



INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT

Institution:

Contact name and information:

Instructions

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

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Recognition

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

Yes: _____

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				
Indigenous peoples				
Persons with disabilities				
Visible minorities				

Number of currently active chairs: _____

Number of empty chairs: _____

Number of chairs currently under peer review: _____



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

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:



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

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

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):



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:
Corresponding actions:
Indicator(s):
Progress:
Next steps:
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):

Key Objective 2:
Corresponding actions:
Indicator(s):
Progress:
Next Steps:
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):



Key Objective 3:
Corresponding actions:
Indicator(s):
Progress:
Next Steps:
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):

Key Objective 4:
Corresponding actions:
Indicator(s):
Progress:
Next Steps:
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):



Key Objective 5:
Corresponding actions:
Indicator(s):
Progress:
Next Steps:
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):

Key Objective 6:
Corresponding actions:
Indicator(s):
Progress:
Next Steps:
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):



PART D: Challenges and Opportunities

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

The greatest challenge UNB encountered in developing its CRC EDI Action Plan (AP) involved the lack of clear and consistent guidelines from the CRC program. The target-setting methodology has been under review since the AP was in development; the date for the methodology's final revision was pushed out and then the date was eliminated entirely. Considering that the AP was developed in order to meet specific targets, it is frustrating and worrisome that UNB's outcomes will be judged based on a method that is being changed at an undetermined point in our progress. Also, while UNB appreciates the importance of receiving reviewer feedback on the AP, revising the plan one year into its progression is hardly ideal. This process should have been carried out in advance of the plan being put into action instead of halfway through its progression.

UNB is pleased to report that all CRC equity and diversity gaps are now closed. In July 2018, UNB nominated [REDACTED] [REDACTED]'s successful nomination allows UNB to address its gap in women chairholders, identified as totaling 1 chair in UNB's internal 2017 target-setting exercise.

Along with closing its CRC gaps, a range of EDI-related successes have arisen as UNB implements the AP. EDI training is provided to all CRC hiring committees in order to facilitate fair and transparent recruitment processes. As well, the two current calls for Expressions of Interest in vacant Tier 2 chairs was designed to ensure Faculties focus on important areas of research without presenting potential candidates. Actions specific to the CRC program have launched institution-wide initiatives, including successful equity roundtables, the development of EDI training tools, and intentional communication among administrative divisions. The Self-ID survey distributed to all current UNB employees, including CRC chairholders, had a 92% response rate and provides an excellent snapshot of FDG data at the University.

The best practices informing the AP's creation have proven effective in implementing the plan to date. UNB believes that shifting institutional culture requires authentic and meaningful consultation with equity-seeking groups; this consultation drove the AP's development. The Bi-Campus Presidential Standing Committee on Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Human Rights has provided focus on and support for EDI initiatives from the highest administrative levels. Implementing these initiatives through ground-level community consultations has created a foundation for success and lasting institutional change.



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.