

# ACCUTE Newsletter

June 1993

Department of English ♦ University of Guelph ♦ Guelph, ON N1G 2W1 ♦ (519) 824-4120, X3268 ♦ Fax: (519) 766-0844  
President: Michael Keefer ♦ Secretary/Treasurer: Ann Wilson ♦ Executive Assistant: Dorothy Hadfield

Published by the Association of Canadian College and University Teachers of English  
Publication of this Newsletter is supported by funds from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

ISSN 1187-8282

## ACCUTE Electronic Mailbox

After some initial glitches, the ACCUTE online computer "mailbox" is up and running. The mailbox can be used to communicate information of urgent interest to our members. Members having information they would like to have appear in the electronic mailbox should send it by fax to 519-837-1315 and we will post it. To access the mailbox from your E-mail account, call [LISTSERV@vm.uoguelph.ca](mailto:LISTSERV@vm.uoguelph.ca). Once connected, enter the command **SUB ACCUTEMB name**, where "name" is your full name, not your userid.

### Inside this issue:

President's Column .....	2
The New ACCUTE Executive .....	3
<i>Thinking About the Profession</i>	
Review of Stuart L. Smith, <i>Report: Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education</i> by R.J. Baker, President Emeritus, University of Prince Edward Island .....	4
Thoughts on The Public, Pedagogy, and Marginalized Professors by J. Russell Perkin, Saint Mary's University .....	6
Identity Crisis: The University and Culture By Bill Readings, Université de Montréal .....	8
Researching Research Options: The 1993 CFH Women's Caucus Forum by Marjorie Stone, Dalhousie University .....	11
Committee for Professional Concerns .....	14
1994 Conference .....	15
Books for Poland: An Appeal .....	16
Calls for Papers / Conferences .....	16
News of Members .....	17
1994 Membership Form .....	19

## President's Column

ACCUTE's 1993 Conference at Carleton University was, among many other things, an occasion for remembering our Association's first formal conference, thirty-five years previously. Our annual banquet, held at the National Arts Centre on June 1, was graced by the presence of several distinguished representatives of the founding members of our Association -- Professors Munro Beattie, Jay Macpherson, Ian Sowton, and Milton Wilson. This issue of the *Newsletter* contains, in the form of Professor R.J. Baker's assessment of the *Smith Commission Report*, a further reminder of the important contributions which members of that founding group continue to make to academic and literary life in Canada.

To celebrate the longevity of our Association is also, inescapably, to engage in reflections as to some of the ways in which it has changed and developed. One of the most obvious changes has been in the scale and diversity of our conference program (which this year contained presentations by almost eighty of our members). But during the past several years there has been another change in our conference which I, for one, look on with some regret.

When I first attended our Association's conferences a little more than a decade ago, one of the things I found most attractive about it was the ACUTE Theory Group. What appealed to me, more than anything particular I may have learned, was the non-instrumental and the collegial character of the discussions that took place. Speaking up at these meetings wasn't something that could be memorialized in a C.V.; the talk, though supposedly anchored by a particular text that everyone would have read, tended

to be free-floating. And there were senior people present who, while making their own contributions, focussed their efforts more distinctly on ensuring that others, including the most hesitant graduate student, got a respectful hearing.

I came away from the Theory Group discussions with a refreshing experience of that unconstrained exchange of ideas among equals that I have always thought of as an enabling condition and in some sense also a source of the strongest work that we do, whether as scholars or as teachers. What can we do to ensure that there is space in future conference programs for the kind of intense, yet also free and non-hierarchical discussions that characterized the Theory Group at its best?

At its meetings during the Carleton Conference, the Executive engaged in some preliminary discussions of alternative formats for sessions at our 1994 conference in Calgary. (We also intend to make sure that there is more time for discussion within standard format sessions.) If you have suggestions as to the shapes which alternative format sessions might take, I would be very pleased to hear from you.

Another request for your opinions and suggestions. Judith Herz, one of our Past Presidents and an invigorating presence within the Canadian Federation for the Humanities, is asking on behalf of the CFH for our advice as to where we think the Federation can most usefully focus its efforts. Would you like to see more resources going into the Aid to Scholarly Publications Program? Should the CFH involve itself in the organization of special conferences on themes of widespread interest (a foretaste of which was provided by the well-attended Round Table on Interdisciplinarity organized by Judith herself at the Carleton Learned's)?

Or should the CFH focus its attention more distinctly on lobbying efforts? In this case, what form do you think such efforts could most usefully take? Please send your suggestions to Professor Judith Herz at Department of English, Concordia University, 7141 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, PQ H4B 1R6.

To conclude. The financial situation of Canadian universities and colleges is now desperate; that of many of our colleagues across the country is correspondingly difficult. The ACCUTE Executive had planned to ask the membership at the 1993 Annual General Meeting for a modest increase in our membership dues (the first in five years). However, once the scale of the crisis in university funding became evident,

the Executive decided unanimously that it could not in good conscience recommend any such increase. Our central office will continue to make all possible economies, without any reduction in the services provided to the membership.

But let me end on an upbeat note. The defeat in the Senate in early June of the Mulroney government's proposed merger of the social Sciences and Humanities Research Council with the Canada Council can stand for us as one small indication of what may be possible if college and university teachers speak out strongly in defence of their interests and the public good. A hearty thanks to all who joined the campaign against this thoughtless and arbitrary measure with letters, faxes, or phone calls.

### The New ACCUTE Executive

At the AGM held in Ottawa on June 1, 1993, Frank Davey was elected Vice-President and President Elect of ACCUTE. Three new members-at-large were elected: Mary Wilson Carpenter, Patricia Merivale, and Peter Schwenger. So also was a new graduate student member: Kathleen Darlington. The ACCUTE Executive for 1993-94 thus consists of the following people:

**President:**

Professor Michael Keefer (English, University of Guelph)

**Vice-President and President-Elect:**

Professor Frank Davey (English, University of Western Ontario)

**Secretary-Treasurer:**

Professor Ann Wilson (Drama, University of Guelph)

**Members-at-large:**

Professor Mary Wilson Carpenter (English, Queen's University)

Professor Patricia Merivale (English, University of British Columbia)

Professor Peter Schwenger (English, Mount St. Vincent University)

**Graduate Student Member:**

Kathleen Darlington (English, University of Manitoba)

**Ex-officio members:**

Professor Doug Wurtele (English, Carleton University), Editor, *English Studies in Canada*

Professor Shirley Neuman (Chair of English, University of Alberta), President, Canadian Association of Chairs of English.

Should you have suggestions relating to the organization of our 1994 conference, proposals for initiatives which you think our Association should take, or requests for assistance or information on matters of professional concern, do not hesitate to contact the ACCUTE office at the University of Guelph. If there are matters which you would like to see discussed at the next Executive Meeting (which will be held in Guelph in late October), please contact any member of the Executive.

## Thinking About the Profession

### **Review of Stuart L. Smith, *Report: Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education*. Ottawa: A.U.C.C. 1991.**

by R.J. Baker, *President Emeritus, University of Prince Edward Island*

The reports of commissions of enquiry based on public hearings, written submissions, opinion surveys, and research reports etc., can be assessed as political documents, as responses to the dissatisfied self-interest groups who always appear at such hearings, as research, or as a set of recommendations, no matter how arrived at. In the last case, the assessment may simply be a measure of the fit between the prejudices, presuppositions and recommendations of the assessor and those of the Commission.

I would give the Smith Report an "A" as a political document, an "A+" with distinction for the degree to which this report will satisfy those who made presentations about the under-valuing of teaching, an "F" or perhaps an "F-" as a research report for the way it uses, or rather does not use, its own research, and a "B" for agreement with my prejudices. But then, I've become an increasingly soft marker.

The Smith Report was commissioned by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (that is, by the presidents, principals, and rectors of Canadian universities in the Association). According to the Foreword by Dr. K. George Pedersen, the Chairman of the Board of the AUCC in 1991, the report "represents an important contribution by Dr. Smith and his associates

to the assessment of quality in the education being provided by Canadian universities today" (ii). As Mandy Rice-Davies said, "Well he would, wouldn't he!"

Except to say that "The Commission is persuaded that the ongoing hunt for international performance indicators is futile" (p. 124) and "though impossible to prove, the Commission has received the general impression that most if not all Canadian universities would, on balance, rank with the top half of U.S. universities, taken as a whole" (p. 15), the Report has little to say about the quality of *learning* at all. It has much to say about the quality of *teaching*, most of it contradicted by its own -- unquoted -- research. Much of the discussion of teaching is really about the *rewarding* of teaching.

But I would still give it an "A" as a political document. The Commission was set up by the AUCC and funded by the AUCC, the Richard Ivey Foundation, the Department of the Secretary of State, and by business and industry. It should satisfy its sponsors.

For the AUCC, the "Commission finds that Canada's universities today are fundamentally healthy and are serving the country well" (p. 14). The presidents can hardly object to that.

For government, the Commission finds that "There is no evidence...that financial restraint has caused a serious decline in the quality of university graduates..." (p. 16). That should please finance ministers. It probably also pleases both the federal and provincial governments by recommending "that higher education remain a provincial responsibility" (p. 27), though provincial governments may have mixed feelings about the recommendation that they become responsible for the overhead costs of research sponsored by the granting councils. It does

recommend increased funding from governments, but gradually and not excessively. It supports the general move towards higher tuition fees, but only "if an income-contingent repayment loan system is instituted" (p. 27). That might mollify students.

For business and industry, the Report recommends regular surveys of employers and graduates to monitor their satisfaction with the suitability of the graduates' education to their employment (p. 144). Since that recommendation must be directed to both the universities and the employers, both may agree but have reservations about costs.

On the whole, though, the Report is a good political document, and that may make it more effective than a good piece of research. Its disregard of research may be judged by the fact that not one of the 111 notes in this report is to an article in *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*. Two are to an issue of *U.S. News and World Report*.

The self-interested groups, other than the presidents, should be very pleased with the uncritical attention paid to them. Throughout the Report, boxes outlined with both a heavy black border and a lighter one highlight double-spaced, italicised quotations. Inevitably one's eyes are drawn to them, and they have an influence greater than the text.

The choice of quotations is significant. Presentations from student associations and faculty associations abound. Americans are favoured. Derek Bok gets three; of the 30 or so Canadian presidents who appeared before the Commission or wrote submissions, only one is quoted, but she is quoted twice. Two quotations come from "letters" to the Commissioner, but they are not listed as written submissions, and there is no indication of their authors' expertise. The

reader may well wonder about the expertise of many of those quoted. Is, for example, Mr. Michael Robb, the assistant editor of a University of Alberta magazine, able to demonstrate that the "quality of undergraduate education in our larger universities has deteriorated rather badly" (p.32)? As I write on student essays, *Evidence?* The quotations, in the main, are there for political or rhetorical reasons rather than rational ones.

Looked at as a piece of research, the Report is very disappointing, particularly in the way it ignores, contradicts, or denigrates the research that Dr. Smith himself commissioned (Seven Reports, available from the AUCC).

Dr. Smith says, "Teaching is seriously undervalued at Canadian universities and nothing less than a total recommitment to it is required" (p. 63). That implies that teaching is bad. But the Commission's Research Report #6, *Telephone Survey of Arts and Science Undergraduates on their University Experience*, not quoted by Dr. Smith, tells a different story. The question: "Overall, how satisfied are you with the teaching you have had at your university?" Of the first and second year students, 0.8% (yes, zero point eight) were very dissatisfied and 2.8% were dissatisfied. For small universities, all four years, NO students were very dissatisfied and only 1.3% were dissatisfied (p. 11). A small study done by the Commission's staff interviewed "twelve randomly selected, full-time, first or second year Arts and Science undergraduates" at the University of Toronto and twelve at Trent. "Virtually all" students at both universities declared themselves to be satisfied; nine Trent students and one Toronto student chose the category "very satisfied." Dr. Smith does quote that, but then says, "Self-selection occurs..." (p. 56). If

the research does not fit the conclusions already arrived at, ignore it or explain it away. It is conceivable that the students *should* have been dissatisfied, and if there were any measures of student learning in the Report, we might be able to connect the serious under-valuation of teaching with poor learning rather than with student satisfaction. But no such measure of learning is provided.

Similarly, Research Report #3, *Assessing the Quality of Teaching in Canadian Universities*, concludes that "Overall, the representatives of the universities considered research productivity to be the most important criterion, with teaching competence very close in importance" (Summary). This is not quoted in the Report. The Report recommends that "student evaluations of teaching should be applied universally" (p. 136). That implies that student evaluations are not used, at least not much, but Research Report #3, not quoted, says "All universities assess the quality of teaching and 94% use student rating questionnaires for this purpose."

To be fair to Dr. Smith, he also omits quotations from the depressing Research Report #5, *Survey of the Perception of Universities among Provincial Government Officials*. I could not have resisted quoting the senior government official who said, "Our approach is just to starve the buggers to death and hope they'll react as we'd like" (p. 15).

One final example. Teaching loads were studied for Ottawa and Alberta, said to be typical universities. But Ottawa is bilingual, the figures given are for courses not hours, and administrators, etc. are included as faculty. Friends tell me that the Alberta data have also been misunderstood.

But what of the 63 recommendations?

I agree with most of them. Those on accessibility, continuing education, distance education, research on higher education, the international dimension, attrition, cooperation would -- on the whole -- be hard to oppose. I have reservations about making the provinces responsible for the funding of research overhead, and about establishing a provincial board to rule on dismissals of tenured faculty, and a national tracking system of all students. I disagree with the recommendation (#8) that the evaluation of faculty should be based on "research (or some other form of scholarship) or on teaching" (p. 135). Donald and Saroyan, quoted in Research Report #3, show that the most important factor defining good teaching is "Up to date subject matter" (p. 7). I would evaluate faculty on research or on scholarship and teaching. So-called "good" teachers who are out-of-date and unscholarly are dangerous; students learn from them. Bad teachers are deplorable, but at least students do not learn nonsense from them; they can't teach.

(Reprinted in abridged form from *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 22.2 [1992].)

---

### Thoughts on The Public, Pedagogy, and Marginalized Professors

by J. Russell Perkin  
Saint Mary's University

This column was prompted by the ACCUTE session on "Explaining Ourselves to the Public" at the conference in Ottawa this year. That session, and in particular Professor Shirley Neuman's eloquent presentation, crystallized an issue which I have been thinking about for some time, namely differences of status within our profession, and the way that these differences give the

lie to some of the radical political claims which are made in theoretical and critical discourse.

I may be naive, but I think that there is one very simple and effective way that English professors could explain the value of their profession to the public, namely through their teaching. But pedagogical issues were largely absent from the "Explaining Ourselves" session, and sessions dealing with composition and rhetoric--an important part of our discipline, at least in its everyday practice--were conspicuous by their absence from the conference programme. ACCUTE still seems dominated by the issues which are of interest to those who teach at institutions with graduate programmes, in spite of the welcome initiative recently to change the name of the organization to include college teachers.

If there is one thing that the public does expect of English professors it is that they contribute to the nurturing of abilities of critical reading and effective writing. Professors often give lip service to the need to democratize learning and the profession, but often these statements are made by privileged radicals who never have to teach first-year literature or composition, because that task has been passed over to the legions of underemployed professors and graduate students. Since the latter do the most labour-intensive work, in return for low pay, one could say that the publications of well-known professors earning high salaries are in fact the surplus value of the academic labour of the underemployed. Because the majority of undergraduates still take an English course at some point in their education, there is an opportunity to explain ourselves to that large percentage of the public who receive a university education, but as I have just noted that type of teaching is undervalued in the

discipline, and those who do it work in conditions which provide little support or encouragement. If we really wanted to disseminate our ideas, what better way could there be than to take this so-called "service teaching" more seriously?

Professor Neuman's talk suggested various ways in which university faculty could reach out to the general public through the local media, extension lecturing, and community service. Coming from a small university where my colleagues have done all these things for many years, I am pleased to see that they are now at last being seen as valuable. But there are some other things that need to be recognized if we are really concerned about improving our image--by which I understand making structural changes in the profession, not just doing some PR work. For one thing, I really don't think it is as hard to get tenure as academics sometimes suggest, nor is it easy to think of cases of tenured academics losing their jobs. Even in cases of gross misconduct, universities usually prefer a generous early retirement package to straightforward dismissal. (I'm sure that everyone can think of examples, and I don't want to risk legal repercussions by naming names). The public perception that academics are a protected species is an accurate one. What is difficult, very difficult, is obtaining a tenure-track job in the first place. If we want to reform the profession, rather than merely improve our press image, we should be concentrating on democratizing conditions of employment, so that those who do the bulk of the real hard work of teaching--college teachers, professors at smaller institutions, graduate students, and most of all part-time faculty--are no longer marginalized. Perhaps this might mean more teaching responsibilities for tenured professors and more job security

and better pay for part-time faculty, so that the differences between them are gradually lessened. Perhaps it might mean that fewer professors should be paid very high salaries so that more can earn a living wage.

I often detect in defences of the importance of research in the humanities a defence of academic prestige and material privilege. We need to acknowledge that being a good teacher requires much of the same kind of work with primary and secondary materials that is required for research that gets published. If the result is not a refereed publication, but rather a well-researched and carefully planned course, shouldn't the professional recognition be the same? If more energy went into what some call the "scholarship of teaching," and less into generating ever more articles and books, it would mean that students would be better off, and our image as a profession would improve. It would only require a change of emphasis in the criteria for hiring and promotion for this change to be effected.

I enjoyed Shirley Neuman's talk a great deal, but I question her suggestion that "we" need to become acquainted with the latest work in education theory. Some of us already are, especially, I would guess, those who teach at undergraduate universities and colleges. We can hardly afford not to be. I often wonder if the split in the profession between those who teach composition and take that task seriously, and those who either dislike it or don't have to do it at all, is not greater than the split between those who are pro- and anti-theory.

I have become increasingly impatient with theory and criticism which talk about the problems of marginalization and the perniciousness of elites, when so much of this discourse comes from one of the most secure elites in our society, the tenured

professors. At the ACCUTE session I found myself, against my own desire, agreeing with parts of Brian Segal's market-driven model for improving the institutional performance of the university. The energy of the self-professed oppositional university professor is more often mobilized in defence of professional prestige than in working to democratize the institution, so perhaps the radical challenge of neoconservatism needs to be harnessed by those who genuinely care about progressive pedagogy rather than political posturing. One can welcome the possibility of altering university structures, while remaining skeptical about the corporate agenda which neoconservative programmes for change are designed to advance. I agree with many of Shirley Neuman's suggestions, but I think far more basic changes are necessary if our profession is going to earn the respect we seem to covet.

---

## Identity Crisis: The University and Culture

By Bill Readings  
*Université de Montréal*

*Bill and Ted's Excellent Adventure* concludes with an exhortation from the time-travelling teenagers that we should "Be excellent to each other." Of course, in the idiom of the film, "excellent" is part of a complex semiotic node, differentially aligned with "bogus," for example. This is quite different from the case in the contemporary University, where the appeal to excellence is far from opposed to the bogus. Excellence is the watchword of the university administrator today, and I want to sketch briefly the contours of my own research into the kind of cultural development this represents.<sup>1</sup> Excellence

functions as a regulatory ideal. It replaces the Kantian appeal to "Reason" and the German Idealist appeal to "Culture" (*Wissenschaft* and *Bildung*) as the animating principle of the University. We are familiar with the appeal to "Culture" from the mouth of Matthew Arnold, and the peculiarity of the twentieth century University has been the tendency of the State to entrust national *literature* departments with the twin tasks of developing and inculcating national culture.

This tendency has been particularly strong in Anglophone universities, where culture was defined against technology (remember Leavis on "technologico-Benthamite civilization"?). In German and French Universities, the relative separation of Church and State allowed state culture to take a much more Enlightenment form, opposed to ecclesiastical superstition. Culture offers to give reason a living institutional form by replacing the Church with the University as a mediating institution between nature and reason. But for the English, who wished this curse upon North America, the split between nature and reason did not appeal to philosophy against the Church, because there was no split between Church and State to function as an analogy to that between tradition and reason. Instead, culture presided over the opposition between a lost organic society of villages and the dead hand of mechanical technology. This is the split marked by T.S. Eliot's "dissociation of sensibility," which explains the centrality of Shakespeare, rather than the Enlightenment, to the idea of culture in English. Literature, not philosophy, is the discipline of culture.

The canon debates currently raging testify to the fact that the idea of culture under attack. They are fiercer in the States because the canon there serves a particularly important function. The New Critics'

argument for the artwork as an autonomous object, essentially unhistorical *qua* art object, was an appreciable democratic gain in a university system rapidly expanding in response to the GI Bill. The poem could be approached by just about anyone, regardless of prior knowledge of history or tradition. In a society of immigrants, founded on a republican declaration of independence from tradition, the canon could claim to represent the *choice* of its own tradition and cultural identity by an autonomous popular will. The canon let the New Critics take a position with regard to a national cultural identity, since it resolved the contradiction between historical ethnicity and republican will. This was because the canon was presented as if it were established by a free and rational decision of the entire people, and the Americans' "choice" of their own historical ethnicity. And now a number of ethnic groups, along with women, gays and lesbians are pointing out that they didn't get to vote in this decision. In England, of course, the issue is more that of the social classes and genders excluded from this supposed "choice."

So we see the emergence of a number of interdisciplinary movements that focus on those excluded not just from but *by* the idea of culture as the organic production and inculcation of national identity: african-american studies, postcolonial studies, women's studies, lesbian and gay studies. And conservatives complain that this means the end of culture. They are right, except that they don't understand that the idea of culture as the particular business of the University is a very historically specific concept. The emergence of "cultural studies," I would argue, sounds the death-knell of culture as the organic *principle* of study in the University as a whole, as culture becomes one object of

study among others.

This produces an identity crisis for the university, whose social mission of "culture" seems to have disappeared. The most evident symptom of this is the emergence of "excellence" in place of "culture" as the idea which functions to integrate all activity in the University. Excellence is what everyone strives for, and everyone is excellent, in their own way. The point about excellence is that it is a *meaningless* term, which serves to de-referentialize the University, functioning as a purely internal and virtual unit of value. Administrators can award and withhold funding on the basis of "excellence," which serves as a common denominator allowing the quantification of otherwise incommensurable activities of research and teaching. What this means is that the University is developing into an ever more autonomous bureaucratic system. Hence the University must henceforth be analyzed as a bureaucratic system for the extraction of surplus value from the handling of differentials in information rather than as an ideological apparatus -- we are now more like the stock-market or an insurance company than a church.

In this context, the Luddite nostalgia that seeks to recall the University to its social mission, to give culture a new meaning and identity, risks being merely a left-wing version of Allan Bloom's attempt to give culture back its old meaning and identity. Culture and identity are no longer vital issues for the University, which is why the system can tolerate and foster the avowedly anti-establishment project of "cultural studies," provided that it responds to criteria of excellence. Even the Université de Montréal, which has, for precise historical reasons, an essentially German idealist role of cultural affirmation, now defines its mission as the

pursuit of excellence.

What are we to do in this situation? How to resist the bureaucracy of excellence without falling back into nostalgia for organic culture? This involves making cultural studies into something other than a work of mourning. It does not mean affirming new identities or fixing the correct ratio between the study and the streets. Instead, such a resistance involves separating the notion of community from the nexus of cultural identity and communicational transparency (the University as the grouping of those who share, and share in, a single idea, such as culture) in terms of which it has been thought in modernity. Rather than finding a new Idea for the University with which to replace either "excellence" or "culture," we have to think the University without an idea, as a place structured by the interminable disymmetry that characterizes the pedagogic relationship. Thought does not make us free; we are addicted to thought. In these terms, the University becomes the place in which we work on the malaise produced by the fact that thought takes place beside thought, that there is never any final identity, propriety or property in thought. The terms for such an archipelago of minor activities remain to be found or made up. If we do not try to pose the question of how to live without identity, then the bureaucracy will answer for us, will provide what already seems to them an excellent answer.

#### Note

1. With Jacques Cardinal, Diane Elam and Robert Martin, I am part of a team, centred at the Université de Montréal, which is beginning a research project directed at understanding the implications of the current disciplinary shifts on the idea and social mission of the University.

## Researching Research Options: The 1993 CFH Women's Caucus Forum

by Marjorie Stone  
Dalhousie University

*ACCUTE Rep. on the CFH Women's Caucus*

The Canadian Federation of the Humanities Women's Caucus held a forum and workshops on research strategies for women in the humanities on June 3, 1993, during the Learned Societies meetings at Carleton University. Organized by Diana Brydon of the University of Guelph, the forum was attended by representatives of numerous societies and associations in the Humanities, and by interested individual academics.

The forum included a presentation by two SSHRC representatives -- Denis Croux and Anne Marie Majtenyi -- concerning its various granting programs. There was also a panel on research strategies and opportunities, and a report by Carmen Lambert of the Social Sciences Federation Women's Caucus on the activities of the SSFC Women's Issues Network. Workshops then addressed three areas of shared concern: interdisciplinary research, strategies for research networking, and the use of graduate students in research projects.

### *The SSHRC Presentation and Response to Questions*

In the SSHRC presentation, Majtenyi noted that out of 1,538 applications last year, 598 awards were in the Humanities. Humanists request and receive less than social scientists on average (the average grant is \$53,657). The average grant for women is higher than it is for men within SSHRC, differing from the sciences, where men receive higher grants on average. The success rate of

applicants was 39%, although applicants did not always receive all the money they asked for (the success rate measured in money was 25%).

In the Research Grants Program, which now includes the Major Collaborative Research Initiative, 75% of the applications are submitted by individual researchers. Roughly one third of the applicants in this program are women, with the lowest number in Economics; in Literature, 88 applicants were male and 66 female, with a slightly lower success rate for women than for men.

Under the separate Strategic Grants Research Program, themes are replaced every eight years. The current five themes are Applied Ethics, Managing for Global Competitiveness, Education and Work in a Changing Society, Science and Technology Issues, and Women and Change. About one-third of the applicants in the four themes aside from Women and change were women. Average strategic grants are higher than grants in the regular program (\$80,968 vs. \$57,000) excluding the Women and Change program, since the results of this competition were not tabulated at the time of the SSHRC presentation. The Women and Change program received the highest number of applications; next is Applied Ethics.

Majtenyi emphasized that the criteria in the Strategic Grants program differ from those in the regular Research Grants program. Researchers can propose specific projects, not programs of one, two, or three years' duration. Priority is given to multi-disciplinary projects undertaken by teams; last year 17% of applications were submitted by individuals, while the majority came from teams of researchers. Ratings are not based on the 70/30 rules of the regular grants, according to which 70% of an applicant's score is based on achievement, and 30% on

the proposal (with the ratio reversed for new scholars). In the Strategic Grants Program the criteria of relevance to social issues and public dissemination are important, and partnerships with public and private groups are encouraged.

The Strategic Grants program also provides grants for networking, when scholars who wish to collaborate are geographically dispersed; grants for workshops (twelve workshops were funded in the last competition); and grants of up to \$5,000 to develop a proposal with a partnership component in it.

Majtenyi noted that there has been a high degree of participation from humanists under the Applied Ethics theme, but a disappointing level of participation from humanists under the Women and Change theme. She stressed that the criterion of relevance to "policy" is defined more loosely than many humanists assume in the Strategic Grants Program. Nevertheless, when asked by one participant how one might relate Renaissance women to contemporary issues in order to satisfy the criteria of the Women and Change program, the SSHRC representatives had few answers, aside from "Be creative" or "Try the regular Grants program." The same answer, "Be creative," was given to the objection that the criterion of partnership with private or public non-academic groups or individuals poses a particular problem for humanities applicants.

Participants reiterated the strong concern many have expressed in the past regarding the cap of 10% of the total grant budget for research leave stipends (see Michael Keefer's "The Research Council Merger," *ACCUTE Newsletter*, December 1993). The leave stipends are particularly important in a period of increasingly heavy teaching commitments and time-consuming

committee work -- burdens that junior faculty (where women still tend to be concentrated) are particularly likely to experience.

Reservations were also expressed about the Major Collaborative Research Initiative (providing grants between \$100,000 and \$500,000), which seems to employ research models drawn from the sciences and social sciences. Since principal investigators must have the support of their universities, the Initiative may create a hierarchy exacerbating economic and regional disparities among researchers at different universities. Principal investigators are also likely to be senior faculty, creating another kind of hierarchy, and research areas and paradigms are likely to be those which are already well established or recognized as important.

Several participants were concerned that the biases in the grant application forms and in the criteria employed by evaluators created barriers for women or for members of culturally disadvantaged groups with non-traditional career patterns. The SSHRC representatives replied that there were provisions in the form for career interruptions, that the form itself was being addressed, but that there was no monitoring of the success rate of applicants with non-traditional track records.

Asked about proactive policies of affirmative action and outreach to historically disadvantaged groups, the SSHRC officers replied that it was up to the organizations within CFH, the universities, and individuals, rather than SSHRC, to lobby for and initiate policies promoting greater equity.

Resistance to this refusal of responsibility led to the "impudent proposal" in one workshop that a group of researchers might possibly use the Strategic Grants program (perhaps under Applied Ethics) to apply for funding to examine and critique

SSHRC policies, application forms, etc. and their effects on equitable representation by gender, race, and class; funding could also be requested for providing an outreach program. The CFH women's caucus might work together with the Social Sciences Women's Issues Network to facilitate the development of such a program of research.

### *Grants-Womanship: Research Strategies*

Carole Gerson of Simon Fraser University presented a list of strategies for success in obtaining research grants, based on experience with the previous SSHRC Strategic Grants Program on Women and Work.

1. Consult SSHRC's annual reports to find out who has received grants for what projects.
2. Seek the advice of colleagues on grant committees, or those with successful records of obtaining grants, and don't hesitate to consult the SSHRC officers.
3. Grants beget grants in many cases, creating a cycle of valorization. Often a seed grant from your university, or some other organization (for instance, the Canadian Research Institute for Advancement of Women, local sources like the Vancouver Research Group or a Bronfman grant) can help you enter the cycle.
4. Learn the rules, and use the discourse in which your application form is framed, even if it seems foreign to your discipline. Use the space on the grant form. Provide headings, subheadings, and precise details in areas where certainty is possible.
5. Use precise, assertive language and don't be afraid to promote yourself. Edit out qualifications, hesitations, apologies. A survey of funding in the sciences found that women did not promote themselves as assertively as men, and were funded at

lower levels on average.

Other panelists and participants added to these points. Valerie Alia of the University of Western Ontario cautioned that, while it is important to study granting patterns, one should not let them determine one's programs of research. "Hold on to your passions," she urged. "Often the times will catch up with you." Louise Forsyth, Graduate Dean at the University of Saskatchewan, emphasized the importance of women in the Humanities consulting and learning from the report on the Women and Work program. Diana Brydon urged women faculty who have devoted periods of their careers to administrative work to incorporate this work in the presentation of their qualifications, and to relate it to research proposals wherever possible.

### *Workshop Suggestions and Insights*

#### **1. Interdisciplinary Research**

Two major problems were noted. First, departmental and disciplinary structures often create barriers and compound accreditation difficulties. Second, language and methodology tend to be dominated by social science models, and sometimes Humanities disciplines are seen as playing a "decorative" role. SSHRC has called for more interdisciplinary research, yet the discourse of applications and accountability it uses does not adequately respect the different discourses of humanities disciplines. It was suggested that the CFH organize a session at next year's Learned's in which researchers involved in interdisciplinary projects could address the particular difficulties and opportunities involved in their work.

#### **2. Networking and Collaboration**

Several suggestions for promoting networking within and across disciplines were made:

- a) setting aside space in society newsletters for proposals involving collaboration
- b) producing a CFH newsletter on collaborative research opportunities or organizing a session in the Calgary Learned's on Collaborative Projects in the Humanities
- c) setting up seminars and workshops within universities and at the Learned's to share ideas about research, grant proposals etc., and involving sessionals and graduate students in these activities
- d) finding a means to disseminate more widely the information about researchers in the CRIA database.

### 3. Involving Graduate Students in Research

The science and social sciences model, in which the graduate student is an apprentice in a research team with a centralized funding source, may not be easily transferable to the more individualistic approach of Humanities researchers. In the sciences there is a protocol for recognizing students' work in the dissemination of results. This would have to be developed in the Humanities in cases where research projects utilize students. Research agendas would also have to be very clearly defined. Nevertheless, involving students more in our research might bring many benefits. Humanities researchers may need to question the common assumption that their work requires minimal funding if they wish to support students as researchers in the sciences do.

#### *Report of the Social Sciences Federation Women's Issues Network*

Carmen Lambert summarized the many achievements of this group, which is represented on the executive of the SSF by a Vice-President responsible for women's issues. It organized a conference with the CFH on

women in the universities, and is organizing another on violence and the role of universities for next year's Learned's. It played a key role in the evaluation of SSHRC's previous strategic grant program on Women and Work. It surveyed the role of women in the organization and in scholarly journals, and assessed support for research on women. It also developed guidelines concerning racism and sexism in publication accepted by both the Humanities and the Social Sciences Federation (and obtainable from Jacqueline Wright in the CFH office). The CFH women's caucus agreed that it would like to play a similarly active role within the CFH.

### Committee for Professional Concerns

We would like to introduce you to the Committee for Professional Concerns for 1993-94, and encourage you to contact either the chair or the members representing your region or "constituency" to express your concerns over the next year. Graduate students are represented on the committee by Lisa MacDonald (UWO) and Susan Johnson (McGill); college faculty by Jay Johnson (Medicine Hat) and Elaine Bander (Dawson College); non-tenure track faculty (the "un- and under-employed") by Valerie Legge (Memorial) and David Jordan (UBC); assistant professors by John Pierce (Queen's) and Kathy James-Cavan (Sask.); associate professors by Ken Borris (McGill) and Barbara Godard (York); and full professors by Ron Huebert (Dalhousie) and another TBA. Beth Popham (Trent) will be serving as interim chair.

We would also like to thank people who contributed to the analyzing of the 1992

*Workload Survey* (excerpts from which will be appearing in forthcoming issues of the *Newsletter*: departing committee members Laurie Ricou (UBC), Nora Stovel (Alberta), Charmaine Eddy (Trent) and Brock MacDonald (Toronto); Herbert Rosengarten (CACE liaison to the CPC) and the members of Canadian Association of Chairs of English; the individual members of ACCUTE who write, phone, email and fax us throughout the year--and especially everyone who responded to the Workload Survey; and Michael Keefer, for his enthusiastic support.

---

## 1994 Conference

### Call for Papers and Suggestions for Plenary Speakers

The 1994 ACCUTE conference will be hosted by the University of Calgary during the first week of June next year. Members are invited to send their suggestions for plenary speakers to Michael Keefer or Ann Wilson at the ACCUTE office (c/o Department of English, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ont. N1G 2W1) *before August 16*. It would be useful if you could indicate in a few sentences what the contributions of the proposed speaker to our discipline have been, and why you think s/he would be particularly effective as a plenary speaker. Please remember to include the address and, if possible, the telephone number of the proposed speaker.

ACCUTE members are also invited to submit proposals and papers for consideration for the 1994 conference. Proposals should be at least 2-3 double-spaced pages in length; completed papers *must not* be longer than 12-13 pages double-spaced (20 minutes speaking time) in length. Papers and proposals should contain no indications of the author's identity.

Please send *two copies* of your paper or proposal, *accompanied by a brief abstract and a brief bio-bibliographical sketch* (these should not be more than a paragraph in length), to the ACCUTE office (c/o Department of English, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ont. N1G 2W1). *They must be received by November 15*. Please note that you must be a paid-up member of the Association for your submission to be considered for presentation at the ACCUTE conference. And please do not double-submit: members who do so will be asked to choose which paper or proposal they would like to have sent to the assessors.

Each paper or proposal will be blindly assessed by two readers, who will be asked to judge it according to the following criteria:

- ◆ its importance and originality as a work of scholarship, a contribution to theoretical understanding, or an assessment of issues that are (or should be) currently under debate among us;
- ◆ its argumentative coherence, interpretive subtlety, and rhetorical or writerly elegance;
- ◆ its suitability for oral delivery within the allotted time;
- ◆ the skill with which it makes its specialized concerns accessible to an audience many or most of whom will not be specialists in the area under consideration.

Decisions will be announced in February, and a draft version of the program will appear in the March *Newsletter*.

---

### Member-Organized Sessions

Members who would like to propose Special Member-Organized sessions for the 1994 conference are reminded that announcements for such sessions must appear in the September *Newsletter*. The

deadline by which announcements must be sent to the ACCUTE office is *August 20*. Organizers should ask that *two copies* of papers and proposals, *accompanied by a brief abstract and a brief bio-bibliographical sketch*, be sent to them, in the first instance, by November 15. They should forward all submissions received, along with a list of their selections and an explanation of their choices, to the ACCUTE office, no later than December 15.

---

### Books for Poland: An Appeal

The University of Silesia's planned Canadian Studies program is endangered by funding cuts. Eugenia Sojka, a member of ACCUTE who is completing a Ph.D. in Canadian Literature at Memorial University and returning to Poland this fall, would be grateful for donations of Canadian literary texts to her university. For information about the CanLit courses planned, please contact Eugenia Sojka, 24 Franklyn Ave., St. John's, NF A1C 4K8. If you are willing to donate spare copies of literary texts, anthologies and criticism, please send them directly to  
 Institute of English,  
 Zaklad Literatary Brytyjskiej,  
 University of Silesia, ul. Bando 10,  
 41-205 Sosnowiec, Poland.

---

### Calls for Papers / Conferences

*Essays on Canadian Writing* invites submissions for a special issue on Postcolonial Theory and Canadian Literatures to be guest-edited by Professor Diana Brydon. Papers on any aspect of this topic are invited. Possible subjects might include: postcolonial reading strategies; rereadings of "major" or "minor" texts; nation and narration; gendered subjectivities; notions of individual versus collective rights. Papers

should follow MLA format, with three copies sent to the following address to arrive by 1 December 1993:

Professor Diana Brydon,  
 Department of English,  
 University of Guelph,  
 Guelph, ON N1G 2W1.

Submissions are invited for a special issue on *Essays on Canadian Writing* devoted to the works of Michael Ondaatje. Though there is already a substantial body of criticism on his work prior to *Secular Love* and *The English Patient*, innovative papers on his earlier work will be of interest, as will essays on his more recent poetry and fiction. The issue will be guest-edited by Dr. Karen Smythe. One-page proposals, accompanied by a SASE, should be sent to:

Dr. Karen Smythe,  
 6030 Cherry Street,  
 Halifax, NS B3H 2K3.

Submissions are invited for a panel on *British Romanticism* at NEMLA, April 8-10, 1994, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Send two-page proposals or 10-page papers by September 1 to:

Tracy Ware,  
 Department of English,  
 Bishop's University,  
 Lennoxville, PQ J1M 1Z7.

Submissions are invited for a Medieval and Renaissance Seminar on "Historical Evidence and the Impact of Theory," to be held at The University of Western Ontario, 20 November 1993. Please send proposals or completed papers of approximately 30 min. on any relevant topics in Medieval and/or Renaissance studies to:

Nicholas Watson or Richard Hillman,  
 Department of English,  
 University of Western Ontario,  
 London, ON N6A 3K7.

Papers of approximately 30 min. in English or French on any interdisciplinarity subject involving Medieval and/or Renaissance studies or on interdisciplinarity itself are solicited for a Medieval and Renaissance Seminar on "Crossing the Boundaries," to be held at The University of Western Ontario, 12 March 1994.

---



---

### Contact

Nicholas Watson or Richard Hillman,  
Department of English,  
University of Western Ontario,  
London, ON N6A 3K7.

A symposium entitled "Post-colonialism: Audiences and Constituencies" will be held in Edmonton at the University of Alberta, October 1-3, 1993. Paper sessions and panels will address issues such as how post-colonialism is constructed and managed as a field of critical inquiry, how the rubric "post-colonial" contains or excludes different readers, and how differences among post-colonial constituencies might be negotiated. We offer this symposium as a space in which productive dialogue can take place. This dialogue will benefit not only the established scholarly community but also a remarkable number of graduate students currently engaged in research on post-colonial topics. Send inquiries to Romita Choudhury, Edmonton Conference, Department of English, 3-5 Humanities Centre, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5; phone: 403 492-7808 or 492-1046, fax: 403 492-8142.

The editors of two proposed collections of new essays on James Joyce (one collection focusing on Joyce and Malcolm Lowry, the other on Joyce and Wyndham Lewis) invite enquiries and proposals as soon as possible. Contact:

Paul Tiessen,  
Department of English,  
Wilfrid Laurier University,  
Waterloo, ON N2L 3C5.

Submissions of one- or two-page proposals are invited for The Margaret Laurence Symposium, sponsored by the University of Ottawa Department of English. Papers should focus on one of three areas: Laurence's African writings, her Manawaka fiction, or biographical and/or autobiographical dimensions of Laurence's writings. Other topics will also be considered.

Please send submissions, accompanied by a short *curriculum vitae* before October 8, 1993 to David Staines, Programme Chair, The Margaret Laurence Symposium, Department of English, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5.

*POSTSCRIPT*, edited and published bi-annually by the English graduate students of Memorial University of Newfoundland, is devoted to the creation of new space for graduate students working, writing, reading and publishing within and beyond the walls of academia. *POSTSCRIPT* welcomes the submission of essays on literature, language, theory and pedagogy, as well as work in progress. Papers responding to issues of current debate within the humanities are encouraged. Please submit one copy of previously unpublished documents which follow MLA format. Manuscripts should be no longer than 7500 words. To ensure unbiased reading, please include a cover page with all contact information, leaving the text anonymous. For a prompt response, enclose a document-sized SASE. Submissions on disk (3.5" or 5.25"), in IBM WordPerfect only, are encouraged but not necessary. Direct submissions before August 30, 1993 to:

*POSTSCRIPT*, Managing Editors,  
Department of English A-3000,  
Memorial University of Newfoundland,  
St. John's, NF A1C 5S7.

---



---

### News of Members

Karin E. BEELER (Calgary) has accepted a tenure-track position in English at the University of Northern British Columbia (Prince George). She has recently published "Divided Loyalties in Eighteenth-Century Nova Scotia/Acadia: Nationalism and Cultural Affiliation in Thomas Raddall's *Roger Sudden* and A.E. Johann's *An dunkle Ufer*," in *The Dalhousie Review* 72.1 (Spring 1992): 66-83, and "Inventing Canada: The Fictionalization of a Cultural Landscape in

French Literature," in *Dalhousie French Studies* 22 (Spring-Summer 1992): 39-52.

Arnold E. DAVIDSON (Duke) has been awarded a Rockefeller Foundation residence fellowship at the Bellagio Study Center in Italy to complete his manuscript, *Margaret Atwood: Violence and Fictional Form*. He has also won the 1993 Association of Canadian Studies in the United States Publication Award for *Coyote Country: Fictions of the Canadian West* (Duke UP, forthcoming, 1993). His book *Writing Against Silence: Joy Kogawa's Obasan* is scheduled to appear from ECW Press (Canada) this fall.

Maxine HANCOCK (Private Scholar, Adjunct of University of Alberta) has been awarded a Canada Council Arts Grant "B" for work on a collection of rural Alberta women's life-stories. In a collaboration with Ehud Ben-Zvi and Richard Bienert, she has also completed *Readings in Biblical Hebrew: An Intermediate Textbook*, scheduled for September 1993 publication by Yale UP.

Richard HILLMAN has accepted a permanent appointment at the University of Western Ontario. He has recently published *William Shakespeare: The Problem Plays*, Twayne English Authors Series (NY: Twayne Publishers, 1993).

Karl JIRGENS (Toronto) has published *Bill Bissett and His Works* (ECW, 1992), has published "Surfaces" in *Canadian Fiction Magazine* #76, and continues to publish *Rampike* magazine. The forthcoming issue of *Rampike* features his interview with Julia Kristeva.

Gary KELLY (Alberta) has published *Revolutionary Feminism: The Mind and Career of Mary Wollstonecraft* (London: Macmillan Press; New York: St. Martin's Press). His essay "Romantic Fiction" appears in *The Cambridge Companion to British Romanticism*, ed. Stuart Curran (Cambridge & NY: Cambridge UP).

Carrie MACMILLAN (Mount Allison) has published *Silent Sextet: Six Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Novelists* (McGill-Queen's University Press), jointly authored with Lorraine McMullen (Ottawa) and Elizabeth Waterston

(Guelph).

Kerry MCSWEENEY (McGill) has recently published an edition of Elizabeth Barrett Browning's *Aurora Leigh* in the Oxford World's Classic series. His and Peter Sabor's edition of Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* in the same series has recently been reprinted. Two articles are forthcoming: "Hardy's Poetic Antecedents" in *Influence and Resistance in Nineteenth-Century English Poetry*, ed. Kim Blank and Margot Louis (London: Macmillan, 1993) and "David Copperfield and the Music of Memory" in the *Dickens Studies Annual*.

Theresa M. QUIGLEY (Moncton) has published *The Child Hero in the Canadian Novel* (NC Press, 1993), a study of children as main characters in adult Canadian novels since 1940.

Cynthia SUGARS (McGill) has published an annotated and textual edition of Malcolm Lowry and Conrad Aiken's correspondence entitled *The Letters of Conrad Aiken and Malcolm Lowry, 1929-1954* (Toronto: ECW 1992).

#### News of Members and other Announcements of Interest to ACCUTE Members

Using the format of the *Newsletter* [Percy SHELLEY (Oxford) has published ...], please let us know about your recent publications and other matters of interest to the membership. Items must be typed, *must not exceed 50 words*, and must not require copy-editing. Space constraints preclude the mention of conference papers, research grants, reviews or encyclopedia entries. To appear in the September 1993 issue of the *Newsletter*, items must reach the ACCUTE office by August 16, 1993.

# 1994 Membership Form

- New Member  
 Renewal

Member's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

## Academic Affiliation Information

Professional Designation: \_\_\_\_\_ Address (use home address *only* if you are without academic affiliation): \_\_\_\_\_

- Professor  
 Assoc. Professor  
 Asst. Professor  
 Sessional Lecturer  
 Instructor  
 Retired Faculty  
 Grad. Student / TA  
 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (wk): \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (hm): \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

I enclose (Please make cheque payable to ACCUTE - University of Guelph):

- The regular membership fee of \$65  
 The reduced fee of \$30 (student / unemployed / underemployed / retired)  
 The household membership fee of \$115 (2 memberships, one subscription to *ESC*)

Second householder's name: \_\_\_\_\_

Second householder's professional designation: \_\_\_\_\_

- The three-year membership fee (1994-96) of \$175

## ACCUTE Membership Directory Information

Please complete the information on research interests found overleaf, for use in the 1994 ACCUTE *Directory*. The *Directory* is used mainly by colleagues seeking scholars to review books, prepare scholarly papers on special topics, and to evaluate manuscripts, grant applications, conference papers, and graduate student theses. In order to help colleagues locate specialists more easily, the 1994 *Directory* will list scholars categorically by *primary area of research interest* first. In addition, members may specify other categories in which they would feel comfortable performing professional tasks; these will be included in a secondary listing format.

---

---

**Primary Listing** (*List only 1 area of specialization*)

List specialization by Period / Nationality / Genre first; include other areas (Theoretical Methodology, Culture / Gender Studies; Authors / Works, etc.) if necessary.

Example: Modern British Drama; Feminist Theory, G.B. Shaw

If you are applying for a household membership, please differentiate clearly between research interests for each member.

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Additional areas**

Periods / Nationalities / Genres \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Culture / Gender Studies \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Criticism / Theory / Methodology \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Language / Linguistics \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Pedagogy \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Authors / Works \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_