THE CANADIAN LINGUISTIC ASSOCIATION, INC.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

MINUTES

Saturday, May 31, 2008, 5:00 p.m.

MacLeod 228, University of British Columbia

PRESENT:
Gary Libben (Alberta; Co-Chair), Ruth King (York; Co-Chair), Ileana Paul (Western; Secretary)
Ana Arregui (Ottawa), Julie Auger (Indiana), Patricia Balcom (Moncton), Michael Barrie (UBC),
Parth Bhatt (Toronto), Réjean Canac-Marquis (SFU), Susanne Carroll (Calgary), Elizabeth Cowper
(Toronto), Rose-Marie Déchaine (UBC), Elan Dresher (Toronto), Monique Dufresne
(Queen’s/UQAM), Carrie Dyck (Memorial), Darin Flynn (Calgary), Ewelina Frackowiak (Ottawa),
Elaine Gold (Toronto), Daniel Currie Hall (Toronto), David Heap (Western), Paul Hopkins, Alana
Johns (Toronto), Arsalan Kahnemuyipour (Syracuse), Sarah Knee (Memorial), Diane Massam
(Toronto), Eric Mathieu (Ottawa), Ronal Beline Mendes (São Paulo), Jeff Mielke (Ottawa), Juvenal
Ndayiragije (Toronto), Mary O’Brien (Calgary), Ana Perez-Leroux (Toronto), Amanda Pounder
(Calgary), Yves Roberge (Toronto), Hotze Rullmann (UBC), Pat Shaw (UBC), Joseph Stemberger
(UBC), Laura Teddiman (Alberta), Lisa Travis (McGill), Egor Tsedryk (St. Mary’s), Mona
Ungureanu (UQTR), Gerard Van Herk (Memorial), James Walker (York), Martina Wiltschko
(UBC).

IN ATTENDANCE:
Noreen Golfman (CFHSS President), Jody Ciufo (CFHSS Executive Director)

1.0 Introductions (G. Libben)
The CLA Executive was introduced: Gary Libben (President), Ruth King (Vice President), Yves
Roberge (Past President), Carrie Dyck (Treasurer), Ileana Paul (Acting Secretary), Rose-Marie
Déchaine (CIL Editor), David Heap (Acting Program Committee Chair), Ana Perez-Leroux
(Member-at-Large), Julie Auger (Member-at-Large), Éric Mathieu (CFHSS Representative), Susie
Jones (Student Member, in absentia).

2.0 Approval of Agenda
It was MOVED (Hall) and SECONDED (Shaw) to approve the agenda. Motion PASSED.

3.0 Presentations
Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (Noreen Golfman, Jody Ciufo)
CFHSS would like to promote the “Breakfast on the hill” and encourages members to attend and to
participate. CFHSS is willing to act as the conveyor of society journals’ responses to changes in
SSHRC funding.

Upcoming Congresses will be at Carleton University (2009), at Concordia University (2010), at the
University of New Brunswick and at St. Thomas (2011), and at Wilfred Laurier University and the
University of Waterloo (2012). The CFHSS is currently considering bids from the University of
Victoria and the University of Regina for 2013.
Libben asked what topics for the Breakfast on the hill would benefit parliamentarians. Anything that can inform policy, for example, families and how families self-identify in the census. Carroll asked how effective this would be given the constitutional division of responsibilities. She also asked if the CFHSS provides advice on what to present. The answer was yes.

4.0 Approval of 2007 Minutes
It was MOVED (Hall) and SECONDED (Perez-Leroux) to approve the 2007 minutes. Motion PASSED.

5.0 President’s Remarks (G. Libben)
Libben made several visits to Canadian universities during the past year, in particular to talk with colleagues who don’t attend the CLA. He was looking for feedback on the association, the conference and the journal, by asking the question “What can the CLA do for you?”. Most colleagues who attend the conference think it is worthwhile and most think the poster initiative is a good one. Suggestions for improvements included awarding more prizes. Libben suggested we discuss possible prizes at the end of the meeting. He also mentioned the possibility of creating a national repository of research and teaching materials.

6.0 New Business
None

7.0 Reports

7.1 Report of the Treasurer (C. Dyck)
See attached report. Some anomalies to be noted are the lower than usual program committee expenses (the committee did not request a cash advance this year and will submit expense claims after the conference) and lower revenues from UT Press. The lower revenues are worrisome and the executive will be meeting with UT Press to discuss this.
It was MOVED (Heap) and SECONDED (Gold) to approve the Treasurer’s report. Motion PASSED.

7.2 Report of the Secretary (I. Paul)
See attached report. Membership numbers are up across the board. There have been some problems with the Membership lists at UT Press. The executive will be following up on this issue with UT Press.

7.3 Report of the Editor of the Canadian Journal of Linguistics (R.-M. Déchaine)
See attached report. Déchaine notes that the journal is in good health intellectually, but that there are some financial problems with UT Press. In particular, she is trying to get clarification from UofT press on the increases in printing and mailing costs. We tried getting typesetting done by UofT Press, but it was very expensive and of low quality. Carroll noted that in Europe there is a strong interest in Canadian French and Canadian English and asked if we could advertise the journal through European associations. Déchaine replied that UT Press is responsible for marketing.
It was MOVED (Carroll) and SECONDED (Perez-Leroux) to approve the Editor’s report. Motion PASSED.
Déchaine thanked the editorial team, including Réjan Canac-Marquis and Katrina

7.4 Report of the Chair of the Nominating Committee (Y. Roberge)
See attached report. The Nominating Committee proposed the following candidates:

Secretary (5-year position): Ileana Paul, University of Western Ontario
Member-at-Large (2-year position): Leslie Saxon, University of Victoria
There were no nominations for CJL editor.
It was MOVED (Heap) and SECONDED (Gold) to close the nominations. Motion PASSED.

7.5 **Report of the Chair of the Program Committee** (D. Heap)
See attached report. There were a total of 150 presentations, of which 78 were oral presentations and 72 poster presentations, with an overall acceptance rate of 90.2%, Heap noted that there were three major changes this year: electronic submissions, a poster session, and the reduction to three days. He has circulated a questionnaire to get feedback from members on these changes.
Carroll asked if the posters spread out among disciplines. The answer is in the final version of the report.

7.6 **Report of the Chair of the Student Paper Contest Committee** (A. Pérez-Leroux)
See attached report.

7.7 **Report on the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences** (E. Mathieu)
See attached report.

7.8 **Report of the Advisor on Aboriginal Languages** (P. Shaw)
The main activity this year was a letter sent to the government to express dismay over announcement of budget cuts to aboriginal language funding. Shaw invited the members to the lunch meeting. On the agenda are the website, a proposal to re-institute standing committee on aboriginal languages, two position papers, the WSCLA proposal, and a discussion of lobbying and dissemination initiatives. Carroll noted that it is not enough for the association to write letters or lobby. It is more important for constituents of individual ministers to lobby directly.

7.9 **Report of the Advisor on the Status of Women in Linguistics** (E. Gold)
See attached report. Last year’s lunch was on the topic of negotiating and was very well attended. This year’s topic was about more general outreach, in particular the Canadian Museum of Languages – please contact Elaine if you are interested in finding out more. Elaine also discussed the International Linguistics Olympiad for high school students. The University of Toronto participated for the first time this year and Canadian students participated for the first time. There were two rounds – open and invitational; the final was in Bulgaria. The open round was a three-hour test – 3 students from Toronto finished in top 20. 12 were invited to invitational. None made it to the final. Please contact Elaine if you are interested in participating (e.g. having local schools participate).

8.0 **Opportunities**
Libben noted again that it would be a good initiative to create more prizes for members. He also suggested creating a national resource centre. We need ideas – please contact Gary if you have suggestions.
It was asked if the CLA can receive donations. We did look into becoming a charitable institution, but it was too complicated.

9.0 **Other Business**
None.
10.0 Adjournment
It was MOVED (Gold) and SECONDED (Rullmann) to adjourn. Motion CARRIED. Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.
## Report of the Treasurer of the CLA
### April 1, 2007 - March 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPENING BALANCE as of March 31, 2007</th>
<th>$56,101.27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 07 U of Toronto Press</td>
<td>$9,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 07 Congress 2007 revenue</td>
<td>$197.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 08 SSHRC travel grant 2008</td>
<td>$4,860.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$14,437.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14,437.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 31/07 Translation of Minutes (06-07)</td>
<td>($570.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 07, Mar 08 Translation of Minutes</td>
<td>($441.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 07 Industry Canada registration fee</td>
<td>($30.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 07 Fed can membership fees 2007</td>
<td>($2,032.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 07 CIPL ($150.00 US, plus bank charges = $148.09)</td>
<td>($148.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 07 Additional expenses Congress 2007</td>
<td>($1,496.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 07 Transfer to Canadian Journal of Linguistics (2 years)</td>
<td>($40,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 07 Travel - Executive</td>
<td>($6,672.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 07 Travel - members - non-students</td>
<td>($405.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 07 Travel - members - students</td>
<td>($4,166.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee advance for 2007 (UWO)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program committee - courier, long distance, printing, travel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>($55,964.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($55,964.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE MINUS EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$14,574.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOSING BALANCE for 2007-8</strong></td>
<td>$14,574.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional expenses for Congress 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present for Past President</td>
<td>$148.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium for Luksic</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>$22.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for Luksic</td>
<td>$817.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive luncheon</td>
<td>$308.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$1,496.99

### Explanation for Executive Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Travel</td>
<td>$6,481.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus Luksic's travel</td>
<td>$(817.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus my travel advance for 08 Congress</td>
<td>$1,009.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$6,672.98
Membership/Subscription Report  
Current CJL Subscriptions by Category and Region (May 29 2008)

- Most institutional subscriptions are in US
- Canadian subscriptions are about 39% regular members, 49% student members
- Regionally, about 39% in Ontario, 18% Quebec, 22% BC (big increase), 9% Alberta
- “Abstract” indicates copies that are sent to abstracting and indexing companies

Summary
- Most institutional subscriptions are in US
- Canadian subscriptions are about 39% regular members, 49% student members
- Regionally, about 39% in Ontario, 18% Quebec, 22% BC (big increase), 9% Alberta
- “Abstract” indicates copies that are sent to abstracting and indexing companies

Comparison with 2007 levels
- 43% increase overall, back to (or above) normal levels for individual subscribers
- Biggest increase is in student memberships (68% increase), but regular/institutional up too
- Partly because journal schedule is caught up, partly because Congress is in Vancouver!
- Institutional subscriptions remain below pre-2007 levels—because of e-accessibility?

Thanks to Amy Desrochers at University of Toronto Press for the numbers.

According to Anne-Marie Corrigan, Project Muse revenues for 2006 were about $6,300, equal to about 97 institutional subscriptions – but with no printing costs, so the fees probably do make up for the subscription losses. We should continue to track this.
Membership renewals

As many CLA presenters will know, there were significant problems with membership renewals this year. This was partly because of the way UTP’s new subscription website was set up, where the non-member subscriber category ($40) was the default one, and simply labelled “Individual”. The “Member” category ($50) was at the bottom of the list, where most people probably wouldn't even think to look for it. I contacted all the non-member subscribers and asked them to contact UTP if they wanted to change their status to “Member”. UTP agreed to absorb the cost for this (in the range of $400), since the error was theirs, and we do pay them a fee to manage our membership rolls. I have asked our Treasurer to keep a close eye on our annual statement, to make sure that UTP does indeed absorb this cost.

We also asked UTP (a) to change the website, making it more transparent, and (b) to increase the non-member subscription rate to $50, so that there is no incentive to avoid membership. They have done both of these things. (We have a non-member subscription category in compliance with the Publications Assistance Program, which lowers our Canadian postage rates substantially.)

However, there were a number of other errors in the membership list, and we have no way of knowing how many people are affected by these. CLA presenters were notified if they were not listed as 2008 members, so presenters who had in fact paid their membership fees were able to contact UTP and correct the error. By contrast, non-presenters will presumably not be aware that they are missing from the membership rolls until their copy of the journal fails to arrive. The Executive and AGM may want to discuss whether (a) to contact the newsletter e-list to warn people of this possibility, (b) to post the list of current members on the CLA website, and invite people (via the newsletter) to contact UTP if their name has been incorrectly omitted; or (c) to leave it up to each individual to notice if their 2008 journal issues fail to arrive.

Both Anne Marie Corrigan (the Journal’s Editor at UTP) and Amy Desrochers (the Circulation Clerk) responded extremely quickly and effectively to the problem, to the extent that they could. Anne Marie thinks some problems may have arisen because the journal’s schedule was catching up, so that some members who meant to renew for 2008 actually renewed for 2007.

Ileana Paul and Ruth King have tentative plans to meet with Anne Marie this summer. This will be a good opportunity to raise any questions members may have.

— Submitted by Martha McGinnis, Secretary
Canadian Linguistic Association Nominating Committee
Report
2007/2008

1.0 Composition of the Committee

The members of the Nominations Committee were Terry Nadasdi, Lisa Travis, and Yves Roberge (Chair).

2.0 Thanks to Outgoing Members

- Rose-Marie Déchaine (Editor, CJL/RCL)
- Martha McGinnis (Secretary)
- David Heap (Program Committee, Chair [2007-2008])
- Ana T. Pérez-Leroux (Member-at-large)
- Susie Jones (Student member)
- Terry Nadasdi (Nominating Committee)
- Sarah Cummins (Program Committee)

3.0 Nominations

The committee would like to propose the following nominations to the membership:

- Secretary (2008-2013): Ileana Paul, University of Western Ontario
- Member-at-large (2008-2010): Leslie Saxon, University of Victoria
- Nominating Committee (2008-2010): Yvan Rose, Memorial University
- Program Committee: Laura Sabourin, University of Ottawa (2008-20012)
  James Walker, York University (2008-20012)
  Mireille Tremblay, Queen’s University (returning as Chair, 2008-2009)

Submitted by,

Yves Roberge
Chair, Nominating Committee
2008 Report of the Program Committee

1. Abstract Acceptance Rate

Of the 174 abstracts received by the Committee, 17 were rejected and 7 were withdrawn, leaving 150 talks on the final program, to give an overall acceptance rate of 90.2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate</th>
<th>Posters (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>U. of British Columbia</td>
<td>174/17/7=</td>
<td>150 talks</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>U. of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>101/11/12=</td>
<td>78 talks</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>York U.</td>
<td>116/14/3=</td>
<td>99 talks</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>U. of Western Ontario</td>
<td>111/15/6=</td>
<td>90 talks</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>U. of Manitoba</td>
<td>85/10/8=</td>
<td>67 talks</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Dalhousie U.</td>
<td>101/18/10=</td>
<td>73 talks</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>U. of Toronto</td>
<td>110/16/11=</td>
<td>83 talks</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>U. Laval</td>
<td>67/9/12=</td>
<td>49 talks</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>U. of Alberta</td>
<td>78/12/8=</td>
<td>58 talks</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Distribution of oral presentations/posters: luckily, of the accepted abstracts, 74 had indicated “either poster or oral presentation”, 74 “oral presentation only” and 9 “poster only”, which gave us the necessary flexibility to fix everything into the reduced program of three days instead of four. Of the 150 presentations in the final program, 72 are posters and 78 are oral presentations.

The distribution and acceptance rate by subject area are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate</th>
<th>Posters (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition (L1/L2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12 (70.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical linguistics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>3 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurolinguistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonetics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>7 (63.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11 (52.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>16 (61.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>16 (31.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL                  | 174       | 157      | 90.2%           |             |

Of the 150 talks on the final program, 110 have student authors and 19 are in French:
3. The call for papers was posted on the CLA website and on LinguistList, and was sent to members by e-mail. For technical reasons, the deadline had to be pushed back twice, which perhaps contributed to the participation rate.

4. Committee meeting: Given the number of abstracts, we shared them among the different committee members so that each member had to evaluate about one hundred (and not all 174). The abstracts were reviewed “blind”, that is without considering the types of presentation (poster or talk). Instead of meeting physically, we held a teleconference. (Many thanks to Jeffrey Steele for his help in putting together an Excel file at the last minute!)

5. INNOVATIONS THIS YEAR:

5a. Electronic submission: Difficult, for everyone involved. My assistants spent hours and hours uploading and re-uploading files; in the end the committee had to make an Excel file for our teleconference. We were among the “guinea pigs” for the Open Conference System, suggested by FedCan: OCS seems to work better for a slower process, with individual evaluations. It was, for example, difficult to get data into table format. The people at SFU who were assigned to this project helped out as best they could, but the experiment didn’t save time or effort, in the short term.

SUGGESTIONS:
- either assign a volunteer to work with OCS and FedCan between now and the fall to develop a system that is better suited to our needs;
- or adopt and adapt a different free system (such as PASHA), which also requires someone with experience and a server to work on it between now and the fall.

5b. Reduction to three days: we were able to do it, with a very full program; it was, however, impossible to reduce the three parallel sessions to two (we need to make a choice).

5c. Poster session: a success, from a scheduling standpoint, but only because almost half of the participants agreed to the two kinds of presentation. Only two people asked to be moved from a poster session to an oral presentation. With so few cancelations, we were able to make one such change.

Consultation and future discussions: Given that there were so many innovations, we decided to create a survey to determine to what extent these experiments were successful from the point of view of the participants. This survey will inform the discussion that will continue at the level of the Association and the executive.

6. Thanks: the committee would like to thank Daniel Currie Hall, who posted the call for papers and the preliminary program, with many updates, on the CLA website, as well as Yvan Rose, who sent out the many announcements. The meetings and the special lunch sessions were organized by Carrie Dyck (Aboriginal languages), Élaine Gold (Status of women) and Stefan
Dollinger (Round Table on the Dictionary of Canadian English). Adriana Salazar and Barbara White from UWO helped out with data management and preparing the program. A very special thanks to the local organizers, Martina Wiltschko and Hotze Rullmann, for their support, their flexibility and their understanding.

David Heap (acting president) for the program committee: Sarah Cummins, Lisa Matthewson, Jeffrey Steele and Mireille Tremblay.
Report on the Student Competition
2007 Meeting of the CLA, Saskatchewan
Ana T. Pérez-Leroux
University of Toronto
Member-at-large

1. This year competition:
   - 45 student presentations; some last minute withdrawals
   - 2 evaluations per talk
   - 14 evaluators
   - Program committee sends a database of program participants and status (whether willing to evaluate, or wishing to participate)
   - Final recommendation of the committee (excerpted from letter to Prof. Libben)

Ms. Bethany Lochbihler's presentation "Mapping Inversion: a morpho-syntactic analysis of the inverse system in Ojibwa", for the Best Student Paper award. The committee voted unanimously in favor of this presentation, on the basis of the very professional presentation style and dynamic presence, which was combined with substantial content, including an excellent evaluation of alternative analysis, clear and effective presentation of data, and a novel and insightful analysis of the inverse system. Furthermore, the discussion demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the data and of the theoretical concepts, and the answers to questions showed a clear understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of her own proposal. The members of the committee concurred in noting that, although the overall quality of the presentation was excellent, this particular paper stood out from others.

2. Difficult to staff, and to manage schedule and schedule changes. Not clear that present structure serves the goals well. It may be easier once the poster system is in place, but that will create an additional layer of involvement.

3. Possible strategies to reduce numbers:

Low impact approaches
   a) restrict participation to ONE paper per person. (2-3 instances this year)
   b) restrict participations by excluding previous years winners. (again, minimal reductions)

High Impact approaches
   c) set a limit number of tries per student (say 3 per career)
   d) do a preselection on the basis of the quality of abstract submitted to a manageable number (15 papers to evaluate?)
Some arguments originating from various discussions with colleagues on the question of abstract production
   c) is hard to implement
   d) will promote more effort in the quality of abstract

4. I would like to propose a motion to either directly consider a)-d) in this committee and the AGM, or,
   establish a committee with a clear timeline of action (say, before next year calls, to develop the new set of guidelines).

Respectfully submitted,

A.T. Pérez-Leroux

Sat June 2nd, 2007

Dear Prof. Libben,
In my role of member at large of the CLA executive committee, it is my role to report on the results of the student competition of the 2007 meeting of the CLA. On behalf of the Student Competition Committee, I am pleased to recommend Ms. Bethany Lochbihler's presentation "Mapping Inversion: a morpho-syntactic analysis of the inverse system in Ojibwa", for the Best Student Paper award. The committee voted unanimously in favor of this presentation, on the basis of the very professional presentation style and dynamic presence, which was combined with substantial content, including an excellent evaluation of alternative analysis, clear and effective presentation of data, and a novel and insightful analysis of the inverse system. Furthermore, the discussion demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the data and of the theoretical concepts, and the answers to questions showed a clear understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of her own proposal. The members of the committee concurred in noting that, although the overall quality of the presentation was excellent, this particular paper stood out from others.
Respectfully submitted,

Ana T. Pérez-Leroux
Associate Professor of Spanish and Linguistics
University of Toronto
Report from the Representative to the Canadian Federation of the Social Sciences and Humanities, Eric Mathieu

• President’s address
  Noreen Golfman attacked with full force the criticism according to which research in the social sciences and humanities is “lacking in pertinence and originality”. She spoke with passion about the need to have a national conversation about research in the social sciences and humanities and challenged those at the General Assembly to “find ways to demonstrate the impact of research … but not at the cost of a discussion of the social and moral values.” Golfman also spoke about the government’s science and technology strategy and, in particular, about its insistence to fund the kinds of research that produce commercial products. She stated that this challenges our community to define the value of its diplomas; to tell the government where and how we fit into the science and technology strategy. Golfman said that the question should be “How does the science and technology strategy fit with us?”. She reassured the members at the General Assembly that the Federation will continue to emphasize the fact that our community has to be part of the government’s strategy, given that “we are part of the conversation that asks how the science and technology strategy is socially responsible”.

I note that one can imagine social science and humanities research differently than via the notions of direct utility for science and technology. In reality, it is not clear that linguistic research, theoretical linguistics at least, is directly useful for these areas. On the other hand, what happened to knowledge for knowledge’s sake? Is it not necessary to insist on the specialness of the humanities?

It is recognized, however, that it is necessary to make a serious effort to explain linguistics to the general public. I wonder, therefore, what happened to the Outreach committee.

During her visit to the General Meeting, Noreen Golfman invited us to send an expert to speak to politicians during the “Breakfasts on the hill” that take place in Ottawa. We would like to take advantage of this opportunity and it was decided at the end of the meeting of the Aboriginal Languages Committee that Pat Shaw (UBC) would go in November to present linguistics research and to explain the importance of funding for linguistics research. I agreed to contact the relevant people to organize Pat Shaw’s visit.

• SSHRC President’s Speech
  Chad Gaffield summed up what he called SSHRC’s new direction, which according to him is made up of three key elements: quality, connections, and impact. Gaffield noted that this assumes raising the quality of research, by enriching the peer evaluation system and improving the connections between disciplines and between the granting agencies, and by integrating output, evaluation and accountability. The plan is outlined in a document called “Framing our direction” and it is available on the SSHRC website.

• Open Access
The VP of Research Dissemination, Jean-Claude Guédon, pointed out that the Federation has offered funding to support a SSHRC pilot project for open access journals. More than 70 projects were submitted to the pilot project.

Is Open Access a solution to the financial problems of the Canadian Journal of Linguistics?

Frits Pannekoek, the president of Athabasca University announced to the General Assembly that AU will launch its open access scholarly press during Congress 2008 in Vancouver. AU is the first university in Canada to create an open access scholarly press and will publish 10 books online in June 2008. Pannekoek reassured members that “quality must not be compromised” and that the books and articles will be peer reviewed.

• **Increase in Association fees**
  The General Assembly voted in favour of a raise in association fees, from 2008. Fees will go up automatically each year, according to inflation. This means an average increase of $22 for small associations, $49 for medium associations, and $88 for large associations. The minimum and maximum fees will be maintained at the current level of $500 and $7500, respectively. This scale will be reconsidered in 2010.
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2007 Conference

We had a very successful lunch discussion at the 2007 conference. The topic was Negotiating from A to Z and the panel consisted of Elizabeth Cowper, University of Toronto, Charlotte Reinholz, Queen's University and Sonya Bird, University of Victoria.

Elizabeth Cowper discussed issues of finding a job, from conducting the first campus visit to negotiating the contract. Charlotte Reinholz discussed concerns around the rising proportion of sessionals at universities and issues around fair treatment of sessionals. Sonya Bird discussed her experiences negotiating for lab space, release time and teaching load.

Over twenty people attended and the discussion was lively.

2008 Conference

At this year's lunch I led a discussion on the topic Should Canada have a Language Museum? There has been a great deal of interest around the world recently in language museums and the goal of this lunch conversation was to see whether members of the CLA might be interested in investigating or initiating a language museum for Canada. I presented material collected over the past year by Kasia Krzyzanowski, a student in Linguistics at the University of Toronto, who has been researching language museums and exhibits around the world, both real and virtual. She has created an excellent website displaying her research at: http://individual.utoronto.ca/kasia_k/museums.html

Many people expressed interest in this project; I will be contacting them in the near future for ideas on how best to proceed. Many of the participants favoured a concept of traveling exhibits, to bring information about Canadian languages and dialects to many communities. Others favoured exhibits on the value of language in general, and others were interested in a central research facility. Overall I felt that this was a very successful meeting with potential for some very exciting projects.

International Linguistics Olympiad

The Linguistics Department at the University of Toronto took part in the International Linguistics Olympiad for High School Students for the first time this year. This is the first time that any Canadian Students took part: 20 high school students from 5 Toronto high schools participated as well as a few Ottawa high school students through the Computer Science department of the University of Ottawa. The Olympiad consists of three rounds: two rounds in North America - an open competition an invitational competition -- and the final, which will be held in Bulgaria in August. The open competition was a three-hour test held in February. There were 763 competitors in North America and the Canadian contingent did very well – 3 Students, all from UTS (University of Toronto Schools) finished in the top 20. No other high school in North America had more than 1 student in the top 20! The second round was a 5-hour test held in mid-march. Twelve Canadian students, all from UTS, were invited to compete as part of 120 finalists. While the Canadian students did well, none were in the top ten. The US organizers were planning to form two teams of 4 to send to compete in Bulgaria.

I think the Olympiad is an excellent outreach program. Many of the students who competed had no idea at all what Linguistics was, but enjoyed the practice problems and the competition. This was the first year, and I had interest from several other schools to participate.
next year. It was definitely a lot of work the first time around, figuring out how to contact the
schools, contacting the competitors, supervising the competitions, sending off the answer sheets
for grading, and interacting with the US organizers.

The US organizers are strongly encouraging us to form our own Canadian team rather
than being part of a North American team. The problem is funding. While the International
Organization covers room and board for the competitors, the home country is responsible for
travel costs. The American Organization budgets $4000 per competitor plus a coach. While the
costs could be lowered, we would probably need total funds of $10000 to send a Canadian team
to the Olympiad. Of course, if we have more universities participating, we would have a wider
fundraising base!

To learn more about the Olympiad, you can check the American Website
http://www.naclo.cs.cmu.edu/ or http://namclo.linguistlist.org/, or google ‘namclo’ (North
American Computational Linguistics Olympiad).

Feel free to contact me (egold@chass.utoronto.ca) for more details about running a
competition at your university.
### Statement of Revenues and Expenses

#### REVENUES / REVENU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>51:2/3</th>
<th>52:1/2/3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Linguistic Association / Association canadienne de linguistique</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange US dollar subscriptions / Échange abonnements en dollars US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:2/3</td>
<td>171.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:1/2/3</td>
<td>89.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising income / revenus publicité</td>
<td>184.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>444.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total subscription revenues / Sous-total des revenus d'abonnements       | 20,444.79|

Single copies / Copies uniques                                              | 48.88   |
Royalties / Royautés                                                         | 10,295.53|
Sub-total other revenues / Sous-total autres revenus                         | 10,344.41|

Previous balance / Solde pré-existant                                        | 1,554.68|
SSHRC grant / Subvention CRSH                                                 | 13,596.00|
Teaching Release / Dégrèvement                                                | n/a     |
Sub-total federal government grants / Sous-total subventions fédérales       | 15,150.68|

Total revenues / Total revenus                                               | 45,939.88|

#### EXPENSES / DEPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>51:2/3</th>
<th>52:1/2/3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJL Salaries / Salaires RCL Editor / Réactrice (UBC) Assistant / Assistante</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,750.00</td>
<td>10,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP Typesetting / Mise-en-page</td>
<td>51:2/3</td>
<td>6,312.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC Typesetting / Mise-en-page</td>
<td>52:1/2</td>
<td>4,004.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52:3</td>
<td>1,525.13</td>
<td>11,841.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP Printing / Imprimerie</td>
<td>51:2/3</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52:1/2</td>
<td>5,818.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52:3</td>
<td>2,905.99</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP Mailing / Courier</td>
<td>51:2/3</td>
<td>1,094.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52:1/2</td>
<td>3,070.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52:3</td>
<td>1,134.15</td>
<td>1,094.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP Subscription management / Gestion abonnements</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,272.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP Journal management / Gestion revue</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>170.29</td>
<td>11,842.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC Others expenses / Autres dépenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>658.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone / Téléphone</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier and postage / Courier</td>
<td></td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail / Courriel</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td>195.14</td>
<td>1,219.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total expenses / Total dépenses                                              | 28,154.46| 52,026.86|

#### NET INCOME / REVENU NET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NET INCOME / REVENU NET</td>
<td>17,785.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6,986.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2441.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>