

Minutes of the MLA Delegate Assembly

THE DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MET ON 8 JANUARY 2011 AT THE J. W. MARRIOTT LOS ANGELES Hotel. First Vice President Russell A. Berman presided. The assembly was called to order at 1:13 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 79 delegates, because 158 delegates had signed in for the meeting at the beginning. [Note: Of the 271 delegates, 181 (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), Gaurav Desai moved the adoption of the agenda that had been sent to the assembly, subject to emergency change. Ian Barnard proposed a motion to amend the agenda by moving four of the five components of agenda item 6—the report of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee, the report of the executive director, the Finance Committee report, and the annual reports from the MLA’s standing committees—to the point just before agenda item 9 (Announcements). This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. On behalf of the DAOC, Desai spoke against the amendment. He noted that the reports in question presented work done by colleagues on the business of the assembly and of the organization and should be accorded the short time needed for their consideration at the point in the agenda that the DAOC had proposed. Since there was no further discussion, the chair stated the question on the amendment and asked the assembly to vote. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 51 yes and 95 no. The chair asked if there was further discussion of the agenda. Since there was none, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the adoption of the agenda that had been sent to the assembly. The agenda was adopted by a vote of 129 yes and 4 no.

Desai 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. The next order of business was an amendment to the Delegate Assembly bylaws that David Chioni Moore had submitted to the DAOC in accordance with the procedure for amending the bylaws stipulated in bylaw 9. Moore had proposed to amend the first rule in the appendix to the bylaws—“Anyone wishing to be recognized by the chair must go to a microphone on the floor of the auditorium and must state name and institution before addressing the assembly”—by inserting the phrase “and, if they

wish, the constituency they represent” between the words “institution” and “before.” The chair assumed this motion to amend the bylaws and explained that the DAOC, after reviewing the proposed amendment at its October meeting, had consulted with Moore about clarifying the meaning of *constituency*. The result of the consultation was a revised version of the bylaw amendment that Moore agreed was preferable to his original wording. The DAOC’s revised text read as follows (changes and additions to the original bylaw text are shown in boldface):

Individuals wishing to be recognized by the chair must go to a microphone on the floor of the auditorium and must state name and institution **and, if they wish, constituency represented (e.g., Shakespeare division, Middle Atlantic region, creative writing special-interest delegate, ex officio delegate from the DAOC)** before addressing the assembly.

The chair asked if there were objections to considering the revised amendment in place of the original amendment. Since there were no objections, the chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment as revised by the DAOC and asked Moore if he wished to speak first. Moore declined; no other speakers came forward. The chair therefore stated the question on the bylaw amendment and asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the bylaw amendment by a vote of 133 yes and 5 no. This vote was more than the two-thirds majority needed for immediate adoption of the amendment. The chair announced that the amended rule would be incorporated into the rules for the current meeting.

3. Again on behalf of the DAOC, Desai moved that the assembly approve the minutes of the 2009 meeting as printed in the May 2010 issue of *PMLA*. The chair asked if there were corrections. Since no corrections were offered, the chair declared the minutes approved as published.

4. The assembly elected two of its members, Maria Damon (English, Univ. of Minnesota, Twin Cities) and Ana María Medina (Spanish, Univ. of Houston, Downtown), to the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee for three-year terms (from 10 Jan. 2011 through the close of the Jan. 2014 convention). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the current officers of the association, the assembly elected Rey Chow (comparative literature, Duke Univ.), Barbara Fuchs (Spanish, Univ. of California, Los Angeles), Mary Louise Pratt (Spanish, New York Univ.), and Michelle Toumayants (comparative literature, Penn State Univ., University Park) to the Nominating Committee for two-year terms (2011–12). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the DAOC, the assembly elected the following persons to the Elections Committee for two-year terms (2011–12): Ann L. Ardis (English, Univ. of Delaware, Newark), Deirdre d’Alberty (Bard Coll.), and Rebecca Haidt (Ohio State Univ., Columbus).

5. The chair called on Gaurav Desai, chair of the DAOC, to present the DAOC’s annual report. Desai intro-

duced the members of the committee to the assembly, presented a summary of the committee’s report, and announced that Teresa Mangum would be the next chair of the DAOC. The chair asked if there were questions or comments on the report. No one came forward.

6. The assembly received a report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution that consisted in the amendment to the constitution that was published at the MLA Web site in September 2010. The amendment resulted from an Executive Council proposal to change the threshold for ratification votes on resolutions. The chair recognized Sara Armengot, who, on behalf of the council, moved to amend article 11.C.7 of the constitution by striking out the phrase shown in brackets below and inserting the text shown in boldface:

A majority vote of the assembly shall be required for approval of a resolution. Each resolution so approved must be reviewed by the Executive Council. The council will then, in a timely manner, either forward to the membership the resolution as approved or with nonsubstantive modifications or determine, in accordance with the provisions of article 7.B.3, that it is unable to forward the resolution to the membership. All resolutions forwarded to the membership must be ratified [by a majority of the association’s membership voting in a mail ballot] **by a majority vote, provided that the number of those voting in favor of ratification is equal to at least 10% of the association’s membership. When the council forwards a resolution to the membership, it shall establish all relevant dates for the ratification process, including those for the distribution and return of ballots and for the determination of voting eligibility.**

The chair opened the floor for discussion of the proposed amendment, announced that a representative of the Executive Council would speak first, and recognized Michael Bérubé. Bérubé explained that the council’s proposed amendment grew out of the previous year’s discussion of ways to improve the resolution process. A review of membership voting patterns showed that, in recent years, resolutions were ratified by only three to four percent of the membership. [Note: Charts showing the level of voter participation in various recent MLA votes were provided electronically to assembly members before the meeting.] The council concluded that such low support represented a challenge to the legitimacy of resolutions and decided to call for a ten percent threshold. Bérubé ended his comments by anticipating two possible objections to the proposed amendment. First, it was appropriate to set a threshold for votes on resolutions and not for other membership votes because only resolutions commit the association to a position on and to specific language about a public or professional issue. Second, while other scholarly associations do not have a voting requirement like the one the proposed amendment called for, several of them do not allow member-initiated resolutions. The

council thought that it was important to keep the MLA's resolution process and that the proposed amendment would strengthen the process.

One opponent of the amendment said that it limited members' opportunity to express their views on political matters and that asking the Executive Council to address an issue, an alternative to the resolution process suggested at the previous day's Open Hearing of the Delegate Assembly, was an unacceptable move toward less democracy and toward statements made with even more of a minority voice. Other opponents of the amendment said that it was unfair to respond to a crisis in participation in all MLA votes by setting an arbitrary ten percent threshold on resolution ratification votes alone, a threshold that might discourage participation instead of increasing it. One speaker suggested that the council was obliged to increase voter participation before taking other steps. Supporters of the amendment said that it would not have the effect of limiting members' discourse, since resolutions could be proposed as usual. One speaker added that the option of asking the council to act—an option available throughout the year to all members—should not be disparaged. Some speakers said it was reasonable to require that at least ten percent of the membership vote in favor of measures that are supposed to represent the views of the entire membership; one expressed the view that the proposed threshold should be higher. Other supporters of the amendment said that the proposed threshold for ratification votes was attainable and would, when publicized, encourage voter participation. Another speaker suggested that the amendment would strengthen the MLA's political voice because it might encourage the proposal of resolutions that addressed the situation of the humanities in ways that garnered broad membership support.

The chair interrupted a speaker to announce that the time for discussion of the proposed amendment had expired and that the amendment would come to an immediate vote. The assembly approved the amendment by a vote of 100 yes and 36 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.

7. The assembly received the report of the executive director and the Finance Committee report. The chair recognized Executive Director Rosemary Feal to present the first report. Since delegates had had the opportunity to read the report in advance, Feal asked for questions and comments. Since no one came forward, Feal said that delegates were welcome to comment on the report or ask questions at any time during the year. The chair asked delegates to turn to the Finance Committee report and recognized Feal to present it. She commented briefly on the fact that the 2010–11 fiscal year had concluded with a small surplus. Then, in accordance with an action taken by the 2009 Delegate Assembly, she reviewed the association's dues structure. She noted that the changes

to the dues structure approved by the 2009 assembly had gone into effect for the 2011 membership year, and she reported that the share of association income represented by membership dues in 2009–10 was 10.6%, as compared with 15.5% in 1992–93 (the last year that saw a major change in the dues structure before 2009). She said that the MLA's dues structure was in line with other associations' dues structures, except that the MLA set lower dues for members in lower income categories and for graduate student members. Feal concluded the dues presentation by saying that the Finance Committee recommended no changes to the dues structure. She asked if there were questions about the Finance Committee report or the dues structure; there were none.

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, Radio Committee, 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 Brian Kennelly of the DAOC, who commented briefly on the reports, thanked committee members for their hard work, and said that Rosemary Feal would respond to questions. Feal invited delegates to communicate with her throughout the year about committee work and about issues that the MLA should address. The chair asked if there were questions or comments from the floor. There were none.

8. The assembly held an open discussion of two topics selected by the DAOC: successful strategies for language and literature departments and public advocacy for the humanities. Delegates had received background information on these topics in advance of the assembly meeting. The chair asked Second Vice President Michael Bérubé to preside over the open discussion. Bérubé reminded all present that one hour had been set aside for the open discussion, thirty minutes for each topic. He also reminded those in attendance of the rules that would govern the open discussion.

Sara Armengot and Sima Godfrey introduced the first topic, successful strategies for language and literature departments, which was designed to elicit comments from those in attendance on the strategies they used or considered using to counter cutbacks to their departments and programs. To initiate the discussion, Armengot and Godfrey provided an outline of possible strategies, which included general categories—be proactive, forge alliances, research

available resources, raise the public profile of your department or program—and examples in each category.

Several speakers emphasized the need for extensive networking in any attempt to improve the position of a department or program. They said it was necessary to identify and cultivate supporters in the institution, in the community, and in government; to make connections across disciplines, in the administration, and across types of institutions; and to educate colleagues about the value of language study and of the humanities and about their usefulness in many contexts; and to open and maintain lines of communication with current students, whom you wish to draw into your department or program, and with majors who have graduated, who can serve as a public relations resource. Other speakers argued for getting beyond public relations and called for a structural analysis of institutions and funding that would challenge the current allocation of resources and wealth in society. It was also suggested that professors should join in student protests against budget cuts.

Discussion also touched on the need for curricular and structural changes that would enhance the standing of a department or program and of the field. A curricular expansion into translation studies was helpful on one campus. Changing the staffing of courses along the lines suggested in the MLA report *Foreign Languages and Higher Education* would demonstrate a willingness to transform the status quo and to keep pace with students' needs. Becoming an administrator and bringing firsthand knowledge of the humanities to that job was suggested as another strategy. Several speakers commented on available informational resources (e.g., a new book on the entrepreneurial university, models of collaborative projects in the United States and abroad). One speaker said that a way for colleagues to share information about resources and their own experiences was needed. It was also suggested that any broad-based effort to lobby at the federal or state level would need support and guidance from the MLA.

Adelaide Russo and Brian Kennelly introduced the second topic, public advocacy for the humanities. To guide the discussion, they listed examples of advocacy activities at the national, university, and community levels.

The first speaker noted that most people have a grasp of the visual and performing arts but that few know what the humanities are. She suggested that the definition provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities be included in public communications and be backed up with specific examples. Several speakers said that advocacy efforts should focus on the values and perspectives that humanities majors bring to the work they do after graduation and on the importance of the humanities to higher education. It was noted that the kind of budget analysis done for the University of California—which showed that the humanities provide funding for other fields—should be done for other university systems. Other speakers said that many professors already engage in public advocacy

through their community outreach activities (e.g., working with high school teachers, leading book talks). It was suggested that such outreach activities and other efforts associated with public advocacy of the humanities should be counted toward tenure in both research and teaching institutions. One speaker pointed out that professors have a perfect opportunity to advocate for the humanities whenever the parents of students come onto campus.

Speakers provided information about existing initiatives (e.g., Language Roadmap, led by the University of California Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching; Teachers as Scholars) and useful documents (e.g., *Scholarship in Public*, from the organization Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life). It was also suggested that advocates for the humanities use the National Humanities Alliance and the network of humanities centers.

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

9. In the category of new business, there was one emergency resolution. The chair recognized Teresa Mangum of the DAOC for a report on the committee's handling of this and another emergency resolution that had been submitted to the DAOC during the Open Hearing on Resolutions the previous day. Mangum explained that Delegate Assembly bylaw 7 establishes a 1 October deadline for the submission of resolutions but also states an exception for resolutions "occasioned by emergencies arising after 1 October," which "must reach the Organizing Committee no later than twenty-four hours before the scheduled assembly meeting." The DAOC received two emergency resolutions during the open hearing. One of them called for the MLA to oppose cutbacks in academic programs and tuition increases and to advocate full funding of public higher education. Because of the long-term nature of the issues addressed in this resolution, the DAOC determined that it did not meet the emergency criterion established in Delegate Assembly bylaw 7 and so could not be placed on the assembly's agenda. The second resolution that the DAOC received during the open hearing had two parts. The first part referred to a bill requiring the elimination of ethnic studies courses that the Arizona House of Representatives passed at the end of April 2010. The governor of Arizona signed this bill into law on 11 May 2010, and the MLA Executive Council addressed this legislation in an open letter to the governor of Arizona, which was sent at the end of May 2010. The second part of this resolution dealt with the DREAM Act, a piece of federal legislation that came to the United States Senate in December 2010 for action. Given the timelines associated with each part of this resolution, the DAOC determined that only the second part met the requirement for an emergency resolution. The committee therefore placed on the assembly's agenda only the second part of this resolution, which was submitted by Barbara Foley on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and Modern Languages.

The chair asked if there were questions about the DAOC's decisions with respect to the emergency resolutions that had been submitted the previous day. One speaker noted that the Arizona law referred to in the part of the second resolution that was not forwarded to the assembly did not go into effect until 1 January 2011 and asked if the DAOC had taken this date into account when making its decision. Mangum responded that the DAOC was aware of the 1 January implementation date but considered the effects that the passage and signing of the law had had before 1 October as an indication that a resolution treating this subject could have been submitted by 1 October.

After reminding the assembly that it could consider an emergency resolution only if three-fourths of the members agreed to consider it, the chair again recognized Mangum to present the resolution text that the DAOC had forwarded to the assembly. The resolution (labeled Emergency Resolution 2011-1) read as follows:

WHEREAS the U.S. Senate voted down the "Dream Act," which would have granted undocumented students in high schools legal status by attending college, thus depriving them of paths to citizenship and tuition assistance;
BE IT RESOLVED that the MLA support the efforts of undocumented students seeking paths to legal status.

The chair then put to the assembly the question of whether it wished to consider the resolution. The vote on this procedural motion was 98 yes and 18 no, which was sufficient to allow the assembly to discuss and take action on the resolution.

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 chair then recognized Mangum, who presented the DAOC's recommendation that the assembly approve a version of the resolution that incorporated three amendments that the DAOC had formulated. These amendments were displayed on the screen in the meeting room. The chair ruled that the DAOC's amendments would be processed first, even though they affected the preamble.

In its first amendment, the DAOC proposed to strike the words "voted down" in the preamble and insert the words "refused to vote on." The amended wording characterized the Senate's action more accurately. 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 96 yes and 15 no. The DAOC's second amendment called for the insertion of the word "eligible" before the words "undocumented students." The addition of "eligible" was needed because the legislation included requirements that undocumented individuals would have to meet to qualify for the benefits of the act. The chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. Supporters of the amendment

agreed that the inserted word was needed for accuracy. There were two arguments against the amendment. One was that the addition of "eligible" was not necessary since the original language does not imply a reference to all undocumented students. The other was that adding this limitation in the preamble entailed a similar and undesirable limitation in the *resolved* clause, undercutting the spirit of broad inclusion that the resolution should aim for. When discussion came to an end, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 71 yes and 37 no. In its third and final amendment, the DAOC proposed to strike the words "in high schools legal status by attending college, thus depriving them of." Striking this language would bring the resolution closer to the provisions of the DREAM Act. The chair opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. One speaker opposed the amendment because the elimination of the reference to attending college meant that the resolution became a statement of support for the second path to citizenship included in the DREAM Act: military service. This was not the intent of the resolution's proposers. Another speaker supported the amendment because it removed language that was unclear and that could be misinterpreted. At the conclusion of the discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 93 yes and 23 no.

Now that the assembly had disposed of the DAOC's three amendments, the chair opened the floor for discussion of the *resolved* clause. He recognized Barbara Foley, the resolution's proposer of record, who proposed to amend the *resolved* clause by adding the words "by attending college" at the end. This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. Steven Yao suggested replacing the word "college" with "institutions of higher education," since the latter phrase was more inclusive. The chair asked Foley if she accepted this change; she did. Since no assembly members objected to the change, the wording of the amendment was revised by unanimous consent. The chair called for discussion of the revised amendment. After brief discussion, during which it was noted that the amendment served to restore the restriction that the DAOC's third amendment to the preamble had eliminated, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly approved it by a vote of 111 yes and 4 no. The chair asked if there was further discussion of the *resolved* clause. Heather Steffen made a motion to amend the *resolved* clause by adding the word "all" before the words "undocumented students." This motion to amend was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. Those who spoke in favor of the amendment noted that the added word served to broaden the reach of the resolution and also served to counteract the reference to "eligible" students in the amended preamble. Those who opposed the amendment said that the added word was not needed either to clarify the language of

the resolution or to broaden the reach of the resolution, which was already broad enough. When discussion of the amendment came to an end, the chair asked the assembly to vote on it. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 53 yes and 60 no.

Since there was no further discussion of the *resolved* clause, the chair called for discussion of the amended preamble. No one came forward. The chair then stated the question on the adoption of Emergency Resolution 2011-1 as amended and asked the assembly to vote. The assembly adopted the resolution by a vote of 106 yes and 8 no. The text of the resolution approved by the assembly read as follows:

WHEREAS the U.S. Senate refused to vote on the “Dream Act,” which would have granted undocumented students paths to citizenship and tuition assistance;

BE IT RESOLVED that the MLA support the efforts of undocumented students seeking paths to legal status by attending institutions of higher education.

10. The chair called for the announcement of other items of new business, noting that any new proposals could be discussed but could not be voted on until the next assembly meeting. No items of new business were announced.

11. The chair called for announcements. No one came forward.

12. The chair declared the 2011 meeting of the Delegate Assembly adjourned sine die at 4:34 p.m.

Delegates in attendance:

Divisional Delegates: Marco Arnaudo, Ali Behdad, John Bruni, Robert Lawrence Caserio, James V. Catano, Mary L. Coffey, Eleni Eva Coundouriotis, Erik G. Ekman, Mary E. Faraci, Thomas Foster, Anne-Lise François, Susan K. Gillman, Katherine D. Harris, Gail K. Hart, John C. Hawley, Nathalie Hester, Tony Jarrells, Kimberly M. Jew, Robert M. Johnston, Ann R. Keefer, Stephanie Louise Kirk, Natasha Korda, Dale Larson, Wenxin Li, Marissa K. López, Lokangaka Losambe, John Wharton Lowe, Christopher Lupke, Laura Elizabeth Lyons, Ruth Mack, Susan McCabe, Peter M. McIsaac, David Chioni Moore, Rosmarie T. Morewedge, Leslie Morris, Ourida Mostefai, James Hiestler Najarian, María Rosa Olivera-Williams, Jorge P. Pérez, Catherine Perry, Nancy J. Peterson, Dora E. Polachek, Malea Powell, Gerald Joseph Prince, Christine M. Probes, Scott Proudfit, Julie Rak, Lynn Tarte Ramey, Patricia Roberts-Miller, Martin B. Shichtman, Sarah Stanbury, Jan

Christopher Susina, Robert Train, Steven Ungar, Lisa Voigt, Marc A. Weiner, Mark A. Wollaeger.

Special-Interest Delegates: Karen Alexander, Herman Beavers, Robert J. Blake, Suzanne Bost, James R. Britton, Patricia R. Campbell, Kevin J. H. Dettmar, Carolyn M. Dever, Stacey Lee Donohue, Amy Feinstein, Audrey A. Fisch, Barbara Foley, Sheryl I. Fontaine, Thomas J. Garza, Paul Giles, Nancy Gray, Gregory Hampton, Lila Marz Harper, Monica F. Jacobe, Stacey Katz Bourns, Heather K. Love, Richard Middleton-Kaplan, Kyoko Omori, Ricardo L. Ortiz, Israel Reyes, Ralph James Savarese, Martha Stoddard Holmes, Sandra Ballif Straubhaar, Karen Tongson, Ingeborg Walther, Rebecca Weaver-Hightower, Jennifer Wicke, Steven G. Yao, Mimi Yiu, Vershawn Ashanti Young.

Regional Delegates: Susan C. Anderson, Jason Arthur, Ian Barnard, Christopher Baswell, Kent Baxter, Jeannine Blackwell, Mark R. Blackwell, Gina Bloom, James J. Bono, Will Brantley, Cynthia J. Brown, Marshall Brown, Jonathan Burgoyne, Marc Caplan, John C. Charles, Tita Chico, Jones DeRitter, Marilynn Desmond, Adriano Duque, Gregory Eiselein, Daylanne K. English, Tracy Evans, Paul Gilmore, Paolo Giordano, Jeffrey Grossman, Lucas Harriman, Jonathan Gil Harris, Jarrod Hayes, Alejandro Herrero-Olaizola, Juli Highfill, Marion E. Hines, Kersten Horn, William Hutchings, Holly Jackson, Francisco Jiménez, Nancy E. Johnson, Stephen Knadler, Elizabeth Landers, Christopher LeCluyse, Domingo Ledezma, Carmen A. López-Álvarez, Christopher Lukasik, James Dillon Mardock, Patrizia C. McBride, Ellen McClure, Caroline McCracken-Flesher, Linda McManness, Anne Moore, Panivong Norindr, Nobuko Miyama Ochner, Hiram Perez, Seth Perlow, James Petterson, Trey Philpotts, Kevin Piper, Pedro Ponce, Ashley Puig Herz, Elizabeth M. Richmond-Garza, Boukary Sawadogo, John L. Schilb, Matthew Senior, Heather M. Steffen, Theodore L. Steinberg, Anna W. Stenport, David Suchoff, Joseph M. Sullivan, Cedric R. Tolliver, Irene Tucker, Emil Volek, Katharina von Hammerstein, Jennifer M. Wilks, John Robert Ziegler.

Delegates Representing Regional MLAs: Nancy Anne LaGreca, Joy Landeira.

Officers and Members of the Executive Council: Jonathan Arac, Sara Armengot, Russell A. Berman, Michael Bérubé, Lawrence I. Buell, Jennifer Crewe, Dorothea Heitsch, Sidonie Smith, Lynne Tatlock, Kathleen Woodward.

Members of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee: Gaurav Desai, Sima N. Godfrey, Brian Kennelly, Teresa Mangum, Adelaide M. Russo.

Parliamentarian: Jeanette N. Williams.

Clerk: Rosemary G. Feal.