PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE
Jason Haslam

It seems fitting that I write this piece on the sunniest and warmest day Halifax has had all year, both because in true Maritime style I’ve spent most of these columns complaining about snow, and because as Halifax bids adieu to ACCUTE, it is in the knowledge that our association’s future looks bright. Seeing the dedication and skill brought by new President Manina Jones, VP Madeline Bassnett, and Coordinator Stephanie Oliver at the office at Western, I know that ACCUTE will flourish. In case you missed it, check out the already very active ACCUTE Facebook page they’ve started.

The new Board is also hard at work: new Contract Academic Faculty (CAF) caucus representative Ross Daniel Bullen and outgoing rep Erin Wunker have also set up an ACCUTE CAF Facebook page and Twitter account. Amazing work by all, and within weeks of the conference!

The summer newsletter can also be an energizing one, since it follows so closely on the intellectual and social vibrancy of the conference. Our membership is back to the more sustainable level (555 members at this writing), and we had a final total of 332 conference registrants (the second most in a decade), meaning approximately 60% of our membership attended the conference. Numbers don’t tell the whole story, but they are an indication of our members’ active engagement. I think everyone who attended the conference can speak to the excitement, and, I hope, to a sense of some positive change in the air.

After our conference, however—and after I wrote the above—reports of terrible violence and oppression filled the news: the heart-rending
attack on the LGBTQ Latinx and Black community in Orlando; the imprisonment in Iran of Homa Hoodfar, a colleague from Concordia University; the murder of British MP Jo Cox. We’re still within the horror of these clearly disparate events, with members of the ACCUTE community affected variously by each.

This newsletter is not the best forum to address these differently targeted acts of hatred and violence in any detailed manner, but they remind us we can’t be complacent, that change requires action. ACCUTE can be a space for forms of such collective, public action, both in the specific terms of academic work (as teaching and criticism), and in the larger, more communal sense.

Our conference did engage forms of that work in particular ways. Certainly our two plenary speakers made us think about necessary change to our profession, our research, our teaching, and our relationship to the social and material world. Christine Bold (Guelph)—in her address, “Indigenous Modernities: From Wild West to Vaudeville” (co-sponsored by CACLALS)—reconfigured understandings of modernity’s debt to Indigenous artists, writers, and performers, recognizing that Indigenous artists are at the centre of modernity’s cultural production. Analyzing the intersections of Indigeneity, gender, sexuality, performance, and the popular marketplace, Dr. Bold offered a unique archive of textual and visual material, as well as collaborative work with Indigenous scholars, including Monique Mojica, who permitted video to be shown for the purpose of this talk. ACCUTE joins Dr. Bold in her thanks for this permission.

Stephanie LeMenager (Oregon) also placed humanities scholarship firmly in an ethical relation to the world in her talk, “The Humanities after the Anthropocene.” Dr. LeMenager addressed the important, but fraught, role of literature in the ethical discussions of how to live and structure societies in the face of this unique moment for our species and the planet. Focussing in part on poetry, she discussed the importance of unsettling our relationship to the world as it is, and noted that poetry’s dense and sedimented structures are ideal for such a difficult and complex series of questions. Turning her own presentation into just such a sedimented performance, she challenged those in attendance regarding how we can change our perceptions of, and relations in, the world, with an eye to an ethical life “after the Anthropocene.”

This critical political work continued in the half-day public event, “Sharing the Land, Sharing a Future,” which ACCUTE co-sponsored with the CFHSS, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples Anniversary Initiative, and several other associations, as discussed below by new ACCUTE president Manina Jones. I would like to thank her for taking the lead on this undertaking, as well as Linda Morra and Deanna Reder for representing ACCUTE and, in Dr. Reder’s case, also representing the Indigenous Literary Studies Association at the event. This conversation is one that needs to and will continue in the future at ACCUTE and beyond.

The ethical and cultural force of these events continued throughout, in the “energized community” of the whole ACCUTE conference, to echo this year’s Congress theme. I can’t summarize every amazing panel or talk, but would note that many generated post-conference attention on social media and other forums. And, yes, the Dance Party offered us a space of communal energy. I hope it’s not trite to cite Emma Goldman’s thoughts on dancing...

If I can be permitted a turn to bathos now, though, I do need to note that the managerial and professional advocacy work of ACCUTE also continued, as detailed in the reports below. We
were very pleased with our membership drive, which was a great success due in large part to our campus representatives (thanks all!). Our advocacy on a wide number of fronts continued, from statements on the Trans-pacific Partnership and copyright, to Bill 100 in Nova Scotia, to the pressing issues of precarity in the academic workplace. You can see news of these and many other issues on our blog. We still work to revive some form of the SSHRC Congress travel grant: Tim Wilson, SSHRC Executive Director of Research Grants and Partnerships (and Renaissance literature scholar), presented at our Celebration of Research, and he was open to further discussions on this issue.

On the managerial side, ACCUTE has now completed its first full year as an incorporated not-for-profit, which allows us to insure the Board, and provide a solid legal and financial structure for the future. We have also revived the membership directory, and digitized the past ACCUTE Newsletters we had in the office, with issues dating back to 1987 now available. Significantly, the Board also appointed a new editor for our journal, which I report on below.

But now, I need to turn to the bittersweet moment of offering thanks to those who have helped to support ACCUTE over the past two years. I can’t possibly list everyone, but I do want to mention as many as possible. Thanks to everyone who served on the Board over the past few years, for your collective and individual willingness to chew over problems with us, and look toward the future. Thanks especially to our outgoing CAF Caucus representative Erin Wunker, who engaged with this position in ways that we all recognize as extraordinary. Thanks to Mike O’Driscoll, Mark Simpson, Laura Schechter, and the whole ESC team: I’ll repeat this in the Editor search below, but they have not only made our journal the best damn generalist journal in the discipline, but they have allowed ACCUTE to thrive as well. The Halifax office also owes them thanks for their diligent work in the process of incorporation.

Thanks to all who helped with the last two conferences: our LACs—Jason Wiens (Calgary; who served as LAC for several associations!) and Rob Stacey (Ottawa)—as well as our department partners and our many student assistants.

Thanks to the English department here at Dal, and past and present Chairs Trevor Ross, David McNeil (a former ACCUTE secretary-treasurer), and Carrie Dawson. The department supplied the majority of the material support for our office. I’d also like to thank the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for our office space and other infrastructure.

And my endless thanks to members of the Halifax office: Brittany Kraus, our RA for the second year, who was invaluable for our membership drive and conference planning this year; Lyn Bennett, ACCUTE’s VP, who always had an eagle eye on the program, and also had a grounding effect on my own endless “what if” scenarios; and last but as far from least as you can get, Lynne Evans—as I’ve said many times before, Lynne made incorporation possible, even as she managed the office, our daily finances, and left a clear set of policies and protocols that ACCUTE offices in the future will be able to follow easily to ensure our continued intellectual and institutional health—and all with care and good humour.

And, of course, thanks to new President Manina Jones, Vice President Madeline Bassnett, and coordinator Stephanie Oliver. I know all of ACCUTE will join me in being tremendously excited for this next stage of ACCUTE’s development.

And with that, I’ll sign off, even while looking forward to our continuing, collective work. See you all in Toronto next year. Allons-y!
REPORT ON THE SEARCH FOR ESC’S NEW EDITOR
Jason Haslam

On 17 December 2015, the Halifax office, working with the current co-editors of ESC—Mark Simpson and Michael O’Driscoll—issued on our blog a Call for Expressions of Interest for the position of Editor of ESC; this call was then circulated through the Canadian Association of Chairs of English (CACE), in our newsletter, through social media, and through direct emails.

As of 01 April (the deadline for Expressions of Interest), we had an expression of interest that we were very encouraged by from the University of Western Ontario’s Department of English, with Allan Pero taking the lead as Editor. We specifically appreciated the details of the bid, the departmental and university support offered, and the potential for the “Scholarship@Western” electronic repository and journal software. We then arranged a teleconference with Allan and his chair, Bryce Traister, to discuss the bid. Among the many topics discussed were the details of the proposed editorial team; the journal software available; the bookkeeping and office support available or that could be acquired; journal finances; and the journal’s general operations.

The Board members who took part in the meeting were very impressed with what we heard, and so we took the bid to the larger Board with our support. At our meeting on May 28, the Board unanimously voted to appoint Allan Pero as the editor of ESC: English Studies in Canada, for an initial 5-year term starting on July 1 2017. This appointment was then unanimously endorsed at our AGM on May 30.

We are all extremely excited by Allan’s appointment, and for the future development of ESC. Thanks to the generosity and foresight of the current editors, we have a full year to manage a smooth transition of the journal operations to Allan and his team at Western, and we hope that process will also provide a best-practices model for future transitions.

But for now, I want to add my personal thanks to Allan and the team at Western for the care they put into their bid, and for the obvious skills and energies they are bringing to our journal. As I said just above, ESC is the best damn generalist journal in the discipline, and now we can rest assured that it will continue to be well into the future.

Finally, on behalf of all of ACCUTE, I again want to thank Mike, Mark, former editor Jo-Ann Wallace, and everyone who has worked so hard on ESC over the past 15 years at Alberta. I’ve personally worked very closely (albeit often on the phone!) with Mark and Mike over the past two years, and one couldn’t have asked for a better team to work with. Words on this page, or at the AGM, or over the course of the next year won’t be able to express the gratitude I and all ACCUTE members feel for your dedication, expertise, and always present goodwill—but you should expect those words to keep coming, anyway!

(Mark Simpson, Allan Pero, and Mike O’Driscoll toasting ESC at the dance party.)
VICE PRESIDENT’S REPORT  
Lyn Bennett

I’m happy to report on ACCUTE membership news and the 2016 conference. Our big news is that our membership is up by 25% of last year’s total – an impressive 100+ members! We’re happy to see an almost equal number of graduate students among our membership this year, but most of our increase is from all ranks of the tenured and tenure-track professoriate. A larger membership is important for the health of our organization, and a big thanks is owed to Coordinator Lynne Evans and Assistant Brittany Kraus as well as our dedicated Campus Reps for a very successful membership drive. Kudos to all! You can see some of the membership figures and ratios in the graphs, presented at the AGM, on the next page.

That our membership increases are largely among those paying fees at the higher end is good news as well. I’ve done some preliminary number crunching and, provided that our membership distribution remains roughly the same, membership fee revenue should go up by $2000 to $3000 once the new fee structure voted in at the 2015 AGM is implemented on the CFHSS software, a move currently planned to take place on June 30.

The biggest item on the VP agenda this year was, of course, conference planning. As you can see on the graph below, our 2016 conference was larger at 85 versus 2015’s 65 panels; this growth accounts at least in part for membership increases, as 20 extra panels also means about 60 more presenters. The new ACCUTE office may want to increase the numbers even more: including more panels and extending the conference into the evening or into a full day on Tuesday are both possibilities. But we leave that to them.

I trust that everyone enjoyed a memorable and enriching meeting of ACCUTE at Congress 2016, and I look forward to the next!

All best wishes to the UWO team!

Congress 2016  
Registrants  
2015 = 289  
2016 = 332

2015 = 65 Panels

2016 = 86 Panels
Membership

- **Graduate Students** = 35% (153)
- **Instructors** = 7% (29)
  - Part-Time = 5% (21)
  - Post-Docs = 2% (8)
- **Other** = 8% (35)
  - Independent/Unemployed/Undeclared
- **Professors** = 50% (224)
  - Assistant = 7% (32)
  - Associate = 20% (88)
  - Full = 14% (61)
  - College = 3% (13)
  - Retired = 2% (9)
  - Sessional = 5% (21)

Membership

- **Graduate Students** = 34%
- **Instructors** = 4%
  - Part-Time = 2%
  - Post-Docs = 2%
- **Other** = 10%
  - Independent/Unemployed/Undeclared (10.5%)
- **Professors** = 52%
  - Assistant = 9% (45)
  - Associate = 18% (92)
  - Full = 15% (80)
  - College = 2.5%
  - Retired = 1.5%
  - Sessional = 6%
FINANCIAL REPORT
Lynne Evans

On behalf of the Board, I’m pleased to report that ACCUTE is in solid financial health.

In the past year, the Halifax office worked with ACCUTE’s accounting firm, Deloitte LLP, to prepare Notice to Reader accounting statements in order to file information returns for the Canadian Revenue Agency and Corporations Canada. These Notice to Reader statements report on the combined operations of the ACCUTE office and ESC. The ACCUTE-office-only numbers are the focus of my report.

Statement of Operations (page 8)
This statement records ACCUTE-office-only revenue and expenses for the period ending 30 June 2015. The first column shows ACCUTE’s actual results for the period ending 30 June 2015, and the second column is a projection of where ACCUTE will be at the end of this financial year, 30 June 2016.

At last year’s AGM, we projected a loss for the ACCUTE-office (not including ESC operations), of $7,300. As you can see, we were pretty close in our estimate, though we did end up about $250 better than we expected. For this year, the year ending this June 30th, we’re expecting break-even operations (well, we’re projecting just over $500 operating surplus for the year). So revenues this year were up by almost $5,600. This comes almost entirely from increased Membership dues, which were a result of a number of membership drive initiatives and the larger conference. Our total expenses were down slightly—mostly due to the fact that 2015 was not a transition year, and so we didn’t have any office-transition expenses. Expenses were also down because this year’s dance party was a Congress-hosted event with a cash bar. Other items, however, have increased. We’re expecting higher travel costs this year as well as increased accounting and legal fees. The main take away from this report is that ACCUTE needs to maintain a membership base of at least 500, and preferably closer to 550 members, in order to meet the expenses of ACCUTE-only operations.

Statement of Financial Position (page 9)
This statement reports on the ACCUTE-office’s yearend net worth, which we expect to increase by $12,565 this year. This increase in our net worth— from $46,825 last year to just over $59,000 this year—comes two sources: our projected $565 of operating income, and a transfer from ESC to the ACCUTE-office in the amount of $12,000.

Summary
As of 30 June 2016 ACCUTE will have a solid reserve: just over one year’s operating expenses. Clearly, ACCUTE’s current financial stability is directly attributable to the financial support it has received from ESC operations. Membership dues revenues are also crucial, and as ACCUTE moves forward it will continue to focus efforts on maintaining, and growing, its membership base in order to ensure the continued financial health of the Association.
## Statement of Operations (excluding ESC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUTE Membership Dues</td>
<td>$39,540.00</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Congress Revenue</td>
<td>$8,366.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Aid for Plenaries</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$50,406.00</td>
<td>$56,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFHSS Membership Dues</td>
<td>$4,116.00</td>
<td>$3,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Salary</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$901.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Transition</td>
<td>$1,429.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting/Legal Fees</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$3,555.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conference Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Travel</td>
<td>$9,474.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Travel</td>
<td>$8,030.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Costs</td>
<td>$6,434.00</td>
<td>$6,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Staff</td>
<td>$464.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Planning Trip</td>
<td>$858.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>$673.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>$1,801.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$57,480.00</td>
<td>$55,435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income (Loss)</strong></td>
<td>($7,074.00)</td>
<td>$565.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Financial Position (Excluding ESC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2015 (Actual)</th>
<th>June 30, 2016 (Projection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUTE Chequing</td>
<td>$18,645.00</td>
<td>$15,971.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUTE Savings</td>
<td>31,419.00</td>
<td>43,419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>6,236.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$56,300.00</td>
<td>$59,390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Conference Cheques</td>
<td>$9,475.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$9,475.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained Earnings</td>
<td>$46,825.00</td>
<td>$59,390.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Savings Account Balance includes a $12,000 transfer from ESC to ACCUTE in May 2016

To join or renew your ACCUTE membership, please visit our website: [accute.ca]
ESC REPORT
Mark Simpson & Michael O’Driscoll, Co-Editors

2015-16 has been a very successful year for ESC. In addition to supporting the ACCUTE Board on incorporation and other important matters, the journal produced four strong issues, including a joint special issue with JMPS (another academy first!), and culminating in a special celebration of our forty years in existence with the “Forty on Forty” Readers’ Forum in 41.4. Our Office Coordinator Laura Schechter continues to keep our business on track. Our finances remain very strong, and we again this year transferred $12,000 to the ACCUTE office in support of the Association’s activities.

You may be aware already that ESC is going through a period of change. After fifteen years at the University of Alberta, we have decided that it is in the best interest of the journal to move to a new home. With that in mind, ACCUTE issued a call for expressions of interest in December. In response to that call, we received an excellent submission from Western University and a team there, headed by Allan Pero, that is eager to take on editing the journal and is backed by ample institutional support. We are happy that the ACCUTE Board and membership endorsed that transition, as Jason details above, and we’ll look forward to discussing details of the move with the EAB, Association membership, and Allan and his team.

Changes to Editorial Advisory Board
You’ll recall that last year five of our longstanding EAB Members stepped down, and we’ve now confirmed our new members, as follows:
- Faye Hammill (Strathclyde)
- Daniel Heath Justice (UBC)
- Wendy Hui Kyong Chun (Brown)
- Winfried Siemerling (Waterloo)
- Lisa Surridge (Victoria)

The term of appointment to the EAB is for five years, once renewable. We are extraordinarily grateful to these individuals for their willingness to support ESC.

Production Details
Our December 2015 issue (41.4) was published in early May, leaving us precisely where we were (several months behind schedule) this time last year. We expect the March 2016 issue to be out by early July (that’s a special issue on “Fear, Love, and Confusion: A Special Issue on the Automated Body,” edited by Cecily Devereux and Marcelle Kosman), then we’ll run a double in September, and a single in December, which should return us to the proper schedule.

41.1 (March 2015): Single Special Issue on Magazines and/as Media: The Aesthetics and Politics of Serial Form, Guest Edited by Faye Hammill, Paul Hjartarson, and Hannah McGregor. Introduction; 7 articles. This was published in coordination with The Journal of Modern Periodical Studies, which produced a companion issue (6.2, 2015), with the same editors, including a further five related articles.

41.2-3 (June/Sept 2015): Readers’ Forum on “Fast Evil” (Edited by Mark Simpson) with 8 contributions; 8 articles; and 13 book reviews.


Total Production Figures:
- Readers’ Forum Pieces: 48
- Peer Reviewed Articles: 19
- Book Reviews: 20
**ESC Submission Figures**

The figures below indicate the current and historical number of submissions per reporting year. Our number of submissions increased this year by comparison to last year’s numbers: this year we received 60 total submissions, whereas last year we received 40. The increase brings our submission numbers back to the level we saw in the period from 2010 to 2013. While we still aspire to reach, on a consistent basis, the level of our peak year (2014, with 79 submissions), we remain pleased by this year’s turnaround.

![Submissions 2006-2016](image)

**Acceptance Rate**

The journal’s acceptance rate over the last year—expressing the number of acceptances over against the total decisions (acceptances, acceptances with specified revisions, and rejections) made between 1 May 2015 and 30 April 2016—remains consistent with the rate of the preceding three years: 34%, which while respectable is likely higher than it should be for a journal of ESC’s profile. We want to see the acceptance rate closer to 20-25%; we believe that the rise we have seen over the past few years issues chiefly from the substantial number of special issues published, since these issues, generated either through calls-for-papers or targeted solicitations, tend to have higher acceptance rates than do general issues of the journal. We aim to complete the peer review of all articles within a six month period; on average, an accepted article moves to publication within twelve months of submission—a timeline that is considerably shorter than most journals. We currently have eleven articles awaiting publication, two pending ASR’s, and an additional 31 articles under review.

**Who Publishes in ESC?**

A survey of the last five volumes of the journal, in which we published 110 peer-reviewed articles by 124 authors and coauthors, reveals the answer: members at all levels of the profession, with almost two thirds (61%) from the ranks of tenured or tenure-track scholars. A quarter of ESC’s peer-reviewed articles, published in those five volumes, came from Full Professors, while 15% of our peer-reviewed articles were authored by only the very best graduate students in the discipline. These figures demonstrate that ESC publishes excellent
work from all levels of the profession, striking a judicious balance between established and emerging or transitional members of the academy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer-Reviewed Articles Published in Volumes 37-41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST or Sessional Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Doctoral Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Scholar / Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publication stats are really quite stable from last year. We had a slight increase in co-authored pieces (from 114 to 124), and a slight decrease in publications by tenured or tenure-track authors (from 63% to 61%, although that’s still up from 57% in 2014). The special issues this year had more co-authored pieces than a standard issue would be likely to have, which might be an indication of changing practices in the discipline. These statistics indicate that ESC is indeed a journal of first choice for successful scholars—a venue, that is, worthy of the admiration of the academy and a meritorious space in which to present one’s work. With a quick time-to-publication rate and a large global readership, ESC is a highly effective way to reach the broadest academic audience possible.

**Digital and Print Readerships**

ESC currently has 656 print subscriptions. Of the journal’s 590 individual subscribers (which is up by 80 from last year), most are located in Canada (where they represent 67 different institutions) while approximately 4% of subscribers are located in the United States or overseas (that doubles last year’s international figure). 66 libraries or other institutions subscribe to print copies of the journal, and 40 (or 61%) of those are non-Canadian. While the number of institutional subscriptions has declined by 8% in the past three years (and another five institutions have not renewed for Volume 42), that decline is a consequence of institutional shifts to digital aggregation, which has resulted in increased readership and revenues. Because digital distribution is economically advantageous and results in a larger readership, we have no concerns about this trend.

On average, an ESC article is downloaded every 6.6 minutes in over 95 countries around the world. Over the last seven years, ESC has achieved an outstanding online presence by developing partnerships with four digital aggregators: Project Muse, EBSCO, ProQuest, and Gale Publishing. (We are also currently contracted with Project Muse to make available thirty years of back issues.) These partnerships have greatly increased our profile and availability around the world. Seven years ago we reported 20,000 article downloads across those four digital aggregators. In 2010 that number was 53,000, and in 2011 that number was almost 73,000. For 2013 and 2014 we reported digital readerships of approximately 138,000 and 135,000 respectively. However, those figures may have been inaccurate—derived, that is, from information inaccurately reported.
Our statistics show us that readers with paid access to the journal online are primarily from the United States, Canada, Australia, and the UK, although China, Spain, the Netherlands, and Turkey also show strong engagement. Over the past year, about three-quarters of those downloads occurred outside of Canada, testimony to the journal’s strong international standing.
Some of the data provided also allows us to track downloads at the level of issue and article. The most popular issue by far on Project Muse this year was the Volume 35.1 (2009) special issue on Aboriginal Redress (edited by Jennifer Henderson and Pauline Wakeham). It had 1,986 downloads, compared to the Volume 38.3-4 (2012) special issue on Childhood and Its Discontents (edited by Nat Hurley), which had 1,481 downloads, and Volume 31.23 (2005), which had 1,468 downloads. That 2005 issue included the Readers’ Forum (on “Feminism ... What Are We Supposed to Do Now?”), organized by Cecily Devereux and Jo Devereux, as well as a cluster of articles on Diagnosing Romanticism, guest edited by Stephen Ahern, and articles on Victorian Ethics and Postcolonial Memory. The most downloaded individual article was Nima Naghibi and Andrew O’Malley’s “Estranging the Familiar: ‘East’ and ‘West’ in Satrapi’s Persepolis” from 31.2-3 (2005), with 880 downloads from Project Muse and 4,914 downloads on EBSCO (for a total of 7.6% of our total downloads!).

We can also now report on the activity we’re seeing through Open Journals System, our open access venue—although we’ve seen some unreliability with the reporting mechanisms, so take this with a grain of salt. It appears that ESC articles were downloaded 7,048 times last year and 27,019 times in the current year: that’s a whopping 280% increase. We’re not sure why this is the case, but we’re exploring the matter with our OJS team. We can also name this year’s most downloaded articles through OJS: Marjorie Stone’s “The Corporate University in Canada and the U.S.: History, Manifestations, and Oppositional Strategies” (1082 downloads); Donna Pennee’s “Looking for Autonomy through Service” (901 downloads); and Cecily Devereux’s “Hysteria, Feminism, and Gender Revisited: The Case of the Second Wave” (488 downloads).

**Special Issues**

ESC produced one special issue this year, Guest Edited by Hannah McGregor, Paul Hjartarson, and Faye Hammill. Titled “Magazines and/as Media: The Politics and Aesthetics of Periodical Form,” this issue was produced simultaneously with a companion issue published by the *Journal of Modern Periodical Studies* on the same subject: a first in journal publication history, as far as we know. Next up: a special issue on “The Automated Body” (42.1) will be released in July, and is being edited by Cecily Devereux and Marcelle Kosman. Their call for papers generated a healthy response (nineteen submissions). The Editors are currently discussing the final special issue to be produced by the University of Alberta team, scheduled for March, 2017.
COMMITTEE FOR PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS REPORT
Veronica Austen

I would like to thank Jennifer Andrews, Melissa Dalgleish, Lee Easton, Elissa Gurman, Erin Wunker, and Rob Zacharias for serving on the Committee for Professional Concerns this year. Their wonderful ideas and quick willingness to contribute to all of our tasks made my job as chair easy.

Our main activity this year was to organize the two CPC panels for the conference. “(Not) Speaking the Realities of Academic Labour” featured Lucia Lorenzi’s (UBC) “Invisible Lines on the C.V.: Unsilencing Violence and Harassment in Academic Spaces” and Hannah McGregor’s (Alberta) “The Gendered Labour of Loving What You Do: Pedagogy, Public Speech, and Precarity.” “The Spectrum of the Professoriate and the Rise of the Teaching Stream” included Heidi Tiedemann Darroch’s (UVic) “Teaching-Stream Roles in Research-Intensive Institutions: Specialization, Status, and Stigma”; Brenna Clarke Gray’s (Douglas College) “Teach First, Research Questions Later: Understanding the Role of the College Teacher-Scholar”; Lee Easton’s (Mt Royal) “Redefining ‘Work’: English Studies, Teaching, and the Shifting Canadian Post-Secondary Landscape”; and Sylvia Terzian’s (St. Jerome’s) “The Role of the Academic Underclass: Facing the Challenges of the Changing Professoriate.” The CPC thanks not only our panellists but also the incredible audiences for provoking such productive discussions. I hear the panels were well-tweeted too, so hopefully our discussions got to provoke other thoughts and discussions outside of the time/space of the panels themselves.

As we look towards next year, the CPC is working towards formalizing guidelines regarding appointments to this committee. As well, we will continue with our usual mandate of organizing panels for the conference, so please feel free to contact me with any ideas you may have for future CPC panels. What are the issues in our academic worlds that most need discussing? As I noted in the Spring Newsletter, the growing number of ACCUTE conference panels devoted to professional issues in recent years suggests that we are at a time when we are increasingly wanting to understand and often critique the systems in which we work. Foregrounding professional issues is one of the things ACCUTE, as a generalist organization, can do particularly well. ACCUTE offers us the chance to see ourselves as more than just our specific fields of English studies and instead see our commonalities as we fight to make our academic worlds into the places we’d like them to be. So, feel free to join in the fray and bring your ideas forward to the CPC.

Hope to see you at next year’s conference!
It has been both a pleasure and an honour to serve ACCUTE as the Contract Academic Faculty Representative. It has also been an exercise in managing emotional labour and structural limitations. As your CAF representative, and with the support of the ACCUTE Board, I was able to represent the organization at two major events this year. This fall I was invited to speak on a panel about precarious labour and contemporary working conditions at Universities Art Association of Canada conference hosted at NSCAD in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The panel was comprised of two tenured faculty and two contract academic faculty members. The conference offered an opportunity to speak to issues of precarity and the mission of pedagogical praxis in higher education with people outside the immediate field of literary studies. I was also invited to speak on the keynote panel at the MLA Subconference in Austin, Texas. The Subconference is an independent and evolving group of graduate students and adjunct faculty in the humanities who describe themselves as “interested in creating new a new kind of conference environment, in order to propose alternative professional, social, and political possibilities for ourselves and our peers.” The conference runs simultaneously with the MLA and the MLA President was present at our panel. The MLA Subconference allowed me the opportunity to connect with CAFs in the United States, and once again reinforced for me the ways in which cross-border organization around the issues of precarious labour will be difficult. We need to organize within Canada across institutions first, in my opinion.

This year I also continued to write about CAF issues and the effects of austerity measures on the sustainability of higher education in venues such as rabble.ca, Hook & Eye: Fast Feminism, Slow Academe, and the Chronicle of Higher Education’s Vitae.

The challenges of serving as the CAF rep are, I think, obvious: working in precarious and often overloaded or severely under-employed situations (which restrict access to email addresses, library access, and protection/support from faculty unions and associations) makes it very difficult to organize long-term projects to better the working conditions of one’s own self and one’s CAF peers. I had hoped to gather data on CAFs in Canada and have several times reached out to the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives to start a project. However, without stable working conditions it is hard to either hold a grant as a CAF or to find the time to do the work for free. CAFs need long term and dedicated allies amongst the tenured professors. This, too, is a challenge given the increasing demands on tenure-track and tenured faculty. I know this, yet it seems worth reiterating.

I want to express my appreciation to the Board for their support over the last two years, and to welcome Dr. Ross Bullen (OCAD), my friend and colleague, who has agreed to accept the torch as I pass it to him.
GRADUATE STUDENT CAUCUS REPORT
Elissa Gurman

It has been a busy and successful year for the Graduate Student Caucus. Our main focus this year was on increasing our presence both at the conference and on social media in order to better serve, represent, and communicate with graduate student members of ACCUTE. Towards this end, we created ACCUTE GSC Facebook and Twitter accounts, and used them to disseminate information to our members. We also organized three events for this year’s conference. We ran a very well-attended pub night, and held a lively and informative professionalization panel for graduate students, which featured talks by Brent Ryan Bellamy, SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellow at Memorial University; Marjorie Mather, Publisher and Editor of English Studies at Broadview Press; and Kate Lawson, Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of English at the University of Waterloo (see below, from left to right). This panel was immediately followed by the graduate caucus lunch, where we presented the results of our annual survey and elected our new executive committee. If you’d like to see the results of our survey, they will be available on the GSC page of the ACCUTE website.

I’d like to thank this past year’s executive, Elizabeth Bernath, Kala Hirtle, and Shawna Guenther, for all of their hard work, and welcome our new executive, President Kala Hirtle (Dalhousie), Vice-President Thomas Stuart (UWO), Secretary Nahmi Lee (UWO), and President-Elect Elizabeth Bernath (Toronto).
PRIESTLEY PRIZE
COMMITTEE REPORT
Laura Robinson

This year’s Priestley Prize committee consisted of Steven Bruhm (Western), Candida Rifkind (Winnipeg), and Laura Robinson (RMC). The committee agreed to use the following criteria, established the previous year:

Size:
- a full-length article, not an opinion piece or review essay

Significance:
- makes a memorable, original, and significant contribution to the discipline,
- with rich implications
- shows engagement with relevant scholarship & ability to synthesize knowledge
- shows a significant new methodology, a new archive, or a new interpretation

Quality of Argumentation:
- clear articulation of an overall claim
- sustained and strong argumentation
- cohesive & well organized argument
- compelling demonstration of the claim through developed reasoning and engagement with relevant supporting evidence

Style:
- jargon-free & clear, with good flow
- Accessible to general academic/scholarly readership
- Ideally, elegant & stylish—with flair!

Committee members then dug into the fascinating and varied articles in ESC Volume 40. So many of the articles were excellent and engaging, that the decision was a difficult one; however, the committee came to a decision on the winning essay:


Grinnell provides a captivating reassessment of the Okanagan, most frequently represented as a tourist paradise, through his analysis of Patrick Lane’s novel, Red Dog Red Dog. Elegantly structured, this article firmly and consistently remains outside sentimental and solipsistic visions of nature and instead focuses on the novel’s dual attention to looking and looking away, confrontation and avoidance. In doing so, Grinnell produces a convincing argument for the complicated mechanics of loss and the ethics of attachment to both people and places. This essay is a beautiful shuttling between theories of the ecological and readings of the novel, bridging several disciplines and fields (ecocriticism, memory studies, Canadian literature, Romanticism, trauma theory) and yet always coming back to Lane’s novel to show readers how it offers an alternative to seeing nature as either the real or the sublime “by evoking precisely both of these possibilities together” (124). Part of what makes this article stand out is the delicate way Grinnell uses his own living and teaching experiences in the Okanagan to frame his reading. As well, the specific textual analysis has implications beyond the novel by using Lane’s work to illustrate and expand upon the urgencies of the ecological in a manner that is eloquent and moving without being heavy-handed. While the article picks up on traditional themes in Canadian literature – hostile landscapes, dysfunctional families, untimely and violent deaths – Grinnell highlights Lane’s innovative treatment of those themes.

Congratulations, George!

Read articles from ESC: English Studies in Canada, including this year’s winner of the F.E.L. Priestley Prize, at the ESC Archives.
CACE REPORT
Lisa Vargo

Approximately 25 people attended this year’s CACE meeting, held annually the day before the start of ACCUTE. It was a (long) day of collegiality and information exchange about issues that departments and Heads of English share in common. This year featured discussions about the opportunities and challenges of amalgamation of other units and departments into English departments; academic incivility and re-engagement with community; mentoring mid-career faculty and faculty with poor teaching records; and the decline of reading by students as the issue intersects with enrolment and library resources. On Saturday morning three heads participated in CACE round table at ACCUTE on English and Community Engagement. A thank you to the 2015-16 Executive: Vice-President, Jennifer Andrews, UNB; Jacqueline Jenkins, U Calgary, Secretary-Treasurer and local coordinator; Iain Higgins, U Victoria, Member-at-Large; and Past President Bryce Traister, UWO. Jacqueline Jenkins will become the next President; Vice-President: Peter Sinnema, U Alberta; Secretary-Treasurer: Andre Furlani, Concordia U; and Member-at-Large Brenda Austin-Smith, Manitoba. I will serve as the Past President.

(Note: not a picture of CACE. Just some wee rabbits holding a panel discussion at Congress.)
FROM THE CONFERENCE

Report from “Sharing the Land, Sharing a Future”
Manina Jones

[Ed. note: ACCUTE members may recall the old print newsletter published versions of conference presentations, and responses to the conference, that were felt to hold wide interest for our members. We revive that practice here, publishing ACCUTE President Manina Jones’ report on the “Sharing the Land, Sharing a Future” event that ACCUTE cosponsored, and Mark McCutcheon’s piece below on the Trans-Pacific Partnership and copyright, a longer version of which was presented at the 2016 conference in Calgary.

We hope these pieces will generate discussion—and, in the case of Manina’s, thoughts on future ACCUTE actions and structures—amongst our members: you can respond with your own thoughts by clicking the links to the respective blog entries at the end of each piece.]

It was my privilege to attend a public forum at Congress 2016, hosted by ACCUTE in collaboration with the Canadian Federation of the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS), the Canadian Association for Social Work Education, the Canadian Historical Association, the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA), and the Canadian Sociological Association. “Sharing the Land, Sharing a Future” was organized to foster discussion about how the humanities and social sciences can act on the challenges posed by the 2015 Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP). The session was opened by Marlene Brant Castellano (Trent University, co-Chair Oversight Committee for the RCAP Anniversary Initiative); and Stephen Toope (President of the CFHSS). This was followed by a powerful key note address by Cindy Blackstock of the First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada and member of the Board of Directors of the CFHSS. Long active in research on the history of residential schooling and other government policies and practices, and vigorously involved in contemporary issues around child protection and Indigenous children’s rights, Dr. Blackstock approached the theme of reconciliation through her discipline of Social Work, but she challenged scholars in the humanities and social sciences to think about the founding of our disciplines and their role in the oppression of Indigenous people. At the conclusion of her discussion about the links between social change and scholarship, Blackstock urged scholars not just to produce research in the spirit of reconciliation, but to have the courage to hold government and society to account for the implications of that work.

(Cindy Blackstock at “Sharing the Land, Sharing a Future”; picture courtesy Manina Jones)

The plenary session also featured a panel featuring representatives of the six co-sponsoring scholarly associations. For ACCUTE, this forum was an ideal occasion to draw on the research and teaching strengths of its members and to work in coalition with the Indigenous Literary Studies Association (ILSA). ACCUTE was thus represented by a
presentation co-authored by Linda Morra (ACCUTE Campus Rep, English at Bishop’s University) and Deanna Reder (President of ILSA, Departments of First Nations Studies and English at SFU), delivered by Deanna. ILSA is a new society (a member of the CFHSS as of Congress 2016) with, as Deanna put it, “a commitment not only to promote the study of Indigenous literatures, but also to indigenize literary method; and to talk about our responsibilities to Indigenous writers, students, and communities seriously by developing accessible resources, by uncovering and promoting Indigenous writing, and by integrating Indigenous understandings into our analyses.”

(Deanna Reder at “Sharing the Land, Sharing a Future”; picture courtesy Manina Jones)

Linda and Deanna observed that while ACCUTE has hosted events and panels on Indigenous topics, the TRC calls to action should prompt us to make the Indigenization of Departments of English across Canada a priority. In response to such calls, they proposed that ACCUTE should use its experience in advocacy to:

1. Promote Indigenous protocols, scholars, scholarship, programs and courses/students and contribute to the development of Indigenous scholars, which means supporting mentorship at every level.
2. Host regular discussions, panels, and roundtables on Indigenizing the discipline.
3. Create curriculum about residential schools, treaties, literatures by Aboriginal authors and Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies.

ACCUTE might “begin with an assessment of how many Indigenous literature experts each college and university has—and not just assume that Canadianists or Americanists can teach in this subject area, even though these allies are vital.” Such expert scholars “can best promote the studies of Indigenous literatures and … would be able to train a new generation of literary scholars.” Deanna and Linda ultimately suggested that this initiative – in line, I would add, with the CPSA’s striking of a committee to address the terms of the TRC – could develop an articulation of best practices to foster space within the discipline for Indigenous literatures, scholars, and students.

The main session of “Sharing the Land” was followed by break-out group discussions on key themes led by noted scholars, including nation-to-nation relationships (Mark Dockstator, First Nations University of Canada), the well-being of Indigenous children (Blackstock), Indigenizing education (Jan Hare, Indigenous Education, UBC), the power of the arts in healing and reconciliation (Jonathan Dewar, Shingwauk Residential Schools Centre).

On behalf of ACCUTE, I’d like to thank Deanna and Linda for their contributions to this important event. I hope it will stimulate a continuing conversation about how our research, teaching, and institutional structures can cultivate respectful and productive relationships.

Would you like to comment on this piece? You can by clicking here.
FROM THE CONFERENCE

“The TPP will invalidate millions of dollars of tax-payer funded research in Canada”: Implications of the TPP for Canadian Literature and Literary Studies
Mark A. McCutcheon (Athabasca)

The Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, is a sweeping international trade agreement that has been led by US trade interests and joined by a dozen countries, including Canada. The TPP is not so much a “free trade” deal as it is a “corporate rights” deal: it entrenches privileges and interests for corporate (and especially US) businesses in ways that put them above the sovereign laws of signing nations. It was negotiated—in secret, and undemocratically—by trade and business representatives from the mid-2000s until the fall of 2015; it was finalized and signed by all participating nations just this February. But the TPP is not yet a done deal: it still needs to pass a vote in Parliament, and the Canadian government is now holding public consultations on it.

The TPP holds onerous intellectual property requirements, for patents, copyright, and digital copyright enforcement (for instance it will force Internet Service Providers to spy and snitch on their own customers, and to cut off users merely suspected of infringement).

This article focuses on the TPP’s requirement for Canada to extend the duration of copyright protection. Canadian law confers automatic copyright protection on original works, with limited exceptions, for a limited duration. In Canada, the term of copyright protection lasts fifty years after the death of the author (Murray and Trosow 49). After the copyright term expires, a work is no longer copyright protected—it enters what we call the public domain. The public domain consists of the total corpus of works whose copyright terms have expired. For example, T.S. Eliot died in 1965, so as of January 2016, the complete works of Eliot exited copyright protection and entered the public domain. Public domain works may be freely reproduced, repurposed, or transformed by anyone, for any purpose, without payment to or permission from the rights holder. As Carys Craig notes, Canadian jurisprudence envisions the public domain as “a vibrant cultural space that facilitates exchange and transformation, inspiration, and innovation, and thereby serves the public interest” (67); Craig argues that the public domain should be treated as a “human entitlement equivalent in nature, purpose, and importance to the freedom of speech” (77; cf. Birnhack 63). The public domain is crucial to freedom of speech because it lets “new ideas form when old ideas interact” (Birnhack 85).

Some other countries party to the TPP also have a copyright term of life-plus-fifty years, like New Zealand (see this world map of copyright terms). But the TPP is being led by US trade interests, and in the USA, and most of Europe, the copyright term lasts not fifty but seventy years after the author’s death. So T.S. Eliot’s works won’t enter the European public domain until 2036. And in the USA, changes to copyright law made in 1978 and 1998 mean that nothing published between 1923 and 1977 will enter the US public domain until ninety-five years after date of publication. (Works published after 1977 are protected for life plus seventy years.) So most of Eliot’s works won’t enter the US public domain until at least 2030.

Compare these copyright term lengths—which are practically perpetual monopolies—with the term set by the first modern copyright law, Britain’s 1710 Statute of Anne: fourteen years after publication date, renewable once if the author outlived its expiry. But short copyright enjoyed only a short life: it was only enforced as of 1774, and it only lasted until 1808, after which time subsequent legislation, together with global agreements, have kept lengthening the copyright term.

The term-lengthening trend that continues with the TPP is based on effective lobbying, not on economic evidence. Many international studies show that the public costs of long copyright outweigh its private benefits (Rossini and
Australian government studies in 2000 and in 2010 consistently argue against copyright extension as a cost to any jurisdiction that imports more IP than it exports (Productivity Commission; cf. Rimmer 41, Weatherall 12). A 2006 report for the UK government concludes that Britain’s copyright term of life-plus-seventy-years “far exceeds the incentives required to invest in new works” (Gowers 50). A 2011 report for the UK government cited economic evidence and the government’s own 2010 study to conclude that copyright term extensions are “economically detrimental” (Hargreaves 19). A 2011 study by the Canadian government (Canada, Innovation, Science and Economic Development) concludes that “extending the term simply does not create an additional incentive for new creativity” (Geist, “Trouble” ¶4).7 A 2009 New Zealand study prompted specifically by the TPP concluded that “the costs of extending copyright for New Zealand consumers would outweigh the benefits for New Zealand creators” (Ergas 1). While this study’s calculations have been contested (see Barker, Stephens), the preponderance of evidence and disinterested analysis shows copyright term extension is a net cost to countries that are net importers of IP, and a benefit only to net exporters—meaning, really, just the USA (PDF). As Matthew Dawes puts it, “extending IP protection and enforcement in trade agreements does not benefit countries that are net IP importers—which is every country negotiating the [TPP] other than the US” (¶16). Like New Zealand, Canada is demonstrably a net importer of IP (PDF). Statistics Canada’s 2015 table of international transactions in services shows a line for “charges for the use of intellectual property” with a negative balance, about -$7.25 billion dollars, every year from 2010 to 2014 (Canada, Statistics Canada). Since Canada is a net importer of IP, the economic evidence shows copyright extension will cost Canada, not benefit us.

Michael Geist has illustrated this prospective cost by identifying the Governor General’s Award winning authors whose expected entry to the public domain would be delayed by the TPP. Twenty-two GG winners will enter the public domain in the next twenty years. But under the TPP, they would not enter it until 2037. These authors include Margaret Laurence, Gabrielle Roy, and Marshall McLuhan (“Official” ¶11-12). Using Geist’s premise that the TPP comes into force in 2017, Table 1 shows just a few notable Canadian and international authors whose entry to Canada’s public domain in the next twenty years would be postponed by the TPP for a further twenty years.

Table 1. Some authors the TPP will keep out of public domain for 20 more years:

**Canada & Quebec:** Ernest Buckler, Franklin W. Dixon, Marian Engel, Jacques Ferron, Hugh Garner, A.M. Klein, Margaret Laurence, Pat Lowther, Gwendolyn MacEwan, Marshall McLuhan, Alden Nowlan, Gabrielle Roy, George Ryga, Elizabeth Smart, Ethel Wilson

**USA:** James Baldwin, Djuna Barnes, John Berryman, Richard Brautigan, Truman Capote, Philip K. Dick, John Gardner, Brion Gysin, Frank Herbert, Langston Hughes, Jack Kerouac, Martin Luther King, Henry Miller, Carson McCullers, Vladimir Nabokov, Charles Olson, Dorothy Parker, Katherine Anne Porter, Ezra Pound, Ayn Rand, Carl Sandburg, Anne Sexton, Upton Sinclair, John Steinbeck, E.B. White, Thornton Wilder, Tennessee Williams


**France:** Louis Aragon, Roland Barthes, Simone de Beauvoir, Michel Foucault, Jean Genet, Anaïs Nin, Jacques Prévert, Raymond Queneau, Jean-Paul Sartre, Marguerite Yourcenar

In addition, Canada has agreed to make term extension retroactive: this means that the life-plus-seventy-years copyright term would not only apply to authors who died in 1967 (that is, fifty years before the TPP would go into force in 2017). Retroactivity means term extension would also apply to authors who died seventy years before the TPP goes into force, meaning authors who died in 1947 or later (Clifford, Sutton). As Table 2 shows, term extension retroactivity means that many authors who are now already in Canada’s public domain would be removed from it. Retroactive term extension would force publishers,
scholars, and others who now legally sell or freely provide the works of authors who died in or before 1965 to take them out of circulation (LePan). This re-privatization would make a confusing and impoverished mess of the Canadian public domain.

Table 2. Some authors the TPP will remove from the present public domain:

Canada & Quebec: Frederick Philip Grove, Harold Innis, Wyndham Lewis, Malcolm Lowry, E.J. Pratt, Duncan Campbell Scott, Robert Service


France: Antonin Artaud, Gaston Bachelard, Georges Bataille, André Breton, Albert Camus, Jean Cocteau, Colette, Paul Éluard, Frantz Fanon, André Gide, Tristan Tzara

The deferral of some authors’ entry to the public domain and the removal of others from it would harm the public domain and cost the Canadian public. The New Zealand study (its calculations aside) identifies four such costs:

1) an increased transfer of money from Canadian consumers to foreign copyright holders, especially US rights holders;
2) foregone consumption (Ergas 10), the cost of consumers not buying copyright-protected works at the marked-up prices that copyright protects;
3) less domestic production of derivative works—works that use or adapt prior works—since producers of derivative works would face licensing and tracing costs to clear their intended uses with rights holders; and
4) higher costs for “intermediaries” like libraries and universities: costs such as tracing (i.e. locating rights holders), license fees, and acquiring still-copyrighted and therefore more expensive works.

Further costs, like those facing intermediaries, face scholarly researchers, publishers, and digital projects for clearing, licensing, or acquiring copyrighted works for research projects, publication, or other distributions—and for removing presently public domain works from their repertoires. Project Gutenberg’s Canadian website features numerous free digital editions of public domain works—by E.J. Pratt, T.S. Eliot, and Hemingway, among others—alongside notes about how the TPP would affect each, and exhortations to the public to oppose the TPP. Broadview Press CEO Don LePan decries the chaos that term extension holds for Canadian publishing: “If the TPP is approved in Canada, then, say goodbye to [Broadview’s] Orwell and Eliot editions … say goodbye to a number of books that we’ve been making available in Canada for some time” (¶8). Given its impact on works by authors who died between 1947 and 1987, the TPP’s impact on the public domain would also hurt research projects on modernist literature in particular. The U of Victoria’s Stephen Ross, one of the directors of the Modernist Versions Project, says:

Ross’ colleague and co-director James Gifford has published editions of Hemingway and is now finalizing editions of H.D. and Evelyn Waugh. Gifford says copyright term extension would mean shelving all these editions—and retroactive extension would block some non-publication uses of the texts, too. “Various products grown from hundreds of thousands of dollars in Canadian
federal and provincial as well as private funding,” says Gifford, “would become illegal for Canadians to access … The TPP would effectively end a number of current projects in Canada and prohibit use in Canada of some research already completed.”

So the costs of copyright extension wouldn’t just be monetary; there’d be related cultural and social costs. Higher purchase costs for purchase, licensing, and research use are higher costs for public access to knowledge and culture, higher costs for various forms of literacy, higher costs for using copyrighted works in exercising expressive freedoms and producing new works. To the understandable question—“What’s wrong with creators wanting to protect their property?”—the answer is that most creators don’t benefit from term extension—“Only corporate copyright owners are likely to benefit (somewhat) from term extension,” concludes Weatherall (13; cf. Hunter). Or, as Berkeley law scholar Mike Wolfe puts it, “term extension is a tool that rewards those who need it least.”

Higher purchase costs for purchase, licensing, and research use are higher costs for public access to knowledge and culture, higher costs for various forms of literacy, higher costs for using copyrighted works in exercising expressive freedoms and producing new works. To the understandable question—“What’s wrong with creators wanting to protect their property?”—the answer is that most creators don’t benefit from term extension—“Only corporate copyright owners are likely to benefit (somewhat) from term extension,” concludes Weatherall (13; cf. Hunter). Or, as Berkeley law scholar Mike Wolfe puts it, “term extension is a tool that rewards those who need it least.” On balance, then, “in a policy world in which copyright strives to balance creativity and access,” as Geist writes, “term extension does not enhance creativity but it does restrict access” (“Trouble” ¶3). What’s more, as Ariel Katz argues, “adding 20 more years of copyright protection is more than just bad policy; it might well create an unconstitutional limitation on our freedom of expression.” Extending copyright means limiting our Charter-protected freedom of speech (Amani) and harming Canadians’ social literacy (see Brodie). The economic evidence still suggests that the 1710 Statute of Anne’s fourteen-year copyright term may have struck the best balance between authors’ and users’ interests in the first place, by limiting copyright duration to a term more like a decade than a century.

If Parliament does vote in the TPP, we will need to strategize solutions and workarounds, along the lines of what Rosemary Coombe and co-authors call “dynamic fair dealing” (39). As academic authors, do we want our publications kept in copyright lockdown for even fifty years, never mind seventy? Scholarly publishing’s small print runs suggest academic books don’t enjoy the enduring popularity of Eliot or Orwell.

But first: we can still stop the TPP and the mess it would make of the Canadian public domain (not to mention the Internet). There are hopeful signs that the TPP is on the ropes, in Canada and the USA (see Geist, “In search”). So I encourage you to participate in the government’s public consultations, which continue until the end of June; and to contact Canada’s Minister of International Trade, the Honourable Chrystia Freeland—and CC Minister Freeland’s parliamentary secretary, MP David Lametti, a law scholar who has previously argued for shorter copyright term (“Coming to terms”). And contact your own MP, to demand they reject the TPP for the exorbitant costs and Charter violations with which it would burden Canada.

Would you like to comment on this piece? You can by clicking here.
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The Celebration of Research, after the Annual General Meeting
(Note: empty chairs = people in line at the desk of our sponsor, Broadview Press (or at the food and bar just outside the room))
In the role of Placement Officer for the Graduate Program in English at Toronto, I’ve been observing the academic job market as it has unfolded over the last year, especially in North America. Any job-seeker who was “out there” doing applications or interviewing already knows that it has been a very tight year, with a scarcity of postings in general and a drought in some fields. A recent study by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences observes that this situation is not confined to English alone, estimating that humanities hiring in the United States now is down 31% from pre-economic downturn (i.e. pre-2008) levels [see “Ongoing Weaknesses in the Academic Job Market for Humanities,” Academy Data Forum, www.amacad.org]. Things are not over yet, of course, but here are some preliminary figures and observations that I hope ACCUTE members will find useful.

Postings in Canadian Degree-Granting Institutions: It can be difficult to know what counts as a job in “English”: some jobs in English departments may not be suitable for literature specialists (e.g., jobs for film theorists or theatre practitioners) while, conversely, a graduate in English might well find work in another unit as a specialist in sexuality studies, or digital humanities, for example. But (taking the rather restrictive criterion of jobs involving literatures in English) on my count there were 22 TT/permanent postings this year in “English” in degree-granting institutions in Canada, and another 26 related-field positions for which at least some people holding doctorates in English could conceivably apply (e.g., media studies, creative writing, Indigenous cultural studies, and so forth). The absence of recent hiring surveys for English departments in Canada (more on this below) makes it difficult to compare this information or to detect trends.

But to illustrate the wider university context: at the moment of writing this piece, at what is usually considered the tail-end of the hiring season, there are currently (in an ironic coincidence) 22 active postings on the University Affairs website for TT positions in business and management studies.

Postings for Canadian Colleges: I do not have overall figures for hiring in this sector since college jobs are not posted centrally, usually appear only on the Human Resources website of the hiring institution, and have very quick closes (sometimes as short as a week). I was able to keep an eye on Ontario colleges only, and counted 16-18 postings for permanent college positions in English/Liberal Studies/Writing and related areas this cycle. (The ambiguity is because some postings were potentially multiple.) One should not generalize from the single province. However, anecdotally, this seems to be an area where hiring is fairly robust, which would make sense given enrollment growth and program expansion in the college sector.

Crunching the MLA Job Information List: In the fall, the MLA will release its report/autopsy of the 2015-16 JIL, but here is my own assessment based on a handcount of all positions posted between the opening of the JIL in early September 2015 and the beginning of May 2016. (There has been very little new activity subsequently.) As of May 1, there had been 777 postings to the JIL under “English,” some of which were postdocs. Note that this is not the entirety of jobs in North America or even in the US: composition positions, jobs in faith-based colleges, and non-TT positions may well appear in HigherEdJobs or Vitae instead.
To break this down: Of the 777 postings, 228 were for entry-level TT/permanent positions in literary studies or similar. (This includes primarily-literature jobs with some demand for writing instruction.) 210 jobs were for TT/permanent writing positions including composition, communication, and rhetoric. 84 were for TT/permanent jobs in creative writing. 68 were for LTA/VAP and adjunct positions. 46 were for postdocs (although further postdocs appeared under the Postdoctoral section of the JIL). 42 postings were for chairs and deans, and 33 for associate/full positions. 51 postings were miscellaneous including researcher jobs, and areas such as film and translation that nonetheless were posted to “English.” Note that these numbers do not add up to 777 exactly due to some duplications, errors, and repostings on the JIL. The most salient findings here are the low figure for assistant-level TT positions, at 228, and the fact that jobs in writing (28%) and creative writing (11%) add up to almost 40% of all postings on the JIL.

UK Positions: I’ve been trying to audit UK as well as European and other international postings although have been able to survey only the first systematically. So far I have counted 85 postings for “permanent” entry-level positions in English in the UK this year (primarily in England) i.e. at lecturer/senior reader level. The hiring season in the UK is still ongoing. Note that a number of these are not really “international” searches in the sense that UK/EU citizenship or right to work aka right of residency is required of applicants.

Canadian LTA/VAP Positions: Because LTA/VAP/sessional positions are not centrally posted, there is no reliable tally for these. However, I have counted 55 LTA/VAP positions in English in Canada posted since the beginning of January. This does suggest that LTA/VAP positions have rebounded somewhat post-2008. (A survey I did of sessional hiring in Canada for 2009-11 showed that LTA positions were severely reduced at that time.) This is the classic good news/bad news situation, because it stands to reason that many of these positions are in lieu of TT jobs, of which there were so few this year.

What are the Hiring Patterns in Canada, and Where Are Our PhD Graduates Going? The sad situation is, that we don’t know and will not know until the CACE/ACCUTE annual hiring survey is reinstated. (The last report was for the year 2012-13.) While the report is nominally a co-production between ACCUTE and CACE (Canadian Association of Chairs of English), more recently the responsibility for administering and tabulating the survey has migrated to CACE, in the belief that departmental chairs would be more willing to share data within their own professional association, ensuring a higher response rate. While there have been some difficulties in recent years in keeping the questionnaire focussed and user-friendly, and in generating enough material to provide meaningful results, my understanding is that CACE now is attempting to get the hiring survey back on track. So good luck to CACE in its efforts and an encouragement to chairs to participate. These are challenging times for English departments and for graduates from them, and our community will benefit from having this information.
CONGRESS 2017
Call for Panels

Member-Organized
A member-organized panel (which often follows the conventional three- or four-paper format, but can take a variety of forms, including roundtable) is proposed by an ACCUTE member (deadline the preceding August 15) for the annual ACCUTE conference. Member-organized panels are not invitational: the organizer picks the topic but does not pre-select the participants. As with general submissions to the ACCUTE conference, paper proposals and submitted papers are peer reviewed, with the panel organizer acting as the first vettor (see ACCUTE’s Vetting Guidelines). Participants are selected in consultation between the organizer and the ACCUTE office, depending on the vetting results. If a panel proposal is selected for the program, the organizing member is expected to attend the ACCUTE conference in May to act as Panel Chair.

What Makes a Good Member-Organized CFP?
Some CFPs attract many submissions; some, few or none. A successful CFP is neither too general (Munro’s fiction) nor too specific (Jungian approaches to The Great Gatsby). It identifies an interesting or timely topic or critical problem, or an under-represented area, and reflects current scholarship in that field. Think of the eventual audience as well as the submitters: try to pick a topic that is not overly specialized and that has a general or cross-field appeal. Craft the CFP carefully, without issuing too many directives, and let your submitters show what they can do with it. And be sure to spend some time publicizing the CFP to the kinds of scholars who would be an asset to the event.

Submitting a Member-Organized Panel Proposal
If you would like to submit a panel proposal, email ACCUTE with the following information indicated clearly:

- The proposed panel title and format;
- Your name and institution;
- The email address(es) for submissions;
- The text of the CFP to a maximum of 200 words;
- Please also include the ACCUTE submissions procedures in your CFP (i.e., “Please send the following: A file containing a 300 to 500-word paper proposal, without personal identifying marks; A file containing a 100-word abstract and a 50-word biographical statement; the 2017 Proposal Information Sheet available on the ACCUTE website”)

If accepted, your CFP will be publicized to the ACCUTE membership in early or mid-September with a deadline for submissions of November 1. Note that you are responsible for ensuring that submissions conform to ACCUTE’s proposal guidelines, as described in the final bullet point, above.

After you have vetted your papers, you will forward all the materials you received to the ACCUTE office, and paper proposals and/or submitted papers will be sent to a second external assessor. Any submissions not selected for your panel will go into the “general pool” and considered for the ACCUTE conference program.

Jointly Organized
Jointly organized panels (which often follow the conventional three- or four-paper format, but can take a variety of forms, including roundtables) are held at the ACCUTE conference but are co-sponsored by another association. They are usually initiated by an ACCUTE member who is also a member of the organization that jointly sponsors the panel (deadline the preceding August 15). They are intended to foster links between ACCUTE and other scholarly
associations, whether those associations regularly attend Congress or not. Of special interest to ACCUTE are those organizations that address fields that have traditionally been under-represented at our conference, such as American, Medieval, and Eighteenth-Century Studies, but other areas are welcome as well. While ACCUTE welcomes panels that correspond with the annual Congress theme, any topic that reflects ACCUTE’s mandates or the interests of its members will be considered.

(Please note: if you wish to host an ACCUTE-sponsored panel at another Congress conference, you should not send in a proposal as below. You should ask the organizers of the other association if they allow jointly sponsored panels. If they do, follow any process they have for proposals; as an ACCUTE member, you may then request permission to have the panel listed as co-sponsored in the ACCUTE program. Such panels will not appear as CFPs for our conference, but can be advertised through the co-sponsoring association’s CFP, ACCUTE’s blog, and other CFP sites.)

Submitting a Joint Panel Proposal
Joint panel proposals begin with a discussion between the proposer of the panel—usually in consultation with the president of the co-sponsoring society—and the president of ACCUTE, most often during the summer months.

If you would like to propose a jointly sponsored panel, email ACCUTE with the following information indicated clearly:

- Name of the co-sponsoring association;
- The proposed panel title;
- Your name and institution;
- The email address(es) for submissions;
- The text of the CFP to a maximum of 200 words;
- Please also include ACCUTE submissions procedures in your CFP (i.e., “Please send the following: A file containing a 300 to 500-word paper proposal, without personal identifying marks; A file containing a 100-word abstract and a 50-word biographical statement; the 2017 Proposal Information Sheet available on the ACCUTE website”)

If accepted, your CFP will be publicized to the ACCUTE membership in early or mid-September with a deadline for submissions of November 1. Note that you are responsible for ensuring that submissions to your panel conform to ACCUTE’s proposal guidelines, as stated in the final bullet point, above.

Organizer(s) of the jointly sponsored panels are solely responsible for choosing participants using the vetting or assessment protocols of the co-sponsoring association; ACCUTE does, however, ask that all submissions be vetted, and that organizers bear in mind the ACCUTE Vetting Guidelines. The organizer(s) advise the submitters of the results, and forward the successful papers (with accompanying materials) to the ACCUTE office. If a proposed jointly sponsored panel is selected for the ACCUTE program, the organizing member is expected to attend the ACCUTE conference in May to act as Panel Chair; if this is not possible, the co-sponsoring society should assign a Chair.

Please note: Ordinarily, each association is permitted one joint panel at ACCUTE, but two may be permitted if the response warrants.
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ACCUTE bids “Farewell to Nova Scotia” once again.
(You just knew we had to say it, didn’t you?)