



# Recognizing Excellence:

## A Guide to Nominating Fellows of the Royal Society of Canada

(August 2022)

## Table of Contents

Leaders with Purpose.....	3
Fellows of the Royal Society of Canada .....	3
Key dates.....	4
An overview of the process.....	4
The role of the nominator.....	4
The nomination dossier .....	6
Letter from Primary Nominator .....	6
A short citation .....	6
A detailed appraisal .....	6
Letters of reference .....	7
Curriculum vitae.....	7
The selection process.....	8
Checklist.....	9
Frequently asked questions .....	9
Appendices.....	11
Appendix I: The Primary Nominator’s Letter .....	11
Appendix II: Citation .....	12
Appendix III: Detailed appraisal .....	13
Appendix IV: Letter of reference.....	15
Appendix V: Referee biographical statement.....	17

## Leaders with Purpose

The Royal Society of Canada (RSC) was created in 1883 by an Act of Parliament as Canada’s National Academy, the senior collegium of Canada’s leading artists, public intellectuals, scholars, scientists, and creative writers. The RSC serves Canada and Canadians by recognizing these leaders in research and innovation and mobilizing them in open discussion and debate about complex and timely issues in the headlines or on the horizon. Their integrated interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding is a valuable national resource. This is a lifetime recognition.

The concept of excellence has always been at the heart of the RSC. In recent years, scholarly and scientific research and the arts have contributed new ways of defining and pursuing an inclusive excellence that both builds on and moves well beyond previous perspectives. Today, excellence is recognized to depend on diversity and equity, as highlighted in Canada and around the world.

The Strategic Plan 2018-2022—*Mobilize, Catalyze, Sustain*—renews the RSC’s historic mission by defining excellence as necessarily inclusive. The RSC embraces equity and diversity, methodological and epistemological openness, and the full range of disciplinary excellence. It welcomes nominations from all intellectual endeavours across linguistic, gender, racial, regional, and institutional boundaries. The RSC also judges these nominations without bias. The RSC selection process seeks to ensure that recognition and inclusion are accorded to First Nations, Inuit, and Métis candidates.

These are our principles.

This guide will assist nominators in preparing dossiers for consideration by Fellowship selection committees. Nominations are valid for one year only.

## Fellows of the Royal Society of Canada

The RSC consists of Fellows elected in three Academies (Academy I, Arts and Humanities; Academy II, Social Sciences; and Academy III, Science), Members of the College of New Scholars, Artists and Scientists, and Institutional Members from across Canada. There are currently more than 2,500 RSC Fellows, more than 400 members of the College, and more than 60 institutional members.

### There are three pathways to Fellowship in the Royal Society of Canada:

o **Fellows** are those with exceptional and original publications, intellectual achievements, and creative activities. Their achievements are in the arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences. They are either Canadian citizens or Permanent Residents of Canada for at least three years at the time of their nomination.

o **Specially Elected Fellows** are those in public life who have made exceptionally valuable contributions to promoting the objectives of the RSC in ways that contribute significantly to Canadian society. They are either Canadian citizens or Permanent Residents of Canada for at least three years at the time of their nomination.

o **International Fellows** are those who — through exceptionally distinguished accomplishments in the arts, humanities, social sciences and sciences — have promoted the objectives of the RSC with clear relevance to Canadian society. Please note that the candidate’s relation to Canadian academia must be tangible and sustained; candidates with only a passing relation to Canada will not be considered. They are neither citizens nor Permanent Residents of Canada.

*Research interests and practices are changing. Our processes for selecting Fellows reflect these changes. They are principle-based but leave room for each Academy to respect differences and be flexible.*

## Key dates

The process for selecting Fellows operates on an annual cycle.

### **December**

All nominations must be received by the RSC Secretariat by **December 1, 2022** at **8:00 p.m. EST**.

### **January-April**

RSC selection committees review dossiers and make recommendations.

### **April**

The RSC Council considers the list of recommended candidates to stand for election.

### **May/June**

RSC Fellows vote on approved candidates. Candidates must receive 75 per cent of all votes cast, excluding abstentions.

### **July**

Elected candidates are notified by the RSC President of their election.

### **September**

Elected candidates are publicly announced.

### **November**

At the RSC Induction Ceremony, elected candidates recite the oath, sign the ledger book, and are formally welcomed into the Fellowship.

## An overview of the process

### The role of the nominator

The nomination process follows a series of steps, each with requirements to ensure that prospective Fellows are evaluated fairly. An important role is played by the Nominator who submits the nomination dossier for review.

Those eligible to nominate a candidate are:

- RSC Fellows
- Institutional Members of the RSC

The Nominator determines under which discipline to nominate the candidate. If the candidate conducts their work in a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary field, the Nominator chooses the discipline that is the best fit. The choice of discipline by the Nominator is critical since disciplines are grouped within ten multidisciplinary Divisional Selection Committees (described later) that begin the selection process.

**Academy of Arts and Humanities (Academy I)**

- Architecture/Urbanism
- Area Studies
- Art History
- Arts
- Classics/Humanities
- Creative Writing
- Folklore/Ethnology
- History
- History & Philosophy of Science
- Languages/Philology
- Library/Archival Science
- Linguistics
- Literature
- Medieval Studies
- Musicology
- Philosophy/Ethics
- Religious Studies
- Theology

**Academy of Social Sciences (Academy II)**

- Administration/Management
- Anthropology/Archaeology
- Criminology
- Demography
- Economics
- Education
- Geography
- Industrial Relations
- Journalism
- Law
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Sociology
- Social Work

**Academy of Science: (Academy III)**

- Animal biology
- Applied sciences and engineering
- Astronomical sciences
- Atmospheric sciences
- Chemistry
- Earth sciences
- Environment/Ecology
- Mathematics, and computer sciences
- Medical sciences
- Microbiology and biochemistry
- Molecular biology and genetics
- Ocean sciences
- Physics
- Plant biology

## The nomination dossier

1. Letter from the nominator
2. A short citation (prepared by the Primary Nominator)
3. Detailed appraisal (prepared by the Primary Nominator)
4. Letters of reference
5. Short biographical note for each referee
6. Curriculum Vitae of the candidate

*Note that any component of a nomination written in French may have 20% more words than the usual limit.*

Please also note that, following RSC policy, misrepresentation on application forms is grounds for dismissal of the application.

### Letter from Primary Nominator

This letter is *not* an appraisal but instead introduces the nomination by presenting the referees and explains why the referees have been chosen. The letter should not highlight or repeat information from the detailed appraisal.

### A short citation

The short citation should include the candidate's full name, institution and discipline or artistic field. It should briefly summarize the appraisal and be written for non-specialists. The citation cannot exceed 70 words (85 in French).

The citation is provided to Fellows when they vote on candidates recommended by RSC selection committees.

### A detailed appraisal

The detailed appraisal is the opportunity to describe the candidate's exceptional achievements and impact. The appraisal cannot exceed 1,200 words (1,450 in French).

The appraisal should clearly state how the candidate has made exceptional contributions to their field. It is important to be only as technical as necessary, such that all members of the relevant multidisciplinary selection committees can confidently assess the merits of the work.

*This is not the time to be modest. Be clear about the excellence of the nominee's achievements.*

The appraisal should be explicit about the original, innovative, and significant qualities of the candidate's work. The appraisal should describe the national and/or international impact of the work, and the candidate's reputation and expertise. Examples of this include: publications in top-rated journals; scholarly books; translations of work into foreign languages; invitations to give influential or named lectureships at Canadian or international universities or other similar fora; election to significant international academic bodies; service on advisory panels of leading international agencies and non-governmental organizations; and performances or juried exhibitions.

In summary, the appraisal should describe the impact of the candidate's achievements, and clearly outline the larger relevance of their work.

**TIP: Include accessible explanations of highly technical aspects or avoid them in favour of describing the larger significance of the work.**

## Letters of reference

Letters of reference are crucial components of the nomination. These letters are each a maximum of 750 words (900 in French). *A 250-word (300 in French) biography of each referee must be included separately, either after each respective letter of reference or all together, after all reference letters.*

The Nominator cannot act as a referee for a candidate whom they have nominated. Selection committees will consider not only the quality and persuasiveness of the letters from referees, but also the reputation of the referees themselves.

*Letters of reference are CRUCIAL. Referees should be distinguished and internationally recognized experts in the domain of the candidate.*

Special attention should be given to the selection of the referees. The closeness of the relationship between the referee and the candidate should not be taken lightly. For example, if a referee has published or received grants with the candidate, or supervised the candidate's dissertation, this would be considered to be close to the candidate and would impact the selection committee's assessment of the candidate. Furthermore, if a referee shares any private, professional, business or public interests with the candidate, this will be considered a conflict of interest and will seriously jeopardize a candidate's likelihood of being elected. The Royal Society of Canada reserves the right to resolve areas of uncertainty and to determine if a conflict exists. Finally, unless it is inevitable, we would not recommend that the referee and candidate are from the same institutional affiliation.

Reference letters are typically "fact-heavy." They explain the specific originality, significance, and impact of the candidate's achievements. Details of the practical or theoretical implications of the candidate's work are useful.

*Letters of reference should be fact-heavy and provide specific and objective examples to back up assertions.*

Referees should comment on the national and international reputation of the candidate.

Details of teaching quality or routine service and administrative posts are relevant *only to the extent* that they have contributed significantly to the candidate's artistic, creative, intellectual, scholarly, and scientific achievements and impact. Otherwise, they should be omitted. Finally, reference letters **should not** reiterate the candidate's achievements as listed in their CV. A good letter of reference should bring a convincing argument towards the quality of the candidate's work and explain why these are significant in their field. It is more productive to have a reference provide a qualitative assessment of the candidate's work and to justify this assessment by explaining its impact in the field and how it is being used by other researchers. External metrics, such as citation index, should be used sparingly, and should only be included as an element of a larger, developed argument towards describing the candidate's excellence.

*Use clear, non-technical language. Make sure the description of the nominee's work is exciting, engaging and persuasive. Instead of summarizing the CV, state the original and exceptional contributions of the candidate.*

**Reminder: Referees must provide a short biographical note about themselves – maximum 250 words (300 in French)**

The number of reference letters required varies by Academy. The Academy of Arts and Humanities and the Academy of Social Sciences require three letters of reference. The Academy of Science requires five letters. These requirements are for all types of Fellowship (Fellows, International Fellows and Specially Elected Fellows).

## Curriculum vitae

The CV is intended to help the selection committee appreciate the full scope of the candidate's contributions and achievements. The page limit for the CV is 50 pages. It would be expected that the following entries be included in the CV: publications, key scholarly presentations, awards and distinctions, and grants.

The CV format can vary, depending, for example, on standards in particular fields and among diverse candidates. Selection committees seek to evaluate CVs appropriately in keeping with the RSC's commitment to inclusive excellence.

Administrative posts are relevant only to the extent that they have contributed significantly to the candidate's artistic, creative, intellectual, scholarly, and scientific achievements and impact (e.g., as the head of a research team or lab).

***TIP: Remove or downplay references to activities that cannot be clearly seen as contributing to exceptional achievement.***

## The selection process

After the completed nomination dossier is received, it will be reviewed by one of the ten Divisional Committees for the Selection of New Fellows. These multidisciplinary committees are composed of a particular Division's director and secretary, and three or more Fellows. The RSC and its Academies ensure that selection committees are populated in a manner that reflects the diversity of the relevant scholarly community, and the spread of disciplines within the Division. Committee members are provided with guidelines to ensure awareness of best practices for inclusive excellence, including those related to unconscious bias. The RSC Conflict of Interest Policy is also reviewed in advance.

**The Divisional Committees are:**

### **Academy of Arts and Humanities (Academy I)**

- Division 1 - Humanities (English)
- Division 2- *Lettres et sciences humaines* (French)
- Division 3 - Arts (Bilingual)

### **Academy of Social Sciences (Academy II)**

- Division 4 - English
- Division 5 – French

### **Academy of Science (Academy III - Bilingual)**

- Division 6 - Applied sciences and engineering (ASE)
- Division 7 - Earth, ocean & atmospheric sciences (EOAS)
- Division 8 - Biological Sciences (BIOS)
- Division 9 - Medical Sciences (MEDS)
- Division 10 - Mathematical and physical sciences (MPS)

***i.e. A nomination to the Division of Biological Sciences should be referred to as "Academy III, Division 8."***

All nominations recommended by the Divisional Committees are then forwarded to the appropriate Academy Committee for the Selection of New Fellows. Each Academy's list of recommended candidates is then forwarded to the RSC Council for consideration for election. Those recommended individuals are then put to a vote by all Fellows in the appropriate Division. Candidates must be approved by 75 per cent of the votes cast by Fellows in the appropriate Division (excluding abstentions). Each elected candidate receives a letter inviting them to express their interest in standing for election by the RSC Fellows. The letter outlines the rights and responsibilities associated with Fellowship.



## Checklist

Make sure the nomination dossier includes:

- A letter from the Primary Nominator, signed by either an RSC Fellow or university president (from the RSC Institutional Members).
- A citation (prepared by the Primary Nominator), written for non-specialists, with a maximum of 70 words (85 in French).
- A detailed appraisal from the Primary Nominator, outlining the candidate's contributions to their field (maximum of 1,200 words, 1,450 in French).
- Letters of Reference, with details emphasizing the originality, impact and significance of the candidate's work (maximum 750 words, 900 in French). Academy I (Arts & Humanities) and Academy II (Social Sciences) require **three letters** of reference. Academy III (Science) requires **five**.
- Short biographies (*maximum 250 words, 300 in French*) from each referee (separate from the letters of reference).
- Curriculum Vitae, including a list of publications, key scholarly presentations, exhibitions, artistic performances, awards, distinctions and honours. Maximum 50 pages.
- Should the above-mentioned criteria not be met, the nomination dossier will be rejected. No additional documents will be accepted.

## Frequently asked questions

### Who can nominate Fellows?

There are two ways to be nominated for election to the RSC:

- o By a current Fellow
- o By an Institutional Member.

### Can letters of nomination or reference be signed by more than one person?

No.

### How does the Primary Nominator decide in which discipline to nominate a candidate, if the discipline is not included on the RSC list?

The Primary Nominator determines in which discipline to nominate a candidate. The discipline should be the one that most closely matches the candidate's work (see p. 5 of this document).

### How does the choice of discipline affect the selection process?

The selection process is based on review by multidisciplinary committees that group together specific disciplines. Each nomination file will be adjudicated in the Divisional Committee that includes the discipline chosen by the Primary Nominator.

### What makes a nomination stand out?

Excellence and impact are the fundamental and most important characteristics of a nomination. The scholarly originality, impact, and expertise of the referees are critical factors in making the case for candidates.

**Should nominations make reference to teaching awards or administrative appointments?**

Include reference to teaching awards or administrative appointments only to the extent that they have directly contributed to exceptional artistic, creative, intellectual, scholarly, and scientific achievement and impact.

**Can nominators act as referees for a candidate they have nominated?**

No.

**What makes a good reference?**

Referees should be outstanding in their own right, with significant national and international reputations. They should be experts in the candidate's field. They should have direct knowledge of the candidate's work and be able to describe the significance, impact and originality of the candidate's career. International referees are valued, as the nominee's national and international reputation is a primary determinant.

**How technical or field-specific is the selection process?**

As the nomination advances through the process, the selection becomes less and less specific to the candidate's research specialty. This is why it is important to describe the candidate's work in non-technical, readable prose. For example, a researcher specializing in raccoon behaviour might have a nomination dossier with letters of reference from other raccoon researchers. This dossier might initially be evaluated by colleagues in animal biology within the Biological Sciences Division selection committee, then by the broader committee. It would then go to the selection committee of the Academy of Science to be, if selected, voted on by all Fellows in that Division.

**Does the RSC provide feedback on dossiers that did not make the cut?**

The RSC does not provide feedback on nominations that are unsuccessful.

**For how long is my nomination file valid?**

A nomination dossier is valid for one competition. The Primary Nominator of an unsuccessful nomination is contacted during the summer months, i.e. approximately 8 months after submission.

**Can I re-nominate, in a subsequent year, someone whose nomination has been unsuccessful?"**

Yes, you can submit a re-nomination in the year immediately following an unsuccessful nomination or in any subsequent year. Please note that, although many components of the original nomination can be re-used, the nomination will, in its formal aspects, need to have all the elements of a new nomination. Thus, for example, letters will need to have current dates and signatures and the CV will need to be up-to-date.

## Appendices

### Appendix I: The Primary Nominator's Letter

This letter must be signed by a current RSC Fellow or president of an institutional member of RSC. The Primary Nominator Letter **must** follow the model below. Nominations that do not follow the model will automatically be rejected and excluded from the selection process.

*[Institutional Letterhead]*

November 1, 2022

Manager, Fellowship & Awards  
The Royal Society of Canada  
282 Somerset Street West  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K2P 0J6

Re: YYY

Dear Manager, Fellowship & Awards,

I am pleased to submit a completed nomination package for Professor YYY for election to Division 4 of Academy II.

The file is complete and includes a brief biographical statement for each of the three referees who have agreed to write in support of Professor YYY's nomination. It also contains all required documentation, including a citation, my detailed appraisal, and the nominee's CV. The referees are expert scholars in their fields: Professor LMN is the leading U.S. scholar of comparative legal professions. She is well qualified to speak to Professor YYY's international reputation in that field. Professor DEF is a professor at Oxford and author of the leading (until Professor YYY's book came out) comparative law treatise published in English. Mr. Justice RST was for 25 years a law professor at the University of Toronto where he was acknowledged as a leading scholar in the field of civil procedure. He is especially well placed to assess Professor YYY's scholarship in the field of judicial institutions and civil procedure.

While Professor YYY's work is often interdisciplinary in nature, I have nominated her in Division 1 of Academy II, as much of her work focuses on cross-cultural comparisons of law, including law related to First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples. However, she is appointed in the Faculty of Law and therefore it is appropriate to judge her work in this discipline.

Yours sincerely,

***[Signature, (mandatory)]***

ABCD  
Professor of International Commercial Law

## Appendix II: Citation - maximum of 70 words (85 in French)

### **LASTNAME, First Name, Faculty of Law, McGill University**

YYY's innovative approaches to comparative law and legal theory have contributed to opening a significant new research field: cross-cultural comparison of judicial institutions. Her studies on theory, history and evolution of western legal traditions, together with pioneering scholarship on customary law and codification, have reinvigorated comparative law research worldwide. Professor YYY has conducted ground-breaking work on how Indigenous traditional justice can be integrated effectively into federal and provincial courts.

### Appendix III: Detailed appraisal from the Primary Nominator - maximum of 1,200 words (1,450 in French)

For thirty years Professor YYY has contributed a stream of innovative studies to the international literature of comparative law and legal theory. From the time of her doctoral thesis and early work on private international law—that branch of law that most puts into question the territory-based conception of state law—she has been preoccupied with fundamental questions of legal legitimacy. Her pioneering work on custom, codification, the trans-systemic borrowing of persuasive authority by courts, and comparative legal methodology have carried this inquiry into realms of comparative research not usually subjected to penetrating theoretical analysis. Her critique of Canada’s immigration and refugee regimes, like her earlier doctoral dissertation, puts into question received wisdom about the relationship between territory and legal institutions, and directly challenges traditional statist views of legal subjectivity. In her essays on the history and evolution of western legal traditions and in his most recent theoretical monograph entitled *Legal Traditions of the World* she draws the several threads of her scholarship together in a grand synthesis of the local vernacular and the transcendent in legal normativity. Over the past thirty years Professor YYY has carved out a world-wide reputation for powerful analyses of, and creative approaches to, the central questions of legal legitimacy and authority.

Publishing in both the French and English languages, she has effectively exploited the unique comparative law laboratory of contemporary Quebec and Canada to develop and test hypotheses about legal institutions, legal processes and comparative judicial methodology. These hypotheses have been applied by scholars to locales as distinct as Eastern Europe and South-East Asia.

While theoretically sophisticated, her work has always focused on the actual functioning of legal rules within their procedural and institutional settings. Her current scholarship targets how the cultural roundedness of law and legal traditions leads to the transformation of borrowed institutions when they are implanted in a new social environment.

In addition, Professor YYY has conducted significant ground-breaking scholarship on how the cultural approaches and traditional knowledge inherent in Indigenous justice concepts can be integrated into federal and provincial legal institutions. This work has substantially enhanced cross-cultural understanding and is at the forefront of scholarly work on legal pluralism.

Professor YYY’s early work in private international law led her to examine the porous frontiers of modern national legal systems, and to reject then prevalent views about the normative closure of these systems. This inquiry matured into her path-breaking studies of persuasive authority and the cross-systemic pollination of legal ideas. In turn, these investigations blossomed into her work on the history and institutional character of legal traditions—a direction in comparative law that has gradually come to displace the formal, doctrinal comparison of the rules and concepts of national systems as a central problem of international comparative law.

From the outset of her career as a student of private international law, she has also focused upon substantive issues of legal regulation that lie on the margins of official legal systems. Her studies on the right to privacy and the legal regimes governing the treatment of refugees, the latter being the subject of a monograph authored while she held the Bora Laskin Fellowship in Human Rights Law, reflect her capacity to see overarching legal ideals that inform apparently disparate branches of the law. During the past two decades she has written several studies on codification, the interpenetration of the Civil law and the Common law traditions and the notion of mixed legal systems. These have been published in leading journals in Canada, the United States and Europe.

A further dimension of Professor YYY’s deep concern with the legitimacy of legal institutions and processes is reflected in her twenty-year preoccupation with structural and methodological features of contemporary judicial institutions. Several recent publications on civil procedure, judicial methodology, the nature of precedent, class actions, court organization and the independence of the judiciary are informed by her search for the intellectual

foundations of adjudication as a social institution. She is acknowledged as an international authority on the design of appellate courts.

Professor YYY's work in comparative law earned her election, at a young age, to the International Academy of Comparative Law (IACL), as well as several prizes and research fellowships, including the prestigious Grand Prize (Canada Prize) of the IACL for her treatise *Legal Traditions of the World*. She has served as the Director of the Institute of Comparative Law at McGill and has been a President of both the Quebec and Canadian Comparative Law Associations. She has edited a number of scholarly collections produced on the occasion of the Annual Meetings of these organizations.

The animating intellectual theme of Professor YYY's work has been the inadequacy of state-centred conceptions of legal normativity to meeting the needs of an increasingly mobile and diverse world community. The corpus of her scholarship constitutes a theoretically sophisticated exploration of the institutions, processes and history of contemporary western legal traditions. Her vast legal culture and wide-ranging exploration of both substantive and methodological questions makes her the pre-eminent scholar of comparative law in Canada today.

## Appendix IV: Letter of reference – maximum of 750 words (900 in French)

*[Institutional Letterhead]*

October 23, 2022

Primary Nominator

Street Address

City, Province

Postal Code

Re: Professor YYY

Dear Primary Nominator,

I have been asked to write in support of the nomination of Professor YYY for election to the Royal Society of Canada. I am most pleased to do so as I believe Professor YYY to be at the very top rank of Canadian legal scholars. Indeed, as I assess Professor YYY against a more universal standard, I can honestly say that her academic Contributions to scholarship on Indigenous peoples' issues and theorizing social diversity are in the top rank of common law jurists world-wide.

Let me begin by noting my various interactions with Professor YYY. None of these, I believe, put me in a conflict of interest with respect to this reference. While we have never directly collaborated on any projects, she and I share a keen interest in the topic of Reconciliation, a topic for which she recently received a major research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). In addition, I have reviewed her scholarship at the request of the Law Commission of Canada. Indeed, I have read most of the published items that are listed on her CV. There is much to say about YYY's teaching, support of graduate students, administrative leadership in the trans-national Indigenous rights community, and counsel work for Canadian aboriginal organizations. But since membership in the Royal Society of Canada is meant to recognize scholarly excellence, I shall confine my observations to this aspect of her academic career.

My reference focuses on four features of YYY's scholarly career.

First, ongoing commitment to scholarship. YYY has maintained a consistent pace of scholarly research and writing since the early 1990s.

Second, international recognition. Her work has attracted attention in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States, as attested by the significant number of named lectureships that she has presented over this same period.

Third, policy impact. YYY has been sought after not only by First Nations, but by federal and provincial governments, commissions of inquiry such as the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, and by think tanks such as the Law Commission of Canada.

Fourth, intellectual and theoretical sophistication. YYY's scholarship is of the highest order, a point confirmed by the prizes and awards—the Smiley Prize in Political Science; the New Zealand Law Foundation Fellowship; the Bertha Wilson Professorship; and the AIATSIS Fellowship in Australia.

Professor YYY's research interests are broad and far-reaching, including private law, administrative law, constitutional law and international law. More recently, in her work with the Law Commission she has taken on the enormously challenging task of attempting to discern the fundamental premises of different Indigenous legal traditions in Canada. This is a work of comparative scholarship that no-one has yet attempted. I have read a draft

of this monograph and am staggered by the depth of knowledge of comparative law that it reveals and the originality of YYY's arguments.

Until the past decade, most work on aboriginal law in Canada has been about the law of Canada as it relates to aboriginal peoples. YYY has been at the forefront of scholars who are closely investigating the normative and conceptual premises of aboriginal law as the "law of aboriginal peoples.", including the integration of traditional Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing. This task has led her into the fields of legal anthropology and legal pluralism theory. In my view she is pushing the traditional analyses of scholars like Etienne LeRoy and Norbert Rouland in new and exciting ways. My own research in legal pluralism has been enriched by YYY's studies of Indigenous law in Canada, and her insights have greatly enhanced the work of the Quebec research group "Autochtonie et gouvernance" of which I am a member.

Professor YYY has been a creative and productive legal scholar for almost twenty years, and over the last six years she has carved out a place as one of, if not **the** most original and creative theorists of Indigenous law in the English-speaking world. He is intellectually engaged, generous with his ideas, supportive of the research of others and, by her example and by her counsel, has been able to assist her colleagues and other First Nations scholars in upgrading their own work.

Among Canadian law professors not now a member of the Royal Society, I am hard pressed to think of any who are more deserving of the honour of election to membership in the Royal Society of Canada.

Yours sincerely,

***[Signature, (mandatory)]***

Roderick A. Macdonald, FRSC  
F.R. Scott Professor of Constitutional and Public Law



## Appendix V: Referee biographical statement – maximum of 250 words (300 in French)

Please ensure to have a biographical statement for each of the referees. The biographical statement should not be the CV of the referee, and it should be added as part of the last page of the referee letter. The maximum length of the referee biographical statement **should not be longer than 250 words**.

**Referee:** Professor LMN, Harvard University

Professor LMN is the Learned Hand Professor of Law at Harvard University where she has taught since the mid-1970s. She obtained a B.A. from the University of Chicago in 1959, a J.D. in 1961 and a Master of Comparative Law in 1963, also from Chicago. She was named Learned Hand Professor of Law in 1993. Her primary research interests lie in Comparative Constitutional Law in the United States and Europe, International Human Rights, Comparative Law, and the Legal Profession.

She has published five leading monographs and a dozen peer-reviewed articles in top journals. She is a Fellow of the National Academy of Sciences.