

## **Academy 1 Annual Meeting Minutes**

**Names of the meeting in-person participants:** Cheryl Warsh, Ray Siemens, Christopher Dragan (RSC Staff), Masc Lapprand, Robert Stainton, Maite Taboada, Carolyn McLeod, Valerie Korinek, Gary Libben, Allen Hepburn, Alexie Tcheuyap, Robert Lecker, Chad Gaffield, Cynthia Milton, Megumi Masaki, Sheila Embleton, Julia Wright, Sean Caulfield

**Names of online participants:** Gary Waite, Guy Poirier, Elizabeth Sauer, Isabelle Daunais, Eve Egoyan, Marcel Martel, André Lapierre

### **Poll #1 That the Agenda be accepted as presented**

Moved: Robert Stainton

Seconded: Valerie Korinek

Passed

### **Poll #2 That the minutes of the 2021 Annual Business Meeting be approved as posted on the event portal.**

Moved: Cheryl Warsh

Seconded: Ray Siemens

Passed with one abstention

## **1. Opening Remarks**

Julia Wright began by providing an update on the work that was done in order to support artists and scholars who are not affiliated with a university. Moving forward the RSC will waive fees for these individuals, as well as provide support for induction travel as part of a three-year pilot to increase nominations and diversity. In the coming years it will be important to monitor the impact this three-year pilot has on nomination numbers.

Julia then noted that the arts and humanities (Academy #1) was very well represented at this year's COEE 2022, and underscored the importance of continuing to profile these disciplines at upcoming RSC and related national events.

In closing, Julia thanked the current and past members of Academy Council (Gonia Jarema, Sean Caulfield, Gary Libben, Cheryl Walsh, Jean Delisle, Isabelle Daunais, Owen Underhill, and Eve Egoyan) and RSC staff for their work and support over her time as a president.

## **2. Nomination Selection Process**

### **Division 1, Cheryl Warsh**

The Committee received nominations for individuals whose contributions and records of achievement were extremely impressive. We thank Christopher Dragan and the RSC for the excellent support we have received throughout the process.

There were several matters that arose in our discussions and which we would like to bring to the attention of the RSC. We are approaching these matters from the position of properly fulfilling the Committee's mandate of inclusivity, diversity and equity.

### *2.1. Nominees who are current members of the New College.*

As raised in last year's report, the Committee (as is the case in other Divisions and Academies) has an increasing number of present New College members who are seeking to move into the New Fellows category before their College term has ended. While these candidates are certainly worthy of promotion, and we have so nominated two of them, we note that there are several possible issues that should be considered.

1. There may be the appearance of bias if a series of College members immediately move to Fellow status. College members would have the inherent advantage of having been successfully vetted by a previous RSC committee.
2. If the purpose of the College was to expand the scope of RSC membership, successful early applications could have the opposite effect if they become, or are seen to have become, an inside track to becoming full Fellows. That is, some individuals and nominating institutions might be discouraged from nominating additional candidates to be Fellows.
3. If many or most College members immediately apply for Fellow status upon the completion of, or during their terms, it could double the workload for the Committee, which would have to deal with internal as well as external applications.

### *2.2. International Candidates*

The Committee was presented with a Nomination, for a Candidate who was born in Canada but obtained all of their post-graduate education, professional employment, engagement and achievements in the United States. The sole Canadian component was the nomination (not the references) by Canadian scholars. While this was a very worthy candidate, there remain structural advantages, such as prestige, access to funding and professional opportunities to be working in our much larger neighbour, or as one of our Committee members termed it, "in the big leagues."

In previous years, the Committee has dealt with non-Canadian applicants who had spent many years working in Canadian universities, but who were considered International applicants and were successful at becoming International Fellows.

Therefore, the Committee proposes that when such applications are submitted, there is a process whereby the Nominators can be requested to change the status to an International application. In this way, another seat in the regular pool can be available for a worthy Canadian candidate, in keeping with the goal of inclusivity.

### *2.3 Special Categories of Candidates*

The Committee once again was faced with the dilemma of properly ranking lifetime achievements and non-academic historians. Ageism is another equity issue, and we would appreciate more discussion on the value of accomplishments over a lifetime, even if those accomplishments took place years earlier.

Also, non-academic scholars, such as librarians and independent scholars, may make contributions that are not as easily quantifiable as a line in a Published Articles list on a curriculum vitae. Given the shrinkage of academic appointments in the Humanities over the last generation, these individuals increasingly are a significant component of doctorates. Furthermore, this generation is the most diverse, and any barriers would work against the goal of promoting diversity in membership.

### **Questions from Report:**

A question came up about the nomination process and in particular in relation to diversity. Julia Wright responded that work was being done in this area through the ACM and we can have further discussion on this issue during this agenda item.

A question was raised in relation to the number of nominations that Academy 1 is receiving. Christopher Dragan noted that numbers seem fairly stable, with a small impact from the pandemic.

A question was raised around conflict of interest if a university can nominate their own faculty, and if this negatively impacts artists who are not affiliated with institutions. Julia confirmed that there are checks and balances in the review process, and that therefore the nominations process does structurally include conflict of interest issues.

A comment was made around non-affiliated applications not having the same guidelines around their applications with unconventional resumes, and it was noted that this should be taken into account during the review of applications.

### **Division 2, Isabelle Daunais**

#### Composition du comité:

Le Comité était composé des cinq personnes suivantes: la présidente Isabelle Daunais (Université McGill) et les membres Pierre Anctil (Université d'Ottawa), Johanne Lamoureux (Université de Montréal), Marcel Martel (York), Gilles Routhier (Université Laval).

Trois mandats venaient à échéance, ceux de Pierre Anctil, Isabelle Daunais et Gilles Routhier.

Le comité est heureux d'annoncer que Marcel Martel a accepté le rôle de président pour un mandat de deux ans et que Lucie Hotte (U. Ottawa), Solange Lefebvre (Université de Montréal) et Jean-Marc Narbonne (Université Laval) ont accepté de se joindre au comité pour un mandat de deux ans. Johanne Lamoureux a accepté de renouveler sa participation au comité pour un second mandat de deux ans.

Ce nouveau comité permet de couvrir des disciplines variées: histoire (M. Martel); littérature (L. Hotte); histoire de l'art (J. Lamoureux); philosophie (J.-M. Narbonne) et sciences religieuses (Solange Lefebvre).

#### Candidatures reçues:

Le nombre de candidatures soumises demeure bas. Le comité en a reçu cinq et en a retenu deux.

Il s'agit d'un défi permanent, en partie culturel (la « tradition » de présenter des candidatures à la Société Royale est moins ancrée dans les universités francophones), en partie structurel (les universités francophones n'ont pas tendance à créer des instances internes, par exemple au niveau facultaire, favorisant les candidatures à des prix et distinctions).

Ceci n'a pas été discuté au comité, mais à titre personnel je peux dire que la Faculté des Arts de l'Université McGill a créé il y a cinq ou six ans un comité dédié spécifiquement aux candidatures à la Société Royale (comité que j'ai présidé au cours des trois dernières années). Pour des raisons démographiques, McGill n'est pas en mesure de proposer beaucoup de candidatures francophones, mais un tel comité a l'avantage d'encourager des collègues qui ne le feraient pas spontanément eux-mêmes à soumettre leur candidature. C'est un modèle qui pourrait être imité par d'autres Facultés de lettres et sciences humaines.

### **Division 3, Eve Egoyan**

Thank you, Julia, for guiding us throughout this year's process.

Thank you, too, Julia for finally bringing the RSC together in support of unaffiliated members and retired members who can now, I believe, waive the annual fee and also be invited to attend their induction into the RSC. Thank you!

Through the year we discussed unrepresented art forms as well as underrepresented provinces.

We are seeking election of artists in the field of dance/choreography as we only have one member at present as well seeking new members in theatre, film and architecture.

Music is presently over-represented (especially pianists!!!).

We are also seeking the election of artists from B.C., Quebec and the Atlantic provinces. Ontario and the Prairies are well represented.

Gender balance is still an issue with 37 members identifying as female and 50 as male.

We have also discussed ways to increase the number of unaffiliated artists nominated to the RSC.

I would like to suggest that we list the priorities discussed above when we are soliciting nominations for next year.

In short, we need nominations from underrepresented groups which include :

- unaffiliated artists
- artists from B.C., Quebec and the Atlantic
- artists in the field of dance/choreography as well as in theatre, film and architecture

We should also add a reminder that the data is clear that men remain overrepresented.

### 3. Report on Academy Committee on Membership, Sean Caulfield

#### Goals

The Academy of Arts and Humanities in the Royal Society of Canada (RSC) struck a new Academy Committee on Membership (ACM), with the purpose of advancing the diversity of the Academy of Arts and Humanities by encouraging more nominations from underrepresented disciplines, demographic groups, and institutions.

#### Membership:

Acting Chair – Sean Caulfield, Professor, Department of Art and Design, University of Alberta

Beverly Diamond, Professor Emerita, Ethnomusicology, Memorial University

Jean Grondin, Philosophie, Université de Montréal

Liz Ingram, Professor Emerita, Department of Art and Design, University of Alberta

Owen Underhill, Professor, School for the Contemporary Arts (Music), Simon Fraser University

#### Activities over the Year

- Meet by zoom and corresponded through email regularly
- Finalized terms of reference
- Developed a list of potential nominees
- Chair reached out to Vice President of Research and/or appropriate nominator institution

Identified a list of 6 potential nominees from across the country.

Next year the committee will monitor what impact the ACM's activities have had on application numbers.

### 4. Pointers from the Selection Committees

Julia pointed out that the selection committees have a huge challenge in that there are huge differences in various disciplines in relation to professional accomplishments. Another ongoing challenge is to keep balance between small universities and larger institutions.

CV formats can also contribute to difficulties during the assessment process given the difference that arise across disciplines. Review committees were encouraged to keep this in mind in assessing the CVs in nomination packages.

Cheryl recommended that the nomination letter comes from someone who knows the applicant well. Also recommended to have individuals reapply.

A question was raised about Indigenous scholars or artists who may be making work that sits outside western knowledge systems. Julia acknowledged this issue, and stressed that the division chairs are aware of this when nomination packages are assessed.

The issue of supporting smaller institutions was underscored given they often do not have the same internal support as larger institutions. It was suggested that the broader RSC community can provide support to help mitigate this issue.

It was pointed out that CV's should include community activities, particular for individuals who come from a less traditional academic background.

## 5. Other business.

### **Report from incoming president Sheila Embleton**

Sheila stressed the importance of focusing on diversity including smaller universities, francophone, as well as racialized scholars and artists. Update the fields in the nominations guidelines so that individuals feel welcome to apply. The three-year pilot supporting unaffiliated artist is a good step to encourage diversity. The possibility of initiating a number of 'floating' slots to encourage diversity and interdisciplinarity is something in the Committee on Membership Report, and hopefully will be implemented soon.

Ensure to keep arts and humanities profile high at COEE and other RSC initiatives. This is a concrete demonstration of how integral the humanities are to everything.

Thanks to Julia Wright for her outstanding work as president throughout the challenging period of the COVID pandemic.

### **Poll#4 Adjournment of meeting**

**Robert Lecker Moved**

**Passed**

Time of adjournment

10:48