



INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT

Institution: Royal Roads University

Contact name and information: Deborah Zornes, Deborah.zornes@royalroads.ca
1 (250) 391-2600 x.4486

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: _____ 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	46	2	Withheld	Withheld
Indigenous peoples	1	0	Withheld	Withheld
Persons with disabilities	4	0	Withheld	Withheld
Visible minorities	15	1	Withheld	Withheld

Number of currently active chairs: 4

Number of empty chairs: 1 (note: The Tier 1 CRC will be split into two Tier 2 CRCs and recruitment will be undertaken in 2019)

Number of chairs currently under peer review: 0



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

A portion of this section has been removed to protect the privacy of RRU's chairholders.

Royal Roads University (RRU) currently has four Canada Research Chairs and one new unfilled Tier 2 Chair through the most recent allocation cycle. Discussions regarding how to allocate the new chair internally were held October 3rd with the Vice President Research, International, Marketing and Business Development, the Vice President Academic and Provost, the Deans of each of the faculties/college; Human Resource; and Research Services. Discussions were held at the same time regarding the upcoming end of our Tier 1 CRC's term in April 2020.

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:

Our action plan stated that this was planned as part of the 2018/19 HR Operating plan. Work has begun on this activity but is not yet complete. Currently, we are seeking to establish a baseline regarding equity groups within Royal Roads. To do so we are gathering qualitative and quantitative hiring and advancement data, developing and encouraging strategies designed to improve hiring and support a diverse workforce, and reviewing and developing best practices policies, procedures and strategies for equity, diversity, human rights, sexual violence, bullying and harassment. As such, we do not have key findings yet, but will provide that data as part of the next report.

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

Within the existing CRCs at RRU, the comparative review of the Chairs found the following:



A portion of this section has been removed to protect the privacy of RRU's chairholders.

Variations between chairs for teaching are ~10%; for research are ~20%; and for service are ~8%. The differences are mostly found between the two most recently hired/renewed chairs and one nearing the end of his term. Going forward, Tier 2 workloads are proposed to be: teaching 15%, research 70%, and service 15%.

Institutional Support – salary and benefits. For new Tier 2 chairs, and recent renewals, the CRC funds are used for salary and benefits (65,000) and research costs (35,000). Institutional Support - other: The Tier 1 chair has one additional office space for his team. All other support including administrative support, access to internal research grants, mentoring, IT support, and professional development funds are the same for all chairs.

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

An informal environmental scan was undertaken when the action plan was drafted. Key findings included: the size of the institution (small) making recruitment for Tier 1 chairs more difficult, the university is primarily focused on social sciences and humanities which makes it difficult to justify an NSERC or CIHR chair at this time, the university is designed to be inter-disciplinary (i.e., there are not traditional schools/departments, rather schools are inter disciplinary in nature); research at RRU is inter- and trans-disciplinary in nature and applied to real world issues. A more detailed scan was planned however there were two reorganizations within the university over the past 18 months with research services shifting from being led by an Associate VP Research, to a Vice Provost Research and Interdisciplinary Studies. In September this year research was shifted again and added to the VP International, Marketing and Business Development's portfolio and the VPs title shifted to include research (VP Research, International, Marketing and Business Development VPRIMB). As a result of changes in the institutional structure, a thorough and comprehensive environmental scan has not been conducted as described in the action plan. As part of the recent shift to the VP RIMDB we are developing a new Strategic Research Plan and will complete an environmental scan.

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):

Consultations and discussions were held with Human Resources, Vice Provost, Research and Interdisciplinary Studies, CRC holders, and senior executive. Research Services hosted a workshop open to faculty and staff on strategies to mitigate unconscious bias, led by Shari Graydon.



The Director of Research Services, Deborah Zornes, who led the development of the EDI Action Plan, attended the Gender Summit 11 North America in 2017, to learn from and consult with experts. She attended workshops and sessions at the Canadian Association of Research Administrators conference in 2017 on EDI, and has attended one webinar, and one workshop on Athena Swan. Zornes is a member of the Advisory Committee on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Policy (ACEDIP) for the Tri-Agencies in her capacity as the President of the Canadian Association of Research Administrators allowing her to connect with experts in the field of EDI in Canadian Institutions.

Research Development Coordinator Gwen Hill attended the 2017 Diversity and Inclusion: The Power of Inclusion Conference. Hill was able to consult with, and gain resources from, The Hon. Senator Murray Sinclair, former chair of the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission; and Mary-Frances Winters, President and CEO of the Winters Group, an organization dedicated to providing EDI strategic development. Hill has completed the CRC Bias in Peer Review training module as well as courses in [Diversity Recruiting](#) and [Unconscious Bias](#).

Hill and Zornes have attended meetings with the Canada Research Coordinating Council and have gathered information and provided feedback on the proposed areas of focus.

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 candidates, in particular women, Indigenous peoples, and/or persons with disabilities.
Corresponding actions:
Postings have been drafted in consultation with Human Resources and the appropriate Dean to recruit specifically from the FDGs.
Indicator(s):
2019 recruitment restricted to women scholars to address the equity gaps at RRU.
Progress:
Meeting was held in October with the VP Academic and Provost, VP Research, International, Marketing and Business Development, the university’s three Deans, Human Resources, and Research Services to discuss the fall 2018 new Tier 2 allocation, to discuss the equity gaps, and to discuss what to do with the upcoming first term completion for the Tier 1.



It was determined that the new Tier 2 would be in the area of Digital Communications in the Public Interest, and that the Tier 1 would not be renewed, but would be split into two Tier 2s, one in Indigenous Justice, and one in Digital Strategy, Digital Transformation and the Future of Business.

Decisions were also made to restrict the recruitment to women

Draft ad was sent to the CRC Secretariat for feedback and review and is used as template.

Next steps:

These postings are being presented to the Human Resources Governing Council at RRU the week of December 3, 2018 and will be publicly posted by the end of December, 2018 for a minimum of 30 days.

Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):

The university executive has been in full support of this objective, which has led to a smooth process in drafting the new CRC postings. We have had support from the CRC administrative staff in drafting the postings and determining language for targeted recruitment. Feedback from the CRC Secretariat has led to a revision of the ad for a Tier2 in Indigenous Justice with the intent of making the posting more inclusive of Indigenous experiences and research.

Key Objective 2:

Train all members of recruitment committees, as well as administrators and other staff/faculty that may be involved in recruitment, on unconscious bias.

Corresponding actions:

Training sessions in unconscious bias
Promotion of the CRC Bias in Peer Review training module

Indicator(s):

All members of recruitment committees trained
All administrators and other staff/faculty involved in CRC recruitment trained
Percentage of faculty/staff throughout the university trained

Progress:

In March of 2018, Research Services and Human Resources jointly presented two half-day sessions on unconscious bias training facilitated by Shari Graydon, a well-known educator and advocate of EDI. 32 members of the RRU core faculty, executive, and staff involved in recruiting, adjudication, and hiring attended the sessions.



Next steps:
The CRC Bias in Peer Review training module will be promoted to all faculty and staff at RRU through our internal newsletter and directive e-mails from the VP RIMDB. Training for members of recruitment committees will be mandatory when they are established.
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
We have not had as much uptake of the CRC Bias in Peer Review training module as hoped; we anticipate that the related e-mails from the VP RIMDB in 2019 will help to promote this for RRU faculty and staff.

Key Objective 3:
Review of recruitment practices.
Corresponding actions:
Using “upstream recruitment,” or pipeline development and networking before a position is opened by encouraging faculty and staff to track prospects from conferences and discipline-specific events Using open-access resources (e.g. conference proceedings, academic journals, lists of postdocs) to identify potential faculty candidates Intentionally selecting committee members who are committed to diversity and inclusion, and developing an inclusive search plan Setting up implicit bias training that is relevant to the faculty or department and tailored to the unique needs of the hiring committee Crafting inclusive job ads with effective diversity statements designed to recruit intentionally for historically underrepresented candidates and the four federally designated groups (FDGs): women; persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples and visible minorities.
Indicator(s):
Implementation through 2019
Progress:
Still in the planning and development phase
Next steps:
Complete implementation plan re. processes and training



Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Currently working on planning and development of training and process implementation

Key Objective 4:
Ensuring CRC search committees include at least two members from any of the FDGs.
Corresponding actions:
When the recruitment committees are established a minimum of two members will be from the FDGs
Indicator(s):
Number of FDGs represented on recruitment committees.
Progress:
n/a until the recruitment committees are established
Next steps:
n/a
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):

Key Objective 5:
Review accessibility and responsibility for accessibility communications at the institution.
Corresponding actions:
In collaboration with HR, determine the person responsible for accessibility communications at the institution.
Indicator(s):



A person within RRU HR will be designated as responsible for hiring-related accessibility communications at the institution.
Progress:
Complete
Next steps:
n/a
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Determined to be Gina Williams, HR Advisory. All CRC ads include a statement regarding accessibility and Ms. Williams contact information

Key Objective 6:
Collect self-identification data from CRC applicants Collect self-identification data from RRU faculty and staff.
Corresponding actions:
Development of a self-identification data form and a plan for implementation
Indicator(s):
Launch of the project – by January 2019 Completion rates
Progress:
In progress with meetings led by HR
Next steps:
Plan for awareness and education re. the employment equity survey in January 2019, followed but launch of the survey by February 1, 2019
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):
Currently working on a communications plan and including EDI information on the HR web-site (early December 2018), prior to launch of awareness training and survey.



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 two most significant challenges to implementing the EDI plan have been: 1) no empty chairs or renewals to test the process on, and 2) changes in the reporting structure of Research Services. Until now there were no vacant chairs to recruit to, therefore we were unable to test and assess the processes contained within the plan. With the new allocations fall of 2018, and the decision to split a current Tier 1 into two Tier 2 chairs and recruit for three new chairs, part of our process will be to assess how the plan has worked and identify areas that might need to be changed. This more formal assessment of the plan has been assigned to Ms Hill in research services, under the direction of the Director, Research Services

As noted earlier, there were organizational changes over the last 18 months regarding where research services is located within the institution. While day-to-day practices have been maintained and we have made progress on our institutional EDI plan, we have not been able to be as systematic and determined as we had intended. With the recent shift to the VP RIMBD, research has gained a higher level of prominence in the institution.

The process of developing this EDI plan, as well as our Accountability and Transparency document, has allowed us to clarify our gaps and create opportunities for supporting diversity among our CRCs. The commitment from the institution throughout has been strong. As an institution with only 4 CRCs up until now, it was not compulsory for RRU to address the EDI requirements. Our senior executive were committed to putting an EDI Action Plan in place as the right thing to do. That early development and the finalization of the plan has been instrumental in being both better prepared and more knowledgeable and aware of EDI considerations as we move towards having six CRCs by the end of 2019.

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.