

**Editors' Association of Canada**  
**Association canadienne des réviseurs**

---

**National Executive Council**  
**Meeting Minutes**



**EDITORS**  
**RÉVISEURS**  
**CANADA**

**February 9, 2025**

**Zoom**

# Contents

1.	Call to Order.....	3
2.	Land Acknowledgement .....	3
3.	Approval of Agenda .....	3
4.	Review of Outstanding Action Items from Previous Meetings .....	3
5.	Budget Update.....	5
6.	Update on Ongoing Projects.....	5
a)	Publishing committee .....	5
b)	Francophone updates.....	6
c)	Member services/Volunteer management committees .....	6
d)	Certification.....	7
e)	Standards committee.....	7
f)	Academic Editing SIG .....	7
g)	Webinars/Training and development committee.....	7
h)	Career builder committee.....	8
i)	Student relations committee.....	8
j)	Marketing and communications committee .....	8
k)	Mentorship committee.....	9
l)	Executive director .....	9
7.	Break (10 minutes) .....	10
8.	Branches and Twigs .....	10
9.	Strategic Planning.....	10
10.	Nomination procedures for awards .....	11
11.	Sponsoring ACES conference and US relations.....	19
12.	Date of AGM .....	20

13. Next Meeting March 9, 2025, 1:00-4:00 p.m. (ET)..... 20

14. Adjournment..... 20

Appendix A – Meeting Agenda..... 21

Appendix B – Action Items ..... 23

Appendix C – Online Motions..... 33

**PRESENT:**

**NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL (NEC)**

Kaitlin Littlechild	President
Alex Benarzi	Vice-President
Maria Frank	Past President
Tara Avery	Treasurer
Heather Buzila	Secretary
Ellen Keeble	Director, Branches and Twigs
Mina Holie	Director, Marketing and Communications
Suzanne Aubin	Director, Member Recruitment and Retention
Arija Berzitis	Director, Professional Standards
Elizabeth Horner	Director, Publications
Błażej Szpakowicz	Director, Training and Development

**OTHERS**

Natasha Bood	Executive Director
--------------	--------------------

**1. Call to Order**

Kaitlin called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. EDT.

**2. Land Acknowledgement**

Kaitlin read the land acknowledgement.

**3. Approval of Agenda**

MOVED BY Maria Frank

SECONDED BY Alex Benarzi

that the NEC approves the agenda.

Carried

**4. Review of Outstanding Action Items from Previous Meetings**

#1: Directors to add notes to January meeting minutes: There was a technical glitch and the January meeting didn't record. All directors are asked to add notes to the draft meeting minutes; however, some directors haven't added their notes yet. Heather will contact those who still need to add notes.

#2: VolunteerConnect: No update.

#3: Member awareness enhancement: This is to update the governance website pages with the roles of each NEC director and committee. The blog posts that Suzanne and

Heather worked on last year were posted on the French blog as the first posts. Suzanne has also updated the hotline information on the website after there was some confusion about it in the members' only Facebook page. Suzanne has contacted Ellen to ask the branches and twigs if they do use hotlines and if so to get the correct contact information from them.

Heather asks if we can use existing blog posts and shorten them for the NEC pages.

Alex asks about the committee page on the website—right now it just has information about the chairs. Information from the Overview of National Committees and Positions document can be used to add information to this page.

#4: Volunteer access management: Ellen talked to Badou Bousso and he suggested using a service like NetID, which is a service to authenticate a user using one ID and password across all services they need. Some people are having trouble accessing the services on the weekends, when staff are not available to provide access codes, and chairs requested more control over access. Ellen has started to research what other companies supply services like NetID, and she has consulted Michelle Ou and Badou. We'd need to look into the budget for a service like this.

Natasha says Michelle is trying to get more information about what exactly people couldn't access on the weekend. Natasha says that we need to educate people on how to use Google and make sure they are using the right account and are connected to the Google Drive. Natasha would be hesitant to put a lot of effort into finding a service like NetID.

Alex says the majority of what we do is on Google and that is free.

Ellen had a twig reach out to ask if they could buy Google Workspace, and Ellen let them know they already have those services. Ellen is going to make sure that branches and twigs have access to documents that explain how to use Google services.

#5: Reduced certification exam fees: We discussed this at the last meeting and it didn't seem like the NEC was in favour. Arija brought it back to the certification committee and let them know that it likely wouldn't be going forward.

#6: Credential maintenance points for volunteers: Arija discussed this with the certification committee last week. Arija will reach out to Alex to discuss how best to readjust the points system so that more credits can go to volunteers.

#7: Committee outreach: Alex says committees met at the end of January and it went well. Most committee chairs were present. People shared the projects that they were working on and discussed how to combine efforts to work on parallel projects. The group will be meeting once a month at the end of the month to continue these discussions.

#11: 2025 awards presentation: This is ongoing.

#17: Quebec insurance task force: Suzanne says the task force has been created with two members. No other updates.

#18: Certification exams and ELAP for Francophones: No update.

#19: Content management workflow: This refers to redesigning the governance website. Maria suggested this in November. Mina emailed directors for feedback in January but hasn't gotten any feedback yet.

#20: Revising Editing Canadian English: No update.

## **5. Budget Update**

Tara says she doesn't have an update.

Natasha says it is end-of-year wrap-up time. Natasha says the auditors reached out to schedule the audit for the week of April 21, which is on schedule for the AGM. It's also the time of year when the office sends out T4s, T4As, and 2024 royalties for webinars

## **6. Update on Ongoing Projects**

Include a brief overview of what your committee is currently working on, as well as any other info you'd like to discuss.

### **a) Publishing committee**

Elizabeth says the committee put together a name change recommendation for ELAP. She has a document detailing the recommendation. The document asks should we change "Edit Like a Pro" to "Professional Editorial Training"? Reasoning: the title is simple and clear so people know immediately what they are purchasing; the name aligns with PES, which creates stronger brand alignment; and the title is flexible to allow it to reach to other types of training materials. The committee thinks Editors Canada should provide more training materials, so it is important that the title is flexible.

Heather suggests looking back at past meeting minutes to see why it was originally named "Edit Like a Pro" to see if there's anything there to contradict a name change.

El will send the committee's document to the NEC for review.

Alex asks when Edit Like a Pro was first published; Heather says that it was back in 2019 when the first volume was published.

Heather asks what the cost of changing the names would be. Kaitlin says it would be good to include this information in the proposal because the names are registered, so

there would be a cost if we wanted to change the name of past volumes. Alex suggests only changing the name going forward.

Some volunteers that were writing exercises for ELAP copy editing have said no to writing more exercises because of the work volume. The committee will be reaching out to more volunteers. There's the potential that ELAP copy editing may need to be cut down to 6 or 7 exercises instead of 8 exercises. Elizabeth is wondering how important it is to push for 8 exercises. Structural editing has 6 exercises, and proofreading has 7 or 8 exercises.

Kaitlin says it is a massive undertaking for volunteers, equivalent to full-time work. It is difficult to get volunteers on board and to stay on board.

Ellen asks if the committee only reaches out to those people who are certified. Kaitlin says the exercises are written by certified editors and then tested by any editors.

Arija wonders if there are better ways of distributing the workload. Elizabeth isn't sure.

Kaitlin says that volunteers sign up but then it takes a really long time and then volunteers drop out.

Alex asks if there's been any thought about collaborating with university editing programs. Heather says that universities ask us for permission to use ELAP in their courses so that wouldn't work.

Elizabeth says the committee will continue to reach out to volunteers and will keep the NEC updated.

## **b) Francophone updates**

Suzanne says she has nothing to update. She is trying to get the two Francophone advisers involved with as many things as possible. First she wants to introduce them to the NEC. But it is proving to be difficult. She fears we are not using the advisers at all. She wonders if anyone has reached out to the advisers besides her. She is worried that we are not using the advisors when we have two volunteers who are willing to help.

Kaitlin says maybe the advisers could reach out with what they are willing to help with or what type of work they would like to do. She will invite the advisors to the next NEC meeting.

## **c) Member services/Volunteer management committees**

Volunteer management: Suzanne has sent out 10 emails to those who have shown interest in volunteering—one is a Francophone. Suzanne has followed up with all the people she has emailed.

MOVED BY Alex Benarzi  
SECONDED BY Suzanne Aubin

that Maylon Gardner be given a voice at the meeting.

Carried

Member services: Maylon says they are working on three projects: first is the welcome kit so it is more useful for members and using it is more promotional and very member focussed. There's a disconnect right now between what is in the member kit and what is being shown. The committee is making sure that people who have been away from Editors Canada and return get a welcome back email that includes updates; they are also attempting to create a Discord for Editors Canada members, which would provide more value to membership—there would be channels for a water cooler situation and other channels for more professional resources to share ideas and documents, as well as social events.

#### **d) Certification**

Arija says that exams from last November will be marked by four volunteers. For next year, the committee proposes to have a question for part A and two piloters per exam, and then have all four pilots running at the same time to save time. A volunteer offered to write part B on her own. They are still recruiting members for the committee.

#### **e) Standards committee**

Arija says the committee is meeting monthly to finish up trailing issues like coming up with a glossary to add to PES as a supplement. One committee member offered to write a blog post on how AI can be used in editing.

#### **f) Academic Editing SIG**

Arija says Congress is taking place in Toronto in May/June. Editors Canada has a half-price exhibit table to run the entire 8 days because the conference last year was cancelled. The committee is planning to attend the Toronto branch meeting to see if anyone is willing to help set up or staff the table. The SIG has a blog post that they are going to publish from a writer who attended a history conference. Letitia Henville will be attending the Congress to help out. Emily Lam is the group chair for the time being.

Ellen asks if people who are not academic editors can staff the table. Arija says anybody can help get the word out about Editors Canada.

#### **g) Webinars/Training and development committee**

Błażej says there aren't really any updates. The committee has reached out to the certification chair to discuss the possibility of holding free certification webinars for members to tie in with the upcoming exams; Saleh said he would get back to the



committee by April and let them know if he can find presenters. Webinars are running as normal right now.

#### **h) Career builder committee**

Alex asks Maria if she informed the committee chair about the switch from Maria to Alex as director. Maria says she will check to make sure the email was clear about it.

The committee's main focus is the career builder hub. They reached out through Michelle to get a quote from our web developer. There is some confusion about the quote not reflecting what needs to be done. The committee needs clarification.

#### **i) Student relations committee**

Maria sent out a presentation to the NEC for review and comment. The committee wants to know if there are any objections to them recording it and presenting it as a livestream.

Alex asks if this is intended for editing-specific programs or broader programs. Maria says the committee didn't specify; possibly they just want to have a presentation ready to go.

Suzanne asks if there is a French presentation. Maria is not sure and will need to ask the committee. Suzanne suggests contacting the Quebec branch because that might be a source of information. Ellen says that Sylvie Collin would be a good contact. They have previously discussed paper marketing materials, and Sylvie indicated when Editors Quebec went into universities to present the materials weren't necessary.

#### **j) Marketing and communications committee**

Mina says the French language blog's first post was on January 24. Gaby has found a proofreader, Nancy Foran is providing information on the style guide in French, and Laura Bontje has provided an orientation to the French proofreader.

Mina says work on the French Meet an Editor project has resumed. The project lead has started working with Sara. The proposal and timeline are being discussed, as well as what resources are needed.

Suzanne says she was interviewed for Meet an Editor in French but it hasn't been posted yet. Is there a backlog? The committee is trying to find a video editor but needs to use internal staff, and they've just started this project again so it is not ready for publication.

Mina says for the social media migration plan that we may need a new national position as a moderator for Bluesky, similar to the Facebook group moderator.

Mina: about merging the PES account on X with the main Editors Canada account. The committee is wondering which months of the year the PES account gets more active so they can avoid merging the two accounts at that time. Mina wonders if we have any activity trends for the PES account and if anyone is monitoring it.

Alex suggests that leaving X altogether may be a better plan because X is basically a state-run platform right now in his opinion.

Mina says the committee is trying to get information from Michelle about when to merge the two X accounts. She says about Bluesky that Michelle has suggested informing the members that the switch will happen after the AGM. There will be a period of about 8 to 12 weeks when we will have both X and Bluesky accounts. Michelle is considering deactivating the Editors Canada X account by the end of 2025.

Heather asks about needing a moderator for Bluesky—what happens now on X? Is there a moderator or does Michelle just keep track of posts? Mina says there was a volunteer moderating the PES X account, but the volunteer stepped down last year. Michelle checks the PES account but nobody monitors it.

Ellen wonders if we can take the content we are posting on X and post it on Bluesky instead. Mina says that there first needs to be someone to monitor the account, and if we need a new national position for it that we'd need to create a mandate first.

Alex says that right now there is no one monitoring X, so why do we need a volunteer to monitor Bluesky? Natasha says that Michelle has been monitoring X. She says that monitoring Bluesky could be assigned to staff and we wouldn't need a volunteer to monitor it. Ellen suggests that for a soft launch of Bluesky we could just posting the content we are already posting on X, which Michelle could monitor. From an anecdotal standpoint, Ellen is starting to see more people she used to follow from the editing community on X moving over to Bluesky, so there's an opportunity to reach that audience again and grow more.

Kaitlin says creating a presence on Bluesky could get more lapsed members/returning members engaged. Facebook already has moderators.

Natasha says that Michelle Ou can monitor posts on Bluesky like she does on X and she monitors all the national accounts; the Facebook members' only group is the only group that has moderators. Kaitlin wonders if Michelle will have the time to add monitoring Bluesky. Natasha will ask Michelle, but she thinks it's fairly easy to monitor the accounts.

Ellen says Editors Canada already has a Bluesky account.

## **k) Mentorship committee**

Suzanne says that Alex found a volunteer who is interested in chairing the committee. This person has been in contact with Sara.

## **l) Executive director**

Natasha says the work and culture grant for a knowledge management consultant was declined. Natasha asked for feedback on why, and work and culture says they got 80% more applications than usual. We still have an application in to the Canada book fund.

Natasha says the dictionary group has formed their own organization. The editorial committee is 80% done the letter Q. Their first board meeting is next week, and we are allowed to have Editors Canada representation on their board. Natasha is joining the board, and she says if anyone else wants to join to reach out to her. The dictionary group received an Access Copyright grant to get funding for honorariums; the grant ends at the end of May. Technically the grant is under Editors Canada and needs to be transferred to the dictionary group.

## **7. Break (10 minutes)**

## **8. Branches and Twigs**

Ellen is gathering training for Google Groups because it seems to be an underused tool. Lots of training exists already from Google, so it just needs to be gathered and distributed.

Ellen connected with Editors Manitoba, whose chair hasn't been able to attend meetings so far this year. She received an update that some Editors Manitoba members will be attending the book launch of the second edition of *Elements of Indigenous Style*. The launch is streamable on the publisher's YouTube channel; this information has been shared with other branches and twigs.

Heather asks about Editors Edmonton and if it is going to be disbanded due to lack of a chair over the last few years. Ellen says it is in a holding pattern because the Calgary twig originally thought that if Editors Edmonton and Calgary had to merge, they would have to become a branch, but that isn't true. But Editors Calgary is still overseeing Editors Edmonton. Calls were put out to get an Edmonton chair, but no one responded. It needs to be decided sooner rather than later if the two twigs are going to merge.

## **9. Strategic Planning**

Kaitlin says the NEC has received the draft strategic plan to review and comment on, and then it goes back to the consultant and they'll put together the next version. Talks are in the works about adding one final member consultation. We are hoping to have it ready for voting at the AGM.

Natasha thanks people for adding their comments to the draft. The consultant has the draft and is working on it for the NEC's and staff's final meeting with the consultant next week. Natasha says after the meeting that we'll need a volunteer to copy edit the draft and then it will be translated into French. The consultant will then do the design of the strategic plan so it is ready to be sent to members. Once the design process is done, that's when the consultant has completed their work for us. Consulting members might just be sending out the draft along with the link to a Google form for members to leave feedback.

## 10. Nomination procedures for awards

MOVED BY Heather Buzila

SECONDED BY Maria Frank

that we make the vote about revising the Awards and Scholarship Procedures a roll-call vote. I believe that making the revisions to the procedures as proposed will negatively affect the reputation of the President's Awards and that many members won't agree with the change. Therefore, I believe it's important for the minutes to reflect how each person voted.

Carried

Kaitlin says earlier this week that she sent out two revisions to the Awards and Scholarships procedures—one revised by Heather and one revised by Ellen. These will be the basis for this discussion.

Alex asks Heather why she believes that having no supporters for President's Awards will not be favourable to the members. Heather says she believes that removing the supporters from the nominations makes the award less important. She says as she detailed in an earlier email, the rest of the awards all require at least one supporter for the nominations—this could be a note from a professor or just supporters for the nomination. Heather believes that the President's Awards should follow the same lines. She believes that removing all supporters from the President's Awards will make the awards less valuable and less meaningful to the people it is awarded to. She thinks we need to move cautiously because we don't know why the people who created the President's Awards required three supporters for each nomination. Heather says she talked to people about why three supporters were required, but the people she talked to didn't know, so she doesn't know where to look for more information about this.

Heather says that the only difference between her revision to the procedures and Ellen's revisions is that Heather would like to keep one supporter to the nomination and Ellen would like to have no supporters required. Otherwise, Heather agrees with the rest of Ellen's revisions to the procedures. She isn't against removing some supporters but would like a trial run of having one supporter before we move to having no supporters.

Alex says he is hesitant to not change things "because we don't know why they were done a certain way in the past" as a reason. He says it's fair to ask what the current needs are. Alex says we are in a different situation now than we were pre-COVID with volunteers and our current volunteers are doing a lot more work than they used to. He says sometimes there are only very few people on a committee and that they may be the only ones who know the volume of work they are doing, so it would be tough to find three supporters to a nomination. He says instead of relying on the procedures from the past and why they were created that we need to look at what the present needs are. He thinks that the importance of recognizing volunteers supersedes any lack of prestige there may be from changing the nomination procedures because currently we won't have a lot of nominations for the amount of people we have.

Heather agrees that we don't always know the work that committee chairs are doing. She suggests that in a case like that, the director who oversees a committee and would know how much work they are doing can nominate the committee chair and then find one supporter to support the nomination. She says that any person on the NEC can support a nomination except for the president. She says nominations for the President's Award need to start with the NEC. She doesn't see that removing all the supporters from the nomination will solve the problem—it needs to start with the NEC and for us to nominate people and then nominations will grow from there. She says that last year we only had one nomination for a President's Award, but that was the first year that happened. If you look back over the years, there have always been lots of nominations with the three supporters—it's hard to say what happened last year to explain why there was only one nomination.

Alex says as of right now there are no nominations for any of our awards (Heather adds that nominations for the President's Awards haven't opened yet), so there's less of an appetite for nominations. He says wouldn't taking away the need for supporters open the award up and make it simpler to nominate people? He thinks it could create another problem if all the nominations are coming only from directors.

Ellen says that we need to recognize that as directors we have the privilege of a wider network and we work more with the people that we're talking to. Ellen says that asking another director to support a nomination is only reflecting the nominator's relationship with the supporter. The supporter may know nothing about the merit of the nomination and what the volunteer brings to the nomination. She says needing supporters feels like a barrier to the opportunity for people to be recognized for what they've done in the organization. She says the president could receive many nominations for the same person from different people, but we can't assume that all those people know each other and are able to collaborate to make the nomination happen. She says we are a very siloed organization and increasingly virtual and she sees the need for supporters as a barrier for someone to be given the opportunity to be recognized.

Maria says that she thinks we should still have one supporter for a nomination. She says nobody works in a vacuum; we all work with other people. She says, for example, if you were nominating a committee chair, you could ask a member of the committee to be the supporter for your nomination. The supporter doesn't have to do anything; they just need to agree that the nominee is doing great work. She says the nominator would likely ask for supporters from the group of people that the nominee works with, so they would know the nominee. Maria agrees that three supporters is quite a lot but everyone would know one person.

Tara says this approach only works if they are on a committee, and many of our volunteers aren't on committees. They may only work with one other person or a staff person. She says that having to ask for supporters puts extra pressure on the asker, who may also be short of time, and also puts pressure on who they ask, who has to co-sign the award. She says it is a barrier. She says that not everyone who is nominated for a President's Award gets one automatically. The documentation says that the president and two other people review the nominations, which in the end means that 7 people

need to say yes to one volunteer receiving an award. She says editors are often introverts who may not feel comfortable asking other people to sign something.

Heather says that one of the proposed changes is that staff people would be able to nominate or support a nomination, so that would make up the one supporter in a case where the nominee works with limited people.

Tara says she still doesn't understand why there needs to be extra people involved. She says it is still going to the president and the president's team to determine if it is a valid nomination or not.

Heather says that all the awards have judges and they all need supporting documentation.

Tara says that the other awards have cash prizes. She says it makes sense to have the extra people look at the nominees when there is a financial stake involved. She says that shouldn't come into play when you just want to thank people publicly for doing a good job, and making it easier to do so.

Alex says that is the crux of the issue. The goal of this award—more than the ones that have cash prizes—is that it's recognition at a time that more recognition is needed.

Natasha asks in the chat: Is it implied that the president supports the nomination when they approve the award? Heather says just as with any other award, when the judge selects a winner they are implying that they support it. But that's different than the job of a supporter for a nomination.

Natasha says that if we're looking at the background of a nomination, it is possible for the president to say no to a nomination, so that technically is another person in support of it.

Maylon asks a question in the chat: If the award is meant to be prestigious, how is adding a supporter who doesn't know the nominee or their work adding to the prestige? Heather says when she's nominated people in the past, it's not just someone adding their signature and walking away. It's always been somebody who believes the nominee deserves an award.

Alex says that is part of the privilege of being in the NEC, that you know more people. He says when he started as a committee member, he didn't know very many people. If he wanted to nominate someone, he wouldn't have known who to go to at that time, and he thinks there are other people in that situation. It doesn't need to come from the top down.

Heather agrees that we don't want the awards to be "top down." But most first-time volunteers would likely get a feel for the organization and for how the awards work before they nominate someone for an award.

Alex says that the organization is siloed and that people volunteer to work in specific roles, so they may not get to know a lot of other people. He says with Ellen's revisions, we're encouraging people who may only work with one other person to nominate someone for an award, and we're blocking this if we require a supporter.

Ellen says the idea of prestige comes from the organization that's granting the award. If we're an organization that believes in EDI, why are we putting a block on giving volunteers an equal opportunity to be nominated and the chance to be recognized? She says requiring a supporter feels restrictive when it doesn't have to be.

Tara says this goes double for someone who is neurodivergent or has trouble going to people they don't know.

Heather says she doesn't have much more to say, but in her revision of the nomination she's urging caution about not going from three supporters down to no supporters. She suggests trying to have one supporter needed for a year and if that doesn't work, then we would go to no supporters.

Maria says we can always amend the procedures again going forward. She says we need to keep in mind the people that have won the award in the past who have needed a nominator and three supporters for their award; they might see the change from needing three to no supporters as quite a drastic change.

Alex says the quality of your work should not be determined by the number of supporters to your nomination. The president should look at the nominee's nomination blurb to determine the quality of the nominee's work.

Tara says she doesn't understand why we would take things cautiously in this context. We could try having no supporters for a year and if we get a flood of nominations, we could revise the procedures again next year to needing more supporters. She says that she's still upset that Editors Canada didn't hand out a Karen Virag award at the conference last year because we had no nominations, especially when it is volunteers holding the organization together, and she doesn't want to see that happen again. We should open it up and make it easy for the people who are doing the work and working with others to be able to recognize those who have helped them, those who have mentored them.

Suzanne says that the procedures say the president and two other directors will evaluate the nomination. So that means there is one nominator and three people who vet it, which makes four people. Tara agrees with what Suzanne said. Tara asks why you need extra people before it gets to the president, if there will be three people vetting it. Suzanne says that if it were only the president who were evaluating nominations, then there would be a need to include supporters so that there were more voices given to the nomination.

Alex says the people nominating are more likely to know the nominee than the president and two directors who are evaluating the nominations. He says that he doesn't believe that this is enough of a distinction.

Ellen says if there are questions that the president and two directors have that they can reach out to the nominee or nominator directly. Ellen wonders who we are missing out on hearing about because the nominations require supporters to be considered.

Kaitlin joins the discussion using *Robert's Rules of Order* that says the chair can join informal discussions if the board is 12 members or fewer, while ordinarily the chair

would sit out of discussions. She says the purpose of the supporter is to make sure the nominations are made in good faith. She says if we don't need a supporter that it's easy enough to nominate a friend or someone who maybe doesn't deserve it. This is a prestigious award. People may get together to decide to nominate each other. Editors all work with words, and it's easy enough to put together 100 to 300 words speaking nicely about someone. But having one supporter to a nomination says that the nominee is doing outstanding work and they are deserving of a high level of recognition. If we remove the supporter, it's harder for the president and two directors to go through the 100-to-300-word descriptions and really get a sense of the work the nominee has done.

Alex says that friends nominating each other likely wouldn't happen that much. He says it is more likely that we'd miss deserving people than get undeserving people. We should be able to trust each other to act in good faith. And he says that it's not a cash award, so that does matter to how many supporters are required for a nomination.

Maylon asks in the chat if we are worried about getting too many nominations. Kaitlin says that last year was an anomaly but historically there have been a lot of nominations to choose from. We haven't gotten to the bottom of what happened last year and there was only one nomination.

Maylon asks if there has historically been an integrity issue with our awards. Kaitlin says no because we have had a lot of checks and balances in place.

Maria says that many of the directors at this meeting have not been on the judging panel for awards, so they don't see the number of awards that come in.

Arija says in the case where she nominated someone, she did find it a burden to get three supporters, but she didn't have a problem finding those three supporters.



MOVED BY Ellen Keeble  
SECONDED BY Tara Avery

that we amend the Awards and Scholarships Procedures as proposed:  
[strikethrough means removed, underline means added]:

The Editors Canada President's Award for Volunteer Service recognizes outstanding service to the organization, at the branch, twig or national level, by ~~members~~ volunteers.

[...]

Any member or student affiliate in good standing of the association can be nominated for the President's aAward. Candidates must have performed service on a wholly volunteer basis. Self-nominations are not allowed.

Editors Canada members or student affiliates in good standing, as well as staff members ~~Anyone can nominating~~ nominate an Editors Canada member or student affiliate for the President's Award ~~must submit a nomination (200 to 500 words)~~ describing the extraordinary volunteer service provided by the candidate (100 to 300 words). ~~The nomination must be supported by a minimum of three Editors Canada members in good standing who must all be copied on the nomination when it is emailed to the president. The Awards Committee may request a biographical note of the candidate (of no more than 150 words). The nomination must also include a biographical note for the candidate of no more than 150 words, as well as their address, phone number and email address.~~

Kaitlin: nay

Alex: yea

Maria: nay

Tara: yea

Heather: nay

Ellen: yea

Mina: yea

Suzanne: yea

Arija: yea

Elizabeth: yea

Błażej: yea

Carried

MOVED BY Heather Buzila  
SECONDED BY Maria Frank

that we send the matter of revising the Awards and Scholarship Procedures to members for consultation, according to the Consultation Policy. As stated in the Consultation Policy, matters that affect the association and its members include reputational matters, which I believe changing these procedures is, as well as decisions made by the NEC. Members will be concerned about how valuable a nomination for a President's Award is if a person doesn't have to have other people willing to support it. This in turn means the award will lose value because of the change. Because of this, I believe that we should send this matter to the members for consultation.

#### DISCUSSION:

Alex asks what the threshold is to proceed to a consultation with members. Heather reads from the Consultation Policy: "matters that affect the association and its members include the following: reputational matters, governance structures, decision-making discussions by committees, branches, twigs, co-chairs, and the national executive council, decisions made by the national executive council, and volunteer relations. It may be applied to any business of the association except that which is exempt under the legislation." She says it would be exempt if it were about human resources or privacy. She also said that each member's vote should be documented in the minutes.

Maylon asks in the chat about who will be writing the email and who will be presenting it to membership. Heather says it will probably Michelle Ou who will write the email and then the NEC can review it.

Alex says he can make an argument that being on X would be harmful to Editors Canada's reputation. What is the difference between only the NEC deciding on that versus sending it to members? He says he could understand member consultation if it was something bigger, but the revision to the procedures is a small matter.

Heather says the difference is that she wanted to make a motion under the Consultation Policy for the procedures and no one made one for the discussion about leaving X. She also thinks members will be more concerned about this than we're giving them credit for. She says when this discussion started, she wished that it would have gone to members from the start so that the members would have made the decision.

Kaitlin says this is a member award and they are the ones doing the nominations and they're the volunteers doing the work, so we should consult with the members. She says there may be strong feelings among members, just like there are strong feelings in this meeting. She says based on what Heather read from the Consultation Policy, this meets the criteria for going to members. Kaitlin says the next item on the agenda is about US relations, and should a decision be made that affects the reputation of Editors Canada, it could go to members as well.

Maylon asks in the chat: Is this a time to include a more general question in this email of if they [members] feel other/all other awards need to be re-evaluated?

Suzanne says the EDI committee has been mandated to review the Equity Fellowship and what constitutes a submission from someone. There was an issue that came up last year with a nomination about what constitutes being an acceptable nomination. When that happens, would that need to go to members for consultation? Heather says only if someone makes a motion for it to go to members for consultation.

Alex wonders how the email/communication would be written. Maria thinks it will go through an exec read. Heather says that is why she suggested that Michelle write it because she is a neutral party.

Kaitlin says the concern is that if we make an announcement about this large-scale change that people who have received the award in the past may feel that their contributions and the award has been devalued. She says the intent is to check in with members to see what they want to happen with the procedures.

#### VOTE:

Kaitlin: yea

Alex: nay

Maria: yea

Tara: nay

Heather: yea

Ellen: nay

Mina: abstain

Suzanne: abstain

Arija: yea

Elizabeth: abstain

Błażej: yea

Carried

Alex asks if the process can be concluded by the AGM. He doesn't want this to be put on the backburner and addressed years down the road. Kaitlin says that if it's placed on the agenda for the AGM it will be done in a timely manner. The months leading up to the AGM will allow members to read the email and consider their options. Błażej agrees that the AGM is the best place to decide on this.

Alex asks where this leaves us for this year's awards. Kaitlin says that it is too late in the awards season to make substantive changes to the awards procedures, so they will carry

on like they historically have. By having members vote at the AGM, that will leave lots of time for any changes to be implemented for next year.

## **11. Sponsoring ACES conference and US relations**

Heather says that the email discussion about sponsoring ACES concluded that we would not support ACES because they haven't paid their sponsorship for the 2024 conference and it isn't in the budget for this year.

Błażej says that discounting the geopolitical context, ACES hasn't supported us over the last couple of years, so it makes it difficult to agree with sponsoring their conference this year.

Kaitlin asks if we should continue to support US editing organizations given the current political climate. Tara says that not supporting the US editing organizations ultimately hurts those that we already have relationships with; it doesn't do anything for us to cut ties with them today. She says that she doesn't like that Editors Canada is still on X and Facebook because the people who make money off those platforms have already stated their political affiliation. But she says that doesn't have anything to do with the editing organizations unless someone declares they are representing the US government as an editing organization. Tara says that it is likely going to be those who are in US editing organizations who will be hurt by the US government's policies.

Alex agrees and says extricating ourselves from the US organizations doesn't help anything and that the matter of not sponsoring ACES is separate because of the other factors previously discussed.

Kaitlin asks if this [cutting ties with US organizations] should be a question that is posed to members. We need to take into account members' opinions, and this is a very divisive topic. But if we're trying to boost our profile and attract more members, this could be a sensitive area that we are trying to navigate.

Heather says we need to be careful that we don't get too political on this topic and on other topics because we are an editing organization, not a political organization. She says there have been times in the past when we have avoided making statements as an organization because it was deemed to be too political. We need to be an editing association first and not start boycotting any groups.

Kaitlin says that we are already a little bit political because we are pulling out of X and moving to Bluesky (or by being on X in the first place). Some members do not like us even being on Facebook. We are following the tide of members who are moving off X and moving to Bluesky.

Tara says we've made a semi-political stance by being on X, etc. in the first place. Alex says that it is similar to attending last year's Congress or pulling out like we did based on the protests.

Błażej says that not taking a position is also going to be a political statement. He says given that, it makes sense to consult the membership.

Suzanne wonders if this warrants a blanket reaction. If we know of a partner in the US who is standing for the position of the present US government, then to put some distance between them and Editors Canada or to refuse to work with them would be one thing. But she says she isn't sure how Editors Canada could take one broad position without consequences. Isolation on either side isn't productive or peaceful.

Błażej says that we don't need to present this to members as either we maintain relations with everyone or cut ties with everyone. He says presenting members with a more nuanced stance makes sense. He says we need to consult the membership on this.

Alex agrees, especially if we're talking about social media in particular and creating a survey. It makes sense to find out how members are feeling and where they are on this position.

## **12. Date of AGM**

Heather asks if we can start the discussion on the date of the AGM because Michelle needs to know the date because she has a lot to do before the meeting. Kaitlin says we will start the discussion over email.

Maria says that there are certain people who need to be there so it is more important to coordinate their schedules.

Alex asks when the AGM was last year. Natasha says it was on the last Thursday of June in 2024.

## **13. Next Meeting March 9, 2025, 1:00-4:00 p.m. (ET)**

## **14. Adjournment**

MOVED BY Tara Avery

SECONDED BY Błażej Szpakowicz

that the meeting be adjourned.

Carried

## Appendix A – Meeting Agenda

### AGENDA / ORDRE DU JOUR Editors' Association of Canada / Association canadienne des réviseurs National executive council meeting (February 9, 2025)

Zoom link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88207237788?pwd=jMBMUnGP9Pl9wmrw8gUnbYSCDZ1lx2.1>

Meeting ID: 882 0723 7788

Passcode: 777693

Dial by your location

+1 587 328 1099 Canada

+1 647 374 4685 Canada

+1 647 558 0588 Canada

+1 778 907 2071 Canada

+1 780 666 0144 Canada

+1 204 272 7920 Canada

+1 438 809 7799 Canada

Attending:

- NEC members
- Natasha Bood, executive director

NEC documents in [Google Drive](#)

Sunday, February 9, 2025

1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. (ET)

1. Call to order (1:30)
2. Land acknowledgment
3. Approval of agenda
4. Review of [outstanding action items](#) from previous meetings (1:45 to 2:00)  
Heather
5. Budget update (2:20 to 2:40) Tara and Natasha

6. Break (2:40 to 2:45)
7. Update on ongoing projects (2:45 to 3:15) (include a brief overview of what your committee is currently working on, as well as any other info you'd like to discuss)
  - a) Publishing committee El
  - b) Francophone updates Suzanne
  - c) Member services/Volunteer management committees Suzanne
  - d) Certification Arija
  - e) Standards committee Arija
  - f) Webinars/Training and development committee Blazej
  - g) Career builder committee Alex
  - h) Student relations committee Maria
  - i) MarComm committee Mina
  - j) Mentorship committee Suzanne
  - k) Executive director Natasha
8. Branches and twigs (3:15 to 3:30) Ellen
9. Strategic Planning (3:30 to 3:40) Natasha/Kaitlin
10. Nomination procedures for awards (3:40 to 4:10) Kaitlin/Ellen
11. Sponsoring ACES conference and U.S. relations (4:10 to 4:25) Heather
12. Next meeting Sunday, March 9, 1:00–4:00 p.m. (ET)
13. Adjourn

## Appendix B – Action Items

Number	Action Items 2024-2025	Category	Person(s) Responsible	Previous Status (if applicable)	Current Status	Last Updated (date)
1	Draft of the 2025 January minutes: All meeting attendees to add their notes.	Current	NEC directors, Natasha Bood		Notes added; however, some directors haven't added their notes yet. Heather will contact those who still need to add notes	February 7, 2025
2	VolunteerConnect: Examine current accessibility and usability, and update the system accordingly. First, a new task force to be formed.	Current	Suzanne Aubin		No update	February 9, 2025
3	Member awareness enhancement: Update governance webpages with job descriptions or post to blog sites in both languages to highlight the roles of NEC directors and committees.	Current	NEC directors		Use existing blog posts for NEC pages; use committee descriptions from volunteer document	February 9, 2025



4	Volunteer access management: Some volunteers need access to the information systems on weekends, but no assistance is available from the national office when they encounter some technical issues. Come up with new ideas to address this problem.	Current	NEC directors		NetID? Find out what people are having trouble accessing	February 9, 2025
5	Reduced certification exam fees: Consider offering certification exams at a reduced rate for individuals facing financial hardship, similar to our membership fee reduction policy.	Current	Arija Berzitis		Decided not to follow this plan	February 9, 2025
6	Credential maintenance points for volunteers: Consider awarding extra points for certified editors who volunteer to help develop exercises (e.g., Edit Like a Pro	Current	Arija Berzitis		Arija connect with Alex about this	February 9, 2025

	series) toward their credential maintenance.					
7	Committee outreach: Facilitate informal bi-monthly or quarterly meetings with committee chairs to share updates, foster collaboration, and identify the NEC's support opportunities.	Current	Alex Benarzi		Met on January 29, majority of committees present; shared projects that they were working on; standing meeting on last Wednesday of each month	February 9, 2025
8	Social media strategy: Consider Bluesky as an alternative to X and the potential consolidation of the Professional Editing Standards (PES) X account into national accounts.	Current	Mina Holie	NEC in agreement with shifting to Bluesky and merging the PES account with national accounts. Turning it over to Michelle and MarCom for further discussion and next steps.	Proposal for the social media migration plan currently WIP.	February 7, 2025
9	Revision of Editors Canada's land acknowledgment: Update our current statement in consultation with	Current	NEC directors, Natasha Bood	Natasha to contact the Indigenous Editors Association (IEA) for the next step. NEC director	Emailed the executive director of the IEA and waiting for a response.	February 6, 2025

	Indigenous groups.			in charge TBD.		
10	Editors Canada marketing video "La révision vue par..." (French version of the Meet an Editor project): Determine a new video editing contractor and, after the NEC vote and approval, sign a contract, depending on the approved 2025 budget.	Current	Mina Holie	Pro formas coming in. However, pending the 2025 financial budget completion.	Determine d to utilize internal resources instead of hiring an external vendor. Can be marked as Done.	February 7, 2025
11	2025 Awards presentation: Begin work with the conference committee for a possible virtual event.	Current	Alex Benarzi, Sara Abdul	Work in progress	in progress	February 9, 2025
12	Volunteer awards: Start the process for an NEC vote to change the procedure for volunteer award nominations.	Current	Alex Benarzi, Ellen Keeble	Work in progress; Ellen to reach out to Michelle for documentation.	Discuss at Feb. 9 meeting	February 9, 2025
13	Advocating for Editing discussion from conference - document to be sent out for	Current	Kaitlin Littlechild	In Progress	Set aside for now	February 9, 2025

	discussion by email (request for discussion from Heather).					
14	Look into possible funding to hire someone to manage Editors Canada's records.	Current	NEC directors, Natasha Bood	In progress - application to Canada Book Fund and WIC Catalyst fund	WIC Catalyst fund application was not successful. They gave us positive feedback on our grant, but there were 80% more applications than expected. Awaiting Canada Book Fund results.	February 6, 2025
15	Create a national position for Francophone managing editor of the blog.	Current	Mina Holie	Mandates created and approved on Nov. 28, 2024. Document updates currently pending due to a missing file and other priorities.	Documents updated on Jan. 30, 2025 (except for the organizational chart). Noted some missing descriptions in other sections, but can be marked as Done.	February 9, 2025

16	Maria will share the Career Builder Committee's proposal for the Career Development Hub for discussion by email	Current	Maria Frank	Sent latest iteration of the proposal for NEC review on Jan. 7, 2025	Feedback from the NEC was shared with the committee on January 23. Alex will be the director for this committee going forward.	February 7, 2025
17	Quebec insurance task force: Recruit task force members	Current	Suzanne Aubin	Work in progress	Task force has been created with two members	February 9, 2025
18	Certification exams in French & Edit Like a Pro for Francophones: Prior to 2019, when the French exams were running, there was a study guide. We got a grant last year but are still looking for a person to help restart the French program. According to Suzanne, we have a member who has shown interest.	Current	Suzanne Aubin	Work in progress	No update	February 9, 2025

19	Content management: Establish effective information management and workflow tracking mechanisms to ensure that the governance reports webpage is kept up-to-date. Data retention period?	Current	NEC directors, Natasha Bood	Currently discussing <a href="#">the governance webpage</a> . Working documents created and distributed to the NEC. Awaiting the directors' review. Implementation deadline undetermined.	No update	February 9, 2025
20	Publications Committee: Look into what to start with the revision of Editing Canadian English (3rd Ed., 2015)	On Hold	El Horner, Kaitlin Littlechild	Review complete. Work cannot continue until there is a new Director of Publications.	No update	February 9, 2025
21	Length of directors' term & their roles and responsibilities: Reconsider the term length for president, vice-president and past president. Determine if the past president can become more of a consulting role. In addition, filling the secretary position is more pressing (check the bylaws to see if	On Hold	NEC directors	Recording secretary and secretary roles have been combined. Other issues are put on hold until the new strategic plan is completed.		February 9, 2025

	the recording secretary and secretary roles can be combined into one).					
22	Reconsideration of the conference adviser position: Return back to the original model or eliminate this position due to potential redundancy	On Hold	NEC directors	Put on hold until the new strategic plan is completed		April 21, 2024
23	Webinars: Look for additional webinar hosts as well as a way of doing live-captioning for accessibility for people attending live. **Currently put on hold as no activity for about 10 months because of the other priorities**	On Hold	Błażej Szpakowicz	No updates		April 21, 2024
24	VolunteerConnect: Leah to update the language used in the VolunteerConnect spreadsheet—from English only to bilingual to	On Hold	NEC directors	Standing by for our next meeting		November 5, 2023

	encourage more francophone members' participation					
25	Editors Canada 2026 in-person conference: Investigate Halifax as our first option.	Done	Sara Abdul, Tara Avery, Ellen Keeble	Conference location and committee chairs decided and formally approved by NEC		December 6, 2024
26	Branch/Twig Toolkits: Ellen to update the toolkits and work on rewording.	Done	Ellen Keeble	Some tasks still remaining and ongoing, but can be removed from the list of action items as Done.		January 12, 2025
27	Create an outline of branch expectations for conferences.	Past	Sara Abdul, Tara Avery, Ellen Keeble, Lori Perrie	DONE. We have email drafts to send to branches and twigs; have started with Halifax.		November 8, 2024
28	Editors Canada 2025 conference: Try to determine the location well in advance for smooth transition from the current committee members to subsequent members. Ellen to send out an email to all branches & twigs to see if	Past	Ellen Keeble, Tara Avery	An online motion to cancel the 2025 conference was passed on November 4, 2024.		November 4, 2024



	any of them are interested.					
--	--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix C – Online Motions

21	That Heather Buzila be appointed to the role of NEC secretary.	The previous secretary stepped down at the beginning of January, and the position has been vacant since then. Heather reached out to express an interest in rejoining the NEC in the secretary position. Suzanne Aubin has confirmed that no one else has expressed an interest through the volunteer relations email. Upon NEC approval, the new secretary will assume the role effective immediately.	Online	January 25, 2025	January 29, 2025	Kaitlin Littlechild	Suzanne Aubin	8	0
22	That we approve the appointment of Gaby Balan as the managing editor for L'Hebdomadaire des Réviseurs.	Gaby accepted the managing editor role during the 2023–2024 NEC year, following the selection process conducted within the MarCom. Through NEC votes, Editors Canada's French-language blog L'Hebdomadaire des Réviseurs was officially established on October 23, 2024, and its managing editor position was officially established on November 2, 2024. This motion is to formally appoint Gaby retroactively to the date of creation of the managing editor position.	Online	January 29, 2025	January 31, 2025	Mina Holie	Suzanne Aubin	9	0
23	To approve the 2024 June meeting minutes (access through this link) for posting on the website.		Online	January 30, 2025	February 2, 2025	Mina Holie	Tara Avery	7	1