

Minutes of the MLA Delegate Assembly

THE DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MET ON 6 JANUARY 2018 AT THE NEW YORK HILTON. FIRST Vice President Anne Ruggles Gere presided. The assembly was called to order at 12:38 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. She 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 63 delegates, because 126 delegates had signed in for the meeting at the beginning. [Note: Of the 303 delegates, 158 (52%) 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), Shaden Tageldin moved the adoption of the agenda that was distributed to delegates when they signed in for the assembly meeting. The chair asked if there was discussion of the agenda. Since there was none, the chair asked if there were objections to adopting the agenda. There were no objections, so the chair declared the agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

Tageldin then offered a motion on behalf of the DAOC that the rules presented to the assembly be adopted. This motion occasioned no discussion and no objections. The chair therefore declared the rules adopted by unanimous consent.

Again on behalf of the DAOC, Tageldin moved that the assembly approve the minutes of the January 2017 meeting as printed in the May 2017 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, Svetlana Tyutina (Spanish, California State Univ., Northridge), to the DAOC for a three-year term (from 8 Jan. 2018 through the close of the Jan. 2021 convention). In the election of a delegate to serve on the Executive Council, Leah Richards (English, LaGuardia Community Coll., City Univ. of New York) was elected for a four-year term (from 8 Jan. 2018 through the close of the Jan. 2022 convention). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the current officers of the association, the assembly elected Moradewun Adejunmobi (African studies, Univ. of California, Davis), Anton Kaes (German, Univ. of California, Berkeley), and Domna C. Stanton (French, Graduate Center, City Univ. of New York) to the Nominating Committee for two-year terms (2018–19). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the DAOC, the

assembly elected the following persons to the Elections Committee for two-year terms (2018–19): Stephanie J. Fitzgerald (Univ. of Kansas), Kate Flint (Univ. of Southern California), Smaro Kamboureli (Univ. of Toronto), and Lázaro Lima (Univ. of Richmond).

3. The assembly was asked to confirm the automatic annual increase of 2.5% in the dues amount for every membership category, rounded to the next dollar, that the 2017 assembly had approved (see *PMLA*, vol. 132, no. 3, May 2017, p. 762). The chair recognized David Pan of the DAOC and the Executive Council, who drew delegates' attention to the minutes of the 2017 meeting and reasons given there for the approval of the increase and who presented the chart below, showing the effect of the automatic increase on current dues amounts. Pan said that the increased dues amounts would become effective in September 2018 if the assembly approved them.

On behalf of the council and the DAOC, Pan moved that the assembly confirm the scheduled dues increase. The chair called for discussion of the motion; no one came forward. The chair therefore asked the assembly to vote on the motion, which was approved by a vote of 111 yes and 16 no.

4. The chair called on Shaden Tageldin, chair of the DAOC, to present the DAOC's annual report. Tageldin elaborated on the items covered in the report, including the reports on which the assembly would be taking action; announced that Cheryl Narumi Naruse would chair the DAOC in the coming year; thanked her fellow committee members, the parliamentarian, and the MLA staff for their guidance and support; and said that it had been a privilege and an honor to serve as DAOC chair. The chair asked if there were questions or comments on the report; no one came forward.

5. The assembly received a report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution that consisted of the two amendments to the constitution published on the MLA Web site in September 2017. Both amendments were initiated by the Executive Council (see *PMLA*, vol. 132, no. 5, Oct. 2017, p. 1274). The first amendment was based on a recommendation from the association's lawyer that a member of the Executive Council serve as a trustee and on related recommendations from the MLA staff: that the current informal arrangement whereby the MLA's president sits with the trustees be formalized, that provisions for different term lengths and for term limits be included, and that references in article 4 to restricted funds and budget accounts that no longer exist be eliminated. The second amendment grew out of the council's experience with having a council member who taught at a community college and who provided a valuable perspective on matters that came before the council.

The chair recognized Angelika Bammer of the DAOC and the Executive Council, who, on behalf of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, moved that the assembly adopt the first amendment presented in the committee's report. The amendment—to article 4, Administration—read as follows (language subject to change struck, and new language shown in boldface):

F. The permanent fund of the association and its other endowment funds shall be administered by a board of ~~three trustees, each appointed by the Executive Council for a three-year term, the three terms to be staggered by one year~~ **trustees composed of the association president and four other trustees appointed by the Executive Council. One of the appointed trustees shall be a current member of the Executive Council, and another of the appointed trustees shall be designated the managing**

Current Dues Schedule		Dues Schedule Subject to Confirmation	
Dues Class	Amount	Dues Class	Amount
B Employed Less Than Full-Time	\$25	B Employed Less Than Full-Time	\$26
1 Up to \$30,000	\$50	1 Up to \$30,000	\$52
2 \$30,000–\$50,000	\$80	2 \$30,000–\$50,000	\$82
3 \$50,000–\$70,000	\$120	3 \$50,000–\$70,000	\$123
4 \$70,000–\$100,000	\$160	4 \$70,000–\$100,000	\$164
5 \$100,000–\$140,000	\$200	5 \$100,000–\$140,000	\$205
6 \$140,000–\$180,000	\$250	6 \$140,000–\$180,000	\$257
7 \$180,000–\$220,000	\$300	7 \$180,000–\$220,000	\$308
8 Over \$220,000	\$350	8 Over \$220,000	\$359
L Joint Secondary	\$50	L Joint Secondary	\$52
E Student	\$25	E Student	\$26

trustee. **Each appointed trustee shall serve for three years, except that the trustee appointed from the Executive Council shall serve for two years. No trustee other than the managing trustee shall serve for more than three consecutive terms. The association president shall not vote except to break a tie.**

G. The trustees shall invest and reinvest the principal of all funds received so as to preserve the principal unimpaired to the best of their ability. The income accruing on all property in their hands may be reinvested with the authorization of the Executive Council; otherwise it shall be paid over to the executive director of the association, who shall add the income received from the permanent fund to the current funds of the association; ~~the income received from the Monograph Endowment Fund to the Monograph Current Account, and the income received from the Research Endowment Fund to the Research Current Account.~~

H. The Executive Council may remove any **appointed** trustee by a unanimous vote of those present at a meeting called for the purpose and shall fill any vacancy arising from the death, resignation, or removal of any trustee.

The chair opened the floor for discussion of this amendment. Since there was no discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 129 yes and 1 no.

Again on behalf of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, Bammer moved that the assembly adopt the second amendment presented in the committee's report. The amendment—to the head paragraph of article 8—read as follows (language subject to change struck, and new language shown in boldface):

The Executive Council shall be composed of twelve at-large members and two members from the Delegate Assembly. The Executive Council shall always include at least one MLA member, **regardless of category of membership**, who self-identifies as a part-time faculty member; ~~regardless of category of membership~~ **and at least one MLA member, regardless of category of membership, who teaches full-time at a community college or other two-year institution.** In accordance with the provisions of article 8.A.5, at all times there shall be on the Executive Council representation from the three groups of dues-paying MLA members established by the constitution: regular members, student members, and life members. Executive Council members' terms shall begin at the close of the association's convention following their election. A council member's category of membership at the time of election shall stand throughout that council member's term of office. All members of the Executive Council must retain membership in the association during their terms of office.

The chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment; no one came forward. The assembly therefore proceeded to a vote on the amendment and approved it

by a vote of 136 yes and 4 no. The chair noted that, in accordance with the procedure outlined in the constitution, both amendments would be forwarded to the Executive Council for action.

6. The assembly received a report from the 2017 Elections Committee about the committee's work to implement the set of constitutional amendments affecting the composition of the Delegate Assembly that the assembly had approved and the membership had ratified in 2016 (see *PMLA*, vol. 131, no. 3, May 2016, pp. 830–32). One of the amendments called for allotting the same number of assembly seats to each of the seven electoral regions. Since the seven regions were not equal in size, the committee wanted to make regional representation more equitable by making the regions more equal in size. Having considered the numbers of members in each state within the seven regions, the committee determined that the electoral regions could be made more equal in size by moving New Jersey out of Region 3 (Middle Atlantic) and into Region 2 (New York State) and moving Virginia out of Region 5 (South) and into Region 3. In accordance with article 10.D of the constitution, the committee transmitted its proposal for these regional reconfigurations to the assembly.

The chair recognized Angelika Bammer of the DAOC and the Executive Council, who, on behalf of the Elections Committee, moved that New Jersey be moved from Region 3 to Region 2 and that Virginia be moved from Region 5 to Region 3. The chair called for discussion of the motion; no one came forward. The chair therefore asked the assembly to vote on the motion, which was approved by a vote of 127 yes and 9 no.

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, and Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession. The chair recognized Paula Krebs to present the executive director's report and the Finance Committee report. Krebs highlighted a number of items covered in the reports: the increase in membership, enhancements to the *MLA International Bibliography*, the addition of online tutorials to *The MLA Style Center*, the Connected Academics project, the association's advocacy work, and budget projections for the 2016–17 and 2017–18 fiscal years. She also noted two new convention features: the Possible Futures Career Fair, which introduced job seekers with advanced

training in the humanities to recruiters from mission-driven organizations and companies, and advocacy tables, where members found postcards that they could address to members of Congress to urge support for humanities education. The chair invited questions about and comments on the reports; no one came forward.

The chair then recognized Michelle Brazier of the DAOC to present the reports from the association's committees. She encouraged delegates to read the reports and to send any questions to the MLA office. On behalf of the DAOC, Brazier thanked committee members for their work throughout the year. Since there were no comments on or questions about the reports, the chair proceeded to the next item of assembly business.

8. The assembly received a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Advocacy Policies and Procedures, which the Executive Council had appointed in October 2016 and charged with clarifying and refining the procedures through which the association speaks out publicly on issues, including the resolution process, and making recommendations for change in the interest of efficiency and effectiveness. The chair recognized Michael Bérubé, the chair of the ad hoc committee, to present the report. Bérubé said that the report covered the many forms of advocacy the association and its members can engage in throughout the year (e.g., statements or policies issued by the Executive Council, amicus briefs) but that the resolution process was the most public form of association advocacy because of the debate of resolutions during the assembly meeting at the convention. The report also detailed how the resolution process had changed in recent years to remedy problems that had been identified. Because the ad hoc committee found that the process remained flawed—membership participation continued to decline, the length of the process worked against its effectiveness—it had formulated recommendations for streamlining the process and increasing member participation. Specifically, the ad hoc committee recommended changing the submission deadline for regular resolutions from 1 October to 1 September, increasing the word limit from 100 words to 200 words, and increasing the number of supporting signatures required for submission from ten to one hundred. The earlier submission deadline would allow the DAOC to evaluate the claims made in resolutions and work with resolution proposers on possible changes to the resolutions' language. The council's fiduciary review of resolutions, as specified in article 7.B.3 of the constitution, would take place in October. Resolutions that pass this review would be submitted to the membership for comment and then a vote on whether the resolution should be forwarded to the Delegate Assembly for action. This membership vote would have the same ten percent threshold currently required for the membership ratification vote on resolutions. The assembly's vote on resolutions, which could not be amended on the floor, would be the final step in the revised process and would

be binding. The ad hoc committee noted that this revised process did not accommodate emergency resolutions. Instead, matters that arise after the submission deadline for regular resolutions would be handled through requests addressed directly to the Executive Council.

The chair called for discussion of the ad hoc committee's report, which was limited to thirty minutes. She added that the report was also the topic of the assembly's open discussion (see next item). A delegate asked Bérubé to elaborate on the relation between the proposed membership vote and the following assembly vote and what the reversal in the timing of these votes meant for the assembly's role in the process. A specific question posed was what would happen if the assembly did not approve a resolution that the membership had already approved. Bérubé said that the assembly, which is normally representative of the membership, would not be likely to vote differently from the membership, except, perhaps, on very divisive issues, but that the ad hoc committee's intent was to give the assembly the last word. He added that an assembly reversal of a membership vote might generate some ill will among members but would not provoke a constitutional crisis. Another delegate commented on the different thresholds for membership and assembly votes. This portion of the discussion of the ad hoc committee's report came to an end after Samer Ali, a member of the committee, encouraged delegates and observers to speak as experts and scholars on current issues and to take advantage of the many avenues for public advocacy detailed in the report.

9. The assembly's open discussion was dedicated to an extended discussion of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advocacy Policies and Procedures (see previous item). The chair asked Second Vice President Simon E. Gikandi to preside over the open discussion. Gikandi reminded all present that one hour had been set aside for the open discussion. He also reminded those in attendance of the rules that would govern the open discussion. The chair then recognized Shaden Tageldin, chair of the DAOC, for an introduction to the discussion. Tageldin reviewed the four questions that the DAOC had formulated to help guide the discussion. A document presenting these questions had been distributed to delegates before the meeting and was made available to observers at the meeting. The first question was about the scope of MLA advocacy, a question that arose because of the difference between the MLA constitution's narrow description of the association's purpose and the newer mission statement's description of the work of the association in broader contexts. A related question was how to understand the MLA itself, which is both a scholarly organization and a collection of members whose views on larger social and political issues can diverge widely. The DAOC's second question was whether the procedural changes recommended by the ad hoc committee were sufficient to meet the deeper challenge of addressing issues that divide the

membership. The third question had to do with the various consequences of the ad hoc committee's proposals regarding the vetting of resolutions by the DAOC and the Executive Council in October: the possibility that the council's fiduciary review could remove a resolution from further consideration, the need to ensure that the online comment period before the membership vote is constructive, and the disallowing of amendments to resolutions once the DAOC and the Executive Council had completed their reviews. The fourth question was whether the ad hoc committee's proposed alternative to emergency resolutions was adequate. Tageldin also encouraged comments on the other avenues for public advocacy outlined in the report and concluded her introduction by recapping the rules governing the open discussion.

The chair opened the floor for the open discussion; it began with a question about the ad hoc committee's rationale for requiring one hundred signatures. While current technologies make this possible, they also cause a concern about members who might be closed out of the process because of access issues. Teresa Mangum, a member of the committee, explained that the main intention behind this requirement was to draw more attention to the resolution being proposed and to engage more members in the process from the beginning. A subsequent speaker expressed concern about the potential for unwanted exposure if signatures are to be collected on social media. Michael Bérubé said that signatures would be collected at the MLA Web site and would not be publicly available and that social media would be used only to publicize the resolutions being proposed. Speakers also commented more generally about the online discussion of resolutions. One thought that it would allow more people to participate and so would provide more membership input into the assembly's debate of and vote on resolutions. Another said that online discussion was less effective and that membership input should not be limited to online discussion. Since the ad hoc committee's proposals did not eliminate debate on the floor of the Delegate Assembly or change the rules that allow nondelegates to speak, members would be able to participate in both types of discussion.

Several speakers raised questions about the membership vote that would precede the Delegate Assembly's debate and vote and the possibility that the assembly could overturn a membership vote, which is something that the assembly is not currently empowered to do. Committee members explained that the membership would not be voting on the resolution itself but on the question of forwarding it to the assembly for consideration. One speaker thought that the membership vote proposed by the committee would be a good way of gauging membership interest in a resolution. Another said that the ten percent threshold was unnecessary if the vote only determined whether the resolution came to the assembly for consideration. Still others noted that the distinction the committee was making between voting to forward a

resolution and voting on the resolution itself would not be understood, especially if the resolution addressed a controversial issue, and so a negative assembly vote could easily be interpreted as overturning the will of the membership. One speaker also thought that giving the final say on a resolution to a smaller body after a larger segment of the membership has weighed in was problematic. Bérubé acknowledged that the distinction the committee was making would not work in practice and said that the committee would reconsider its proposal on the membership vote.

The open discussion also touched on the ad hoc committee's proposal to prohibit amendments to resolutions on the floor of the assembly. Bérubé explained that the committee's intent was to streamline the process and to focus floor debate on the merits of resolutions. This focus on the content of resolutions, which the committee did not propose to restrict in any way, was necessary if the assembly was to have the final word on resolutions. He added that, in the end, the assembly would decide whether to accept this committee proposal. Some speakers favored the proposal because of their past experience with floor amendments that focused on syntactical minutiae. One speaker asked about a potential problem: Would there be a mechanism for modifying the wording of a resolution if it dealt with circumstances that changed after the 1 September submission deadline and before the assembly meeting?

Paula Krebs responded to a question about the status of the report and next steps. She said that the ad hoc committee had submitted an earlier draft of its report to the DAOC and the Executive Council in October 2017 and had revised the report for the assembly based on comments and suggestions from the DAOC and the council. The committee planned to meet again in April 2018 to consider the feedback received at the assembly meeting and to decide on further revisions to the report. Because any changes to the resolution process require amendments to the MLA constitution, the committee's final proposals would come back to the assembly, probably next year, in the form of amendments to be voted on.

The proposed elimination of emergency resolutions was also discussed. Several speakers argued against this proposal as unnecessary and as limiting the long-standing prerogatives of members and of the assembly. The alternative of requesting that the Executive Council issue a statement was not seen as an appropriate substitute for the democracy inherent in the assembly. It was also suggested that the constraints imposed on the council by its fiduciary responsibilities would have an undesirable effect on the council's response to such requests.

The open discussion came to a close after fifty-three minutes, at which point First Vice President Anne Ruggles Gere returned to the chair.

10. In the category of new business were two emergency resolutions—so designated because they were

received after the 1 October deadline for submission of regular resolutions. The first had been submitted to the DAOC in December; the second had been submitted to the DAOC during the Open Hearing on Resolutions the previous day. The texts of the emergency resolutions and supporting materials provided by the proposers were distributed to delegates immediately before the assembly meeting.

The first emergency resolution, designated Emergency Resolution 2018-1, was submitted by Edgar Illas and Mario Santana and read as follows:

Whereas the illegal dissolution of the autonomous government of Catalonia by the Spanish State envisions the intervention in the school system of Catalonia;

Whereas attacks on Catalan as a language of education will likely increase due to the exceptional measures invoked by the Spanish state; and

Whereas the intervention of the Catalan government can further restrict the use of Catalan in schools and damage the presence of Catalan literature and scholarship in higher education;

Be it resolved that the MLA support the autonomy of the Catalan school and university system and the protection of Catalan language and literature.

The chair explained that the assembly could consider an emergency resolution only if three-fourths of the members present agreed to consider it. A room count was performed using the delegates' electronic voting devices. Since 111 delegates signaled their presence, the resolution would be considered only if at least 84 delegates voted in the affirmative. The chair then put to the assembly the question of whether it wished to consider the resolution. This procedural motion was not debatable, so the assembly proceeded immediately to a vote on the motion. The assembly's vote was 73 yes and 40 no, which was not sufficient to allow the assembly to discuss and take action on the resolution.

The second emergency resolution, designated Emergency Resolution 2018-2, was submitted by John Maerhofer on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and the Modern Languages and read as follows:

Whereas a Federal Court has upheld the Trump Administration's travel ban, a.k.a. "Muslim Ban";

Whereas this Ban threatens non-US students, faculty and scholars living in/contemplating travel to the US;

Whereas the xenophobia, racism, religious bigotry, and nativism accompanying the travel ban increase the precarity of non-tenure-track faculty and undocumented students and rationalize enhanced surveillance and repression of minority groups, e.g., "Black Identity Extremists";

Be it resolved that the MLA condemns the "Muslim Ban" and any additional attempts by the US government to target demographic groups on the basis of religion, race, or nationality.

The chair reminded the assembly that it could consider an emergency resolution only if three-fourths of the 111 members present agreed to consider it and put to the assembly the question of whether it wished to consider the resolution. The assembly's vote, 98 yes and 17 no, was sufficient to allow the assembly to discuss and take action on the resolution. The chair recognized Heather Willis Allen of the DAOC, who introduced the resolution on the floor of the assembly on behalf of the proposer of record and presented the DAOC's recommendation that the assembly adopt the resolution. The chair noted that the assembly's rules allowed for twenty-five minutes of debate on the resolution, exclusive of time devoted to secondary motions (e.g., amendments). She also explained the process of consideration for a resolution with a preamble: to ensure that amendment of the preamble occurred only after amendment of the *resolved* clause was completed, no amendments to the preamble would be permitted until debate on the resolution was closed. At that time, the chair would call for amendments to the preamble. Amendments to the preamble could be debated, but no further debate on the resolution as a whole would be in order. After amendment of the preamble was completed, a single vote would be taken on the entire resolution.

The chair opened the floor for discussion of the resolution and recognized the proposer of record, who had the right to speak first. Maerhofer said that the resolution aimed to address the detrimental effects that the travel ban would have on students and non-tenure-track faculty members and the possibility of expanded security crackdowns on supposed extremist groups that oppose the ban. The chair then called for further discussion. Sima Godfrey made a motion to amend the *resolved* clause by adding the words "sexual orientation" after "race." This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. In response to a question about the evidence for this addition, Godfrey explained that the "additional attempts" language of the *resolved* clause pointed to possible future actions and that actions already taken by the Trump administration in the context of military service justified the addition. Speaking in support of the amendment, a delegate said that sexual orientation was not far removed from the other identity categories already named in the resolution. A speaker who opposed the amendment said that sexual orientation was not relevant to the travel ban, which was based on religious bigotry and xenophobia, and that the addition would dilute the force of the resolution. Another speaker was concerned that the reference to sexual orientation did not cover transgender issues. After Godfrey conceded the points made by those who opposed the amendment to the *resolved* clause, the chair asked the assembly to vote on it. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 32 yes and 84 no.

The chair called for further discussion of the resolution; no one came forward. The chair therefore opened the floor for debate and amendment of the preamble.

Nathan Gorelick made a motion to amend the third *whereas* clause by striking the word “rationalize” and inserting the word “motivate.” This motion to amend was seconded. The chair asked if there were objections to making this change. Stephen Brockmann said that “rationalize” applied to something that was already happening while “motivate” pointed to something that could happen in the future. He therefore proposed to amend the amendment on the floor by keeping the word “rationalize” and adding “and motivate” after it. After consulting with the parliamentarian, the chair asked if there were any objections to the proposed amendment to the amendment—substituting “rationalize and motivate” for “motivate.” Gorelick objected, saying that his intent was to remove the word “rationalize,” since it could be misinterpreted as meaning “make rational” something that was irrational. Veli Yashin suggested that “justify” was a better alternative than “motivate.” The chair ruled against the consideration of a tertiary amendment and called for further discussion of the amendment to the amendment. After two more comments on the relative merits of the different formulations, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment to the amendment. The amendment to the amendment failed by a vote of 27 yes and 82 no. The chair then called for a vote on the original amendment, to strike “rationalize” and insert “motivate.” The assembly voted against the amendment; the vote was 58 yes and 59 no.

The chair called for further discussion of the preamble. Howard Horwitz proposed a motion to amend the preamble by striking the third *whereas* clause. This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. All those who spoke opposed the amendment; they said that the third *whereas* clause provided necessary context and established a crucial connection with the work of the association. When discussion came to an end, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 15 yes and 94 no.

The chair asked if there was further discussion of the preamble. Feroza Jussawalla proposed to amend the third *whereas* clause by inserting the phrase “international and refugee students and faculty” after “non-tenure-track faculty.” This motion to amend was seconded, and the floor was opened for discussion of the amendment. Hatem Akil, who was not a delegate, suggested a different formulation: replace “non-tenure-track faculty and undocumented students” with “non-tenure-track and international faculty and undocumented, refugee, and international students.” When the chair asked if there were objections to considering Akil’s text, Gaurav Desai, who was an assembly member, pointed out that only a delegate could propose a motion to amend the resolution. Interpreting this intervention as the formal proposal of an amendment to the amendment on the floor, the chair again asked if there was an objection to considering the amendment to the amendment in place of the amendment on the floor.

Instead of stating an objection, Shaden Tageldin offered another reformulation of the relevant phrase in the third *whereas* clause: replace “non-tenure-track faculty and undocumented students” with “international, refugee, and undocumented faculty (tenure- and non-tenure-track) and students.” After consulting with the parliamentarian, the chair asked if there were any objections to considering this last reformulation instead of the amendment on the floor. There was an objection, so chair directed the assembly to return to its consideration of the amendment on the floor. Since there was no further discussion, the chair called for a vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 47 yes and 35 no.

Jennifer Buckley, noting that specificity was needed to increase the power of the resolution, made a motion to amend the first *whereas* clause by striking it and inserting the following:

Whereas the US Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has upheld a portion of the Trump Administration’s executive order, popularly known as the “Muslim Ban,” barring entry into the United States by citizens of Syria, Libya, Iran, Yemen, Somalia, and Chad;

This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. Speakers noted that the list of countries was incomplete and that the latest ruling on the executive order had come from the Supreme Court. The chair asked the assembly to vote on the current amendment before considering further amendments. The assembly adopted the amendment by a vote of 49 yes and 37 no.

Following up on the previous discussion and in the interest of accuracy, Buckley proposed to amend the new version of the first *whereas* clause by striking “US Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals” and inserting “United States Supreme Court” and by striking “and” before “Chad” and inserting “Venezuela, and North Korea” after “Chad.” This motion to amend was seconded. The chair called for separate votes on the two parts of the proposed amendment. The assembly approved the substitution of “United States Supreme Court” for “US Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals” by a vote of 82 yes and 4 no; the assembly also approved the revised listing of countries affected by the executive order by a vote of 71 yes and 9 no. The newly amended version of the first *whereas* clause therefore read as follows:

Whereas the United States Supreme Court has upheld a portion of the Trump Administration’s executive order, popularly known as the “Muslim Ban,” barring entry into the United States by citizens of Syria, Libya, Iran, Yemen, Somalia, Chad, Venezuela, and North Korea;

The chair asked if there were further amendments to the preamble. Patrick Hogan, referring to one of the articles included in the resolution’s supporting materials, proposed to amend the latest version of the first *whereas*

clause, again for accuracy, by inserting “most” before “citizens,” striking “Venezuela” before “and North Korea,” and inserting “and some citizens of Venezuela” after “and North Korea.” This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair asked the assembly to vote on the motion. The assembly adopted the amendment by a vote of 57 yes and 24 no. The thrice amended *whereas* clause therefore read as follows:

Whereas the United States Supreme Court has upheld a portion of the Trump Administration’s executive order, popularly known as the “Muslim Ban,” barring entry into the United States by most citizens of Syria, Libya, Iran, Yemen, Somalia, Chad, and North Korea and some citizens of Venezuela;

Jonathan Skolnik then proposed to amend the third *whereas* clause by inserting “those labeled as” before the reference to “Black Identity Extremists.” This motion to amend was seconded and occasioned no discussion. The chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment, which was adopted by a vote of 83 yes and 6 no.

Taking up a proposal from Maerhofer, who could not propose a motion since he was not a delegate, Stephen Brockmann proposed to amend the third *whereas* clause by inserting “not only” before “increase” and replacing the word “and” before “rationalize” with “but also.” This motion to amend was seconded and occasioned no discussion. The chair called on the assembly to vote, and the assembly adopted the amendment by a vote of 74 yes and 7 no.

The chair asked if there was further discussion. Christopher GoGwilt offered a motion to amend the latest version of the first *whereas* clause by striking the word “by” and inserting the word “for.” This motion to amend was seconded; there was no discussion. The chair asked the assembly to vote on the motion, which was approved by a vote of 55 yes and 28 no.

The chair asked if delegates wished to propose any other changes to the preamble. Catherine Fung made a motion to amend the third *whereas* clause by striking “non-tenure-track faculty, international and refugee students and faculty, and undocumented students” and inserting “international, refugee, and undocumented students and faculty (tenure-track and non-tenure-track).” This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. After a comment from a speaker who opposed the amendment, the chair announced that time for discussion of the preamble had expired; she invited a motion to extend the time for discussion. Tageldin made a motion to extend the time for discussion by five minutes. This motion was not debatable and required a two-thirds vote for passage. The assembly’s vote on the motion was 59 yes (67%) and 29 no (33%), which was sufficient to extend debate. After brief further discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 27 yes and 57 no.

The chair called for further discussion; no one came forward. Therefore, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amended resolution. The assembly approved it by a vote of 79 yes and 6 no. The text of the resolution approved by the assembly read as follows:

Whereas the United States Supreme Court has upheld a portion of the Trump Administration’s executive order, popularly known as the “Muslim Ban,” barring entry into the United States for most citizens of Syria, Libya, Iran, Yemen, Somalia, Chad, and North Korea and some citizens of Venezuela;

Whereas this Ban threatens non-US students, faculty and scholars living in/contemplating travel to the US;

Whereas the xenophobia, racism, religious bigotry, and nativism accompanying the travel ban not only increase the precarity of non-tenure-track faculty, international and refugee students and faculty, and undocumented students but also rationalize enhanced surveillance and repression of minority groups, e.g., those labeled as “Black Identity Extremists”;

Be it resolved that the MLA condemns the “Muslim Ban” and any additional attempts by the US government to target demographic groups on the basis of religion, race, or nationality.

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. Feroza Jussawalla proposed a motion requesting that the Executive Council consider making a statement to address the issues raised by the #MeToo movement. Although the MLA already has a stated policy against discrimination and harassment and a statement on “Appropriate Conduct at the MLA Convention,” Jussawalla asked that the council reinforce its commitment to making all association conventions, related conferences, and committee meetings safe spaces, free of inappropriate suggestions or conduct, for all its members. This motion was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the motion. Since no one commented on the motion, the chair called for the announcement of other items of new business. Rhonda Collier offered a motion urging the Executive Council to choose warmer cities for future conventions whose venues had not already been chosen, and she urged specific consideration of Puerto Rico for a future convention. This motion was seconded, and the chair reminded the assembly that only discussion of the motion was allowed. Two delegates stated their strong support for holding a convention in Puerto Rico; one delegate argued against ruling out cities in the northern United States and in Canada and commended Canadian cities’ ability to handle snow emergencies. Sarah Chinn asked why two successive conventions had been held on the East Coast if it is MLA policy to hold conventions in different geographic locations—eastern, central, western—on a rotating basis. Paula Krebs responded to this question. Though she did not know why the New York convention followed one held

in Philadelphia, she said that conventions are planned far in advance and that few cities can host a convention as large as the MLA's. She added that there are many factors that the council takes into consideration when it chooses a convention site and that the cost factor works against meeting in warmer locations in the winter. She also noted another limiting factor: that the timing of the convention is tied to the job search process. More options would become available if this connection were loosened. The chair once again called for the announcement of additional items of new business; no one came forward.

12. The chair called for announcements and took the opportunity to tell the assembly that the 2019 convention would be held in Chicago and that the convention theme was Textual Transactions. There were no other announcements.

13. The chair declared the 2018 meeting of the Delegate Assembly adjourned sine die at 4:36 p.m.

Delegates in attendance:

Forum Delegates: David Alff, Sigrid Anderson Cordell, Johannes Burgers, Germán Campos-Muñoz, Heekyoung Cho, Samuel Cohen, Rhonda Collier, Eleni Eva Coundouriotis, Adrienne Damiani Merritt, Carol DeBoer-Langworthy, Matthew V. Desing, Douglas Eyma, Stephanie A. Fetta, Catherine Fung, Malik Gaines, Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, Martin Joel Gliserman, Dara E. Goldman, Nathan Gorelick, Yogita Goyal, Patricia E. Grieve, Jie Guo, Taryn Hakala, Patrick Colm Hogan, Anca Luca Holden, Howard Horwitz, Michelle A. Karnes, Rajender Kaur, Rachael King, Lee Konstantinou, Jessie M. Labov, Carmen Lamas, Russ Leo, Devoney Looser, Lunden Eschelle MacDonald, Laurence Mall, Colin Martin, Alessandra Montalbano, Jane Mushabac, Laura O'Connor, Sharon O'Dair, Nancy J. Peterson, Christine M. Probes, Susanne Rinner, Kristin C. Ross, Eve Salisbury, Maurice A. Samuels, Miléna Santoro, Allison Schachter, Liana Silva, Jonathan S. Skolnik, Alexandra Socarides, Elizabeth Swanstrom, Qiaomei Tang, Andrea W. Tarnowski, Jane F. Thrailkill, Per Urlaub, Silvia Valisa, Priya Wadhera, Christian Peter Weber, Sarah G. Wenzel, Jennifer Wicke, Sebastian Wogenstein, Duncan McEachern Yoon.

Professional-Issues Delegates: Anastasiya Andrianova, Karyn Marie Ball, Sukanya Banerjee, Olivia Banner, Anna Beskin, Karen Elizabeth Bishop, Jennifer Buckley, Frank Cha, Chandrima Chakraborty, Clarissa Clo, Erin Cowling, Ivonne del Valle, Danielle Evans, Rachel Ihara, Elizabeth Johnston, Anna M. Klobucka, David R. Leight, Rebecca Lorimer Leonard, Anne Garland Mahler, María del Pilar Melgarejo, Loknath Persaud, Teresa Marie Purvis, Janice A. Radway, Ben Sifuentes-Jauregui, Jerome Singerman, Barbara Spackman, Joyce Lynn Tolliver, Amanda L. Watson, Susan Weeber, Veli N. Yashin.

Regional Delegates: Carlos Abreu Mendoza, Laura J. Beard, Russell A. Berman, Katia C. Bezerra, N. Carolina Bloem, Carrie T. Bramen, Stephen Matthew Brockmann, Lena Burgos-Lafuente, Nicole Burgoyne, Donna M. Campbell, Christine M. Cano, Robert Lawrence Caserio, Matthew Cheney, Sarah E. Chinn, Maria Chouza-Calo, Michael C. Cohen, Ana Corbalan, Sean Dempsey, Stacey Lee Donohue, Caroline Egan, Anke K. Finger, Audrey A. Fisch, Emily C. Francomano, Sima N. Godfrey, Christopher GoGwilt, Todd Herzog, Anna Maria Jones, Feroza Framji Jussawalla, Kasongo Kapanga, Corey Lamont, Jill LeRoy-Frazier, Charles Waite Mahoney, Sara Mattavelli, Seth Michelson, Feisal G. Mohamed, Brooke Opel, Catherine M. Peebles, Roy Perez, Dora E. Polachek, Mary L. Poteau-Tralie, Rachel Price, Nasrin Qader, Suzanne Raitt, Leah Richards, Enrique Salas-Durazo, Willis A. Salomon, Rebecca Sanchez, Beth Seltzer, Sarah J. Townsend, Luiz Fernando Valente, Lily Wong.

Delegates Representing Regional MLAs: Joseph Donica.

Officers and Members of the Executive Council: Emily Apter, Angelika Bammer, Brian Croxall, Gaurav G. Desai, Anne Ruggles Gere, Simon E. Gikandi, David Tse-chien Pan, Evie Shockley.

Members of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee: Michelle J. Brazier, Cheryl Narumi Naruse, Shaden M. Tageldin, Heather Willis Allen.

Parliamentarian: Daniel E. Seabold.

Clerk: Paula M. Krebs.