



INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT

Institution:

Contact name and information:

Instructions

Filling out all four sections of this report is mandatory. Institutions must email a PDF of this completed report and, if applicable, a revised copy of the institution's equity, diversity and inclusion action plan by December 15, 2018, to edi-edi@chairs-chaire.gc.ca. If an institution chooses to revise its action plan in anticipation of the assessment process, it must post an updated version of the plan on its [public accountability web page](#).

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Recognition

Each year, the Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat recognizes an institution with exemplary recruitment, nomination and/or appointment practices that promote equity and diversity. Indicate below whether your institution would like to be considered for the program's recognition. The evaluation process for the recognition will be based on the committee's assessment of this progress report and the institution's corresponding action plan.

Yes: X

No: _____

PART A: Equity and Diversity Targets and Gaps

A.1) Provide the current targets and gaps for your institution in the table below (using the [target-setting tool](#)).

Designated group	Target (percentage)	Target (actual number)	Representation (actual number)	Gap (actual number)
Women	28	8	11	0
Indigenous peoples	1	0	n/a	n/a
Persons with disabilities	4	1	n/a	n/a
Visible minorities	15	4	n/a	n/a

Number of currently active chairs: 28

Number of empty chairs: 4

Number of chairs currently under peer review: 0



A.2) Provide any contextual details, such as empty chairs for which recruitment processes have started (limit 200 words):

We have begun recruitment processes for the vacant Tier 1 Chair (NSERC). We have initiated allocation processes for the three new Tier 2 Chairs (1 SSHRC; 2 NSERC).

PART B: Results of the institution's Employment Systems Review, Comparative Review and Environmental Scan

In developing their action plans, institutions were required to develop objectives that were S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely), and include a measurement strategy for monitoring, reporting on progress, and course correcting if necessary, based on: 1) an employment systems review; 2) a comparative review; and 3) an environmental scan (see Appendix A for the requirements that the program stipulated to develop the action plans).

B.1) Outline the key findings of the employment systems review that was undertaken when drafting the action plan limit 250 words:

The University of Guelph 2014 Diversity Matters Census asked people to self-identify with any of the following groups: a Woman, Sexual Orientation, A Person with a Disability, an Aboriginal Person or a Visible Minority/Racialized Person. With 2,520 completed surveys, the University of Guelph achieved 82%, exceeding Federal Contractors Program compliance requirements.

The Census shows:

- 505 faculty/professional employees self-identified as a woman. This is more than "available" professional women in the Census Metropolitan Area (CMA)
- 166 faculty/professional employees self-identified as a Racialized Person.
- 5 faculty/professional employees identified as Aboriginal People. This represents an employment gap at the university, with availability in the CMA at 19.
- The census data show no employment gap in persons with disabilities with sixty-two of the



faculty/professional group self-identifying with this category.

The university's Employment Equity Goals 2017-2020 are available at <https://www.uoguelph.ca/diversity-human-rights/sites/uoguelph.ca.dhr/files/public/Employment%20Equity%20Goals%20PDF.pdf>

Employment Equity goals relevant to the CRC program include, for example:

- To develop and implement special measures to attract and hire a workforce that is representative of equity groups. **Benchmark:** Number of advertising sources and/or partnerships targeting underrepresented groups is increased.
- To monitor measures in place to ensure consistent implementation of recruitment, selection, hiring, and retention policies. **Benchmark:** Regular review of recruitment, selection, hiring and retention policies.
- To ensure equity in salaries and promotions for underrepresented groups. **Benchmark:** Report is complete and any anomalous salaries are identified and corrected.



B.2) Outline the key findings of the comparative review that was undertaken when drafting the action plan (limit 250 words):

To meet Objective 2 of our 2017 Action Plan, the university conducted a comparative review of institutional financial support provided to the university's active men and women chairholders in Fall 2018. The numbers of individuals from the other three groups are not significant enough to compare. The exercise revealed a gap in data systems; i.e. current systems do not permit tracking of *actual* institutional support. The data was therefore drawn from nomination/renewal forms. The university has initiated planning to address this gap.

Key findings

1. There are more men in Tier 1 positions than women; 36% of Tier 1 Chairs are women; 64% are men. By contrast, there are more women in Tier 2 positions than men; 53% women and 47% men.
2. Because the number of Tier 1 women is low (less than 5), we have only compared salary for Tier 2 Chairholders. The average annual salary of Tier 2 women is \$190,555 which is marginally higher than the average salary of Tier 2 men who earn \$185,137.
3. The distribution of genders by funding agencies is imbalanced. The ratios of female: male chairs per funding agency are: CIHR 1:3, NSERC 6:9 and SSHRC 5:2

B.3) Outline the key findings of the environmental scan that was undertaken when drafting the action plan (limit 250 words):

The institutional Action Plan builds on and leverages the university's 2017 Inclusion Framework. Inclusion Framework key findings spurred the following priorities which align with and advance the CRC institutional Action Plan:

- a. Support researchers in realising inclusivity in the research enterprise by developing and delivering training and resources (Framework Priority 3.3). The Office of Research is responsible for coordinating training sessions as part of its Faculty Information Workshop Series, with subject expertise from DHR.
- b. Engage with traditionally underrepresented students, staff and faculty to better understand their needs, identify gaps in existing support services, and address gaps (Framework Priority 2.1) Responsibility for this priority is shared by: Associate Vice President Academic, Human Resources, Faculty and Academic Staff Relations

B.4) Provide an overview of who was consulted in the drafting of the action plan. What form did the consultation/engagement with members of the four designated groups (i.e. women, persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples and visible minorities) and other underrepresented faculty take? What equity diversity and inclusion (EDI) experts were consulted? Note: Do not to disclose any third party personal information (limit 250 words):

The Inclusion Framework was the result of five years of consultation with stakeholders. In 2011/12, the Institute on Governance (IOG) undertook an operational review of the University of Guelph's Human Rights and Equity Office. As part of this review, the IOG used an on-line survey to obtain insight from students, staff and faculty, and conducted in-depth interviews. In 2013, the renamed Office of Diversity



and Human Rights (DHR) conducted follow-up focus groups to further clarify community needs and aspirations based on survey results and interviews. Feedback related to EDI collected from students, staff, and faculty to inform the University of Guelph Strategic Framework: Our Path Forward (2016) was also reviewed. Collectively, these consultations resulted in the Inclusion Framework for the University of Guelph which informed the EDI action plan.

The action plan was drafted in close consultation with the Assistant VP, Diversity and Human Rights (DHR) and Assistant VP, Faculty and Academic Staff Relations. The DHR provides the university with expertise in EDI and led the consultation that resulted in the Inclusion Framework. The DHR is therefore highly knowledgeable of current institutional EDI planning and progress. The FASR provides expertise in the faculty collective agreement, which includes measures to ensure transparent and equitable hiring processes for all faculty positions, including CRC.

The action plan was reviewed by the CRC Advisory Committee, which includes representation from at least two of the four designated groups.



PART C: Objectives, Indicators and Actions

Indicate what your institution's top six key EDI objectives are, as well as the corresponding indicators and actions (as indicated in the action plan). For each objective, outline what progress has been made, with reference to the indicators. Use the contextual information box to communicate any progress made to date for each objective.

<p>Key Objective 1: Meet or exceed CRC Program institutional targets for all four designated groups by December 2019.</p>
<p>Corresponding actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selectively use targeted recruitment to address gaps in accordance with the university's CRC policy 2. Actively work to exceed targets for each of the Four designated groups to mitigate risk due to turn-over
<p>Indicator(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By December 2018: achieve at least 60% of CRC target for members Visible Minorities; exceed the CRC target for Aboriginal Peoples 2. By December 2019: meet or exceed CRC target for members of Visible Minorities; meet or exceed CRC target for persons with disabilities; continue to meet or exceed CRC target for women; continue to meet or exceed the CRC target for Aboriginal Peoples.
<p>Progress:</p> <p>The university has achieved its 2018 targets for visible minorities and Indigenous People. With targeted searches launched this fall, the university expects to meet its targets for members of visible minorities with its October 2019 nominations.</p>
<p>Next steps:</p> <p>The university will continue to utilize targeted searches selectively</p>
<p>Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):</p> <p>While we are exceeding the target for women CRCs, the university recognizes the gender imbalance in STEM disciplines. Under the leadership of the Provost, the GenEq committee has set these goals: Increasing gender diversity in STEM and other fields in which women and other gender groups are under-represented; Improving how we recognize research and scholarship in terms of gender-based inequities; Addressing work-life issues that make it challenging for women and under-represented gender groups to participate equitably on campus.</p>



Key Objective 2:

Demonstrate the value of diversity, inclusion, and equity throughout the management, implementation, and promotion of the university's CRC program.

Corresponding actions:

1. Establish a committee mandated to review and evaluate recruitment and selection processes according to the university's revised CRC policies and the university's Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Action Plan.
2. Align standard operating procedures with policy; communicate and implement these procedures consistently.
3. Review the level of support being provided to individuals from the Four Designated Groups, to ensure they are not disadvantaged compared to other CRC chairholders and develop an action plan to correct any disadvantages. Consult with CRC members of the Four Designated Groups in order to determine the level of support required.
4. Review communications publicizing the university's CRC policies, actions, and postings to ensure that they express the value of diversity (ongoing)
5. Review communications publicizing CRC renewals and nominations to ensure that all emphasize research excellence, alignment with SRP, and with the values of the institution (ongoing).

Indicator(s):

1. Number of Canada Research Chairs in research areas relevant to diversity, equity, and inclusion is increased by 50% by 2019 (for a total of three).
2. Comparative review of support (financial and non-financial) provided to CRC chairholders is completed by December 2018
3. Every nomination and renewal submission meets the university's and the CRC Program's expectations of transparency, equity, fairness
4. Materials publicizing the university's CRC policies, actions, postings, and appointments clearly express the value of diversity and (in case of appointments) the merit of the nominee

Progress:

The university is on track to achieve this objective, as measured by progress against indicators.

1. The CRC Advisory Committee was established in September 2017. It reviews all nominations, including for renewal, and makes recommendations to the Provost & VPA and VPR in accordance with its mandate:
 - The proposal's and/or the candidate's ability to address any underrepresentation among the four designated groups identified by the CRC program.
 - The likelihood of success against CRC selection criteria;
 - The fit of the proposal's and/or candidate's research program with the university's Strategic Research Plan;
 - Composition, training, assessment process, and other modus operandi was consistent with TIPS requirements.
2. Faculty and Academic Staff Relations (FASR) and the Office of Research Services (ORS) are both involved in implementation of the university's CRC policy. Standard operating procedures of these offices have been updated and flow-charted to ensure that EDI principles are integrated in operations. Updates include:
 - FASR has updated its standard "requests to advertise" checklist to include new CRC requirements – for all faculty recruitment, not only CRC.
 - As it does for all academic searches, FASR consults with DHR to ensure that targeted CRC searches are compliant with Ontario Human Rights legislation.
 - FASR has updated its standard "request to negotiate" form to include two new sections:
 - 1: for all faculty recruitment the form now includes an attestation form requiring the Dean's signature, that the selection followed institutional requirements to ensure equity and transparency in search, recruitment and selection.
 - 2: for CRC positions only the form includes an attestation form requiring the signature of all Advisory Committee members, attesting Composition, training, assessment process, and other modus operandi was consistent with TIPS requirements



- o FASR performs a comparative review of salary for all faculty recruitment, not only CRCs. This will remain in place for CRCs.
 - o FASR will maintain the archive of all materials related to CRC searches, for monitoring and accountability purposes.
 - o The ORS will alert the Provost's Office when a Chair is 18 months from termination so that the Provost's Office can communicate with the relevant dean to ensure appropriate transition planning.
3. A gender-based comparison of institutional support is completed. Other groups could not be compared because the numbers are not significant enough to enable valid comparison. Results are summarized in B2. Consultation is scheduled for Spring/Summer 2019, following analysis of the Diversity Matters Census.
 4. Communications of CRC policies are reviewed by the Assistant VP Diversity and published by the Office of Research Communications to ensure AODA compliance.
 5. Communications of CRC renewals and nominations are published by the university's Communications and Public Affairs.

Next Steps:

- The relevant offices, FASR, ORS, DHR, Provost's Office and Finance will review work-flow and updated forms in Summer/Fall 2019.
- The Office of Research has updated its internal "CRC request form" to include the financial and non-financial support provided by the department/college in order to enable better monitoring and comparison at the nomination stage.
- The Office of Research is working with relevant financial units on campus to enable better monitoring and comparison of actual institutional contribution to chair programs.

Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):

The comparison of financial support is based on committed funds, rather than actual. The university's current systems do not enable us to capture actual expenditures that are paid by the institution, or to track non-financial support provided. As identified above, the financial units are developing systems that will enable better monitoring and reporting of financial support provided to chairholders by the institution.



Key Objective 3:

By December 2019, implement two key Inclusion Framework priorities to make the research environment and the university's CRC program more inclusive.

Corresponding actions:

In accordance with the Inclusion Framework:

1. Support researchers in realising inclusivity in the research enterprise by developing and delivering training and resources (Framework Priority 3.3). The Office of Research will coordinate training sessions as part of its Faculty Information Workshop Series, with subject expertise from DHR.
2. Engage with traditionally underrepresented students, staff and faculty to better understand their needs, identify gaps in existing support services, and address gaps (Framework Priority 2.1) Responsibility for this priority is shared by: Vice-President Academic, Human Resources, Faculty and Academic Staff Relations.

Indicator(s):

1. CRC chairholders from the four designated groups are included in the consultation on supports available for members of under-represented groups ([Inclusion Framework](#) priority 2.1) based on results of the Diversity Matters Census 2018
2. training modules in integrating EDI principles in research programs coordinated by the Office of Research Services and developed/delivered by ODHR to research office staff and researchers, including CRC chairholders

Progress:

The university is on track to meet this objective. The Diversity Matters Census 2018 has been implemented. Analysis will be completed by spring/summer 2019.

Next Steps:

The ORS will continue to support the work of relevant offices (DHR and FASR) to implement Inclusion Framework priorities by December 2019.

Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):



PART D: Challenges and Opportunities

Other than what has been outlined in the section above, outline any challenges and opportunities/successes, as well as best practices that have been discovered to date in developing and implementing the institutional equity, diversity and inclusion action plan (limit: 500 words):

Best practices:

The FASR has a suite of tools and processes to support equitable and transparent search and recruitment of all faculty. While some of these have been updated in response to new CRC program requirements, the strong foundation was already in place. For example:

Faculty Recruitment Guidelines are intended to serve as a best practice guide to effective, fair and equitable recruitment and selection of new Faculty Members at the University. The purpose of the guidelines is to ensure that selection processes are fair, welcoming of diversity, defensible and result in the best hiring decisions.

The recruitment checklist includes the following items for the Search Committee:

- o Confirm membership (diversity, student rep required)
- o Orientation through Diversity and Human Rights (DHR) for all members
- o Identify position requirements
- o Determine advertising strategy (including measures for reaching diverse applicant pool)
- o Draft advertisement in consultation with Faculty & Academic Staff Relations (FASR), if needed

The Request to Advertise form is submitted by the Dean to FASR for the Provost's approval. It requires the search committee be listed, and "To ensure the committee is reflective of the diversity of the University, the composition of the Search committee will include one or more representative members from the equity seeking groups." It also identifies that while FASR will post the position to usual outlets, hiring departments/ colleges are required to list other measures/outlets to ensure a diverse applicant pool.

The Request to Negotiate form is submitted by the Dean to the FASR for Provost approval. It includes:

- Number of Applicants from Applicant Tracking Data: (provided Diversity & Human Rights);
- Justification of candidate ranking;
- Salary Range & Justification, including salary comparators.

As outlined above, the Request to Negotiate form now includes two attestation forms: Dean must attest to the fairness of the search committee process and compliance with the Collective Agreement; the CRC Advisory Committee must attest to the process's compliance with CRC EDI requirements.

This document is used by FASR to conduct a salary comparison to ensure fair remuneration.



Appendix A - Institutional Equity, Diversity, Inclusion Action Plan Requirements

To remain eligible for the program, all institutions with five or more chair allocations must develop and implement an equity, diversity and inclusion action plan. This plan must guide their efforts for sustaining the participation of and/or addressing the underrepresentation of individuals (based on the [institution's equity gaps](#)) from the four designated groups (FDGs)—women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities and visible minorities—among their chair allocations. Institutions are expected to develop the plan in collaboration with individuals from each of the FDGs, chairholders, faculty and administrators responsible for implementing the program at the institution.

It is important to note that institutions can only address their gaps once chair positions become available (i.e., when their current chairholders' terms end). However, it is expected that institutions will manage their chair allocations carefully in order to meet their equity and diversity targets, which includes choosing not to renew Tier 2 or Tier 1 chairholders as necessary.

Institutions must have action plans posted on their websites as of December 15, 2017. They must also email a copy of their action plan by email to the program at edi-edi@chairs-chaire.gc.ca. If an institution fails to meet these requirements by the deadlines stipulated, **the program will withhold peer review and payments for nominations submitted to the fall 2017 intake cycle, and to future cycles as necessary, until the requirements are fulfilled.**

Institutions must inform the Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat when they revise or update their action plans by emailing edi-edi@chairs-chaire.gc.ca.

On December 15, 2018, institutions will be required to report to the program using the [Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Progress Report](#), and publicly on their [public accountability and transparency web pages](#), on the progress made in implementing their action plans and meeting their objectives.

The action plan must include, at a minimum, the following components:

1) Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Objectives and Measurement Strategies

- impactful equity, diversity and inclusion objectives, indicators, and actions that will enable swift progress towards:
 - addressing disadvantages currently experienced by individuals of the FDGs; and
 - meeting the institution's equity targets and goals by December 2019—aggressive objectives must be set using this timeline based on the number of chair allocations that are (or will become) available in the institution within the next 18 to 24 months (the 18 months starts as of December 15, 2017, when the action plan is implemented).



- objectives should be S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely), and include a measurement strategy for monitoring, reporting on progress, and course correcting if necessary, based on:
 - an employment systems review to identify the extent to which the institution's current recruitment practices are open and transparent; barriers or practices that could be having an adverse effect on the employment of individuals from the FDGs; and corrective measures that will be taken to address systematic inequities (an example of corrective measures that could be taken by institutions in Ontario is provided on the [Ontario Human Rights Commission website](#));
 - a comparative review—by gender, designated group, and field of research—of the level of institutional support (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.) provided to all current chairholders, including measures to address systemic inequities;
 - an environmental scan to gauge the health of the institution's current workplace environment and the impact that this may be having (either positive or negative) on the institution's ability to meet its equity, diversity, and inclusion objectives, and measures that will be taken to address any issues raised; and
 - the institution's unique challenges based on its characteristics (e.g., size, language requirements, geographic location, etc.) in meeting its equity targets, and how these will be managed and mitigated.
- institutions will be required to report to the program and publicly on the progress made in meeting their objectives on a yearly basis.

2) Management of Canada Research Chair Allocations

Provide a description of:

- the institution's policies and processes for recruiting Canada Research chairholders, and all safeguards that are in place to ensure that these practices are open and transparent;
- how the institution manages its allocation of chairs and who is involved in these decisions (e.g., committee(s), vice-president level administrators, deans / department heads);
- the institution's decision-making process for determining in which faculty, department, research area to allocate its chair positions, and who approves these decisions;
- the decision-making process for how the institution chooses to use the [corridor of flexibility](#) in managing its allocation of chairs, and who approves these decisions;
- the decision-making process and criteria for determining whether Tier 2 and Tier 1 chairholders will be submitted for renewal and who is involved in these decisions;
- the process and criteria for deciding whether to advance individuals from a Tier 2 chair to a Tier 1 chair, and who is involved in these decisions;
- the process and criteria for deciding which chairholder(s) will be phased-out in the case where the institution loses a chair due to the [re-allocation process](#), and who is involved in these decisions;



- the decision-making process for determining what level of support is provided to chairholders (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.), and who within the institution is involved in these decisions;
- safeguards taken to ensure that individuals from the FDGs are not disadvantaged in negotiations related to the level of institutional support provided to them (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.);
- measures to ensure that individuals from the FDGs are not disadvantaged when applying to a chair position in cases where they have career gaps due to parental or health related leaves or for the care and nurturing of family members; and
- training and development activities related to unconscious bias, equity, diversity and inclusion for administrators and faculty involved in the recruitment and nomination processes for chair positions (acknowledging that research has shown unconscious bias can have adverse, unintended and negative impacts on the overall success/career of individuals, especially those from the FDGs).

3) Collection of Equity and Diversity Data

Provide a description of:

- the institution's processes and strategies for collecting and protecting data on the FDGs (both applicants to chair positions and successful candidates);
- the institution's strategies for encouraging individuals to self-identify as a member of the FDGs; and
- an example of the institution's self-identification form as an appendix.

4) Retention and Inclusivity

Provide a description of:

- how the institution provides a supportive and inclusive workplace for all chairholders (including those from the FDGs) and how this is monitored (e.g., survey of chairholders, monitoring why chairholders leave the institution);
- the procedures, policies and supports in place that enable the retention of individuals from the FDGs;
- the process by which the institution manages complaints from its chairholders/faculty related to equity within the program;
- the contact information of an individual or individuals at the institution responsible for addressing any equity concerns/complaints regarding the management of the institution's chair allocations; and
- a mechanism for how concerns/complaints are monitored and addressed, and reported to senior management.