



INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT

Institution: Carleton University

Contact name and information:

Andrea Lawrance, Director, Carleton Office for Research Initiatives and Services

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: _____

No: _____ **x**



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	29%	6	7	no gap
Indigenous peoples	1%	3	6	no gap
Persons with disabilities	4%	<1	*	*
Racialized persons	15%	<1	*	*

Number of currently active chairs: 20

Number of vacant chairs: 5

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):

Carleton has five vacant Tier 2 Chairs. This number includes only those CRCs allocated to the university prior to September, 2018. The recruiting process is complete for one of these, and the nomination is being prepared for submission to the Secretariat. The candidate is an equity group member. Two others are currently being advertised, while two are not yet at the recruitment stage. The university is particularly focused on closing its gap in the area of hiring CRCs who identify as persons with disabilities, and in ensuring no gap occurs among the other three designated groups as empty Chairs are filled or vacancies created. To do this, we may be using the corridor of flexibility. We want to ensure our CRC openings attract the widest possible population of qualified candidates, whether by making Tier 1 Chairs into Tier 2s, or changing a Chair’s agency affiliation (e.g., from NSERC to SSHRC) to hire a candidate whose approach differs from the position’s original assignment.



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 employment systems review showed that Carleton is doing well in its hiring of members of the four federally designated equity groups among its Canada Research Chairs. At the time of the review, Carleton exceeded the published CRC equity targets in two of the four categories (women and racialized persons), and was in the process of nominating a candidate who self-identified as Indigenous (nomination since confirmed). When considering the statistics for representation of the designated groups among CRCs at all medium-sized universities, Carleton was found to have a higher representation of women and racialized persons (and now Indigenous CRCs). The review showed that Chairs with self-identified disabilities were under-represented at our institution.

The results of the most recent university-wide employee equity and diversity census showed that among the university's faculty employment group as a whole, Carleton exceeded the national representation level only among persons with disabilities, and is below the national external workforce representation in each of the four categories. Whether or not the differences are statistically significant, the university takes them seriously and has developed a set of goals to remedy the situation.

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

The comparative review showed that the university's practices regarding CRC compensation and support were being applied uniformly across all the active Chairs. Where differences existed in salary, they were attributable to objective factors inherent in the methodology used to calculate any faculty member's starting salary. All CRCs receive a standardized salary increment in recognition of being a Chair, the amount dependent only upon whether they are Tier 1 or 2. Similarly, differences in space allocations and equipment provided were attributable to differing needs among the various disciplines and research areas of the various CRCs. Research funds were uniformly provided to CRCs in accord with the university practice. All CRCs benefitted from half-load teaching release: the exact quantification of this is according to the differing number of courses constituting a normal teaching load from faculty to faculty within the university. Anecdotal information about possible excess committee participation burden on faculty who self-identify as designated group members will be assessed in the 2019 environmental scan.



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

The objective data portion of the environmental scan showed that all CRCs consistently received the promised level of teaching release, as well as other institutional support promised to them by the university. Basic CRC research funding provided by OVPRI was standardized, and remained consistent for both Tier 1 and 2 Chairs.

The individual and group interview portion of the full environmental scan, tabled while collective bargaining with the faculty association in 2017-18, is being completed by the Office of Quality Initiatives (OQI) in 2019. We believe the responses to the OQI survey will be more candid than anything that could be achieved by those directly responsible for managing the university's CRC program on a daily basis. OQI is arm's length from both the Office of the Vice-President (Research and International) and OVPRI's Carleton Office for Research Initiatives and Services, as well as from the Office for Equity Services, which receives, investigates, and resolves any allegations of discrimination. The OQI survey will probe in depth for subjective details and observations to uncover evidence of other disadvantaging or inequitable processes, practices, or outcomes that affect the members of the four designated groups. We thus expect that the results will go much further in helping the university to identify and redress the subtle or hidden barriers and disadvantages that our CRCs perceive and experience. With this information, we will be able to develop preventive practices and processes, and establish systems for prospective monitoring.

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 racialized persons) 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 initial version of the CRC EDI action plan was developed as a collaborative and consultative effort, including the following:

Document development:

1. Members of the federally designated equity groups
2. Director of Equity Services
3. Director of the Carleton Office for Research Initiatives and Services
4. Research Facilitator, Institutional Initiatives (CRC Program)
5. Manager, Faculty Affairs, Office of the Provost
6. Manager, Institutional Analysis, Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Review and comment:

7. Acting President, Carleton University
8. Interim Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
9. Vice-President (Research and International)
10. Acting Associate Vice-President (Research and International)
11. Associate Vice-President (Strategic Initiatives and Operations)
12. Manager, Research Communications

Review and approval: Board of Governors, Carleton University



The revised version involved development work by the above. A further revision will incorporate the results of individual interviews and focus group consultations with CRCs who self-identify as members of the four designated groups, and CRCs who do not so identify. Consultations took the form of face-to-face meetings, discussions, and review/critique of the document as elements of it were developed. The director of Equity Services, an expert in equity, diversity, and inclusion matters both within the university and in the wider community, was a core member of the document development team. The document was generated through an iterative process including all the participants cited above, and involved collaborative and individual writing and review sessions. Members of three of the four federally designated groups (women, persons with a disability, and racialized persons) were directly involved in all stages of writing 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: Close any existing or foreseen potential gaps in meeting equity targets
<p>Corresponding actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advertising specifically targeted members of the four designated groups 2. Available Chairs may be allocated to areas appealing to FDG members 3. Hiring committees are charged with carefully attending to EDI considerations through the hiring process
<p>Indicator(s): At least one CRC self-identifying as an Indigenous person and one self-identifying as having a disability will be hired.</p>
<p>Progress: CRCs who self-identify as Indigenous, as female and as a racialized person have been hired. Three of our four EDI targets are met or exceeded.</p>
<p>Next steps: We are focused on closing the gap in the fourth EDI category, and on continuing to recruit EDI candidates from those categories where we have met our targets.</p>
<p>Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words): Self-identification responses are low; we may be achieving all targets but unable to claim it without CRCs/applicants choosing to self-identify. Voluntary completion of the self-identification survey is being made mandatory, with a "choose not to answer" option for each question: may or may not solve the problem. We may use the corridor of flexibility to reorient Chairs, hopefully drawing more EDI applicants.</p>

Key Objective 2: Improve understanding of EDI issues and ways to combat unconscious bias in the recruiting and hiring process for CRCs in all Faculties, leading to a culture change promoting EDI throughout the University
<p>Corresponding actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training in unconscious bias is completed by all members and persons involved in the recruitment, assessment, and hiring of CRC candidates 2. Hiring committee members and persons involved in the interview or decision processes receive training in alternative methods of career assessment appropriate to consideration of members of the four designated groups. The content is determined by the director of Equity Services. Dissemination of the resources to the hiring manager for any CRC will be provided as part of the Academic Hiring Committee checklist. Hiring committees are made aware that the latest equity statistics (by faculty) are available on the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) website for reference. 3. A hiring committee Equity Champion is identified, who is supported and advised by Equity Services, which will be the resource for training. 4. Regular EDI including unconscious bias workshops for all hiring committee members (not just for CRCs) will continue to be available semi-annually and upon request



Indicator(s): Training in preventing unconscious bias will be completed by all members of Carleton faculty who are involved in hiring processes.
Progress: All CRC hiring committee members receive training in preventing unconscious bias and in alternate methods of career assessment by the director of Equity Services. An Equity Champion is named for every hiring committee at its outset, responsible for ensuring EDI requirements are met in all facets of the process, in all deliberations, and in all hiring actions.
Next steps: The results of the Office of Quality Initiatives (OQI) survey will be used to determine if there are areas where training needs to be changed to reinforce it or make it more effective.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words): Training is going smoothly across all hiring committees. We will monitor it and be prepared to improve the content/delivery should reports from the Equity Champions show there are problems arising despite the current training.

Key Objective 3: Remove systemic and institutional barriers to the recruitment and hiring of CRCs who identify as women, racialized persons, persons with disabilities, or Indigenous persons.
Corresponding actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A self-identification survey of all active CRCs will be conducted 2. Developing a Carleton Co-ordinated Accessibility Strategy 3. Through campus-wide consultation, conducted by the Indigenous Strategic Initiatives Committee, develop an action plan directing Carleton's response to the Truth and Reconciliation Report: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Indigenous Learning Place Consultation and Report b. Indigenous Strategic Initiatives Committee Action Plan
Indicator(s): The number of self-identified members of the four designated groups will increase among CRCs in particular, and among faculty and university staff in general, based on university self-identification surveys.
Progress: In the past year, representation among Carleton's CRCs who self-identify as Indigenous, women, or racialized persons has increased. The university is focused on achieving and surpassing the target for persons self-identifying as having a disability. The university's Coordinated Accessibility Strategy is in development, due for release in April 2019. The Indigenous Learning Place Consultation and associated report are completed. The Indigenous Strategic Initiatives Committee is operational, and its consultations are underway to develop an action plan, expected by fall 2019.
Next Steps: A new self-identification survey of current CRCs will be conducted in early 2019, as a coordinated effort at the time of the OQI survey. Any institutional barriers uncovered in the survey, or identified in the forthcoming Accessibility Strategy and the Indigenous Action Plan, or when the Federal Contractors Survey is conducted (December 2019), will be promptly addressed and solutions implemented.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words): The university's Co-ordinated Accessibility Strategy and Indigenous Action Plan will apply to the entire university. The improvements to the physical plant and institutional culture emanating from these we believe will help make Carleton an employer of choice for persons self-identifying as having a disability or as Indigenous. In addition to our CRC EDI recruiting efforts, we expect these comprehensive initiatives will bolster our ability to attract and retain Chairs from the two groups where we have been most challenged to meet targets (having a disability/Indigenous).



Key Objective 4: Increase the diversity of applicants for CRC positions at Carleton, and better characterize the applicant pool

Corresponding actions:

1. All advertising for unfilled faculty positions, including Canada Research Chair vacancies, includes the equity statement, *“Carleton University is strongly committed to fostering diversity within its community as a source of excellence, cultural enrichment, and social strength. We welcome those who would contribute to the further diversification of our university including, but not limited to: women; racialized persons; First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples; persons with disabilities; and persons of any sexual orientation, gender identity and/or expression. Carleton understands that career paths vary: legitimate career interruptions will in no way prejudice the assessment process, and their impact will be taken into careful consideration.”* Applicants are provided instructions on how to request any necessary accommodations during the recruitment process. Advertising will specifically invite persons identifying as members of the four designated groups to apply.
2. All applicants will be required to complete the self-identification survey which will be returned to and anonymized by OIRP. The survey will offer the option “Choose not to answer” for each question, but completion of the form will be mandatory.

Indicator(s): Applicant self-identification surveys report participation by members of all four designated groups for each posted CRC vacancy.

Progress: The voluntary self-identification survey was implemented for CRC applicants this year; however, participation rates have been low, making the applicant population data unreliable.

Next Steps: We are moving to a mandatory completion of the survey as a condition of submitting an application for a CRC opening. The survey will continue to be anonymous, although applicants will have to declare in a cover letter that they have completed it. In the spirit of self-identification still being voluntary, we are offering a “choose not to answer” option on each question, but hope that if applicants must complete it, they will decide to provide factual information that allows us to characterize the population.

Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words): Privacy legislation makes it impossible for us, as the employer, to find out whether a person self-identifies as a member of one of the four designated groups unless they choose to disclose this to the hiring committee. Thus, fully characterizing our applicant population will be impossible without full cooperation by those applying, and knowing that we are indeed considering an equity candidate will depend upon their choosing to self-disclose to the committee. Otherwise, the information remains protected. These are obstacles that we hope will resolve naturally (i.e. through applicants choosing to disclose), but there is no guarantee.



Key Objective 5: Continuously meet and exceed all equity hiring targets

Corresponding actions:

1. Carleton will maintain its compliant status prospectively by managing CRCP vacancies through a planning process that tracks both equity and diversity targets and available CRCs, two years in advance of any expected vacancy.
2. Advertising is targeted to professional groups specifically representing members of the four designated groups in those fields of research relevant to the discipline of the CRC being advertised, from October 2017 forward. Both the university’s standard venues for CRC advertising placement (CAUT, *University Affairs*, Carleton website) and additional appropriate placements will be used.
3. Hiring committees will be charged with keeping the university’s equity targets clearly in focus as they consider candidates.
4. The Equity Champion shall monitor hiring processes and deliberations to assess the intrusion of unconscious bias or need for alternative assessment methods, identify any structural or systemic barriers that may arise, and bring any such discoveries to the hiring committee’s attention for correction.
5. The Carleton Office for Research Initiatives and Services shall be responsible for monitoring compliance with Carleton’s CRC equity and diversity targets, and shall advise the vice-president (Research and International), the director of Equity Services, and the deans whenever the university’s compliance status changes. This group, along with the manager of Faculty Affairs and the chairs of those departments where CRC vacancies exist will determine course corrections.

Indicator(s): By December 2019, Carleton University will have recruited at least one new Canada Research Chair with a self-identified disability, one Indigenous Chair, and additional candidates who identify as women, or members of racialized persons.

Progress: Carleton has implemented and is continuing to use all the above-listed actions in order to reach and exceed its EDI goals. As of December 2018, the university meets its target for hiring CRCs who self-identify as Indigenous, and exceeds its targets for women and racialized persons.

Next Steps: The university is focused on meeting and exceeding its target for hiring of CRCs who self-identify as having a disability, and on expanding its recruitment of CRCs in those FDGs where we meet or exceed our targets at this time.

Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words): The university is doing well in meeting and exceeding its EDI targets in the CRC program; however, we have been challenged in attracting and recruiting a CRC who self-identifies as having a disability. Thus, while all of the above actions will be continued, we are considering modifying our Chair allocation process and may use the corridor of flexibility to meet our remaining target, and exceed our other targets that are already successfully met.



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):

The greatest challenge Carleton has experienced in implementing its CRC EDI Plan is the requirement to meet our equity target of hiring at least one person who self-identifies as having a disability before December 2019. We believe the problem has several possible dimensions.

Carleton has an excellent public reputation as the most accessible campus in Canada, and has for years been making great strides in accommodation. Our advertising for CRC (and other) positions makes every effort to highlight this fact, not just to meet an equity target but because accessibility is something to which the university is firmly and publicly committed.

During the past year, completion of the anonymous self-identification form was encouraged but optional for those applying for a CRC position. The response was less than we hoped, resulting in an incompletely characterized applicant pool. There may be few CRC candidates with disabilities in the fields in which we were hiring, they may apply but choose not to self-disclose, or they simply do not choose to apply here. The data neither prove nor disprove any of these possibilities. We are moving to mandatory completion of the self-identification form. It will still be anonymous, relies on an honour system to report that it was completed, and offers a “choose not to answer” option for every question. We still risk not being able to fully characterize the applicant population by equity group (or lack thereof), but will know how many choose not to answer, itself a meaningful characteristic.

Even with a fully self-disclosing population, the requirement to keep self-identification decoupled from the individual applications means that unless an applicant chooses to self-disclose to the hiring committee, the committee is essentially operating without all the information which cannot be de-anonymized for them. EDI provisions require that all candidates be treated equitably, and that the hiring committees keep EDI matters and targets at the forefront of all their deliberations. At the same time, the institution may be disadvantaged in meeting its targets because the hiring committees cannot be advised as to who among the candidates is a member of which equity group. The committee must rely on the candidate to voluntarily disclose such information to them. There is no guarantee the candidate will choose to do so. We suspect this is a common problem.



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 racialized persons—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.