

Minutes of the MLA Delegate Assembly

THE DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MET ON 10 JANUARY 2015 AT THE VANCOUVER CONVENTION Centre. First Vice President Roland Greene presided. The assembly was called to order at 1:22 p.m. The chair made preliminary announcements about the conduct of the meeting and called for a demonstration of the electronic voting system to be used during the meeting and for an explanation of the light at the podium that would warn speakers when their allotted time was about to expire. The chair also explained that, because the meeting was open to all MLA members and to credentialed members of the press, speakers should have no expectation of confidentiality. He added that tweeting was allowed but that no photography or voice or video recording was permitted. The chair announced the quorum for the meeting, which was 77 delegates, because 153 delegates had signed in for the meeting at the beginning. [Note: Of the 269 delegates, 176 (65%) attended all or part of the meeting (see the list that follows for the names of the delegates in attendance).]

1. On behalf of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee (DAOC), Julie Rak moved the adoption of the agenda that had been sent to the assembly, subject to emergency change. The motion occasioned no discussion and no objections. The chair therefore declared the agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

Rak then offered a motion on behalf of the DAOC that the rules presented to the assembly be adopted. She reviewed the rules dealing with time limits for discussion and for speakers and noted that copies of the rules were available for observers at the back of the meeting room. Rak's motion occasioned no discussion and no objections. The chair therefore declared the rules adopted by unanimous consent.

Again on behalf of the DAOC, Rak moved that the assembly approve the minutes of the January 2014 meeting as printed in the May 2014 issue of *PMLA*. The chair asked if there were corrections. Since no corrections were offered, the chair declared the minutes approved as published.

2. The assembly elected one of its members, Shaden M. Tageldin (comparative literature, Univ. of Minnesota, Twin Cities), to the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee for a three-year term (from 12 Jan. 2015 through the close of the Jan. 2018 convention). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the current officers of the association, the assembly elected David J. Bartholomae (English, Univ. of Pittsburgh), Meta DuEwa Jones (English, Howard Univ.), L. Camille van der Marel (English, Univ. of Alberta), and Lisa Vollendorf (Spanish, San Jose State Univ.) to the Nominating Committee for two-year terms (2015–16). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the DAOC, the assembly elected the following persons to the Elections Committee for two-year terms (2015–16): Heather Dubrow (Fordham Univ., Bronx), Enrique García Santo-

Tomás (Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor), and Joshua K. Lund (Univ. of Pittsburgh).

3. The chair called on Julie Rak, chair of the DAOC, to present the DAOC's annual report. Rak drew attention to two sections of the committee's report. One dealt with the disposition of the two resolutions that had been submitted for the assembly's consideration by the 1 October deadline; the other outlined a new initiative involving the establishment of subcommittees of the assembly.

Turning to the resolutions, Rak explained that since both dealt with academic boycotts, the DAOC needed to determine whether the resolutions were in conflict and how they related to an existing resolution, Resolution 2002-1, which states that "the MLA condemn[s] boycotts and blacklists against scholars or students on the basis of nationality, ethnic origins, and religious background as unfair, divisive, and inconsistent with academic freedom." The DAOC judged that the resolutions were in conflict, which meant that the assembly could not adopt both. The committee then formulated a special procedure that would allow the assembly to consider both resolutions, but it also developed an alternative plan for considering the issue of academic boycotts, a plan that would provide opportunities for the entire MLA membership to engage in a debate about the issues arising from the resolutions. The plan included the following elements: (1) the proposers of record of both resolutions, referred to as resolution teams, would withdraw their resolutions; (2) the DAOC would devote part of the open discussion at the 2015 meeting to a discussion of boycotts; (3) each resolution team would organize a session, in debate format, for the 2016 convention; (4) each resolution team would have a highlighted area on *MLA Commons* for discussion of the issues raised by the resolutions; (5) the resolution teams would be permitted to resubmit their resolutions, perhaps with revisions, by 1 October 2016 for consideration by the 2017 Delegate Assembly; and (6) a town hall meeting open to all MLA members would be held before the Delegate Assembly meeting at the 2017 MLA convention to air the issues one last time before a potential assembly vote. Because the proposers of record of both resolutions agreed to pursue the alternative plan, the DAOC removed the resolutions from the assembly's 2015 agenda. Rak said that the agreement also necessitated a special rule concerning the submission of proposals on the same subject as the two withdrawn resolutions during the time period covered by the agreement. The DAOC had therefore prepared an addendum to its report, which the assembly would be asked to consider after the discussion of the DAOC's annual report, as submitted, had come to an end.

Rak then reviewed the DAOC's plan to establish four subcommittees of the Delegate Assembly that will provide a means for assembly members to work throughout the year on several important association issues. She said that three of the four subcommittees—on K–16 education, on MLA outreach, and on the humanities workforce—corre-

spond to Executive Council subcommittees and will allow for additional assembly input into the council's deliberations. The fourth subcommittee focuses on the functioning of the Delegate Assembly itself, including the resolution process. All the subcommittees will have space on *MLA Commons* for their work and will report their findings to the 2016 assembly. Rak asked first- and second-year delegates to indicate their interest in serving on one of the subcommittees by filling out the sign-up sheet that had been distributed to them. The sign-up sheets were collected before the assembly proceeded to the next order of business.

The chair asked if there were questions or comments on the report. There was one question, on what was meant by *humanities workforce*, to which Margaret Ferguson responded. She said that the corresponding council subcommittee was still developing its agenda but that it would address issues related to contingent labor and the working conditions of faculty members.

The chair then recognized Rak, who presented the addendum to the DAOC's report and introduced the special rule, which read as follows:

The Delegate Assembly will not consider motions or resolutions on academic or institutional boycotts of Israel or on matters related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict until the January 2017 meeting.

Rak said that the resolution teams had expressed concern about the possible submission of similar resolutions during the time that the DAOC and the teams had agreed to dedicate to a wide discussion of the issues raised in the teams' resolutions. The special rule aimed to address this concern and to preserve the agreed-on time for discussion. The chair stated the question on the special rule and explained that because notice was not given, adoption of the special rule required a vote of the majority of the assembly's membership, which was defined as those delegates who had signed in for the meeting at the time of the vote on the special rule. The number of those delegates and the number of votes required for adoption would be announced just before the vote on the rule. If adopted, the rule would be binding on the 2016 assembly unless the 2016 assembly voted to rescind or amend it.

The chair opened the floor for discussion of the motion to adopt the special rule. A delegate asked why a two-year delay was needed. Rak said that time was needed to carry out the plans for discussion set out in the agreement. She noted in particular that resolutions could not be formulated until after the 2016 convention sessions sponsored by the resolution teams had been held, which meant that resolutions could not be considered before the 2017 assembly meeting. Two speakers questioned the need for the special rule to refer not only to proposals on boycotts, the subject of the two resolutions that had been withdrawn, but also to proposals on matters related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Rak said that the aim of the broader language of the rule was to avoid compromising

the agreement with the two resolution teams. She added that the DAOC would consider all proposals submitted and evaluate them in the context of the agreement with the resolution teams. Since there was no further discussion, the chair announced that 173 delegates had signed in for the meeting and that the number of votes required for adoption of the special rule was 87. The assembly adopted the special rule by a vote of 95 yes and 49 no.

4. The assembly received a report from the Executive Council on the reason for the council's decision not to forward to the membership one resolution, Resolution 2014-2, that the 2014 Delegate Assembly had approved (see May 2014 *PMLA* 578). The council had reviewed the resolution at its February 2014 meeting in accordance with the provisions of article 7.B.3 of the MLA constitution. The specific provision that came into play during the council's review was as follows: If the council finds that a resolution contains erroneous, tortious, or possibly libelous statements, it will not forward the resolution to the membership for ratification. Because the resolution attributed to "foundations such as Lumina" an agenda that the Lumina Foundation's general counsel said "does not accurately reflect the Foundation's agenda or work," the council determined that the resolution contained potentially libelous statements and so could not be forwarded to the membership. The council's decision to withhold Resolution 2014-2 was immediately communicated to the proposer of record, who was also told about options for resubmitting the resolution for consideration at the 2015 Delegate Assembly meeting.

Samer Ali, a member of the council and the DAOC, presented the report to the assembly. The chair asked for questions. There were none.

5. The assembly received a report from the Elections Committee, which had met in November 2014 to discuss the effects that the replacement of the association's division and discussion group structure by the new convention forum structure, which the Delegate Assembly had discussed in 2012 (see May 2012 *PMLA* 674–76) and 2014 (see May 2014 *PMLA* 568), would have on the size and composition of the Delegate Assembly and to formulate recommendations for changes in assembly representation. The chair recognized Julie Rak. Speaking on behalf of the DAOC, Rak prefaced the report with a procedural comment. She noted that the assembly would be voting on the committee's recommendations, not on the full contents of the report, and that the report opened a process of consultation with the assembly on different aspects of the composition of the assembly.

The chair then recognized Christopher Lupke, a delegate and also a member of the Elections Committee, who presented a summary of the report. He reviewed the constitution's provisions for three main types of delegates—those representing areas of study, those representing special interests, and those representing geographic regions—and explained that the implementation of the new convention forum structure would affect the first delegate type: in-

stead of 88 divisional delegates, the assembly would have 147 forum delegates. The question for the committee was whether offsetting adjustments to the other delegate types needed to be made. The committee's deliberations were guided by the DAOC's sense that such a large increase in the size of the assembly would make assembly meetings unworkable and by the committee's constitutional responsibility to ensure that the assembly continue to broadly represent the interests of the membership. Finding that members identify primarily with their fields of study and are concerned with professional issues, the committee concluded that it would be best to accommodate the increase in representation for areas of study by reducing the number of delegates representing geographic regions and eliminating the requirement that the number of regular and graduate student seats in each region be proportional to the membership in the region. The committee suggested that each region be allocated five seats, which would allow for the representation of graduate students and a range of professional statuses. The committee also concluded that the increase in the number of forum delegates necessitated a change in their mode of election—from election by a five-member executive committee to election by each forum's membership. In addition, the committee suggested that special-interest representation, which had not changed significantly since the assembly was established in 1971, should be refocused on professional issues of concern to the association. The committee proposed the following list of professional issues, with seat allocations:

<i>Category</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Independent and Retired Scholars	2
Careers outside the Classroom	2
Contingent and Contract Faculty Members	6
Continuing Education	2
Distance and Online Programs	2
Creative Writing Programs	2
Disability in the Profession	2
Race and Ethnicity in the Profession	3
LGBTQ in the Profession	3
Women and Gender in the Profession	3
Less-Taught Languages Programs	2
Academic Freedom	3
Academic Labor	3
Scholars Residing outside the US and Canada	2
Composition, Rhetoric, and Writing Programs	3
Language Programs	3
Community Colleges	6
Graduate Students	6

Lupke encouraged the assembly to discuss the committee's proposals and to suggest changes for the committee to consider at its next meeting. He then reviewed the committee's recommendations. The first called for a constitutional amendment to provide for the election of forum delegates by the members of the forums. The second called for phasing in the addition of new forum delegates

over a three-year period. The third called for constitutional amendments that would allow for a reduction in the number of regional delegates and the elimination of the proportional allocation of regional seats. The fourth called for a constitutional amendment that would allow for the representation of professional issues instead of special interests. The third and fourth recommendations also called for the elimination of specific numbers of regional and professional-issues delegates, so that the assembly could make future adjustments to the composition of the assembly without the need for constitutional amendments.

Rosemary Feal explained that the assembly's approval of recommendations calling for constitutional amendments would initiate the amendment process, whereby the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution formulates the requested amendments and forwards them to the Delegate Assembly for action. She also explained that the assembly would not be voting on the Elections Committee's proposals concerning the number of regional delegates and the framework for the representation of professional issues at this meeting. She encouraged the assembly to discuss the proposals, however, so that the committee could revise them in time for the 2016 assembly meeting, at which votes would be taken on the committee's proposals and on the constitutional amendments that would enable their implementation.

The chair called for discussion of the committee's report, which was limited to thirty minutes. A delegate asked whether the phase-in process to be used for forum delegates also applied to regional delegates. Lupke responded that the reduction in the number of regional delegates would be accomplished by attrition. Feal added that all elected delegates would complete their terms. Another delegate asked for an explanation of forum membership. Feal said that a primary affiliation with a forum conferred the right to vote in forum executive committee elections and forum delegate elections and that all MLA members would have the opportunity to establish primary affiliations with up to five forums. Members would also be able to participate in as many forum groups on *MLA Commons* as they wish, but being a member of a *Commons* group was not the same thing as a primary affiliation. A third delegate expressed concern about a possible loss in diversity of representation if the reduction in regional delegates occurs at the same time as the increase in forum delegates, who would be likely to come from the two coasts and from better-funded institutions. Lupke encouraged discussion of this point, since not all committee members felt strongly that regional representation was less important than other types of representation and since the regional seats allow for the representation of many different groups and professional statuses. The next speaker, also a delegate, noted that the elimination of proportional representation for graduate students within the regions would cause a significant drop in graduate student representation, from the current twenty-seven

regional seats to seven. Lupke pointed out that the committee's list of professional issues included six seats for graduate students and that forum delegates might also be graduate students, but he acknowledged that there would most likely be less graduate student representation than there has been. He also noted that the constitutional amendments the committee called for would allow the assembly to address more easily any representational problems it identified. The final speaker was a delegate who commended the committee for its recommendation on the election of forum delegates by the forums' members.

The chair asked delegates to turn to the first recommendation in the report, which read as follows:

The committee recommends that the assembly propose an amendment to article 10.A.1 of the constitution providing for the election of a forum delegate by that forum's membership. If the assembly agrees to propose this amendment, the amendment process would not be completed until June 2016. Therefore, the first election of forum delegates by forum members could not be held until the fall of 2016.

The chair called for discussion of the recommendation. There was none, so the chair asked the assembly to vote on the recommendation. The assembly approved the recommendation by a vote of 139 yes and 5 no.

The chair asked delegates to turn to the second recommendation in the report, which read as follows:

Provided that the current amendment to article 10.A.1 ["One delegate shall be elected by the executive committee of each officially constituted **division forum**."] is approved by the assembly and ratified by the membership, the committee recommends that the addition of forum delegates be made over a three-year period, with one-third of the 59 additional delegates taking their seats on 11 January 2016, one-third on 9 January 2017, and one-third on 8 January 2018. The Elections Committee will determine the year in which each forum is added to the assembly by lot. (Note: Because of technical constraints and the need for the constitutional amendment outlined in the first recommendation, above, the system allowing the election of forum delegates by forum members cannot be in place until the fall of 2016. Thus, the first cohort of forum delegates—those taking their seats in January 2016—would be elected under the current rules.)

The chair called for discussion of the recommendation. Again, there was no discussion, so the chair asked the assembly to vote on the recommendation. The assembly approved the recommendation by a vote of 146 yes and 3 no.

The chair asked delegates to turn to the third recommendation in the report, which read as follows:

The committee recommends that each of the seven current electoral regions be allocated five seats, for a

total of thirty-five regional delegates, and that one seat in each region be reserved for a graduate student. It should be noted that the committee's intention is to use the four remaining seats in each region to provide representation for different ranks (assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, adjunct professor) and types of institutions. If the assembly agrees with this recommendation, it will need to propose amendments to articles 10.A.2 and 10.A.3 of the constitution to reduce the number of regional delegates and eliminate proportional representation. The language of the amendment to article 10.A.2 should not specify the number of delegates allocated to each region. It should instead refer to a "number of regional delegates to be determined by the Delegate Assembly," so that the assembly, which is empowered by the constitution to approve changes in the apportionment of delegates, can make future changes it deems necessary without the need to amend the constitution.

The chair called for discussion of the recommendation. The first questions were about the numbers specified in the first sentence of the recommendation: whether there could be more than one graduate student representative per region and whether approving the recommendation meant approving the numbers specified. Feal explained that approval of the recommendation would lead to the formulation of constitutional amendments that would eliminate proportional representation in the regions and remove the set number of regional delegates currently specified in the constitution. The numbers in the committee's recommendation were suggestions that the assembly needed to discuss. Lupke agreed that the committee's recommendation on constitutional amendments was separable from the question of the number of regional delegates that the assembly wanted to have. He said that the committee would meet again at the end of January and would revisit the suggestions in the report in the light of the assembly's discussion. The committee's modified suggestions would come to the 2016 assembly for discussion and action. Responding to a question, Lupke suggested using the assembly's group on *MLA Commons* for further discussion of these questions before the 2016 meeting.

A delegate asked what would happen if the assembly rejected the recommendation. Feal responded that the current provisions for regional representation would continue in effect and that the assembly would therefore increase significantly in size. She explained that the committee's four recommendations were intended to work together to provide the assembly with flexibility when it considers questions about the assembly's categories of representation, and she said again that the constitutional amendments recommended by the committee would come back to the assembly in 2016 for a vote. Feal then noted that the committee's third recommendation combined two things: the elimination of a specific number of regional delegates and the elimination of proportionality

as the basis for the allocation of regular and graduate student seats in the regions. Suggesting that the recommendation would be clearer if the two parts were separated, she consulted with the parliamentarian on dividing the question. After a pause for the parliamentary consultation, the chair put to the assembly the question of dividing the committee's third recommendation into two parts. This question was not debatable, but Feal responded to two questions from delegates. The assembly decided to divide the recommendation by a vote of 87 yes and 39 no.

The chair called for discussion of the first part of the divided recommendation, which read as follows:

Does the assembly agree with the recommendation that a number of regional delegates to be determined by the Delegate Assembly be apportioned among the seven geographic regions equally and agree to propose the necessary constitutional amendment?

A delegate asked when the proposed change would take effect. Feal said that the 2016 assembly would formally consider the proposed amendments and that the ratification portion of the constitutional amendment process would take place later in 2016. The 2017 election cycle was therefore the first that could be affected, which meant that the changes would be seen in the 2018–19 assembly. The delegate added a comment on the potential loss of relevant regional perspectives on issues if the number of regional delegates was reduced. Another delegate observed that the addition of 60 forum delegates would give the assembly 338 members, a size that was still manageable. Lupke explained that the Elections Committee had factored in not only the existing forums that would gain delegates but also the twenty-three possible new forums included in the forum structure that the Executive Council had approved and other future forums. He encouraged delegates to put forward other ideas on the composition of the assembly. A regional delegate said that his response to issues was shaped more by his region than his field and disputed the idea that regional representation was less important than other types of representation. He suggested that the real difficulty regional delegates face is how to consult their constituents. Since there was no further discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the recommendation. The assembly approved the recommendation by a vote of 85 yes and 31 no.

The chair then called for discussion of the second part of the divided recommendation, which read as follows:

Does the assembly agree with the recommendation that graduate student representation should no longer be proportional and agree to propose the necessary constitutional amendment?

There was no discussion, so the chair put the recommendation to a vote. The assembly approved the recommendation by a vote of 80 yes and 39 no.

The chair asked delegates to turn to the fourth recommendation in the report, which read as follows:

The committee recommends that the assembly propose an amendment to article 10.A.4 of the constitution providing for the representation of professional issues instead of special interests. Again, the language of the amendment should not specify the number of delegates in this category to eliminate the need for a constitutional amendment every time the assembly wishes to alter the apportionment of delegates.

The chair called for discussion of the recommendation. One delegate expressed concern about the combinations of populations and programs put forward in the committee's professional-issues categories and called for more assembly input into the process of refining the committee's proposals. Another delegate suggested replacing the single category Contingent and Contract Faculty Members with two categories, one for full-time non-tenure-track faculty members and one for part-time non-tenure-track faculty members. A third delegate suggested replacing "Less-Taught Languages" with "Less Commonly Taught Languages" in the name of one proposed category. There were two questions about when the assembly would vote on the list of categories. Feal responded that the committee's proposal would be reconsidered in the light of assembly members' comments and that discussion of a revised proposal could be held on *MLA Commons*. Because of the length of the associated constitutional amendment process, the assembly had two years for discussion before any changes would be implemented. Since there was no further discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the recommendation by a vote of 122 yes and 6 no.

6. The assembly received a report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution that consisted in the seven amendments to the constitution that were published at the MLA Web site in September 2014. The amendments grew out of three proposals from the Executive Council. The council's first proposal was to amend the constitution to allow for the replacement of the association's division and discussion group convention structure by the new forum structure that the assembly had reviewed and the council had approved in 2014 (see May 2014 *PMLA* 568 and Oct. 2014 *PMLA* 862). This proposal necessitated the following two amendments (language subject to change shown in brackets and new language shown in boldface):

Amendment 1 (to article 10, Delegate Assembly—Composition and Election)

A. The assembly shall represent the following:

1. *Areas of study*. One delegate shall be elected by the executive committee of each officially constituted [division] **forum**.

Amendment 2 (to article 12, Conventions and Meetings)

C. The Program Committee shall exercise general supervision over [divisions and discussion groups] **forums**,

making recommendations to the Executive Council about their number, the fields represented, and the conduct of their meetings at the convention. The executive director, assisted by the Program Committee, shall have final responsibility for planning or approving [forums] **plenary sessions** and other special events at the convention.

D. The executive director shall be empowered to make regulations regarding papers and discussions and to coordinate or modify the various [divisions, forums, and discussion groups] **forums** in any program until the Executive Council meets and acts on the changes or policies involved.

The council's second proposal was to eliminate constitutional references to printed matter, including a printed directory. This proposal, which was prompted by changes that were made to the policies that govern the Web site to protect members' privacy, resulted in the following four amendments (language subject to change shown in brackets and new language shown in boldface):

Amendment 3 (to article 6, Officers—Election)

D. The second vice president of the association shall be elected from the field of English (including American) in alternate and only in alternate years. At all times the Nominating Committee shall bear in mind the various fields of interest within the association. The Nominating Committee shall have final authority to rule on the eligibility of nominees recommended by petition. Candidates, including those nominated by petition, must have been [listed in the printed directory of members] **included in the membership list** of the association for the two preceding years. No member shall serve more than one term as second vice president. Current members of the Executive Council shall not be eligible for nomination for second vice president, either by the Nominating Committee or by petition.

Amendment 4 (to article 8, Executive Council—Composition and Election)

A. Each year three at-large members of the Executive Council shall be elected for four-year terms according to the following procedure:

1. The Nominating Committee, bearing in mind the provisions stated above and in paragraph 5 below, shall nominate seven candidates whose names shall be submitted to the executive director no later than 15 April. The names shall be listed, together with brief vitae and a notice of the right to petition, in an appropriate publication of the association before 1 June. Candidates, including those nominated by petition, must have been [listed in the printed directory of members] **included in the membership list** of the association for the two preceding years.

Amendment 5 (to article 10, Delegate Assembly—Composition and Election)

C. Each year one-third of the members of the Delegate Assembly shall be elected for three-year terms, except

for ex officio members, who shall serve for the duration of their terms in office. Elected delegates' terms shall begin at the close of the association's convention following their election. Candidates for election must have been [listed in the most recent printed directory of members of the association] **included in the membership list of the association for the preceding year** or, if they are graduate students, in the current membership list. No delegate may be elected to represent more than one category at a time, and no member may serve for more than two successive terms. During an elected term in office, delegates who change geographical location or professional status shall not lose their seats. Vacancies arising from death, resignation, or failure to maintain membership shall be filled at the next regular election.

Amendment 6 (to article 10, Delegate Assembly—Composition and Election)

E. Any member of the association may initiate a petition proposing an additional candidate for regional and special-interest contests. The petition must include the written consent of the candidate, the signatures of at least twenty-five members of the association, and specification of the contest involved. The Elections Committee shall have final authority for assigning candidates to particular contests. A notice of the right to petition, together with the deadline therefor, shall [be printed] **appear** in an appropriate publication of the association along with the announcement of the candidates selected by the Elections Committee.

In its third proposal, the council called for the elimination of the limiting gender reference to “men and women of letters” in article 3.D. This proposal resulted in the following amendment (language subject to change shown in brackets and new language shown in boldface):

Amendment 7 (to article 3, Membership)

D. *Honorary members and fellows.* Foreign scholars may be elected honorary members of the association, and distinguished [men and women] **persons** of letters of any nationality may be elected honorary fellows. [. . .]

The chair recognized Margaret Noodin of the DAOC, who, on behalf of the committee, moved that the assembly adopt the amendments presented in the report. The chair opened the floor for discussion of amendments 1 and 2. Since there was no discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on these two amendments. The assembly approved them by a vote of 118 yes and 2 no. The chair opened the floor for discussion of amendments 3 through 6. There was no discussion; the assembly approved this set of amendments by a vote of 118 yes and 2 no. The chair called for discussion of the final amendment; there was none. The assembly voted to approve this amendment by a vote of 122 yes and 1 no. The chair noted that, in accordance with the procedure outlined in the constitution, the amendments would be forwarded to the Executive Council for action.

7. The assembly received the report of the executive director, the Finance Committee report, and annual reports from the following association committees: *PMLA* Editorial Board, Publications Committee, Committee on Scholarly Editions, Committee on the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, Advisory Committee on the *MLA International Bibliography*, Committee on Honors and Awards, Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada, Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, Committee on Information Technology, Committee on Disability Issues in the Profession, Committee on Community Colleges, Committee on the Status of Graduate Students in the Profession, Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession, and Steering Committee on New Structures for Languages in Higher Education. The chair recognized Executive Director Rosemary Feal to present the first report. Feal drew members' attention to the section of her report on the four special projects in which the association was engaged in 2014. Work on the revision of the division and discussion group structure had been completed, and the implementation of the new forum structure, which would accommodate members' evolving intellectual interests, had begun. The Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature had issued its final report and recommendations, which were receiving wide attention in the press, on social media, and on campuses. The recommendations were being refined and implemented on campuses, and discussion was continuing on *MLA Commons*. The task force report set the stage for Connected Academics, a major grant-funded project through which the MLA will develop resources for departments and graduate students interested in exploring the wide range of careers open to those with a humanities PhD. Finally, in 2014 the language consultancy service, which offers advice to departments on curricular and structural reforms and on the implementation of recommendations from *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*, the 2007 report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, became a continuing project of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages and completed eight consultancies. Feal concluded her presentation by inviting questions. The chair asked if there were questions or comments; no one came forward. The chair then asked delegates to turn to the Finance Committee report and again recognized Feal to present it. Feal explained the committee's role (to formulate the association's annual budget) and the Executive Council's role (to modify and approve the budget, thereby authorizing expenditures). She encouraged delegates to look not only at the expenses incurred as a result of association activities but also at the revenue generated by those activities. She concluded her presentation by asking for questions from the floor or after the meeting, by e-mail. The chair asked if there were questions about the report. Patricia Ann Ward, noting

that the number of life members was probably increasing because of changes in retirement rules, asked whether it would make a difference if the full-time teachers among life members continued to pay dues but retained the life-member or some other appropriate designation. Feal said the staff would have to query the membership database to identify the subset of members Ward referred to, and she thanked Ward for her suggestion. The chair asked if there were other questions on the report; there were none. The chair then recognized Stephanie Louise Kirk, of the DAOC, to present the reports from the association's committees. Kirk encouraged delegates to read the reports and thanked committee members for their hard work and dedication during the past year. The chair asked if there were questions or comments; there were none.

8. The assembly received a recommendation from the DAOC on the options for submitting signatures in support of a resolution or a petition set out in Delegate Assembly bylaw 7. Julie Rak, chair of the DAOC, presented the recommendation and explained that all current options require members to submit original signatures but that in the future members will be able to deposit their signatures online after logging in at the MLA Web site. Since the online option would not be operational soon, the DAOC recommended that the assembly authorize an additional way for members to sign on to a resolution or a petition that does not require an original signature: sending an e-mail message indicating support for a particular resolution or petition from the address that is recorded in the member's MLA membership record (which members can check at the Web site). Rak proposed a motion that the assembly authorize the implementation of this added option. The chair opened the floor for discussion of the motion. Since no one came forward, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the motion. The assembly approved it by a vote of 117 yes and 2 no.

The chair proposed a fifteen-minute break and asked if there were objections. Since there was an objection, the chair asked the assembly to vote on taking a break. The assembly approved taking a fifteen-minute break by a vote of 68 in favor and 43 opposed.

9. The assembly held an open discussion of the following topic: The MLA in the World: How Should the MLA Engage with Controversial Issues? To organize the discussion, the DAOC divided the topic into four subtopics: Energizing the Delegate Assembly as a Democratic Institution: The Resolution Process; Institutional and Individual Boycotts: How Can the MLA Approach This Issue?; What Is the Relation between Boycotts and Academic Freedom?; and How Should the MLA Respond to Problems with Faculty Governance and Retaliation against Public Speech? Delegates had received background information on the topic and subtopics before the assembly meeting. The chair reminded all present that ninety minutes had been set aside for the open discussion and that the time would be evenly divided among the four subtopics. He also reminded

those in attendance of the rules that would govern the open discussion. The chair recognized Julie Rak, who gave an overview of the open discussion. She explained that two of the subtopics formulated by the DAOC addressed issues arising from the two resolutions that were submitted for the assembly's consideration and then withdrawn. Of the other two subtopics, one was prompted by internal questions about the assembly's processes for considering issues, including the resolution process, and the other arose from events that were reported in the media during the previous year. Rak said that each subtopic would be introduced by a DAOC member and that each discussion segment would conclude with an informal opinion poll in the form of a question that delegates would be asked to answer using their electronic voting devices.

The chair then recognized Jennifer Wicke for an introduction to the first subtopic, Energizing the Delegate Assembly as a Democratic Institution: The Resolution Process. Wicke encouraged delegates to comment on, challenge, or reenvision the relation between the assembly and the MLA as a whole and to discuss the effectiveness of the resolution process in addressing members' issues. Speakers agreed that there were many issues for the MLA to address and put forward a distinction between professional issues and political issues. There was disagreement about whether the MLA should address both types of issues. Some speakers thought that it was important for the MLA to speak out on all issues, even divisive political issues, and one said that doing so would result in robust debates and public stances that would enhance the association. Other speakers said that the MLA should concentrate on professional and academic issues (e.g., education in the United States, tenure, graduate student issues, adjunct labor) and take positions on them that most members could support. One speaker who shared this view said that addressing political issues degrades the association. Discussion also touched on the resolution process itself, which one speaker commended as democratic, open to members' proposals, and able to galvanize debate. A subsequent speaker noted that resolutions can be helpful to members who wish to address issues in their home institutions. Another speaker suggested that the Delegate Assembly would benefit from expanded opportunities for preliminary discussion of resolutions (e.g., on *MLA Commons*) and that the resolution process should not be the only means available to members for addressing controversial issues. There was a call for rethinking the resolution process because ratification votes show that resolutions do not represent the will of most members. This call prompted a number of comments on the requirement, established through a 2011 constitutional amendment, that a resolution be ratified by "a majority vote in which the number of those voting for ratification equals at least ten percent of the association's membership" (MLA constitution, art. 11.C.7). Those who opposed the ten percent threshold gave the following reasons: it unnecessarily prevents the association from

speaking out, since the Delegate Assembly, which is representative of the membership, has already approved the resolutions; a similar threshold is not required for other association votes; it curbs the expression of minority viewpoints. Responding to one speaker's comment, Rosemary Feal said that resolutions had indeed been ratified since the requirement was put in place. Those in favor of the ten percent threshold offered the following reasons: a resolution is supposed to represent the membership's thinking on an issue; the threshold is not an impossible bar to reach if members care about an issue and mobilize in support of a resolution; delegates' election statements do not cover every issue that might be addressed in a resolution, so a significant membership vote on resolutions is needed as a check on the assembly. One speaker thought that a higher threshold was needed for resolutions that address controversial political issues. When the time for this discussion segment expired, the chair asked the delegates to indicate their agreement with the following statement: the current MLA resolution process is an effective way for the MLA to make statements on issues that matter to me. Forty-seven delegates agreed with the statement, while 59 disagreed.

The chair recognized Susan Solomon for an introduction to the second subtopic, Institutional and Individual Boycotts: How Can the MLA Approach This Issue? Solomon posed several questions to help frame the discussion: Should individuals decide whether to participate in a boycott, or will it carry more force if it is adopted by an institution or an organization? Is it possible to boycott an institution without affecting affiliated individuals? What outcomes does the boycott seek to achieve? Are there other means for achieving these outcomes? The discussion explored three main issues: whether the boycott of Israeli institutions called for by the boycott, divestment, and sanctions (BDS) movement was justified, whether the MLA should support the boycott, and whether boycotts of institutions can be distinguished from boycotts of individuals. Supporters of the boycott said it was an appropriate way to show support for Palestinians' academic freedom and to protest the denial of educational opportunities brought about by Israeli policies. The boycott was an appropriate strategy because it originated in a call issued by civil society and was nonviolent. The complicity of Israeli academic institutions in government policies was also cited as a justification for the boycott. Opponents of the boycott said it was antithetical to academic freedom and the humanist tradition in that it stifled open discussion and scholarship. They also noted that the boycott would harm individuals who relied on institutions and institutional funding for various activities. Another problem was targeting universities, which work to advance openness and education, in an effort to protest government policies. These arguments on both sides were the basis for opposing answers to the question of whether the MLA should support the boycott. One boycott supporter added that the MLA should join with other organizations that have endorsed the boycott. A

delegate expressed concern about reconciling a resolution calling for a boycott of institutions with a previous resolution stating the MLA's opposition to boycotts of individuals. On the question of distinguishing between types of boycotts, one speaker noted that the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) had issued guidelines for the academic boycott of Israel that included a call for "common sense" boycotts of individuals. The boycott therefore violated the MLA's resolution opposing boycotts of individuals. Another speaker established a distinction between an individual as such, who would not be subject to the boycott, and an individual acting as a representative of an institution, who would be. Another acknowledged that harm to individuals could result from the boycott, so a decision to join the boycott, even though consistent with the MLA's mission of showing concern for academic freedom and the right to education of people in other countries, would not be an easy one. When the time for this discussion segment expired, the chair asked the delegates to indicate their agreement with the following statement: I find discussing academic boycotts within the context of the Delegate Assembly useful. Sixty-three delegates agreed with the statement, while 37 disagreed.

The chair recognized Julie Rak for an introduction to the third subtopic, What Is the Relation between Boycotts and Academic Freedom? Rak noted that academic freedom is a complex concept and provided a definition from the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT):

CAUT actively defends academic freedom as the right to teach, learn, study and publish free of orthodoxy or threat of reprisal and discrimination. Academic freedom includes the right to criticize the university and the right to participate in its governance. Tenure provides a foundation for academic freedom by ensuring that academic staff cannot be dismissed without just cause and rigorous due process.

She posed two questions to guide the discussion: Is there a relation between boycotts and academic freedom? If there is a relation, does it help the MLA determine whether to endorse or resist boycotts of any kind? Speakers agreed that there is a relation between boycotts and academic freedom but disagreed about what the relation is. Some said that academic boycotts are antithetical to academic freedom because they shut down free and open discussion. They also violate the academic freedom of individuals at targeted institutions, an effect that the boycott guidelines issued by PACBI acknowledge. Others said that the boycott of institutions called for by the BDS movement is an exercise of academic freedom that aims to support Palestinians' academic freedom and that the censorship of boycott supporters violates their academic freedom. They also disagreed about the interpretation of the PACBI guidelines. Two speakers acknowledged that the boycott could have a negative impact on individuals' academic freedom but asked whether that was an acceptable price to pay for protesting the treatment of Palestinians. One

speaker said the boycott is a political act that goes beyond academic freedom and calls for taking sides between two opposing parties; thus, a decision on participating in the boycott cannot be made on the basis of academic freedom alone. When the time for this discussion segment expired, the chair asked the delegates to respond to the following polling question: Do you believe that institutional boycotts help or hurt academic freedom? Forty-eight delegates said that they help; 26 said that they hurt.

The chair recognized Samer Ali for an introduction to the fourth and final subtopic, How Should the MLA Respond to Problems with Faculty Governance and Retaliation against Public Speech? Ali said that the discussion should address the question of how the MLA should respond to attempts to punish faculty members for exercising their free speech rights and to recent events and structural changes in higher education that constituted challenges to faculty governance (e.g., the revocation of a professor's appointment to a tenured position; the defunding of higher education; the rising influence of corporations, foundations, and outside donors). Several speakers agreed that it was necessary for the MLA to take action in cases where institutions retaliate against faculty members for their political speech. The Executive Council's letter to the chancellor of the University of Illinois, Urbana, objecting to the revocation of Steven Salaita's appointment to a tenured position was cited as an example of such action. Speakers noted that students, junior faculty members, and adjunct faculty members were also subject to retaliative actions and deserved the MLA's attention. On the issue of faculty governance, one speaker called attention to the changing demographics of faculty members in higher education and said that the bodies entrusted with faculty governance needed to include the full range of faculty members, not just tenured and tenure-track faculty members. He encouraged the MLA to address this aspect of the issue. There was a question about the MLA's ability to investigate issues or cases that members might submit. Rosemary Feal responded that the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Rights and Responsibilities receives letters and other communications from members but cannot engage in any investigations. The committee studies the issues brought forward and sometimes drafts statements, which it submits to the Executive Council for consideration. Feal said that members can send requests for letters or statements on particular issues directly to the council; she added that the resolution process is also available to members. The chair noted that the officers often engage with issues that members raise. Responding to a follow-up question about the effectiveness of these letters and statements, Feal said that members who use MLA statements in local situations often report to the MLA office on the outcome and that the MLA staff tracks the higher education press to see if MLA letters and statements have wider resonance. The chair asked for further discussion; no one came forward. The chair asked the delegates to indicate their agreement with the follow-

ing statement: As a delegate, I believe that the MLA should publicly speak out against problems with faculty governance and public speech. Sixty-six delegates agreed with the statement; none disagreed.

The open discussion came to a close after eighty-two minutes.

10. In the category of new business, there was one motion that had been received by the 1 October submission deadline and could thus be discussed and voted on by the assembly. The motion (labeled Motion 2015-1) was submitted by John Maerhofer and Margaret Hanzimanolis on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and the Modern Languages. It read as follows:

Whereas Part-Time Faculty (PTF) constitute over 50% of the faculty in the US, and presumably a similar percentage of language and literature faculty;

Whereas PTF are presumably and anecdotally underrepresented in the governance of the MLA (standing committees, taskforce committees, and other appointed or nominated positions) insofar as employment status is known;

Whereas structural and economic barriers effectively exclude most PTF from the annual convention and governance participation;

Whereas the material conditions and scale of disenfranchisement between the PTF, as a group, and other contingent faculty (such as lecturers and instructors) is significant;

Whereas the perspectives of PTF on matters of interest to the Association are often invisible;

Be it Moved that MLA Executive Council and staff take deliberate steps to increase PTF in appointed internal governance roles;

Be it Further Moved that MLA revise the online membership renewal protocol to require identification of employment status, for statistical purposes;

Be it Further Moved that MLA track the effectiveness of efforts dedicated to increased representation of PTF by collecting and disseminating data on PTF members;

Be it Further Moved that Part-time status be viewed a necessary and desired representational demographic in the selection process for nominees for all elected positions, standing committee appointments, taskforce membership and other ad hoc committee appointments, rather than a liability.

Be it Further Moved that the Delegate Assembly initiate an amendment to create a dedicated slot on the Executive Council for a Part-time Faculty;

Be it Further Moved that the Elections Committee and the Delegate Assembly reserve three DA slots for Part-time Faculty, distinct from the existing "lecturer, adjunct, and instructor" category, and increase the number of delegates in the Assembly, if necessary, to accomplish this purpose.

The chair recognized Jennifer Wicke of the DAOC to present the motion to the assembly. After introducing the

motion on the floor, Wicke said that Margaret Hanzimanolis, one of the proposers of record, wished to propose amendments to the motion. Wicke also explained that the DAOC, which is not required to make recommendations on motions as it is on resolutions, did not have a recommendation for the assembly on the current motion. Noting that the Executive Council shared the concerns about part-time faculty members embodied in the motion, she said that a council member would comment on the motion during the discussion.

The chair then presented to the assembly Hanzimanolis's request that the motion be divided into three, as follows: the preamble and the first four *moved* clauses would be considered the first motion, the fifth *moved* clause would be considered the second motion, and the sixth *moved* clause would be considered the third motion. The chair asked for questions on the proposed division; there were none. The chair asked if there were any objections to dividing the motion in three. Since there were no objections, the chair declared the motion divided. He then presented to the assembly Hanzimanolis's request that the assembly approve two amendments to the first motion: to strike the second *moved* clause and to strike the final phrase of the last *moved* clause. The chair asked if there were any objections to the two proposed amendments. Since there were no objections, the first motion was amended accordingly. The first motion, which was on the floor, read as follows:

Whereas Part-Time Faculty (PTF) constitute over 50% of the faculty in the US, and presumably a similar percentage of language and literature faculty;

Whereas PTF are presumably and anecdotally underrepresented in the governance of the MLA (standing committees, taskforce committees, and other appointed or nominated positions) insofar as employment status is known;

Whereas structural and economic barriers effectively exclude most PTF from the annual convention and governance participation;

Whereas the material conditions and scale of disenfranchisement between the PTF, as a group, and other contingent faculty (such as lecturers and instructors) is significant;

Whereas the perspectives of PTF on matters of interest to the Association are often invisible;

Be it Moved that MLA Executive Council and staff take deliberate steps to increase PTF in appointed internal governance roles;

Be it Further Moved that MLA track the effectiveness of efforts dedicated to increased representation of PTF by collecting and disseminating data on PTF members;

Be it Further Moved that Part-time status be viewed a necessary and desired representational demographic in the selection process for nominees for all elected positions, standing committee appointments, taskforce membership and other adhoc committee appointments.

The chair opened the floor for discussion and recognized Hanzimanolis, who, as a proposer of record, had the right to speak first. Hanzimanolis said that the motion's focus was on part-time faculty members, not contingent faculty members, because it was important to ensure representation for half of the teachers in higher education in the United States today. Lisa Berglund asked Hanzimanolis to explain the distinction between *part-time* and *contingent*, terms she said were often used interchangeably. Hanzimanolis said that *contingent* is an umbrella term for all non-tenure-track faculty members and that *part-time* refers to a subcategory of non-tenure-track faculty members. Berglund requested further clarification of the motion by asking for a definition of part-time faculty members that would take account of two elements: non-tenure-track status and reduced course load. At the chair's request, Berglund restated her question: In the motion, is part-time synonymous with non-tenure-track contractual faculty who are teaching semester to semester but who may be full-time? Hanzimanolis's response was no; she added that *part-time* and *full-time* are categories that the National Center for Education Statistics uses in its data collection.

Speaking on behalf of the Executive Council, Gaurav Desai said that the motion's reference to *part-time faculty members* needed clarification because the meaning of the term is different across institutions. He added that the council was interested in encouraging all kinds of faculty members to participate in association governance, and he called attention to the opportunity members have to suggest themselves and other members for appointment to the association's standing committees, since the council takes suggestions for such appointments seriously. One delegate asked if consideration had been given to providing monetary support that would enable part-time faculty members to serve in the Delegate Assembly. Another delegate expressed concern about the exploitation of part-time faculty members and the institutionalization of this subclass of faculty members. The chair asked if there was further discussion of the motion. Since no one came forward, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the motion. The assembly approved it by a vote of 59 yes and 3 no.

The chair called for discussion of the second motion that resulted from the division of the original motion. It read as follows:

Be it Further Moved that the Delegate Assembly initiate an amendment to create a dedicated slot on the Executive Council for a Part-time Faculty.

A delegate asked if part-timers would be able to serve, given their low pay and heavy time commitment to the classroom. Barbara Altmann commented on the importance of the issue of representation and on the need for a definition of the type of faculty members for whom representation was being sought. She then stated her concern that an important issue would be decided in the absence of a quorum. Noting that a point of order had been raised

regarding the presence of a quorum, the chair ordered a count of the house. There were 70 delegates still in attendance, which meant that a quorum had been lost. However, according to the assembly's rules, discussion could continue and votes could be taken if the majority of those present, or 36 delegates, wished to continue. The chair asked the assembly to vote on the question of continuing despite the lack of a quorum. By a vote of 46 yes and 16 no, the assembly voted to continue. The chair explained that for the remainder of the meeting a binding vote on any motion would require a majority of the quorum, or 39 votes.

The chair called for further discussion of the motion on the floor. There were comments on the need for a clear definition of who counts as a part-time faculty member, on part-timers' ability to serve and whether financial protection or a stipend for service could be offered, and on making an important decision on the composition of the Executive Council with so few delegates in attendance. Addressing the question of a definition, the chair said that if the motion carried, the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution would have to define the term *part-time* and would include the definition in the amendment that it returned to the assembly for consideration. A delegate asked if the assembly would be able to amend the definition that the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution formulated. Rosemary Feal said that the assembly would not be able to amend the language of the amendment formulated by the committee. She added that the assembly was not required to provide guidance on a definition but that if it did not, there was no assurance that the committee would formulate an acceptable amendment. Another delegate expressed concern about leaving the definition to the committee and called for a more comprehensive approach to considering the council's composition, as had been done earlier in the meeting with the assembly itself. Since there was no more discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the motion. The assembly adopted the motion by a vote of 42 yes and 15 no. The chair said the motion would be forwarded to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The third motion that resulted from the division of the original motion came to the floor. It read as follows:

Be it Further Moved that the Elections Committee and the Delegate Assembly reserve three DA slots for Part-time Faculty, distinct from the existing "lecturer, adjunct, and instructor" category, and increase the number of delegates in the Assembly, if necessary, to accomplish this purpose.

The chair called for discussion and recognized Hanzimanolis, who had the right to speak first. She asked for the assembly's permission to withdraw the motion. The chair asked if there were any objections to granting permission for Hanzimanolis to withdraw the motion. Since there were no objections, the motion was withdrawn.

11. The chair called for the announcement of other items of new business, noting that new proposals could be discussed but could not be voted on until the next assembly meeting. He then presented an item that the MLA's officers had forwarded to the assembly for discussion: the recent announcement by Arizona State University (ASU) that it would increase the teaching load of non-tenure-track instructors of freshman composition from four to five courses per term with no increase in compensation. According to ASU, the fifth course would replace the instructors' service and professional development requirement, for no increase in workload. The chair said that the instructors had not been consulted about the change, which was likely to mean that each instructor would be teaching as many as fifty additional students each year, since composition courses were capped at twenty-five students. He added that the university's decision contravened MLA guidelines on several points—compensation for full-time instructors, number of courses taught per term, number of students per course, participation in departmental deliberations, and access to professional development—and asked the assembly to discuss the narrow question of how to deal with an institution that violates MLA guidelines as well as the broader challenge of maintaining those guidelines and communicating them effectively in the context of a changing profession. He noted that the Executive Council, which might take up the matter at its February 2015 meeting, would benefit from the assembly's input.

The chair then opened the floor for discussion, which was limited to fifteen minutes. George Justice, dean of humanities at ASU, said that the contract basis for full-time teaching at many institutions was a 5-5 load and that tenured and tenure-track faculty members at ASU also carried a 5-5 teaching load, with reductions for other mandated university work. He explained that ASU had converted many part-time positions with per-course compensation to full-time positions with benefits to better serve ASU students and that the 5-5 teaching load would come with a salary increase, from \$32,000 to \$36,000 a year. Several speakers said that the planned change, even with an increase in compensation, was an instance of superexploitation of non-tenure-track faculty members; that teaching five composition courses a term was an overwhelming workload; and that students would not be well served. They encouraged the Executive Council to take up the matter. There was also a comment on the impossibility of eliminating the service requirement for these instructors, who would still be required to attend committee meetings and whose students would still ask for letters of recommendation. Two delegates suggested that the council also look into the teaching load imposed on postdoctoral fellows.

The chair asked if there were other items of new business. Margaret Noodin reported to the assembly that several delegates and other MLA members, including the executive committees of the Division on Language Change, the Division on American Indian Literatures, the

Division on Ethnic Studies in Language and Literature, and the Discussion Group on the Two-Year College, had offered to work with the MLA staff to update the MLA Language Map and the enrollment survey to include all modern languages taught and critically examined by MLA members and, to the extent possible, to gather information on language courses and on the number and status of language instructor positions. Patrick Gallagher asked about the possibility of holding the assembly meeting in two sessions over the weekend to increase participation. Rosemary Feal said that it would be very difficult to schedule two sessions given other requirements that must be met (e.g., compliance with the submission deadline for emergency resolutions). Noodin suggested that the DAOC could find additional ways to facilitate the assembly's discussion, perhaps through use of *MLA Commons* before the meeting. There was a question about revising the assembly's agenda so that important motions came to the floor earlier in the meeting. In her response, Julie Rak noted that any delegate can propose a change to the order of the agenda when the agenda is presented to the assembly for adoption at the start of the meeting.

12. The chair called for announcements; there were none.

13. The chair declared the 2015 meeting of the Delegate Assembly adjourned sine die at 6:49 p.m.

Delegates in attendance:

Divisional Delegates: Mary-Grace Albanese, David Alworth, David Arbesu, Mary McAleer Balkun, Jennifer DeVere Brody, Pamela Allen Brown, Katie Chenoweth, T. Craig Christy, Deborah L. Clarke, Albrecht Classen, Ann Baynes Coiro, Mary Jean Corbett, Corry Cropper, Kathleen Davis, Cristina Ferreira-Pinto Bailey, Kate Flint, Andrew Franta, Daniel Frost, Charles Victor Ganelin, Deniz Gök-türk, Jessica Greenfield, Timothy M. Harrison, Gina Ann Herrmann, Peter James Hitchcock, Héctor Hoyos, Lydia Kerr, Stephen P. Knadler, Bonnie Lenore Kyburz, Jessie M. Labov, Eloy LaBrada, Michael LeMahieu, Susan H. Lurie, John Marx, Brian McGrath, Laura Murphy, Christopher John Newfield, Carmen Nocentelli, Yolanda Padilla, David Pan, Donald E. Pease, Thomas Augustine Prendergast, Ato Quayson, Phillip Round, Martin B. Shichtman, David R. Shumway, Thomas Russell Smith, Sharon Snyder, Rivka Swenson, Shaden M. Tageldin, Joseph Terry Thomas, Christy Tidwell, Aarthi Vadde, Ariel Watson, Johanna

Watzinger-Tharp, Alison Parks Weber, Ellen Welch, Ming-Bao Yue, Irene Zanini-Cordi, Lisa Zunshine.

Special-Interest Delegates: Angelika Bammer, Patrick S. Bernard, Lauren M. Bowen, Lisa Cacho, Donna M. Campbell, Ginny Carney, David Clemens, Gabrielle Dean, Sébastien Dubreil, Cristina Maria Guardiola, Richard Hardack, Salah D. Hassan, H. Edward Higginbotham, Dolan Hubbard, Priya Jacob, Maryse Jayasuriya, Beth Ellen Jörgensen, Jeongoh Kim, Rachael King, Christopher E. Larkosh, Elizabeth Mathews Losh, Dory Nason, Channette Romero, Clara Rowland, Andrew Schonebaum, Karen Shimakawa, Steven H. Shoemaker, Leah Strobel, Miriam L. Wallace, Patricia Ann Ward, Patrick Williams, Hertha D. Sweet Wong.

Regional Delegates: Chiji Akoma, Emily Apter, Lisa Berglund, Mariana Bolivar Rubin, Amy Boylan, Ute T. Brandes, Michelle Jeannette Brazier, Heather Brown, Mia Chen, Adam Coon, Juan E. De Castro, Eda Dedevas Dundar, Christopher Eng, Maria Faini, Gregory Foran, Benjamin Friedlander, Patrick L. Gallagher, Enrique García Santo-Tomás, Jürgen E. Grandt, Jenelle Grant, Nathan Grant, Kevin G. Guerrieri, Emily A. Haddad, Lisa Haegele, Margaret Hanzimanolis, Gillian H. Harkins, Gina Hausknecht, Christine Henseler, Todd Herzog, Benjamin Kahan, Katie Kane, Andrea Lyn Knutson, Diana Leong, Anna Lillios, David C. Lloyd, Christopher M. Lupke, Julia Reinhard Lupton, Kyle McAuley, Margaret McGehee, Emily McGinn, Salvador Mercado, Alex Mueller, Allison Muri, Jonathan Naito, Lisa Nalbone, Cheryl Narumi Naruse, Patrick R. O'Malley, Frank A. Palmeri, Joshua Phillips, Stephen David Powell, Richard Mark Preiss, Damaris Punaes-Alpizar, Mark A. Reid, Roopika Risam, Natalia Ruiz-Rubio, Nicholas G. Salvato, Rosaura Sanchez, Cynthia Schmidt-Cruz, Cynthia L. Selfe, Heather Steffen, Jordan Stone, Erin Sweeney, Judson D. Watson III, Jacquilyn Weeks, Jennifer Willging, Heather Willis Allen.

Delegates Representing Regional MLAs: Ezra Cappell, Emily D. Johnson, Kristin A. Le Veness, Craig Svonkin.

Officers and Members of the Executive Council: Samer M. Ali, Barbara K. Altmann, Brian Croxall, Gaurav G. Desai, Margaret W. Ferguson, Roland Greene, Donald E. Hall, Lutz Koepnick, Paula M. Krebs, Tracy Denean Sharpley-Whiting.

Members of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee: Stephanie Louise Kirk, Margaret A. Noodin, Julie Rak, Susan Solomon, Jennifer Wicke.

Parliamentarian: Jeanette N. Williams.

Clerk: Rosemary G. Feal.