INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT

Institution: Concordia University

Contact name and information:
Dr. Justin Powlowski, Associate Vice-President, Strategy and Operations
Office of the Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies
(justin.powlowski@concordia.ca)

Instructions

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

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Recognition

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

Yes:_____ No: X

PART A: Equity and Diversity Targets and Gaps

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

Designated group	Target (percentage)	Target (actual number)	Representation (actual number)	Gap(actual number)
Women	31	8	6	2
Indigenous peoples	1	0	***	***
Persons with disabilities	4	1	***	***
Visible minorities	15	4	7	0

Number of currently active chairs: 26

Number of empty chairs: 8

Number of chairs currently under peer review: 2

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

As of December 2018, one (1) Canada Research Chair nomination (CIHR Tier 2 in research area of Molecular Biophysics of Human Health) and one (1) renewal (CIHR Tier 2 in research area of Clinical Nutrition) have been submitted and are pending review. Results are expected in April 2019. One (1) Chair nomination (research area of Critical Disability Studies and Communication Technology) is also expected to be submitted for review before April 2019.

Concordia also has six new Chair allocations from the CRC Secretariat as a result of the 2018 exercise: one (1) SSHRC Tier 1, four (4) SSHRC Tier 2 and one (1) CIHR Tier 2. There is also one (1) current NSERC Tier 2 chair that will end a second term in October 2020. An internal call for letters of intent (LOI) was published in October 2018 to identify research areas for these allocations. We expect this will conclude in the second quarter of 2019 and that nominations will be submitted to the CRC Secretariat in 2020 for most of these allocations.

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 key findings of the employment systems review were the following:
-faculty hiring at Concordia is governed by the provisions of the Concordia University Faculty Association (CUFA) Collective Agreement, and carried out in a process that involves departments, Faculties and the Provost's office. Additional considerations for CRC hiring are covered in the Policy on Research Chairs.
-the CUFA Collective Agreement requires that advertisements specifically encourage applications from all qualified candidates, including women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal persons, members of sexual minorities, persons with disabilities, and others who may contribute to diversification.
-additional provisions to insure that persons with career interruptions are encouraged to apply were implemented with the last call for CRC LOI's (2017) and should be integrated into the Policy on Research Chairs.
-EDI training, provided by the Senior Lead, Equity and Diversity, Office of the Provost, was instituted at the departmental hiring committee level in our last call for CRC LOIs, and should be expanded to all committees involved in the hiring process as well as integrated into the Policy on

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

The key findings of the comparative review were the following:
-the research allocation amounts that CRCs receive, as well as the CRC-related course remission levels, are standardized in the Policy for Research Chairs.
-other parameters, such as salary stipends, lab space and start-up funds are negotiated with the Faculty Deans as per the CUFA Collective Agreement and prevailing discipline-specific norms.
-Concordia's small number of CRC Chairs (currently 26), spread over 4 Faculties, 2 Tiers and all 3 federal agencies makes it difficult to obtain any statistically significant measure of systematic discrepancies, but in general within Faculties and Tiers there do not appear to be any significant discrepancies in compensation that affect the FDGs.
-although no discrepancies are evident, the internal management of the program would benefit from oversight and monitoring measures, including: review of the Policy on Research Chairs, together with the Deans, to determine whether any additional parts of the offer to CRCs can be standardized; and systematic review of each individual CRC offer parameter before it is sent to the candidate.

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

The key findings of the environmental scan were:
- there is a lack of data at Concordia University, or an effective way of collecting it, on overall faculty diversity, which would allow us to identify the target groups, either within applicant pools or at the university as a whole. The Office of the Provost has started two initiatives that will provide these data.
-specific data about the integration of the current CRCs has not been surveyed, although the administration is made aware of (and can take action on) issues that individual Chairholders raise through preparation of their annual Chairholder reports and the mandatory mid-term review and performance evaluation processes.
- the Special Advisor to the Provost on Campus Life is leading a campus overview of best EDI practices, with meetings planned throughout the 2018-2019 academic year, that will be expected to identify issues and propose solutions to support an equitable and diverse environment overall at

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):

During the drafting of the Action Plan, members of the Senate Research Committee, the University Research Committee, and administrators from the Offices of the Vice President, Research and Graduate Studies, and Provost and Vice President Academic, were consulted. This took the form of several meetings with the Senate Research Committee and a joint meeting between the Senate Research Committee and the University Research Committee wherein the Action Plan was discussed, and drafts of the Plan exchanged. Amongst the 20 faculty members of the SRC and URC, 9 are women, 2 are indigenous and 4 are visible minorities. Amongst the 6 administrators consulted, 4 are women. The main source of EDI expertise was two of these administrators, the Senior Lead, Equity and Diversity, and the Manager, Academic Leadership and Inclusion, both from the Office of the Provost, who in turn consulted with colleagues at other universities.

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:
Be at least 4 Chairs over CRC program targets for all FDG categories combined by July 2021.
Corresponding actions:
CRC LOI process currently underway will lead to new nominations that will help us reach objective.
Indicator(s):
Number of chairs filled for each FDG category, comparison from previous years/reports.
Progress:
Recent CRC nominations/renewals submitted/awarded, flex moves and new chair allocations obtained.
Next steps:
New nomination for 04/2019 + LOI process underway for vacant chairs as described above (section A.2).
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
New allocations and flex moves for EDI have allowed us to move forward with new processes to achieve thi

Key Objective 2:
Provide ongoing EDI-related training for all involved in CRC search, hiring and nomination processes.
Corresponding actions:
Training program to implement for CRC hiring committees and others involved in CRC nomination processe
Indicator(s):
Training sessions conducted and individuals trained, feedback obtained from trainees, introduction of new tr
Progress:
EDI training provided to hiring committees in last CRC call (2017-2018).
Next Steps:
Extension of training program reach to take place for the most recent call for LOIs.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Importance of the training and implementation at multi-committee level has been emphasized via communic

Key Objective 3:
Extend EDI principles and monitoring beyond CRC Action Plan to demonstrate institutional priority.
Corresponding actions:
Proactive EDI policies and procedures for regular faculty hiring; regular data gathering to inform EDI; survey
Indicator(s):
Data that can inform EDI decisions; policies and procedures adopted to support diversity and equity.
Progress:
Applicant survey instituted for regular faculty hires; planning for institution-wide faculty survey; EDI training i
Next Steps:
Institution-wide faculty survey to take place in 2019: finalization of “Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Pla
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Draft EDI document for regular faculty hiring created and university-wide consultations on EDI started.

Key Objective 4:
Inscribe EDI principles in Policy on Research Chairs and related Procedures.
Corresponding actions:
Modifying Policy and Procedures to account for EDI principles in various aspects of chair management.
Indicator(s):
Modifications have been done to the Policy and Procedures to account for EDI principles; impact of modifica
Progress:
Inventory of Policy/Procedure aspects to be reviewed/modified in Summer and Fall 2018.
Next Steps:
Drafting of proposed modifications, for consultation then approval at Senate by June 2019.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Will use the success of process changes in the current call for CRC LOIs to help inform Policy modifications

Key Objective 5:
Acquire better data on EDI status, perceptions and challenges at Concordia.
Corresponding actions:
Prepare and conduct a Chairholder survey. Analyze results and report on results. Faculty applicant pool sur
Indicator(s):
Participation rate in surveys, production of reliable data on EDI at Concordia on which to base additional act
Progress:
First stages of preparation of Chairholder survey in Fall 2018.
Next Steps:
Chairholder survey to be conducted in first quarter of 2019, followed by analysis and reporting on results; ur
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Pilot surveys of applicant pools done in Fall 2018, which will be expanded to all faculty hiring including CRC

Key Objective 6:
Improved procedures to enhance equity and diversity from the LOI call to making an offer.
Corresponding actions:
Various best practices to encourage and/or implement (see Action Plan, page 8).
Indicator(s):
Specific modifications made to procedures for hiring and tools developed and made available to individuals
Progress:
Some procedures (search firm) were used for the CERC nomination process, which was successful in ident
Next Steps:
Implement some of the procedures and tools in the CRC searches and hiring committees that will result fror
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Emphasis on importance of EDI principles and unconscious bias training are being introduced into the adjuc

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 recent additional allocation of Chairs, along with the unlimited flex moves that were obtained in relation to EDI, allow us to immediately implement elements of the Action Plan much earlier than initially anticipated, which was then based only on the turnover rates of our existing Chairs.

We have just submitted our CERC application. This was the result of a long and careful process in which EDI principles played a central role, and we are happy that we were successful in selecting a member of one of the FDGs. In this respect, we found the services of a search firm very helpful in generating a diverse pool of candidates, which encourages us to try the same strategy in future CRC hiring exercises.

The lack of data at Concordia University on overall faculty diversity, which would allow us to identify the target groups, either within applicant pools or at the university as a whole continues to be an issue. Although the Department of Human Resources has the capacity to collect diversity data on staff members, including faculty, via the employee web portal, it is completely voluntary and data collected is far from complete. Measures are being taken to address the collection of faculty data related to the diversity of the applicant pool for each competition through an applicant survey currently underway and that will be in place for each tenure-track recruitment initiative moving forward.

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

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

It is important to note that institutions can only address their gaps once chair positions become available (i.e., when their current chairholders' terms end). However, it is expected that institutions will manage their chair allocations carefully in order to meet their equity and diversity targets, which includes choosing not to renew Tier 2 or Tier 1 chairholders as necessary.

Institutions must have action plans posted on their websites as of December 15, 2017. They must also email a copy of their action plan by email to the program at edi-edi@chairs-chaires.gc.ca. If an institution fails to meet these requirements by the deadlines stipulated, **the program will withhold peer review and payments for nominations submitted to the fall 2017 intake cycle, and to future cycles as necessary, until the requirements are fulfilled**.

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

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

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

1) Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Objectives and Measurement Strategies

- impactful equity, diversity and inclusion objectives, indicators, and actions that will enable swift progress towards:
    - addressing disadvantages currently experienced by individuals of the FDGs; and
    - meeting the institution's equity targets and goals by December 2019—aggressive objectives must be set using this timeline based on the number of chair allocations that are (or will become) available in the institution within the next 18 to 24 months (the 18 months starts as of December 15, 2017, when the action plan is implemented).

- objectives should be S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely), and include a measurement strategy for monitoring, reporting on progress, and course correcting if necessary, based on:
    - an employment systems review to identify the extent to which the institution's current recruitment practices are open and transparent; barriers or practices that could be having an adverse effect on the employment of individuals from the FDGs; and corrective measures that will be taken to address systematic inequities (an example of corrective measures that could be taken by institutions in Ontario is provided on the Ontario Human Rights Commission website);
    - a comparative review—by gender, designated group, and field of research—of the level of institutional support (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.) provided to all current chairholders, including measures to address systemic inequities;
    - an environmental scan to gauge the health of the institution's current workplace environment and the impact that this may be having (either positive or negative) on the institution's ability to meet its equity, diversity, and inclusion objectives, and measures that will be taken to address any issues raised; and
    - the institution's unique challenges based on its characteristics (e.g., size, language requirements, geographic location, etc.) in meeting its equity targets, and how these will be managed and mitigated.
- institutions will be required to report to the program and publicly on the progress made in meeting their objectives on a yearly basis.

2) Management of Canada Research Chair Allocations

Provide a description of:

- the institution's policies and processes for recruiting Canada Research chairholders, and all safeguards that are in place to ensure that these practices are open and transparent;
- how the institution manages its allocation of chairs and who is involved in these decisions (e.g., committee(s), vice-president level administrators, deans / department heads);
- the institution's decision-making process for determining in which faculty, department, research area to allocate its chair positions, and who approves these decisions;
- the decision-making process for how the institution chooses to use the corridor of flexibility in managing its allocation of chairs, and who approves these decisions;
- the decision-making process and criteria for determining whether Tier 2 and Tier 1 chairholders will be submitted for renewal and who is involved in these decisions;
- the process and criteria for deciding whether to advance individuals from a Tier 2 chair to a Tier 1 chair, and who is involved in these decisions;
- the process and criteria for deciding which chairholder(s) will be phased-out in the case where the institution loses a chair due to the re-allocation process, and who is involved in these decisions;

- the decision-making process for determining what level of support is provided to chairholders (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.), and who within the institution is involved in these decisions;
- safeguards taken to ensure that individuals from the FDGs are not disadvantaged in negotiations related to the level of institutional support provided to them (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.);
- measures to ensure that individuals from the FDGs are not disadvantaged when applying to a chair position in cases where they have career gaps due to parental or health related leaves or for the care and nurturing of family members; and
- training and development activities related to unconscious bias, equity, diversity and inclusion for administrators and faculty involved in the recruitment and nomination processes for chair positions (acknowledging that research has shown unconscious bias can have adverse, unintended and negative impacts on the overall success/career of individuals, especially those from the FDGs).

3) Collection of Equity and Diversity Data

Provide a description of:

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

4) Retention and Inclusivity

Provide a description of:

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