

Minutes of the MLA Delegate Assembly

THE DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MET ON 5 JANUARY 2013 AT THE SHERATON BOSTON HOTEL. First Vice President Marianne Hirsch presided. The assembly was called to order at 1:15 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 announced the quorum for the meeting, which was 82 delegates, because 164 delegates had signed in for the meeting at the beginning. [Note: Of the 267 delegates, 180 (67%) 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), Sima Godfrey 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.

Godfrey 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.

Again on behalf of the DAOC, Godfrey moved that the assembly approve the minutes of the January 2012 meeting as printed in the May 2012 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 two of its members, Stephanie Louise Kirk (Spanish, Washington Univ. in St. Louis) and Julie Rak (English, Univ. of Alberta), to the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee for three-year terms (from 7 Jan. 2013 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 Melissa Gonzalez (Spanish, Davidson Coll.), Karen Newman (comparative literature, Brown Univ.), Tyechia Thompson (English, Howard Univ.), and Katie Trumpener (comparative literature, Yale Univ.) to the Nominating Committee for two-year terms (2013–14). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the DAOC, the assembly elected the following persons to the Elections Committee for two-year terms (2013–14): Gail E. Hawisher (Univ. of Illinois, Urbana), Molly Murray (Columbia Univ.), and Carolyn S. Williams (Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick).

3. The chair called on Sima Godfrey, chair of the DAOC, to present the DAOC's annual report. Godfrey said that the report did not cover the emergency resolution submitted to the committee the previous day. She also called attention to the fact that one of the two resolutions that had been submitted by the 1 October deadline had not been forwarded to the assembly for consideration because the supporting materials had been submitted late. The committee had encouraged the proposer of this resolution, which

addressed the important issue of student debt, to resubmit the resolution for the next assembly meeting. Godfrey concluded her presentation of the DAOC's report by noting that the topic chosen for the open discussion had been informed by the motion and the resolution that were on the assembly's agenda and by suggestions received from assembly members. Godfrey thanked all those who had sent suggestions. The chair asked if there were questions or comments on the report. No one came forward.

4. The assembly received a report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution that consisted in the amendment to article 3 of the constitution that was published at the MLA Web site in September 2012. The chair recognized Mecca Sullivan, a member of the Executive Council and the DAOC, who presented the amendment to the assembly. Sullivan explained that the amendment resulted from a council proposal to align the process for changing the dues structure for life members with the process for changing the dues structure for regular and student members. Under current constitutional provisions, changing the dues structure for life members requires a constitutional amendment, whereas changing the dues structure for regular and student members requires only an assembly vote on a motion, followed by the council's confirmation of the assembly's action. The purpose of the amendment was to allow the assembly and the council to use the same process for revising the dues structures of all membership categories. On behalf of the committee, Sullivan then moved to amend article 3.C of the constitution by striking out the sentences shown in brackets below and inserting the sentences shown in boldface:

Life members. Persons eligible for regular membership may become life members by making a single payment, thereafter becoming exempt from the annual payment of dues. With each completed decade of membership, the fee for life membership shall be diminished by one-fourth. [Persons who have paid membership dues for forty years shall become life members without further payment. Persons who have been members for twenty years or more and who have retired from active service may notify the association of their retirement and shall thereafter become life members without further payment.] **In addition, criteria for the granting of life membership shall be included in the dues structure. Members who have met these criteria shall be granted life membership and shall thereafter make no payment.**

The chair opened the floor for discussion of the proposed amendment. Since no one wished to speak, the chair stated the question on the amendment and asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the amendment by a vote of 152 yes and 5 no. The chair noted that, in accordance with the procedure outlined in the constitution, the amendment would be forwarded to the Executive Council for action.

5. 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 Executive Director Rosemary 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. No one came forward. The chair then recognized Debra Castillo, of the council and the DAOC, to present the reports from the association's committees. Castillo commented on the excellent work that the committees had accomplished over the past year and thanked the committees for their work. The chair asked if there were questions or comments; there were none. The chair then asked delegates to turn to the Finance Committee report and again recognized Feal to present it. Feal noted that the association was managing well in the current weak global economy thanks to robust sales of the *MLA International Bibliography* and targeted spending cuts. She asked if there were comments or questions about the report. Debra Ann Modellmog asked if there was a relation between the decline in the number of MLA members and the dues increase that had recently gone into effect. Feal explained that membership associations in general had seen declines in membership and that the drop the MLA was experiencing corresponded to a contraction in the numbers of graduate students and tenure-track positions in the field. She added that the decrease in 2012 membership was smaller than the decrease the previous year, so it was not clear what factors influenced members who did not renew. Because the staff anticipated a drop in membership after the dues increase, Feal said a survey of former members would be undertaken to find out why they decided not to renew. The chair asked if there were other questions or comments; there were none.

6. The assembly held an open discussion of the role of faculty members in university-wide curricular matters, including online initiatives, a topic selected by the DAOC. To help organize the discussion, the DAOC also proposed three subtopics: (1) online learning: democratization or instrumentalization? how do online initiatives redefine education and knowledge production?; (2) the outsourcing to online venues of commonly taught and less-commonly-taught language courses; and (3) the credentials necessary for online teaching: MA? PhD? Delegates had received

background information on the topic and subtopics in advance of the assembly meeting. The chair asked Second Vice President Margaret Ferguson to preside over the open discussion. Ferguson reminded all present that one hour had been set aside for the open discussion. She also reminded those in attendance of the rules that would govern the open discussion. The chair recognized Debra Castillo for an introduction to the topic. Castillo said that the topic was based on the new-business proposals and other suggestions that had been submitted to the DAOC, and she urged delegates and MLA members to continue to provide input for future assembly discussions.

The discussion began with a question about the exclusion of the MFA from the third subtopic. Sima Godfrey said that the DAOC had received that subtopic from a member, and she agreed that the MFA should be included in the discussion of credentials for online teaching. Several speakers commented on the effectiveness of online formats for different types of course material; introductory language courses were considered well suited to the online environment while writing and literature courses were not. It was noted in general that online courses are good at transmitting information but that they cannot duplicate the intellectual engagement that characterizes the relationship between professors and students in the classroom. Discussion also touched on the suitability of online courses for different types of students. Advanced students can deal with online courses because of their past experience in a college or university; first-year students, first-generation college students, and students with certain types of disabilities were not considered good candidates for online learning. Thus, access to higher education is enhanced only in a limited way, for certain kinds of courses and for certain sets of students. It was also noted that effective online courses implement pedagogical approaches designed for online use and that effective teachers have the ability to exploit those approaches. Several speakers described their positive experiences with teaching online courses and said the online environment offers exciting possibilities that more teachers should explore. Some speakers attributed distinct advantages to hybrid courses, in which at most fifty percent of class time is spent online and which allow for a multiplicity of instructor-to-student and student-to-student interactions.

The issue of faculty governance was also addressed. A speaker noted that the system of faculty governance at her university ensured that online courses did not form a separate venture but were part of the university's overall intellectual project for all students, wherever they were. Several speakers described situations in which faculty governance was ignored when decisions about online learning were made on their campuses. They cautioned everyone about the problems that can arise when the campus office or unit that makes the decisions (e.g., public affairs, cooperative learning) lies outside the faculty-governance structure. Problems included the displacement of faculty members whose courses are replaced by commercial

online packages and the overreliance on adjunct faculty members as online instructors. A speaker mentioned another kind of course that falls outside faculty control: the high school course that is offered for college credit. Discussion also explored the idea that meaningful faculty governance requires the service of informed faculty members on oversight committees. To be informed, faculty members need to take online courses themselves and make sure that their institutions' mission statements are compatible with a push for online learning.

Several speakers commented on the argument that online learning opportunities should be developed because they save money. Most questioned this argument because of the costs associated with the design, development, and implementation of pedagogically sound online courses (e.g., compensation for faculty members who develop and deliver courses, support for students who take courses). In addition, they did not think it was acceptable to generate savings from the hiring of adjuncts, from not compensating faculty members for their work on online courses, and from the enrollment of hundreds of students in a single online course. A speaker noted another cost factor: the effect on the environment of the increased use of electricity. Speakers also addressed the related issues of copyright in and ownership of online course materials, since many schools claim control over the courses and modules developed by their faculty members and stand to benefit from those products.

Discussion also touched on what the MLA could do to help faculty members address the issues raised. It was suggested that the MLA collect and disseminate information on the ways in which online courses are managed on different campuses. Given that information, the MLA could also outline best practices in faculty governance, course development, and staffing.

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

7. 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 2013-1) was submitted by Margaret Hanzimanolis on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and Modern Languages and by Maria Maisto and Karen Lentz Madison. It read as follows:

1. Whereas a significant expression of the de-professionalization of US higher education is the growing reliance on part-time (50.7%) and contingent (75.5%) faculty members;
2. Whereas no data on part-time faculty pay and working conditions is required of institutions, as part of the mandated federal data collection system, which makes historical and institutional comparisons of part-time faculty pay and benefits difficult;
3. Whereas the MLA has been an important contributor to the 2012 Coalition on the Academic Workforce

(CAW) survey, and has undertaken other internal efforts, which together have begun long overdue data collection and the formulation of guidelines on contingent and part-time faculty working conditions and pay;

4. Whereas the 2012 Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) reports that the average pay for part-time faculty is less than \$3000/course, or \$24,000 for an average full-time equivalent (FTE) workload;

5. Whereas The Adjunct Project has assembled data from part-time faculty at over 2200 institutions that indicate a significant number of institutions in the United States pay less than \$2000 per course, or \$16,000 per year for an average FTE workload;

6. Whereas students, parents, high school guidance counselors, and even trustees in some districts are largely unaware of the pay and working conditions of part-time and contingent faculty;

7. Whereas many faculty members hired by the course are denied unemployment compensation between terms despite not having reasonable assurance of further employment;

BE IT MOVED that the MLA

ACTIVELY PROMOTE the establishment of more comprehensive, mandated, national part-time faculty and contingent working condition and pay data;

ENCOURAGE members' institutions to collect and publicize more data about part-time/full-time faculty ratios, as well as part-time faculty pay, and working conditions, to trustees, parents, students, and high school guidance counselors;

CREATE and **PUBLICIZE** a database of institutions whose part-time faculty pay and working conditions reach the MLA Recommendation on Minimum Per-Course Compensation for Part-Time Faculty Members;

ACTIVELY SUPPORT the NEA/New Faculty Majority request that the Department of Labor clarify that part-time faculty do not have a reasonable assurance of continued employment and thus are eligible for unemployment benefits between terms; and

SUPPORT part-time, contingent probationary non-tenured and allied tenured faculty in their efforts to improve the professional conditions of labor in higher education.

The chair explained the two-stage process of consideration for motions and resolutions with preambles. She would call first for debate on and amendment of the *moved* or *resolved* clause or clauses and then for debate on and amendment of the preamble before putting the full text of each item to a vote. The chair recognized Adelaide Russo of the DAOC to present the motion to the assembly. After Russo had introduced the motion, the chair opened the floor for discussion of the five-part *moved* clause and recognized Margaret Hanzimanolis, one of the proposers of record. Hanzimanolis spoke about three aspects of the motion: the need for a ruling from the United States Department of Labor on the eligibility of part-time faculty members for unemployment benefits; the need to

lobby for the mandatory collection of data on part-time and contingent faculty members for the federal government's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System; and the need for the MLA to enhance its efforts to collect and publicize information on the pay and working conditions of part-time and contingent faculty members.

The chair called for further discussion of the *moved* clause. Donald Pease asked if the distinction in the motion between part-time and contingent faculty members could be clarified by the addition of definitions. Referring to the final part of the *moved* clause, Russo said that the motion identified three categories of faculty members: part-time, contingent, and probationary. She therefore proposed a motion to amend that part of the *moved* clause by adding a comma after "contingent." This motion was seconded, and the chair opened the floor for discussion of the proposed amendment. Since there was none, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 126 yes and 2 no. The chair asked if there was further discussion of the amended *moved* clause. In answer to another question about what the terms *part-time* and *contingent* refer to, Hanzimanolis said that *contingent* is the broadest term that includes specific categories of teachers—e.g., part-timers, graduate students, non-tenure-track faculty members on short contracts—under its umbrella. She added that regional variations contribute to the confusion that surrounds this terminology and that the Department of Labor should be lobbied on the issue of uniform names for employment categories.

Discussion then focused on the third part of the *moved* clause and whether to amend it to make clear that the absence of an institution from the proposed database should not be taken to imply that the institution was not in compliance with MLA recommendations. Some speakers saw the need for clarification; others did not. Rosemary Feal explained that the wording of the motion was not critical, since assembly motions are not published as official statements but presented to the Executive Council as recommendations for action. She said that the council would take into account the assembly's stated concerns about the possible negative implications of this part of the *moved* clause. In answer to a question about the second part of the *moved* clause and the usefulness of establishing a ratio of part-time to full-time faculty members if the full-time numbers included contingent faculty members, Hanzimanolis said that it was important to provide staffing information to students and parents even if the metric used lacked nuance.

The chair announced that the time for the discussion of the motion had expired but that the motion's preamble had not been addressed. She asked if there were objections to extending discussion ten minutes for consideration of the preamble. Since there were no objections, the chair called for discussion of the preamble. Hanzimanolis responded to a question about the provenance of the salary information given in the fourth and fifth *whereas*

clauses. She said that we have no good national data on the pay of part-timers because the collection of these data is not mandated by the government. The information in the motion comes from crowdsourced projects, with data reported directly by part-timers across all disciplines.

The chair asked if there was further discussion of the preamble. Since no one came forward, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amended motion. The assembly approved it by a vote of 115 yes and 1 no.

8. Also in the category of new business was one regular resolution that was received by the 1 October submission deadline for resolutions. The resolution, which was referred to as Resolution 2013-1, was submitted by Susan G. O'Malley on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and Modern Languages. It read as follows:

Whereas in 2011 the CUNY Board of Trustees passed the Pathways curriculum for implementation by September 2013;

Whereas Pathways bypasses faculty governance, and only the administration's appointees "participated" in the decision-making;

Whereas the AAUP states "faculty has primary responsibility for . . . curriculum [and] subject matter," and college governance regulations state, "The Faculty . . . confer degrees";

Whereas the Administration acted despite senates', councils', and nearly 5,000 instructional staffs' opposition,

Resolved the MLA affirms the faculty's right to determine curriculum and graduation requirements and to withhold implementation of any curriculum that has not been recommended by the appropriate college governance body.

The chair again explained the two-stage process of consideration for a resolution with a preamble. She would call first for debate on and amendment of the *resolved* clause or clauses and then for debate on and amendment of the preamble before putting the full text of the resolution to a vote. The chair then recognized Jonathan Arac, of the DAOC, who 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 that the DAOC had formulated in response to the discussion of the resolution at the open hearing held the previous day. These amendments were displayed on the screen in the meeting room. The chair asked if there were objections to considering the DAOC's amendments one at a time before beginning the previously outlined two-stage process for considering the resolution. There were none, so the assembly began by considering the DAOC's amendments.

In its first amendment, the DAOC proposed to strike the words "Pathways bypasses" in the second *whereas* clause and insert the words "the approval of Pathways bypassed." The chair called for discussion of the amendment. There was none, so the chair asked the assembly to vote

on the amendment. The assembly was unanimous in its approval of the amendment; there were 112 yes votes. In its second amendment, the DAOC proposed to strike the quotation marks in the second *whereas* clause. The chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. No one came forward, so the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 108 yes and 2 no. In its third and final amendment, the DAOC proposed to strike the word "college" in the *resolved* clause and insert the word "faculty." The chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. There was again no discussion, so the chair called for a vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 116 yes and 1 no.

Now that the assembly had disposed of the DAOC's three amendments, the chair opened the floor for discussion of the *resolved* clause of Resolution 2013-1 and recognized the proposer of record. O'Malley said that the *resolved* clause addressed the general issues of faculty governance and faculty control of the curriculum and graduation requirements, while the preamble presented the specific example of the Pathways curriculum at the City University of New York (CUNY). She explained that the Pathways curriculum was being promoted by an education reform movement that stressed college completion above all other measures of an institution's quality and that Pathways had been imposed by CUNY's chancellor and Board of Trustees over the objections of the five thousand faculty members who signed a petition against Pathways, the University Faculty Senate, the majority of the faculty councils in the constituent colleges, and the faculty union. She noted further that provosts were threatening to take action against schools whose faculty governance councils did not put forward courses for Pathways.

The chair asked if there was further discussion of the *resolved* clause. James Mardock said it was necessary to make clear that the resolution did not pertain only to CUNY. He therefore made a motion to amend the *resolved* clause by striking "the faculty's right" and inserting "the right of college and university faculty." This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. No one came forward, so the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly adopted it by a vote of 108 yes and 2 no.

The chair asked if there was further discussion of the amended *resolved* clause. Referring to the CUNY administration's response to the resolution, in which it was noted that faculty decision making on various matters of academic policy is subject to guidelines that the CUNY Board of Trustees may establish, a delegate asked if boards of trustees generally have such oversight power. O'Malley could not speak to the situation at other schools but said that faculty governance at CUNY is complicated by the fact that each constituent college has its own academic or faculty council with primary responsibility for formulating policy on academic matters and that local college policies take precedence over policies established by the central

administration. Following up on a suggestion that the *resolved* clause be made consistent with the preamble by the addition of a reference to CUNY, Jennifer Wicke made a motion to amend the previously amended *resolved* clause by inserting the phrase “CUNY’s faculty and any other” after “the right of” and before “college and university faculty.” This motion to amend was seconded and occasioned no discussion. The chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly adopted it by a vote of 94 yes and 17 no.

Since there was no further discussion of the *resolved* clause, the chair opened the floor for discussion of the preamble. Joya Uraizee made a motion to amend the preamble by inserting a new *whereas* clause just before the *resolved* clause. The new clause read as follows:

Whereas the violations of faculty governance occurring at CUNY have been repeated at numerous other institutions,

This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of this amendment. Mia Chen objected to the use of the word “repeated,” since it implied that CUNY was the first institution at which such violations occurred, and suggested striking “have been repeated at” and inserting “have been an issue at.” The chair asked if there were objections to this substitution. There were objections, but they could not be discussed unless Chen proposed a formal amendment. Chen withdrew her suggestion. Mark Cantrell made a motion to amend the proposed *whereas* clause by inserting the words “type of” before “violations.” This motion to amend the amendment was seconded, and the chair asked if there were objections to the proposed insertion. There were objections on grammatical grounds. The chair asked concerned delegates to hold a conference to resolve all issues; the assembly meeting therefore came to a pause. The result of the conference on the wording of the amendment to the amendment was presented by Jonathan Arac: to strike the word “the” after “Whereas,” to insert the words “like those” before “occurring,” and to strike the words “been repeated” and insert in their place the words “taken place.” Chen added that the word “occurring” should also be deleted, but the chair ruled that this change would be handled separately. Arac’s formulation was displayed on the screen in the meeting room to make the proposed changes clear:

Whereas ~~the~~ violations of faculty governance **like those** occurring at CUNY have ~~been repeated~~ **taken place** at numerous other institutions,

There was no discussion, so the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment to the amendment. The assembly adopted it by a vote of 107 yes and 3 no. The chair then called for a vote on the proposed deletion of the word “occurring.” The assembly voted to delete the word by a vote of 90 yes and 15 no.

The chair asked if there was further discussion of the motion to amend the preamble of the resolution by inserting the now twice-amended new *whereas* clause. A delegate asked if there was evidence for the claim made in the new clause about “numerous other institutions.” Several speakers provided the requested evidence by citing states and schools where new core requirements are being imposed. Arac noted that the supporting documents provided with the resolution did not include this new evidence and asked if it was necessary to supplement the resolution’s supporting documentation for the MLA’s written records. Rosemary Feal said that the documentation submitted with a resolution serves only to inform the assembly’s discussion. The documentation should not be taken as definitive proof of the claims made in the resolution, nor does the assembly’s approval of the resolution imply approval or acceptance of the documentation as evidence. Thus, it was not necessary to add to the documentation for the MLA’s written records. Since there was no further discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the insertion of the new *whereas* clause, as amended. The assembly adopted it by a vote of 105 yes and 4 no.

The chair asked if there was further discussion of the preamble to Resolution 2013-1. After a speaker commented on the need to counter assertions made in CUNY’s response to the resolution about faculty involvement in decisions about Pathways, Sima Godfrey made a motion to close debate. The chair asked if there were objections to closing debate; there were none. Resolution 2013-1 as amended therefore came to an immediate vote. The assembly approved the resolution by a vote of 108 yes and 2 no. The text of the resolution approved by the assembly read as follows:

Whereas in 2011 the CUNY Board of Trustees passed the Pathways curriculum for implementation by September 2013;

Whereas the approval of Pathways bypassed faculty governance, and only the administration’s appointees participated in the decision-making;

Whereas the AAUP states “faculty has primary responsibility for . . . curriculum [and] subject matter,” and college governance regulations state, “The Faculty . . . confer degrees”;

Whereas the Administration acted despite senates’, councils’, and nearly 5,000 instructional staffs’ opposition,

Whereas violations of faculty governance like those at CUNY have taken place at numerous other institutions,

Resolved the MLA affirms the right of CUNY’s faculty and any other college and university faculty to determine curriculum and graduation requirements and to withhold implementation of any curriculum that has not been recommended by the appropriate faculty governance body.

9. Also in the category of new business was one “emergency” resolution—so designated because it was

received after the 1 October deadline for the submission of regular resolutions. It had been submitted to the DAOC during the Open Hearing on Resolutions the previous day. The text of the emergency resolution and the statement it refers to were distributed to delegates immediately before the assembly meeting. After reminding the assembly that it could consider an emergency resolution only if three-fourths of the members agreed to consider it, the chair recognized Debra Castillo to present the resolution to the assembly. In her presentation, Castillo said that the DAOC had determined that the resolution met the association's criteria for an emergency resolution. The resolution (labeled Emergency Resolution 2013-2) was submitted by Héctor Hoyos. It read as follows:

Whereas the MLA is concerned by the tragic shootings at Virginia Tech and Newtown, Connecticut, and wishes to join the broader academic community in calling for a far-reaching solution to gun violence,

Be it resolved that the MLA endorse the Statement on Gun Violence in America issued by the Association of American Universities (AAU) on January 2, 2013.

The chair put to the assembly the question of whether it wished to consider the resolution. The vote on this procedural motion was 101 yes and 5 no, which was sufficient to allow the assembly to discuss and take action on the resolution. The chair again recognized Castillo, who presented the DAOC's recommendation that the assembly adopt the resolution. The chair opened the floor for discussion of the *resolved* clause and recognized the proposer of record. Hoyos said that he was surprised that there had been no MLA resolution at the time of the shootings at Virginia Tech and that it was urgent to address the issue of gun violence in the wake of the shootings in Newtown, Connecticut. He added that the statement issued by the AAU expressed the sentiments of many educators and that its endorsement would intensify the pressure on legislators to consider new laws.

The chair opened the floor for discussion of the *resolved* clause. No one came forward. The chair then called for discussion of the preamble. Brian McGrath made a motion to amend the preamble by inserting the phrase "Columbine, Nickel Mines," before "Virginia Tech." This motion to amend was seconded. The chair asked if there were objections to the addition of the phrase. Since there was an objection, the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. A speaker argued against the amendment because the addition diluted the focus of the resolution. Another referred to other campus shootings and said that it was better to add nothing than to add references to all such incidents. The main argument in favor was that the addition provided an important historical perspective as well as performative force. Another speaker noted that the addition of a reference to Columbine was needed because the AAU statement included a reference to Columbine. Discussion of the amendment came to an end, and

the chair asked the assembly to vote on it. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 9 yes and 88 no.

The chair called for further discussion of the resolution's preamble. Laura Mullen made a motion to amend the preamble by striking "Virginia Tech and Newtown, Connecticut," and inserting "shootings at numerous schools, colleges, and universities, the most recent of which is Newtown, Connecticut," a phrase that she and other delegates had formulated. The chair called for discussion of the amendment. A speaker said that changing the *whereas* clause was unnecessary if the purpose of the resolution was to endorse the AAU statement. Another thought that the more general language of the amendment still seemed parochial, since it did not cover the many other venues in which recent mass shootings had taken place, and that the original language was best suited to the immediate issue raised in the resolution. Another speaker favored the amendment because the more general language allowed for a consideration not just of the exceptional mass shootings referred to in the original language but also of the individual shootings that happen every day and are equally tragic but go unrecognized. Since there was no further discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly rejected it by a vote of 26 yes and 67 no.

The chair asked if there was further discussion of the preamble. Sima Godfrey made a motion to close debate. The chair asked if there were objections to closing debate. There was an objection, so 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 Emergency Resolution 2013-2 by a vote of 63 yes (68%) and 30 no (32%). The emergency resolution therefore came to an immediate vote. It was adopted by a vote of 82 yes and 10 no.

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 one came forward.

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

12. The chair declared the 2013 meeting of the Delegate Assembly adjourned sine die at 4:34 p.m.

Delegates in attendance:

Divisional Delegates: Katherine H. Adams, Marco Arnaudo, Candace Barrington, John Bruni, Bruce R. Burningham, Robert Lawrence Caserio, Albrecht Classen, Edith W. Clowes, Marcel H. Cornis-Pope, Siobhan S. Craig, Kathleen Davis, Gaurav G. Desai, Jeffrey R. Di Leo, Nathalie Dupont, Erik G. Ekman, Mary E. Faraci, Kate Flint, Jeanne A. Follansbee, Daniel Frost, Gail K. Hart, Héctor Hoyos, Tsitsi Jaji, Lydia Kerr, Sue J. Kim, Stephanie Louise Kirk, Yu Jin Ko, Brian Lennon, Wenxin Li, Marissa K. López, John Wharton Lowe, Joshua K. Lund, Thomas H. Luxon, Brian McGrath, Leslie Morris, James Hiester Najarian, Carmen Nocentelli, Margaret A. Noori, Pina Palma, David Pan, Donald E. Pease,

Catherine Perry, Dora E. Polachek, Gerald Joseph Prince, Julie Rak, Patricia Roberts-Miller, Ashley Shelden, Martin B. Shichtman, David R. Shumway, Robert Simon, Julie E. Singer, Jordan Alexander Stein, Alan Stewart, Rajani Sudan, Jan Christopher Susina, Timothy Sweet, Rivka Swenson, Nicole Tabor, Shaden M. Tageldin, Beverly White Taylor, Sylvia Tomasch, Robert Train, Melissa Tuckman, Joya F. Uraizee, Aarthi Vadde, Orrin Nan Chung Wang, Ming-Bao Yue.

Special-Interest Delegates: Emory Reginald Abbott, Patrick S. Bernard, James R. Britton, Donna M. Campbell, Patricia R. Campbell, Monica Feinberg Cohen, Sheila Marie Contreras, Barbara C. Ewell, Marion Gehlker, Michael E. Geisler, Cristina Maria Guardiola, Susan Elizabeth Gustafson, Regine I. Heberlein, Jami L. Huntsinger, Rebecca Lynn Ingalls, Priyanka Jacob, Beth Ellen Jörgensen, Matt Langione, Luis Martin-Cabrera, Miles McCrimmon, Trimiko Melancon, Debra Ann Moddelmog, Tonya Moutray, Laura Mullen, Dory Nason, Steven L. Newman, Andrew Schonebaum, Sandra Ballif Straubhaar, Laurie Taylor, Barbara Thornbury, Robert D. Tobin, Patricia Ann Ward, Mimi Yiu.

Regional Delegates: Sari Altschuler, Susan C. Anderson, Gustavo Arango, Sara Armengot, Pascale Barthe, Kristin Bergen, Elizabeth Berkebile McManus, Christine Blackshaw, Ute Brandes, Will Brantley, Joanne M. Braxton, Martin Joseph Camargo, Alexandra Campana, Mark Cantrell, Daniel Frank Chamberlain, Mia Chen, Peter M. Coviello, Kimberly

Cox, Eda Dedevas, Nathalie Marie Degroult, Susan C. Dixon, David B. Downing, Gregory Eiselein, Daylanne K. English, Granville Ganter, Bishnupriya Ghosh, Scott Paul Gordon, Kevin G. Guerrieri, Lisa Haegele, Gillian H. Harkins, Christine Henseler, Emily Hind, William Hutchings, Nancy E. Johnson, Andrea Lyn Knutson, Mark Larabee, Domingo Ledezma, Margherita R. Long, Julia Reinhard Lupton, James D. Mardock, Mary McCay, Caroline McCracken-Flesher, Emily McGinn, Linda McManness, Cathryn M. Mercier, Giovanna Montenegro, Mary Ann O'Farrell, Paul W. Peppis, Joshua Phillips, Anjali Prabhu, Richard Mark Preiss, Roopika Risam, Tracy Rutler, Shawn Christopher Salvant, John L. Schillb, George G. Shuffelton, Susan Solomon, Anna W. Stenport, David Suchoff, Theresa Tinkle, Cedric R. Tolliver, Johannes Türk, Jennifer Willging, John Robert Ziegler.

Delegates Representing Regional MLAs: Kristin A. Le Veness, Renee Schatteman.

Officers and Members of the Executive Council: Samer M. Ali, Jonathan Arac, Lawrence I. Buell, Debra Ann Castillo, Jennifer Crewe, Margaret W. Ferguson, Dorothea Heitsch, Marianne Hirsch, Lutz Koepnick, Richard M. Ohmann, Mecca Jamilah Sullivan, Kathleen Woodward.

Members of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee: Sima N. Godfrey, Adelaide M. Russo, Jennifer Wicke.

Parliamentarian: Jeanette N. Williams.

Clerk: Rosemary G. Feal.