INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT

Institution: McGill University

Contact name and information: Angela Campbell angela.campbell@mcgill.ca

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-chaires.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:_____ 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	32%	49	53	no gap
Indigenous peoples	1%	1	-	-
Persons with disabilities	4%	6	-	-
Visible minorities	15%	23	31	no gap

Number of currently active chairs: 155

Number of empty chairs: 11

Number of chairs currently under peer review: 9

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

For our April 2019 submissions to fill vacant chairs, we have revamped our internal recruitment and selection processes to ensure that every nomination presented to the TIPS has gone through equitable recruitment and selection processes at all levels (departmental, faculty, institutional), with determinations made by diverse, equity-trained review committees.

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:

Our employment systems review was conducted as part of McGill's participation in an Employment Equity Program under Quebec legislation. While not every aspect of McGill's Employment Systems Review is directly relevant to the CRC Program McGill has identified several objectives which are particularly germane.

One finding from the review was the need to increase capacity of search committees, including those involved in CRC processes, to understand the legislative framework related to Employment Equity in Quebec and to ensure that committees are well-equipped to apply the corrective measures prescribed therein. The legislation calls for preferential hiring of members of designated groups when two or more candidates are deemed to be of equal merit. The Act further stipulates that merit should be determined according to equivalency class (e.g. 90% to 100% excellent category, 80% to 89% very good category, etc.) rather than by numerical ranking. Our review indicates that preferential hiring based on equivalency class should be commonplace rather than exceptional but that more work was needed to increase understanding and uptake related to this framework at McGill.

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

While a complete comparative review of the CRC program is scheduled for Spring 2019, ongoing attention has been paid to conditions of chairholders within the program to ensure fairness. Internal review committee members look at all the plans for supports from the Deans/Chairs to ensure parity/equity across nominations. A core group of people, including the Associate Provost (Equity and Academic Policies) and the Senior Employment Equity Advisor, sit on all 3 internal review committees so we can observe all nominations that come forward and spot any discrepancies in allocation of resources to different nominees.

Further, the Annual Reports For Chairholders are closely monitored with a view to addressing inequity where it is reported.

One finding that has emerged from our review is the need to ensure that individual chairholders are not responsible for negotiating protected time individually, as this could lead to wide disparities

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

McGill's Environmental Scan was presented to University Senate in Spring 2016.

One finding from the Report pertained to workplace culture and norms, including reports from women and racialized faculty of feeling undervalued, isolated and demoralized, and a recommendation was made for the appointment of of a senior administrative officer position with a specific mandate to promote diversity and inclusiveness in order to help address issues of climate and to strengthen reporting structures related to harassment and discrimination.

Another main theme was concern about the lack of faculty diversity, and a sense that hiring practices for tenure track positions lacked robust equity measures and were not transparent. A recommendation was for resources to be allocated to address this issue, in order to promote culture change and to

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 Associate Provost (Equity and Academic Policies) and the Senior Employment Equity Advisor took the lead on drafting the EDI Action Plan.

This was done in broad consultation with members of the McGill community, including senior leadership, the equity team in the Office of the Provost, the Research and Innovation team, and the Chairs and members of the Joint Board Senate Committee on Equity (JBSCE). The JBSCE includes subcommittees for women, persons with disabilities, queer people, racialized and ethnic persons, Indigenous persons and a family care committee; the membership of these subcommittees include academic and support staff as well as student representatives.

Drafts of the report were circulated for feedback at multiple stages of development, and comments were diligently reviewed and incorporated into the writing of the document. In-person meetings were also held with the Dean's working group and the JBSCE to elicit input in developing the plan.

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.

Key Objective 1:
Responding to concerns identified in environmental scan (2016)
Corresponding actions:
Creation of 2 EDI-focused positions; enhanced EDI education, community-building, and recognition
Indicator(s):
AAUDE survey would show improved climate for FDG members; enhanced recruitment/retention practices
Progress:
EDI education strengthened re hiring, learning/working environment, harassment/discrimination reporting
Next steps:
AAUDE survey data to be disaggregated by race, gender; survey to be re-administered in 2020
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
To grow EDI education and response capacities, we created several new positions, including: a Senior Emp

Key Objective 2:
Improved information, training and processes related to accommodations for CRCs who identify as PWD
Corresponding actions:
Equity education deployed; accommodations process delineated and duty to accommodate communicated
Indicator(s):
Training modified; increase in CRC who self-ID as PWD; increase in requests for accommodation;
Progress:
Equity education developed and delivered; accommodations delineated and communications proceeding;
Next Steps:
Continue comms strategy; continue equity education; closely monitor CRC target for PWD
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
A major obstacle relates to the incomplete information our community members have regarding what consti

Key Objective 3:
Ensure selection committees apply the corrective measure of preference within equivalency classes
Corresponding actions:
Modify selection committee training to ensure committees have full understanding of this measure
Indicator(s):
Training is modified; Information is disseminated via multiple means; CRC EDI targets achieved.
Progress:
Training has been modified and delivered to over 200 faculty search committee members
Next Steps:
Ongoing in person training; commitment to having difficult conversations to support culture change
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
The notion of equivalency classes has not been readily accepted in our academic setting; for many colleagu

Key Objective 4:
Improve data collection and analysis throughout search process to identify and remove barriers for FDGs
Corresponding actions:
Improve applicant survey; increase response rate; analyze at all stages of proccess
Indicator(s):
Applicant survey modeled on best practices; response rate increases; yearly analysis conducted
Progress:
Applicant survey is improved; a significant increase in response rates has been achieved;
Next Steps:
Continue to improve survey and response rate; analyze data at close of yearly cycle
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Our applicant data is currently collected manually; participation in the survey and capacity to analyze the da

Key Objective 5:
Ensure chairholders are not individually responsible for negotiating conditions linked to their CRC
Corresponding actions:
Comparative analysis, education of Deans & Chairs, corrective measures where required.
Indicator(s):
Substantive fairness in chairholders' conditions; corrective measures applied where required.
Progress:
Shortcomings are being identified and corrected; annual reports of CRCs reviewed
Next Steps:
More fulsome and structured comparative review and analysis to be undertaken in 2019
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
On request, analysis was undertaken of fairness of conditions/salary versus those of others. Where shortco

Key Objective 6:
Increase representativeness and improve climate for significantly underrepresented FDGs in CRCs
Corresponding actions:
Strategic Indigenous studies cluster hire initiative; ongoing nomination for CRCs of members of FDGs.
Indicator(s):
Enhanced representation among CRCs; retention, success, & satisfaction of CRCs who are FDG members
Progress:
Enhanced representation of Indigenous CRCs since 2018 (1 confirmed and 1 forthcoming)
Next Steps:
Ongoing targeted recruitment and nomination of CRCs, especially PWD and Indigenous
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Legal advice indicates we may not reserve chair nominations to members of FDGs. Training review committ

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):

Challenges:
• Given that McGill is a large campus, rolling out EDI education and raising awareness to a uniform, satisfactory level can present a challenge. We are boosting resources and examining the prospect of online training/education to ensure that all individuals responsible for academic recruitment and chairholder nomination and selection have appropriate training, with view to enhancing EDI on our campus.
• Our employment equity data set is not yet complete; we are currently at a 65% response rate overall (70% for tenure track faculty). Without accurate data it is difficult to measure our progress. We are taking steps to boost response rates through (a) regular prompts, (b) communications about the importance and use of this information to develop sound policy and about the confidentiality in which it is held; (c) communications about who is included in FDGs, which is particularly important for persons with disabilities, as the notion of "disability" is not fully understood.
• The physical layout of our campus and the state of many McGill buildings present a real challenge for persons with disabilities that impact mobility.

Opportunities:
• True promise for boosting EDI lies in our current Indigenous priority hire – 6 recruitment licenses have just been issued in diverse disciplinary areas; these are in addition to at least 3 other existing licenses. McGill has real potential to boost its complement of Indigenous professors with a view to realizing on the commitments undertaken in the 2016 Provost's Task Force on Indigenous Studies & Indigenous Education, and the Calls to Action set for postsecondary institutions by the Truth & Reconciliation Commission.
• Opportunistic hires where excellent candidates are identified without a license whose recruitment would boost EDI/representation of FDGs. Currently pursuing 2 opportunistic hires.
• Explore possibilities with Deans and Advancement to examine potential for endowed chairs that would increase EDI/representativeness – e.g., African Diasporic Studies, Disability Studies, Indigenous Language Revitalization.
• McGill's Bicentennial is approaching (2021) and equity is a key theme – this will be an opportunity to raise EDI awareness on campus

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-chaires.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-chaires.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.