



INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT

Institution: Simon Fraser University

Contact name and information: Dugan O'Neil, Associate Vice-President Research

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	32	10	12	0
Indigenous peoples	1	0	*	*
Persons with disabilities	4	1	*	*
Visible minorities	15	5	8	0

Number of currently active chairs: 32

Number of empty chairs: 14

Number of chairs currently under peer review: 1 renewal



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

SFU has several CRC positions currently in the search phase. We currently have active searches for:

- o Tier 1 Canada Research Chair in Information Visualization
- o Tier 1 or 2 Canada Research Chair in Learning Analytics and Learning Design
- o Tier 1 Canada Research Chair in Statistics and Actuarial Science and CANSSI Scientific Director
- o Tier 2 Canada Research Chair in Computer Graphics
- o Tier 2 Canada Research Chair in Digital Humanities
- o Tier 2 Canada Research Chair in Experimental Particle Physics
- o Tier 2 Canada Research Chair in Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship

There are also some chairs in development, specifically two positions in the area of Indigenous Governance at the Tier 2 level.

*Please note cell counts less than 5 are expressed as *.

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:

SFU based its action plan on an Employment Systems (ESR) review conducted in 2007/2008, after consulting with the Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat (TIPS). The ESR found gaps for each of the four designated groups (FDGs), with visible minorities most affected. The majority of gaps were found among staff:

- Women: Senior Managers; Supervisors
- Indigenous peoples: Professionals; Semi-Professionals and Technicians
- Persons with disabilities: Professionals; Administrative and Senior Clerical; Clerical
- Visible minorities: Middle and other Managers; Supervisors; Semi-Professionals and Technicians; Administrative and Senior Clerical; Clerical; Semi-skilled Manual Workers; Other Manual Workers

Many of the ESR recommendations have been addressed, such as conducting exit surveys (Human Resources; Faculty Relations), creating a disability accommodation policy, and efforts to reduce physical barriers on the Burnaby campus. Job-splitting of tenure-track positions was discussed in the last round of collective bargaining between the SFU Faculty Association and Faculty Relations, but nothing has been agreed to at this time. Some recommendations provided guidance for increasing equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) efforts in the CRC program such as sustaining or increasing



diversity, developing recruitment best practices, improving policy, collecting better data on the FDGs, and creating structural mentorship supports.

Objectives identified in the action plan based on this ESR:

- Build practices and processes to sustain or increase diversity among CRC chairholders and applicants.
- Enable better availability and quality of data on the FDGs and gender/sexual diversity.
- Explore options for creating structural supports for mentorship, career planning, and professional development.

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

The comparative review was conducted using information from CRC applications on file after consulting with TIPS and SFU's privacy officer, and notifying chairholders.

The analysis shows average, consistent elements of support:

- Access to SFU facilities
- Administrative support (\$25,000/year)
- Graduate scholarships: PhD (\$7,000/semester), Masters (\$6,000/semester)
- Protected time for research (50%)
- Relocation expenses (\$20,000)
- Start-up research funds

Negotiable aspects are additional travel/materials funds; market differentials or retention awards; increased teaching release; salary awards; additional research funding; or additional students support.

Gender. Potential differences emerged for stipend and market differentials - female chairholders had lower stipends, but higher market differentials; however, fewer female chairs negotiated market differentials. Male chairholders may have negotiated more teaching release; it is hard to say if this is significant as teaching load varies between faculties. The majority of chairholders (60%) received the same amount of administrative support, the remaining 40% received support above this amount; male chairholders received the majority of additional support.

Visible minorities. No significant differences

Field of study. SFU chairholders (n=38) span 27 disciplines; the small sample size obviates a formal comparison, but apparent differences do not exist.

The comparative review was challenging due to teaching load variance, inconsistent language, qualitative differences in research, and number of chairholders.

Objectives identified in the action plan based on this review:

- Establish a standardized equitable process for allocating institutional support for chairs.
- Provide training, coaching and mentorship for faculty interested in opportunities or renewal with the CRC program with a strong focus on members of the FDGs.



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

The environmental scan was divided into two stages; Phase 1 consisted of reviewing:

- SFU websites and communications to determine if images and messages reflect diversity and are welcoming and inclusive of the campus community;
- equity policies and documents for language, timeliness, and accessibility; and
- the transparency of processes for recruitment.

A scan of SFU websites shows imagery used is reasonable and paints a picture of a diverse student, faculty, and staff body. At the time of the scan, information about EDI at SFU was widely spread.

Equity Related Policy. Employment Equity Policy (GP 19), Human Rights Policy (GP 18), and Disability Accommodation in the Workplace (GP 40). GP 19 was last updated in 1992 and recommended for review; this policy is in abeyance pending the report and recommendations of SFU's current EDI community consultation. GP 18 is relatively recent (2014) and is scheduled for review in 2019.

Recruitment Related Policy. Academic appointments are governed by the SFU Faculty Association Collective Agreement (2014-2019) which contains articles relating to Employment Equity (Article 13), Continuing Academic Appointments (Article 23), and principles for Specially Funded Chairs (Articles 42.67-42.71). A policy regarding foreign faculty is being revised to reflect account recent legislation. Overall, these policies are accessible, timely, and transparent.

Phase 2 of the scan will be informed by an EDI consultation (2019) consisting of:

- open forums, focus groups, and speakers;
- examining existing and past equity programs, policies, training, practices, needs, and initiatives; and
- a student-focused scan and survey on belonging (completed in 2018).

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):

SFU's action plan was informed by an advisory committee and an external equity consultant. This was a diverse group, where decision-making was done on a consensus model, with the caveat that the action plan would be revisited under the new equity portfolio when it is established. The advisory group was consulted over a four-month period and met every two weeks. The CRC Advisory committee consisted of (public information):

- o a current CRC chairholder
- o a member of the SFU Faculty Association equity committee (Faculty member)
- o Director and Executive Director of Faculty Relations
- o WWEST NSERC Chair for Women in Science and Engineering for BC and Yukon (Faculty member)
- o External equity consultant
- o Primary author (Master in Public Health, Social Inequities)

The final draft of the action plan was reviewed and approved by the Vice-President, Academic and the Associate Vice-President, Research. Great care was taken to consult current literature and practices



regarding data collection best practices, strategic equity plans, and EDI-focused approaches. There was also a strong focus on taking a structural approach to drafting the plan to ensure that identified objectives could result in meaningful and lasting impacts relative to EDI in the CRC program at SFU.

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:
Establish a standardized equitable process for allocating institutional support for chairs.
Corresponding actions:
1. Analysis of institutional support held by current Chairholders, with focus on what is standard and what is negotiated. 2. Developed an Institutional Support memo for the VPR office to share with Deans and Chairs outlining standard and negotiated elements of support. 3. Create tracking system to monitor support.
Indicator(s):
1. Variance between chairholders on standardized elements of support. 2. Awareness of Institutional Support Memo.
Progress:
Memo outlining standard and negotiated support has been sent to the Deans and shared with grant facilitators and other research support staff. The VPR office is in the process of establishing a tracking system for institutional support for CRC chairholders.
Next steps:
Monitor institutional support by conducting bi-annual comparative review (next review to take place in 2019). Consider speaking with current chairholders to assess the level of support they are receiving.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Good uptake of the suggestions to standardize support. Still in progress: we will be able to gauge the success of this initiative once we have developed more nominations.

Key Objective 2:
Carry out an annual review of the CRC Allocation Principles and Process memo.
Corresponding actions:
1. Review/update CRC Allocation Principles and Process memo. 2. Update information on SFU CRC accountability page.
Indicator(s):
1. Increased awareness of CRC Principles and Processes among relevant SFU stakeholders. 2. CRC nomination processes reflect the Guiding Principles of the CRC Allocations Principles and Processes memo.
Progress:
All Deans, Chairs, and Directors are aware of this memo. CRC nominations and processes are being monitored for compliance by Faculty Relations and the VPR office.
Next steps:



Communicate changes to relevant SFU stakeholders. Ensure that SFU recruitment processes align with the CRC Allocation Principles and Process memo.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Annual review of CRC Allocation Principles and Process memo is complete. Language was updated to include more discussion about CRC EDI requirements, address recent changes in the VPR and Faculty Relations portfolio, Tier 2 stipend increase, and update SFU's new allocation (not to be released until the embargo has lifted).

Key Objective 3:
Provide EDI training and resources for all faculty and CRC hiring/search committees, such as providing unconscious bias training, written resources, or coaching.
Corresponding actions:
1. Consult with Deans and Department Chairs/Directors and others about distribution, use and effectiveness of current training and resources, to identify gaps and needs. 2. Create clear processes for delivering training. 3. Develop internal resources on implicit bias.
Indicator(s):
1. Diversity of applicants shortlisted. 2. Awareness of equity targets and importance of EDI requirements within search committees. 3. Meeting or exceeding equity targets.
Progress:
Data on the diversity of applicants shortlisted is difficult to ascertain due to current practice of gathering data on applicants anonymously. Search committees are all aware of the importance of EDI and of SFU's equity targets.
Next steps:
Create process for training or facilitating equity champions to sit on hiring committees. Currently developing internal processes and practices for collecting diversity data on applicants in a confidential manner, rather than anonymously.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Developed implicit/unconscious bias guide for discussion with search committees after they have completed the CRC online bias module.

Key Objective 4:
Build practices and processes to sustain or increase diversity among CRC chairholders and applicants.
Corresponding actions:
1. Establish best practices and venues for posting CRC job vacancies that may increase the representation of the FDGs. 2. Providing equity advisors or advisory services to departments, faculties, and units to assist with CRC hiring processes. 3. Developing educational seminars and materials on the importance of employment equity to increase awareness within the SFU community.
Indicator(s):
1. Diversity statistics, obtained through annual data collection, of chairholders and applicants will indicate whether the recommended actions are effective in sustaining or increasing the diversity of CRC chairholders and applicants. 2. Increased awareness of the importance of equity within the SFU community and for CRC nomination processes.
Progress:



Data collection on current SFU chairholders is proposed on a biannual basis, to be next conducted in the Fall of 2019. The Director of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, Faculty Relations has developed equity focused workshops for Chairs and Directors on topics such as appointments, salary review, and tenure and promotion. We have had increased interest from departments and faculties around EDI requirements for CRC searches and faculty appointments. People are eager for resources to ensure their recruitment processes are equitable.
Next steps:
Currently developing internal processes and practices for collecting diversity data on applicants in a confidential manner, rather than anonymously. Developing processes to help facilitate equity champions on departmental/ faculty searches. Develop an internal CRC Chairs Administration Guide highlighting CRC EDI requirements, internal SFU processes, resources, and best practices.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
1. Created SFU Faculty Recruitment Guide. 2. Created a Job Posting Resource to guide departments, schools, and faculties when posting job ads to increase the diversity of applicants. 3. Secured membership in Pride at Work Canada to have access to job posting board and webinars/educational materials for staff and faculty; exploring other memberships that could enhance SFU's ability to recruit diverse applicants. 4. Director of EDI, Faculty Relations is a member of institutional CRC search committees as an equity champion.

Key Objective 5:
Enable better availability and quality of data on the FDGs and gender/sexual diversity.
Corresponding actions:
1. Create a committee to explore how SFU can improve its data collection, address challenges, and maintain reporting requirements. (Delivery system) 2. Develop survey tool to collect information. (Survey tool)
Indicator(s):
1. Increase in number of SFU faculty and staff who have a diversity record. 2. More fulsome data.
Progress:
Survey tool in late stages of development; survey will be delivered in 2019.
Next steps:
Data collection committee expects to make recommendations before the end of January 2019 on how to best administer the survey. Create an implementation plan to present to senior administration for changing how diversity data is being collected. Finalize survey tool for use.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Multi-unit, cross campus data collection committee has been meeting since October 2018, and expects to make its recommendations by the end of January. Survey tool draft has been shared with SFU stakeholders for input, will be finalized early in 2019.

Key Objective 6:
Build community awareness of SFU EDI initiatives.
Corresponding actions:
1. Establish a strategy for creating an online presence for the EDI initiative. 2. Develop a plan to build community awareness of EDI at SFU. 3. Engage in a campus wide community EDI-focused consultation.
Indicator(s):



1. Better awareness and support of EDI on campus. 2. EDI embedded in SFU policies and practices. 3. Participation level in EDI consultation (2019) from SFU staff, students, and faculty.
Progress:
Deep interest in EDI and support from senior administration and various units/departments/schools. EDI considerations are a component of Academic Plans submitted for approval in 2018.
Next steps:
1. The EDI Initiative is developing a communications plan to facilitate a community consultation during spring 2019. 2. Compile and share SFU-based, EDI related training opportunities. 3. Several elements are being created to compliment the consultation and increase awareness of EDI on campus: a. Conversation series b. Workshops on EDI related topics for staff and faculty c. Library Resource Repository on EDI
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
The EDI Initiative now has a web presence, events calendar, a weekly digest, and resource page. A strategy and guiding principles for the consultation have been drafted in consultation with the EDI Advisory Group and Working Group. A resource for Inclusive Events has been created and shared with the SFU community.

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):

<p>Opportunities/Success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EDI community consultation will raise awareness and inform the structure of SFU’s equity portfolio, which will support the CRC equity program at SFU. By intentionally consulting with the community we will have a better grasp of issues and better uptake of future EDI initiatives. • Working with the EDI initiative working group, and the EDI Advisory group has greatly supported and informed the steps SFU has taken to implement the CRC action plan recommendations. <p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Until SFU’s community consultation is complete and resulting recommendations are made and considered, we are continuing to ensure that the CRC EDI requirements are being met, with an eye on the future and being strategic as to how these elements are being actioned. • Institutional change takes time; it is important to investigate the different levers for change, and to be strategic and forward-thinking. • Data collection on applicants and successful nominees is still a challenge, we are exploring practices and processes for gathering this data confidentially rather an anonymously. This will make our data more robust and improve our ability to monitor our progress relative to equity targets. <p>Best Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with a wide range of people and units at SFU has been critical to the successes we have had so far. • Working within a diverse team structure has also been instrumental in forward movement on recommendations from the action plan.
--



- Focusing on structural interventions, processes, and practices is key to advancing EDI within the CRC program at SFU.
- Implementation plans with concrete action items and timelines are critical to moving forward recommendations.
- Communication is key. We strive to ensure the CRC EDI requirements are shared early on in nomination processes. Making sure everyone involved (grant facilitators, search committees and Chairs, Deans, etc.) has all the information before they start moving forward on a nomination ensures better adherence to requirements and transparency, and more equitable outcomes.

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.