



Academy of the Arts and Humanities Annual General Meeting  
Monday, November 15, 2021, 7:30 to 8:30

**Time the meeting was called to order**

7:32 EST

**Names of the meeting participants**

Adrian Shubert, André Lapierre, Carole Gerson, Chad Gaffield, Cheryl Warsh, Christl Verduyn, Diana Nemiroff, Elizabeth Sauer, Gary Libben, Gary Waite, Gonia Jarema, Isabelle Daunais, Jean Grondin, Jonn Axsen, Julia Wright, Leslie Howsam, Marie Battiste, Michele-Antoinette Johnson, Owen Underhill, Rob Stainton, Sean Caulfield, Sheila Embleton, Sheila Petty, Solange Lefebvre, Win Siemerling

\*\*College members: Jonn Axsen, Genevieve Le Baron

**1. Opening Remarks**

Thanks to Gonia Jarema for work as secretary.

Welcome to the new President Elect Sheila Embleton and the new Secretary Sean Caulfield.

**Poll #1**

That the Agenda be accepted as presented

For - 95%

Against -

Abstain - 5%

**Carried.**

**Poll #2**

That the minutes of the 2020 Annual Business Meeting be approved as posted on the event portal

For - 67%

Against -

Abstain - 33%

**Carried.**

**2. Nomination Selection Process**

Division 1, Gary Libben – received 37 nominations 16 approved

Thanks to members of the committee for the difficult job—many of the applications were “extraordinary” and not all could be selected.

Division 2, Isabelle Daunais – All applications were excellent and recommended. Also renewing committee membership as members’ terms end.

Division 3, Owen Underhill – 3 nominations approved

Hoping to grow the division with non-affiliated artists (not faculty at a university). It is proposed that non-affiliated artists receive funding to attend induction ceremony. This issue also relates to diversity. The question for how to find funding for this is still open and this is an issue to be discussed in future.

Wright: Thanks to Gary for his work Chairing Division 1. He is now leaving to become the Secretary of the RSC. Thanks to Cheryl Warsh for taking over as Director of Division 1.

### **3. Update on the Membership Review**

A membership review needs to happen every 5 years under RSC by-laws. Continuing concern in our Academy that we do not see enough nominations. Membership report does not help us address improving diversity of nominations. Introduced metrics that put this academy at a disadvantage, on terms that do not compare well to the sciences. Our divisions have not had an increase in a number of years. Therefore we need to find ways ourselves of increasing the number of diverse nominations.

#### **New Motion on Standing Committee**

**Academy Council moves that the Academy of the Arts and Humanities establish a new standing Academy Committee on Membership, and submit it for ratification by the RSC Council, on the following terms:**

1. The Academy Committee on Membership (ACM) shall be kept separate from Academy Council in order to ensure the independence of the nominee selection process overseen by Council.

2. The Secretary, Past Secretary, and one Fellow elected at the AGM will oversee a process for creating the first ACM no later than 28 February 2022.

3. The ACM's main purpose is to advance the diversity of the Academy of the Arts and Humanities by actively encouraging at least five nominations in each nomination year of scholars and artists from underrepresented disciplines, demographic groups, and institutions.

4. The first task of the ACM shall be electing a chair and drafting terms of reference by 1 May 2022, to be shared with the Academy Council and archived by the RSC office, that includes the following:

a) the ACM shall include at least three Academy Fellows for terms of two years, renewable once, as is consistent with other positions in the Academy, under a process to be defined in the terms of reference and kept separate from Academy Council;

b) the ACM shall report at each Academy AGM on the number of nominees it identified and the number of those who were elected;

c) the ACM shall encourage nominations simply by a formal letter to the candidate's Vice-President Research *or* a potential nominator in the Academy of the Arts and Humanities, briefly identifying the excellence of the candidate, by 30 June of each year.

d) conflict of interest guidelines.

The goal is to get at least 5 nominations each year. This is in addition to nominations from Fellows, which are needed too.

Chad Gaffield underscored his view that the report did stress the humanities in a positive and supportive light. It was clarified that the purpose of the motion is not meant to address the membership report.

Sheila Embleton spoke in favor of the motion. Stressing the need to increase diversity. Sheila also wanted to stress that the membership report also painted the humanities in a positive light.

Owen Underhill spoke in favor of the motion.

Gary Libben spoke in favor in the motion.

Julia M. Wright once again stressed that the purpose of the motion is to advance the diversity and number of nominations in Academy One.

Diana Nemiroff spoke to the issue of not being able to attend the induction ceremony due to costs. Julia agreed with this issue and underscored the use of online meetings to help with costs.

Christl Verduyn stressed the workload issue related to the standard C.V. Julia responded that finding a common CV is an ongoing issue. Perhaps a standing committee might be a way forward. Christl mentioned that a mentor program may help others put together a nomination package.

### **Poll#3**

That the Academy of the Arts and Humanities establish a new standing Academy Committee on Membership, and submit it for ratification by the RSC Council

For - 78%

Against - 9%

Abstain - 13%

**Carried.**

Owen Underhill volunteered to help with finding member for the standing committee. There were no further nominations, so Underhill was **acclaimed** to serve on the committee described in #2.

Gary Libben asked if this committee will be announced? Julia agreed that it would be good to send an update on new committee.

### **4. Other business.**

Julia M. Wright asked for ideas to be sent in re: regularizing CVs.

Shelia Embleton asked what the goal of the CV work would be? How would this help the issue? Maybe create more work? Julia M. Wright responded that at this point the purpose is to have a discussion to see if action needs to happen or not?

Solange Lefebvre asked what the problems with the CV are? Gary Libben provided examples where only publications/creative work are listed but supervision or other aspects of the research program are not mentioned. Gary Libben suggested that maybe it would be best to just list what the RSC is looking for. Julia M. Wright responded that there is an evolving sense of what is expected from artists and researchers.

Cheryl Walsh mentioned that there is a disparity between how individuals present themselves. There was agreement on providing guidance on topics for the CV.

Julia M. Wright underscored that perhaps the issue is more about updating the guidelines for the CV. Suggested that the Division directors work on lists of possible elements in a cv, and circulate to Academy Council for further discussion; when ready, they can be posted as part of the nomination guide on the RSC website.

Robert Stainton agreed that a standardized CV would create more obstacles and improved guidelines would be helpful.

Marie Battiste suggested that updating CV/nomination guidelines should embrace indigenous knowledge traditions. It was stressed that this work will create some difficulties around assessing excellence within different cultural traditions. Julia M. Wright responded that this is an excellent idea and gave suggestions on how to assess these alternative modes of research and creative work within various communities. Julia M. Wright raised the possibility of including non-voting members. Marie Battiste responded that they it may be good to turn to the committee to ask who is the right person to act as an expert for a particular research/creative area.

Sheila Embleton stressed that the membership committee understood that there was understanding around how difficult to compare divisions within the RSC. Given this, all they had left was to look at success rates when it comes additional slots. Julia M Wright responded that uneven number of slots makes it difficult compare success rates.

#### **Poll#4**

Adjournment of meeting  
That the meeting be adjourned  
For 100%  
Against  
Abstain

#### **Time of adjournment**

8:35 EST