2018-2019 Report of the Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC)

Update on Progress and Recommendations

APUO-University of Ottawa Committee on
Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDIC)

uOttawa

"Although the significance of diversity can be described as international, the means by which diversity manifests itself will be local."

-Sara Ahmed, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life,* p 16

This report reflects work of the Equity, Diversity, Inclusion (EDI) committee in the academic years of 2017/2018 and 2018/2019. The current committee would like to thank Dr. Ivy Bourgeault (APUO), Dr. Amir Attaran (APUO) and Michelle Brown (APUO), past members of the EDIC, for their invaluable contributions. Though they did not author this report, their work and contributions last year inform and inspire it. Thank you as well to Jamie Lundine, the research assistant for the EDIC in 2017-2018 who is one of the authors of this report and who completed the environmental scan of best EDI practices at Canadian Universities for the committee.

We would like to preface this report by acknowledging the commitments to equity, diversity and inclusion made by both the University and the APUO in this past year. The committee would like to note the EDI commitments agreed upon in the new collective agreement and the projects that are currently underway to address equity concerns in the hiring and promotion processes, to train selection committees for Deans, and in response to the gendered pay gap highlighted by the 2016-2017 EDIC report and by feminist scholarship and activism at this university. These are important initiatives. The committee supports the appointment of Dr. Steffany Bennett as the Special Advisor to the President on Diversity and Inclusion. These initiatives offer opportunities for both the APUO and the University to increase the diversity of the professoriate, and to create a more equitable environment for faculty to work in.

The committee requests that the University and APUO presidents meet with us in February of 2019 to respond to each recommendation in the report. We also ask that the Presidents update us on progress made towards recommendations from the 2016-2017 report. Please note that in Appendix III we have included an extended version of this report that contains further discussion of EDI research and initiatives, as well as theoretical analysis of different approaches to EDI.

Sanni Yaya and Kathryn Trevenen

Co-chairs, EDIC

Introduction

The University of Ottawa's Strategic Plan – Destination 2020 – demonstrates a clear commitment to "defining the world of tomorrow," for the next generation of Canadians. Demographic trends show us that Canada is becoming increasingly diverse, with new immigrants and Aboriginal Canadians being the fastest growing groups in the country. The University of Ottawa currently lacks detailed information on the diversity of its professoriate but we certainly know that historically the University has lacked diversity in executive and leadership positions. Canada wide a 2010 CAUT report found that "the Canadian academy remains largely white and male" (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2010) and CAUT analysis of census data demonstrates ongoing underrepresentation of women, Aboriginal, and visible minority professors, as well as significant earnings and unemployment gaps (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2018).

Until we have data on the University of Ottawa professoriate, it is difficult to understand the scope of the diversity and equity challenges at the University and it is also difficult to identify particular strategies for addressing these challenges. This report will recommend data collection strategies, as well as providing an overview of EDI best practices at Canadian universities. While data collection is an important and pressing first step, there are other strategies that can be considered as well. This committee believes that the University of Ottawa is uniquely positioned to become a leader in institutional equity and diversity because of its history of thinking about language-based diversity and inclusion, with a commitment to French/English bilingualism across its campuses and faculties. Extending that experience to include equity and diversity concerns related to Indigeneity, race, gender, disability and sexuality, among others, must be a priority in the coming years.

The barriers to diversifying the professoriate have been well documented in university contexts across Canada and in the United States of America, the United Kingdom and New Zealand and Australia. Approaches to diversity vary across geographical and organizational contexts, yet 'what works' is not well understood. In this report, we will provide an overview of what is known about diversity, equity and inclusion at uOttawa and Canadian universities. We outline frameworks for equity in higher education, drawing on the recent and ground-breaking analyses done by Frances Henry et al. in *The Equity Myth*. We conclude with recommendations for the coming year for the University of Ottawa.

Methodology

This report was produced through an environmental scan of equity, diversity and inclusion practices at Canadian universities. Building on the knowledge and expertise of the members of the EDIC at uOttawa, published and grey literature were collected between July and August 2018. This literature was supplemented through web searches, including daily scanning of Twitter, where there is an active community involved in discussions of equity, diversity and inclusion in the academy. Further data collection focused on those Canadian universities that have consistently been named as the Best Canadian Diversity Employers over the past five years (Table 1). External meetings were held with Universities Canada, and the Office of the Vice-

President, Equity and Community Inclusion at Ryerson University, and documentation was provided by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT).

Table 1 Canada's Best Diversity Employers

2018	2017	2016	2015
Ryerson University UBC University of Calgary University of Manitoba University of Toronto University of Victoria University of Waterloo	Ryerson University UBC University of Calgary University of Manitoba University of Toronto University of Victoria	Ryerson University UBC University of Toronto University of Victoria	Ryerson University UBC University of Toronto University of Victoria

Best Practices for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion at Canadian Universities

Equity Frameworks

Henry et al. argue that workplace equity in Canada has been situated within three policy frameworks: 1) human rights codes, both federal and provincial, 2) the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and 3) employment equity policies, e.g. the Federal Contractors Program (Henry et al., 2017). In response to these frameworks, Universities in Canada have adopted three broad approaches to addressing equity and diversity: 1) human rights or anti-discrimination law, 2) "equity" frameworks and 3) "diversity" frameworks. Human rights or anti-discrimination approaches address legal obligations to providing work environments free from discrimination. This includes creating anti-harassment and anti-discrimination policies and providing reporting mechanisms for complaints. This has historically been the approach adopted by the University of Ottawa through the Human Rights Office. As of 2014, the majority of Canadian institutions surveyed employed a human rights framework and this framework is important for understanding and addressing complaints and individual cases of discrimination once people work within an institution.

Scholarship has highlighted, however, that a human rights mechanism is essentially reactive and does not proactively address structural inequities such as racism, sexism or ableism. These structural inequities mean that many people in marginalized groups are not hired in the first place, an inequity that discrimination and human rights complaint processes cannot address. In response to the shortfalls of the human rights approach, proactive equity or diversity frameworks began emerging at a small number of universities. These frameworks seek to address both discrimination and workplace environment within the institutions, and focus on changing the institution at a structural level. These frameworks are also intersectional, accounting for both the historical disadvantages that marginalized groups have experienced, and the ways that systems of oppression such as sexism, ableism, islamophobia and racism intersect.

Building on their analysis of these three different frameworks, Henry et al. make a series of recommendations for Canadian universities. According to their policy and document analysis of thirty English-language universities Henry et. al. recommend that EDI work at institutions be supported by:

- **Leadership at the top.** This study notes that support for EDI initiatives must come from Presidents, Vice Presidents and Deans within academic institutions so that cultural change occurs.
- **Senior advisory committees.** A review of U15 websites demonstrates a trend toward creating EDI senior advisory committees and positions.
- **Adequate resources and funding for EDI committees and senior advisors.**
- **Careful and ongoing equity data collection**
- **Structural *as well as* individual approaches to understanding equity, inclusion and discrimination**

Several relevant Canadian institutions have made commitments to addressing EDI on campuses across Canada, including Universities Canada and the tri-council agencies. In follow up to the Gender Summit 11, which was held in Montreal in November 2017, Universities Canada released a statement on behalf of University Presidents (Universities Canada, n.d.). They committed university Presidents – including uOttawa – to the following seven principles:

Embracing pluralism and thriving through diversity – shaping science and innovation

1. We believe our universities are enriched by diversity and inclusion. As leaders of universities that aspire to be diverse, fair and open, we will make our personal commitment to diversity and inclusion evident.

2. We commit our institutions to developing and/or maintaining an equity, diversity and inclusion action plan in consultation with students, faculty, staff and administrators, and particularly with individuals from under-represented groups. We commit to demonstrating progress over time.

3. We commit to taking action to provide equity of access and opportunity. To do so, we will identify and address barriers to, and provide supports for, the recruitment and retention of senior university leaders, university Board and Senate members, faculty, staff and students, particularly from under-represented groups.

4. We will work with our faculty and staff, search firms, and our governing boards to ensure that candidates from all backgrounds are provided support in their career progress and success in senior leadership positions at our institutions.

5. We will seek ways to integrate inclusive excellence throughout our university's teaching, research, community engagement and governance. In doing so, we will engage with students, faculty, staff, our boards of governors, senates and alumni to raise awareness and encourage all efforts.

6. We will be guided in our efforts by evidence, including evidence of what works in addressing any barriers and obstacles that may discourage members of under-represented groups to advance. We commit to sharing evidence of practices that are working, in Canada and abroad, with higher education institutions.

7. Through our national membership organization, Universities Canada, we will work to generate greater awareness of the importance of diversity and inclusive excellence throughout Canadian higher education.

These principles highlight the value that equitable and diverse campuses bring to students, employees and the community at large. They also highlight the need for an equity framework that addresses structural barriers to access.

The **Canadian Research Chairs** (CRC) program has also come under criticism for its lack of diversity. The CRC program reports on gender equity and as of April 2018, only 21 percent of the Tier 1 CRC posts were held by women. Very little progress has been made in over a decade; the percentage of women holding Chairs did not change between 2006 and 2016; it held steady at 17 percent ("Program statistics," n.d.). People of colour, Indigenous people and people with disabilities are also seriously underrepresented. In response to these criticisms, the CRC program developed online resources documenting best practices for promoting equity, diversity and inclusion at each stage of planning for, recruiting, hiring and retaining diverse faculty.

The CRC program recommends that search committees have representation from designated groups; that search committees be sensitized to issues of equity and unconscious biases through training or other awareness-building activities; that search committees be aware of any representation gap among the institution's chair holders, and of the institution's strategy to address any underrepresentation as per the CRC target-setting exercise; and that the institution's equity officer (or equivalent) is involved and consulted at all stages of the process.

Data Collection, Monitoring and Reporting

Only a small minority of Canadian universities routinely collect data on equity and diversity (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2018; Henry et al., 2017). A May 2018 report from the University of Toronto's Equity and Diversity in Research and Innovation (EDRI) Working Group for example, stated that "[t]he need for quality data specific to U of T underpins many of the Working Group's Recommendations and we have made specific Recommendations to facilitate collection and use." A similar challenge was documented in the 2016/2017 report from this committee, which experienced barriers when attempting to access data on equity and diversity at the Faculty level at University of Ottawa ("APUO - University of Ottawa Equity , Diversity and Inclusion Committee: Update on Progress 2016/2017," 2017). This is a challenge across Canadian Universities, but also an opportunity to establish a community of practice around data collection and knowledge generation in this area.

Several universities stand out in their experiences of EDI data collection processes. *Dalhousie's Be Counted* Census campaign achieved approximately 80 percent coverage of self-reported EDI data. Ryerson University and University of Toronto run on-going data collection exercises, which are integrated within the institutional web-based Human Resources (HR) systems. At Ryerson, each time a faculty member logs into the online system a pop-up provides a prompt to fill in the survey (if they have not already done so).

A movement toward greater transparency and reporting is also becoming a requirement by the tri-council funding agencies. Following the lead of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) in June of 2018, the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) released a joint statement regarding their intent to introduce self-identification of diversity indicators for applicants (Canada, n.d.). Additionally, on behalf of the tri-council agencies, NSERC is leading a national consultation process for the adoption of a *Made-in-Canada* version of the United Kingdom's Athena SWAN (Scientific Women's Academic Network) Charter ("NSERC - Made-in-Canada Athena SWAN Consultation," n.d.). To comply with government-led gender equity initiatives, institutes of higher education have adopted the Athena SWAN Charter across the United Kingdom. The charter requires the use of organizational self-auditing to apply for either bronze, gold or silver award status. Although widely accepted as best practice, evaluation of the Charter's impact has been minimal and demonstrated mixed results (Caffrey et al., 2016). This consultation process provides an opportunity to engage with NSERC and other agencies, as they outline the framework for Canada and implement a pilot project in a select number of universities.

Hiring

Norms of the university and academic culture more generally emphasise individualism, "colour-blindness", egalitarianism, "excellence" and academic freedom over all other values (Ahmed, 2012). However, these values are often in direct tension with equity approaches that value non-academic routes to knowledge and experience. In order to recruit a more diverse pool of

candidates, scholars argue that Universities need to consider and value other types of knowledge. In line with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report recommendations, for example, cluster-hiring or cohort hiring has been put forward as an approach to hiring Indigenous faculty and to introducing indigenous content into university curricula (Henry et al., 2017).

The scholarship also argues that ensuring each hiring committee has representation from protected group members is important, as well as providing bias reducing training. In the context of a US institution, for example, departmental training was shown to be effective (Devine et al., 2017). The evidence-based intervention was evaluated using a cluster randomized control trial. During the trial, two-and-a-half-hour anti-bias workshop was offered to 46 departments that were matched with 46 control departments (representing all 6 STEM schools/colleges at the University). The workshop was designed using the prejudice habit model and participants were asked to write personal "statements of commitment" to act to counter gender bias. In the two-years post-intervention, the intervention departments hired 18 percent more women than the control departments (32 percent women hires in the control and 47 percent in the intervention group) (Devine et al., 2017). Bias-reducing workshops may be effective with hiring for other protected groups, and must be combined with promotion and retention strategies in order to retain hires from the protected groups.

Recommendations for the University of Ottawa

In 2019, the EDIC committee recommends the following four EDI priorities for the University and APUO to consider.

1. Collect data and report on progress annually: this is a minimum requirement by any institution that has made a public commitment to diversity. Self-reporting on diversity metrics is an important best-practice that has been endorsed by the tri-council research agencies and will increasingly be a requirement of research teams – as funding agencies as well as journals move to ensure that they are publishing research from a broad range of perspectives. Without data, Universities remain opaque structures that lack accountability to faculty, staff, students and the public. Putting in place on-going equity data collection systems is imperative, and this report lays out a tool (see Appendix II) – informed by surveys conducted at Ryerson University and the University of Toronto.

2. Develop EDI targets related to gender, race, disability and indigeneity and make them public: According to research at the University of Michigan, accountability is an important mechanism for securing equity gains. Institutions that develop and publish specific equity targets can be held accountable for progress towards those targets.

3. Provide bias reducing training to hiring committees. As research above demonstrates, this training can increase attention to equity and diversity needs in the hiring process.

4. Appoint trained APUO members to serve as Equity officers on all hiring committees. These members do not have to be members of the unit that is doing the hiring and they should

report directly to the Dean and Provost if equity concerns have not been considered in the hiring process.

5. Make funding available for professors to integrate equity content into course content:
Through the Universities Canada statement, uOttawa has made a commitment to teaching EDI content across faculties. As a University located in the nation's capital, the University of Ottawa can influence a national and international agenda, through funding for research and teaching on equity across campus. We recommend that the University establish a teaching and learning grant program related to EDI.

6. Put uOttawa forward as a pilot institution for the "Made in Canada" Athena SWAN – NSERC is leading consultations on the adaptation of the United Kingdom's Gender Equality Charter, called Athena SWAN. The Committee recommends that uOttawa engage with NSERC and put the university forward as an institution to pilot the Athena SWAN Charter in Canada.

7. Incorporate the recommendations of the TRC report, and consultation with Indigenous communities, into all diversity and equity initiatives at the University.

Signed,

Victoria Barnham (Employer)

Caroline Andrew (Employer)

Steffany Bennett (Employer)

Sanni Yaya (Employer)

Manon Desgroseilliers (Employer)

Kathryn Trevenen (APUO)

Alexandre Baril (APUO)

Gulzar Charania (APUO)

Darren O'Toole (APUO)

References

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. London and Durham: Duke University Press.

APUO - University of Ottawa Equity , Diversity and Inclusion Committee: Update on Progress 2016/2017. (2017), 1–39. Retrieved from https://www.uottawa.ca/president/sites/www.uottawa.ca.president/files/edic_october_30_final_report.pdf

Benedictus, R., Miedema, F., & Ferguson, M. W. J. (2016). Fewer numbers, better science. *Nature*, *538*(7626), 453–455. https://doi.org/10.1038/538453a

Bowleg, L. (2008). When Black + lesbian + woman ≠ Black lesbian woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. *Sex Roles*, *59*(5–6), 312–325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z

Caffrey, L., Wyatt, D., Fudge, N., Mattingley, H., Williamson, C., & McKevitt, C. (2016). Gender equity programmes in academic medicine: a realist evaluation approach to Athena SWAN processes. *BMJ Open* , *6*(9), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012090

Canada, G. of. (n.d.). Self-Identification Data Collection in Support of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Retrieved August 2, 2018, from http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_97615.html

Canada Research Chairs. (n.d.). Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan. Retrieved September 12, 2018, from http://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/action_plan-plan_action-eng.aspx

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (2010). The changing academy? A Portrait of Canada's University Teachers. *CAUT Education Review*, *12*(1), 1–6. Retrieved from http://www.caut.ca/docs/education-review/the-changing-academy-a-portrait-of-canada-rsquo-s-university-teachers-(jan-2010).pdf?sfvrsn=14

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (2018). *Underrepresented and Underpaid: Diversity & Equity Among Canada's Post-Secondary Education Teachers Canadian*.

Cummins, H. A. (2005). Mommy tracking single women in academia when they are not mommies. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *28*(2–3 SPEC. ISS.), 222–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2005.04.009

Dalhousie University. (n.d.). Be Counted - Human Rights & Equity Services. Retrieved September 18, 2018, from https://www.dal.ca/dept/hres/equity---inclusion/be-counted.html

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Cox, W. T. L., Kaatz, A., Sheridan, J., & Carnes, M. (2017). A gender bias habit-breaking intervention led to increased hiring of female faculty in STEMM departments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *73*(February), 211–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.07.002

EDRI Working Group. (2018). Equity and Diversity in Research & Innovation Working Group

Report. Retrieved September 14, 2018, from http://www.research.utoronto.ca/edri/

Farr, M. (2018). Arbitration decision on student evaluations of teaching applauded by faculty. Retrieved August 29, 2018, from https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/arbitration-decision-on-student-evaluations-of-teaching-applauded-by-faculty/

Ford, L. E. (2016). Two steps forward, one step back? Strengthening the foundations of women's leadership in higher education. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, *4*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2016.1170705

Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family? *Research in Higher Education*, *58*(6), 672–694. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2

Hart, J. (2016). Dissecting a Gendered Organization : Implications for Career Trajectories for Mid-Career Faculty Women in STEM. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *87*(5), 605–34. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2016.0024

Henry, F., James, C., Li, P. S., Kobayashi, A. L., Smith, M., Ramos, H., & Enakshi, D. (2017). *The Equity Myth : Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian universities*. UBC Press.

Holman, L., Stuart-Fox, D., & Hauser, C. E. (2018). The gender gap in science: How long until women are equally represented? *PLOS Biology*, *16*(4), e2004956. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2004956

Human Rights Office, U. of O. (n.d.). Diversity and inclusion. Retrieved September 1, 2018, from https://www.uottawa.ca/respect/en/diversity-inclusion

Lundine, J., Bourgeault, I. L., Clark, J., Heidari, S., & Balabanova, D. (2018). The gendered system of academic publishing. *The Lancet*, *391*, 1754–1756. Retrieved from https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(18)30950-4/fulltext

Muhs, G. G. y, Niemann, Y. F., González, C. G., & Harris, A. P. (Eds.). (2012). *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Logan: Utah State University Press. Retrieved from https://muse.jhu.edu/book/18279

Nagel, M. (2016). Pitfalls of Diversity Management Within the Academy. *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies*, *16*(16), 45–74.

Nature. (2018). Women feature only rarely as first or last authors in leading journals. *Nature 2018 555:7698*.

NSERC - Made-in-Canada Athena SWAN Consultation. (n.d.). Retrieved September 15, 2018, from http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/NSERC-CRSNG/EDI-EDI/Athena-SWAN_eng.asp

Office of the President, U. of O. (n.d.). Diversity and Inclusion. Retrieved September 17, 2018, from https://www.uottawa.ca/president/strategic-areas/diversity-and-inclusion

Program statistics. (n.d.). Retrieved September 18, 2018, from http://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/about_us-a_notre_sujet/statistics-statistiques-eng.aspx

Sheridan, J., Savoy, J. N., Kaatz, A., Lee, Y.-G., Filut, A., & Carnes, M. (2017). Write More Articles, Get More Grants: The Impact of Department Climate on Faculty Research

Productivity. *Journal of Women's Health*, *26*(5), 587–596.
https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2016.6022

Tamblyn, R., Girard, N., Qian, C. J., & Hanley, J. (2018). Assessment of potential bias in
research grant peer review in Canada. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, *190*(16),
E489–E499. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.170901

Universities Canada. (n.d.). Universities Canada principles on equity, diversity and inclusion.
Retrieved August 1, 2018, from https://www.univcan.ca/media-room/media-
releases/universities-canada-principles-equity-diversity-inclusion/

Wilburn, A., Vanderpool, R. C., & Knight, J. R. (2016). Environmental Scanning as a Public
Health Tool: Kentucky's Human Papillomavirus Vaccination Project. *Preventing Chronic
Disease*, *13*, 160165. https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd13.160165

Witteman, H. O., Hendricks, M., Straus, S., & Tannenbaum, C. (2017). Female grant applicants
are equally successful when peer reviewers assess the science, but not when they assess the
scientist. *BioRxiv*, 232868. https://doi.org/10.1101/232868

Online training module, in Leading for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education
offered by University of Michigan https://www.coursera.org/learn/leading-for-equity-diversity-
inclusion

Appendix I: Past and Current EDIC members

2017-2018

Caroline Andrew (Employer)

Steffany Bennett (Employer)

Sanni Yaya (Employer)

Manon Desgroseilliers (Employer)

Michelle Brown (APUO)

Amir Attaran (APUO)

Ivy Bourgault (APUO)

Kathryn Trevenen (APUO)

2018-2019

Victoria Barnham (Employer)

Caroline Andrew (Employer)

Steffany Bennett (Employer)

Sanni Yaya (Employer)

Manon Desgroseilliers (Employer)

Kathryn Trevenen (APUO)

Alexandre Baril (APUO)

Gulzar Charania (APUO)

Darren O'Toole (APUO)

Appendix II: Proposed EDI survey for uOttawa

The University of Ottawa recognizes that our teaching, scholarship and other activities take place in the context of a highly diverse society. The University values this diversity as it contributes to the diversification of ideas and perspectives and thereby enriches our scholarship, teaching and other activities.[1] This survey is one of the first steps in the University's efforts to eliminate barriers to inclusion and to ensure that diversity becomes a criterion of excellence on our campus.

In order to assess its progress toward its diversity goals, and to be able to develop initiatives to improve in areas where it is not meeting its goals, the University needs to collect data from its community from time to time.

Your information is used to produce aggregate data. No information that identifies an individual and their diversity self-identification data will be released or shared, except with the staff working with the Special Advisor, Diversity and Inclusion and the Equity, Diversity, Inclusion Committee who are required to access the information to fulfill their responsibilities, or with the permission of the person from whom the information is collected.[2]

If you do not wish to respond to the survey, please indicate on the first page that you choose not to participate by ticking the box at the top. This will allow the University to include you in the response rate to the survey even if you did not choose to provide any information.

You are welcome to update your information and complete a new survey at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns about the Employment Equity Survey, please contact XXXXX

Thank you for your continued support of the University.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

☐ I have read and understood the reasons why uOttawa is collecting this self-identification information, how it will be protected and used, and who will have access to the information.

OPT-OUT

If you do not wish to complete this survey, check the box below. Otherwise, please proceed to Section B.
☐ I do not wish to complete this survey

---

[1] Taken from University of Toronto survey
[2] Adapted from Ryerson

Please tell us why you do not wish to complete the survey

_____

Women
The purpose of this question is to obtain data about employees who identify as women, whether cisgender or transgender. There is a separate question that asks about self-identification based on gender identity and gender expression, as well as sexual orientation.
Do you self-identify as a woman?
1 Yes
1 No
1 Prefer not to answer

Section X
Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Gender Expression
LGBTQ+ is an acronym often used to refer to people, as a group, who identify as, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Pansexual, Trans, Gender Independent, Queer, Questioning, Two Spirit or who otherwise express gender or sexual diversity.

Do you identify as LGBTQ+?
1 Yes
1 No
1 Prefer not to answer

Persons with Disabilities

Based on the definitions from the Federal Contractors Program, "persons with disabilities" are persons who have a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric or learning impairment(s) AND

A) who consider themselves to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment, OR
B) believe that an employer or potential employer is likely to consider them to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment.

This also includes persons with disabilities who have been accommodated in their current job or workplace.
Some examples of disabilities are noted below. Please note that these definitions follow medical definitions of disability.
• Acquired brain injury
• ADHD
• Autism spectrum disorder
• Chronic health disability (e.g. Crohn's disease, hemophilia, epilepsy, asthma, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, cancer, etc.)
• Co-ordination/dexterity disability (e.g. arthritis, cerebral palsy, cystic fibrosis, multiple sclerosis)
• Deaf, deafened, hard of hearing

• Learning disability
• Mental health disability (e.g. schizophrenia, chronic depression, anxiety disorder, bipolar disorder, etc.)
• Mobility disability (e.g. amputations, paraplegia, reliance on walker/ scooter/ or mobility aid due to disability)
• Speech impairment (e.g. aphasia, stuttering, cluttering, etc.)
• Vision loss or impairment/legally blind (not correctable by glasses or contact lenses)

Do you self-identify as a person with a disability?
1 Yes
1 No
1 I choose not to answer

If yes, please indicate the type(s) of disability you have:
1 Visible
1 Non-Visible
1 Both
1 I choose not to answer
3"invisible disability," or non-visible is a term commonly used to describe a disability which is non-evident or not readily apparent to others

Section X (only appears if yes selected on previous screen)
Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Gender Expression

Please provide information about your sexual orientation, gender identity and/or gender expression to help the university better understand its diversity and barriers that impact specific LGBTQ+ groups.

The list is intended to be representative rather than comprehensive, providing the University of Ottawa with some sense of the diversity of sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression at the university.

Please select all that apply
1 Bisexual
1 Gay
1 Lesbian
1 Queer
1 Two Spirit
1 Trans
1 Genderqueer
1 Non-binary
1 I would like to specify an identity in addition to selecting from the list
1 Prefer not to answer

Aboriginal Peoples in Canada
For the purposes of the Diversity Self-ID, Aboriginal Peoples include persons who are First Nation, Inuit or Métis. The term Aboriginal Peoples was established by the federal government.

Do you self-identify as an Aboriginal person in Canada?
1 Yes
1 No
1 Prefer not to answer

Aboriginal Peoples in Canada
Please provide information to help the university to better understand its diversity and barriers that impact specific Aboriginal groups.
Please note that Status refers to First Nations people who are recognized by the federal government as "Indians" under the federal *Indian Act*. Treaty refers to First Nations people who are Status and belong to a First Nation that signed a treaty with the Crown. Non-Status refers to individuals who consider themselves to be First Nations' people, but who are not recognized by the federal government as "Indians" under the *Indian Act*.
Please select all that apply
1 First Nations: Status (including Treaty)

1 First Nations: Non-Status

1 Métis

1 Inuit

1 I would like to specify an identity in addition to selecting from the list

1 Prefer not to answer

(only appears if employee indicates they wish to specific an identity)
Aboriginal Peoples in Canada
Please enter the identity you wish to specify. _____

Racialized Persons/Persons of Colour

We are aware that many individuals no longer use the term "visible minorities", and instead self-identify as "people of colour" or "racialized persons". For the purposes of employment equity, members of such groups in Canada are persons, other than Indigenous/Aboriginal People (defined above), who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour, regardless of place of birth or citizenship.

Do you self-identify as a "Person of Colour", or "Racialized Person"?

1 Yes
1 No
1 I choose not to answer

Race and Ethnicity

This self-identification is **not** intended as an indication of one's place of origin, citizenship, language or culture and recognizes that there are differences both between and among subgroups of persons of colour.
If you identified as Indigenous/Aboriginal in Question 3, please use this question to identify any other race or ethnicity groups with which you identify.

Human Resources & Equity Page **4** of **6** July 2016
The options below originated from the categories used for collection of data and statistical purposes by the Federal Contractors Program.
Please check all that apply.

What racial and ethnic origins do you identify with (choose all that apply)?
    a. Please indicate the racial and ethnic origins you identify with (select all that apply):

      11 Asian
- q Asian Caribbean (e.g. Guyanese, Trinidadian)
- q East Asian (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean)
- q European (e.g. British, French, Spanish, Portuguese)
- q South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan)
- q South East Asian (e.g. Malaysian, Filipino, Vietnamese)
- q Another (please specify) _____

      11 Black
- q African (e.g. Ghanaian, Kenyan, Somali)
- q Caribbean (e.g. Barbadian, Jamaican, Grenadian)
- q European (e.g. British, French, Spanish, Portuguese)
- q North American (e.g. Canadian, American)
- q South and Central American (e.g. Brazilian, Panamanian)
- q Another (please specify) _____

      11 Latin/Hispanic
- q Caribbean (e.g. Cuban, Haitian)
- q Central American (e.g. Mexican, Honduran)
- q European (e.g. Spanish, Portuguese)
- q South American (e.g. Brazilian, Argentinian)
- q Another (please specify) _____

      1 Middle Eastern
- q North African (e.g. Libyan, Moroccan)
- q Middle Eastern (e.g. Syrian, Lebanese)
- q West Asia (e.g. Iran, Afghani)
- q Another (please specify) _____

      11 White

q European (e.g. British, French, Polish, Russian)
q North American (e.g. Canadian)
q South American (e.g. Argentinian, Chilean)
q Another (please specify) _____

11 Mixed Race

If we have not identified a category with which you identify, please indicate which racial or ethnic origins you identify with below:

11 Another (please specify) _____
11 Another (please specify) _____
11 Another (please specify) _____

11 I prefer not to respond

Appendix III: Extended Report

Introduction

Canadian universities have a history of employment equity policies that date back to the 1980s (Henry et al., 2017). These polices can be traced to feminist activism addressing sexual and gender-based violence and discrimination on college campuses as well as wage inequity and the wage gap. They are also rooted in anti-racist organizing, disability activism and LGBTQ activism which challenged Canada's reputation as a multicultural and equal nation, recognizing that equality of opportunity remains aspirational, and not yet reality.

The University of Ottawa's Strategic Plan – Destination 2020 – demonstrates a clear commitment to "defining the world of tomorrow", for the next generation of Canadians. Demographic trends show us that Canada is becoming increasing diverse, with new immigrants and Indigenous Canadians being the fastest growing groups in the country (Statistics Canada as cited in (Henry et al., 2017). These trends have been recognized by the University and there is an increased emphasis on situating uOttawa within an international context. Dr. Adel El Zaïm's appointment as Chief Internationalization Officer is a demonstration of the value of international collaboration and uOttawa's position within the nation's capital. Further, the University of Ottawa has a strong history of language-based diversity and inclusion, with a commitment to French/English bilingualism across its campuses and faculties. Enshrined in our mission is a commitment to the promotion of the French language and culture in Ontario. This mandate means that the University community is skilled at negotiating differences and seeing the value of a diverse community—linguistic and otherwise.

In November 2016, an Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusion was established to examine gender disparities within the university system. Subsequently, President and Vice-Chancellor Jacques Frémont appointed Professor Steffany Bennett as Special Advisor, Diversity and Inclusion, for a two-year period. The Human Rights Office has been relocated to report directly to the Secretary-General of the University as the President stated his "firm resolve to be focused at all times on matters of diversity and inclusion". Finally, the university announced that "members of selection committees for deans and vice-presidents will now be required to undergo training on unconscious bias." These initiatives offer opportunities for both the APUO and the University to improve both the diversity of the professoriate, and create a more equitable environment for them to work in.

The barriers to diversifying the professoriate have been well documented in university contexts across Canada and in the United States of America, the United Kingdom and New Zealand and Australia. Approaches to diversity vary across geographical and organizational contexts, yet 'what works' is not well understood. Where diversity mechanisms have been deployed, and in the Canadian context, there is limited rigorous evaluation of approaches or interventions (Henry et al., 2017).

Methodology

This report was produced through an environmental scan (Wilburn, Vanderpool, & Knight, 2016) of equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) practices at Canadian universities. Building on the knowledge and expertise of the members of the EDIC at uOttawa, published and grey literature were collected between July and August 2018. This literature was supplemented through web searches, including daily scanning of Twitter, where there is an active community involved in discussions of equity, diversity and inclusion in the academy. Further data collection focused on those U15 universities that have consistently been named as the Best Canadian Diversity Employers over the past five years (Table 1). External meetings were held with Universities Canada, and the Office of the Vice-President, Equity and Community Inclusion at Ryerson University and documentation was provided by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT).

Table 2 Canada's Best Diversity Employers

2018	2017	2016	2015
Ryerson University UBC University of Calgary University of Manitoba University of Toronto University of Victoria University of Waterloo	Ryerson University UBC University of Calgary University of Manitoba University of Toronto University of Victoria	Ryerson University UBC University of Toronto University of Victoria	Ryerson University UBC University of Toronto University of Victoria

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion at uOttawa

The leadership at the University of Ottawa has made a commitment to "ensuring equity, diversity and inclusion in the scholarly and leadership environments of our students, staff, and faculty" (Office of the President, n.d.). Through the appointment of a new Special Advisor, uOttawa has placed a fresh emphasis on EDI. The University of Ottawa's Human Rights Office currently makes the following statement on Diversity and Inclusion:

> *Diversity is a fact. It's naturally occurring. We're all diverse within ourselves, with a unique mix of values, beliefs and talents, not to mention characteristics like gender, sexual orientation, culture, language, and more. Diversity also exists among people and within institutions, with their many ways of doing and of being.*
>
> *Inclusion takes effort. It's how we try to bring out the unique strengths of individuals, groups and institutions. Research shows that by adopting and integrating inclusive practices and policies, and by managing them well, institutions and the people within them thrive. They become more engaged, innovative and productive*
>
> *(Human Rights Office, n.d.).*

The University believes that an inclusive campus has at least three elements:

- ☐ Freedom from barriers, such as harassment and discrimination;
- ☐ Opportunities for everyone to strive towards their full potential;
- ☐ Use of differing perspectives, experiences and knowledge to create safe, innovative and vibrant environments.

The University operationalizes EDI within a human rights framework (see below for further discussion), with a strong focus on the individual. The Special Advisor position has also potentially been created within this framework, conceptualizing EDI as encompassing "all matters relating to any grounds enumerated under the Ontario Human Rights Code, including race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, marital status, family status or disability" (Office of the President, n.d.).

The University has conceptualized diversity as an individual characteristic, noting that "[w]e're all diverse within ourselves." While each individual has a range of values and experiences, diversity action as an instrument for change must acknowledge the need for justice and equitable opportunities for historically disadvantaged groups (Ahmed, 2012). Missing from the uOttawa statements is an acknowledgement of the systemic inequities, such as colonialism, cissexism, racism and sexism (see Table 2) which are structural barriers to inclusion. As the university changes how it addresses EDI, this Committee encourages the University to adopt an intersectional equity-based approach, that places diversity work within a broader historical and socio-economic and historical context.

The University should similarly be cognisant of the critique of the approaches to "managing diversity" within the neoliberal university context (Ahmed, 2012; Henry et al., 2017). It has been noted that the increased attention to diversity has not resulted in greater transparency or accountability within the existing university infrastructure: "With increasing attention to assessment, what can be said about something as simple as disaggregated recruitment and retention data…? A data-driven university will cloak itself in silence over such simple analysis" (Nagel, 2016).

Best Practices for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion at Canadian Universities

"What does diversity do? What are we doing when we use the language of diversity? These questions are ones that I pose … to diversity and equality practitioners working in universities…."

> \- Sara Ahmed, *On Being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life, pg 1*

Early activism for equity on Canadian university campuses began with feminist gender equality champions who advocated for policies to address sex-based discrimination on campuses (Henry et al., 2017). This eventually led to the development of sexual harassment policies and subsequently, human rights offices at various universities. Within this context, gender inequities

amongst faculty and university staff also came under scrutiny. As the landscape changed, so too did policy framework. In 1986, the Government of Canada introduced the Federal Contractors Programme (FCP) which formed the legal basis for the push for equity offices and policies at Canadian universities. The FCP requires employers to collect and report equity data on three protected groups: women, people with disabilities, Aboriginal peoples and visible minorities (Henry et al., 2017). Within this framework, the first step towards equity is representation – which resulted in the well-recognized equity statements included in nearly all job postings at universities across Canada:

> *"According to government policy, all qualified candidates are invited to apply;*
> *however, preference will be given to Canadians and permanent residents.*
> *When submitting your application, please indicate your status. The University*
> *of Ottawa is an equal opportunity employer. We strongly encourage*
> *applications from women, Aboriginal peoples, members of visible minorities*
> *and persons with disabilities."*

Workplace equity is thus situated within three policy frameworks within Canada: 1) the human rights codes, both federal and provincial, 2) the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and 3) employment equity policies, e.g. the Federal Contractors Program (Henry et al., 2017).

With changes in the regulatory environment in Canada, Henry et al. (2017) document three mechanisms that Canadian universities adopted in response: human rights or anti-discrimination law, equity frameworks and diversity frameworks. Human rights or anti-discrimination law address legal obligations to providing work environments free from discrimination. This includes creating anti-harassment and anti-discrimination policies and providing reporting mechanisms for complaints. As of 2014, the majority of Canadian institutions surveyed (thirty-six out of forty-nine) employed a human rights framework (Henry et al., 2017). In response to the shortfalls of the human rights approach, equity frameworks began emerging at a smaller number of universities (twelve out of forty-nine). The main criticism of the human rights approaches are that they do not adequately address structural inequities, including racism (Henry et al., 2017) (see Table 2). In 2014, one Canadian University had begun to utilize human-rights within a diversity framework. Henry et al. (2017) note findings from Agócs and Burr (2016) that diversity emerged in the United States as a "less controversial" approach to inequities than affirmative action.

Table 3 Advantages and disadvantages to addressing frameworks for addressing EDI (created from content in Henry et al., 2017)

Approaches to EDI	Advantages	Disadvantages
Human Rights	Fits within the neoliberal context of the academy	Does not address broader structural inequities Focus on individual Not proactive (complaint-driven)

		Developed primarily to address workplace sexual harassment
Equity	Proactive Addresses structural inequities Theoretically effective	Subject to criticism based on perceptions of "unfairness" and "reverse discrimination" Subject to implementation failure because of resistance and denial
Diversity	Recognize cultural diversity and plurality	Vague Often does not deal with inequity Preoccupation with "managing diversity" rather than structural inequities

Institutional structures to support the relevant frameworks are crucial to EDI within the university context. According to their policy and document analysis of thirty, English-language universities, Henry et. al. noted that most universities had committees that supported the mechanisms through which organizations framed EDI work (Table 3). A review of U15 websites demonstrates a trend of supporting senior advisory committees with high-level administrative staff (Table 4).

This aligns with Henry et al.'s 2017 recommendation to hire "an administrator responsible for equity whose office should be well resourced, with adequate financing and expertise, located within the very senior administrative structure of the institution" (pg 315). The authors recommend that the mandate for equity come from a provost or a president as an academic leader, rather than from Human Resources (Henry et al., 2017). Other Universities of note are University of Guelph which has an Assistant Vice-President, Office of Diversity and Human Rights, and Ryerson University with a Vice-President, Equity and Community Inclusion.

Table 4 Senior advisory committees at English-language U15 Universities included in The Equity Myth analysis, 2011-2014 (N=13)

	Equity Committees
Dalhousie	Employment Equity
McGill	Equity
Queens	Aboriginal, Accessibility, Employment Equity
Ottawa	EDIC
Toronto	Anti-racism, Diversity, Equity
McMaster	Equity, Sexual Harassment

Waterloo	Equity
Western	Aboriginal, Accessibility
Manitoba	None
Saskatchewan	None
Alberta	Aboriginal, Employment
Calgary	Gender, Sexual Harassment
British Columbia	Diversity, Employment Equity, Human Rights

Table 5 U15 Universities with a high-level administrative EDI position, 2018

	Positions
Dalhousie	N/A
McGill	N/A
Queen's	Deputy Provost, Academic Operations and Inclusion
Ottawa	N/A
Toronto	N/A
McMaster	Associate Vice-President, Equity and Inclusion
Waterloo	Associate Vice-President, Human Rights, Equity & Inclusion
Western	N/A
Manitoba	N/A
Saskatchewan	N/A
Alberta	N/A
Calgary	Director, Office of Diversity, Equity and Protected Disclosure
British Columbia	Associate Vice-President, Equity & Inclusion

Despite the introduction and evolution of these mechanisms – beginning in the 1980s – CAUT reports "the Canadian academy remains largely white and male" (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2010). Analysis of census data demonstrates ongoing underrepresentation of women, First Nations, and visible minority professors, as well as significant earnings and unemployment gaps (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2018). Changes in the broader social context, in particular Black Lives Matter movement, the release of the TRC report and #metoo have highlighted the slow pace of change and resulted in increasing national interest in EDI programmes in scientific and academic settings. Several relevant Canadian institutions have made commitments to addressing EDI on campuses across Canada, including Universities Canada and the tri-council agencies. Interestingly, various institutions have adopted elements from all three frameworks, however there seems to be a trend towards Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) being used in tandem. In follow up to the Gender Summit 11, which was held in Montreal in November 2017, **Universities Canada** released a statement on behalf of University Presidents (Universities Canada, n.d.). They committed university Presidents – including uOttawa – to the following seven principles:

Embracing pluralism and thriving through diversity – shaping science and innovation

1. We believe our universities are enriched by diversity and inclusion. As leaders of universities that aspire to be diverse, fair and open, we will make our personal commitment to diversity and inclusion evident.

2. We commit our institutions to developing and/or maintaining an equity, diversity and inclusion action plan in consultation with students, faculty, staff and administrators, and particularly with individuals from under-represented groups. We commit to demonstrating progress over time.

3. We commit to taking action to provide equity of access and opportunity. To do so, we will identify and address barriers to, and provide supports for, the recruitment and retention of senior university leaders, university Board and Senate members, faculty, staff and students, particularly from under-represented groups.

4. We will work with our faculty and staff, search firms, and our governing boards to ensure that candidates from all backgrounds are provided support in their career progress and success in senior leadership positions at our institutions.

5. We will seek ways to integrate inclusive excellence throughout our university's teaching, research, community engagement and governance. In doing so, we will engage with students, faculty, staff, our boards of governors, senates and alumni to raise awareness and encourage all efforts.

6. We will be guided in our efforts by evidence, including evidence of what works in addressing any barriers and obstacles that may discourage members of under-represented groups to advance. We commit to sharing evidence of practices that are working, in Canada and abroad, with higher education institutions.

7. Through our national membership organization, Universities Canada, we will work to generate greater awareness of the importance of diversity and inclusive excellence throughout Canadian higher education.

The **Canadian Research Chairs** (CRC) program has also come under criticism for the lack of diversity. CRC reports on gender equity and as of April 2018 only 21 percent of the Tier 1 CRC posts were held by women. Very little progress has been made in over a decade; the percentage of women holding Chairs did not change between 2006 and 2016; it held steady at 17 percent ("Program statistics," n.d.). People of colour, Indigenous people and people with disabilities are also seriously underrepresented. In response to these criticisms, the CRC program developed online resources documenting best practices for promoting equity, diversity and inclusion at each stage of planning for, recruiting, hiring and retaining diverse faculty (Canada Research Chairs, n.d.).

The CRC program recommends that search committees have representation from designated groups; that search committees be sensitized to issues of equity and unconscious biases through training or other awareness-building activities; that search committees be aware of any representation gap among the institution's chairholders and of the institution's strategy to address any underrepresentation as per the CRC target-setting exercise; and that the institution's equity officer (or equivalent) is involved and consulted at all stages of the process (Canada Research Chairs, n.d.).

Given the slow process, we should also remember that "[s]trong critiques have been made of the uses of diversity by institutions and of how the arrival of the term ''diversity'' involves the

departure of other (perhaps more critical) terms, including ''equality,'' ''equal opportunities,'' and ''social justice'' (Ahmed, 2012).

Data collection, monitoring and reporting

Despite the proliferation of metric-driven evaluations as part of what has been called the "managerial" practices at universities, only a small minority of Canadian universities routinely collect data on equity and diversity (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2018; Henry et al., 2017). A May 2018 report from the University of Toronto's Equity and Diversity in Research and Innovation (EDRI) Working Group stated that "[t]he need for quality data specific to U of T underpins many of the Working Group's Recommendations and we have made specific Recommendations to facilitate collection and use. Unfortunately, there is an absence of U of T data, but this should not hinder moving forward on the Recommendations" (EDRI Working Group, 2018). A similar challenge was documented in the 2016/2017 report from this committee, which experienced administrative barriers when attempting to access data on gender distribution at the Faculty level at University of Ottawa ("APUO - University of Ottawa Equity , Diversity and Inclusion Committee: Update on Progress 2016/2017," 2017). This is a challenge across Canadian Universities, but also an opportunity to establish a community of practice around data collection and knowledge generation in this area.

Of those that collect data, fewer have made public commitments to equity targets. A further challenge with data collection is the recognition that individual faculty may occupy more than one protected group. This reality is often referred to as intersectionality – a concept emerging from black feminist scholarship in the United States– which describes "the notion that social identities and social inequality based on ethnicity, sexual orientation, sex/gender…are interdependent and mutually constitutive… rather than independent and uni-dimensional" (Bowleg, 2008).

Operationalizing the concept of intersectionality to measure complex experiences of racism, sexism, transphobia, ableism, heterosexism and other types of discrimination is not a trivial task (Bowleg, 2008), and one that the university must take seriously. There is little work on this topic within the formal institutional structures, however the work by Henry et al. in *the Equity Myth* is a strong example of intersectional scholarship on EDI in Canada. Recognizing those challenges, there is a need to learn from Canadian scholars with expertise in EDI.

Several universities stand out in their experiences of EDI data collection processes. *Dalhousie's Be Counted* Census campaign achieved approximately 80 percent coverage of self-reported EDI data (Dalhousie University, n.d.). Ryerson University and University of Toronto run on-going data collection exercises, which are integrated within the institutional web-based Human Resources (HR) systems. At Ryerson, each time a faculty member logs into the online system a pop-up provides a prompt to fill in the survey (if they have not already done so).

A movement toward greater transparency and reporting is also becoming a requirement by the tri-council funding agencies. Following the lead of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) in June of 2018, the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and

Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) released a joint statement regarding their intent to introduce self-identification of diversity indicators for applicants (Canada, n.d.). Additionally, on behalf of the tri-council agencies, NSERC is leading a national consultation process for the adoption of a *Made-in-Canada* version of the United Kingdom's Athena SWAN (Scientific Women's Academic Network) Charter ("NSERC - Made-in-Canada Athena SWAN Consultation," n.d.). To comply with government-led gender equity initiatives, the Athena SWAN Charter has been adopted by institutes of higher education across the United Kingdom. The charter requires the use of organizational self-auditing to apply for either bronze, gold or silver award status. Although widely accepted as best practice, evaluation of the Charter's impact has been minimal and demonstrated mixed results (Caffrey et al., 2016). This provides an opportunity to engage with NSERC and other agencies, as they outline the framework for Canada and implement a pilot project in a select number of universities.

Hiring

Norms of the university and academic culture more generally emphasise individualism, "colour-blindness", egalitarianism, "excellence" and academic freedom over all other values (Ahmed, 2012). However, these values are often in direct tension with equity approaches that value non-academic routes to knowledge and experience. In order to recruit a more diverse pool of candidates, the University needs to consider and value other types of knowledge. In line with the TRC recommendations, for example, cluster-hiring or cohort hiring has been put forward as an approach to hiring Indigenous faculty and to introducing indigenous content into university curricula (Henry et al., 2017). This committee also recommends that both the APUO and the University examine ways that they can further contribute to Indigenization and reconciliation efforts. While broad program, curriculum and hiring decisions are obviously made by the University, we believe that the APUO has a valuable role in contributing to training and education for APUO members in relation to the TRC recommendations. Since APUO members staff hiring committees, they need to be trained to read dossiers from Indigenous candidates and to prioritize hiring Indigenous people in their various units.

Ensuring each hiring committee has representation from protected group members is important, as well as providing bias reducing training. In the context of a US institution, departmental training was shown to be effective (Devine et al., 2017). The evidence-based intervention was evaluated using a cluster randomized control trial. During the trial, two-and-a-half-hour anti-bias workshop was offered to 46 departments that were matched with 46 control departments (representing all 6 STEMM schools/colleges at the University). The workshop was designed using the prejudice habit model and participants were asked to write personal "statements of commitment" to take action to counter gender bias. In the two-years post-intervention, the intervention departments hired 18 percent more women than the control departments (32 percent women hires in the control and 47 percent in the intervention group) (Devine et al., 2017). Bias-reducing workshops may be effective with hiring for other protected groups, and must be combined with promotion and retention strategies in order to retain hires from the protected groups. As the EDIC report from 2017 notes, while there has been some movement re gender, other protected groups have not been explicitly protected by the CA and by data collection in the

past. This committee argues strongly that while gender pay equity and considering gender discrimination is extremely important, it is equally important to examine the impact of structural racism against Black, Indigenous and people of colour as well as the impact of ableism, homophobia, transphobia and classism. This committee would also like to note the importance of considering equity issues related to undocumented people, refugees, and newcomers as well.

Promotion and retention

Promotion processes at universities are also shown to disadvantage women and racialized professors. The primary measures of academic merits include publication in high-impact peer reviewed journals and obtaining competitive grants and student appraisals. It has been demonstrated that women are disadvantaged in scholarly publishing (Lundine, Bourgeault, Clark, Heidari, & Balabanova, 2018; Nature, 2018) and grant-making processes, partly as a result of implicit biases in granting committees evaluation of academic excellence (Tamblyn, Girard, Qian, & Hanley, 2018; Witteman, Hendricks, Straus, & Tannenbaum, 2017). Women are also less likely to be nominated for prestigious research chairs, as highlighted by the Canada Research Chairs program ("Program statistics," n.d.). Further, time spent carrying out academic care and service work, such as teaching, community outreach and engagement and sitting on committees (including diversity, equity and inclusion committees) is higher amongst women and racialized staff than for white men (Cummins, 2005; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Henry et al., 2017; Holman, Stuart-Fox, & Hauser, 2018; Sheridan et al., 2017). Teaching and service work are often not given significant weight in consideration for promotion or tenure within the university structure.

A recent decision by an arbitrator at Ryerson University has provided new grounds for reassessing the measure by which faculty are assessed. Specifically, the university may no longer use student appraisals for promotion or tenure decisions, given the strong evidence of "biases around gender, ethnicity, accent, age, even "attractiveness," [that] may factor into students' ratings of professors, making SETs deeply discriminatory against numerous "vulnerable" faculty" (Farr, 2018). This decision supports research demonstrating that race, "accents", disability and other factors negatively impact student evaluations.

Universities elsewhere are beginning to reimagine evaluation criteria. Recognizing the structural inequities built into academic incentives, the University Medical Center Utrecht in the Netherlands is beginning to "*create policies that ensured individual researchers would be judged on their actual contributions and not the counts of their publications. And we wanted our research programmes to be geared towards creating societal impact and not just scientific excellence*" (Benedictus, Miedema, & Ferguson, 2016). The Committee recommends that uOttawa follow this lead.

Mentorship has also been shown to be an effective approach to successfully navigating an academic career (Ford, 2016; Hart, 2016; Henry et al., 2017; Muhs, Niemann, González, & Harris, 2012). Drawing on lessons from women's leadership initiatives in other academic contexts, the University of Ottawa could establish a formal mentorship program for junior academic staff from protected groups. This programming could build on the programming

offered by the Center for Academic Leadership at the University of Ottawa—a center that has already begun to offer programs targeting women, for example.