option 1 as phrased, perhaps the constitution can be changed to*

permit “no more than three” members from the same college, as “more than two” is open-ended and would also permit more than three. If not, then option 2 makes sense.

- 6. I like the Board’s second option, allow a non-precedent-setting exception for this year. I do not see any danger—of ppcc hijacking the state?--in this option, and it makes life easier for all involved.*
- 7. Personally, I think any of the solutions would work. I would prefer to amend the constitution to allow multiple members from the same institution. These are dedicated professionals who are willing to step up and take on additional responsibilities within their already busy lives and should be allowed to serve if the electorate has voted them into office. If it does get to be a problem with someone being overly power hungry we could always exercise a methodology to correct the situation, but that is unlikely to happen.*
- 8. Ask the membership by popular vote to allow for a one-year, non-precedent setting exception to the rule that would allow the current board to remain intact*
- 9. Thank you for being transparent about the CoADE Board situation. This situation has happened before. One year Karen Lemke, Cathleen Chavez and I were on the executive board. We were all from Adams State. There was no intent on our part to violate the CoADE constitution, it just happened that we were all willing to serve that year. I don't think any of us at the meeting where Cathleen and I were elected knew that we were violating the constitution. I was filling in the remaining year of the secretary position so there was not a conflict for the next year. I think it is fine to use your second solution (2. Ask the membership by popular vote to allow for a one-year, non-precedent setting exception to the rule that would allow the current board to remain intact.) so that the CoADE board can continue work without the disruption of new person coming on to the board.*