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ABOUT DIVERSITYLEADS

Leadership is vital to Canada’s social and economic prosperity. We need the best leaders to address the pressing challenges of global competitiveness, economic and social development. Diversity in leadership helps organizations attract top talent, meet the needs of diverse markets and communities, promote innovation, improve employee satisfaction and performance, and reduce risks. It also shapes the aspirations of young people.

DiversityLeads aims to:

- Benchmark and assess the progress of diversity in leadership;
- Examine barriers at the individual, organizational, and societal levels;
- Explore leadership representation in media; and
- Develop an integrated approach across groups, sectors and levels for sustained change.

This project will produce new knowledge that informs and offers practical and creative tools to enable organizations to operate effectively and implement sustained change.
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DiversityLeads includes faculty from Ryerson University, McGill University, York University, OCAD University and the University of Toronto, working with a growing list of community partners including:

- Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN)
- Assembly of First Nations (AFN)
- City of Toronto
- DiversiPro Inc.
- Environics Institute
- Equal Voice
- The Globe and Mail
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DiversityLeads is a five-year Community University Research Alliance (CURA) Project, made possible with the generous support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE PROJECT

Supported by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and more than twenty community partners, DiversityLeads is a five-year research project that aims to:

- Benchmark and assess diversity in leadership;
- Explore barriers to diversity in leadership;
- Examine leadership representation in media; and
- Develop frameworks to inform an integrated approach for sustained change across groups, sectors, and levels.

The report is the first of its kind to profile and provide insight on where, how, and why women in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) are advancing to senior leadership positions.

Specifically this project:

- Measures the representation of women, including visible minority women, in senior leadership positions in seven sectors: elected office; the corporate sector; the voluntary sector; the education sector; agencies, boards, and commissions (ABCs); and the legal sector.
- Examines similarities and differences across and within sectors; and
- Suggests leading practices to help women advance to senior leadership positions.

This analysis is based on data collected on 5,081 individuals in senior leadership roles in organizations across these seven sectors located in selected areas of the GTA.

THE BUSINESS CASE FOR DIVERSITY

Increasing the number of talented women in senior leadership positions has a number of social and economic benefits for the organization. This 'business case' for diversity is well documented in the literature and helps organizations to:

- Overcome the skills shortage and the war for talent;
- Respond to increasingly diverse markets;
- Increase innovation and creativity;
- Increase employee satisfaction and reduce turnover; and
- Mitigate legal and reputational costs.

FINDINGS

Women are underrepresented in senior leadership positions (see Table 1). Although women account for 51.3% of the GTA’s population (see Appendix 1), only 28% of senior leaders in the seven sectors analyzed in 2011 were women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total Sample Analysed for Gender</th>
<th>Sector Average, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector executives</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate sector boards and executives</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector boards and executives</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education sector boards and executives</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government appointments to agencies, boards, and commissions</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal sector leaders</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,081</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Representation of women in senior leadership positions by sector, 2011
The proportion of women in senior leadership positions varies across sectors.

Both the education sector (40.8%) and government appointments to agencies, boards and commissions (38.5%) have the highest percentages of women in senior leadership positions. The corporate sector (17.4%) has the lowest percentage of women represented in these positions.

The proportion of women in senior leadership positions varies within sectors.

Within sectors, there are some organizations that can be classified as leaders (at least 40% of board and senior management positions held by women) while others are laggards. The overall averages of rates of female leadership representation in each sector mask significant differences among organizations within sectors.

- On all school boards, at least 40% of elected trustees were women. In contrast, only one municipality had at least 40% women councillors.
- Within the public sector, 57.1% of municipalities had at least 40% women among their executives. Among Ontario Ministries, 44.8% had at least 40% women; however, 20.7% had none.
- In the corporate sector, only two companies (4.3%) had at least 40% women on their boards, while 38.3% of boards had no female members at all. Similarly, there were eight companies (11.9%) where at least 40% of the executive team were women, while twice as many teams (25.4%) had no women at all.
- In the corporate sector, federally regulated companies had a higher percentage of women in leadership positions (22.2%) compared to non-federally regulated companies (15.2%).
- In the voluntary sector, 66.7% of foundations had executive teams with at least 40% women; 33.3% had no women on their executive teams.
- In the education sector, 60% of university boards and senior leadership teams had at least 40% women; 33% of college boards and 66.7% of college executive teams had at least 40% women.
- All provincial ABCs had women in senior leadership roles but only 38.5% had at least 40% of their appointments held by women. In the 26 provincial organizations analysed, the percentage of women in these positions ranged from just over 10% to over 70%.
- All law firms have women in senior leadership positions, however, the proportion of female partners in the GTA’s top law firms ranged from 19.2% to 33.1%.

Such variations demonstrate the need to further examine the differences in practices aimed at increasing female leaders among leading and lagging organizations. Clearly, the ability of leading organizations to attract 40% or more women to senior roles suggests that there is a sufficient pool of qualified and talented women. Lagging organizations have much to learn from leaders in this area.

The representation of female visible minorities in senior leadership positions is significantly less than non-visible minority women.

Though female visible minorities account for approximately 25.6% of the GTA population – which is comparable to the proportion of female non-visible minorities (25.8%), they account for a much smaller percentage of leaders across all seven sectors (see Table 2). We assessed visible minority status for 4,605 of the 5,081 leaders analysed (90.6%) and found that female visible minority leaders comprise only 2.6% of leaders across sectors compared to female non-visible minority leaders (22.5%). We were unable to determine the visible minority status of 2.9% of the leaders. Among elected officials, 6.6% were female visible minorities compared to less than 1% among corporate sector leaders. The education sector had the highest level of leadership representation (6.9%) for female visible minority leaders.
AN INTEGRATED STRATEGY TO ADVANCE WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP

Current research on understanding barriers and promoting inclusive leadership is fragmented. Significant resources and efforts have been devoted to programs that not only promote diversity and inclusion in the workplace, but also encourage representativeness among leaders. When it comes to strategies to advance women in leadership, however, results have been uneven and there are substantial gaps in every sector. To address these gaps, the DiversityLeads project is developing evidence-based and comprehensive strategies to advance gender diversity in leadership using an ecological model as the framework to understand the interrelationship of three levels or contexts: the individual (micro), organizational (meso) and societal (macro).

Societal Level

At the societal level, policies, culture, and structures impact the way in which leaders are defined, developed and supported. Broad societal forces influence the process of gender socialization and help shape the values, assumptions, and aspirations of young people; these continue to have an effect on individuals over the course of their lifetimes. For example, the ‘confidence gap’ that exists between men and women – which can profoundly influence career outcomes – is observed as early as primary school. Media also play a critical role at this level. Images of leadership communicate and reinforce gendered notions of leaders and leadership characteristics. These assumptions simultaneously reflect and influence organizational realities. Similarly, government legislation and policy initiatives can also shape and reflect our values and can have a profound impact on advancing women leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample Analysed for Gender</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% Non-Visible Minority Women</th>
<th>% Visible Minority Women</th>
<th>% Unknown Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector executives</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate sector boards and executives</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector boards and executives</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education sector boards and executives</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies, boards, and commissions</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal sector leaders</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,081</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Level

In order to increase gender diversity in organizations, a comprehensive framework of analysis to evaluate current policies and to develop future programs and practices is needed. Based on extensive research and industry consultation, the Diversity Institute identified six key areas of operation where organizations, regardless of sector, can evaluate their policies through a detailed checklist.

Leadership and Governance
For diversity initiatives to be successful, they must have the support and commitment of executive management who have the power to influence change across the organization. Diversity must be integrated into an organization’s strategy and embedded throughout its value chain with clear accountability mechanisms in place.

Strong and Transparent Human Resource Practices
How an organization recruits, selects, manages, develops, promotes and engages its female employees has a profound impact on its ability to attract, retain and advance women into leadership positions.

Quality of Life and Organizational Culture
Creating an inclusive environment which welcomes and supports women is critical. Leading organizations have a wide range of programs aimed at reducing the challenges of balancing work and family obligations, which benefit all employees but female employees specifically.

Measure and Track Diversity
Simply stated: what gets measured gets done. To ensure that policies aimed at initiatives aimed at advancing women to leadership positions translate into concrete results, organizations must establish and track metrics, which enables goal setting and accountability as well as evidence-based strategies for improvement.

Integrate or Mainstream Diversity across the Value Chain
Increasing diversity is more than just a human resource function and requires applying a diversity lens to all of an organization’s functions and activities, including procurement and inbound logistics, product and/or service development, marketing and customer service, communications, media buys, philanthropic decisions and government relations. Organizations do not exist in a vacuum and should use their sphere of influence to communicate the importance of diversity in their interactions with suppliers, customers, policy makers and the media.

Develop the Pipeline
A long term, integrated strategy will ensure that young women have the aspirations, skills and confidence needed to succeed. Organizations committed to diversity should actively support school outreach and scholarship, re-entry and transitional programs, research on diversity, and partnerships with associations, professional organizations and educational institutions.

Recognizing the commonality of these leading practices, the Diversity Institute has developed a Diversity Assessment Tool which can be customized to help organizations measure their own performance, compare it to others within its sector, and to develop a comprehensive strategy to advance gender diversity and inclusion within their organization.

Individual Level

Regardless of the barriers that persist, it is obvious that some talented women are succeeding in leadership roles. It is critically important that we learn from their experiences in order to inspire and coach aspiring female leaders. Previous research on leadership has suggested that there are behaviours and skills that can assist women in objectively assessing their strengths and weaknesses so that they can better navigate the “unspoken rules” of organizational structures. Much more needs to be done to provide young women with access to networks, coaching and support to encourage them to set their goals high and to equip them with the skills, confidence and attitudes they need to succeed.

While leaders have both the power and responsibility to affect change, all individuals – regardless of where they are in the hierarchy – can influence diversity within their workplaces, families and social life to promote inclusion.
INTRODUCTION

CONTEXT

This report focuses on the representation of women in leadership positions in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) in 2011. Women account for 51.3% of the residents in the GTA, and female visible minorities account for approximately 25.6% of GTA residents (see Appendix 1). As leadership plays a vital role in the region’s social and economic prosperity, it is important that we promote the best leaders – both men and women – to address the pressing challenges of local innovation and global competitiveness.

The Benefits of Diversity in Leadership

While Canada has strong Employment Equity and Human Rights legislation and a tradition of progressive policy making, in recent years the focus has shifted from a compliance-based to a business-based case for diversity. Diverse leadership offers Canadian organizations a competitive advantage and is a source of strength and prosperity for Canadian communities. There is a growing body of research that highlights the benefits of workplace diversity in general and the specific benefits of diversity in leadership across public and private sectors: improved financial and organizational performance; better connected domestic and global markets; recruitment from global and domestic labour pools; increased creativity and innovation; and enhanced social inclusion (Conference Board of Canada, 2008). Diverse leaders also serve as role models, shaping the aspirations of younger generations.

Diversity is linked to improved performance. Studies suggest that companies with higher percentages of women on their top management teams perform better financially (McKinsey & Company, 2007, 2008; Conference Board of Canada, 2008).

Diverse teams are more likely to “think [outside] the box” and come up with innovative solutions to challenges (Certo et al., 2006). There is evidence to suggest that a critical mass of women broadens the perspective of boards of directors to better represent the concerns of diverse stakeholders; women are more likely than men to pursue answers to difficult questions; and, finally, women tend to bring a more collaborative approach to leadership, thereby improving communication between the board and senior executives (Konrad & Kramer, 2006). The inclusion of women and visible minorities on boards can additionally enhance the public reputations of the companies they serve (Miller & Trianna, 2009). Diverse voices are also likely to be more strategically innovative, while senior executive groups which are diverse produce superior outcomes (Dalton, 2005).

As women gain positions of power and increased wealth, having women in executive positions helps ensure that organizations meet the needs of increasingly diverse markets and communities. Access to global markets may be enhanced by promoting talented women to leadership positions (Adler, Brody & Osland, 2001).

Having women in leadership roles also helps organizations attract top talent. Women tend to seek out organizations with diversity management strategies (Martins & Parsons, 2007; Ng & Burke, 2005), and organizations with women in leadership roles are more successful at leveraging and retaining the talent of other women (Sealy & Singh, 2009). Women leaders are role models and play important roles in the professional development of other women (Sealy & Singh, 2009) and serve as role models for female workers in the lower ranks (Adler, Brody & Osland, 2001).

Women in leadership roles also help to shape the hopes and aspirations of female youth (Aguirre, 2008). Failure to provide positive role models can lead to social exclusion, which carries very high social and economic costs.
AN ECOLOGICAL APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM

In recent decades, significant progress has been made in the advancement of women, however, barriers remain at the societal, organizational and individual levels. While there is a strong consensus in the academic literature that diversity in leadership is beneficial to society, organizations and individuals, there is less agreement on ways to assess impediments facing specific populations and inclusion strategies. To address this need, DiversityLeads is developing an evidence-based and comprehensive strategy to advance gender diversity in leadership using an ecological model as the framework to understand linkages between societal (macro), organizational (meso) and individual (micro) issues. When advocating for more gender diverse leadership it is important to understand that systemic changes in structures at the macro level, for example, typically take decades but cannot be neglected because the societal context constrains opportunities for significant changes at the organizational and individual levels. Similarly, if efforts focus on individuals without addressing the organizational processes and societal structures in which they operate, change cannot be sustained. Finally, the experiences of the women who have managed to reach top management positions may shed light on the skills and attitudes needed to navigate barriers to advancement. Therefore, an ecological model which takes these societal, organizational and individual levels into consideration is essential to create and sustain change (Thurston & Vissandjee, 2005).

Societal Level

Organizations do not exist in a vacuum; broad societal forces and policies perpetuate assumptions and stereotypes which present challenges to women in leadership roles. For example, we know that the ‘confidence gap’ between males and females, which is a complex function of the socialization process, is observed as early as primary school. Legislation and policies related to employment equity, human rights, access to affordable day care and reproductive rights have a profound impact on the ability of women to advance in the workplace. Media also perpetuates gender stereotypes by using images to reinforce gendered notions of leadership, often presenting men as “experts” (Wilson, 2004; Wood & Landry, 2008). News programming frequently sets the agenda for public debate and often excludes women from these debates. The White House Project (2009) monitored the number of women who appeared on the United States Sunday morning talk shows and found that women were routinely outnumbered nine to one. In over half of this programming, women did not appear at all.

Stereotypes are further perpetuated when female executives are portrayed as anomalies. On average, media images show women in the home (Prieler et al., 2011) and as younger than men (Mastro & Ortiz, 2008), which communicates and reinforces perceptions of female professional incompetence (Heflick & Goldenberg, 2009) and unsuitability for leadership positions. This, in turn, perpetuates the norm of the male executive (Grandy, 2010) and the global ‘think manager-think male’ phenomenon, which associates masculine qualities with leadership and was first documented almost 40 years ago (Schein, 1973). Although women have since been promoted to leadership roles, leadership characteristics are still attributed to masculine qualities (Schein, 2007). Pervasive stereotypes present women as lacking the ‘right stuff’ to be leaders (Kandola, 2004; Ojo, 2006), especially in the traditionally male-dominated domains such as business and politics. For example, female political leaders who are deemed competent are often associated with a lack of warmth or likeability, while those who are regarded as likable are often judged to be incompetent (Bligh et al., 2011).

Organizational Level

While most organizations have attempted to change the exclusive work environments of previous eras (Metz, 2009), systemic barriers affecting the advancement of women remain.

Though senior executives have the power to influence organizational change from the top
down, women still face challenges at the level of leadership. For example, when women are promoted to leadership positions, they are often held to higher performance standards than men (Lyness & Heilman, 2006; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007) and tasked with responsibilities associated with great risk of failure (Ryan & Haslam, 2007). In addition, surveys show that both male and female employees prefer working for men (Powell, 2012). Ironically, when women demonstrate characteristics that are associated with masculine styles of leadership (confidence, self-reliance and dominance), they face a backlash (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Research further indicates that both recruitment choices and succession planning decisions are heavily influenced by informal networks and the adherence to unwritten rules. Once hired, women are often disadvantaged in terms of opportunities for networking and mentoring (Linehan & Scullion, 2008; McDonald, 2011; Sabattini, 2008). They are also less likely to be given ‘stretch’ assignments and developmental opportunities (Powell & Graves, 2003), which are both critical to promotional opportunities.

Research by the Diversity Institute and Catalyst (2007) showed that 66% of women feel that ‘who you know’ is more important than ‘what you know’ when it comes to decisions about which employees will be promoted; whereas only 60.5% of men felt the same. Women are additionally less likely than men to feel that their organization advances the most competent individuals to senior positions (57% versus 59%). The Diversity Institute and Catalyst study (2007) also showed that more women (41%) than men (39.5%) felt that they were being held to a higher standard than their peers. Further research has indicated that this feeling is a fact: female workers are held to higher performance standards than their male counterparts (Heilman et al., 2004; Lyness & Heilman, 2006).

In addition, the long hours, late meetings, and last-minute requests often required by leadership positions can come in conflict with the responsibilities faced by women at home (Watts, 2009). As women are more likely to bear the brunt of childcare and family obligations, the lack of family-friendly policies in the workplace (Wood & Newton, 2006) and the support necessary to succeed (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010) impede even women who have successfully advanced to senior management positions.

Women also face challenges that are particular to different sectors – for example, there are diverse pathways to leadership in politics; some rise through the party ranks, while some move from one level of government to another. Studies have shown that parties will often set targets for female representation, but then run women in ridings where they have little hope of being successful (Equal Voice, 2011).

Research shows that while there is no shortage of women in the pipeline, many Canadian firms cite a lack of qualified female candidates to explain low levels of female representation on their boards (Dhir, 2010). Yet, women are achieving higher levels of education than ever before (Statistics Canada, 2011) and their numbers have been slowly increasing in managerial positions. Nevertheless, overall progress to the executive level has remained marginal (Catalyst, 2006; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010; Schein, 2007).

Female visible minorities face added challenges when it comes to leadership positions. They navigate a work culture that offers them less access to mentors and senior executive networks than non-visible minority women (Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Hopkins et al., 2008). Yap & Konrad (2009) found that, while non-visible minority women were promoted 1.9% less than their male counterparts, visible minority females were promoted even less often (7.4%). There are also gaps in career advancement and satisfaction of visible minority women compared to other groups within an organization (Cukier, Yap, Hannan & Holmes, 2010). While there are increasing numbers of highly qualified visible minorities in the Canadian workforce, they are not achieving senior leadership positions in significant numbers (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 2007).

**Individual Level**

At the individual level, there is considerable research to suggest that women often make decisions that affect their career prospects because they lack confidence to succeed. The
sense of diminished self-efficacy is often shaped by the social context in which there are limited role models and highly gendered professional stereotypes and notions of leadership.

Women are less likely to promote themselves (Bowles & McGinn, 2005); when they are successful, they are more likely to credit the team or circumstance and when they fail, they are more likely to blame themselves. Ironically, when women exhibit characteristics which are associated with leadership – confidence, self-reliance, dominance, self-promotion – they may face a backlash because of an incongruity between perceptions of the leader role and the female gender role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Another related factor that has far reaching implications is differences in communication styles (Basow, 2008) and the fact that women are less likely to negotiate for what they want (Babcock & Laschever, 2007; Small, Gelfand, Babcock & Gettman, 2007). When women do assert themselves and negotiate, they are considered less socially attractive, less likeable, and less hirable (Bowles, Babcock & Lai, 2007).

Given that such barriers to the advancement of women persist, it seems obvious that integrated strategies are needed to effect change at the societal, organizational and individual levels.

**PROJECT SCOPE**

This report profiles the representation of women in the senior most leadership positions in the GTA, focusing on five municipalities: Toronto, Brampton, Mississauga, Markham and Richmond Hill. These five areas, with a population of approximately four million people, account for 72.5% of the GTA’s population. Half of this population are women, and approximately half (49.8%) of the female population are visible minorities (see Appendix 1).

Our focus is on seven distinct sectors: the elected, public, corporate, voluntary, education and legal sectors, as well as appointments to agencies, boards and commissions. Counts were done of women in senior leadership positions in each of these sectors. These seven sectors were further broken down into sub-sectors, which are detailed later in the report.

We also counted the number of female visible minorities in the seven sectors.

**METHODOLOGY**

There are three approaches to tracking diversity in leadership. The first draws on self-reported employee data collected by organizations. The Employment Equity Act requires that some organizations collect, report and track the representation of four designated groups (women, visible minorities, people with disabilities, and Aboriginal persons) at all occupational levels, including senior management. In the GTA, many large employers are subject to this legislation and do report rates of representation, but most of employers in the GTA are not required to provide this data.

The second form of data collection is surveys in which employees self-report demographic information. Typically, these are conducted by organizations on a voluntary basis. While this report draws on several large surveys that have been conducted in the GTA, response rates for this type of survey is typically modest (much less than 50%), and may have response biases. For example, companies with good results may be more likely to respond than those with poor results.

The third approach to tracking leadership diversity is to use publicly-available information to determine the demographic profile of individuals. Using published data to identify and classify leaders in specific demographic categories has limitations, as not all organizations publish information about their senior executives and boards of directors, and the available information may be ambiguous. However, information in the public domain has a number of advantages because it can be verified more easily and is less likely subject to response biases. In addition, data may be more complete and representative than typical survey results. While it is not without its critics, this approach was praised by the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC, 2010) which reviewed reports using this method and concluded that “the strong, rigorous data collection methods gave the work more credibility.”

This study used this third approach, relying on publicly-available information on leadership in organizations within the targeted sectors. Where possible, we identified the gender and visible minority status for leaders using captioned
photographs and biographies. When captioned photographs were not available, biographical information was used to track pronouns to identify individuals by gender.

Four researchers were trained to apply a common set of definitions from government sources to publicly-available data – male, female, visible minority, non-visible minority. All data were coded three times and inter-coder reliability exceeded 95%. Where there was uncertainty or differences of opinion among the coders, another coder was brought in to review the data. Data was clarified with surveys and interviews when demographic information was publicly unavailable or indefinite or listed as unknown.

The quantitative analysis was supplemented by qualitative research and literature reviews about the sectors, organizations and emerging trends. Organizations with the highest percentages of female representation in leadership positions were identified and their diversity initiatives were noted in order to share practices and policies with less proactive organizations.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

This study is the first to examine the representation of women in leadership across sectors in the GTA and, as such, will provide a useful baseline for subsequent research. This phase of the DiversityLeads project focuses on assessing the representation of women in senior leadership roles. Subsequent phases of the research will delve more deeply into organizational practices and societal issues such as media representation.

Organizations can learn from one another by tracking and sharing their results and approaches, and DiversityLeads will continue to help advance evidence-based strategies and approaches as well as evaluations.
DEFINITIONS

Diversity in Leadership: Refers to the representation of women and visible minorities in the senior most leadership positions, such as the elected, public, corporate, voluntary, education and legal sectors, as well as the appointments to agencies, boards and commissions.

Gender: The Ontario Human Rights Commission defines gender as “a person’s sense of self, and the sense of being male or female. A person’s gender identity is different from their sexual orientation...and may be different from their birth-assigned sex” (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2012).

Visible Minority: The Employment Equity Act defines visible minorities as “persons, other than Aboriginal Peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour” (Department of Justice Canada, 2011). Examples of visible minorities include: Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, Arab, West Asian, Korean and Japanese persons, as well as mixed and other visible minorities.

Employment Equity Act (EEA): First legislated in 1986, and expanded in 1995, the Employment Equity Act (EEA) seeks to improve and achieve fairness in employment and promotional opportunities by addressing the treatment of four traditionally disadvantaged groups: women, visible minorities, Aboriginal persons and people with disabilities (EEA, 1995). Under the terms of the EEA, employers are required to identify and remove discrimination in employment practices by collecting information on designated groups, analyzing their underrepresentation, identifying employment barriers and developing plans for removing those barriers.

Federal Contractors Program (FCP): The EEA regulates specific federal employers, including Crown corporations with 100 or more employees and private companies with 100 or more employees that bid on federal contracts worth $200,000 or more. Under the Federal Contractors Program, these companies are required to undertake employment equity initiatives under the Federal Contractors Program.
Elected Officials

Overview

Political leaders have the power to shape policies that fundamentally alter opportunities for all women. They profoundly influence images and assumptions about leadership as they frequently appear in the media. The absence of women in the senior most ranks of politics, therefore, has a ripple effect through other sectors.

Support for increasing the number of women in elected office is strong. In a 2004 poll, 90% of Canadians supported increasing the number of women in public office and identified this as the most important change needed in our political system (Equal Voice, 2012; Paul, 2005). To this end, political parties have set targets for female representation in elected office. However, female candidates are typically run in ridings where they have little hope of being elected (Equal Voice, 2011) and, as a result, progress has been slow. The proportion of women in the federal parliament increased from 22% in the 2008 election to almost 25% in the 2011 election. However, with regard to female representation in federal politics, Canada ranks 39th in the world. With regard to the number of women elected in recent provincial elections, the trend is similarly mixed (Equal Voice, 2012).

Politics is a challenging sector because advancement is complex and often highly dependent on informal processes. Unlike other sectors, where one joins an ‘organization,’ there are diverse pathways to political leadership: some rise through the party ranks, some move from one level of government to another. For example, Canada’s only female Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Kim Campbell, moved from a college instructor to a School Board Trustee before entering provincial politics. She then ran federally, and once elected became a Cabinet Minister and then Prime Minister. Some politicians are recruited from other leadership positions in business, academia, media, labour or nongovernmental organizations.

Role models are important and the election of women to public office has inspired others to follow suit (Caiazza, 2004; Clark, 1991). However, the treatment of women in public office by the media is increasingly viewed as a disincentive to running for office. Sexism in the coverage of the 2008 US

Figure 2: Representation of women senior leaders in elected office, 2011
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primaries was well-documented (Carroll, 2009), and there is little doubt that female politicians are as regularly scrutinized for their appearance as for their policies, which tends to trivialize them (Braden, 1996). However, recent research suggests that gender stereotypes have less influence on the choices made by the electorate (Dolan, 2010).

The problem of the underrepresentation of women in political leadership roles is not unique to Canada, although other countries have made more progress in this area. Research suggests that this is a complex problem resulting from an intersection of three factors. These include: the constant reinforcement of political leadership as a male domain; the ways in which political systems identify and promote female candidates; and the choices that women make for themselves that are shaped by their socialization as well as the realities of political life. Addressing these challenges requires a detailed understanding of the processes that affect a woman’s decision to run for political office – such as candidate selection, being elected and advancing though the ranks. In addition, each political system – whether it be at the school board, municipal, provincial or federal level – has its own distinct characteristics, and the institutions that shape the identification, coaching, nomination and financing of campaigns are all different.

Barriers preventing women from entering politics have been eroded but still exist. For example, in spite of being comparably qualified, women are more than twice as likely as men to insist that they are not qualified to run for office (Lawless & Fox, 2005). This is only one example of how the confidence gap – where men tend to overestimate their abilities from a very early age while women tend to underestimate them – manifests.

Similarly, recruiters tend to focus more on encouraging men to run for office than women (Krook, 2009; Sanbonmatsu, 2006) and substantial amounts of research provides evidence that party policies, such as this one, have an impact on the level of female involvement (Opello, 2006). Finally, notions of masculinity permeate political institutions, reinforcing the socialization of women who then become nurturing supporters rather than leaders themselves. Research has also shown that, as family roles are often gendered, a spouse and children become advantageous for male politicians but a disadvantage for female ones (Krook, 2009).

Female visible minorities face additional challenges in elected office, especially since the 1998 amalgamation of seven municipalities – comprised of the regional government of Metropolitan Toronto and six local area municipalities (North York, East York, York, Toronto, Etobicoke and Scarborough) – into a single municipality, called the City of Toronto or the ‘Toronto megacity’ (City of Toronto, n.d.). As a result, it is more difficult for individuals who are not established to run for office as there are now fewer electoral opportunities available and substantially larger wards (Siemiatycki, 2008). Stereotypical images of leaders present a further problem as they often demean and marginalize underrepresented groups (Mahtani, 2001; Wilson & Sparks, 1999) and do not present visible minority women as political leaders.

**Methodology**

Our study looked at elected officials on school boards and city councils, as well as in the Ontario legislature and in the federal parliament.

**Findings**

In 2011, 38.1% of elected officials were women. There were also differences among subsectors – school board trustees had the highest proportion (56.7%) of women. At the municipal level, 32.6% of elected representatives are women, compared to 28.6% of Members of Parliament (MPs). The percentage of women Members of the Provincial Parliament (MPPs) was the lowest at 25.7% (see Figure 2).

Within subsectors there are also significant variances between leaders and laggards. In all school boards, at least 40% of elected trustee positions are held by women. In contrast, only one municipality has at least 40% women among its councillors. Female visible minorities were significantly underrepresented, accounting for 6.6% of elected officials compared to 31.4% of female non-visible minorities. They were best represented in the education sector at 6.9% (compared to 28.7% of female non-visible minorities).
The differences in the participation of women at different levels of government warrants further examination. Often local government – school boards and municipal government – are a pipeline to provincial and federal politics. A common assumption is that proximity to home is an issue which might explain the higher level of representation in school boards and municipal government, but not the gap between the provincial and federal levels.
A representative bureaucracy ensures that a wide range of viewpoints inform government decision-making processes and the public sector plays a pivotal role in the way the government operates. Representation is important at two levels: passive – a public service that mirrors the demographics of the population it serves – and active – a public service that represents the interests of the full range of populations that it serves (Smith & Monaghan, 2011). While the first type of representation is not necessarily linked to the second, a diverse public service is a symbolic commitment to equal access to power and draws on the widest possible pool of candidates when making public service appointments (Evans et al., 2007). The senior most leaders in the public sector play an important role in policy making and have considerable discretion in areas such as resource allocation and priority making (Kingdon, 1995; Smith & Monaghan, 2011).

The specific benefits of diversity in the public sector include:

- Signalling the importance of representation and inclusion;
- Bringing to bear a broader range of experiences and knowledge available to decision-making processes;
- An ability to influence the process of agenda-setting and prioritization; and
- Attracting a broader range of candidates who may be considered for public service appointments (Evans et al., 2007).

Although a greater proportion of leaders in the public sector are male, women have made considerable strides in obtaining these leadership positions in the past twenty years. In 1995, only 19.4% of public sector executive officers were women and, by 2006, this number increased to 33.8% (Evans, Lim & Shields, 2007). In 2010, it was reported that 44.1% of the federal executive positions were filled by women (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2010).

As in other sectors, there are issues with the recruitment, development and advancement of women in public service. There is evidence that policy areas are considered to be gendered, as women are more likely to be in portfolios dealing with issues considered to be “feminine,” such as health care, education, children and families, women’s issues and social services. Men are more likely to be involved in defense, finance, the economy, foreign affairs, etc. (Taylor et al., 2008; Smith & Monaghan, 2011).

Figure 3: Representation of women senior leaders in the public sector, 2011
Methodology

This study looked at public service leadership in municipalities (Toronto, Mississauga, Brampton, Markham, Richmond Hill, and the Regions of York and Peel) and provincial governments. It focused on the executives in municipalities (usually the Chief Administrative Officer, City Manager, Deputy City Manager and Commissioner), police executives (Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs), Deputy Ministers (DMs) and Assistant Deputy Ministers (ADMs) in the Province of Ontario.

Findings

In 2011, 37.3% of the public sector leaders analysed were women.

It is important to note that the pool for municipal and provincial government executives is strong and it appears that initiatives to promote women have been particularly effective at the provincial level. However, there are gaps in some ministries, such as in policing. Contextually, leadership in policing is unique; there is a specialized career path, a smaller pool of qualified applicants and a small number of organizations and executive positions. As such, a single retirement, as was the case in Toronto, can dramatically change the metrics from one year over the next. Nevertheless, continued attention to developing qualified female leaders is important.

Subsectors within the public sector differed significantly: among municipal and regional executives, the percentage of female leaders was 35.9% and, although the proportion of female police executives was only 7.7%, the representation of women as provincial DMs and ADMs was higher at 40.1% (see Figure 3). Within the different subsectors there were also significant variances. In the analysis of GTA municipalities, for example, 57.1% have at least 40% women. Among Ontario ministries, 44.8% have at least 40% women; the Ontario ministries with the highest percentages of women in leadership roles included Training, Colleges and Universities (100%); Aboriginal Affairs (75%); and Health Promotion and Sport (66.7%). However, 20.7% of all Ontario ministries had no female leaders.

Overall, female visible minorities were underrepresented, accounting for only 1.9% of public sector senior leaders compared to 18.7% for female non-visible minorities. However, this rate might not be representative. Due to a lack of publicly-available information, we were unable to identify whether or not 16.7% of the female leaders analyzed were visible minorities or non-visible minorities. Nevertheless, in the subsectors, female visible minorities were best represented as provincial DMs and ADMs at 2.5% (female non-visible minorities comprised 17.2% of all DMs and ADMs).
Overview

In the corporate sector, diversity among executives and within boards is linked to positive financial performance (Conference Board of Canada, 2008; Kochan et al., 2003; McKinsey & Company, 2007, 2008; Stephenson, 2004). In particular, it has been suggested that the inclusion of three or more women on an organization’s board has clear benefits as women: broaden the board’s discussions to better represent the concerns of diverse stakeholders; are more likely than men to pursue difficult questions; and tend to have a more collaborative approach to leadership, improving communication between the board and senior executives (Konrad & Kramer, 2006).

Moreover, having more women on boards contributes to positive attitudes among female employees and has an impact on promotional rates of other women to top management, executive and CEO positions (Elsaid & Ursel, 2011; Matsa & Miller, 2011; Skaggs et al., 2012). However, a long-term integrative approach is required to increase the number of women on boards (Bilmoria, 2006).

Overall, female corporate board membership in Canada is 15% less than it is in the United States (Stuart, 2006). In 2007, Corporate Knights – a Canadian magazine that annually reports on the diversity of Canadian boards, including many of the top 50 corporations – found that almost 25% of boards did not have female directors. By 2010, this number decreased to fewer than 20% (Corporate Knights, 2010; Shin, 2007). These numbers may be slightly skewed as the same women tend to serve on multiple boards (Catalyst, 2007). Regardless, female board members are often excluded from leadership positions on major committees or from the role of chairperson (Miller & Triana, 2009).

As in other sectors, the barriers to advancing women in leadership positions within the corporate sector are complex. Part of the issue has to do with highly gendered and stereotypical notions of leadership: ‘think manager – think male’. The perceptions that only men are leaders and leadership characteristics are masculine have persisted, despite obvious gains made by women in the sector (Schein, 2007). As women are stereotyped as caregivers, and not leaders, bias and prejudices against female leaders persist (Eagly et al., 2000; Scott & Brown, 2006).
Systemic barriers to recruitment and succession planning have an impact on women’s advancement in the corporate sector including an overreliance on informal networks – which women typically do not have access to (Linehan & Scullion, 2008; Mann, 1995; McDonald, 2011). Unlike men, women are less likely to have powerful mentors and are less likely to understand the complex and political ‘unspoken rules’ that influence advancement (Sabattini, 2008). Finally, women are less likely to be given ‘stretch’ assignments and opportunities for development than their male co-workers are (Powell & Graves, 2003).

Women repeatedly report feeling that they are devalued in corporate environments (Diversity Institute & Catalyst, 2007). For example, in a number of different contexts, women have reported experiences of making a point in a meeting and having it ignored until it is presented by a male co-worker (Eagly & Carli, 2007). A recurrent theme is that male colleagues are constantly credited with their ideas and work. Empirical evidence suggests that these feelings are based in reality and that women have higher bars to pass (Lyness & Heilman, 2006).

There is also little doubt that shouldering the majority of domestic duties presents a host of challenges for women in the corporate sector. However, issues of work-life balance have been increasingly raised as a key area of concern by a broad spectrum of employees within the sector (Ogden, McTavish & McKean, 2006).

Many of these findings are amplified when it comes to visible minority women. Research by the Diversity Institute and Catalyst (2007) found that more visible minority women believe that ‘who you know’ is more important than ‘what you know’ in career development decisions than non-visible minority women do (72% versus 54%). Visible minority women also report less satisfaction with progress they have made in meeting their career goals than non-visible minority women (69% versus 63%). Additionally, visible minority women were more likely than non-visible minority women to report few role models in their organizations (56% versus 43%), and they also feel that they were held to a higher standard of performance than their non-visible minority peers (47% versus 35%).

Methodology

We identified the largest 119 companies headquartered in the GTA based on revenue reported in the Financial Post 500. Crown corporations were excluded. From these companies, we examined 453 board members and 636 executives (see Appendix 2).

Findings

There is a paucity of female leaders in the corporate sector (see Figure 4). Although they account for half the workforce, women comprised 17.4% of corporate sector leaders analysed.

It should be noted that there are large variances between organizations. There are distinct leaders and laggards in the representation of women in senior leadership positions within the corporate sector: only two companies (4.3%) had at least 40% women among their board members, while 38.3% of boards had no women at all. Similarly, there were eight companies (11.9%) where at least 40% of the executive team was female, while twice as many (25.4%) had no women at all. In addition, female visible minorities were significantly underrepresented, accounting for 0.6% of corporate leaders compared to 14.0% of female non-visible minorities. They were better represented in senior management at 0.9% (compared to 14.0% of female non-visible minorities).

There are differences in the representation of women in leadership positions between companies that are regulated by the EEA and organizations that are not regulated. For the corporate sector, the EEA has a positive effect on the number of women in director and senior management positions (see Table 3).

For the corporate sector, a higher representation of women in leadership positions was found in the federally regulated companies (22.2%) as compared to non-federally regulated companies (15.2%). This finding suggests the efficacy of the EEA in the corporate sector and reinforces the efficacy of annual analysis and reporting on diversity, as well as on initiatives to promote inclusion.
Table 3: The Employment Equity Act and women in senior leadership positions in the corporate sector, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Company</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Regulated Companies</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Federal Regulated Companies</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

The voluntary sector employs over 1.3 million people in communities across Canada and includes 6.5 million volunteers (Voluntary Sector Initiative, 2009). These organizations often provide services to their communities that supplement government efforts and play a major role in the economy (Barr et al., 2006).

Though the majority of voluntary sector employees are women (HR Council for the Voluntary and Non-profit Sector, 2008; Mailloux, Horak & Godin, 2002), women remain underrepresented on boards of directors. In Ontario, women hold only 44% of all board seats, but fare better as Executive Directors or in CEO positions, averaging 62% representation (Bradshaw et al., 2009).

In large charitable organizations, board members are often selected based on their ability to raise funds or for technical, financial and legal roles. Candidates with senior corporate experience are often preferred. Given that women are dramatically underrepresented in senior corporate roles, this perpetuates their underrepresentation among larger charities and foundations. There are advantages to increasing the representation of women in the voluntary sector. Women bring specific advantages when it comes to completing strategic tasks (Nielsen & Huse, 2010) on boards and in senior executive positions. For example, three or more women on a board increase fund raising, social performance, and the board’s overall effectiveness in representing the concerns of stakeholders. Female directors also raise important questions and decrease conflict within the board (Konrad & Kramer, 2006).

Methodology

The study focused on the twenty largest charities and foundations registered in the GTA, based on revenue (see Appendix 3). Ethno-cultural foundations and charities were not included as they are often led by the specific ethnic and cultural groups they serve.
Findings

Overall, the senior management and board of directors of 14 charities and six foundations were analysed. Out of this data set, we calculated the proportion of non-visible minority women and visible minority women from senior management and the boards of directors. In 2011, the proportion of women in positions of leadership in the voluntary sector was 34.8% of leaders analysed (see Figure 5).

Women are well represented in leadership positions in the voluntary sector: overall in the largest charities and foundations in the GTA, 34.8% of top leaders were women in 2011. However, at the board level, the representation of women was much lower: 29.0% compared to 52.8% of executives.

Moreover, these averages mask variations within the sector: for example, 66.7% of the foundations had executive teams comprised of at least 40% women, while 33.3% had none.

In addition, female visible minorities were significantly underrepresented: among the large foundations we examined, 2/3 had no female visible minorities on their boards and 100% had no female visible minorities on their senior management teams. Charities were not much better: 9/14 had no visible minority females on their boards and 10/14 had none on their senior management teams. The United Way of Greater Toronto stands out as the exemplar in this sector with the highest percentage of diverse women on both its board (4/21) and senior management team (2/8). More research is needed to understand its processes.
**EDUCATION SECTOR**

**Overview**

Schools and post-secondary institutions are uniquely positioned to influence youth who become future leaders as women in academic leadership roles serve as powerful role models and mentors to younger women.

Nidiffer (2010) notes that women move into leadership roles at a slower rate than their male colleagues. For example, in the college and university faculty level, “women faculty members at the assistant professor level equal men in several disciplines, but women represent many fewer full professors” (Nidiffer, 2010). Although women are acquiring graduate degrees in record numbers (Robbins & Simpson, 2009), they remain underrepresented in the senior most leadership positions in post-secondary institutions. The education sector needs leaders who reflect their student populations, since a failure to provide positive role models can lead to social exclusion, which carries high social and economic costs.

In 2010, only 15.4% of leading research universities and 19% of all university presidents were women (Robbins & Schipper, 2010). Although universities that have been established in the last 50-100 years have more women in senior positions (Priola, 2007; Thomas & Davies, 2002), women are underrepresented at all levels in older universities that carry a higher status (Hearn, 2001). In addition to being underrepresented in leadership positions, women are often relegated to certain departments or faculties where the workplace culture is reflective of gender differences (Acker, 2012; Leathwood & Read, 2009).

The White House Project (2009) reported that the effect of women taking on leadership roles within institutions of higher education goes beyond simply raising the numbers of diverse leaders: the authors argued that “the presence—or absence—of female academic leaders can have far-reaching influences not only on the institutions themselves, but…on the scope of research and knowledge that affects us all.” Research shows that under the right conditions, a more diverse leadership has the potential to raise the performance of the sector to the benefit of learners, staff and the business community (Aguirre & Martinez, 2002).

As in other sectors, women face challenges becoming leaders in higher education settings, which includes contending for tenure and promotion, work-family responsibilities, gaining
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family-friendly policies, career choices and planning, mentoring relationships and programs, the glass ceiling, and the impact of gender and race on achieving leadership status (Airini et al., 2011; Bornstein, 2007; Dominico, Fried & Zeger, 2009; Ramsey, 2000).

Methodology

Our study examined the public and Catholic school board directors in the Toronto, York and Peel districts, as well as boards of governors and executives (presidents, vice presidents, provosts, and vice-provosts) of colleges and universities based in the GTA.

Findings

Overall, women comprise 40.8% of senior leaders in the education sector. This sector has the highest percentage of senior leadership positions compared to other sectors in the GTA.

However, there are significant differences in the rates of representation within the sector, especially when comparing the representation of women as school board directors and those who are senior leaders in post-secondary institutions. Half of school board directors, 44.3% of college leaders and 37.5% of university leaders were women.

Similarly, 60% of university boards and senior leadership teams were comprised of at least 40% women. Among college boards, only one third had at least 40% women but two thirds college executive teams had at least 40% women.

As in other sectors, most of the female leaders were non-visible minorities; 42.9% of school board directors and 40% of university executives were non-visible minority females. In fact, none of the school board directors and university executive positions were held by female visible minorities.
AGENCIES, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Overview

Agencies, boards and commissions (ABCs) and other special purpose bodies administer many essential government services. These organizations are governed by boards, which may include elected and appointed representatives, and vary from largely independent institutions to advisory boards and offices created for local or smaller projects.

Additionally, there are corporations that deliver services and programs such as Toronto Hydro and the Toronto Community Housing Corporation at the municipal level, and the Ontario Pension Board and Hydro One at the provincial level. In such cases, municipal, provincial and federal governments are sole or major shareholders. Finally, citizens may be nominated or appointed to the boards of certain external organizations, for example, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

Although there has been very little research that focuses on gender diversity in agencies, boards and commissions, these organizations are among the largest corporations in the country. As both major employers and service providers in the GTA they hold considerable influence over policy implementation and decision making. Increasing the rate of women among their board members can, therefore, contribute to an organization’s effectiveness and ability to serve the community.

Methodology

The study looked at appointments to ABCs made by both the City of Toronto (i.e. municipal ABCs) and the Province of Ontario (i.e. provincial ABCs).

Demographic data as an aggregate was provided by the City of Toronto for 173 appointments to municipal ABCs.

A total of 273 senior executives were identified from the largest provincial ABCS, as determined by revenues reported to the Ministry of Finance for 2010-2011.

Figure 7: Representation of female appointments to Ontario agencies, boards and commissions, 2011
Findings

Overall, 40.6% of female leaders in both municipal and provincial ABCs were women.

In municipal ABCs, 43.9% of board appointments were women.

The data provided to us for the municipal boards only contained information about gender in aggregate form and we were unable to determine the breakdown between non-visible minority and visible minority leaders. Therefore, the results communicated in Figure 7 and in the following analysis only refer to the representation of female leadership for appointments to provincial ABCs in 2011.

Among provincial ABCs, 38.5% of appointments were women (see Figure 7).

While all provincial ABCs have women in senior leadership positions, only 38.5% of ABCs have at least 40% of all appointments held by women. There was also a high level of variance in terms of women in senior leadership positions: the percentage of women in the 26 provincial ABCs analysed ranged from over 70% to just over 10%.

Female visible minorities were significantly underrepresented, accounting for only 5.1% of provincial boards of directors, compared to 31.1% of non-visible minority females. In addition, 65.4% of provincial ABCs had no female visible minorities on their boards of directors.
**LEGAL SECTOR**

**Overview**

The representation of women in the legal profession has a profound influence on the representation of women in other leadership roles as well as in opportunities available to all Canadian women. The legal sector occupies a unique and influential role – it is most often a path to positions of power and authority in Canada.

Women who are successful in the pursuit of a political career often have legal degrees (Adler, 1996; Mariani, 2008). At the executive level, 73% of Canadian Prime Ministers were practicing lawyers prior to taking office, including the first (and only) female Prime Minister of Canada, Kim Campbell (Dodek, 2009). Following the 2008 federal election, 15.9% of those in the House of Commons were lawyers. Within the federal government, lawyers dominate policy making and play a prominent role in the Department of Justice. Selected from pools of top lawyers, judges also occupy a particularly powerful position in our system of democracy.

For law firms, there are significant advantages to advancing women to senior leadership positions, including retaining talent, successfully competing for clients, and maximizing business performance (Law Society of British Columbia, 2009; Catalyst, 2005b). The number of women in Canadian law schools now exceeds the number of men (LSUC, 2008, 2010; LSBC, 2009), but it is difficult for law firms to retain female talent.

Women are exiting as senior associates and income partners prior to becoming equity partners for a number of reasons. Cases before the court suggest that overt and systemic discrimination remains a significant impediment for female lawyers. Research has found that female lawyers see a number of barriers to career advancement, including a lack of mentoring opportunities and role models as well as exclusion from informal networks (Catalyst, 2005a, 2005b, 2006). Other research suggests that women are more likely to change their status and move away from private practice in order to find positions that provide them with greater job security, greater balance between career and family responsibilities, and a less stressful work environment (TSC, 2011).

---

**Figure 8: Representation of women senior leaders in the legal sector, 2011**

- **Judge**: 40.2%
- **Partners in Law Firms**: 25.0%
- **Crown and Deputy Crown Attorneys**: 42.9%

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners in Law Firms</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown and Deputy Crown Attorneys</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

This analysis considers the following leaders within the legal profession: judges from the Ontario Court of Justice, the Court of Appeal for Ontario, and The Ontario Superior Court of Justice; partners in the largest private law firms headquartered in the GTA (Lexpert, 2010); and Crown attorneys and Deputy Crown attorneys.

The law firms examined were:

- Aird & Berlis LLP
- Bennett Jones LLP
- Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP
- Blaney McMurtry LLP
- Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
- Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP
- Davies Ward Philips & Wineberg LLP
- Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
- Fraser Milner Casgrain LLP
- Goodmans LLP
- Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
- Heenan Blaikie LLP
- McCarthy Tétrault LLP
- McMillan LLP
- Miller Thomson LLP
- Ogilvy Renault LLP
- Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP
- Stikeman Elliott LLP
- Torys LLP

Findings

Overall, of the 2,455 legal sector leaders analysed, 26.7% are women (see Figure 8).

Women are underrepresented as leaders in the legal sector. Women comprised 40.2% of the judges at the three courts studied, however, they only represented 25% of partners in law firms. Public sector lawyers – Crown and Deputy Crown attorneys – had the highest rates of female leadership at 42.9% of the total number analysed.

All law firms have women in senior leadership positions; however, the overall average masks significant variance at the organizational level. Among the top law firms in the GTA, for example, the proportion of women as partners ranged from 19.2% to 33.1%.

With regards to female visible minority leaders, the highest proportion were judges (3.2%), which paled in comparison to female judges who were non-visible minorities (28.1%). Similarly, in the analysis of law firms, only 2% of partners were visible minorities, while 22.8% were non-visible minorities. Finally, our analysis of Crown and Deputy Crown attorneys showed no female visible minorities compared to 35.7% who were female non-visible minority leaders.
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The business case for diversity is well established, but our analysis of the data shows that, in spite of tremendous gains, women are still underrepresented in the senior most leadership roles in politics; the public service; the private sector; the voluntary sector; the education sector; agencies, boards and commissions (ABCs); and the legal sector.

This study provides an important benchmark, essential to setting goals and tracking progress. It also identifies the differences between and within sectors that can help us understand effective strategies to advance women into leadership positions. Similarly, we found additional evidence of the effects of Employment Equity legislation. Regulated companies and Federal Contractors tended to have higher rates of women in senior leadership roles. As Employment Equity legislation requires measuring and reporting, it is a strong confirmation that ‘what gets measured, gets done’. Furthermore, it highlights the need for organizations to address barriers that are the result of unconscious bias rather than overt design.

Rates of female representation in leadership roles range dramatically across sectors; with the education sector leading at 40.8% and the corporate sector lagging with only 17.4%. There are also differences between the number of women in senior executive positions and board appointments within sectors as well as differences among and within subsectors. Often averages across sectors mask huge variances between leading and lagging organizations within sectors.

The significant gaps between leaders and laggard within sectors as well as differences among and within subsectors also present interesting opportunities to explore the practices undertaken by organizations with higher proportions of women in senior positions. These variances belie the claims that there are no qualified women available to fill these leadership positions: clearly, some organizations have prioritized diversity and sought out diverse leaders, while others have not.

The differences across sectors also suggest avenues for additional research. For example, it is possible to explore the creation of systemic barriers in the ways that qualifications are defined and recruitment processes operate for corporate boards. For instance, as with other nonprofit organizations, universities are complex, multi-billion dollar enterprises and may recruit board members from the private sector based on the assumption that corporate experience can be adapted to the nonprofit context. However, there is very little movement in the other direction. Further investigation is necessary to understand why this is the case and to consider the possibility that individuals with executive experience in the nonprofit and government sectors may be potential candidates for senior corporate management and board positions.

Despite the importance of measuring and tracking rates of gender diversity, our study found that visible minority women, in particular, are almost absent from leadership roles in most of the seven sectors studied. While roughly comprising the same proportion of the GTA population as non-visible minority women, this lag is the result of the particular challenges and intensified barriers that visible minority women face.

Furthermore, both visible and non-visible minority women who have managed to ascend to top management positions in spite of the barriers to advancement are also, in and of themselves, interesting subjects for further research. Their experiences may shed light on how aspirations are shaped and the skills and attitudes needed to navigate the challenges, thereby informing our efforts to prepare the next generation of leaders.
THE WAY FORWARD: LEADING PRACTICES TO ADVANCE WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP ROLES

The Ecological Approach to Effecting Change

We need the best leaders to address the pressing challenges of global competitiveness, economic and social development. DiversityLeads is developing an evidence-based ecological model to advance inclusion and diverse leadership. The ecological model allows us to consider organizations as entities composed of individuals that operate in a broad societal context. A comprehensive strategy to advance talented women to senior leadership positions in all sectors must address change at the societal, organizational and individual levels.

Societal Level

There is ample evidence that our societal context—policies, culture and structure—has a profound impact on the ways in which leaders are conceived, developed and supported.

Where gender is concerned, the media exerts particularly powerful influence on how we perceive leaders and leadership, however, the influence is often subtle. One of the most effective ways to influence media is through corporate and consumer activism; as progressive organizations increasingly commit to a comprehensive diversity strategy, they use their purchasing power, procurement policies and philanthropic resources to effect change in the social environment.

When organizations apply a diversity lens to advertising and communications, they influence the external environment. Organizations can help to shape assumptions about who can be a leader by ensuring that advertising images are inclusive and profile female leaders. As consumers and citizens, individuals also exert influence on governments, corporations and nonprofits by commenting on the representation of women in the media.

Progressive organizations also use their government relations to promote female-friendly legislative and policy initiatives. For example, senior leaders in corporate Canada partnered together to advocate for national daycare policy (Coffey, 2005). Leaders of large organizations in sectors where women are underrepresented have joined efforts to encourage girls and women to aspire to leadership roles.

Figure 8: The Ecological Model to Effecting Change
Organizational Level

Leadership and Governance
Diversity strategies that receive senior management buy-in are the most successful, as their strategic importance is understood and communicated across the organization. Executives can also communicate the strategic importance of diversity by engaging in succession planning with explicit diversity goals in mind.

Research suggests that enhancing the gender diversity of boards may improve the gender diversity of senior management teams (Bilmoria, 2006) but increasing the gender diversity of boards themselves requires explicit strategies. Organizations must take diversity into account in succession planning to avoid the phenomenon of ‘mirror hiring’, which occurs when executives promote individuals who look and act like they do. Progressive organizations consider diversity when filling board vacancies and have developed explicit strategies to improve the number of women on their board, including targeted outreach and recruitment, internal development programs, and diversity training for board members.

Executive commitment to leadership diversity may be the most important factor in influencing organizational commitment and effective practices. Senior leadership commitment results in diversity becoming a part of an organization’s strategy and its operational activities (Martins & Parsons, 2007). Recent studies (Mercer, 2011) indicate that, despite efforts to increase gender diversity, 82% of Canadian organizations do not have a clear strategy or philosophy for developing women as leaders. As diverse leadership is strongly linked to increased organizational performance and competitiveness (McKinsey & Company, 2007, 2008), it is imperative that leaders begin to develop and implement a diversity strategy within their organizations.

Leaders from underrepresented groups can have a transformational effect within organizations and shape broader societal notions of who can and who cannot be a leader. As such, highly visible female leaders at the executive level can become role models for and shape the aspirations of women in the lower ranks (Adler, Brody & Osland, 2001; Yoder, 2001).

The commitment of political leaders to gender diversity can affect real change on a large scale. For example, Jean Charest, Quebec’s Premier, fulfilled his commitment to advancing women in elected office by splitting his cabinet appointments equally between women and men (Smith, 2008).

Similarly, the Ontario Court of Justice has a diversity mandate in its appointment process: the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee is legislated to reflect Ontario’s diverse population, including gender as well as racial and cultural minorities (Ontario Courts, 2011). However, appointments are often based on career experience in senior government positions or firm partnerships. There are few women who advance to the firm partnership level.

Linking performance evaluations and compensation decisions for managers to achieve diversity targets is an important component of any strategy at this level because it makes managers accountable. By increasing manager accountability, these targets are more likely to be acted upon. For example, every Deputy Minister in the OPS has established tangible diversity performance commitments (OPS Diversity, 2010, 2011).

Some organizations appoint a Chief Diversity Officer. This position creates an executive officer, ideally at the Senior Vice-President level, who has the power and authority to implement change within the organization. For example, the OPS’ Chief Diversity Officer and Diversity Office have the power and authority to be active agents of change within the organization, and issue annual reports on diversity for the OPS (OPS, 2009).

In the education sector, we see an increase in institutions adding senior diversity executives to their executive teams. Universities with a senior administrator and office devoted to equity and diversity provide more unified and coherent strategies for increasing diversity on campus, using their authority to effect changes within the organization and transform these strategies into measurable action (Foo & Fong, 2009). The University of Toronto was one of the first post-secondary institutions to introduce a Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, signaling the strategic importance of diversity.
In the corporate sector, financial services organizations have begun to implement explicit diversity priorities. In order to meet these priorities, some have established a diversity council. For example, the Royal Bank of Canada (RBC) has formed a Diversity Leadership Council, which is chaired by the CEO. This council is responsible for creating and implementing policies to increase diversity and integrate it into the organization’s operational activities (RBC, 2011).

Linking organizational performance to diversity helps produce commitment to diversity across the organization. For example, the Legal Leaders for Diversity (2011) is a network of lawyers who serve as General Counsels in some of Canada’s largest organizations. They have recently issued and signed a statement of support for diversity and inclusion, reiterating the business case for diversity in attracting and retaining top talent in the legal sector, as well as enhancing creative thinking, innovation and problem solving (General Counsel in Canada, 2011).

**Strong and Transparent Human Resource Practices**

Good human resource practices are essential in order to identify and attract well-qualified female candidates. Overall, organizations with diverse leadership have inclusive, bias-free, and transparent mechanisms in place to recruit, select, hire, develop, promote and manage the best workforce possible.

In order to recruit well-qualified female candidates, organizations can undertake a number of strategies and implement policies to attract women to the organization. These include posting vacant positions externally, actively targeting women for recruitment efforts, communicating the organization’s commitment to diversity and ensuring that selection committees are representative. For example, to signal their commitment to diversity, most educational institutions now include explicit diversity statements in their job postings to attract underrepresented groups, including women.

Similarly, to ensure that senior management and boards in the education sector are more representative of the student body, inclusive and bias-free human resource practices target increasing levels of diversity and contribute to the development of an internal pool from which succession planning for these leadership positions can occur. For example, Centennial College (2012) has implemented bias- and barrier-free recruitment, selection, hiring and promotion at all levels so that its employees’ skills and knowledge are respected, valued and used appropriately.

It is also critical that organizations consider alternative pathways to positions. A recent Catalyst report revealed that in the corporate sector, women pay a higher penalty for pursuing a non-traditional career pathway and this disadvantages them when it comes to the leadership pipeline (Carter & Silva, 2010). To rectify this, organizations can open up senior management positions by defining them in terms of key competencies and skills.

Performance management and promotional processes must also take into account the importance of diversity. For example, promotional processes can be made more transparent by focusing on competencies (instead of technical knowledge and experience) and alternative pathways to promotion can result in the increased visibility of leadership opportunities for female employees. Women should also be encouraged to participate in high-profile and global assignments to enhance their visibility and expand their leadership skills (Adler, Brody & Osland, 2001).

Research by the Diversity Institute shows that corporate sector organizations that provide diversity training tend to have higher levels of career satisfaction than those that do not (Diversity Institute & Catalyst, 2007). The YMCA of Greater Toronto has a Diversity and Social Inclusion plan which includes various training programs and educational initiatives on diversity issues (Yerema & Leung, 2012f). By engaging in diversity training with its employees, an organization creates a common culture among employees, promotes awareness, and provides resources to eliminate barriers to inclusion. Diversity training among middle management is also an important consideration, as it helps to diminish bias and provides managers with the skills to identify and accommodate difference.

Furthermore, employee support such as coaching, training and mentoring, as well as networking opportunities can promote advancement (Paul, 2005). In politics, which has largely informal
career paths, prospective female candidates can be recruited and supported with internal coaching, mentoring, and training in their careers and campaigns.

For example, in 2008, Mayor David Miller and Councillor Pam McConnell launched the Toronto Regional Champion Campaign where young women are mentored by female councillors for eight months. This on-going campaign aims to recruit and help organize women to run for municipal office (City of Toronto, n.d.).

Mentoring and networking opportunities also help women in the corporate sector. Similarly, TD Bank (2010a) recently offered a pilot career planning system program to support its employees, in which 400 female employees at a critical stage in their careers were paired with senior executives to discuss career planning and development (TD Bank, 2010a).

In addition, a qualified pool of leadership candidates requires strong foresight for internal mentoring and development, which can be implemented by giving diverse employees access to specialized training and professional interactions to ensure that they have the knowledge and skills necessary to become leaders. For example, in the voluntary sector, World Vision encourages employee development through subsidies for tuition and professional accreditation, a variety of in-house and online training programs, formal mentoring, and career planning services (Yerema & Leung, 2011b).

To increase the number of female senior leaders, it is also important to support training and education programs to keep employees on track during and after parental leave. The time spent away from the workplace can disadvantage women due to skills atrophy (Grant, 2010). To mitigate this, CIBC (2012) offers a program called ReConnect: Career Renewal for Returning Professional Women, which is a seven day immersion program that aims to renew critical business knowledge, provide leadership skills and serve as an important stepping stone for professional women looking to return to the workforce.

Similarly, Women in Capital Markets recently launched an award that enables women to re-establish their careers in banking and finance after taking a time off to have and raise children. This award, which includes a $5,000 grant for education, access to a mentor and a three-month paid internship at a bank, gives women the opportunity to build networks, professional connections, and experience after a leave (Eichler, 2011). In the legal sector, Stikeman Elliott has a number of individual transitional coaching opportunities for women returning from maternity leave (Stikeman Elliott, 2012).

**Quality of Life and Organizational Culture**

A recent Conference Board of Canada (2011) study reported that an inhospitable organizational culture is one of the reasons that the number of women leaders has stagnated over the last two decades. Organizational cultures can create systemic barriers that exclude women from advancing to senior management positions.

Retaining the best female talent may require work environments in which women can successfully balance and fulfill their caregiver and employment obligations. Since many women are the primary caregivers of their families, defining the “workday” and “workplace” with more flexibility will help women in senior positions balance professional and personal obligations more effectively (Adler, Brody & Osland, 2001).

Helping employees balance work and family obligations is a challenge that progressive organizations are addressing. By offering family-friendly policies, flexible working arrangements, and services to help employees manage their workloads and stress, organizations can increase employee satisfaction, achieve higher rates of retention, and diminish the costs of absenteeism and turnover.

The OPS (2011) offers a number of flexible working arrangements to its employees, including flexible hours, telecommuting, shortened work weeks, compressed work weeks, job-sharing, job-trading, and reduced summer hours (Yerema & Leung, 2012c). Similarly, OPS’ employee assistance plan (EAP) is a comprehensive set of resources that employees can access to help manage workloads and stress. The Queen’s Park Child Care Centre is a non-profit onsite daycare facility that offers priority placement to OPS employees. This enables women to take the option of returning to work, knowing that they have nearby child care facilities (Yerema & Leung, 2012c).

Similarly, many corporate sector companies such as TD Bank offer flexible work options, including
changes to start and end times, reduced workweeks, job partnerships/sharing, and changing the number of days in the workweek while keeping the hours the same (TD Bank, 2012). HP Canada offers similar flexible working arrangements (HP Canada, 2012).

In the voluntary sector, World Vision helps employees balance their work and personal lives with flexible hours, shortened and compressed work week options, telecommuting, and a formal earned days-off program. World Vision also provides its employees access to coaching and counselling services through its employee assistance program to help manage their workloads and stress (Yerema & Leung, 2011b). The YMCA of Greater Toronto operates a subsidized onsite daycare facility, as well as an after school program for the children of employees enrolled in primary school (Yerema & Leung, 2012f).

Similarly, studies on the educational sector have suggested that more support is needed to assist female academics in advancing. Robbins & Simpson (2009) recommend a number of family-friendly policies, including flexible parental leave and tenure appointment policies, part-time options and child care, and a guarantee that academic hiring committees do not punish family-related employment gaps.

Among large ABCs, Toronto Hydro publicizes the support it offers to employees for family leave as part of its benefits package. One such benefit is emergency leave top-up payments for employees who are called upon to care for a loved one, which cover up to 95% of salary for eight weeks (Yerema & Leung, 2011a).

In the legal sector, particularly in large corporate law firms, attention is being focused on improving the workplace environment. More flexible work arrangements and more family-friendly policies are critical. Stikeman Elliott, for example, has flexible hours, and offers telecommuting options, a technology stipend, remote access, technical support and administrative assistance (Stikeman Elliott, 2012).

**Measure and Track Diversity**

Setting targets and tracking progress is critical to a well designed strategy. Establishing well designed diversity metrics provide a benchmark against which progress can be measured and strategies can be refined. By sharing this information publically, organizations demonstrate commitment and accountability.

Organizations should establish and track metrics throughout the career cycle of an employee (e.g., recruitment, promotion, development, separations) in order to better understand its pipeline, particularly if retention is an issue. Firms can also conduct exit interviews to help identify why women leave. Collecting and analyzing demographic data in employee engagement surveys are also important because they help organizations determine the climate of the workplace and track progress.

Progressive political leaders, like Jean Charest, Premier of Quebec, have established and met ambitious targets for women in political leadership roles. Others, like the New Democratic Party, have also set targets for female candidates. Not only was the NDP the first federal party to elect a female leader in 1989, but also it has established “policies committed to having 50% of female candidates in winnable ridings” (NDP, 2012), which involves the active support of female candidates to win nominations and elections.

The Ontario Public Service (OPS) conducted its first employee survey in 2006 as a pilot project. In 2007, it was expanded to include all OPS employees. Additional surveys were conducted in 2009 and 2011. These surveys have helped the OPS to develop and implement an action plan and have established a corporate baseline against which progress in key areas can be measured (Queen’s University, 2010).

In the corporate sector, we have clear evidence that “what gets measured gets done”. Companies subject to the Employment Equity Act are required to report on diversity metrics as well as their strategies. The Act does not impose quotas or targets; instead, it requires organizations to create diversity plans, measure, and report on effectiveness, thus making diversity more of a priority.

Other corporate sector companies, such as Shoppers Drug Mart, also track diversity and employee engagement in order to target initiatives to achieve the greatest impact and meet employee needs (Shoppers Drug Mart, 2011). Most banks and some service firms, such as KMPG, conduct employee engagement surveys with self-reported diversity
data in order to refine and target programs and to improve employee satisfaction and retention.

Tracking the representativeness of appointments to agencies, boards and commissions helps to improve the number of women leaders within organizations. The City of Toronto (2008; 2012b) collects diversity data from applicants at all stages of the appointment process (e.g., applicant pool, shortlisted candidates, appointed members) in order to track and evaluate whether diversity objectives are being met. These results are also used to ascertain areas for improvement, including targeted outreach and the identification and removal of systemic barriers (City of Toronto, 2006).

Most educational institutions produce Employment Equity plans and continue to conduct Employment Equity surveys which inform upcoming recruitment goals (Yerema & Leung, 2012b). Setting targets has been shown to drive results. At the University of Toronto, the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design made an explicit commitment to focus on the recruitment of women faculty. Between 2004 and 2008, the proportion of women members of the core faculty increased from 8% to 21% (University of Toronto, 2008).

The Law Society of Upper Canada’s Retention of Women in Private Practice Working Group commissioned The Strategic Counsel (TSC) (2011) to undertake an annual survey of lawyers who filed a change to either their working or practicing status, which was designed to understand and benchmark movements and changes of women in the legal profession.

Integrate or Mainstream Diversity across the Value Chain

It is important for an organization to integrate diversity across all of its operations, from its procurement processes to the production and delivery of goods and/or services. Integrating diversity across the value chain requires thinking about diversity in all of an organization’s activities (procurement, product development, operations, sales and marketing, customer service, etc.) and in its relationships with external stakeholders, such as suppliers, customers, political and educational institutions, and the media.

Under the Employment Equity legislation, companies supplying goods to federal departments must report on diversity. While the impact of such measures is highly dependent on how they are implemented and evaluated in procurement processes, this is one example in the public service of how diversity can be mainstreamed. In the corporate sector, American-based multi-nationals tend to be at the forefront of thinking about diversity in the context of their procurement policies.

For example, PepsiCo Canada (2011) has publically committed to sourcing its products and services from diverse suppliers. In 2009, its global spending with female- and minority-owned vendors reached almost $1.3 billion. In Canada, considering diversity in procurement is a newer concept, though leading organizations such as RBC (2011) actively seek out suppliers who are women, new immigrants, people with disabilities, and Aboriginal persons, and consider a supplier’s diversity status when evaluating a potential vendor (RBC, 2011).

Product and service design and development should also keep diversity in mind as markets, clients and citizens become increasingly diverse. Within the public sector, applying a diversity lens to the policy development process can reveal significant issues which disadvantage women or other underrepresented groups. Ministries within the Ontario Public Service, for example, have been called upon to consider all dimensions of diversity in creating policy (OPS Diversity Office, 2010). In the corporate sector, it is increasingly recognized the women influence or make the majority of purchasing decisions. As a result, the particular needs of women are considered in the process of designing products and services.

For example, female entrepreneurs are one of the fastest growing segments of the Canadian economy – 80% of businesses are now started by women, so designing services that target their needs can produce dividends (RBC, 2006). In the voluntary sector, the needs of women and diverse communities should similarly be considered in offering services. While providing language services to new immigrants, for example, some agencies provide transportation support and onsite child care, recognizing that these may be a particular barrier for women (Wayland, 2006). Women in senior roles can also help target female clients more effectively.
Organizations should also ensure that their communications reflect the communities that they serve and profile diverse leaders whenever possible. In politics, providing female candidates and commentators to the media, for example, is one way to reinforce the notion that women belong in leadership roles. The same applies to other sectors, particularly those, like the corporate sector, where women are underrepresented in part because of gendered notions of leadership.

Similarly, reviewing marketing, promotional and advertising materials with an eye to diversity is important. Organizations committed to diversity should consider diversity in their media buys and use their influence as large customers to engage with the media and other stakeholders on diversity. This is one of the most effective ways organizations can use their sphere of influence to shape the external environment.

Continually communicating a commitment to diversity sends signals to key stakeholders. The diversity lens should also be applied to organizations’ outreach and philanthropic activities, as these can play a critical role in shaping the workplace environment and developing the next generation of leaders. CIBC, for example, has donated more than $6 million to support organizations for women and girls. Organizations should ensure that the associations that represent them are diverse. Thinking of diversity through the value chain not only ensures that organizations are truly inclusive, but provides tangible evidence of their commitment to the external community and helps shape the societal environment which, in turn, has a profound impact on opportunities for women.

**Develop the Pipeline: Help inspire the next generation of leaders**

Over the long term, integrated strategies are needed to increase the external talent pool of people ready and willing to take on leadership roles in the future. These play a key role in opening up opportunities for young women. Equal Voice Youth was established in 2005 to provide outreach to engage Canadian youth in a drive to increase the number of women in elected office. This program increases political awareness, educates young women about their participation in policy-making and politics, and provides in-depth mentoring and coaching (Equal Voice, 2012).

The Canadian Advanced Technology Alliance – Women in Technology (CATA-WiT) is one of many associations through which large corporations help encourage young women to consider technology careers and provide mentoring support for young women (Backbone Magazine, 2009). The Law Society of Upper Canada (2011) has also engaged in outreach activities to a number of Ontario law schools to ensure female law students are aware of opportunities in mid- and large-size private firms. These activities also include the communication of education prospects and information about practicing law, the business of law, types of practices, and available resources.

Women in Capital Markets offer two levels of outreach programs. Both the High School Liaison Program and the University Connections Program encourage young women to consider a career in capital markets (Women in Capital Markets, 2012a, 2012c). Further, in order to make the education required for such a career a reality, Women in Capital Markets (2012b) also offers a scholarship fund.

**Individual Level**

Regardless of the barriers that persist, it is obvious that talented women are succeeding and taking their place in leadership roles. It is critically important that we learn from and share their experiences in order to inspire and coach aspiring female leaders. The research is also clear: more needs to be done to equip women with the skills, confidence and attitudes they need to succeed, encouraging young women to set their goals high and providing them with access to networks, coaching and support. In addition, all of us need to understand and use our own sphere of influence to effect change. Every individual, regardless of where they are in the hierarchy, can influence others. Women in leadership roles have a great deal of influence, but allies are critically important – the task is too important to be left only to women.

DiversityLeads will continue to advance our understanding of what works at the societal, organizational and individual levels, with particular focus on analysing the practices of leading organizations in each sector, as well as the approaches taken by successful female leaders, in order to develop fact-based strategies to advance women and other underrepresented groups to leadership roles.


### APPENDIX 1: WOMEN AND FEMALE VISIBLE MINORITY WOMEN IN THE GTA, STATISTICS CANADA 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>Female VM</th>
<th>% Female VM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto (Total)</td>
<td>2,476,565</td>
<td>1,283,235</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>607,740</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel (Total)</td>
<td>1,154,070</td>
<td>585,435</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>292,700</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>431,575</td>
<td>218,030</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>124,270</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>665,655</td>
<td>338,860</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>166,260</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>56,840</td>
<td>28,545</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York (Total)</td>
<td>887,005</td>
<td>451,525</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>169,475</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgina</td>
<td>41,930</td>
<td>21,125</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Gwillimbury</td>
<td>20,685</td>
<td>10,305</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitchurch-Stouffville</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>12,255</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>260,760</td>
<td>133,055</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>87,080</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Hill</td>
<td>161,695</td>
<td>82,495</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>38,155</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan</td>
<td>238,005</td>
<td>120,970</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>32,620</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>47,035</td>
<td>23,970</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>19,425</td>
<td>9,520</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>73,370</td>
<td>37,830</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton (Total)</td>
<td>435,390</td>
<td>223,020</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Hills</td>
<td>55,020</td>
<td>27,670</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>53,405</td>
<td>26,815</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>164,485</td>
<td>84,485</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>15,615</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>162,480</td>
<td>84,050</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>8,045</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham (Total)</td>
<td>557,250</td>
<td>284,360</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>47,830</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>87,360</td>
<td>44,855</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>13,890</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>89,835</td>
<td>46,205</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>16,635</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>110,455</td>
<td>56,315</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>9,525</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>140,240</td>
<td>71,730</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>21,155</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>11,760</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>19,075</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>77,370</td>
<td>39,040</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GTA</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,510,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,827,575</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,147,045</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 2: Largest For-Profit (Non-Crown) Corporations in the GTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>2010 Revenue ('000)</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
<th>Senior Management</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manulife Financial Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$37,633,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Bank of Canada, Toronto</td>
<td>$36,026,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Weston Ltd., Toronto</td>
<td>$32,008,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Toronto-Dominion Bank, Toronto</td>
<td>$25,409,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magna International Inc., Aurora,</td>
<td>$24,825,060</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Life Financial Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$24,640,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onex Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$24,366,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart Canada Corp., Mississauga</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Toronto</td>
<td>$14,976,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield Asset Management Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$14,031,690</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Communications Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$12,186,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrick Gold Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$11,251,720</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Drug Mart Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$10,376,067</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Motor Co. of Canada Ltd., Oakville</td>
<td>$9,631,530</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Energy Marketing Ltd., Toronto</td>
<td>$9,478,027</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Tire Corp. Ltd., Toronto</td>
<td>$8,980,800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda Canada Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$8,800,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax Financial Holdings Ltd., Toronto</td>
<td>$6,348,611</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot Canada, Toronto</td>
<td>$5,395,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Canada Ltd., Markham</td>
<td>$5,201,758</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Leaf Foods Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$4,968,119</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears Canada Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$4,957,800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerdau Ameristeel Corp., Whitby (2009)</td>
<td>$4,787,320</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nortel Networks Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$4,664,408</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewlett-Packard (Canada) Co., Mississauga</td>
<td>$4,500,565</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviva Canada</td>
<td>$3,506,029</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PepsiCo (Canada), Mississauga</td>
<td>$3,173,430</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross Gold Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$3,100,403</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aecon Group Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$2,746,243</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nissan Canada Inc., Mississauga</td>
<td>$2,654,700</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hortons Inc., Oakville</td>
<td>$2,536,495</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemens (Canada), Mississauga</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Savings Income Fund, Toronto (renamed Just Energy Income Fund, Toronto - Mr09)</td>
<td>$2,299,231</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russel Metals Inc., Mississauga</td>
<td>$2,175,400</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FirstService Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$2,045,859</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal &amp; SunAlliance Canada, Toronto (renamed RSA Canada Group, Toronto)</td>
<td>$2,037,351</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sino-Forest Corp., Mississauga</td>
<td>$1,981,242</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 2: LARGEST FOR-PROFIT (NON-CROWN) CORPORATIONS IN THE GTA (CONT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>2010 Revenue ('000)</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
<th>Senior Management</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Canada Co., Mississauga (2009)</td>
<td>$1,863,920</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cott Corp., Mississauga</td>
<td>$1,857,399</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherritt International Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$1,771,100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamana Gold Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$1,737,415</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac Fairview Corp., Toronto (2009)</td>
<td>$1,548,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilever Canada Inc., Toronto (2008)</td>
<td>$1,519,822</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torstar Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$1,479,588</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Canada Income Fund, Toronto (renamed Progressive Waste Solutions Ltd.)</td>
<td>$1,472,658</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI Financial Income Fund, Toronto</td>
<td>$1,378,395</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iamgold Corp.</td>
<td>$1,260,453</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Holdings Canada Inc., Burlington</td>
<td>$1,259,605</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Independent Order of Foresters, Toronto</td>
<td>$1,169,350</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinram International Income Fund, Toronto</td>
<td>$1,142,053</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmet Mining Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$1,098,087</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPMG LLP, Toronto</td>
<td>$1,076,510</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlaxoSmithKline Inc., Mississauga (2009)</td>
<td>$1,008,383</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Canada Inc., Toronto (renamed Intact Financial Corp., Toronto)</td>
<td>$994,906</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.I. du Pont Canada Co., Mississauga</td>
<td>$935,240</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbord Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>$918,760</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softchoice Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$910,534</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst &amp; Young LLP, Toronto</td>
<td>$855,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Construction</td>
<td>$842,031</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Corp., Toronto</td>
<td>$779,278</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Papers Inc., Toronto (2008)</td>
<td>$734,736</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patheon Inc.</td>
<td>$696,705</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitran</td>
<td>$692,732</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Manu-Tech Inc., Toronto (renamed Samuel, Son &amp; Co.)</td>
<td>$667,691</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGF Management Ltd., Toronto</td>
<td>$641,578</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsway Financial Services Inc., Mississauga</td>
<td>$255,519</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Co. of Canada, Toronto</td>
<td>$100,402</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Motors of Canada Ltd., Oshawa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Properties Group Inc., Toronto</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDIX 3: LARGEST VOLUNTARY SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS IN THE GTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>2010-2011 Revenue</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
<th>Senior Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 World Vision Canada (2010)</td>
<td>$415,644,688</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Salvation Army Territorial Headquarters</td>
<td>$199,979,967</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YMCA of Greater Toronto</td>
<td>$193,820,730</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hospital for Sick Children Foundation</td>
<td>$164,000,729</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Princess Margaret Hospital Foundation</td>
<td>$143,687,713</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Plan International Canada</td>
<td>$141,795,092</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 United Way of Greater Toronto (2010)</td>
<td>$141,752,454</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario (2010)</td>
<td>$114,929,468</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The Nature Conservancy of Canada</td>
<td>$103,964,383</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 The Canadian National Institute for the Blind (Ontario)</td>
<td>$78,098,339</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Toronto General &amp; Western Hospital Foundation</td>
<td>$76,476,378</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Canadian Diabetes Association (2010)</td>
<td>$72,991,886</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 UNICEF Canada</td>
<td>$68,251,349</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Community Living Toronto</td>
<td>$67,806,590</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Canadian Cancer Society</td>
<td>$58,129,048</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre Foundation</td>
<td>$40,182,582</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Mount Sinai Hospital Foundation of Toronto</td>
<td>$36,110,139</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 York University Foundation</td>
<td>$31,188,994</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Goodwill Industries of Toronto</td>
<td>$23,563,959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MaRS Discovery District (2010)</td>
<td>$15,333,023</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Charitable organizations and foundations were selected based on revenue reported to the Canada Revenue Agency. Retrieved on February 21, 2012, from: http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/chrts-gvng/lstngs/menu-eng.html

Charities which were ethno-cultural were excluded as were religious organizations, hospitals, universities, and other publicly funded institutions. To avoid double counting, institutions which are charities but do not have separate governance structures (such as The University of Toronto Board of Governors and Ryerson University) are included as educational institutions rather than foundations. The Ontario Trillium Foundation, which is a Provincial agency, is included in the discussion of Agencies, Boards and Commissions. The list however does include foundations which are associated with, but are separate from hospitals and educational institutions. For example, the York University Foundation has a separate structure and governance from the University and was included. Charities and foundations for which no information was available or where there was information on less 50% of the senior executives or board of directors were excluded.
### APPENDIX 4: PROVINCIAL AGENCIES, BOARD AND COMMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>2010 Revenue ('000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ontario Pension Board (Total Assets)</td>
<td>$21,551,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. (OLG)</td>
<td>$6,685,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ontario Power Generation Inc.</td>
<td>$5,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hydro One</td>
<td>$5,124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Liquor Control Board of Ontario</td>
<td>$4,576,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ontario Electricity Financial Corporation</td>
<td>$4,413,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Toronto Central Local Health Integration Network</td>
<td>$4,378,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mississauga Halton Local Health Integration Network</td>
<td>$1,255,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cancer Care Ontario</td>
<td>$836,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. GoTransit (renamed MetroLinx)</td>
<td>$652,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Legal Aid Ontario</td>
<td>$353,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ontario Infrastructure Projects Corporation (Infrastructure Ontario)</td>
<td>$211,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ontario Clean Water Agency</td>
<td>$138,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ontario Trillium Foundation</td>
<td>$125,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation</td>
<td>$122,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO)</td>
<td>$119,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ontario Power Authority (2009)</td>
<td>$81,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Royal Ontario Museum</td>
<td>$77,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ontario Securities Commission</td>
<td>$72,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The Ontario Educational Communications Authority</td>
<td>$64,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Metropolitan Toronto Convention Center Corporation</td>
<td>$55,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Ontario Realty Corporation</td>
<td>$55,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ontario Energy Board</td>
<td>$34,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Education Quality and Accountability Office</td>
<td>$33,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Deposit Insurance Corporation of Ontario</td>
<td>$24,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DiversityLeads is a five-year Community University Research Alliance (CURA) project generously supported by the federal Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). This partnership has been formed between academics, private, public, non-profit, and government sectors under Dr. Wendy Cukier, Founder/Director of the Diversity Institute and VP of Research and Innovation at Ryerson University. This project is worth $2.5 million over the 5-year period.

The DiversityLeads project recognizes that diversity among prominent leaders sends a powerful message about the accessibility of power in Canada, which has significant implications for social inclusion. As leadership plays a vital role in social and economic prosperity, it is important that we promote the best leaders – both men and women – to address the pressing challenges of local innovation and global competitiveness.