



The Canadian Society of Plant Biologists
La Société Canadienne de Biologie Végétale

**Report on the Implementation of the
CSPB Diversity and Equity Task Force Report Recommendations**

Daphne Goring
Vice-President, CSPB/SCBV

In consultation with President Geoffrey Wasteneys and the CSPB/SCBV Executive

Preamble:

At the CSPB/SCBV Annual Business Meeting (June 20, 2016; Queen's University), President Anja Geitmann assembled a Diversity and Equity Task Force with the goal of developing a diversity and equity policy for the society. The Diversity and Equity Task Force submitted their report on June 19, 2017.

Task Force Members: Allison McDonald (Chair), Janice Cooke, Heather McFarlane, Ken Wilson

Scope of Reference from the Diversity & Equity Task Force Report:

The task force focused on issues present within the CSPB's by-laws, awards, policies, procedures, leadership, and membership composition as a starting point. Our concerns and recommendations therefore most affect current CSPB members and potential future members and not the larger plant biology community in Canada.

For this report, the recommendations from the Diversity and Equity Task Force have been summarized in five sections (*shown in italics*). Each section is followed by the CSBP plan to implement the recommendations, including steps already taken (look for the [CSPB Implementation of recommendations](#) sections).

Content:

Page 2	I. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - Major Society Awards
Page 4	<u>I. CSPB Implementation of recommendations - Major Society Awards</u>
Page 5	II-III. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - CSPB Executive, Committee Membership
Page 6	<u>II-III. CSPB Implementation of recommendations- CSPB Executive, Committee Membership</u>
Page 7	IV. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - Equity Statement
Page 8	<u>IV. CSPB Implementation of recommendations - Equity Statement</u>
Page 10	V. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - Membership
Page 11	<u>V. CSPB Implementation of recommendations - Membership</u>
Page 12	VI. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - CSPB Meetings
Page 13	<u>VI. CSPB Implementation of recommendations - CSPB Meetings</u>
Pages 14 - 16	Appendix I: Current CSPB Society Awards and Recipients
Page 17	Appendix II: Draft by-law for The Carl Douglas Prize
Page 18	Appendix III: Draft By-Law for The Mary E. Spencer Award

I. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - Major Society Awards

1. Society awards recognize the traditional notions of excellence, original research, and impact on the field of plant biology. The terms of reference do not effectively recognize different styles of excellence, different career trajectories, and non-traditional measures of excellence.

Proposed Solution:

i) All terms of reference for society awards should be reviewed and revised in order to recognize excellence and impact in the broadest terms possible. Examples could include: teaching, service, mentoring, outreach, media interviews and public communication of science, etc.

ii) New awards could be created to specifically target particular areas of excellence and impact that the society believes to be important (e.g. mentoring award, public awareness award, etc.)

2. Several society awards currently exclude many members of the society who have experienced non-linear career paths and have taken personal leaves due to a variety of life events.

Proposed Solution:

i) All terms of reference for society awards should contain a clause that clearly indicates that eligibility time frames will be extended based on the number of personal/professional leaves taken during the time frame indicated. As an example, the Australian Research Council has several awards that, like the CD Nelson Award, are presented to researchers within X number of years after PhD completion. They have fairly clear and reasonable rules about eligibility exemption that would allow a person to extend the time after their PhD during which they are eligible for these awards, based on: "carer's responsibility; disruption due to international relocation for post-doctoral studies or other research employment not exceeding three months per international relocation; illness, maternity or parental leave; unemployment; non-research employment not concurrent with research employment; the primary care of a dependent child (inclusive of carer's responsibility and any maternity or partner/parental leave), two years per dependent child." While this list might not entirely suit the criteria for all of our awards, they might not be a bad place to start. One approach could be to change the bylaw to limit nominees to individuals at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor (or equivalent). While this could be seen as providing no time limit, candidates producing "outstanding research contributions to plant biology," should be pushing for promotion to the rank of Professor within 10-15 years of appointment.

3. Over the history of the society, most of the awards made have been to men. This reflects both demographics of the membership and likely a degree of bias (conscious or unconscious) from a society that has awards going back to 1970 (The Gold Medal) or 1978 (C.D. Nelson Award). Interestingly, there have been no female winners of the David J. Gifford Award in Tree Biology (even under its previous name) which was founded in 1988. Three of 24 Gold Medal winners were women, going back to 1988 when it was awarded to Ann Oaks, and up to 2013 when it was awarded to Bev Green. Similarly, the CD Nelson Award in Plant Biology has been awarded to 3 women, although promisingly, the last two awardees were women. Junior CSPB-SCBV members face many challenges in starting independent research programs. Awards committees and the membership at large would be hard pressed to equalize all aspects of support provided by employers, mentors, and colleagues. It should be noted that of the last 13 C.D. Nelson award winners, all but one is from a research focused university, and only two awardees are not from U15 institutions. This point is not meant to minimize gender, or minority equity, it is to point out another aspect to an un-level playing field. Using academic rank as a metric for assessing eligibility for the CD Nelson Award would help to even things out, the committee would also need to take a greater responsibility, as would nominators.

Proposed Solution:

- i) Make a conscious effort to nominate more women and individuals from underrepresented groups for various awards and recognitions. Thus, a grass roots level of consideration for colleagues from diverse backgrounds needs to occur. Friends and colleagues are the first step in the process.
- ii) Educate evaluation committees on conscious and unconscious biases and how they factor into decisions and evaluations of candidates.
- iii) Regardless of how we move forward, one problem we will face is that as a relatively small society, with a significant amount of interconnectedness, many of the awards become popularity contests. Faculty from larger institutions are more likely to have senior colleagues who are also members of the society, and thus possible nominators. These senior colleagues are also more likely to know the members on the awards committees. From experience in making nominations to society awards, there certainly seem to be links between who is on the award committee in a given year and who is recommended for the award. Needing 3 full members for a nomination can be burdensome for the original nominator, especially if the nomination is for a member from a smaller institution.

4. Concerns were raised about the composition of award committees with respect to diversity. The committee make up for each of the society's named awards include three individuals, who have volunteered or been recruited by the Nominating Committee. Equity within these committees varies greatly.

Proposed Solution:

- i) Remove regional biases within the compositions of each award committee by introducing quotas for committee composition. Currently, there appears to be a distinct eastern Canada bias, with 27 committee members from Ontario or Quebec, 1 from Atlantic Canada, and 5 from western Canada (Manitoba and west). This may limit equity and diversity in conferring awards, due to the familiarity of local nominees to committee members. Making new faculty members feel welcome as CSPB members may help us to recruit more diverse volunteers for these positions.
- ii) All award committees should be composed of members that reflect the diversity present in the society at large.

I. CSPB Implementation of recommendations - Major Society Awards:

1. Review and revise terms of reference for current society awards (Appendix I):
 - i. Consider definitions of excellence.
 - Rather than broadening the criteria of all awards, CSPB is also creating new awards to broaden the recognition of excellence by society members (see below).
 - ii. Revise eligibility time frame descriptions, taking into account personal/professional leaves.
 - Using the Task Force suggested terms such as *rank of Assistant or Associate Professor* could exclude individuals in non-university settings and so other eligibility terms are being proposed.
 - iii. Draft revisions have been prepared for approval by the July 2018 AGM (Proposed By-Law Amendments document).
2. Draft By-law has been drafted for The Carl Douglas Prize (and who is considered a postdoctoral fellow has been defined). (Robert Mullen, Appendix II)
3. Create new society awards to broaden the recognition of excellent achievements by society members:
 - i. New Mid-Career award to recognize outstanding research contributions and distinguished public service to the plant biology community has been drafted. We are proposing to name this award after long-time society member, Mary Spencer, to recognize these two facets of her exemplary career. (Daphne Goring, Appendix III)
 - ii. New Education award (Steven Chatfield to follow up)
 - iii. New Public service award (TBD)

Point 1 will be taken into account in defining the terms of reference for the new awards.

4. Encourage/make it easier for nominations for candidates from diverse backgrounds and full range of universities and research institutions.
 - i. Change nomination requirements: “must be supported by three Full Members” to one Full member, and submit a curriculum vitae instead of “a list of publications” which will allow for a broader assessment of the candidate’s contributions.
 - ii. Encourage the CSPB membership to increase participation in these nominations
 - iii. Review CSPB membership list to look for potential candidates.
 - iv. Regularly review the criteria for nominations to remove potential barriers.
5. As new members are being appointed to CSPB committees, work towards increased diversity and regional coverage. (refer to CSPB membership list).
6. Provide committees with resources for Unconscious Bias Training prior to reviewing award nomination files. E.g. *Canada Research Chairs* Unconscious bias training module: <http://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/programme/equity-equite/bias/module-eng.aspx> This will be added to the duties manual.

II. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - CSPB Executive

1. The executive committee is currently composed of 11 individuals of whom 4 are women. All positions are volunteer. Members can self-nominate or be recruited by the senior director. This can lead to biases as more vocal members may be more likely to self-nominate. With only one senior director, there is potential for inherent bias in recruitment. Because nominations are strongly based on who the senior director knows or meets, the greater the diversity of the Senior Director and the Nominating Committee, the greater the chance for less well known plant biologists to be identified by colleagues or by interactions at smaller meetings. Note that currently, as the chair of the nominating committee, the current senior director is one of three men serving on the committee.

Proposed Solution:

i) One recommendation is for two Senior Directors with a requirement for equity across the two positions. An additional suggestion is for an East/West split. These two individuals could be laddered in their two-year positions, with the longer serving member acting as the chair of the Nominating Committee.

III. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - Committee Membership

1. There are ten standing committees of the CSPB-SCBV. These include the committees charged with selecting winners for the prestigious society awards. Of the ten, four committees are chaired by women. Of note, the C.D. Nelson Award Committee is populated by 3 women, but the David J. Gifford Tree Biology Award Committee includes 3 men, as does the Gleb Krotkov Award Committee. As mentioned above, the more troubling committee make up is that of the Nominating Committee which also is composed of 3 men.

As mentioned above, because membership of the Nominating Committee drives membership of the other standing committees, this has the potential to be problematic. By adding a second Senior Director, the number of individuals on the Nominating Committee would be increased to four. This would more easily allow the achievement of an equitable split in member backgrounds and locations. This, in theory, should lead to greater diversity of individuals on committees and, in future, on the executive.

Proposed Solution:

i) A good practice would be to promote a policy of equity across all the committees. The Nominating Committee would be charged with leading this effort, and in conjunction with the President and Past-President should develop an appropriate policy to bring to the membership. The flip side of this challenge is that people who are willing to self-identify as belonging to an underrepresented group may be overtaxed with service on committees, so we would have to be considerate of their time.

II-III. CSPB Implementation of recommendations- CSPB Executive, Committee Membership:

1. Work towards increasing diversity in the CSPB Executive and Committee membership.
 - Rather than biases in the nomination process for CSPB executive positions, the actual reality is much closer to difficulties in finding willing volunteers to take on these positions. Nevertheless, for executive positions, the nomination process may seem very formal and a barrier, including individuals who would like to self-identify.
 - To counter any potential barriers and make the process more transparent:
 - i. Send informal emails to the CSPB membership to try and identify individuals who are willing to serve in executive positions or volunteer for a committee.
 - ii. Add additional voluntary questions on the membership renewal form to identify members who are interested in volunteering for the society.
 - iii. Conduct a survey of full members to get a better sense of the barriers to participation.
 - iv. For CSPB Executive positions, assist willing individuals with the nomination process.
2. Have the Eastern Regional Director and the Western Regional Director sit as *ex officio* members to advise the nomination committee (Proposed By-Law Amendments document).
3. For committee membership, work towards more diversity and regional coverage as new members are being nominated to the committees (refer to CSPB membership list).

IV. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - Equity Statement

1. It is challenging for one small committee to produce an inclusive equity statement that is reflective of the society, as a whole. Doing so in a rush to meet yearly deadlines would almost certainly lead to confusion and an outcome that does not reflect the needs of individuals who do not see themselves reflected in the general membership of the society. These are the same individuals who likely do not see themselves being adequately recognized by the society. Producing an equity statement that lauds lofty goals, but is pushed to a separate webpage does not seem to fit with the needs or wants of the society.
2. Lack of data on the composition of past and currently members with respect to diversity.
3. There is no code of conduct for society meetings.

Proposed Solution:

- i) To better reflect these needs and wants, one way forward is for the executive of the society to work on developing a Vision and Values Statement for the CSPB-SCBV. Placing a high value on equity and diversity, and their contributions to not only a strong, vibrant CSPB-SCBV, but a strong and vibrant plant biology research community in Canada would be a much better place to start. Placing this value of the society front and centre on our webpage would make a much stronger statement. The additional strength of developing a Vision and Values Statement that truly reflects the membership of the society, is that future changes to bylaws, policies, or codes of conduct can be made within the context of our common goals, rather than in one-off changes that may have unintended consequences. Working on such a statement over the next 14 months, with a goal of presenting it to the membership at the 2018 general meeting, would allow for meaningful consultation and feedback from members.
- ii) Devise a way to collect and analyze data on member diversity for the society. For gender, biaswatchneuro (<https://biaswatchneuro.com/base-rates/base-rate-calculation/>) has some interesting methods for calculating the percentage of women working in the field of neuroscience, which could be modified and applied here. They use this to calculate observed versus expected percentages of female organizers and speakers at conferences, but we could apply this to the society's committee/executive makeup. Other sources of diversity (age, culture, sexual orientation, etc) can be more difficult to track this way, and even gender calculations make some assumptions. What do we know about diversity in terms of the society's membership? Is there something we could be doing to recruit a broader diversity of members? In order to better track diversity, we could have a purely optional field in the membership form that allows individuals to self-identify with one or more underrepresented categories. This information – which we should stress is given on a purely voluntary basis - could be made available only to the executive, and used solely for the purpose of nominating people to committees. It would be worth reaching out to other Canadian scientific societies to ask how they are tracking these data and collecting this information while not violating privacy or equity legislation.
- iii) Develop a code of conduct for society meetings and processes for reporting and addressing violations of that code of conduct.

IV. CSPB Implementation of recommendations - Equity Statement:

1. Develop a Diversity and Equity statement for CSPB to post on website and add to by-laws.

- i. **Draft - CSPB/SCVP Statement of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion**

Adapted with permission from Plant Canada (<http://www.plantcanada.ca/>)

The Canadian Society of Plant Biologists/La Société Canadienne de Biologie Végétale (CSBP/SCPV) welcomes members from all backgrounds. The Society recognizes that its members have varied backgrounds and wishes to be respectful of all individuals. CSBP/SCPV recognizes, reflects and promotes equity and diversity within the organization. In promoting “equity and diversity”, the CSBP/SCPV will seek to address all attitudinal, systemic, and structural barriers. In addition, this statement adheres to the [Canadian Human Rights Act](#). Under the Canadian Human Rights Act, it is against the law to discriminate based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, marital status, family status, genetic characteristics, disability and conviction for an offence for which a pardon has been granted or in respect of which a record suspension has been ordered. The goal of our society is for substantive equality, not representational equality.

2. Recommendation to “collect and analyze data on member diversity for the society” for use in committee nominations.

- i. Add additional voluntary questions on the membership renewal form to collect this information.

3. Strike a committee to develop a code of conduct for CSPB/SCBV meetings and processes for reporting and addressing violations of that code of conduct. Below are a couple of examples to consider:

- Danielle Way was asked by her university to provide a code of conduct for ERM2018. This is what she put together: This example comes from the Canadian Astronomical Society conference booklet (2017).

CODE OF CONDUCT

The organizers are committed to making this meeting productive and enjoyable for everyone, regardless of gender, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, body size, race, nationality or religion. We will not tolerate harassment of participants in any form. Please follow these guidelines:

- Behave professionally. Harassment and sexist, racist, or exclusionary comments or jokes are not appropriate. Harassment includes sustained disruption of talks or other events, inappropriate physical contact, sexual attention or innuendo, deliberate intimidation, stalking, and photography or recording of an individual without consent. It also includes offensive comments related to gender, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, body size, race or religion.
- All communication should be appropriate for a professional audience including people of many different backgrounds. Sexual language and imagery is not appropriate.
- Be kind to others. Do not insult or put down other attendees.

Participants asked to stop any inappropriate behaviour are expected to comply immediately. Attendees violating these rules may be asked to leave the event at the sole discretion of the organizers without a refund of any charge.

Any participant who wishes to report a violation of this policy is asked to speak, in confidence, to any member of the (Name of organizers).

This code of conduct is based on the “London Code of Conduct”, as originally designed for the conference “Accurate Astrophysics. Correct Cosmology”, held in London in July 2015 (https://github.com/apontzen/london_cc/blob/master/codeofconduct.md). The London Code was adapted with permission by Andrew Pontzen and Hiranya Peiris from a document by Software Carpentry, which itself derives from original Creative Commons documents by PyCon and Geek Feminism. It is released under a CC-Zero licence for reuse.

PLANT BIOLOGY 2018 CODE OF CONDUCT

<https://plantbiology.aspb.org/wp-content/uploads/PDF/PLANT%20BIOLOGY%20ANNUAL%20MEETING%20CODE%20OF%20CONDUCT.pdf>

ASPB, CSPB/SCBV, and ISPR which organized the 2018 Plant Biology conference, are committed to ensuring that the meeting is a welcoming and inclusive space for sharing ideas and knowledge.

To this end, we will provide a safe and productive environment that promotes equal opportunity and treatment for all participants and that is free of harassment and discrimination. This code of conduct applies to all Plant Biology attendees, speakers, exhibitors, staff, contractors, volunteers, and guests; and it applies only to sponsored events at and during the Plant Biology 2018 meeting.

What is Harassment?

All forms of harassment, sexual or otherwise, are prohibited. Among the behaviors that will not be tolerated are the following:

- Speech that is not welcome or that is personally offensive, whether it is based on ethnicity, race, gender, age, body size, disability, veteran status, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or any other reason unrelated to scientific merit.
- Deliberate intimidation, stalking, following, sustained disruption of talks or other events, inappropriate physical contact, and unwelcome attention.

Behavior that is acceptable to one person may not be acceptable to another, so we ask that you use discretion to be sure that respect is communicated. Harassment intended in a joking manner nevertheless constitutes unacceptable behavior. Retaliation for reporting harassment is also a violation of this policy, as is reporting an incident in bad faith.

Reporting Harassment

Any harassment, whether experienced directly or witnessed, should be reported promptly to Director of Meetings and Events at jrosenberg@aspb.org or +1 301 792 5883. If the situation feels or seems imminently unsafe, please use a venue phone and ask for security immediately. All complaints will be taken seriously and responded to promptly. Confidentiality will be maintained to the extent that it does not compromise the rights of others.

What We Will Do

Once we have received a harassment complaint, we will promptly:

- Meet privately with the complainant to discuss the details of the situation they encountered
- Meet with the alleged offender
- Report findings to the ASPB CEO, CSPB/SCBV president, or ISPR president who will determine next steps
- Consult with the complainant before taking any action
- Seek legal counsel as appropriate

ASPB, CSPB/SCBV, and ISPR reserve the right to remove an individual from the meeting without warning or refund, prohibit attendance at future meetings, and notify the individual's employer.

For any questions about the policy, please contact one of the individuals listed below.

Crispin Taylor, CEO, American Society of Plant Biologists, ctaylor@aspb.org,

Geoff Wasteneys, President, Canadian Society of Plant Biologists/Société canadienne de biologie végétale, geoffrey.wasteneys@ubc.ca,

Willem Vermaas, President, ISPR, wim@asu.edu

V. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - Membership

1. Diversity and Equity: Members of the committee have the sense that the diversity of our student and post-doc members is greater than that of our full members.

Proposed Solution:

- i) Putting in place measures that make the CSPB interesting and important for individuals from underrepresented groups, so that they feel welcome and “a part of things”, and thus become long-term members.
- ii) Implementing a more formalized mentoring structure for junior scientists. In my recent discussions with new faculty members from visible minorities, it became apparent that they weren’t fully aware of the benefits of networking etc. that the CSPB offers. This is doubly true for government scientists. So I think that more one-on-one mentoring may be required to reach some of these new faculty members, and make sure that they feel welcome and needed in the CSPB. This may help us grow proportions of underrepresented groups in the CSPB. Along these lines, I think that providing mentoring through the CSPB is one way to increase the odds of CSPB grad students going on to postdocs, postdocs landing faculty positions, and new faculty members doing well in their appointments. Sometimes people get all the mentoring that they need within their lab or institution, but oftentimes an external mentor can be extremely valuable. This is especially true for individuals from underrepresented groups, who can learn so much more from someone who shares some of their background and perspective. I have mentored several postdocs and junior faculty members informally through CSPB connections, and so I would like to see some sort of formal mentoring structure put in place within the CSPB.
- iii) Providing resources that help all junior members of the CSPB, but especially those from underrepresented groups, succeed at attaining the next career stage. This could include workshops at meetings and/or materials on the CSPB website in the forms of blog posts or website stories.

2. Definition of Post-Doctoral Researcher with the Society: The current definition of what a post-doc is within the society is vague.

Proposed Solution:

- i) It might be useful to refer to these persons as early career researchers or early career trainees. For example, "Early career trainee membership is open to researchers who have been granted a PhD and who are conducting research related to plant biology, but who have not yet begun an independent position (e.g. Assistant Professor or Group Leader)."
- ii) This designation needs to respect the definition of the person’s home institution, and the position to which the person has been hired. An individual should need to provide some sort of paperwork from their institution to confirm their postdoc status, as is the case with ASPB. At some level, it might not seem fair that some people may be considered postdocs for longer than others, but ultimately the position in which one has been hired should determine one’s status. Taking this further, research associates should not be considered postdocs. At the core of the issue is that postdocs are considered trainees by NSERC and other agencies, while research associates are not.
- iii) Particular awards, like the Carl Douglas Award, can be defined using this: "nominees must be early career trainees within X years since being awarded their PhD." This would effectively limit the award to postdocs, without having to deal with the issues of what people are called in their contracts (which can vary greatly between institutions, provinces, and countries). I believe the same eligibility exemptions we are proposing to apply to the C.D. Nelson Award (to extend the time past 10 years from gaining an independent position) should be applied to the Carl Douglas Award (to extend the time past X years from being granted a PhD).

V. CSPB Implementation of recommendations - Membership:

1. Eastern and Western Regional Directors conduct membership drives, including underrepresented groups.
2. Set up a system to recruit CSPB volunteers to act as mentors for junior scientists.
3. “Provide resources that help all junior members of the CSPB, but especially those from underrepresented groups, succeed at attaining the next career stage. This could include workshops at meetings and/or materials on the CSPB website in the forms of blog posts or website stories.”
 - Various career-related workshops are currently run at the CSPB annual meetings
 - The CSPB Executive is looking for additional suggestions on how to address this recommendation, particularly for underrepresented groups.
4. Provide clear criteria on who is considered a postdoctoral fellow in CSPB.
 - This has been added to the By-law amendment for the George H. Duff Student and Post-Doctoral Fellow Travel Bursaries and the proposed By-law for The Carl Douglas Prize.

VI. Diversity & Equity Task Force recommendations - CSPB Meetings:

1. *Student/Post-Doc Travel Awards: The current process for awarding student and post-doctoral travel awards is not particularly clear. It is based primarily on the applicant's travel distance to the meeting.*

CDETFR -Proposed Solution:

i) *A clear rubric or formula should be devised for the awarding of travel awards using a combination of need and travel distance. This may mean that the application form must be revised.*

ii) *Explore the idea of creating diversity travel awards that students or post-docs specifically can apply to. Several other societies have travel awards that are targeted towards under-represented members.*

iii) *Two separate pots of money should be set aside for student vs. post-doctoral travel awards funds. As post-docs often have fewer financial supports available to them, we suggest increasing the value of travel awards given to post-docs.*

2. *Presentation Awards: Current processes appear to occur on an ad-hoc basis and are frustrating for the judges and candidates. Building off comments supplied by Daphne Goring, Eastern Regional Director, Mark Belmonte, Western Regional Director, and Geoff Wasteneys, Vice President, judging is both challenging and has inherent subjectiveness. We often have concurrent sessions, with competing students speaking at the same time. With a limited number of judges available, very little overlap exists between talks in different session, or across days. Daphne noted, and I have also observed this as a judge, judges are able to identify the best talks and posters amongst those they viewed. However, comparing across sessions or between judging groups becomes much more challenging. Some judges have different key points they look for, but are often open to persuasion by others.*

CDETFR -Proposed Solution:

i) *A great innovation presented by Geoff Wasteneys at the 2016 Annual Meeting at Queen's University was the use of an online spreadsheet to allow judges to select the talks they would view, and post their rubric-aligned evaluations. This could allow for broader coverage of talks, judges' interests being more aligned with the topics being presented, and allows individual judges and the chief organizer to easily compare judging scores. This system seems like it has great potential to even out biases (conscious or unconscious) of particular judges.*

ii) *The Canadian Society of Zoologists (Allison is a member) requires students who want to be considered in each competition to submit their talk abstract (for oral presentations) or their poster (as a PDF) 2-4 weeks prior to the meeting. A committee then evaluates all submissions prior to the meeting and selects the top 3-5 talks and posters to evaluate in person at the meeting. This significantly cuts down the amount of work by committee members and allows all evaluators to see all of the talks and posters in each competition making it easier to reach consensus on a winner.*

3. *Particular meeting logistics (e.g. child-care, disability accommodations, and dietary accommodations) were identified by several members as cause for concern.*

Proposed Solution:

i) *Meeting planning guides should be updated to reflect that the above considerations should be addressed by the local organizing committee for any CSPB meetings held in the future.*

VI. CSPB Implementation of recommendations - CSPB Meetings:

1. Clarify terms of reference George H. Duff Student and Post-Doctoral Fellow Travel Bursaries (By-Law 23). Consider creating “diversity travel” bursaries, and consider having two separate pots of funding for student vs. post-doctoral travel bursaries
 - Please note that these are not awards, but bursaries to “assist students and post-doctoral fellows with travel costs associated with attending the annual scientific meeting”.
 - All students/post-doctoral fellows who apply receive partial travel funding. The travel bursaries are awarded based on distance, but the actual amount funded depends on the number of applicants, along with the total sum of money that has been set aside to finance the bursaries.
 - We do have a very diverse group of students and postdoctoral fellows attending our meetings. The CSPB executive felt that “diversity travel” bursaries were not needed at this time but will continue to monitor this.
- i. The terms of reference and the definition of a Post-Doctoral Fellow has been updated (Proposed By-Law Amendments document).
- ii. Students and postdoctoral fellows will be polled to get a sense of potential financial barriers to attending CSPB meetings.
2. Student presentation awards: Provide judging rubrics to students in advance of the meeting, continue to build an equitable judging system, pre-select student presentations for judging.
 - i. Annual Meeting - By-Law 20 - The Presidents' Awards
 - ii. Regional Meetings - By-Law 21 - The Directors' (ERM) and Waygood (WRM) Awards
 - The CSPB executive felt that all interested students should be given a fair opportunity to compete and did not favour the pre-selection approach used by the Canadian Society of Zoologists.
 - i. Annual meetings (Vice-President): Continue to develop the system of using rubrics and the online spreadsheet for student presentation award judging developed by Geoff Wasteneys.
 - ii.a. Eastern Regional Meeting (Eastern Regional Director): Continue to use rubrics and develop a system that works well in this one-day meeting. The one-day schedule is too tight to have sufficient time to use the annual meeting online spreadsheet system. At the last ERM (Daphne Goring), the oral judging assignments were made so that the two morning judges for each concurrent section judged with a different judge in the afternoon. Rather than relying on actual scores, each judge provided their first and second rankings for the day, and there was excellent consensus in selecting the winner and the honorable mentions. Similarly, for the poster judging, different combinations of judges were assigned to each poster for better cross-evaluation.
 - ii.b. Western Regional Meeting (Western Regional Director): Depending on the length of the meeting, either of the above approaches can be adopted.
3. Meeting logistics: Update CSPB/SCBV Meeting Planning Guide
 - i. The CSPB/SCBV Meeting Planning Guide will be updated to include statements on disability accommodations and dietary accommodations.
 - Child-care is offered at the joint ASPB-CSPB meetings (Plant Biology meetings) as ASPB has an endowment fund which allows the society to offer subsidized child care. At Plant Biology 2018, the rate is \$10.00/hour/child, and registered attendees are expected to provide in advance the dates and times that care is required.
 - Currently, it would be prohibitive for CSBP to offer affordable child-care at other CSPB annual meetings.

Appendix I: Current CSPB society awards and bursaries:

- By-Law 16 - The Society Medal (established in 1967)
- By-Law 17 - The C.D. Nelson Award (established 1977)
- By-Law 18 - The David J. Gifford Award in Tree Biology (established in 1988)
- By-Law 19 - The Gleb Krotkov Award (established in 1990)
- By-Law 20 - The Presidents' Awards (established in 1986)
- By-Law 21 - The Directors' and Waygood Awards (established in 1997, 1998)
- By-Law 22 - Ann Oaks Scholarship and Fund (established in 2008)
- By-Law 23 - George H. Duff Student and Post-Doctoral Fellow Travel Bursaries (established in 1992)
- By-Law 24 - Ragai Ibrahim Award for Best Student Paper (established in 2006)

Recipients of The Society Medal

1970	Arthur C. Neish	NRCC Halifax NS
1971	Michael Shaw	University of Saskatchewan Saskatoon SK
1972	David Siminovitch	Agriculture Canada Ottawa ON
1973	G.H. Neil Towers	University of British Columbia Vancouver BC
1976	Oluf L. Gamborg	NRCC Saskatoon Saskatchewan SK
1979	R.G.S. (Tony) Bidwell	Queen's University Kingston ON
1981	David T. Canvin	Queen's University Kingston ON
1983	Jack Dainty	University of Toronto Toronto ON
1985	Gordon MacLachlan	McGill University Montreal QC
1987	Paul R. Gorham	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
1988	Ann Oaks	McMaster University Hamilton ON
1989	Richard P. Pharis	University of Calgary Calgary AB
1990	Mary S. Spencer	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
1992	J. Derek Bewley	University of Guelph Guelph ON
1995	John E. Thompson	University of Waterloo Waterloo ON
1996	Robert Hill	University of Manitoba Winnipeg MB
1998	Edwin A. Cossins	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
2001	John King	University of Saskatchewan Saskatoon SK
2004	Ragai Ibrahim	Concordia University Montreal QC
2007	Anthony D M Glass	University of British Columbia Vancouver BC
2009	Brian E. Ellis	University of British Columbia Vancouver BC
2010	Norman P.A. Hüner	University of Western Ontario London ON
2011	Fathey Sarhan	Université du Québec à Montréal QC
2013	Beverly Green	University of British Columbia Vancouver BC
2015	Barry Shelp	University of Guelph Guelph ON

Recipients of the C.D. Nelson award

1978	J. Derek Bewley	University of Calgary Calgary AB
1979	Melvin T. Tyree	University of Toronto ON
1982	John D. Mahon	NRC-Plant Biotech Institute Saskatoon SK
1984	Desh Pal Verma	McGill University Montreal QC
1987	Norman P. Huner	University of Western Ontario London ON
1988	Bryan D. McKersie	University of Guelph Guelph ON
1989	David H. Turpin	Queen's University Kingston ON
1990	David B. Layzell	Queen's University Kingston ON
1991	Vincenzo De Luca	Université de Montréal Montréal QC
1992	Stewart B. Rood	University of Lethbridge Lethbridge AB
1993	William C. Plaxton	Queen's University Kingston ON
1995	Gregory J. Taylor	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
1996	Bruce M. Greenberg	University of Waterloo Waterloo ON
1998	J. Kevin Vessey	University of Manitoba Winnipeg MB
2000	Luc Varin	Concordia University Montreal QC
2001	Daphne R. Goring	University of Toronto Toronto ON
2003	Peter J. Facchini	University of Calgary Calgary AB
2004	Daniel P. Matton	Université de Montréal Montréal QC
2006	Gregory B.G. Moorhead	University of Calgary Calgary AB
2007	Robert T. Mullen	University of Guelph Guelph ON
2008	Jörg Bohlmann	University of British Columbia Vancouver BC
2010	Wayne Snedden	Queen's University Kingston ON
2011	Charles Després	Brock University St. Catherines ON
2012	Michael Deyholos	University of British Columbia Kelowna BC
2013	Uwe Hacke	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
2014	Darrell Desveaux	University of Toronto Toronto ON
2015	Janice Cooke	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
2016	Sophia Stone	Dalhousie University Halifax NS
2017	Marcus Samuel	University of Calgary Calgary AB

Recipients of the David J Gifford Award in Tree Biology

1988	Richard P. Pharis	University of Calgary Calgary AB
1991	Erwin B. Dumbroff	University of Waterloo Waterloo ON
1992	C. H. Anthony Little	Canadian Forest Service Fredericton NB
1999	David J. Gifford	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
2004	Stewart Rood	University of Lethbridge Lethbridge AB
2007	Melvin T. Tyree	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
2010	Janusz Zwiazek	University of Alberta Edmonton AB
2012	Robert Guy	University of British Columbia Vancouver BC
2014	Shawn Mansfield	University of British Columbia Vancouver BC
2016	Carl Douglas	University of British Columbia Vancouver BC
2017	Uwe Hacke	University of Alberta Edmonton AB

Recipients of the Gleb Krotkov Award

1990	Dorothy Forward	University of Toronto ON
1992	Donald C. Mortimer	National Research Council Ottawa ON
1994	David S. Fensom	Mount Allison University Sackville NS
1997	W. Raymond Cummins	University of Toronto Mississauga ON
1999	Iain A.P. Taylor	University of British Columbia Vancouver
2001	Carol Peterson	University of Waterloo Waterloo Ontario
2007	J. Derek Bewley	University of Guelph Guelph ON
2010	Hargurdeep "Deep" Saini	University of Waterloo Waterloo Ontario
2012	Harold Weger	University of Regina Regina SK
2013	Connie Nozzolillo	University of Ottawa Ottawa ON

Appendix II: Draft By-Law for The Carl Douglas Prize**By-Law XX - The Carl Douglas Prize**

- a) The Society shall award the Carl Douglas Prize in Plant Biology.
- b) The Prize shall be awarded for outstanding contributions to plant biology by a postdoctoral fellow, based on initiative and originality of the research, productivity of the individual, and leadership during their postdoctoral fellowship. A postdoctoral fellow is an individual who has completed their PhD and is engaged in full-time research under the supervision of a mentor.
- c) Applicants shall have obtained their PhD no more than 4 years (i.e., 48 months) prior to the date of the submission of the application, although career breaks will be taken into account when applicants are nearing the end of this eligibility period (e.g. maternity or parental leave, caregiver's responsibilities, illness, etc.). Applicants need not be Canadian citizens or engaged in a research program in Canada at the time of the nomination or during their postdoctoral fellowship, but must be a current member of the Society and have previously participated as a member of the Society. Applicants can apply more than once, but cannot be a previous recipient of the Prize.
- d) The Prize shall be awarded by decision of the Board of Directors on the recommendation of the Carl Douglas Prize Committee.
- e) The members of the Carl Douglas Prize Committee shall be elected at the annual meeting of members, and shall consist of three Full Members rotated in such a manner as to promote equity and diversity among Members, and that one new member is appointed annually. The longest serving member of the committee becomes the Chair for one year. Membership in the Committee is for three years.
- f) The deadline for applications for the Prize and the subsequent announcement of the recipient of the Prize shall be prior to the annual scientific conference of the Society.
- g) The Prize includes both a \$500 cash award and a reimbursement of travel expenses up to \$500 to attend and present at the annual scientific conference of the Society in the same year as the announcement of the Prize; although the value of the Prize can be subject to change based on determinations by the Board of Directors.
- h) For consideration for the Prize, applicants should submit: i) a current curriculum vitae; ii) a maximum 2-page personal statement describing their most outstanding contributions to research and productivity during their postdoctoral fellowship, including ongoing research, and evidence of initiative and originality of their research and their leadership in research and/or in the greater plant biology community; and iii) one letter of support, ideally from the applicant's postdoctoral advisor, past or present. Applications must be submitted to the Chair of the Carl Douglas Prize Committee prior to the posted deadline.
- i) All application documents shall remain confidential to the Committee and shall be destroyed after each competition.

Appendix II: Draft By-Law for The Mary E. Spencer Award**By-Law XX - The Mary E. Spencer Award**

- a) The Society shall award The Mary E. Spencer Award in Plant Biology.
- b) The Award shall be given for outstanding research in the field of plant biology and active public service engagement in the plant biology community by a mid-career researcher. Nominees must be a current member of the Society, engaged in a research program in Canada at the time of the nomination, and shall have been in an independent, full-time research position for more than 15 years. The award includes a cash prize; the value of the prize is determined by the Board of Directors.
- c) The Award shall be awarded by decision of the Board of Directors on the recommendation of The Mary E. Spencer Award Committee.
- d) The members of The Mary E. Spencer Award Committee shall be elected at the annual meeting of members, and shall consist of three Full Members rotated in such a manner that one new member is appointed annually. The longest serving member of the committee becomes the Chair for one year. Membership in the Committee is for three years.
- e) The Mary E. Spencer Award shall normally be awarded with a maximum frequency of once in two years. The Award shall be presented at the annual scientific conference of the Society.
- f) The recipient of The Mary E. Spencer Award shall be invited to address the members at the annual scientific conference following the one at which the award is made.
- g) A nomination for the Award must be supported by one Full Member and shall be documented with a curriculum vitae and a two-page summary outlining research and public service contributions. The nomination is to be submitted to the Chair of The Mary E. Spencer Award Committee at least ninety days before the annual meeting of members. Nominations shall stand for three years, but may be revised annually and shall be renewable.
- h) Nominations and supporting documents shall remain confidential to the Committee. After the three-year nomination period, or after the awarding of The Mary E. Spencer Award to a nominee, the nominee's "nomination file" shall be destroyed unless the nomination is renewed.