



INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT – 17 December 2018

Institution: Ryerson University

Contact name and information: Dayle Levine – Manager, Institutional Projects – dayle.levine@ryerson.ca

Instructions

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

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Recognition

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

Yes: [x]

No: []

PART A: Equity and Diversity Targets and Gaps

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

Designated group	Target (percentage)	Target (actual number)	Representation (actual number)	Gap(actual number)
Women	31%	4	*	*
Indigenous peoples	1%	0	*	*
Persons with disabilities	4%	1	*	*
Visible minorities	15%	2	*	*

*Representation numbers below 5 are withheld to maintain anonymity.

Number of currently active chairs: 14

Number of empty chairs: 9

Number of chairs currently under peer review: 3



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

During the past year, Ryerson commenced recruitment processes for seven of the ten vacant chairs. Included in the seven processes were three failed searches (Biomedical Engineering, Energy and Power Systems and a CRC in Migration and Integration). Offers were made to candidates in both the Biomedical Engineering and the Energy and Power Systems and were declined in these highly competitive areas. In addition, the CRC subject matter as it relates to Cybersecurity was further refined extending two of the searches. The seven searches currently underway are in our Faculty of Arts (Indigenous Democracies, Democracy); Faculty of Science (Cybersecurity); Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science (Biomedical Medical, Energy and Power Systems and Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning for Cybersecurity) and Ted Rogers School of Management (Migration and Integration). All postings, except for the Cybersecurity position in the Faculty of Science, are advertised as open until filled. The Ryerson Executive Committee for CRC Planning is receiving allocation proposals (January 7, 2019) for the two new allocations (awarded in September 2018). Decisions regarding the subject matter for the two new chairs will be made on January 15, with recruitment commencing shortly thereafter. Currently Ryerson has applications to three positions under peer review (two renewals and one new).

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

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

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

The university has an ongoing program to identify and address the barriers that impact the recruitment, representation and retention of faculty and staff from five groups: women, racialized people, Aboriginal Peoples, persons with disabilities and 2SLGBTQ+ people. Self-identification data from employees is collected and reported annually to identify gaps and track progress. Findings of gaps included were that there were no women CRCs in the Faculties of Science and Engineering and that Ryerson also had no racialized women CRCs and no CRCs who identified as persons with disabilities, Aboriginal Peoples or 2SLGBTQ+. A review of CRC recruitment practices at the university identified areas where EDI could be better incorporated, for example, in the wider dissemination of job advertisements and in the incorporation of EDI selection criteria in the postings. As a result of an identified lack of EDI infusion throughout the hiring process, Ryerson developed tools (e.g. assessment rubrics, interview questions, language for job ads, etc.) and training (e.g. CRC hiring committee training on EDI best practices and barriers and unconscious biases that influence hiring decisions); established an equity representative for CRC hiring committees; and, collects and reports on the diversity of candidates at every stage of the process. The OVPECI identified systemic barriers that have negative impacts on the employment of faculty from equity groups, such as less value placed on different approaches to conducting research and qualitative research and other research paradigms; and lack of support for personal circumstances. This information was also considered in the development of the previously noted tools and training.



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

The information for the comparative review required interviewing the current CRCs to understand their experiences and to gather information about institutional support, mentoring and the incorporation of EDI into their work and teams so that comparisons could be made based on gender and racialized identity (the two groups represented in our current CRCs). Thus far, the interview findings suggest that a number of our current CRCs are proactive in initiating EDI best practices, while other CRCs need additional help to embed EDI into their work. One CRC has established a Code of Conduct for their research team. It was also apparent that the CRCs have different levels of understanding of available institutional resources. There is no evidence to suggest this is related to gender identity or race. However, as a result, it has also been suggested that the university provide opportunities for CRCs to engage amongst themselves and share information, discuss issues and bring forward recommendations to the university administration to improve support for the CRCs; these opportunities would also provide peer mentoring. Note, the university had, and continues to have, a substantial number of vacancies, noted previously, and, as a result, the findings from the small number of CRC interviews conducted have had limited usefulness in understanding inequities. Fulfillment of the vacancies will allow us to establish mechanisms to collect more comprehensive information about the supports and resources provided to Ryerson's CRCs; and to identify and address any equity issues.

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

Ryerson conducted an employee engagement survey in 2012 and 2018. In 2013, the OVPECI office reviewed the results of the survey, comparing the results of faculty and staff from equity groups with results for employees who did not identify as part of those groups and had open forums for employees from equity groups to confidentially discuss the results of the survey for their group. Overall, the results indicated a healthy working environment and strong support for equity, diversity and inclusion at the university. However, experiences differed based on where employees worked and the types of jobs performed, as well as some differences based on equity groups surveyed. Some of the key areas for improvement identified included better communication, more opportunities for employee contributions, enhanced recognition and career development and advancement. Women employees were less satisfied than men in these areas for improvement and results suggested they also were more concerned about having sufficient time to do their jobs and the ability to balance work and personal lives. Racialized employees, while highly engaged overall, were less satisfied with having their voices heard and with being recognized for their contributions. Indigenous employees shared the same concerns as most employees and also expressed concerns about getting regular feedback on work performance and having the opportunity to express their ideas. Employees with disabilities had substantially lower engagement scores, although still around 75%, and expressed concerns about their future at the university. The 2018 survey results are currently being reviewed.

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

1. Executive Committee for CRC Planning, which has representation from three of the four designated groups,
2. CRCs (who had representation from two of the designated groups) were invited to comment on a draft of the plan,
3. Faculty (who have representation of all four designated groups) was invited to provide input based on a draft of the plan, using a confidential email that was set up for that purpose. 12 faculty provided feedback that was incorporated into the plan.
4. Informal discussions took place with members from the four designated groups and OVPECI staff from those groups, using their internal networks and groups, including discussions with members of CRC and faculty hiring committees,
5. OVPECI and internal HR EDI experts, e.g. Aboriginal HR Consultant, were consulted, and
6. Equity professionals from Ontario universities were consulted regarding their plans.



PART C: Objectives, Indicators and Actions

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

Key Objective 1:
Attract excellent diverse candidates for CRC positions from Ryerson's equity seeking group who reflect the diversity of our students and community.
Corresponding actions:
Self ID for applicants to assess the diversity of the pool of applicants, database of Indigenous scholars, identification of advertising venues to reach diverse candidates and use of networks.
Indicator(s):
Aggregate self-identification data at every stage of the hiring process.
Progress:
Applicant Self ID results show a considerable amount of diversity in applicant pools for CRC positions, however, the diversity decreases through the stages of the hiring process.
Next steps:
Enhance training and tools for hiring committees to reduce narrow focus and reliance on proxies for excellence, such as publication in peer reviewed journals and spend more time assessing the quality of the research of candidates.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Ryerson recently hired its first female CRC nominee in the Faculty of Science. Submission currently under peer review.

Key Objective 2:
Infusing EDI into all stages of the process.
Corresponding actions:
CRC hiring committees must select one of their senior members to be equity representatives who receive additional training and consult with the Vice President, Equity and Community Inclusion at all stages of the hiring process.
Indicator(s):
Representatives in place and trained.
Progress:
Committees do select equity representatives who receive additional training regarding their role and best practices for infusing EDI at each stage. However, the ongoing consultation throughout the process has not always been adhered to.
Next steps:
Build in accountability mechanisms for equity representatives and Deans.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Need to identify more effective strategies to address resistance to OVPECI involvement in process.



Key Objective 3:
Training those involved in CRC hiring to break down barriers.
Corresponding actions:
Developed training content for CRC hiring committees.
Indicator(s):
Number of sessions delivered.
Progress:
Increasing uptake in training, but not provided to all committees.
Next steps:
The university needs to establish more consistent processes to support delivery of training to all committees before they begin hiring processes.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Positive feedback from CRC committees in Engineering and Science Faculties concerning training, establishing EDI criteria and language for job postings, outreach support, and tools such as assessment rubrics and suggested interview questions.

Key Objective 4:
Include EDI criteria in job postings.
Corresponding actions:
Developed language to include in ads, including EDI selection criteria, and OVPECI and HR staff available to review on request.
Indicator(s):
Number of requests to review ads from CRC hiring committees, and number of times EDI criteria included in postings.
Progress:
Standard criteria now included in all CRC, and most faculty postings, for demonstrated commitment to uphold the values of equity, diversity and inclusion in research.
Next steps:
Need to find out how EDI criteria is being assessed.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
OVPECI staff been asked for input into Faculty postings regardless of whether or not the posting is affiliated with a CRC.



Key Objective 5:
Experiences of Ryerson CRCs.
Corresponding actions:
Interviews being conducted to gather information about the experiences of Ryerson's CRCs, more specifically the supports they do or do not receive from the university and how EDI is being reflected in their work and teams.
Indicator(s):
Will need to connect this with self identification data of CRCs to identify any inequities.
Progress:
Interviews of existing CRCs completed by the end of 2018, however, because of the number of vacancies further interviews will be required over the next year.
Next steps:
Establish opportunities for CRCs to share information and ideas, so that they can provide peer mentoring and identify areas for the university to provide improved support.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Limited resources to conduct these interviews on an ongoing basis at this time.

Key Objective 6:
Improve accountability mechanisms.
Corresponding actions:
Discussions about options and where accountability lies.
Indicator(s):
None.
Progress:
This is challenging in universities where power over hiring, promotion and many other aspects related to recruiting, supporting and retaining CRCs rests with tenured faculty members who represent informal power structures.
Next steps:
OVPECI to provide recommendations for revising action plan in 2019 to incorporate more accountability for results.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
One Dean is providing leadership by providing clear direction to hire for diversity. This could be a model for changes to the action plan.



PART D: Challenges and Opportunities

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

Ryerson University has many strengths that provide opportunities and have resulted in some successes in advancing EDI in the institution's CRC program. These strengths include the established structures and processes for the ongoing collection and reporting on the representation of employees from Ryerson's five equity seeking groups (including tailored reports to departments detailing areas of underrepresentation); development and delivery of joint training of faculty hiring and evaluation committees that includes the Office of the Vice President, Equity and Community Inclusion (OVPECI); OVPECI and HR staff with expertise in equity, diversity and inclusion including Aboriginal HR Consultant, Education and Awareness Coordinator, Director, Human Rights Services, Director, Strategic Planning and Assessment and Vice President, Equity and Community Inclusion; and a strong group of university and academic leaders and faculty experts and champions of EDI across the university including the President, Provost, Deans and faculty in departments/schools such as Sociology, Disability Studies, Human Resources and Organizational Behaviour and Fashion. This has allowed us to infuse EDI throughout the process by: developing tools, such as the EDI Faculty Hiring Checklist, assessment rubrics, etc.; implementing language and EDI criteria for job ads; establishing the role of equity representatives on CRC hiring committees; and implementing diversity self-identification processes for applicants and report on pool diversity at each stage of the process. Ryerson's OVPECI also recently piloted the role of Faculty Equity and Inclusion Chair, seconding a faculty member to work with CRC hiring committees and individual CRCs to assess systems and practices and identify ways to better infuse equity, diversity and inclusion into the CRCP at the university. OVPECI also has, and is continuing to, partner with NSERC equity professionals to host roundtable discussions to infuse equity, diversity and inclusion in Canada's university research ecosystem. These roundtable meetings include faculty researchers, university equity professionals, senior academic leaders at universities, institutional research and HR staff, and federal research funding agency staff. They provide opportunities for key stakeholders to work together to share information and best practices and provide mutual support. The university's challenges have included some ongoing resistance from faculty to what they see as interference from those who have no subject matter expertise related to their disciplines, and who believe they know how to fairly assess the qualifications of candidates. Therefore equity practices, in their view are unnecessary. The university needs to raise awareness of the CRCP requirements and recommended equity best practices. To be successful infusing EDI into all aspects of recruitment and retention processes and practices related to CRCs, academic leaders must contribute more resources to support infusing EDI in their areas, supplementing the support and resources provided by the OVPECI team. The university also needs to increase support to faculty who want to incorporate equity best practices, including developing and delivering training and developing tools for them to use. Finally, additional monitoring and accountability mechanisms must be established to ensure tools, training, practices and processes discussed are effective.



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

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

It is important to note that institutions can only address their gaps once chair positions become available (i.e., when their current chairholders' terms end). However, it is expected that institutions will manage their chair allocations carefully in order to meet their equity and diversity targets, which includes choosing not to renew Tier 2 or Tier 1 chairholders as necessary. Institutions must have action plans posted on their websites as of December 15, 2017. They must also email a copy of their action plan by email to the program at edi-edi@chairs-chaire.gc.ca. If an institution fails to meet these requirements by the deadlines stipulated, **the program will withhold peer review and payments for nominations submitted to the fall 2017 intake cycle, and to future cycles as necessary, until the requirements are fulfilled.**

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

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

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

1) Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Objectives and Measurement Strategies

- impactful equity, diversity and inclusion objectives, indicators, and actions that will enable swift progress towards:
 - addressing disadvantages currently experienced by individuals of the FDGs; and
 - meeting the institution's equity targets and goals by December 2019—aggressive objectives must be set using this timeline based on the number of chair allocations that are (or will become) available in the institution within the next 18 to 24 months (the 18 months starts as of December 15, 2017, when the action plan is implemented).
- objectives should be S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely), and include a measurement strategy for monitoring, reporting on progress, and course correcting if necessary, based on:
 - an employment systems review to identify the extent to which the institution's current recruitment practices are open and transparent; barriers or practices that could be having an adverse effect on the employment of individuals from the FDGs; and corrective measures that will be taken to address systematic inequities (an example of corrective measures that could be taken by institutions in Ontario is provided on the [Ontario Human Rights Commission website](#));



- a comparative review—by gender, designated group, and field of research—of the level of institutional support (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.) provided to all current chairholders, including measures to address systemic inequities;
 - an environmental scan to gauge the health of the institution's current workplace environment and the impact that this may be having (either positive or negative) on the institution's ability to meet its equity, diversity, and inclusion objectives, and measures that will be taken to address any issues raised; and
 - the institution's unique challenges based on its characteristics (e.g., size, language requirements, geographic location, etc.) in meeting its equity targets, and how these will be managed and mitigated.
- institutions will be required to report to the program and publicly on the progress made in meeting their objectives on a yearly basis.

2) Management of Canada Research Chair Allocations

Provide a description of:

- the institution's policies and processes for recruiting Canada Research chairholders, and all safeguards that are in place to ensure that these practices are open and transparent;
- how the institution manages its allocation of chairs and who is involved in these decisions (e.g., committee(s), vice-president level administrators, deans / department heads);
- the institution's decision-making process for determining in which faculty, department, research area to allocate its chair positions, and who approves these decisions;
- the decision-making process for how the institution chooses to use the [corridor of flexibility](#) in managing its allocation of chairs, and who approves these decisions;
- the decision-making process and criteria for determining whether Tier 2 and Tier 1 chairholders will be submitted for renewal and who is involved in these decisions;
- the process and criteria for deciding whether to advance individuals from a Tier 2 chair to a Tier 1 chair, and who is involved in these decisions;
- the process and criteria for deciding which chairholder(s) will be phased-out in the case where the institution loses a chair due to the [re-allocation process](#), and who is involved in these decisions;
- the decision-making process for determining what level of support is provided to chairholders (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.), and who within the institution is involved in these decisions;
- safeguards taken to ensure that individuals from the FDGs are not disadvantaged in negotiations related to the level of institutional support provided to them (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.);
- measures to ensure that individuals from the FDGs are not disadvantaged when applying to a chair position in cases where they have career gaps due to parental or health related leaves or for the care and nurturing of family members; and
- training and development activities related to unconscious bias, equity, diversity and inclusion for administrators and faculty involved in the recruitment and nomination processes for chair positions (acknowledging that research has shown unconscious bias



can have adverse, unintended and negative impacts on the overall success/career of individuals, especially those from the FDGs).

3) Collection of Equity and Diversity Data

Provide a description of:

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

4) Retention and Inclusivity

Provide a description of:

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