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BACKGROUND

- Canada Research Chairs Program (CRCP) - invests up to $310M a year in research in health, the natural sciences and engineering and the social sciences and humanities
- 2,285 research chair positions allocated to 79 participating institutions
- since 2000, historic underrepresentation of racialized minorities, Indigenous Peoples, persons with disabilities and women
- persistent and documented systemic barriers in the broader ecosystem contribute to this underrepresentation: e.g., bias, discrimination, microaggressions, wage gaps, increased workloads, ineffective equity policies, lack of role models and mentors
BACKGROUND

2017 - the program launched an EDI action plan to respond to recommendations made in its 15th year evaluation.

The action plan required institutions to:

- meet their equity targets by December 2019 (or consequences would be imposed)
- develop their own EDI action plans
- Meet increased public accountability and transparency requirements
2019 - an Addendum was signed to the 2006 Canadian Human Rights Agreement, program committed to requiring institutions to set population level equity targets with a December 2029 deadline: 22% racialized minorities, 4.9% Indigenous Peoples, 7.5% persons with disabilities 50.9% women

- large institutions (hold 83% of the chairs in the program) must set targets by Tier 1 and Tier 2 levels to ensure diversity at both the senior and emerging levels of the program

- If equity targets are not met at the staggered deadlines leading up to December 2029, institutions are limited to submitting new nominations only in cases where the nomination addresses their gaps
EQUITY TARGET DATA

• December 2019 - 77% of institutions met all their equity targets

• April 2022 - 86% of institutions now meeting all their December 2019 equity targets

• institutions not meeting their targets are restricted to submitting new nominations only where it addresses an equity target gap (renewals are exempt)

• upcoming equity target deadlines: December 2022, December 2025, December 2027 and December 2029
SELF-IDENTIFICATION DATA

• The CRCP has been collecting self-ID data for the four designated groups since 2006 following the Canadian Human Rights Agreement

• prior to this the program only collected data on binary gender – now collecting disaggregate data for women, racialized minorities, persons with disabilities, Indigenous Peoples, the LGBTQ2+ community and White people

• following this data over time contributes to having an overview of progress and areas of challenge in representation in the program

• evaluation of equity targets is based on self-identification data collected from nominees and Chairs, form is mandatory, can choose ‘prefer not to respond’ for each question
REPRESENTATION

• between 2016 and 2022 representation in the program increased significantly:

  - women went from 28.9% to **40.9%**
  - racialized minorities from 13% to **22.8%**
  - persons with disabilities from 0.59% to **5.8%**
  - Indigenous Peoples from 0.95% to **3.4%**

• data is also being collected to monitor nomination rates from the LGBTQ2+ community so that further best practices can be implemented
NOMINATION RATES (2006 – 2020)

2017 EDI action Plan

- Women
- Members of visible minorities
- Indigenous Peoples
- Persons with disabilities
GENDER BY TIER

Tier 1

- Gender-fluid; non-binary; trans; Two-Spirit; don't identify with any option provided, Prefer not to answer 6%
- Men 64%
- Women 30%

Tier 2

- Gender-fluid; non-binary; trans; Two-Spirit; don't identify with any option provided, Prefer not to answer 5%
- Men 47%
- Women 48%

*The category of “gender-fluid, non-binary, trans, Two-spirit, and don't identify with any option” were combined with the category of “prefer not to answer” to reduce the risk of identifiability.
The category of “gender-fluid, non-binary, trans, Two-spirit, and don’t identify with any option” were combined with the category of “prefer not to answer” to reduce the risk of identifiability.
RACIALIZED MINORITIES BY TIER

Tier 1
- Yes: 21%
- No: 73%
- Prefer not to answer: 6%

Tier 2
- Yes: 24%
- No: 71%
- Prefer not to answer: 5%
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES BY TIER

Tier 1
- Prefer not to answer: 6%
- Yes: 6%
- No: 88%

Tier 2
- Prefer not to answer: 5%
- Yes: 6%
- No: 89%
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES BY AGENCY

CIHR

- Yes: 4%
- Prefer not to answer: 4%
- No: 92%

NSERC

- Yes: 5%
- Prefer not to answer: 6%
- No: 89%

SSHRC

- Yes: 9%
- Prefer not to answer: 9%
- No: 82%
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES BY TIER

Tier 1
- Yes: 1%
- No: 93%
- Prefer not to answer: 6%

Tier 2
- Yes: 5%
- No: 92%
- Prefer not to answer: 3%
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES BY AGENCY

CIHR
- Yes: 2%
- No: 95%
- Prefer not to answer: 3%

NSERC
- Yes: 1%
- No: 94%
- Prefer not to answer: 5%

SSHRC
- Yes: 10%
- No: 84%
- Prefer not to answer: 6%
### RACIALIZED MINORITIES BY GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Visible minorities</th>
<th>Not visible minorities</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
<td>Persons without disabilities</td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDI ACTION PLANS

• address not only on underrepresentation (diversity), but equity and inclusion more broadly within their policies, practices and environment

• institutions with five or more chair allocations (55/79 institutions) required to develop their own EDI action plans for review by an external panel in April 2019
  - Based on employment systems review
  - Environmental scan
  - Comparative scan

• plans that did not receive a ‘satisfies’ rating (45/55) were required to revise and resubmit their plans for a second evaluation in March 2020

• March 2020 review process = 19/45 required to re-revise and resubmit

• April 2022 = All but 3 institutions now have a plan that meets requirements

• consequences were assigned to institutions not receiving a satisfactory rating in the second review process until requirements were met
LESSONS LEARNED of EDI Action Plans

• many institutions at the time (2018) were only collecting data and focusing their EDI work on women, without considering other underrepresented identities (racialized minorities, persons with disabilities, Indigenous Peoples)

• as a result, analysis and progress for other groups was lacking

• an intersectional lens was not frequently applied, resulting in a lack of understanding of the unique circumstances faced by individuals from multiple underrepresented or marginalized backgrounds.
Plans that did well in the review processes

- strong buy-in and commitment to EDI from senior leadership
- engaged within the institution and with women, persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples, members of visible minorities and chairholders (both from the FDGs and not)
- recognized that the lived experiences and barriers faced by underrepresented groups are different and developed specific strategies to address the barriers faced by individuals
- conducted thorough analyses of employment systems, environment (in terms of culture/climate) and comparative reviews of the support provided disaggregated by the FDGs
- outlined the results of the analyses and how these helped inform their plans
- developed clear objectives which met the S.M.A.R.T. requirement and clearly aligned with the findings of their institutional analyses
Plans that did well in the review process…

- had good data (both qualitative and quantitative)
- developed measures/actions that are informed by and aligned with best practices
- defined and demonstrated a thorough understanding of what 1) Equity, 2) Diversity and 3) Inclusion are and reflected best practices
- consulted with EDI experts in developing their plans (such as individuals in their own faculties or external consultants)
- allocated specific institutional resources in terms of both leadership roles and staff/team members dedicated to EDI
- had strong monitoring and course correction plans
- recognized the need to address underrepresentation with an intersectional lens and at both the Tier 1 (established) and Tier 2 (emerging) levels
LOOKING FORWARD

- many institutions have used CRCP requirements to discuss and advance EDI more broadly
- many institutions have since changed their data collection practices, recognize the need for collecting aggregated data and intersectional approach
- many institutions found barriers in their processes, policies (e.g., lack of transparency, lack of training, lack of data collection, bias and microaggressions in the environment) and are addressing them
- importance of ensuring EDI is not only addressed as numbers (diversity) but EDI as lived experiences (equity and inclusion)
- 20th year evaluation ongoing and engagement activities in 2022 to inform future directions
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