

Minutes of the MLA Delegate Assembly

THE DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MET ON 7 JANUARY 2012 AT THE SHERATON SEATTLE HOTEL. First Vice President Michael Bérubé presided. The assembly was called to order at 1:10 p.m. The chair made preliminary announcements about the conduct of the meeting, 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, and announced the quorum for the meeting, which was 76 delegates, because 151 delegates had signed in for the meeting at the beginning. [Note: Of the 272 delegates, 187 (69%) 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), Teresa Mangum 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.

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

2. Again on behalf of the DAOC, Mangum moved that the assembly approve the minutes of the January 2011 meeting as printed in the May 2011 issue of *PMLA*. The chair asked if there were corrections. Since no corrections were offered, the chair declared the minutes approved as published.

3. The assembly elected one of its members, Jennifer Wicke (English, Univ. of Virginia), to the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee for a three-year term (from 9 Jan. 2012 through the close of the Jan. 2015 convention). In the election of a delegate to serve on the Executive Council, Samer M. Ali (Arabic, Univ. of Texas, Austin) was elected for a four-year term (from 9 Jan. 2012 through the close of the Jan. 2016 convention). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the current officers of the association, the assembly elected Peter Brooks (French, Princeton Univ.), Gail E. Finney (German, Univ. of California, Davis), and A. LaVonne Brown Ruoff (English, Univ. of Illinois, Chicago) to the Nominating Committee for two-year terms (2012–13). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the DAOC, the assembly elected the following persons to the Elections Committee for two-year terms (2012–13): Peter M. Coviello (Bowdoin Coll.), John Wharton Lowe (Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge), Laura Elizabeth Lyons (Univ. of Hawai'i, Mānoa), and Jill Robbins (Univ. of Texas, Austin).

4. The chair called on Teresa Mangum, chair of the DAOC, to present the DAOC's annual report. After noting that the assembly's agenda embodied much of the DAOC's

work and thanking the members of the DAOC and the MLA staff, Mangum asked if there were questions or comments on the report. No one came forward.

5. The assembly received the report of the executive director and the Finance Committee report. The chair recognized Executive Director Rosemary G. Feal to present the first report. Feal invited delegates to comment on the report or ask questions about it on the floor or at any time during the year. Referring to the section of the report that listed budget cuts to programs supported by Title VI of the Higher Education Act, Edith Clowes said that national resource centers were affected by the cuts, not just national language centers. The chair asked delegates to turn to the Finance Committee report and again recognized Feal to present it. She noted that the 2010–11 fiscal year had concluded with a small surplus because of cost reductions in the face of declining revenue from sales of the *MLA Handbook*. Feal asked if there were comments or questions on the report; no one came forward.

The chair then asked the assembly to turn to the annual reports it had received 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. After noting that committee members do much of the year-round work of the association on a volunteer basis, the chair recognized Teresa Mangum of the DAOC to present the reports. She thanked committee members for the amazing work they had accomplished and encouraged delegates to read the reports if they had not already done so. The chair asked if there were questions or comments. There were none.

6. The assembly received a recommendation of a dues increase from the Executive Council and the DAOC. The chair recognized Sima Godfrey, who made a motion to amend the association's dues schedule by striking out the current schedule and inserting the new schedule proposed by the council and the DAOC. The dues proposal, summarized in the table below, featured a small increase over each of three years, from 2013 through 2015, for members in all fifteen income-based dues categories, graduate student members, and secondary joint members. Godfrey noted that the proposed increase was graduated: it was 3.0% a year for members in the five lowest dues categories (1–5), graduate student members, and secondary joint members; 3.5% a year for members in the four middle dues categories (6–9); and 4.0% a year for members in the highest dues categories (R–Z). The resulting dollar amounts are rounded up to the next whole dollar. Godfrey said that the graduated increases in the proposal were a response to the objections to a flat increase raised during the 2009 assembly's discussion of the previous dues increase. She explained that the dues proposal was based on the staff Finance Committee's analysis of trends in the MLA's revenue sources, which showed a

Dues Class	Current Dues Schedule	Proposed Dues Schedule		
		2013	2014	2015
1 Under \$15,000	\$25	\$26	\$27	\$28
2 \$15,000–\$20,000	\$40	\$42	\$44	\$46
3 \$20,000–\$30,000	\$50	\$52	\$54	\$56
4 \$30,000–\$40,000	\$70	\$73	\$76	\$79
5 \$40,000–\$50,000	\$85	\$88	\$91	\$94
6 \$50,000–\$60,000	\$100	\$104	\$108	\$112
7 \$60,000–\$70,000	\$115	\$120	\$125	\$130
8 \$70,000–\$80,000	\$130	\$135	\$140	\$145
9 \$80,000–\$100,000	\$145	\$151	\$157	\$163
R \$100,000–\$120,000	\$165	\$172	\$179	\$187
T \$120,000–\$140,000	\$185	\$193	\$201	\$210
V \$140,000–\$160,000	\$205	\$214	\$223	\$232
W \$160,000–\$180,000	\$230	\$240	\$250	\$260
X \$180,000–\$200,000	\$255	\$266	\$277	\$289
Z Over \$200,000	\$280	\$292	\$304	\$317
E Student	\$20	\$21	\$22	\$23
L Joint Secondary	\$40	\$42	\$44	\$46

marked decline in revenue from book sales, notably from sales of the *MLA Handbook*. A dues increase was necessary to help counter this trend and to help ensure the association's long-term financial strength. Referring to background information that the assembly had received, she noted that MLA dues in general were low compared with dues of comparable scholarly organizations and that those organizations received a larger share of their overall revenue from membership dues than did the MLA.

The chair opened the floor for discussion of the dues proposal. Discussion began with two questions. The first was about whether there was a set target for the percentage of association income that should come from dues. Rosemary Feal responded in the negative and explained that the council's goal was a balanced budget each year. The small dues increases over three years included in the proposal would raise revenue that would help balance the budget. The second question was whether the council had considered the regressivity of the proposed dues schedule, since a member making \$50,000 a year would pay a higher percentage of his or her income in dues than would a member making \$100,000 a year. Feal said the council considered the question of a progressive dues structure but concluded that it was not appropriate for a professional association to define dues as a percentage of income. She noted that the graduated increases in the current proposal did, however, make the structure more progressive. She added that members in the highest dues categories have in essence been asked to raise their dues voluntarily, by making donations in support of the grants that subsidize convention travel expenses for graduate students and adjuncts and the Fund for the Promotion of the Profession.

Discussants were in favor of the dues proposal. The increases for graduate students and for members in the lower dues categories were not considered onerous, and the rationale for the proposal was deemed acceptable. With increased dues revenue, the association would continue to provide important services to members. When there was no further discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the motion to amend the association's dues schedule. The assembly approved the motion by a vote of 157 yes and 6 no. The chair said that the new dues schedule would be forwarded to the Executive Council for confirmation.

7. The assembly held an open discussion of two topics selected by the DAOC: "Imagining the Structures of the MLA for the Twenty-First Century: Disciplines, 'Divisions,' and Our Work" and "The Scholarly Journal: New Challenges and Opportunities." Delegates had received background information on these topics in advance of the assembly meeting. The chair asked Second Vice President Marianne Hirsch to preside over the open discussion. Hirsch reminded all present that one hour had been set aside for the open discussion. The hour would be split unevenly between the two topics: forty to forty-five minutes would be spent on the first topic and fifteen to twenty

minutes on the second. She also reminded those in attendance of the rules that would govern the open discussion.

Adelaide Russo introduced the first topic. She said that Hirsch had been asked by the Executive Council to chair a working group that would explore a revision of the association's division and discussion group structure, which dated from 1974. The DAOC and Hirsch hoped that the open discussion would elicit constructive ideas that would help the working group develop a reorganization proposal. To that end, Russo asked those present to focus during the open discussion on three guiding questions: How do members use the current divisions and discussion groups? How do the current divisions and discussion groups reflect our work? Can you imagine how divisions and discussion groups can be organized otherwise? Hirsch explained further that the goal of the working group was to look critically at the current structure and its main assumptions, at the problems and inconsistencies the structure may contain, at how new directions could be accommodated, and at the wider implications of the organization of knowledge that the division and discussion group structure represents. The working group was interested in creating a structure that was flexible enough to serve the next generation of scholars. Hirsch then asked Alexandra Wettlaufer to poll the assembly on four questions that the organizers of this discussion topic had formulated:

1. Do you and your colleagues organize your time primarily around attending division panels and social events? [73 yes, 89 no]
2. Is your division active between conventions? [43 yes, 108 no]
3. Does the current division structure reflect the ways in which you frame your own work and scholarly profile? [71 yes, 85 no]
4. Do the divisions into national literatures and periods (e.g., 19th-century French, 20th-century English, medieval Italian) continue to be constitutive of contemporary scholarship? [78 yes, 81 no]

Finally, to help keep the discussion on track, the topic organizers had formulated questions that were projected on the screen in the meeting room: (1) The current division and discussion group structure has been in place since 1974, while the profession and the organization of knowledge constantly change. How can the division and discussion group structure build in change over time? (2) What contexts for intellectual engagement do you find most valuable in the larger context of the MLA? (3) What new or complementary ways of organizing knowledge and/or sessions would be most intellectually enabling for you and why?

Speakers made general comments on the good aspects of the current structure (e.g., marginalized fields are protected, divisions provide a point of entry into a scholarly community for graduate students) and the bad (e.g., equal weight is given to very different categories of work)

and raised the issue of periodization: how it informs the current structure and the role it should play in developing a new structure. Many speakers identified lacunae in the current structure (e.g., history and literature, circum-Atlantic studies, digital humanities, pedagogical entities). There were also procedural questions about how divisions and discussion groups are created and maintained. One speaker said it was important to keep the structure open to the regular creation of new divisions; Hirsch noted that the current structure lacks an equally important mechanism for subtracting divisions. The discussion also touched on new convention features (e.g., the presidential theme, collaborative sessions, creative conversations) that should be accounted for in the restructuring of divisions and discussion groups. When time for the discussion came to an end, Hirsch asked those present to continue the discussion within their divisions and take advantage of future opportunities to comment through the MLA Web site on the reorganization.

Jonathan Arac introduced the second topic, the future of scholarly journals. That future was affected by the current financial crisis—some journals have been threatened with closure and some have been closed or relocated—and by the shift in the profession and in the MLA itself from publication to scholarly communication. Both of these factors raised questions about the presentation of scholarly work that scholars and journals needed to address. To guide the discussion, the topic organizers had formulated questions that were projected on the screen in the meeting room: (1) Do we have good reason to continue hard-copy publication of journals? (2) Do universities have good reason to support journals? Are there better models and rationales for university support than those most current? (3) What are the opportunities and challenges represented by open access? (4) How can we better think about the relation of academic dialogue and the distribution of ideas in the context of evaluation and promotion requirements in institutional settings?

One speaker said that the closing of a print journal could not be explained by the cost of printing, since ninety percent of a journal's cost comes from the evaluation and editing of the contents, which are necessary regardless of publication format. Discussion then focused on other factors that are in play (e.g., the role of libraries and of digital publishers, copyright) and the advantages and disadvantages of print and digital publication. A comment about readers' continued interest in print publications prompted the chair to conduct a straw poll based on the topic's first guiding question: Do we have good reason to continue hard-copy publication of journals? Ninety delegates answered yes, sixty-one no. Speakers then elaborated on the outcome of this vote. A print subscription brings paper copies of a journal that an individual or a library can keep forever, while an online subscription allows access to the journal only as long as the subscription is maintained. Print copies that are delivered directly to subscribers

claim immediate attention. Access to digital publications can, however, be easier and quicker, since it is not tied to a physical object. Print publications can be browsed in ways that digital publications can't, but digital searching and browsing have advantages of their own. Print and digital publications prompt different ways of reading, and one may be more comfortable with print than with digital. Print and digital publication have offsetting ecological disadvantages: print consumes paper, while digital consumes energy. The production of different print and digital editions was a new development; the inclusion of more features in the digital edition than in the print edition might lead to a shift in prestige from print to digital.

Discussion also touched on the attractiveness of digital publication to the current generation of students and scholars. One speaker pointed to the need to confront the reality that undergraduates are digital creatures who rarely if ever use print resources. Another spoke about the inevitability of a complete shift to digital publication, which required all to understand and deal with the issues involved.

The open discussion came to a close after one hour, at which point First Vice President Michael Bérubé returned to the chair.

8. In the category of new business, there were three regular resolutions, two that were received from members by the 1 October submission deadline for resolutions and one that was initiated by the DAOC in accordance with the provisions of the MLA constitution. The chair explained the two-stage process of consideration for a resolution with a preamble. He would call first for debate and amendment of the *resolved* clause or clauses and then for debate and amendment of the preamble before putting the full text of the resolution to a vote. The first resolution (labeled Resolution 2012-1) was submitted by Grover Furr on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and the Modern Languages. It read as follows:

Whereas academic freedom protects professors' right to integrate their political views into the course subject matter; and

Whereas cutbacks against all publicly funded social welfare benefits, including higher education, continue unabated; and

Whereas these issues are relevant to every discipline and every subject; and

Whereas Cary Nelson, AAUP President, suggests that each professor "devote one hour each semester in every course to discussing the status and character of campus labor";

Resolved that the MLA encourage its members to devote at least one class period each semester in every course to discussing the cutbacks in public support for higher education.

The chair recognized Sima Godfrey of the DAOC, who presented the resolution to the assembly along with the DAOC's recommendation that the resolution not be

adopted. The DAOC's recommendation was based on three concerns. First, non-tenure-track faculty members do not have the same support systems as tenured or tenure-track faculty members and would therefore be vulnerable if they acted in the way suggested by the resolution. Second, members who are employees at state universities would similarly be in jeopardy because of the loyalty oaths they take. Third, a "class period" in a weekly seminar could amount to ten percent of the course, and spending that much time discussing something other than course material would shortchange student learning. The chair opened the floor for discussion of the *resolved* clause of Resolution 2012-1 and recognized the proposer of record. Furr said he would address the DAOC's objections later, since they dealt with the preamble. He encouraged support for a resolution whose *resolved* clause called for a discussion that would allow students to understand the cutbacks to education and that would combat the disinformation about the issue from politicians and others. Supporting the resolution also meant supporting the exercise of academic freedom.

Patricia Roberts-Miller rose to propose an amendment to the *resolved* clause on behalf of Furr, who was not a delegate and therefore could not propose the amendment himself. She made a motion to amend the *resolved* clause by striking out "one class period each semester in every course" and inserting "one hour each course in every course." This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. A speaker noted that the amended language could be construed to mean an increase in the amount of time devoted to the suggested discussion; another questioned the need for any specification of a time period. Since there was no further discussion of the amendment, the chair asked the assembly to vote on it. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 53 yes and 76 no.

The chair asked if there was further discussion of the *resolved* clause. A speaker argued that the resolution was valid despite the difficulties that non-tenure-track faculty members might face. They could decide for themselves whether and how to act on the resolution, and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) would help them deal with any negative consequences. Another speaker, after expressing doubt that the AAUP or the MLA could help a faculty member whose institution took issue with his or her compliance with the resolution, argued that the resolution could endanger members and was therefore inappropriate. Supporters of the resolution said that it would provide a crucial means of teaching students about the budget cutbacks that are causing a crisis in many institutions. Because the budget cuts affect students in the classroom, it was appropriate to use classroom discussion to elucidate the issues and perhaps strengthen opposition to the cuts. Speakers who opposed the resolution said it unacceptably aimed to tell teachers what to do in their classrooms instead of simply express-

ing opposition to the cutbacks or affirming a teacher's right to exercise academic freedom and discuss the cutbacks with students, an approach that would be more in keeping with past MLA resolutions.

Lila Harper made a motion to amend the *resolved* clause by striking out the words "at least one class period each semester in every course to discussing" and inserting the words "time in their classes to discuss." The motion to amend was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. After brief discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 74 yes and 54 no. The chair then asked if there was further discussion of the amended *resolved* clause. There was none, so the chair opened the floor for discussion of the preamble and recognized Furr, who countered the objections of the DAOC. He said the fact that a teacher who asserts his or her academic freedom might be dismissed by an institution was not an argument against the resolution but an argument for the MLA to go on record once again in support of academic freedom. He added that if a teacher was dismissed, the institution would bear responsibility for the action, not the MLA. Furr also said that the DAOC's concern about loyalty oaths was misplaced, since the resolution had nothing to do with the United States Constitution. Godfrey explained that the DAOC's concern for vulnerable instructors was not misplaced, since instructors are hired to teach a specific subject and would be in danger of losing their jobs if they spent class time on a different subject. For the DAOC, the issue was the forum for a discussion of budget cutbacks, not the value or the importance of such a discussion, and whether a resolution should dictate what teachers do in their classrooms. Furr insisted that the classroom was an appropriate forum, and another speaker said that non-tenure-track faculty members could decide for themselves how to respond to the resolution.

Christopher LeCluyse made a motion to close debate. This motion was seconded, and the chair called for a vote on the motion, which was not debatable and required a two-thirds vote for passage. The assembly closed debate on Resolution 2012-1 by a vote of 111 yes (90%) and 12 no (10%). Resolution 2012-1 as amended therefore came to an immediate vote. The assembly did not approve the resolution; the vote was 37 yes and 87 no.

The second resolution (designated Resolution 2012-2) was submitted by Margaret Hanzimanolis on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and the Modern Languages. It read as follows:

Whereas the study of language and literature entails investigation of local and international context,

Whereas faculty members, students, and writers of interest to the academy may face sanctions or institutional pressures for addressing controversial economic and political issues concerning higher education, or for supporting social justice movements inside or outside the academy,

Resolved that MLA affirm that members of the academic community have the right to challenge legislative or administrative decisions curtailing educational access, oppose political interference in such allied academic areas as ethnic and environmental studies, and address social justice issues relevant to their communities without fear of reprisal.

Ana-Maria Medina of the DAOC presented the resolution to the assembly along with the DAOC's recommendation that the assembly not approve the resolution. Medina said that the MLA was already on record as endorsing the position put forward in the resolution and drew attention to two recent examples, the 2009 MLA Statement on Academic Freedom and the MLA's statement on the Supreme Court's ruling in *Garcetti v. Ceballos*, both available at the MLA Web site (mla.org/academic_freedom_2009 and mla.org/garcetti_ceballos, respectively). She read a portion of the concluding sentence of the latter statement: "we recommend that all public colleges and universities reaffirm the right of their faculty members to speak on matters of public concern—and matters pursuant to their official duties—without fear of retaliation." The DAOC found that the resolution was not needed because it reiterated these and other statements. The chair opened the floor for discussion of the *resolved* clause and recognized the proposer of record. Hanzimanolis explained the context in which the resolution was formulated: widespread campus violence and the curtailment of academic freedom. She noted that the MLA's previous statements did not address the severity of the current circumstances.

David Downing rose to propose an amendment to the *resolved* clause on behalf of Hanzimanolis, who was not a delegate and therefore could not propose the amendment herself. The amendment consisted in the insertion of the phrase "to teach and promote the work of controversial writers" after the mention of "ethnic and environmental studies" and, for grammatical parallelism, the addition of the word "to" before the words "oppose" and "address." The motion to amend was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. There was one speaker, who explained that a companion amendment to the second *whereas* clause would also be offered, so that the resolution would address the situation of writers separately from that of faculty members and students. Since there was no further discussion of the amendment, the chair asked the assembly to vote on it. The assembly adopted the amendment by a vote of 89 yes and 21 no.

The chair called for further discussion of the amended *resolved* clause. In response to a question about the rationale for the DAOC's recommendation, Teresa Mangum said that the DAOC agreed with the sentiments expressed in the resolution but found that the MLA's existing statements and the Executive Council's current practice of addressing specific issues and situations in a timely way obviated the need for a new resolution. Supporters of the resolution argued that the specificity of the new resolution distinguished it

from previous MLA statements and that there was nothing wrong with repeatedly stating the association's opposition to repressive measures and threats. It was also noted that the new resolution was not like past statements in that it dealt with campus matters other than teaching.

When discussion of the amended *resolved* clause came to an end, the chair opened the floor for discussion of the preamble. David Downing made a motion to amend the second *whereas* clause by striking out the words "and writers of interest to the academy" along with the preceding comma and by replacing the comma between the words "faculty members" and "students" with the word "and." The motion to amend was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. Richard Middleton-Kaplan suggested that the amendment also include a reference to staff members. Downing accepted this change, and the chair asked if there were any objections to revising the amendment so the phrase in question would read "faculty members, staff members, and students." No assembly members objected to the change, so the wording of the amendment was revised by unanimous consent. Since there was no further discussion of the amendment, the chair asked the assembly to vote on it. The assembly approved the amendment by a vote of 107 yes and 4 no.

The chair asked if there was any further discussion of the amended preamble; no one came forward. The chair therefore asked the assembly to vote on the twice-amended resolution. The assembly approved the resolution by a vote of 80 yes and 32 no. The text of the resolution approved by the assembly read as follows:

Whereas the study of language and literature entails investigation of local and international context,

Whereas faculty members, staff members, and students may face sanctions or institutional pressures for addressing controversial economic and political issues concerning higher education, or for supporting social justice movements inside or outside the academy,

Resolved that MLA affirm that members of the academic community have the right to challenge legislative or administrative decisions curtailing educational access, to oppose political interference in such allied academic areas as ethnic and environmental studies, to teach and promote the work of controversial writers, and to address social justice issues relevant to their communities without fear of reprisal.

The third resolution (labeled Resolution 2012-3) was initiated by the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee. It read as follows:

Whereas the Occupy Wall Street movement has called attention to the burden of mounting student debt;

Whereas average debt for college graduates in the United States is \$25,000, and collective student debt is nearly \$1 trillion, having doubled in the past five years; and

Whereas some demonstrations have met with violent police action;

Be it resolved that the Modern Language Association support the right to peaceful protests, protected under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that bring student debt to the forefront of national debate.

Teresa Mangum of the DAOC presented the resolution to the assembly along with the DAOC's recommendation that the assembly approve a version of the resolution that incorporated three amendments formulated by the DAOC. She read them out. The first was to strike the words "Wall Street" from the first *whereas* clause, the second was to insert the clause "graduate student debt often exceeds that figure" after the first clause of the second *whereas* clause, and the third was to strike the words "the right to" in the *resolved* clause. After reading out the amended version of the resolution in its entirety, the chair noted that the assembly would need to dispose of each amendment in turn. He recognized Mangum, who moved to amend the *resolved* clause by striking the words "the right to." Thomas Luxon asked if the amendments could be bundled and disposed of with a single vote. The chair asked if there were any objections to proceeding in this manner. There were none, so the chair opened the floor for discussion of the three amendments proposed by the DAOC. After brief discussion, the bundle of amendments came to a vote. The assembly approved them by a vote of 104 yes and 1 no. The chair then called for discussion of the amended *resolved* clause. Those who spoke were in favor of adopting the resolution and commended the DAOC for addressing the issue of mounting student debt. The chair asked if anyone wanted to express an opposing view. No one came forward. The chair called for discussion of the amended preamble; no one came forward. The chair asked the assembly to vote on Resolution 2012-3 as amended. The assembly approved the resolution by a vote 104 yes and 1 no. The text of the resolution approved by the assembly read as follows:

Whereas the Occupy movement has called attention to the burden of mounting student debt;

Whereas average debt for college graduates in the United States is \$25,000, graduate student debt often exceeds that figure, and collective student debt is nearly \$1 trillion, having doubled in the past five years; and

Whereas some demonstrations have met with violent police action;

Be it resolved that the Modern Language Association support peaceful protests, protected under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that bring student debt to the forefront of national debate.

9. The chair reported briefly on an emergency resolution that had been submitted to the DAOC the day

before, during the Open Hearing on Resolutions. The resolution dealt with New Hampshire legislation that stripped colleges of their right to prohibit guns on campus. Because the resolution was submitted with an insufficient number of supporting signatures, the DAOC could not forward it to the assembly for action. The proposer was encouraged to ask the Executive Council to take up the matter.

10. 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. No items of new business were announced, but several delegates asked questions. These questions dealt with the following matters: the recent change in child-care arrangements at the convention, revising the order of the assembly's agenda so that the open discussion follows the consideration of new business, using the projection equipment in the assembly meeting room to display proposed amendments on-screen, establishing a policy on job interviews over Skype and instituting a special registration fee for convention goers who are only interested in access to the job center, the need for shuttle busing in Seattle, and supporting colleagues in francophone studies in their efforts to explain to administrators that a single faculty member cannot cover such a broad field.

11. The chair called for announcements. He took the opportunity to encourage everyone present to come to the MLA awards ceremony later that day. No other announcements were made.

12. The chair declared the 2012 meeting of the Delegate Assembly adjourned sine die at 4:44 p.m.

Delegates in attendance:

Divisional Delegates: Samer M. Ali, Marco Arnaudo, Candace Barrington, John Bruni, Bruce R. Burningham, Linda Camarasana, Robert Lawrence Caserio, Edith W. Clowes, Jeffrey R. Di Leo, Nathalie Dupont, Erik G. Ekman, Mary E. Faraci, Thomas Foster, Andrew Gaedtke, Katherine D. Harris, Gail K. Hart, Nathalie Hester, Tsitsi Jaji, Kimberly M. Jew, Janis A. Johnson, Ann R. Keefer, Stephanie Louise Kirk, Stacy S. Klein, Yu Jin Ko, Natasha Korda, Brian Lennon, Wenxin Li, Marissa K. López, John Wharton Lowe, Joshua K. Lund, Thomas H. Luxon, Laura C. Mandell, Peter M. McIsaac, Natania Meeker, David Chioni Moore, Rosmarie T. Morewedge, Leslie Morris, Margaret A. Noori, María Rosa Olivera-Williams, Jorge P. Pérez, Catherine Perry, Jeffrey N. Peters, Dora E. Polachek, Gerald Joseph Prince, Julie Rak, Brian J. Reilly, Patricia Roberts-Miller, Fernando Rubio, Nicholas Sammond, Martin B. Shichtman, Jiwon Shin, Robert Simon, Julie E. Singer, Rajani Sudan, Jan Christopher Susina, Timothy Sweet, Nicole Tabor, Robert Train, Steven Ungar, Joya F. Uraizee, Lisa Voigt, Orrin Nan Chung Wang, Laura Wittman, Mark A. Wollaeger.

Special-Interest Delegates: Emory Reginald Abbott, Karen Alexander, Herman Beavers, Morris Beja, James R. Britton, Patricia R. Campbell, Susannah Mary Chewing, Sheila Marie Contreras, Kevin J. H. Dettmar, Barbara C. Ewell, Michael E. Geisler, Paul Giles, Aparna Gollapudi,

Susan Elizabeth Gustafson, Gregory Hampton, Lila Marz Harper, Rebecca Lynn Ingalls, Monica F. Jacobe, Stacey Katz Bourns, Petra Kuppers, Zachary Lamm, Miles McCrimmon, Trimiko Melancon, Richard Middleton-Kaplan, Laura Mullen, Steven L. Newman, Nikhil A. Sathe, Ralph James Savarese, Cathy J. Schlund-Vials, Lisa A. Seale, Sandra Ballif Straubhaar, Laurie Taylor, Robert D. Tobin, Karen Tongson, Ingeborg Walther, Jennifer Wicke, Mimi Yiu.

Regional Delegates: Sari Altschuler, Susan C. Anderson, Gustavo Arango, Pascale M. Barthe, Christopher Baswell, Kent Baxter, Gina Bloom, Will Brantley, Joanne M. Braxton, Jonathan Burgoyne, John C. Charles, Sébastien Côté, Jacqueline Couti, Kimberly Cox, Nathalie Marie Degroult, Marilyn R. Desmond, David B. Downing, Gregory Eiselein, Daylanne K. English, Katherine Fama, Lisa Jeanne Fluet, Granville Ganter, Susan L. Gaylard, Paul Gilmore, Colleen Glenn, Scott Paul Gordon, Jeffrey Grossman, Lucas H. Harriman, Jarrod Hayes, Alex Hernandez, Emily Hind, William Hutchings, Christopher LeCluyse, Domingo Ledezma, Patrizia C. McBride, Ellen McClure, Caroline McCracken-Flesher, Linda McManness, Panivong Norindr,

Nobuko Miyama Ochner, Paul W. Peppis, Hiram Perez, Trey Philpotts, Anjali Prabhu, Lynn Ramey, Rashna Wadia Richards, Elizabeth M. Richmond-Garza, Gerhard Richter, Rebecka Rutledge Fisher, Tracy Rutler, Boukary Sawadogo, John L. Schilb, Matthew Senior, George G. Shuffelton, Susan Solomon, Theodore L. Steinberg, Anna W. Stenport, David Suchoff, Irene Tucker, Johannes Türk, Katharina von Hammerstein, Phillip E. Wegner, Jennifer M. Wilks, Victoria Wolff, John Robert Ziegler.

Delegates Representing Regional MLAs: Ruben Espinosa, Nancy Anne LaGreca, Karen Stein, Craig Svonkin.

Officers and Members of the Executive Council: Barbara K. Altmann, Jonathan Arac, Sara Armengot, Michael Bérubé, Debra Ann Castillo, Jennifer Crewe, Dorothea Heitsch, Marianne Hirsch, Richard M. Ohmann, Lynne Tatlock, Alexandra K. Wettlaufer, Kathleen Woodward.

Members of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee: Maria Damon, Sima N. Godfrey, Teresa Mangum, Ana-Maria Medina, Adelaide M. Russo.

Parliamentarian: Jeanette N. Williams.

Clerk: Rosemary G. Feal.