



TABLE OF CONTENTS

You may complete sections individually by selecting them from the table of contents. At the end of each section, you will be redirected to this table of content to select another section to complete or to review. Alternatively, you may complete the full report, without going back to this table of content between each section, by selecting the option "Complete Full Report".

Introduction 

Important Note

(Once you have read the statement below, click the radio button beside it.)

Please note that the information you enter in your report is only saved when clicking on the "Save and Next" button at the bottom of the page. Using the browser navigation buttons or the "Continue Later" button at the bottom of the page will not save the information entered on the page. If after clicking "Save and Next" you see a "Page has errors" message in red, near the top of the page, it means that at least one field is missing information. In such an instance, the empty field will have the words "Answer is incomplete" underneath it, in red.

This report includes mandatory reporting on 1) the CRCP institutional equity, diversity and inclusion action plan (IEDIAP) and 2) the \$50,000 EDI Stipend.

Your institution must submit the report by the deadline date indicated by the program, and must cover the reporting period identified by the program.

Institutions are required to post the most up to date version of their EDI action plan on their [public accountability web pages](#). Ensure to remove all numbers less than 5 prior to posting on your website in cases where your report includes the representation of individuals from underrepresented groups among your chairholders. This is a requirement of the *Privacy Act*.

Each year, institutions must also publicly post a copy of this report to their public accountability web pages within 7 working days after the deadline for submitting the report to TIPS. TIPS will review the report each year; in addition, the annual report(s) will be provided to the external EDI Review Committee, when it is convened every few years, to evaluate the progress made in bolstering EDI at the respective institution and to provide context for future iterations of the EDI action plan.

All sections of the form are mandatory (unless otherwise noted).

Contact information

Please complete the fields below.

Name of Institution:

The University of British Columbia

Contact Name:

Dr. Moura Quayle

Position Title:

Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic Affairs

Institutional Email:

moura.quayle@ubc.ca

Institutional Telephone Number:

604-822-2392

Does your institution have an EDI Action Plan for the CRCP?

Yes

PART A: EDI Action Plan - Reporting on Key Objectives Analyses, Systemic Barriers, Objectives and Indicators

Date of most recent plan (e.g. latest revision of the public plan):

07/28/2020

Rating given action plan in most recent review process:

Satisfies

Name of vice-president level representative responsible for ensuring the implementation of the plan:

Dr. Moura Quayle

In developing their action plans, institutions were required to conduct: 1) an employment systems review; 2) a comparative review; and 3) an environmental scan (see program requirements [here](#)). These assessments were required in order to identify the specific systemic barriers and/or challenges that are faced by individuals from underrepresented groups (e.g. women, persons with disabilities, Indigenous Peoples and racialized minorities, LGBTQ2+ individuals) at the respective institution; institutions were then required to develop key S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) objectives and actions to address them.

Indicate what your institution's key EDI objectives are (up to six) as outlined in the most recent version of your action plan (either the one approved by TIPS or the one currently under review by TIPS), as well as the systemic barriers/challenges identified that these objectives must address. Please note that objectives should be S.M.A.R.T. and include a measurement strategy. List the corresponding actions and indicators (as indicated in your institutional EDI action plan) for each objective, and outline: a) what progress has been made during the reporting period; b) what actions were undertaken; c) the data gathered; and d) indicators used to assess the outcomes and impacts of the actions. Please note that indicators can be both quantitative and qualitative and should be specific. Outline next steps and use the contextual information box to provide any additional information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, lessons learned, etc.) for each objective.

Key Objective 1

Brief description of S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) Key Objective 1:

Key Objective 1: UBC will meet or exceed our disaggregated targets for CRC representation, including developing a better understanding of the data and potential recruitment scenarios for evaluating current strategies against outcomes. Action From UBC's CRC EDI Action Plan Goal RECRUITMENT: UBC's Canada Research Chairs (CRCs) are

recruited through an open and transparent process, making use of evidence-based strategies to ensure applicants are representative of the diversity of researchers available within and outside of UBC.

Systemic barriers -

Please provide a high-level description of the systemic barriers (e.g., summarize what the barriers are and how they were identified):

Systemic barriers: A primary challenge in diversifying the Canada Research Chair program, and the professoriate in general, is the ways in which institutionalized sexism, racism, ableism and colonialism are incorporated into our systems and processes at the societal and university levels. This creates narrow ideas of merit and excellence to reflect only particular worldviews and maintain privilege among certain groups; it restricts research to certain fields and subjects, often with an extractive model that doesn't rely on longstanding relationships in particular places; it limits information about the opportunities to receive a Canada Research Chair award; and has also maintained the amount of the award for the last 20 years, with no increases since the first Human Rights complaint of discrimination in 2006. UBC's highly decentralized governance means that central administration has a limited ability to influence faculty hiring decisions. Faculty hiring is done primarily at the department level with a large degree of participation from Faculty Association members as part of the consultation process. Departmental level faculty members may or may not have undergone the same training as selection committee members, and may have processes in place that resist new ways of hiring. Senior university personnel have very limited ability to influence faculty hiring decisions. Many faculties tend to define categories or fields for searches in traditional ways. If successful in identifying candidates who self-identify as belonging to an equity-deserving group, another challenge is attracting the candidate to a department that may be predominately white and male. Without a "critical mass" of other equity-deserving people, candidates may be concerned about feelings of isolation and thus may seek appointments where greater diversity already exists, compounding the challenge of diversifying some fields or disciplines. These systemic barriers to recruiting under-represented scholars into Canada Research Chairs were identified through CRC Working Group discussions, and key informant or focus group interviews.

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers: 1. Implementing a restricted nominations program, supported by the Federal Court's 2019 Addendum and a BC Human Rights Tribunal Special Program, established for 2019-2024. 2. Ensuring the processes and documentation for equitable recruitment of Federally Designated Groups (FDGs) under the restricted nominations program (including an appointment file guide, advertising guidelines, FAQs, memos, etc.) are communicated to all Deans, Heads of Department, and search committee chairs at UBC. 3. Administering an applicant equity survey as part of the recruitment process, with candidates' eligibility determined by their self-identification with one or more of the FDGs defined by the 2019 Addendum and subsequent updates from the CRCP. Processes for protecting confidentiality of information, and ensuring all applicants have the opportunity to complete the survey, have been developed. 4. Sharing a "Diversifying Your Applicant Pool" resource for reaching internal and external equity groups with information about CRC opportunities at UBC, including a database of advertising venues specifically reaching equity groups in various research fields. 5. Updating the mid-point internal attestation form for the selection committee chair to complete pre-nomination submission to ensure requirements are being met. 6. Disaggregating targets for Tiers 1 and 2, and in reporting to CRCP. 7. Reviewing of all recruitment processes in the context of revised targets for adjustments necessary. 8. Modelling of disaggregated projected turnover of Tier 1 and Tier 2 chairs between 2021 and 2029, with several assumptions tested, to ascertain whether there will be sufficient opportunity to replace vacant chairs with new CRC holders from the FDGs and to meet established targets. 9. Meeting with Deans and Department Heads to share scenario modelling and explore pathways to meeting established targets.

Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative:

Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative: 1. Representation of the FDGs in UBC's Canada Research Chair positions as of March 29, 2022 (from CRCP in Ottawa, including nominations to October 2021, based on 164 active chairs). Women and gender minorities: 43.9% Members of visible minority: 31.1% Persons with disability: 3% Indigenous peoples: 3.7% 2. January 1, 2020 - December 31, 2021 Applicant Pool Data analysis reveals that white and racialized women and Indigenous people are being nominated at proportions above their representation in the applicant pool, while racialized men (for Tier 1 Chairs) and people with disabilities (for both Tier 1 and Tier 2) are being nominated at proportions below their representation in the applicant pool. Applicant Pool Analysis: In order to hire more diverse applicants, UBC has endeavoured to increase the diversity of its applicant pools for all FDGs. The applicant pool survey uses exactly the same terminology in its questions for self-identification to determine eligibility as the CRCP Self-ID survey does. In the following figures we investigate the applicant pools of all CRC postings grouped by academic unit. Women Applicants: There is not an appreciable trend in the percentage of women applicants in any unit. However, there is a very strong variance in most units from 0% to 100% women

candidates. UBC will endeavour to identify if any differences exist within disciplines to account for this variance and to commit to a tighter distribution at a higher percentage. Applied Science began with strong percentages of women applicants but slowly tapered off, and similar patterns exist in other units. The FDG category of Women did not have Gender Minorities added until November of 2021, so Gender Minorities were not included this report. Figure 1: Percentage of women applicants in CRC searches by reporting unit over time. Racialized Applicants: There is a positive trend in the percentage of racialized applicants over time in most units. There does seem to be further work needed in some units, especially in the Applied Sciences, but overall, there is a shift towards more racialized candidates. Figure 2: Percentage of racialized applicants in CRC searches by reporting unit over time. Indigenous Applicants: For most CRC openings, there are no Indigenous applicants. However, targeted searches for Indigenous researchers have been successful and representation exceeds current targets for Indigenous CRCs. Figure 3: Percentage of Indigenous applicants in CRC searches by reporting unit over time. Applicants with Disabilities: A consistently low number of applicants with disabilities apply for positions at UBC. We remain committed to providing opportunities for CRCs who have disabilities, and continuing to explore and implement ways to improve outreach to candidates as well as selection processes. Applicants with Disabilities: A consistently low number of applicants with disabilities apply for positions at UBC. We remain committed to providing opportunities for CRCs who have disabilities, and continuing to explore and implement ways to improve outreach to candidates as well as selection processes. Figure 4: Percentage of applicants with disabilities in CRC searches by reporting over time. Intersectional Applicants: UBC also wishes to focus on the recruitment of candidates who self-identify in more than one FDG, and often face greater challenges due to overlapping areas of marginalization and exclusion. On average, 20-30% of applicants each year are self-identifying in more than one FDG in each unit. The Applied Sciences average is below the rest of the university. Figure 5: Percentage of intersectional applicants in CRC searches by reporting unit over time. 3. The scenario modelling for recruitment revealed that more focused attention will be required at both tiers to enable UBC to meet representation targets, with special attention paid to candidates who self-identify in more than one FDG. UBC Applicant and Nomination pool distributions: The applicant pool describes people who applied to CRC positions. Because the survey is publicly accessible and not tied to an actual application, applicant pool data can be very untidy. The data has been cleaned to try and represent only true applicants, although some noise may exist. The nomination pool describes people who were selected to be nominated to CRC positions and nominees are tied to the year their search was posted, even if the nomination goes forward in a subsequent year. Candidates are represented more than once if they self-identified as more than one FDG in their pool. Both applicant and nomination pools can be assessed for the percentage of each FDG (or intersection thereof) to study bias. Assuming that all applicants are well qualified we should expect the percentage of people of an FDG to be similar between the applicant and nomination pools. There is a lower percentage of Indigenous people and people with disabilities in the applicant pools for CRCs. This is especially pronounced in Tier 1 positions as these are often internal searches, and the number of Indigenous professors and professors with disabilities at UBC limits the potential candidates. For Tier 2, the percentage of Indigenous scholars in the nomination pool is much higher than in the applicant pool. In contrast, the percentage of racialized applicants in the applicant pool is far above the percentage of racialized candidates being nominated at Tier 2, though it is more closely aligned in Tier 1. On average, approximately 75% of applicants self-identifying as women also self-identify with another FDG. However, in 2019 and 2020, approximately 30% of those women self-identifying in more than one FDG were nominated, even though a much higher proportion of women who didn't self-identify in more than one FDG was being nominated. In 2021, approximately 60% of nominations were women self-identifying in more than one FDG, and the percentages of intersectional women in the applicant pool and nomination pool were more closely aligned. In 2020 and 2021, there were approximately 49% of racialized applicants who self-identified in more than one FDG, and nominations were roughly proportional at approximately 48%. Due to limitations in sample sizes, applicant pool data only permits a general analysis of intersectional identities among women and/or racialized applicants. Figure 6: Percentage of FDGs in Tier 1 and 2 applicant and nomination pools.

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period:

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period: 1. UBC successfully achieved 2018 CRCP representation targets at Tier 2 for Indigenous peoples, racialized people, and women, but not for people with disabilities; and at Tier 1 targets are not yet met for women or people with disabilities, as of December 2021. 2. All CRC nominations in 2021 were researchers from the FDGs, and a preferential hiring strategy for people with disabilities was piloted. (More information regarding this pilot follows below). 3. In 2021, selection committees made significant steps to nominate more researchers who self-identified in more than one FDG, especially among women with intersectional identities. 4. Clearer processes, communications, and reporting structures were developed to support departments and schools in their CRC recruitment.

Challenges encountered during the reporting period:

Challenges encountered during the reporting period: • Changes to administrative HR and financial systems at UBC required new learning, processes and attention, diverting resources from programming to administration. •

Leadership of this program in both the Provost's Office and the Equity & Inclusion Office has changed; it takes time to understand all the initiatives underway, and to establish the relationships and momentum to address concerns in a context of decentralized recruitment processes across the faculties and departments at UBC.

Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):

Next Steps: • Update disaggregated targets for Tiers 1 and 2 and reporting to CRCP with new demographic data. (June 2022). • Update modelling of projected turnover of chairs between 2022 and 2029, with several assumptions tested, to ascertain whether there will be sufficient opportunity to replace vacant chairs with new CRC holders from the FDGs and meet established targets (June 2022). • Ensure leadership in those faculties with open CRC positions understand the implications of the applicant pool data for more intentional outreach, as well as the updated modelling and revised targets for their departmental recruitment efforts, particularly with respect to disability targets: meeting with Deans, Associate Deans, Department Heads and Directors, as well as reminders during search processes. (September 2022).

Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

No

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

Do you have other key objectives to add?

Yes

Key Objective 2

Brief description of S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) Key Objective 2:

Key Objective 2: UBC will meet or exceed our targets for CRC representation by 2020, with particular attention to meeting targets for persons with disabilities, including a preferential hiring strategy, and the pilot of a centralized accommodations fund for CRCs. Actions from UBC's CRC EDI Action Plan Goal RECRUITMENT: UBC's Canada Research Chairs (CRCs) are recruited through an open and transparent process, making use of evidence-based strategies to ensure applicants are representative of the diversity of researchers available within and outside of UBC.

Systemic barriers -

Please provide a high-level description of the systemic barriers (e.g., summarize what the barriers are and how they were identified):

Systemic barriers to recruiting under-represented scholars with disabilities into Canada Research Chairs, identified through CRC Working Group discussions, key informant interviews or focus groups, include: 1. Ideas of merit and excellence in the academy have been narrowly constructed to privilege certain groups and types of scholarship – expanding/re-constructing these ideas to include diversity requires intentional measures and monitoring from all levels of the system. 2. General discomfort/lack of awareness about disability create stigma and negative interactions/ attitudes for people with disabilities. Because many researchers with disabilities are forced to respond to this stigma by managing in less-than-ideal situations without disclosing their disability, their peers are able to remain oblivious, and do not develop more understanding and strategies for creating workplaces that are inclusive of people with disabilities. 3. Assumptions about the difficulty and expense of accommodations from both administrators and researchers create reluctance among researchers to disclose a disability and seek accommodations that could support a healthier and more inclusive workplace, and a greater likelihood of being successful, in spite of a duty to accommodate and a new streamlined fund with processes and expertise available to departments. 4. Information on accessibility and accommodations for employees with disabilities at UBC is difficult to locate and navigate, and there is no centralized accommodations fund for staff and faculty, with accompanying processes and expertise. 5. The barriers and stigma in academia mean that recruiting disabled candidates is more challenging, particularly if qualified candidates assess that the risk of disclosing a disability being detrimental to their career is greater than the likelihood that a search committee will be capable of overcoming any biases and equitably assessing their research. 6. Training approaches that are not sustained and supported by policy changes and new processes, with measures to assess implementation and effectiveness, are unlikely to lead to inclusive workplaces.

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers: 1. Evaluated the existing preferential hiring strategy for people with disabilities: people self-identifying with a disability/ies on the Applicant Equity Survey were moved directly to the longlist for careful review by search committees aware that representation of researchers with

disabilities is important. The intention was to ensure that search committees reviewed these applications more carefully to look beyond traditional measures for other markers of research excellence. To assess the preferential hiring strategy: i. eight key informant interviews were completed: interviewees included selection committee chairs who were part of selection processes that included disabled CRC candidates. ii. two focus groups with disability experts were conducted. The preferential hiring strategies in place were assessed to be inadequate to address culture, capacity, and structural issues in the academy and in CRC terms. 2. Revisions to the preferential hiring strategy for people with disabilities were based on learning from the Equitable Assessments of Research Productivity Report (summarized under key objective 3, below), and additional conversations with selection committee chairs and other key informants. a. UBC's preferential hiring strategy documents were updated and incorporated into all processes and communication materials. 3. Designated one accommodations specialist on each campus (UBC-Vancouver and UBC-Okanagan) as the conduit for accessing information, support, and any necessary accommodations for the CRC recruitment process and/or workplace and research environment. 4. Piloted a centralized accommodations fund for CRCs to test new processes for ensuring that necessary accommodations are easily and expertly assessed, procured, and set up for CRCs with disabilities in advance. 5. Ensured all CRC position advertisements have contact details for an accommodations specialist so that prospective candidates or search administrators can discuss any accommodation-related concerns during the recruitment process. 6. Ensured that all applicant equity surveys also include accommodations information for candidates, and whom to contact for confidential consultations regarding their personal situation. 7. Continue to support the Disability Affinity Group (faculty and staff with disabilities, including CRCs) in their work; to advocate for the development of an accommodations policy for faculty and staff; and to leverage the learning from the Centralized Accommodations Fund Pilot for CRCs. 8. Provide input from the learning from this program to experts in UBC's Faculty of Medicine who are developing training initiatives re: disability.

Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative:

Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative: 1. Subsequent comparative analysis of the applicant pool to successful nominations over 2021 shows that further measures continue to be necessary to ensure that excellent researchers from under-represented groups are nominated more often, particularly those with disabilities. The strategy for Preferential Hiring of CRCs with disabilities was to provide the search committee chair with the names of all those applicants who agreed to participate in the preferential hiring process, and self-identified as having a disability, for immediate placement on the longlist. In 2021, of the very few applicants who applied with disabilities and were placed on the longlist during searches, none went forward to nomination during that year. 2. Consultations with search committee members and department heads who had disabled candidates in their applicant pool raised the following concerns with respect to how the preferential hiring process went: a. Not having more information about the nature of the disability seemed to activate many biases and assumptions that potential accommodations for someone with a disability would be an additional burden on the workload of the rest of the department. b. Even if accommodations for CRCs have been removed as a barrier, a renewal of the CRC term through the CRCP peer review process for someone with a disability who has not been able to produce the expected quantity of scholarly output will be difficult – creating a disincentive for any department hoping to sustain research support from the CRCP through two terms. c. Measuring scholarly output based on quantity, for an individual with a disability (on a reduced workload or not), is likely to have a disproportionate and negative comparison for that person relative to a person without a disability. At least in some cases, all else being equal, the difference in quantity of output between one candidate and another is likely to be determinative. If the difference in quantity is a result of a disability – whether or not the candidate has a reduced workload – the failure to consider this factor likely constitutes discrimination on the basis of disability. d. Lived experiences may also affect the content of scholarly activity. This is one of the reasons why diversity is considered to be beneficial. By virtue of their disability, the disabled person may bring unique perspectives, experience, and insights relative to a non-disabled person, at least in some fields or disciplines. For the same reason, almost by definition, that person's work will not necessarily be the same in content or nature as a non-disabled person's work. e. Comparing a disabled person and a non-disabled person, using qualitative and quantitative metrics established for evaluating non-disabled persons, renders these assessment methods inherently discriminatory against disabled persons. Assessing scholarly activity of an individual with a disability should be made on that person's own merits, without comparing that person directly or indirectly with a non-disabled person; yet, rank ordering and comparisons to the 'norm' are inherent in decisions about salary increments, promotion, tenure, and renewal of honours. 3. UBC's 2020 Employment Equity report findings state that the rate of new hires with disability has increased since 2019. With the recent change in Human Resources administration and data management systems, UBC's 2021 Employment Equity Census data is still being analyzed. 4. In the 2018 Employment Systems Review, "...One challenge identified for a new employee with a disability is that the cost to develop a functional workplace falls almost entirely on the unit/department and often requires the individual to advocate for themselves. HR Advisors within faculties/units can provide support in setting up a workplace with dignity, however, new employees have little guidance on the process or requirements and may hesitate to reveal

their need for more information and support to make this successful.” (p.31) 5. Concerns from researchers with disabilities currently at UBC are that their departments do not have the budget available to cover accommodations expenses, and/or the process to obtain them is difficult to navigate and has onerous and time-consuming requirements. 6. Feedback received through community consultations undertaken during development of the Employment Systems Review and Inclusion Action Plan, and since, provides anecdotal evidence that several factors may inhibit faculty and staff from self-identifying as persons with disabilities or seeking work place supports or accommodations. These factors include, but are not limited to, the ways that respondents: • Do not see themselves in the definition of disability; • May have heard anecdotes of inadequate responses to requests for accommodations; • Are worried that it will have an effect on their professional growth and so do not disclose invisible disabilities; • May not update their responses in subsequent voluntary employment equity surveys to reflect disabilities that often occur later in life or after initial appointment.

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period:

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period: 1. The Centralized Accommodations Fund continues to operate, with the communications, financial processes, and collaborative expertise to support effective accommodations for CRCs being leveraged in conversations to advocate for the institution of such a fund for all faculty and staff at UBC. 2. Greater understanding of the barriers within the recruitment process, including misconceptions and a perceived mismatch between a disabled scholar with accommodations and the expectations of the CRC program. 3. This evaluation has led to a two-pronged approach for 2022: a. More frequent conversations to increase clarity among faculty leadership of the consequences of not recruiting to increase representation within their departments, including the results of the scenario modeling exercise and projected paths to equitable representation in all targets. b. Development of a proposal for a more focused 2022 Stipend project. This project will provide accompaniment of selection committees through their CRC recruitment processes during the 2022/23 fiscal year to focus more carefully on ensuring skills and capacities to apply equitable hiring practices, particularly for researchers with disabilities, are evident in their methods and results.

Challenges encountered during the reporting period:

Challenges encountered during the reporting period: The ongoing global pandemic and turnover in key positions leading and supporting institutional initiatives at UBC (such as developing training) continued to present challenges.

Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):

Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines): • Submit proposal for dedicated coaching/consultation provided to selection committees during CRC recruitment processes. (March 2022) • Engage leadership and selection committee chairs in discussions to raise awareness, understand the objectives of, and support involvement of, the consultant/coach for hiring practices. (June-August 2022). • Implement more focused, responsive, and just-in-time information and training for selection committees to address barriers and concerns with respect to recruiting CRCs with disabilities. (August 2022 – March 2023). • Develop recommendations for ensuring more equitable hiring and recruitment practices at UBC based on consultations and completed searches. (December 2022-March 2023).

Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

Yes

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective:

2050

If an amount was entered in the previous question, indicate specifically what the funds were spent on.

GAA Research Assistant's salary and benefits

EDI Stipend Impact Rating

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this key objective:

Moderate impact (the EDI Stipend had moderate impact on achieving progress)

Indicate in the table below any leveraged cash or in-kind contributions provided by the institution

Leveraged cash or in-kind contributions from your institution (if applicable):

	Amount \$	Source / Type (cash or in-kind)
1	5000	in-kind

Key Objective 3

Brief description of S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) Key Objective 3:

Key Objective 3: UBC will meet or exceed our targets for CRC representation, with particular attention to meeting targets for persons with disabilities, including developing research to more equitably assess scholarly activity and research productivity for researchers with disabilities. Action From UBC's CRC EDI Action Plan Goal RECRUITMENT: UBC's Canada Research Chairs (CRCs) are recruited through an open and transparent process, making use of evidence-based strategies to ensure applicants are representative of the diversity of researchers available within and outside of UBC.

Systemic barriers -

Please provide a high-level description of the systemic barriers (e.g., summarize what the barriers are and how they were identified):

Systemic barriers: 1. Ideas of merit and excellence in the academy have been narrowly constructed to privilege certain groups and types of scholarship: current measures of research productivity use the same qualitative and quantitative metrics for evaluating a scholar with disabilities as were established for evaluating a non-disabled scholar. This "bakes" discrimination against disabled persons into the assessment methods themselves. 2. Search committees' understanding of how to assess research productivity equitably for scholars with disabilities, particularly if career interruptions are involved, is limited. 3. With UBC's targets and efforts to increase chair awards to exceptional researchers with disabilities, the question has arisen about how those disabilities are accommodated, and how that accommodation affects the review process for the renewal of the chair award at 5 or 7 years. 4. Most of the current guidelines speak to parental leave and illness, which implies relatively discrete events, rather than long-term and potentially continuous or deteriorating health issues that may affect productivity. 5. Responses at the institutional level tend to focus on individual adjustments based on each individual case, rather than creating changes in the policies, processes, cultures, and environments that would accommodate fluctuations and variations in ability across every researcher's career.

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers: 1. Conducted and continued to add to literature review and comparative analysis of practices and strategies to create more equitable assessments, in anticipation of next steps in the research and the final report. 2. Conducted eight key informant interviews among recognized experts across Canada to inform Equitable Productivity Assessments focus groups 3. Conducted four focus groups (March 26-April 16), including two exclusively for disabled scholars, one exclusively for non-disabled administrators and faculty, and one combined group, with a total of 21 participants from across Canada to explore current research productivity assessments and their effects on disabled scholars. 4. Conducted analysis of focus group data regarding more equitable research productivity assessments for findings (May 2021). 5. Held a workshop with 22 focus group participants and others to review, validate and contextualize findings and develop suggestions for recommendations. Participants were disabled and non-disabled faculty members, administrators, non-tenure-track disabled scholars from across Canada, and representatives of NSERC and CIHR. 6. Shared the final draft of the report with all participants in the research interviews, focus groups, or workshop. The insightful suggestions received were incorporated into the report, with appreciation to those participants for their careful reading of the draft. 7. Published Canada Research Chair Equitable Research Productivity Assessments Final Report on UBC's CRC webpage, including research findings and recommendations (September 2021). This report explores the following questions: a. What barriers and inequities in the assessment of research productivity and scholarly activity of candidates with disabilities prevent them from being nominated as CRCs? b. How might we change that assessment to remove those barriers and inequities? c. Why is the preferential hiring process not effective for disabled scholars? 8. Provided presentations on the research and report to the CRC Working Group, the Equity & Inclusion Office, the Faculty Deans and Department Heads, the Dimensions Pilot Project Team, the Faculty Equity Leads, and to the CRCP Advisory

Committee on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Policy (chairs-chaire.gc.ca) (December 2021). 9. Incorporated the recommendations of this report into the development of other plans, tools, and engagement sessions wherever appropriate.

Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative:

Data gathered and Indicator(s): Excerpts from the research report Canada Research Chair Equitable Research Productivity Assessments Final Report: Disability Tax: Disabled people are required to complete additional daily tasks regarding disability and inaccessibility on campus that take time away from their research and productivity. Disabled scholars must navigate accommodations processes through the filter of their own needs in an opaque and confusing system that is built for standardized bodies and abilities on campus. Examples of this are: inaccessible spaces, such as campus architecture, research spaces, transportation, etc., human interactions: the discomfort of enabled people, or non-disabled people, with disabled people; the stigma and extra medicalization and details required surrounding accommodations and leaves of absence for disabled people. In addition, medicalization of accommodations disproportionately affects other equity groups, as limited access to systems of healthcare and diagnosis affects women, LGBTQ+, BIPOC, and lower socio-economic individuals differentially. [Sources: Mirza, S.A., Rooney, C. 2018. Discrimination prevents LGBTQ people from accessing health care. Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbtq-rights/news/2018/01/18/445130/discrimination-prevents-lgbtq-people-accessing-health-care/> ; Waldron, I.R.G. 2010. The impact of inequality on health in Canada: a multi-dimensional framework. *Diversity in Health Care*, 7: 261-270.] • Disabled scholars are often confined to precarious work positions, rather than research faculty positions, further reducing the pool of disabled tenure track professors. Lack of accommodations in higher education, coupled with many necessary medical treatments not covered by Canadian health insurance, means that as young scholars move from their family homes and into the workforce, they are unable to cover their living costs while in work that does not include extended health benefits. [Sources: Loepky, J. 2021. The 'crip tax': everything has a cost, but for people with disabilities that's quite literally the case. CBC, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/crip-tax-opinion-1.5856848> ; Andre, J. 2016. These are the hidden costs of living with a disability. *Huffington Post*, https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/jacki-andre/the-hidden-costs-of-havin_b_11647994.html]. This means that the expected transition period from high school to full employment, which often requires years of living on severely curtailed income, further disadvantages and potentially exacerbates disabilities for disabled people in financially precarious positions of academia: undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral, and contract faculty. [Source: Adjunct, A.K. 2008. The revolving ramp: disability and the new adjunct economy. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 28(3).] In effect, to reach faculty positions as a disabled person, it may require individuals to hold out, perhaps forgoing treatments, until they are in a stable posting with extended health benefits. Disability as an Institutional Afterthought: Institutions act to minimize costs rather than maximize disabled researchers' contributions through reactive and minimal accommodations rather than proactive accessibility. While some universities, such as McGill University, University of Victoria, and University of Toronto have created a centralized accommodation fund for faculty and staff with disabilities, others are set up to offset costs for departments for assisted technologies and equipment, such as at University of Alberta and UBC. A centralized accommodation fund is easier to navigate: it involves fewer and more specialized personnel as advisors, a streamlined process for getting accommodations set up, and ensures that accommodations are not restricted to assistive technologies and equipment if more is needed. While universities as employers have a duty to accommodate based on their respective provincial human rights code/act, there is a lack of institutional and individual accountability for both understanding and accommodating disability, allowing ignorance and exclusion to proliferate. Furthermore, accessibility as an aspect of equity and justice is generally not considered, except to the extent it has been legislated. While there may be a duty to accommodate, there is not a duty to understand what accommodations mean. This is reflected in the 21% of disabled individuals who reported in the 2017 CSD they did not have any of their needs met. [Source: Morris, S. 2019. Canadian Survey on Disability Reports: Workplace accommodations for employees with disabilities in Canada, 2017. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/89-654-x/89-654-x2019001-eng.htm>] "In many cases the focus on EDI work has been incremental, starting with gender, moving to other equity deserving groups - in some ways disability has been the last group to be incorporated into EDI work [and] thinking about systemic barriers. It has often been case-by-case / ad hoc around accommodations rather than policies and supports in place. We have been reactive rather than proactive." [Quote from research participant.] Many disabled scholars have been funneled into and/or had little choice but to accept precarious academic employment. Due to increased time to degree completion, leaves of absence, or alterations in career milestones, disabled scholars are often only offered sessional or adjunct positions. These positions make conducting research extremely difficult and are carried out at the scholar's expense because the employer does not see it as an expectation of their role. ... There is no clear pipeline to assist precariously employed scholars to move to research and tenure track positions. This is another avenue that contributes to a loss of diversity in the professoriate, in addition to the previously mentioned filtering that occurs during undergraduate and graduate degrees and postdoctoral studies. As a result, those in contractual teaching positions are effectively excluded from research and

tenure track positions. Therefore, even if they could do excellent research as a CRC, they are ineligible to apply.

Recruitment: Systemic ableism in universities filters out disabled people from applying for positions: the language used and information provided in advertisements, accessibility of accommodations and information about supports for disability, university and departmental cultures that have a reputation for being unaccommodating, and expensive or obscure paths to disabled scholar networks all contribute to a likelihood that disabled applicants will not be successful, or will choose not to move.

Selection Committees: Selection committees generally consist of non-disabled faculty, who are ill-equipped and uneducated in disability discourse. This is reflected in the persistent stigma around disability, the lack of disabled voices with a seat at the table, and the desire from committee members for applicants to disclose personal information. This situation is not only directly harmful to the disabled candidate, but it also signals to the candidate how ableist the working environment of the department might be and whether they can trust future colleagues to respect boundaries, privacy, and confidentiality.

Assessment Metrics: Assessing scholarly activity and research productivity tends to be conducted by applying to the applications traditional metrics that purport to be unbiased and fair, but require closer examination. While there is not a single set of metrics that will work for everyone, particularly for the diversity of disabled scholars, increasing the breadth of the metrics used can make assessments more equitable. Experiential knowledge and dissemination of knowledge are hugely important in academia, and yet are not key indicators of academic rigour. Mentoring of up-and-coming scholars, building relationships with community members, and outreach are all integral to academia. Expanding 'standard' metrics ensures that research is reflective of, and relevant to, the broader community. It also enlivens a commitment to institutional social responsibility. These expanded metrics include valuing collaborations, contributions to the academy, mentoring and teaching of future researchers, and relationships with community to ensure knowledge validation and mobilization. While this will benefit all scholars and scholarship, continued and nuanced attention is required to ensure that the scholarship of disabled researchers is properly assessed. No formula will suffice to make metrics equitable; they need to be deconstructed to examine how they privilege and/or marginalize different groups, and what can mitigate those effects to create more inclusive research communities that can include more disabled scholars. While the current standard metrics require working conditions that are not sustainable for most scholars, changing the standards for everyone will not obviate the need to address the unique barriers for disabled scholars.

Interviews: Traditional faculty interviewing practices are not inclusive or accessible, often requiring travel, a substantial number of meetings with few breaks, and a general failure to provide appropriate and supportive accommodations. Additionally, disabled applicants must navigate the complexity of disablism. ... Compared to their non-disabled counterparts, disabled scholars enter into an interview with an additional set of pressures and considerations regarding their performance. Candidates may often do additional work to gauge how ignorant or biased the reviewers or committee members might be, to assess the risks of disclosing a disability, to make committee members feel more comfortable with their disability, and often go into graphic details to explain support needs.

Selection: Prior to and during the selection of a disabled scholar for a faculty or CRC position many disabled candidates may be set up for failure because of a lack of proper communication. This can occur as a result of improper dialogue and education within the department regarding disability and/or not having the same inclusive and equitable metrics being reflected in the review process. Collegial consultation with faculty members who are not part of the selection committee can overturn the attempts of the search committee to apply more inclusive selection criteria. It is therefore important to have open communication and education about access, inclusivity, and accommodations, as well as how ableism and disablism affect the department. There is a lack of knowledge about disability, unconscious ableism, disablism, disability discourse, and disabled lives within the general community. As mentioned in previous sections, non-disabled people fear disability and this limits the conversation and the possibilities of hiring disabled scholars. There needs to be an intentional process by the committee and department to make their community more inclusive prior to hiring a disabled scholar, or the disabled scholar will likely be placed into a hostile working environment (with the knock-on effect of impacting the very productivity that is valued in academic metrics).

- In academic workplaces, disabled persons, Indigenous persons, and sexual minority groups have a higher probability of violence and discrimination, and within these groups, women faculty
- were 1.5 times more likely to report harassment. [Source: Hango, D. 2021. Harassment and discrimination among faculty and researchers in Canada's postsecondary institutions. Insights on Canadian Society, Statistics Canada. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/75-006-x/2021001/article/00006-eng.htm>]

Overlapping and compounding discrimination and inequity is evident in these statistics. Following the selection of an individual by the committee, the applicant must then go to external review as part of their nomination for a CRC. If external reviewers are not also using the same equitable metrics and/or understanding the disability discourse that informs these more equitable metrics, it is unlikely that this candidate will have their nomination approved.

Renewal, Promotion, and Retention: The retention and promotion of disabled scholars can be challenging because of the standard metrics of productivity previously described that do not have the necessary flexibility for the complexity of disability; this is then exacerbated by delays created by a lack of proper supports and accommodations in place from the beginning of the appointment. The traditional work-life balance of academia is ableist and disabling, creating further barriers to disabled scholars being competitive for renewal and promotion. The "publish or perish" mentality and 70+ hour work week have been

demonstrated to be unhealthy and disabling for a non-disabled scholar, and may not be possible for many disabled scholars. Even if more equitable metrics are used in the initial assessment of a disabled candidate, it is unclear whether these would continue to be in effect throughout the career of a disabled scholar. Additionally, disability is not binary: it is diverse and this must be reflected in assessments for promotion and renewal or disabled scholars are set up yet again for failure. Many disabled researchers will have unpredictable interruptions and require changes in accommodations over time, which may be reflected in their CVs. If a scholar is denied access or timely accommodations, they are also denied equal participation. • Nearly 25% of unemployed disabled visible minorities believe their disability disadvantages them in employment. Of unemployed disabled visible minorities, there is a 14.5% difference in employment potential for visible minorities compared to non-visible minorities (defined by Statistics Canada as White and Indigenous people), if they could find an equitable workplace. This is a clear example of racial discrimination layered on top of marginalization due to disability. [Source: The Daily. 2020. A profile of Canadians with a mobility disability and groups designated as visible minorities with a disability. Statistics Canada: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/201203/dq201203a-eng.htm>] “We’re missing 25% of our population’s perspective on virtually everything in the world.” Canada Research Chair Dr. Danielle Peers Higher Education and the CRC Program: The current shift to increase diversity must not be simply a quota or a target. Without transforming the CRC Program’s values and offering support, we risk harming the equity deserving groups that the CRC Program seeks to include. Some participants reported a perception that the CRC Secretariat in Ottawa is not inclusive when assessing applicants from FDGs (e.g., leaves of absence being scrutinized and seemingly penalized and then when the selection committee inquired and argued against those assessments, the CRC Secretariat did not respond). • Tier 1 and Tier 2 CRCs across Canada in 2020 were more likely to prefer not to answer about disability (6.2%) than to self-identify with a disability (5.5%). [Source: https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/about_us-a_notre_sujet/statistics-statistiques-eng.aspx] • NSERC and SSHRC Chairholders also tended to prefer not to answer than to self-identify with a disability, while CIHR Chairholders self-identified at slightly higher rates. [Sources: NSERC, 2020, Table 17: https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/_doc/DGP2020_e.pdf ; SSHRC, 2020, https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/drr/2019-2020/gba_plus-accs_plus-eng.aspx ; CIHR, 2019, <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/52552.html>] The CRC Program has a history of ableism and discrimination, and as an academic funding program perpetuates the same traditional and ableist research excellence ideals and standards as described throughout this report. The CRC Program was developed to recruit excellent researchers from abroad, as well as to retain research excellence within Canada. Rather than widening the potential pool of excellent researchers, these traditional standards have resulted in awards that are a reflection of what is seen in the academy at large: the prizes go to predominantly white and predominantly male members of the academy. Tri-Council grants have low representation of disabled scholars in their applicant pool: there were 1.8% disabled NSERC Discovery grant applicants with 1.4% awarded,[1] 4.1% of applicants for the SSHRC Insight Development grant were disabled and 3.8% were awarded,[2] and 3.2% of CIHR grant applicants identified as disabled but 2% were successful.[3] In the CRC program, a total of 5.5% of chairholders identify as disabled and therefore, of the \$300 million that the CRC program spends annually, only \$16.5 million is awarded to support academics who self-identify as disabled. Considering that 10% of full professors self-identify as disabled,[4] disproportionately fewer applicants and grants awarded indicates that they are receiving insufficient funding to foster sustainability and excellence in their research careers and are potentially being ‘defunded’ out of the academy. [1] NSERC, 2020, Table 17: https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/_doc/DGP2020_e.pdf [2] SSHRC, 2020, https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/drr/2019-2020/gba_plus-accs_plus-eng.aspx [3] CIHR, 2019, <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/52552.html> [4] National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2019, table: 9-30 <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf21321/data-tables>

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period:

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period: 1. Forty-seven people across Canada were engaged in the data collection, validation, analysis, recommendations development and/or reporting on this research project, and all participants requested and received a copy of the final report. 2. Recommendations were developed for UBC and its recruitment, retention, and support of disabled academics; for higher education institutions in general across Canada; and for the national CRC program. 3. Senior leaders and administrators across UBC were offered opportunities to engage with the recommendations of the report, and many of these recommendations have been incorporated into plans at various levels.

Challenges encountered during the reporting period:

Challenges encountered during the reporting period: Happily, considering what this means for increasing accessibility practices, interpretation services for virtual sessions were in great demand, and so booking interpreters was sometimes a challenge.

Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):

Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines): • Continue to ensure that the recommendations and learning from this research are incorporated into plans with the consultant hired under the Stipend funding, and into discussions of more equitable productivity metrics and training for more equitable work environments. (Jan-Dec 2022). • Update CRC EDI Action Plan to reflect learning and ideas from this research to improve equity and inclusion for disabled CRCs at UBC. (June 2022). • Continue to raise disability literacy on campus with all groups – especially leadership and colleagues involved in searches. (Jan-Dec 2022).

Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

Yes

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective:

16000

If an amount was entered in the previous question, indicate specifically what the funds were spent on.

GAA Research Assistant's salary and benefits, honoraria for a limited number of research participants

EDI Stipend Impact Rating

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this key objective:

Extensive impact (the EDI Stipend had an extensive impact on achieving progress)

Indicate in the table below any leveraged cash or in-kind contributions provided by the institution

Leveraged cash or in-kind contributions from your institution (if applicable):

Amount \$ Source / Type (cash or in-kind)		
1	20000	in-kind

Key Objective 4

Brief description of S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) Key Objective 4:

Key Objective 4: UBC's Canada Research Chairs are consulted on an annual basis through a survey or focus groups to improve understanding of the current state and any existing disparities or barriers in their experiences, and to develop initiatives to increase their sense of inclusion and ability to do good research. Actions from UBC's CRC EDI Action Plan Goal SUCCESS: In alignment with Shaping the Next Century, UBC's 2018 Strategic Plan, UBC's Canada Research Chairs are able to collaborate and innovate with their peers while feeling supported and included in a diverse culture of research excellence.

Systemic barriers -

Please provide a high-level description of the systemic barriers (e.g., summarize what the barriers are and how they were identified):

Systemic barriers: 1. Significant differences between disciplines, as well as between faculties and fields of research, create confounding and specific requirements for research support that make comparisons difficult. 2. The amount of the Canada Research Chair award has remained the same over the last 20 years, reducing the real value of the award by 42%, and by approximately 30% since the 2006 Canadian Human Rights Settlement Agreement. This decreasing support has also reduced the capacity to recruit externally considering the additional costs of research and lab set up in particular disciplines, particularly for Tier 1 researchers. 3. UBC is a large, decentralized institution and it can be especially difficult during a pandemic to find a community.

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers: 1. Analyzed the 2020 Chairholder Experience Survey data and reported findings to Deans and Heads. 2. Conducted focus groups with a total of 16 UBC participants, including former CRCs, and new CRCs recruited under the restricted nominations program (May-July 2021). 3. Analyzed focus group data for findings and ideas/recommendations for increasing representation of emerging and exceptional researchers self-identifying from equity groups. (August-September 2021). 4. Updated UBC's CRC website and communications materials to reflect new opportunities and strategies to support more inclusive opportunities for CRCs (October-November 2021). 5. Produced Focus on Equity in UBC CRC Experiences Report. 6. Continued working with the Dimensions project team to ensure greater clarity on available research supports across the institution, and develop an action plan to address gaps and disparities as determined through UBC's self-assessment. 7. Continued to support advocacy and affinity spaces across UBC including: an IBPOC Connections group for staff and faculty; an IGNITE Book Club for racialized faculty; the Disability Affinity Group; the Trans, Two-Spirit and Gender Diversity Task Force; UBC's Black Caucus, established by a collective of Black faculty, staff, and students; and the Anti-Racism and Inclusive Excellence (ARIE) Task Force at UBC. 8. Continued to work with the EIO's Education, Partnerships, and Engagement team to promote their "Through the Lens" workshops to begin to address workplace experiences of equity-deserving groups at UBC. 9. Expanded the CRC Working Group in December 2020, to enable support and engagement with implementation of report recommendations and other actions in the EDI Action Plan.

Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative:

Data gathered and Indicator(s): 1. The 2020 CRC Annual Survey response was excellent with 132 of 150 CRC holders (88%) completing the questionnaire – an 8% increase over 2019's results. 2. Representation of equity-deserving groups (which are defined more broadly at UBC than FDGs, and include other groups who have been historically, persistently, and systemically marginalized) amongst survey respondents compared to 2019: a. Increased for women in tier 1, Indigenous peoples in tier 2, and disabled people in tier 2 b. Decreased for women in tier 2 and racialized people in tier 1 3. Key takeaways from the 2020 survey: a. With one exception, CRCs from the equity-deserving groups were more likely than their comparator group to report having access to teaching and research supports in a way that is comparable to their departmental/school colleagues. The exception was disabled chairholders, where only one half agreed/strongly agreed that they had such access. b. About three quarters of respondents reported that their department/school had created an environment that is respectful of diversity related to gender identity and expression (79%) and sexual orientation (75%). About two-thirds indicated that the same existed for racial and cultural diversity (67%) and Indigeneity and Indigenous Worldviews (64%). Just over one half (56%) reported that their environment is respectful of a diversity of abilities. c. 74% of respondents reported that their department/school ensures access to EDI training and workshops, 69% to implicit bias training, and 47% to conflict training and support. The availability of these varied from Faculty to Faculty. d. Responses to workplace experience questions have remained relatively constant over the past three years. There has been a slight increase in the proportion of respondents feeling accepted in their workplace (+4%) and reporting that UBC has effective policies and practices for addressing inappropriate behaviours (+6%). There continues to be a large and consistent gap where the proportion of women chairholders responding favourably to workplace experience questions is less than the proportion of men. A similar gap exists between disabled and non-disabled chairholders, with disabled chairholders reporting less favourable experiences. 4. Comparison between CRC experiences to Tenure-Track Faculty responses in regularly held UBC-wide Employee Workplace Experiences Survey: Workplace Experiences Survey: Since 2018 several initiatives, focused on CRCs as well as the wider UBC community, were undertaken to understand where inequities may exist. In 2017 and 2021 the Workplace Experiences Survey (WES) was undertaken to survey the wider UBC community. In 2019 and 2020 we conducted experience surveys for CRCs at UBC to understand their specific experiences. All these surveys utilized a common set of questions focused on inclusion and respect but were undertaken at different times and contexts. Most significantly the 2017 WES was conducted with a Yes/No question rather than the 5-point Likert scale used by the remaining surveys. For the 2017 survey, Yes was considered as Favourable and No was considered Unfavourable. For the remaining surveys, responses were converted to Favourable (Strongly Agree/Agree), Neutral (Neither Agree or Disagree), and Unfavourable (Strongly Disagree/Disagree). This will generally reduce the percentage of positive scoring and may obfuscate changes or consistency over by time. WES results were also provided anonymously and in aggregate. This means that WES results will also contain some CRC responses as well. For racialized people and women, the number of non-CRCs is much larger than the number of CRCs and should not bias the data too strongly. While not directly comparable all these surveys provide important insight to the experiences of equity deserving groups on campus and how we can improve the experiences of equity deserving CRCs and other tenure-track colleagues. Inclusion and Respect Questions: • I feel accepted in my workplace • My diversity is valued in my workplace • People treat each other with respect and consideration in my workplace • In my workplace, differences of opinion are handled in a respectful manner • I feel that I am part of a community at UBC The number of respondents for our CRC specific experiences survey has a low response rate of self-identified individuals among Indigenous CRCs and CRCs with disabilities that precludes their inclusion of this analysis. Due to limitations in response levels, we are only able to speak directly

about individuals who self-identified as Women or as Racialized. In general, across all four equity-deserving groups with self-identification questions most closely aligned to those FDGs in the CRCP Self-ID survey, the sentiments of the wider tenure-stream faculty self-identifying within particular equity deserving groups mirrors that of the CRC responses. The CRC experiences surveys reported here were also done in between the two WES Surveys and during an especially turbulent time due to COVID-19. The following figures compare the percentage of favourable scores of the wider tenure-track faculty to the CRCs. "I feel accepted in my workplace" Overall, both women and racialized CRCs feel more accepted in their workplace than the comparator group (comprised of CRCs and all other tenure-track faculty from the same equity-deserving group who responded to the university-wide WES in 2020). Both women and racialized CRCs scored their experiences more positively in 2020 than in the 2019 survey results. Figure 7: Percentage of tenure-track Faculty responding favourably to the question, "I feel accepted in my workplace" within the CRC program compared to the wider UBC community of tenure-track faculty. "People treat each other with respect and consideration in my workplace" CRCs were less likely to feel that people treat each other with respect and consideration in their workplace in 2020 than in 2019. The decrease moves the favourability score to levels similar to those of their comparator group in the wider tenure-track faculty of the WES. Figure 8: Percentage of tenure-track Faculty responding favourably to the question, "People treat each other with respect and consideration in my workplace" within the CRC program compared to the wider UBC community of tenure-track faculty. "In my workplace, differences of opinion are handled in a respectful manner." There is a drop in both CRCs and the wider comparator group in feeling differences of opinion are handled in a respectful manner. The scoring trend has generally gone toward feeling more neutral about this question. Figure 9: Percentage of tenure-track Faculty responding favourably to the question, "In my workplace, differences of opinion are handled in a respectful manner" within the CRC program compared to the wider UBC community of tenure-track faculty. "My Diversity is valued in my workplace" Racialized people seem to have very different experiences when in the CRC program. Racialized people in the CRC program in general feel that their diversity is valued in their workplace - in stark contrast to the broader group of racialized tenure-track faculty at UBC. Women in the CRC program, however, score this about the same as other tenure-track women faculty. Figure 10: Percentage of tenure-track Faculty responding favourably to the question, "My Diversity is valued in my workplace" within the CRC program compared to the wider UBC community of tenure-track faculty. "I feel that I am part of a community at UBC." Similar to other questions, there is a decrease in the WES results from 2017 to 2021. Both women and racialized people in the CRC program are more likely to feel part of a community at UBC than broader tenure-track faculty, and seem to consistently feel this way. Figure 11: Percentage of tenure-track Faculty responding favourably to the question, "I feel that I am part of a community at UBC" within the CRC program compared to the wider UBC community of tenure-track faculty.

5. Findings from the CRC Experiences Focus groups, published in the Focus on Equity in UBC CRC Experiences Report , included: From Former Chairholders: a. The title of 'Canada Research Chair' has been prestigious for chairholders and has boosted their international profile, particularly at academic conferences and gatherings. The acclaim of having been a CRC is still cause for great celebration and has prestige across the academic community. The title itself has also been perceived to provide increased credibility, has contributed to successfully obtaining research grants and funding, and opened doors to interesting research collaborations and gifted graduate students and post-doctoral fellows during the term of the chairholder. b. Former CRCs who self-identified as women, Indigenous, racialized, and/or disabled (the groups most aligned to the CRCP categories of FDGs) stated that some colleagues internal and external to UBC remarked that CRCs are appointed as part of 'affirmative action' rather than in recognition of research excellence. These attitudes create hostile environments and are harmful to chairholders from FDGs. Departmental colleagues may judge those who have been hired under a restricted hiring program as less "qualified" for the position than those who are hired in an open faculty search, because the perception is that not competing against white males and being hired is not competing against the "best". c. Disparities between research support and course releases across units were revealed when chairholders participated in internal committees to evaluate CRC applications. After settling into the university, chairholders shared that they had discovered salary disparities and found it difficult to renegotiate their own salary to an equitable level. This is a great source of frustration about inequitable compensation, particularly among chairholders from FDGs who did not feel equipped with the information needed to negotiate at the time of appointment. The difficulty in renegotiating to reach equity in supports and salary led to a sense of betrayal and long-term dissatisfaction with under-appreciation and lack of institutional support. d. Some chairholders reported unanticipated and unsustainable workloads related to the expectations associated with both their research output/results and administrative work relative to the maintenance of the CRC title. Course teaching releases often came with higher expectations for administrative work (e.g., editing journals, serving on review committees, etc.) that effectively filled the hours released, providing no extra time for research to match the expectations that there would be greater results. In addition, for those who felt that their CRC award was not valued or provided with additional support from their department, it was doubly distressing to be expected to complete all the administrative work of ensuring that the funding for the CRC was received and renewed for the department, while receiving comments that their research outputs were smaller than expected. e. Most chairholders expressed that the support (both monetary and non-monetary) they received as CRCs was inconsistent with expectations for a prestigious

research chair, and with what colleagues in other institutions reported. The title of the CRC brings the weight of additional expectations, but a majority of chairholders did not feel they were provided with the additional resources and support needed to match these expectations for research, funding, and service. From New Chairholders: f. The lack of clarity about rationale and expectations for the CRC restricted nominations and how they are being interpreted/enacted can create conflict within departments and can put nominees in uncomfortable positions. The restricted program's timelines, criteria, and purpose are not clearly communicated to faculty and academic leadership. g. Chairholders felt the application process suffered from a lack of clarity. The time required to provide an initial application in response to the job posting, and then to develop a completely new application for a nomination as a CRC for review, and then complete the revisions to that for submission to the CRCP by the deadlines amid the usual workloads, were hurdles that were unexpected and difficult to navigate. While the initial internal processes within departments may have been unclear, chairholders expressed gratitude for the knowledgeable and very useful feedback from UBC's internal review committee to support them in the national stages of review. h. Concerns were also raised about the ability of externally recruited CRCs to authentically articulate their research relationships with Indigenous communities in their nomination applications when they hadn't yet arrived at UBC, or understood the Canadian context. External recruits were also concerned that a position could be offered conditionally on the CRC being awarded, which increased the pressure and workload of applying for a faculty position, though this is a rare practice at UBC. i. Chairholders described negotiations that took place in a context of little information about what was possible or expected in terms of supports for CRCs, and that this disadvantaged them in requesting equitable support for themselves. j. While the cohort of new CRCs has only just begun their terms, participants shared a resounding appreciation for the administrative staff support they received in the nominations process. Specifically, the CRC Secretariat, Support Programs to Advance Research Capacity (SPARC), some faculty-specific grants officers, the Office of Research Services Okanagan, and the Vice-President, Research and Innovation, Institutional Programs Office were helpful to participants, both in the nominations process and in previous non-CRC-related grant applications. k. Participants who were unable to negotiate teaching releases or sufficient research funding felt there were more "soft" benefits (i.e., prestige, increased opportunities, greater chance of grant application success) than "hard" benefits. Chairholders felt they would be able to take advantage of the title to be successful in future grant applications and opportunities to collaborate on project grants and team grants but believed most benefits would depend on the ways they leverage the prestige of the title, rather than tangible, negotiated benefits. l. Chairholders expressed universal support and interest in the development of a mentorship program for CRCs. Social gatherings and building connections with other CRCs would also be valuable, but emphasis was placed on the desire for mentorship.

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period:

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period: 1. Three years of Chairholders' experiences data provide a baseline that can support trend data over time, and will inform the updated EDI Action Plan. 2. Provided presentations on the research and report to the CRC Working Group, the Equity & Inclusion Office, the Faculty Deans and Department Heads, the Dimensions Pilot Project Team, and the Faculty Equity Leads. 3. The CRC Working Group was refreshed and expanded with new representation from all equity groups as well as UBC's research facilitation support and the Dimensions project team, and is meeting regularly to help shape the actions of the CRC Program Team following up on the results of this CRC Experiences Research.

Challenges encountered during the reporting period:

The global pandemic required the move to on-line meetings, focus groups, workshops, etc. This had an unexpected positive outcome resulting in accessible ways for disabled scholars and others to participate in a more inclusive manner.

Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):

Next Steps: • Develop proposal for piloting mentoring initiatives, as requested in the Experience Survey data and focus groups (March 2022). • If funded, pilot a number of CRC-specific mentoring initiatives, and other networking opportunities (June-December 2022) • Review and refine questions for CRC Annual Experiences Survey (July-Sept 2022). • Review the results of the service workload study "Toward More Equitable Faculty Service: Recommendations towards Recognizing, Valuing, and Making Service Visible at UBC" (https://equity3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2022/04/Final_exec_summary_April12022.pdf) and explore possibilities for new strategies to mitigate inequities in the CRC program (September 2022). • Update CRC EDI Action Plan to reflect learning and ideas from this research to improve equity and inclusion for CRCs at UBC. (June 2022). • Update CRC website and communications materials to reflect new opportunities and strategies to support more inclusive opportunities for CRCs (October-November 2022). • Conduct 2022 Annual CRC Experiences Survey (December 2022).

Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

Yes

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective:

18250

If an amount was entered in the previous question, indicate specifically what the funds were spent on.

GAA Research Assistant salary and benefits

EDI Stipend Impact Rating

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this key objective:

Extensive impact (the EDI Stipend had an extensive impact on achieving progress)

Indicate in the table below any leveraged cash or in-kind contributions provided by the institution

Leveraged cash or in-kind contributions from your institution (if applicable):

Amount \$ Source / Type (cash or in-kind)		
1	15000	in-kind

Key Objective 5

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

Key Objective 6

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

Challenges and Opportunities

Other than what has been outlined in the section above, outline any challenges and opportunities or successes regarding the implementation of the EDI action plan, as well as best practices that have been discovered to date. If COVID-19 has had an impact on the implementation of the institution's action plan, please outline how below. How has or will the institution address these challenges and opportunities? (limit: 5100 characters):

Challenges during this reporting period included ensuring that the deans, heads, and directors across UBC understood the implications of the 2019 Addendum and the decision of the federal court for UBC's CRC program in the context of leadership transitions of both Provosts, and both the AVP Academic and the AVP Equity & Inclusion leading this program. The pandemic, with the attention required for response to changing situations, also has diverted resources and attention. Opportunities during this reporting period included the learning and capacity to hold online focus groups, workshops, etc. in more accessible ways for disabled scholars and others across Canada, leading to a more inclusive and national research project and Equitable Assessments of Research Productivity Report than previously expected using the EDI Stipend Funding. This also enabled more CRCs to participate in the focus groups for the Equity in CRC Experiences research, from both UBC Vancouver (UBCV) and UBC Okanagan (UBCO). Other opportunities arising from the pandemic's online modalities have been to significantly increase the number of current and former CRCs from across UBC-Vancouver and UBC-Okanagan in the CRC Working Group more frequently through online meetings. This has allowed a wider and more frequently available set of perspectives from a broader

range of contexts and lived experience to inform our work. UBC continues to leverage and expand on various strategies and collaborations developed within the CRC program to further efforts for broader system-wide changes to programs, policies, and recruitment of under-represented groups across the institution, such as: • Ethical and transparent data processes including development and dissemination of messaging to encourage self-identification to advance equity in hiring. • Applicant pool data collection and analysis to inform understanding of proportional representation of applicants compared to new hires and where gaps and disparities in hiring persist. • The expanded understanding at UBC of BC's Human Rights Code, and the BC Human Rights Commission's Special Programs for restricted or preferential recruitment, to facilitate greater recruitment of under-represented scholars • Developing the Centre for Workplace Accessibility for faculty and staff at UBC, learning from centralized accommodations fund pilot processes, and consulting with the Disability Affinity Group in its formation, etc. • Informing the Dimensions Pilot Project team with the learning and research from the Employment Systems Reviews, Environmental Scans, and Comparative Reviews that continue to shape this plan and the learning from its implementation. These promising practices demonstrate the need to explore under-representation of identity groups from multiple perspectives and consider all the different aspects of the system that operate to hold inequitable access in place. Piloting different strategies to create change in the system requires careful attention to results, and a commitment to learning from what didn't work and developing new strategies that might.

Reporting on EDI Stipend objectives not accounted for in Part A

Instructions:

- Institutions with EDI Action Plans, use this section to report on EDI Stipend objectives that are not accounted for in Section A.
- Institutions without EDI Action Plans, use this section to report on EDI Stipend objectives.

Objectives associated with your institution's EDI Stipend application

Table C1. Provide information on the objectives associated with your institution's EDI Stipend application, including the funding and timelines, for the reporting period.

EDI Stipend Objective 1

Additional Objectives (if applicable)

Table C1. Provide information on the objectives associated with your institution's EDI Stipend application, including the funding and timelines, for the reporting period.

EDI Stipend Objective 2

EDI Stipend Objective 3

EDI Stipend Objective 4

EDI Stipend Objective 5

EDI Stipend Objective 6

Part D: Engagement with individuals from underrepresented groups

Outline how the institution has engaged with underrepresented groups: e.g., racialized minorities, Indigenous Peoples, persons with disabilities, women, LGBTQ2+ individuals, during the implementation of the action plan (during the reporting period), including how they have been involved in identifying and implementing any course corrections/adjustments, if applicable. For example, how was feedback gathered on

whether the measures being implemented are resulting in a more inclusive research environment for chairholders of underrepresented groups? How has intersectionality been considered in developing and implementing the plan (if applicable)? Have new gaps been identified? How will members of underrepresented groups continue to be engaged? (limit: 10 200 characters)

The CRC program team has ensured that CRCs self-identifying from all five UBC equity groups are represented on the CRC Working Group, which meets bi-monthly to review the EDI Action Plan and discuss progress and strategies to advance. Those discussions are robust and include various perspectives, lived experiences, and disciplinary contexts, leading to a rich appreciation for the complexities of creating change in UBC's large decentralized faculties and divisions. The CRC-specific projects/initiatives are constantly examined from the lens of equity, diversity, and inclusion, and research projects are careful to include broad representation and intersecting identities. Key informant interview and focus group questionnaires are reviewed by Working Group members with a focus on how these questions will surface inequities and nuances of particular experiences among under-represented groups. Participants in all of these initiatives to increase equity, diversity, and inclusion, and improve the CRC program at UBC are invited to share their experiences, knowledge, and wisdom from the perspectives of their lived experience, and care is taken to ensure that as many perspectives as possible are included in these discussions. Both qualitative and quantitative data from these efforts is analyzed using an intersectional lens, wherever numbers permit. Creating separate spaces for participants from particular equity groups where the facilitators/principal chairs also shared the same self-identity has enabled more honest and open conversations. This has contributed to better understanding of the depth and breadth of issues and challenges, and the possibilities for change. CRC Working Group members, other consultation participants, and key informant and focus group participants have been frank and open with respect to the barriers they encounter, and have also proposed solutions. Some of the barriers and gaps identified are in the national CRC program set up and requirements, some are in the ways that UBC operates at a system-wide level, and some are particular to the implementation of the CRC program at UBC. Reports on the current research projects for both more equitable research productivity assessments and CRC experiences at UBC will be available in September 2021, and will set out gaps and recommendations for next steps in more detail. UBC has leveraged strategies and collaborations developed within the CRC program to further efforts for broader system-wide changes to programs, policies, and recruitment of under-represented groups, such as the BC Human Rights Commission's Special Programs, the "Diversifying your Applicant Pool" database/resource, the pilot centralized accommodations fund learning and processes to create an Accessibility/Disability Working Group at institutional leadership tables, etc. Advancing the CRC EDIAP in the context of UBC's recent adoption of the Inclusion Action Plan, the Indigenous Strategic Plan, and President Santa Ono's Commitments against Racism and Injustice have necessitated that Senior Advisors to the President and Provost are included in Working Group meetings, and that interested parties also understand where these plans align and intersect. All equity groups have been consulted in the development of these plans and commitments, and in the subsequent implementation of their actions. UBC's resource/affinity groups have developed solid community standing in recent years, and are developing various channels to advance justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion in the context of decolonization. Various task forces and resource groups are supported by new technologies to be more informed and engaged across both campuses. These opportunities are furthering system-wide changes to representation and success for under-represented groups, including in the CRC program.

PART E: Efforts to Address Systemic Barriers More Broadly within the Institution

Briefly outline other EDI initiatives underway at the institution (that are broader than those tied to the CRCP) that are expected to address systemic barriers and foster an equitable, diverse and inclusive research environment. For example, are there projects underway that underscore the importance of EDI to research excellence? Is there additional training being offered to the faculty at large? Are there initiatives to improve the campus climate? Please provide hyperlinks where relevant, using the hyperlink boxes provided below (URLs should include https://). Note that collecting this information from institutions is a requirement of the 2019 Addendum to the 2006 Canadian Human Rights Settlement Agreement and provides context for the work the institution is doing in addressing barriers for the CRCP. (limit: 4080 characters)

<https://strategicplan.ubc.ca/>

<https://equity.ubc.ca/about/inclusion-action-plan/>
<https://indigenous.ubc.ca/indigenous-engagement/indigenous-strategic-plan/>
<https://antiracism.ubc.ca/>
<https://global.ubc.ca/ubc-global-engagement-strategy>
<https://wellbeing.ubc.ca/>

Shaping UBC's Next Century: UBC's Strategic Plan has Inclusion as one of its three themes, with Collaboration and Innovation, and Inclusive Excellence as Strategy 4. Operationalizing the theme of Inclusion in the Inclusion Action Plan, with specific reference to the CRC EDI Action Plan in Action 4D. The Indigenous Strategic Plan is specifically focused on decolonizing the institution, and President Santa Ono's Commitments against Racism and Injustice have given rise to an Anti-Racism Task Force that considers racism in the context of decolonization on these lands. UBC's participation in the federal Dimensions pilot project includes undertaking a comprehensive institutional scan of EDI-related policies, programs, practices and initiatives, and performing an in-depth, reflective assessment of the university's research-related systems, practices and culture. This will help to inform the development of an action plan with goals that address identified gaps, barriers and trends in EDI within the UBC research ecosystem. UBC's Global Engagement Strategy: In Service also considers how research, learning, and engagement is partnering across sectors and geographies. UBC Wellbeing arose from the Okanagan Charter, and is a framework for wellbeing of faculty, staff, and students across all aspects of campus culture. In addition, the Focus on People 2025 framework also works to embed equity, diversity, and inclusion into the environment for faculty and staff at UBC. All equity groups have been consulted in the development of these plans and commitments, and in the subsequent implementation of their actions. UBC's resource/affinity groups have developed solid community standing in recent years, and are working as well through various channels to advance justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion in the context of decolonization. EDI training and capacity-building efforts focused on recruitment, retention, and success and understanding various lived experiences are offered for faculty, staff, and students through the Equity & Inclusion Office, the Centre for Teaching, Learning & Technology/Centre for Teaching & Learning, various offerings from Extended Learnings, etc. These efforts are shifting the conversation around research excellence, and ensuring that there are shifts in how research excellence among previously ignored groups of researchers is understood at UBC. Changing cultures and mental models requires sustained and intentional efforts at many levels and sites in such a broad system.

<https://strategicplan.ubc.ca/>

<https://equity.ubc.ca/about/inclusion-action-plan/>

<https://indigenous.ubc.ca/indigenous-engagement/indigenous-strategic-plan/>

<https://antiracism.ubc.ca/>

<https://global.ubc.ca/ubc-global-engagement-strategy>

<https://wellbeing.ubc.ca/>

**Before submitting your report, please ensure that your responses are complete.
You will not be able to edit the information after it is submitted.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

You may complete sections individually by selecting them from the table of contents. At the end of each section, you will be redirected to this table of content to select another section to complete or to review. Alternatively, you may complete the full report, without going back to this table of content between each section, by selecting the option "Complete full report".

Complete Full Report

This information will be sent to the Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat when you click 'Submit'. You will receive a confirmation email with a copy of your completed form in HTML format once it is submitted.

Jointly administered by: