



INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT (15 December 2018)

Institution: Mount Allison University

Contact name and information: Dr. Jeff Ollerhead
Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research
Mount Allison University
65 York Street, Sackville NB E4L 1E4
e-mail: provost@mta.ca tel: (506) 364-2622

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	29%	1		n/a
Indigenous peoples	1%	0		n/a
Persons with disabilities	4%	0		n/a
Visible minorities	15%	0		n/a

Number of currently active chairs: 3

Number of empty chairs: _____

Number of chairs currently under peer review: 1



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

We cannot report representation in actual numbers because the numbers are too small. We currently have two Tier 1 CRCs and one Tier 2 CRC. We submitted a nomination in October 2018 for a second Tier 2 CRC. The nominee is from one of the Federally Designated Employment Equity Groups (FDGs). Two of our three current CRCs are also from one of the FDGs.

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 finding from our employment systems review is that we needed to do more training and offer more guidance about how to deal with equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) issues. Concerns were also raised about the interpretation of career interruptions. As a result, we have expanded both mandatory and voluntary EDI training.

We work collaboratively with our unions and hiring committees to ensure that positions are advertised widely, including in non-traditional outlets. All of our Employment Equity Panel members receive specific training on EDI issues, including unconscious bias, how to ask appropriate interview questions, how to interpret gaps in career progression, etc. This training is also required for all CRC nomination committees and senior university administrators.



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

Our comparative review did not reveal any concerns with how our CRCs are treated with respect to level of institutional support. The specific salary and benefits offered to a chairholder are dictated by the provisions of our collective agreement with the Mount Allison Faculty Association (MAFA). Decisions about office space and any related space, including lab space, are based on discussions held during the nomination process between a candidate and his or her dean and the Provost. All CRCs are offered the same level of department level administrative support as any other faculty member. The provision of additional research funding support is negotiated between a candidate and her or his dean and the Provost. Direct financial support for our chairholders is not equal, as there are variations in the costs of conducting research in different disciplines. Each CRC receives a customized package of support to enable them to maximize their opportunities and meeting the objectives laid out in their CRC application.

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

Undertaking a formal environmental scan was challenging as we do not at this time collect EDI data from our employees. In 2019, we will discuss with the Mount Allison Faculty Association (MAFA), and possibly other of our unions, the possibility of conducting biennial surveys of employees to assess the degree to which we are meeting our EDI objectives and to identify any barriers, systemic or specific, to meeting them. This is not to suggest that environmental scans have not occurred but to acknowledge that they have not been conducted in a systematic, institution-wide manner.

Mount Allison is a smaller university. We employ 135-140 full-time faculty members. We hold regular meetings of our Faculty Council, open to all faculty members (including our CRCs) and chaired by the President. Thus, as a community, we have many opportunities to discuss EDI and related issues on a regular basis. Put another way, we are constantly scanning our environment to identify issues and problems related to a multitude of EDI considerations.

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):



Many members of our campus community were consulted in drafting our action plan, including members of our Senate Research and Creative Activities Committee, the majority of our CRCs, our Human Resources Department, and members of our senior administration. Colleagues at other smaller universities were also consulted. Members of multiple FDGs were consulted both in drafting the action plan and in preparing our most recent update to the plan (dated 14 December 2018). Most of the consultation was conducted in one-on-one meetings or in small groups.

Staff in our Human Resources Department were consulted multiple times for professional advice. This said, there remains opportunity for further improvements. We recently hired a new Indigenous Affairs Coordinator and we are currently finalizing the terms of reference for our Indigenous Advisory Circle (IAC). In 2019, our plan will be provided to our IAC for input. Depending on the input received, we may well revise our plan before its next scheduled review in 2020.

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 a diverse pool of applicants for each and every Canada Research Chair position to be filled.
Corresponding actions:
As noted in B.1, we have worked collaboratively with our unions and hiring committees to ensure that positions are advertised widely, including in non-traditional outlets.
Indicator(s):
In our last process, every candidate for the chair was a member of an FDG.
Progress:
If our current nomination is successful, 3 of our 4 CRCs will be a member of an FDG.
Next steps:
We do not expect to be submitting a nomination for 3 years, so we will have an opportunity in 2020, when this plan is next reviewed, to consider other steps we could take.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
We have not faced any obstacles. Our community has embraced the goal of achieving our EDI objectives.



Key Objective 2:
Ensure that our community of CRCs reflects the diversity present in our broader campus community and Canadian society.
Corresponding actions:
We have worked proactively to diversify our community of CRCs and to support them in ways that allow them to feel included.
Indicator(s):
The only CRC (T2) to resign mid-term at Mount Allison since CRCP inception, did so to take up a CRC (T1) chair at another university.
Progress:
If our current nomination is successful, 3 of our 4 CRCs will be a member of an FDG.
Next steps:
We do not expect to be submitting a nomination for 3 years, so we will have an opportunity in 2020, when this plan is next reviewed, to consider other steps we could take.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
We have not faced any obstacles. Our community has been very supportive in helping us to achieve our EDI objectives.

Key Objective 3:
Meet or exceed our equity targets, as defined by the CRC program.
Corresponding actions:
We are transparent with resource allocation to CRC holders; to our knowledge our current chairholders are comfortable that resources are being equitably distributed. This open and transparent process solidifies CRC retention, as holders know that they are treated equitably.
Indicator(s):
Number of chairs filled by members of an FDG nominated and retained. The one CRC Tier 2 that left to take up a Tier 1 at another university, indicated that she was better directly supported at Mount Allison than at her new institution.
Progress:
If our current nomination is successful, 3 of our 4 CRCs will be a member of an FDG.
Next steps:
Although we don't anticipate renewing or replacing a CRC for a number of years, we will work over the next 1-2 years to establish additional policy to ensure that EDI considerations are central to our CRC allocation plan.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
As noted previously, we have not faced any obstacles. We have exceed our targets.



Key Objective 4:
Ensure that our chairholders feel included, integrated, and are retained at Mount Allison.
Corresponding actions:
The Provost meets regularly with each CRC (at least 2-3 times per term) to discuss any issues of concern, including integration issues. New chairholders are mentored by existing chairholders. New chairholders are also supported and mentored by our Director, Office of Research Services.
Indicator(s):
The key indicators are that a CRC stay at Mount Allison and that she or he find success in his or her research program (i.e., they thrive). A secondary metric is that they develop a connected research group on campus with active and successful collaborations.
Progress:
The only CRC (T2) to resign mid-term at Mount Allison did so to take up a CRC (T1) at another university. The other CRCs appear to be thriving; they are winning external research grants, publishing, building new collaborations, mentoring multiple HQP, etc.
Next steps:
Our community has been very supportive in helping us to achieve our EDI objectives. Many colleagues on our campus look forward to collaborating with our CRCs and students vie to work in their labs.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
None.

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



Key Objective 6:
n/a
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):

Mount Allison does face some challenges in attracting faculty members from visible minority groups, including Indigenous people. As a small university with fewer than 140 FTE faculty, there is no critical mass of individuals from a single visible minority group, nor from multiple visible minority groups combined. This can make the recruitment of individuals who are seeking a diverse work environment difficult. While these contextual factors are largely outside of our direct control, we are nevertheless committed to promoting the advantages and opportunities to live and work in a safe, welcoming community and to recruiting and retaining a more diverse workforce.

Key lessons learned include the need for ongoing training on EDI issues and the need to work collaboratively with our unions and hiring committees to ensure that positions are advertised widely, including in non-traditional outlets. Although we have been offering equity training for decades (e.g., how to ask appropriate interview questions), we have expanded our training in recent years to include training on unconscious bias, how to ask appropriate interview questions using a rubric for evaluation, how to interpret gaps in career progression, etc. This training is required for all CRC nomination committees and senior university administrators.



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.