

**Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes  
AGM 2015  
University of Ottawa  
June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015  
4:45 – 6:15 pm  
Submitted by Heather Hillsburg, WGSRF Secretary**

**1. Welcome**

Marie Lovrod, president, welcomed members to the meeting. She thanked everyone for their participation at the conference. She also extended thanks to everyone who contributed to making this conference happen: the conference participants as well as members of the executive, the conference program committee and administrator, the membership administrator, the local organizers, and the awards committees.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

**Motion:** Susanne Luhmann moved to accept the agenda

**Seconded:** Ann Braithwaite

**Motion carried.**

**3. Approval of 2014 Minutes**

**Motion:** Mary Bunch moved to accept the minutes

**Seconded:** Allyson Jule

**Motion carried.**

**4. Business Arising**

None

**5. Reports and Motions**

**a) President's Report- Marie Lovrod**

The primary responsibility of the WGSRF has been organizing the conference at the University of Ottawa. Marie extended thanks to all of the members of the executive, to the members of various committees, and to the volunteers.

There are a few items of business for consideration:

i) Move to raise association fees to the following structure:

Tenure stream= 100\$

Student and low waged= 30\$

This structure would allow us to increase travel funding, and our fees would still be some of the lowest at Congress.

ii) We need to find an accountant to audit or review the finances, or we could do a notice of readership, which will review the practices.

iii) Communications: we own our domain until 2016. Our account with weebly lasts until 2016 as does our google account.

iv) We are still looking for a logo, and have 200\$ set aside for a new logo.

**b) Treasurer's Report- Heather Latimer**

I am pleased to report to the membership that our finances continue to be in good shape for the year ending December 31, 2014, although we continue to face a small loss in income, a trend which began in 2013. The income statement (attached) and bank reconciliation information that I have prepared for the AGM are not audited. The last audit was done of the 2012 financial statements. An audit was intended for 2014, but has not been done because of cost.

❖ **2014 Income Statement (Highlights)**

- For the second time in recent years, our expenditures \$ **15, 912.83** exceeded our revenue of \$ **12,493.19** for a net loss of \$ **3,419.64**
- **This year saw a large decrease in membership dues and donations, which partly explains this loss, as well as an increase in conference expenses.**
- In 2013 we had a net loss of \$ **1,207.47**.
- The last time we had a net income was 2012 (\$ **2,179.71**).

❖ **2014 Bank Reconciliation**

- The difference between the book balance and the account balance as of December 31, 2014 was \$**0.00** with no outstanding cheques or withdrawals. As of December 31, 2014 we have a balance of \$ **24, 557.95**.

❖ **2014 Conference (Brock)**

- Expenses of \$ **16,977.06** (adjusted figure, which includes cost of plenaries, administration and travel funding) far exceeded revenues of \$ **7,735.00** for a net loss of \$ **9, 242.06** (similar to 2013 conference loss of \$**9,765.18**)

❖ **2014 Student/Low Waged Travel Fund**

- On January 1 the Travel Fund had a carry forward of \$ **3, 287.79**
- We received a total of \$**1, 540.00** in donations from members.
- We paid out a total of \$**3, 289.45** to 17 eligible applicants.
- On December 31 the Travel Fund had a closing balance of \$**1,538.34**.

In 2014, I attempted to carry out the bi-annual audit of our books, as per previous years. The person who had done audits previously was no longer available, and I had difficulty finding someone willing to do an audit. Several accountants said that it was not worth their time to audit a small scholarly association. The following is information I received from Julie Guenkel, Senior Manager at SmythRadcliff Chartered Accountants:

“- Audits generally start at about \$5,000. That’s practically half your revenues, so it doesn’t seem that realistic. I guess that leads to the question of why you need an audit. Normally, a NPO will have an audit for the following reasons: 1) Their bylaws require one 2) Their funders require one 3) Their financials are scrutinized by the public so the Board requires one. You might want to revisit the reason for the audit?”

If we decide we do need an audit, Julie suggested that a review engagement (half the price) or a notice to reader (about a quarter the price) might do.

“Here are three levels of service for the preparation by a public accounting firm of financial

statements: Audit, Review and Notice to Reader compilation. While audits may be required under both federal and provincial legislation, some entities may be exempted from the audit requirement if the members agree, in writing, to waive the appointment of an auditor. The differences between these engagements are summarized below:

- **Audit engagement:** An audit consists of an examination of the accounting records, source documents that support the amounts disclosed in the financial statements as well as inquiries concerning an entity's systems, control activities and an evaluation of the risk of fraud. We would gather the necessary evidence to determine whether the financial statements present a fair picture of the entity's financial position and its activities during the period being audited. Our audit report would include a professional opinion on the financial statements.
- **Review engagement:** A review provides more limited assurance that the financial information presented is plausible and conforms to accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations. The review procedures include making inquiries concerning all relevant information, comparisons to financial data for the current and prior periods, and discussion with management regarding the information received. Our review report would provide negative assurance on the financial statements and not result in a professional opinion.
- **Notice to Reader compilation:** A compilation provides no assurance on the financial information presented, or compliance with accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations. We would compile the information provided by management into financial statement format and perform very limited analysis of the figures presented. Our report will specifically state that we are not rendering a professional opinion."

### **c) Membership Report- Rachel Hurst**

This year, Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Feministes has 201 individual members and 7 institutional members. Sarah DeBoice was the Membership Administrator this year, and Rachel Hurst was the Membership Coordinator (Member-at-Large #3).

We did a membership drive for both individual members and institutional members, through an email reminder, encouraging members to renew and also to join our Facebook and Twitter accounts. A membership goal discussed by the executive this year is to increase institutional memberships, which have remained stable over recent years, and declined this year. Members are encouraged to advocate for WGSRF in their departments, and to take out institutional memberships. In previous years (2011), there was some discussion of ways to do so if not financially feasible at the departmental level; these included asking for institutional membership funding from Deans' offices or even Presidents' offices.

Finally, the Membership Coordinator would like to present an item for discussion, which is the possibility to raise association fees for Individual WGSRF members (not Student, Unwaged, Retired, or Low Income), which are currently set at \$65. We have not raised these fees in recent years, and our fees are roughly in the middle of the scale; overall, 43 associations have fees below ours (many clustered at the \$50 mark), and 24 have fees above ours (and here, most are clustered at the \$100+ mark). For comparison, here is a chart of selected association fees. As the

association bears increased costs for the annual conference, the executive would like the membership to consider raising association fees to increase the available budget.

Association	Association fees
Canadian Communication Association (CCA)/ Association canadienne de communication (ACC)	\$35
Association of Canadian College and University Teachers of English (ACCUTE); Sexuality Studies Association (SSA)/Association d'études de la sexualité (AÉS); Canadian Association for the Study of International Development (CASID)/Association canadienne d'études du développement international (ACÉDI); Canadian Comparative Literature Association (CCLA)/Association canadienne de littérature comparée (ACLC)	\$50
<b>Folklore Studies Association of Canada (FSAC)/ Association canadienne d'ethnologie et de folklore (ACEF); Canadian Association for Theatre Research (CATR)/Association canadienne de la recherche théâtrale (ACRT); Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes (WGSRF)</b>	<b>\$65</b>
Canadian Philosophical Association (CPA) /Association canadienne de philosophie (ACP)	\$70
Canadian Sociological Association (CSA)/Société canadienne de sociologie (SCS)	\$80
Canadian Historical Association (CHA)/Société historique du Canada (SHC)	\$85
Environmental Studies Association of Canada (ESAC)/Association canadienne d'études environnementales (ACÉE)	\$90
Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA)/ Association canadienne de science politique (ACSP)	\$105
Canadian Association for Food Studies (CAFS)/Association canadienne des études sur l'alimentation (ACÉA); Canadian Disability Studies Association (CDSA)/ Association canadienne des études sur l'incapacité (ACÉI)	\$150

**d) Undergraduate Essay Prize Committee Report – Alana Cattapan (York/Dalhousie)**

The members of the Undergraduate Essay Prize Committee included: Samantha Balzer (Alberta); Alana Cattapan (York/Dalhousie); Julie Dowsett (York); Danielle Cooper (York);

Sarah Dorchak (Calgary); and Emma McKenna (McMaster). There were thirteen essays in total and most drew on interview research, which is notable, while some of the others were either based on secondary research, personal experiences, literature reviews, historiographies, or some combination of these approaches.

Beyond the top three or four essays there was pretty significant variability in the rankings, and as such, it is hard to speak broadly about the quality of the essays. However, those that were ranked highly were very strong, and it is clear that undergraduate women's studies programs include students with a capacity for excellent scholarship. The winning essay was particularly remarkable and a clear winner. There was near unanimity about that choice. There was slightly less ease in selecting the honourable mentions, but it was really a matter of choosing between three. The honourable mentions we selected both demonstrated substantial conceptual and stylistic refinement and were interesting to read.

### *The Selection Process*

After the selection committee received the essays via email, we each read and assessed them independently, recording our rankings in a shared Google document. Papers were assessed on the basis of the following criteria:

- Was a relevant argument set out in the paper? If so, was the argument fully developed throughout the paper?
- Were other studies/reports/research referred to? In other words, was there a detailed analysis conducted on the issue?
- Was this paper unique in some way? Was there any evidence of originality/creativity?
- Was the writing style at an acceptable level? Were there any grammatical errors or spelling errors? Did the paper flow?
- Did I learn something from reading this paper?
- Was this paper relevant to Women's and Gender Studies?

As the top essays were relatively clear from the rankings, we did not hold a meeting, but rather we deliberated via email—it was a long email chain by the end—to come to a consensus to have one winner and two honourable mentions.

### *Overall Impressions*

While the top essays were evident, a number of the essays were of less-high quality, either because the argumentation was not strong, or because they were not stylistically sophisticated. However, as noted above, there was considerable disparity in the rankings, which makes it difficult to make broad statements about the quality of the essays. It is worth noting, however, that those submitting the essays in the future should pay particular attention to the assessment criteria listed above to make certain that their students' papers are competitive, and to ensure that the quality of submissions remains high.

Further, it seemed as if a number of the essays followed a similar format, drawing on interview research and experiential knowledge. This may have been coincidence, or because instructors are using similar assignments with upper year classes, but in the future the calls for submissions

might emphasize even further that the prize committee is interested in a range of approaches to women's studies.

### **2015 Undergraduate Essay Prize Winner**

#### **Sam Eldridge (University of Victoria), "Climbing the Mountain': Negotiating Dis/Ability and Fitness"**

According to the committee, "Climbing the Mountain': Negotiating Dis/Ability and Fitness" is a sophisticated piece of scholarship. The question driving this essay is: how do "people feel about exercising with disabled, impaired, ill and chronically pained bodies that fall outside the (slippery) boundary of 'normal'." Considering this, the author weaves together academic and activist writings, personal narrative, and the research materials gained from series of interviews. Throughout, this essay demonstrates a commitment to social justice, particularly as it brings together a host of situated knowledges, valuing personal experience as a meaningful mode of knowledge-production. As the author explains, "in writing the following pages [they] got to know 5 bodies—[their] own, in greater depth, and those of four interviewees." Allowing their reader access to this process, the author demonstrates a profound level of vulnerability, self-reflexivity, and a strong commitment to feminist models of situated knowledge.

Throughout this essay, the author demonstrates commanding knowledge of Disability Studies, and works closely and carefully with academic and activist literature on disabled embodiment. The line between scholarship and social justice writing is often murky, and the author makes no attempt to clarify this ambiguity. The author's goal is not to clarify boundaries, but instead to emphasize the connections between knowledge production and experiences of non-normative bodies. Yet, the author takes care not to reify disabled embodiment, regularly reminding their reader of the various privileges of the five participating bodies. Thinking through these privileges, the author situates the five bodies relative to terms like disability, fitness, in/visibility, and normality. This piece self-reflexively attends both to disabled bodies and to geographies of disability.

The most significant physical space to this essay is the gym. Interested in how, where, when, and why the five non-normative bodies exercise, this essay does not simply read the gym as the location of activity, but as a space closely connected to the 'why.' The author reads the gym through a Foucauldian lens, and they describe it as "a site where bodies resist and comply with techniques of power tied to pervasive social/cultural norms." Regimes of fitness are the processes by which the five non-normative bodies in this study become docile, but they are also the means through which these bodies negotiate their relationship to disability and normality.

What makes "Climbing the Mountain" a truly unique piece of writing is the explicit and consistent presence of the author's body, and its fraught relationship to fitness, disability, and normality. The author demonstrates a profound level of self-reflexivity and vulnerability throughout this essay, both central to strong and meaningful feminist literature."

### **2015 Undergraduate Essay Prize - Second Prize Co-Winner**

#### **Julia Dyck (University of Winnipeg), "Threads Among Women: Globalized Capitalism and Female Labour in the Two Thirds-World"**

According to the committee, “Threads Among Women” is a critical examination of media coverage of the April 24, 2013 Rana Plaza garment factory collapse in Bangladesh. Engaging in a transnational feminist approach, the author challenges the neoliberal lens permeating Canadian media coverage on the factory’s collapse.

Exploring how the Canadian media, despite critical approaches, worked to “pull at the heart strings of viewers” yet continue to “reify the image of the ‘average third world woman’” (p. 4), the author destabilizes the neoliberal discourse that “places the locus of responsibility for ending the disempowerment of women in the two-thirds world squarely within the hands of these very women” (p. 5). Further, the author uncovers how the media representations remove responsibility from the shoulders of both corporations and Canadian consumers.

As the author writes, “When faced with the question of what concerned Canadians are to do in order to prevent another disaster such as the one in Bangladesh, it seems the answer often given by media is anything other than to stop consuming from these sources. . . . we are still reminded that these garment factory jobs are pulling millions of women out of poverty, therefore a boycott of Bangladeshi made clothing [is not] the answer” (p. 7). The author hits the proverbial nail on the head in their study of global capitalism’s normalization by revealing the media’s misrepresentation of a homogenous Other in poverty, and calls for immediate policy changes to hold international corporations accountable to foreign workers and their needs.

Such a passionate critique alone gave “Threads Among Women” a high ranking. However, the author’s emphasis on “rethink[ing] the concept of individual autonomy in light of issues such as globalization” and debunking the neoliberal justification for Canadian companies’ roles in foreign countries impressed the committee significantly. This was a well-developed and well-argued essay emphasizing a critical eye to Canadians’ role in the global economy. Understanding our role as Canadian consumers in the global structural violence of oppression and exploitation is a necessary macro-approach to feminist activism; this author succeeds in holding us accountable for such violence.”

### **2015 Undergraduate Essay Prize - Second Prize Co-Winner**

#### **Curtis Tanner Sell (Western), “The Political Body A Foucauldian and Butlerian Analysis of Wrongful Birth Litigation’s Regulation of Life”**

According to the committee, “This paper intervenes on liberal feminist discourses of reproduction, justice, and the body. The author investigates the ways in which the law helps shape, and is shaped by, normativity. In particular, the author is interested in how wrongful birth litigation in Canada “acts as a norm regulating the lives of disabled bodies” (1).

The author develops a theoretical framework through which to unpack how wrongful birth litigation functions in contemporary Canadian jurisprudence to reify a hierarchical corporeal value system that delegitimizes the lives, bodies, and experiences of disabled subjects. The author astutely links together the work of Judith Butler and Michel Foucault to examine how the law functions both as a governing apparatus and as a representational frame. Drawing on Foucault, the author argues that “contemporary law [i]s a regulatory norm that shapes life in accordance with power” (1). The author augments this insight with Butler, conceptualizing “law as an (sic) force that regulates the precariousness of life” (1). It is this precariousness of the life

of the disabled child that interests the author, and the essay moves through more in-depth theoretical reviews of Butler and Foucault before arriving at the crux of their argument.

The author's analysis of wrongful litigation is a novel one, and extends a critical feminist gaze onto what may be considered a simple issue of "women's reproductive freedom." Instead, the author demonstrates how the increasing speculation and monitoring of women's bodies via prenatal testing is linked to a specific form of bio-power, that of increasing the power of the medical apparatus and granting it more legitimacy in its amped-up invasion of women's reproductive processes.

As the author suggests, perhaps most significantly, is the way in which these processes reproduce and enable the limits of what qualifies as a livable—or grievable—kind of life. In shifting the gaze from the subjects who make claims through the legal system (arguing that they are the victims of a medical practitioner that failed to warn them of a disability or a congenital issue in their fetuses), the author asks us instead to consider the lives of the children who, through this very process of litigation, have become objectified, devalued, and marked as 'wrongful'."

#### **e) Graduate Essay Prize Committee Report**

Given that there was only one nominated graduate essay received for this year's competition, the Graduate Essay Prize will not be awarded in 2015. The graduate essay nominated will be considered in next year's competition.

#### **f) Outstanding Scholarship Prize Committee Report**

The members of the Outstanding Scholarship Prize Committee were Connie Guberman (University of Toronto Scarborough), Ilya Parkins (UBC Okanagan), and Hans Rollman (York University). This year the committee received a total of eleven submissions. One of these was deemed ineligible on a technical basis (year of publication) leaving ten books to be considered. Following some initial discussion, a short-list of six particularly strong submissions was identified. After considerable online debate and discussion, two books emerged as clear favourites and given committee members' strong opinions about these books, it was determined (with the approval of WGSRF executive) that they would jointly be awarded the prize (in lieu of one winner and one honorary mention).

Some issues arose during the course of this year's deliberations, worth noting for future consideration:

- Submissions fell into two fairly equally divided categories: edited collections (including textbooks) and sole-authored (or dual-authored) monographs. While some books are clearly superior to others, it can be difficult to compare collections with sole-authored books, since the nature of the two styles and criteria for excellence in each form are somewhat different. If, in the future, it becomes possible to expand the award, it might be useful to develop two categories: one for collections and one for sole-authored (or team-authored) monographs. For instance, there could be an award for 'Outstanding Anthology' (textbooks or edited collections) and an award for 'Outstanding Original Research' (published monograph by a single author or team).
- One of the original five committee members removed themselves from the committee before deliberations began (owing to time constraints); however, another member did not

respond to numerous efforts to contact them and the committee eventually proceeded on the assumption they had withdrawn from the committee. This, however, delayed the adjudication process; in future it would be useful to confirm members' willingness to serve and perhaps collect additional contact information earlier in the process (for instance, members' phone numbers). Members should also be strongly encouraged to contact WGSRF executive or their fellow committee members if their ability to serve on the committee changes.

All in all, there was healthy competition and enthusiastic interest in this award on the part of publishers and authors. Several excellent books were nominated and the committee enjoyed a vigorous debate about the merits and drawbacks of the various books. The submissions reflected the broad and extensive range of scholarship being undertaken in the field of women's, gender and feminist studies; and the committee discussions reflected the dynamic breadth of theoretical and conceptual debates that characterize the field as well. This award is time-consuming to review and adjudicate, but represents an eminently worthwhile contribution to the association and the broader field of study.

#### **2015 Outstanding Scholarship Prize Co-Winners:**

**May Friedman (Ryerson University), *Mommyblogs and the Changing Face of Motherhood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 2013.**

According to the committee, "May Friedman's book *Mommyblogs and the Changing Face of Motherhood* reveals a great deal more than its title suggests. While the cultural significance of 'blogging' still tends to provoke an uncertain reaction from the academy, Friedman demonstrates mommyblogging to encompass a socially rich and conceptually complex terrain spanning the intersection of technology, identity, personhood, and community. Drawing on the accounts and experiences of mommies who blog, Friedman considers the implications and inspirations of this mode of engaging with the experience of motherhood – and with the ways in which the broader society treats and shapes that experience – from the perspective of various theoretical framings including queer theory, hybridity, and cyborg theory. In an elegant and accessible style rich in narrative depth, Friedman offers an exciting example of how feminist writing and theory can reinvigorate theoretical debates and can offer vital insights into the complexities of women's engagement with an ever-shifting technological terrain. It's worth noting that the book and its assertions provoked strong debate within the committee. Far from a detraction, however, members felt this reflected the importance and value of our interdiscipline producing work that provokes and challenges. A field such as women's and gender studies is always at risk of settling into conventional modes of discourse and engagement; innovative work that unsettles and provokes differing and sometimes difficult reactions is invaluable in maintaining the vitality of our field and the openness of our dialogues. We are pleased to award Friedman this well-deserved recognition for her contribution to women's and gender studies."

**Heather Latimer (UBC), *Reproductive Acts: Sexual Politics in North American Fiction & Film*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press. 2013.**

According to the committee, "Heather Latimer's *Reproductive Acts: Sexual Politics in North American Fiction and Film* is an innovative volume that offers a model for interdisciplinary inquiry into gender and sexuality. The book elegantly analyzes half a dozen novels and one film, suggesting that their representations of reproduction bear the imprint of the reproductive politics

in which each is forged. In bringing together literary critical analysis with political theory and contemporary histories of struggle surrounding reproduction, Latimer creates an effective dialogue between humanistic and social scientific approaches. Her work is theoretically rich and yet intimately in conversation with experiences, representations, policy-making and activism, and so the book underlines the urgency and relevance of theory and the ongoing significance of representation for feminist action. Latimer’s hemispheric methodology – which refuses simplistic distinctions between national imaginaries, stressing the linked circulation of images and ideas through Canada, the US, and Mexico – helps to interrogate orthodoxies which continue to structure our intellectual work. Altogether, *Reproductive Acts* sets a new, deeply multidisciplinary agenda for the future of gender studies, pushing us toward relevant and integrative approaches.”

**g) Conference Committee Report- Susanne Luhmann**

This year’s program committee consisted of the following members:

- Amy Milne (program administrator)
- Susanne Luhmann (chair)
- Christabelle Sethna with Jessica Dunkin (local organizers)
- Ann Braithwaite and Jessica Wright (keynotes); Ann (scholarly recognition event)
- Annalee Lepp (coordinators meeting and receptions/evening program)
- Review process: Alissa Overend, Merrick Pilling (panel proposals), Suzanne Lenon, Emily Jackson, Corinne Mason (paper proposals and session making)
- Additional help: Alan Santinele Martino, Eli Dehnavi

The program committee also received a lot of support from the executive, the previous president, Annalee Lepp, and the current president, Marie Lovrod.

Review process

	2015	2014
Panel proposals received total	33	26
French language	2	nk
Accepted total	32 (French 2)	22
Paper proposals received	63	76
French language	2	4
Accepted	52 (French 1)	55 (French nk)
Final program		
Sessions	49	43
Keynotes	3	2

This means we have 6 sessions (and one keynote) more this year than last year. This proved to be challenging for scheduling. To accommodate all accepted proposals, we shortened the lunch break and added a fifth parallel session for one day of the conference. We will have to wait and see whether this fuller program proves productive or problematic.

All submissions underwent a rigorous anonymous review process: the program administrator anonymized each proposal, which was then sent out and assessed by two (for panel proposals) or

three (for paper proposals) external reviewers. Their recorded assessments (of clarity of proposal, quality of scholarship, argument etc.) and status (yes, maybe, no) were then used to accept/ reject panels, and form sessions from individual paper submissions.

We streamlined this process this year by working with the new program committee structure (see below). This structure worked well for the panel proposals. But the forming of individual papers into sessions proved more complicated and was basically left to one member of that group. My suggestion is that we review the program committee structure with that in mind. (See my comments below.)

We were again successful in securing grants for our keynotes from the international and the interdisciplinary funds respectively. And we are co-sponsoring a third keynote with Disability Studies this year. The task of applying for funding, which is not cumbersome at all, should be part of the keynote portfolio, but requires access to the Congress online system.

We also added a couple of sessions to this year's program, which were initiated by the program committee, such as a panel on alt ac careers. My suggestion is that we initiate more professional development sessions for next congress, as we have done in the past.

Two issues remain: how to better include and reach French language scholars and the question of accommodation of special needs. The program committee needs to include at least one person who is able to read, and ideally write in, French. As it stands our association's name makes the false promise of it being a bilingual association, which we are currently not. Also, we need to address our commitment to accessibility and accommodation of special needs. I think we want to do more here than accommodation being an afterthought. I suggest that accommodation should be part of the tasks of the local organizers.

**Conference Program Committee and Chair (2016 Congress - Calgary) – (6-8 members plus local organizers) – my suggestions for revisions are in blue**

i) **Program Co-Chairs (2 people – maybe one of them the association president?):** oversee the process of program development from call for papers to scheduling to final reports and work closely with the conference administrator as well as the executive.

ii) **Keynotes (2 people - one of them a program co-chair):** Develop suggestions in discussion with committee and board; invite and communicate with keynote speakers; write Federation funding applications and final report; publicize with Congress and other relevant associations; organize introductions and hosting. (In order to be able to do this, at least one person needs to have access to the online Congress system.)

iii) **Programming/ Reviewing (6 people – three for the panel proposals, three for the paper proposals – at least one of them should be a program co-chair to chair the paper review and session forming process. At least one member of this subcommittee should be able to read French:** Review anonymous proposals; develop draft program; keep track of changes; produce the final program with program chair and program administrator; organize cross-listed sessions; organize association initiated sessions on professional development, etc.)

**iv) Special Events Organization (1 person):** Receptions, awards, scholarly achievement, cultural events, etc. [This ideally should be somebody on the executive because they need to be part of the conference calls and should have access to the Congress online system](#)

**v) Conference Local Arrangements Organizer (1-2 people):** [needs to include accessibility arrangements](#)

I am grateful for the hard work by all members of the program committee -- without whom this conference would not be possible. Special thanks to the student conference administrator, Amy Milne, who did a very good job of keeping track of the many details involved in putting this program together.

### **h) Coordinators' Meeting Report – Annalee Lepp**

There were 25 attendees at this year's meeting, with group sessions in the morning and breakout sessions in the afternoon. Members discussed issues of common interest such as recruitment and retention of graduate students, preparing students for the non-academic work force, fundraising and community engagement, work equity on campus, program prioritization & how departments use metrics to rank programs as good/strong or as poor to allocate resources and close programs. Overall, the people agreed that, despite widespread institutional problems, WGS is growing and attracts excellent students.

## **6. Elections**

**a) President Elect:** Allyson Jule, Trinity Western (nominated by Ann Braithwaite), acclaimed.

**b) Secretary:** Ilya Parkins, UBC Okanagan (volunteered), acclaimed.

**c) Conference Liaison/Program Chair:** Corinne Mason, Brandon (volunteered)

### **d) Conference Program Committee**

i) Lead on Keynotes: Jessica Wright, Marie Lovrod, Claire Carter

ii) Program Committee: Corinne Mason, Amber Dean, Jen Johnson, Jocelyn Thorpe, Rhea Hoskin, Miglena Todoreva

iii) Lead on Special Events: (awards etc): not filled

**e) Outstanding Scholarship Prize Committee:** Hans Rollman, Eva Karpinski, Marie Lovrod, and Manuela Valle-Castro

**f) Undergraduate Essay Prize Committee:** Krista Johnson, Wendy Robbins, Alana Cattapan, Tegan Zimmerman

**g) Graduate Essay Prize Committee:** Rebecca Godderis, Jennifer Musial, Sonja Boon, Ela Przybylo.

**h) Graduate Student/Sessional Faculty Representative**

Rather than create a new executive position for graduate students and sessional instructors, members discussed striking a task force on precarious labor that has close ties to the executive, but is also a stand-alone group.

There will be 5-7 people in this group, and resources will be made available for their work.

Motion tabled to create a task force on precarious labor: Annalee/Ann/Susanne

Seconded: Natalie Duchesne

Motion Carried

Anna Bogic, Natalie Kouri-Towe, and Miglena Todoreva will sit on the task force.

**i) Special Projects:** Ann Braithwaite- she will continue to participate in conference calls.

**j) Local Coordinator:** We will pursue a local coordinator at U of Calgary, Rebecca Sullivan. Ronnie Joy Leah will draw connections between the conference and local women's groups.

**k) Communications:** Shannon Stetner and Tatjana Taksava acclaimed.

### **8) New Business**

a) Is an audit necessary?

The cost is expensive, but the association would get a verification, which is a mini-audit. Marie will get more information on how to do an exploration.

b) Raising Conference Fees to 100\$ (from 65\$) and 30\$ (from 25\$). This is the member rate, the non-member rate is 10-20\$ more.

**Motion:** Rachel Hurst

**Seconded:** Heather Latimer

**Motion carried:** the new fee structure will be in place for the fall.

### **9) CRIAW Campaign**

The campaign has been extended for another term

The campaign piloted in Saskatoon, Winnipeg, and Ottawa this past school year.

### **10) Thanks to Departing Executive Members**

Susanne Luhmann (Conference Committee Chair)

Heather Hillsburg (Secretary)

### **11) Adjournment**

**Motion:** Marie Lovrod

**Second:** Annalee Lepp

Motion carried, meeting adjourned at 6:10pm.

### **In attendance at the 2015 AGM:**

Ronnie Joy Leah (Athabasca U)

Mary Bunch (University of Toronto)

Melissa Autumn White (McGill)

Nicole MacDougall (Queen's University)

Katelyn MacMullin (Concordia University)  
Zaren Healey White (Memorial University)  
Ann Braithwaite (University of Prince Edward Island)  
Susanne Luhmann (University of Alberta)  
Annalee Lepp (University of Victoria)  
Tegan Zimmerman (MacEwan University)  
Heather Hillsburg (Lakehead University)  
Susan Manning (Mount Saint Vincent University)  
Rebecca Godderis (Laurier- Brantford)  
Miglena Todoreva (University of Toronto, OISE)  
Patricia Kmiec (University of Toronto)  
Wendy Robbins (University of New Brunswick)  
Gary Lee Pelletier (York University)  
Jean Borsa (University of Saskatchewan)  
Elizabeth Kerr (Carleton University)  
Allyson Jule (Trinity Western)  
Ushnish Sengupta (University of Toronto)  
Natalie Kouri-Towe (University of Toronto)  
Jennifer Vansteenkiste (University of Guelph)  
Anna Bogic (University of Ottawa)  
Alexandre Baril (Wesleyan University)  
Pamela McKane (York University)  
Margot Francis (Brock University)  
Carol Lyne D'Arcangelis (Memorial University)  
Vicki Hallett (Memorial University)  
Krista Johnston (University of Winnipeg)  
Jennifer Musial (Dickenson College)  
Alana Cattapan (York University)  
Natalie Duchesne (Concordia)