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Executive Summary

This report examines employment equity practices for the hiring of academic staff at McGill University (henceforth referred to as “the University”). This project stems from broader concerns raised by students and staff on the state of equity at the University.

Employment equity aims to correct for historical disadvantages faced by members of designated groups, and in doing so, applies policies that actively recognize these disadvantages and correct for them. In Canada, the four designated groups are: women, Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities, and members of visible minority groups. Quebec law adds a fifth category to its provincial employment equity legislation: ethnic minorities (persons whose mother tongue is neither French nor English and who are neither Indigenous peoples nor members of a visible minorities). McGill adds a sixth category in its Employment Equity Policy approved in 2007: members of sexual orientation and gender identity minorities.

At McGill, practices of employment equity are to be guided by the this policy. However, this is not the case, as evidenced by this report as well as human rights complaints on employment equity made against McGill to the Quebec Human Rights Commission. In response to the major concerns pertaining to employment equity practices at McGill, the Students’ Society of McGill University (SSMU) 2014-2015 made it a priority to investigate McGill’s equitable hiring practices.

The objectives of the report were then to:

1. Illustrate the current structure for academic hires at McGill. Hiring practices at the university are obscure and inaccessible to the general public. In writing this report, one of our primary aims is to lay out how hiring works at the University, and where equity fits into that hiring structure.

2. Identify any concerns with the current structure. With a clear view of how equitable hiring works at McGill, we put forth our major concerns with the University’s hiring structure.

3. Provide recommendations for moving forward. Based on our own concerns and observations particular to the McGill context, combined with research into equitable hiring at other top Canadian universities, we provide recommendations to improve equitable hiring at McGill.

To carry out our objectives, we conducted interviews with key players in the implementation of employment equity, examined University policy documents, and looked at employment equity documents at other Canadian universities. Considering there are no official documents that outline the relationship between different bodies and individuals in the implementation of employment equity, as well as no step-by-step guide of (equitable) hiring practices at McGill, much of the information gathered for this report is retrieved from our interviews. We recognize the possibility of inconsistency in the presentation of the information we have gathered, but we in turn consider this inconsistency indicative of the state of employment equity at McGill.

After looking at three case studies – the Faculty of Law, the Faculty of Engineering, and the Department of History – we came to several conclusions about the state of equitable hiring at McGill. Our main concerns are as follows:

- **There is a lack of commitment, formalized practice, and transparency in regards to employment equity at McGill.** The passing of the Employment Equity Policy eight years ago did little to increase representation in academic hires. This is likely due to the lack of guidance or formalized practice regarding employment equity, making it exceedingly difficult for departments to practice equitable hiring. There is no direct communication between the upper administration and departmental hiring committees, creating a litany of practices at the departmental level that promote inequitable hiring. There is also very little transparency regarding hiring at McGill. Consequently, this report focuses largely on outlining the structure of academic hiring.

- **There is a lack of leadership from the upper administration on equity.** While other top Canadian universities have devoted significant resources to equity offices and equitable hiring practices, McGill has dedicated few resources to the implementation of employment equity. No equity office exists, nor have there been any proposals to create one. There have not been initiatives to create guidance for departments on how to implement equitable practices. Furthermore, the Employment Equity Policy was adopted eight years ago with the creation of another designated group to track, gender identity and sexual orientation minorities, but since then, the University has not moved to track this group. This is a basic aspect of policy here at McGill, yet its implementation has been continually and inexplicably postponed. Furthermore, this lack of active leadership on equity translates into a lack of guidance for hiring committees to implement employment equity, placing the burden on individuals. Individualized and decentralized equitable hiring practices do not address systemic discrimination. The University administration must lead the way on employment equity.

- **There is no required or optional equity training for those involved in academic hires.** Other universities develop many resources to guide committees through the
process of equitable hiring. McGill has no institutional mechanisms in place to guide equitable hiring, nor has it shown the commitment to do so. The lack of such a simple initiative is a central concern.

- **Under-representation at the faculty level has a significant effect on students.** Research has shown that under-representation in faculty has a negative effect on racialized and minority students, promoting a culture of systemic discrimination and microaggressions.

- **There is a lack of resources and infrastructure for equity.** There is no framework guiding employment equity at the University aside from the policy, and active implementation of that policy has been sorely lacking.

- **There are technological limitations in implementing employment equity.** As mentioned previously, gender identity and sexual orientation minorities are not tracked, which the University attributes to IT complications. In addition, the University has no applicant tracking system, a relatively common practice. Employment applications and self-identification surveys filled out by applicants are not kept in a centralized location and are not quantifiable, making it impossible to measure progress through hiring by tracking who does or does not get hired. Measuring success rates according to identity category is crucial in understanding progress in employment equity.

- **There are significant concerns with the institutional and departmental culture regarding equity.** Equity at McGill has largely focused on women (and by proxy, white women) as opposed to other identity categories.

- **There is a lack of academic diversity that hinders creating a safe space for members of minority groups.** McGill lacks programs such as Black Canadian Studies or Equity Studies, and only recently created an Indigenous Studies Minor. The lack of certain areas of study, as well as budget cuts to smaller departments that lend themselves to such academic diversity, ultimately harms efforts to create an inclusive environment.

While some of these problems are deeply entrenched, the University can begin to combat systemic issues by actively implementing employment equity measures; there is no excuse for the University’s inaction. In order to follow in the footsteps of its peers, McGill must work to create a more centralized and organized employment equity framework. Possibilities for doing so include establishing an employment equity committee, creating equity training for those who head academic hires, creating employment equity guides for hiring committee members, showing greater leadership and rhetorical commitment to equity, creating more accountable structures for employment equity, facilitating stronger mentorship programs,

2 Microaggressions are defined as “the everyday verbal, nonverbal, and environmental slights, snubs, or insults, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative messages to target persons based solely upon their marginalized group membership” (“Diversity in the Classroom”, 2014).
working to increase intellectual diversity, creating employment equity assessment frameworks, and establishing an effective applicant tracking system.
Introduction

Behind this project

In 2007, McGill’s Employment Equity Policy was adopted by the Board of Governors and Senate.\(^3\) The policy outlines the University’s commitments to eliminating barriers to employment and outlining objectives for doing so.\(^4\)

However, there have been notable events since the passing of that policy that necessitate re-examination of the University’s employment equity and equitable hiring policy. In 2009, the Queer Equity Subcommittee began pushing for the option to self-identify as a gender/sexual identity minority on the Minerva Employment Equity Survey,\(^5\) in alignment with the McGill Employment Equity Policy. Eight years since the implementation of the Policy – which includes the addition of the category of gender/sexual identity minority – this option is still not available for McGill employees, and thus there is still no data regarding “persons of minority sexual orientations and gender identities.”

Other notable events have been more public. In 2013, Woo Jin Edward Lee, a course lecturer and doctoral student in the School of Social Work who identifies as a person of colour and a member of the LGBTQ community, filed a complaint of systemic racism in employment against the university.\(^6\) Lee was not included on the shortlist for an interview for two available faculty lecturers positions at the School of Social Work. Considering the School of Social Work has historically hired very few racialized faculty members, the fact that all shortlisted candidates were white women indicates the incomplete understanding of equity in McGill’s employment practice.\(^7\)

More recently, an employee in McGill’s Faculty of Medicine filed a Human Rights Complaint against the University on the basis of ethnic discrimination. The employee, who identified as

\(^3\) The issue of employment equity predates the policy. In 2006, the Senate Subcommittee on Women wrote a report, “Hiring/Promotion of Women Faculty at McGill,” that examined the progress of employment as it affects women. It provided data on representation of different faculty based on gender and concluded that “Despite over a decade of concern, McGill has made limited progress towards creating a genuinely diverse faculty.” (Equity Subcommitee on Women, “Senate Subcommittee on Women: Report on Hiring / Promotion of Women Faculty at McGill,” December 2006, accessed March 12, 2015, http://www.birs.ca/workshops/2007/07w2125/Report_on_Hiring_and_Promotion_of_Women_Faculty.pdf)


\(^5\) This is an optional survey for McGill employees to self-identify as members of designated groups.


Hispanic, was discriminated against and harassed due to their ethnic origin, age, and language ability, and was fired without due notice or cause.8

Employment equity includes issues such as retention, promotion, and tenure. Recently at McGill, an ad hoc working group was established in response to concerns raised by some faculty members to consider the question of whether there is unconscious systemic bias affecting tenure stream academic staff at McGill and potentially creating barriers to reappointment, tenure, and promotion of persons belonging to designated groups, particularly visible minorities.9 A comprehensive article that outlines the scope of underrepresentation at McGill was published in the McGill Daily in April 2015. The article, “No More Excuses: Investigating the Lack of Equity at McGill and How Faculty Staff Experience Race,” highlights the experiences of racialized professors in different departments and emphasizes the necessity for student support in inciting change.10

The concerns on the progress of employment equity have even been raised at McGill Senate meetings, one of the official channels for questioning university policy and practices. During the November 2013 Senate meeting, then-Arts Student Senator 2013-2014 Claire Stewart-Kanigan asked a question about the status of the Employment Equity Policy. Lydia White, then-Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity) and Chair of the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity, the position responsible for the Employment Equity Policy, responded by saying that the data collection and reporting phase is still in effect as the University searches for ways to improve the tracking system.11 White additionally stated that some employment equity workshops and trainings were held by the Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office. More recently, at the May 2015 Senate meeting, the 2015 Report on Employment Equity was presented by White and was met with concern from many Senators. The report showed that there have not been any significant transformations in representation from 2008-2015.12

---

10 Ibid.
Table 1: Breakdown of McGill university employment by designated groups, 2008-2015\textsuperscript{13}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Group</th>
<th>% of 2008</th>
<th>% of 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal people</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minorities</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minorities</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity &amp; sexual minorities\textsuperscript{14}</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the myriad of concerns raised by students and staff relating to employment equity practices at McGill, the Students’ Society of McGill University 2014-2015 made it a priority to further investigate McGill’s equitable hiring practices. This report is a documentation of our investigation into the status of implementation for the McGill Employment Equity Policy in the hiring of academic staff.

What is Employment Equity?

Employment equity is a principle particularly unique to the Canadian context, and is very different from workplace equality approaches elsewhere – such as affirmative action in the United States. As defined in federal Canadian law, employment equity “encourages the establishment of working conditions that are free of barriers, corrects conditions of disadvantage in employment and promotes the principle that employment equity requires special measures and the accommodation of differences for the four designated groups in Canada.”\textsuperscript{15} The four groups referred to in this above definition are women, Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities, and members of visible minority groups. Quebec law adds a fifth category to its provincial employment equity legislation: ethnic minorities (persons whose mother tongue is neither French nor English and who are neither Indigenous peoples nor members of a visible minorities).\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} From Associate Provost White’s May 2015 Senate report on employment equity, (see \url{https://www.mcgill.ca/senate/files/senate/d14-58_report_on_employment_equity.pdf}). These numbers are indicative of all employees of McGill University and not separated by general employees versus academic employees (except for women). It is difficult to understand why this separation was not quantified, as the Associate Provost (Policy, Procedures and Equity) is not in charge of staffing in general, but rather academic staff.

\textsuperscript{14} Data on this category created by the university has yet to be collected.


At its core, employment equity attempts to correct for historical disadvantages faced by members of designated groups, and in doing so, applies policies that actively recognize these disadvantages and correct for them. Such policies and practices may involve identifying and removing barriers within an organization’s employment practices and creating policies to target those barriers.

Employment equity at McGill

Table 2: Employment equity by the numbers at McGill (March 2014)\(^{17}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total(^{18})</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Aboriginal</th>
<th>Visible Minority</th>
<th>Persons With Disabilities</th>
<th>Ethnic Minority</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation &amp; Gender Identity Minority(^{19})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Academic</strong></td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>827 (50.8%)</td>
<td>4 (0.2%)</td>
<td>134 (8.2%)</td>
<td>17 (1.0%)</td>
<td>228 (4.8%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Track</strong></td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>540 (31.6%)</td>
<td>2 (0.1%)</td>
<td>172 (10.1%)</td>
<td>27 (1.6%)</td>
<td>262 (15.3%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full implementation of employment equity is essential at academic institutions. Enakshi Dua, who has studied equity in Canadian universities, has demonstrated that various Canadian universities have developed anti-racist policies, including employment equity policies, anti-harassment policies and clauses, and anti-racist workshops,\(^{20}\) but these policies have never been fully realized or effectively implemented. In light of this inaction, faculty and students at McGill consistently vocalize their concerns about employment and representation.\(^{21}\)

Senate subcommittees have been focusing more critically on the gaps in equity at the university, notably in regards to ethnic and racial diversity. In 2010, McGill’s Equity Subcommittee on Race and Ethnic Relations issued a report arguing that the sheer numbers of McGill’s faculty representation point to the problem of institutional racism. It overviews

\(^{17}\) Data compiled by SEDE Office.

\(^{18}\) Survey completion rates: Contract Academic Staff: 58.5%, Tenure Track Academic: 80.7%

\(^{19}\) Data not included due to non-collection by McGill.


many of the systemic barriers to employment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion for faculty of colour. The barriers that the report identifies are:

- The use of merit/excellence (as defined by those already in power) as a basis of evaluation
- Lack of support networks for racism-specific mental health challenges
- Apathy from upper administration members towards issues of underrepresentation
- Biases faced by faculty of colour in teaching evaluations
- Pigeonholing of faculty of colour to teaching methodology classes and required classes, which are often less popular among students.\(^\text{22}\)

Notably, the report highlighted that non-tenured faculty members of colour often do not discuss their experiences of racism out of fear of jeopardizing their employment.\(^\text{23}\) For instance, the report identifies the recurring challenge of finding a chair for the Equity Subcommittee on Race and Ethnic Relations, particularly due to fears of speaking openly about issues of race and experiences of racism. The plethora of concerns demand an examination of the current efforts (or lack thereof) of McGill’s upper administration in advancing employment equity at McGill.

The following report examines McGill’s faculty hiring structure in regards to equity and provides recommendations for McGill in improving equitable hiring practices. This report aims to:

**Illustrate the current structure for academic hires at McGill.** Hiring practices at the University are inaccessible to the general public. In writing this report, one of our primary aims is to lay out how hiring works at the University, and where equity fits into that hiring structure.

**Identify any concerns with the current structure.** With a clear view of how equitable hiring works at McGill, we lay out our major concerns with the University’s hiring structure.

**Provide recommendations for moving forward.** Based on our own concerns and observations particular to the McGill context, combined with research into equitable hiring at other top Canadian universities, we provide recommendations to improve equitable hiring at McGill.

---


\(^{23}\) A recent McGill Daily article and CKUT radio documentary highlighted some of these dynamics. (Full disclaimer: one of the authors of this report, Carolin Huang, produced the radio piece.) The pieces in question can be found at [http://www.mcgildaily.com/race/NoMoreExcuses.html](http://www.mcgildaily.com/race/NoMoreExcuses.html) and [https://ckutnews.wordpress.com/2015/05/07/presenting-speaking-the-unspoken-a-critical-examination-of-mcgills-celebrated-employment-practices/](https://ckutnews.wordpress.com/2015/05/07/presenting-speaking-the-unspoken-a-critical-examination-of-mcgills-celebrated-employment-practices/).
Given the limitations in time and resources of this project, our report focuses solely on academic hiring. We recognize that academic retention, promotion, and tenure are also integral parts of ensuring employment equity, as is non-academic hiring, retention, and promotion.

However, academic staff hold an immense amount of power in representing the University and in decision-making. In this way, the hiring practices for academic staff speak greatly to the university’s commitments, priorities, and goals. As a student-centred research-intensive university, McGill has an obligation to its students to provide an inclusive environment for learning, particularly through the presence of a diverse faculty.

**Employment Equity at McGill: How it works**

**Structure**

To identify the gaps in McGill’s practices of employment equity, it is important to understand the general structure of Employment Equity Policy and hiring at McGill.

There are three key components, or levels, of Employment Equity Policy: the federal and provincial level (herein referred to as “Outside Policy”), the University administrative level, and the faculty-departmental level.

“Outside” Employment Equity Policy

**Designated group categories**

At the Outside Policy level, there are federal and provincial policies guiding employment equity – the Federal Contractors Program (1986), and the Loi sur l’accès à l’égalité en emploi – Commission des droits de la personne et des droits de la jeunesse (2001). These laws base employment equity on specified “designated group” categories. McGill fell under the Federal Contractors Program until 2012.

There are four designated categories defined within federal policy: persons with disabilities, Aboriginal people, women, and visible minorities. Quebec adds a fifth group to this grouping: ethnic minorities, which means those whose mother tongue is neither English nor French and who do not otherwise identify as a visible minority. McGill’s employment equity policy adds a sixth group to these categories: “sexual orientation and gender identity minority.”

---

Table 3: Designated group categories recognized at federal, provincial level and McGill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>McGill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Minorities</td>
<td>Visible Minorities</td>
<td>Visible Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal People</td>
<td>Aboriginal People</td>
<td>Aboriginal People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual orientation and gender identity minorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment equity policy

Employment equity laws are designed so that designated groups are taken into account in a quantifiable manner. In practice, the laws govern that employers use designated group categories in order to compare the demographics of their own workforce with those of the available labour market. Employers should then determine where the largest “gaps” are within their workplaces, namely, how designated groups are underrepresented within their workforce as compared to general labour market availability. When employers then decide to hire, these gaps help evaluate the final, shortlisted candidates. It is only once a final shortlist is made - determined on the basis of merit - that employment equity laws come into effect. The new hire, selected from the final shortlist, should be a member of a group that has a larger representation gap within the employer's workplace.

Employment equity versus affirmative action, and other misconceptions

Canadian employment equity laws are very distinctive from affirmative action or quota-style policies. Instead, employment equity is a tool intended to help employers navigate their hiring processes in a way that recognizes historical inequities while still governing these processes in a merit-based way.

SEDE’s Employment Equity fact sheet goes over the various common misconceptions of Employment Equity:

- “Employment Equity means treating everyone the same”
- “Employment Equity is ‘reverse discrimination’”
- “Employment Equity requires employers to fill quotas”
- “Employment Equity means hiring unqualified people”
● “Employment Equity means lowering job standards”
● “It is too difficult and expensive to accommodate persons with disabilities”
● “Workplace equality should be left up to market forces; there is no need to intervene”

Enforcement of federal and provincial employment equity laws
Enforcement of these policies, unfortunately, is relatively limited – both at the provincial and federal levels. Sanctions are very rarely applied for not following or attempting to follow employment equity regulations. When sanctions are applied, they usually come as the result of cases filed to Human Rights Commissions.

Administrative-level/university-wide employment equity policy at McGill
In 2007, McGill’s Employment Equity Policy was approved by the University’s Senate and the Board of Governors. The preamble of the policy states the following:

“The University is committed to achieving and maintaining a fair and representative workforce and will initiate employment equity measures to ensure the full participation and advancement at all levels of employment of groups which have traditionally been under-represented. These employment equity measures will include the identification and removal of any discriminatory barriers to the selection, hiring, promotion and training of members of the under-represented groups. Special measures and reasonable accommodations will be implemented, as necessary, to enable members of these groups to compete with others on an equal basis.”

Currently, McGill is required to report to Senate every two years on the status of representation at the university. It reports the provincial government every two years, and is no longer required to report to the federal government.

The Policy outlines the University’s objectives in promoting an equitable workplace and establishing objectives for eliminating barriers at McGill. Some of the key implementation aspects of the Policy include: [emphasis added]

• developing an employment equity plan appropriate to each employee sector together with guidelines to assist those who make employment decisions in implementing the plan;
• ensuring that these plans address equity in the hiring, promotion, and recognition (through, for example, allocation of endowed and research chairs, special designations and honours) in all sectors of the workforce;
• ensuring that those in positions to make or influence employment decisions are aware of the University’s employment equity policy and the employment equity plan relevant to their sector;
• ensuring that all “position requirements” constitute bona fides and necessary requirements for the position advertised;
• requiring appropriate academic, administrative and support units to report on the status of employment equity within the unit;
• ensuring that academic administrators (deans, chairs, directors) and the heads of administrative and support units actively support the University’s initiatives in furtherance of the objectives of this Policy;
• reporting to Senate every two years on the status of employment equity in the various sectors of the workforce.

However, despite these listed points, implementation is largely an informal process. Recruitment practices involve equity-related data collection, and the University regularly submits employment equity reports to the provincial government and McGill Senate. Informal attempts to meet objectives are conducted primarily by the Associate Provost (Policy, Procedures & Equity) (APPPE) in the vein of raising education and awareness.

The APPPE works closely with the Academic Personnel Office (APO), the office that is in charge of overseeing the administrative functions of academic hires. The APO also works with the McGill Provost and the Associate Provost (Budget & Resources). The APO deals in “all matters relating to the recruiting, hiring, appointing, conditions of employment, salary, leaves and retirement of academic staff.” The APO offers guidance to deans and chairs on academic hires and helps co-manage academic hires.

However, in terms of employment equity, the role of the APO is very limited. The APO largely deals with hires in administrative matters. The APO receives data regarding equity and representation from academic hires, but does not take an active role in implementing employment equity. There is no specific equity training that goes on within the APO for employees, the APO does not have an equity designate, the APO does not have any sort of equity guidelines tailored to departmental hires, and the APO does not play an active role in academic hires – it does not sit on hiring committees, nor does it offer guidance during the

---

28 Data on the representation of members of designated groups is collected through self-identification forms. There is an optional self-identification survey, the “Employment Equity Survey” on Minerva for all employees at McGill and optional self-identification forms “Diversity and Equity Survey” (https://www.mcgill.ca/apo/equity-diversity-survey) are available to faculty applicants.
29 Interview with Lydia White, February 11, 2015.
hiring process. Rather, academic hiring decisions rest almost entirely within their respective departments.\textsuperscript{31}

The University-mandated process for open academic hires\textsuperscript{32} is relatively limited in terms of equity. Below is a guide to the process, according to McGill’s website:\textsuperscript{33}

- The Provost approves the need for a new position and gives the go-ahead for hiring process to begin.
- The advertising process:
  - Advertisements for tenure and contract academic positions must follow these regulations.
  - Advertisements must include some sort of Equity statement similar to the following: *McGill University is committed to diversity and equity in employment. It welcomes applications from: women, Aboriginal persons, persons with disabilities, ethnic minorities, persons of minority sexual orientation or gender identity, visible minorities, and others who may contribute to diversification.*\textsuperscript{cite}
  - In letters of acknowledgement to applications, the University includes the optional Diversity and Equity Survey, which allows applicants to identify as a member of a designated group if they so choose. **However, the protocol regarding the confidentiality of these surveys is unclear.** Some hiring committees have access to the information from the surveys; other times, only chairs do. In an interview, former Associate Provost Lydia White acknowledged this confusion.\textsuperscript{34}
- A departmental hiring committee is formed. There is no uniform process for committee selection; generally, it depends on the department and the available position. The University does not offer guidelines on ensuring equity education for committee members or including any sort of equity designate. As such, equity concerns are typically at the discretion of the department or committee chair.
- The committee conducts interviews of shortlisted applicants. Equity is generally not a formalized concern. If equity issues come up during the hiring process – ranging from microaggressions to hiring discrimination – they are left to the discretion of the chair (chairs do not have any sort of formalized equity training). There is no formalized process to field complaints about equitable hiring either from candidates or committee members. The practice in place to formally promote equitable hiring is a data form (the Employment Equity Data Report) in which committees must justify why designated group members were not interviewed or chosen for the position. According to the Deans and Chairs Guide, there is another policy in place to ensure

\textsuperscript{31} The APO is not the only office at McGill that manages hires: Human Resources also works closely with hiring, but not faculty or academic hires. Instead, HR deals with staffing and helps the APO with data collection and analysis.

\textsuperscript{32} Open academic hires refers to hiring for an open position within a department – as opposed to spousal hires or hires for research chairs.


\textsuperscript{34} Interview with Lydia White, February 11, 2015.
the inclusion of designated group members.\footnote{According to the guide: “If there is no one from any of the designated groups (six categories) among the short-listed applicants, then the Department/Faculty should interview the top ranked applicant who is known to be a member of a designated group and who is judged to be in the top ten of all applicants.”} However, it is unclear if this practice is actually followed.

- The committee makes a recommendation for hire. The Provost then approves the hire. The Policy instructs the Provost to approve the hire only if the Diversity and Equity Survey and the Employment Equity Data Report are included in the final paperwork.

### Methodology

This is a largely qualitative study of McGill’s hiring practices, with interviewing and policy research constituting the central methods. While we recognize the importance of a quantitative approach in addition to our qualitative approach, there is a lack of available data to accurately depict McGill’s hiring numbers in terms of representation. In addition, interviewing allowed us to inquire in depth as to the intentions, history, and context behind the current hiring practices.

Through interviews with central actors in McGill’s academic hiring structure, including members of Human Resources and the Academic Personnel Office who are responsible for carrying out employment equity obligations, Department Chairs, Faculty Deans, and members of hiring committees, we were able to map out the responsibilities of the central actors and relationships between these actors.\footnote{Non-confidential interviewees included then Associate Provost (Policy, Procedures and Equity) Lydia White, Employment Equity Administrator Alison Verkade, Equity Subcommittee on Race and Ethnic Relations Chair Adrienne Piggott, Director of Staffing at McGill Pierre Thibodeaux, Dean of Law Daniel Jutras, Dean of Engineering Jim Nicell, then-Chair of History and Classical Studies Elizabeth Elbourne, SEDE Equity Educational Advisor (LGBTIQ) Tynan Jarrett, and SEDE Equity Educational Advisor (Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity) Sarah Malik.} These interviews also guided the direction of our research and ensured that our research is situated within the current climate of McGill.

We chose three departments or faculties as case studies – the Faculty of Engineering, the Faculty of Law, and the Department of History and Classical Studies – to understanding how hiring works in practice; how informal practices figure into hiring.

All three case studies present different issues and dynamics that exist in hiring at McGill.

- We looked at the Faculty of Law because it has been historically and is currently a faculty dominated by white academic staff. In February 2007, there were only two academic staff of visible minority (out of thirty-seven).\footnote{See https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0BwtRca3ILgu0UKJoeWcyTktEQk0.} In March 2015, there were...
ten academic staff of visible minority (out of sixty-seven).\textsuperscript{38} In both years, there were no Aboriginal academic staff. Following these shortcomings, the Faculty of Law became the first department or faculty to collaborate with the SEDE Office on matters related to employment equity. In 2012, the Office worked with the Faculty of Law to develop best practices with regards to reaching a diverse pool of applicants and evaluating candidates.

- We looked at the Faculty of Engineering because of longstanding and well-publicized issues in the Faculty regarding gender equity.
- We looked at the Department of History and Classical Studies because wanted to examine a ‘typical’ smaller department in the Faculty of Arts.

These case studies are not intended to be exhaustive, nor are they intended to be representative of the practices that exist across the entire University. However, these studies do demonstrate the diversity in hiring practices that exist. We feel that these studies identify some of the dominant trends concerning equity at McGill: decentralized practices, varied understandings of what equity means, lower prioritization of equity, and the ultimate advancement of women over other identity categories.

We spoke with professors across the department and faculties named above over a period of six weeks, assessing their understanding of equity and how it plays out within the academic setting. These interviews also provided us with an understanding of the informal dynamics and biases that play into hiring at McGill. We asked questions related to the hiring procedure (outreach, shortlisting, interviewing, evaluating, reporting), and the existence of equity initiatives. In addition to interviewing, we looked through written documents, such as policy documents, data reports, news articles, committee reports, and academic articles to develop our concerns with the current structure.

We also examined documents available on peer universities’ websites, including Dalhousie, York, Western, Queen’s, and Windsor, to compare hiring structures and discern any equitable hiring practices present that are absent at McGill. We thus grounded our recommendations in equitable practices at peer universities. These recommendations also stem from our interviews, and analyses of reports, academic research and policies.

The nature of this research, largely due to the reliance on interviews to understand how equitable hiring works in practice, often produced contradictory information (for instance, different notions of the confidentiality of the Diversity and Equity Survey). We believe this is largely due to the decentralized and disorganized structure of academic hiring. We have used our best judgement to provide a clear picture of equitable hiring and employment at

\textsuperscript{38} See \url{https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2OKLPzpPEXjZ0FHcHpyY2J2cEU/view?usp=sharing}. 
the University while maintaining that what we depict may not be consistent across the University. Instead, we aim to present clear examples of trends that we have noticed in our research.

**Case studies: An in-depth look at hiring practices**

**Department of History and Classical Studies**

The following information on the Department of History and Classical Studies has been gathered primarily through confidential interviews with five faculty members and the former Chair of History and Classical Studies.

The Department of History and Classical Studies (henceforth referred to as the Department) is a department within the Faculty of Arts that comprises 39 full-time faculty members, as well as visiting professors, faculty lecturers, and post-doctoral scholars. Fall 2014 saw 639 students enrolled in the Department of History and Classical Studies, capping five years of over 50% growth in the number of students enrolled in the Department. The Department describes itself as having “particular strengths in Canadian history, British and European history, East Asian history, the history of medicine, and the history of science, and it is building up newer fields, such as the history of gender and sexuality, the history of the Atlantic and Indian Ocean worlds, and global history.” Multiple professors note that the Department prides itself on its teaching, rather than prioritizing research over teaching.

**Hiring committees follow non-standardized practices when making a new academic hire.** Committee members are selected according to the position sought – generally, professors with similar research interests to that of the open position will be selected by the hiring committee chair. Committees discuss, through consensus, whether candidate preferences should be determined via ranking, discussion, etc. – though most decision-making happens through a discussion-based process.

After the screening process by the chair, which is carried out to determine the qualifications of candidates, the top ten candidates are determined by the committee. Generally, three to four top candidates are brought in for an interview; top candidates are then reviewed and selected by the committee. The top candidate is then reviewed in a departmental meeting.

Generally, an informal assessment takes place, such as dinner or lunch with candidates. Professors spoke to this as an important measure in determining how well a candidate would ‘fit’ within the departmental culture.

Within this hiring process, equity concerns take on a less prominent role. Equity is pursued in a less formalized process: candidates self-identify via the Equity and Diversity survey, which departmental committees have access to. Equity may be discussed as an important consideration during the process, but there are no apparent formal mechanisms for actively implementing equity.

In speaking with professors, we learned of several instances of microaggressions or informal discrimination that occurred within the hiring process, either directed toward candidates or members of the committee. Due to confidentiality concerns, we cannot publish the specific details of these instances. Regardless, it seems that in these instances discussed, an appropriate measure would have been intervention from the chair of the hiring committee, which never occurred according to these sources. This suggests that hiring committee chairs are inadequately trained in day-to-day situations involving equity; in fact, they have no equity training to speak of that we discovered.

Furthermore, **most of the focus on equity has occurred in regards to women.** Women have historically been underrepresented in History, and have increased in number over the past ten to fifteen years. Other markers of identity – such as race, ethnicity, or ability – receive less focus, a pattern that many attributed to the relative lack of diversity within the field of history overall.

**Merit was cited by multiple professors as the key factor in academic hires.** Many pointed to hiring situations in which the number one candidates’ ‘equity qualifications’ went largely unconsidered or undiscussed, whereas the second, third, and fourth ranked candidates will sometimes be discussed in terms of equity.

Generally, many professors spoke to the departmental culture as a relatively organic one that would be resistant to perceived outside interference in regards to equity measures. This is a trend that can be seen across the university. **Because of the particular, highly specialized nature of academic hires, it is often seen as an intrusion on academic freedom to implement equity measures or policies.**

Overall, we found the history department to be in the ‘middle of the road’ in terms of equity concerns. Individual understandings of what equity is vary widely, though equity is a relatively non-controversial concept. There has been a slight shift in the department’s
institutional culture in terms of women, but other groups lag far behind. Despite the fact that this is a major issue, it is generally perceived as one that takes a backseat to academic excellence.

**Faculty of Engineering**
The following information on the Faculty of Engineering has been gathered primarily through confidential interviews with two faculty members, the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs Fabrice Labeau, and the Dean of Engineering Jim Nicell.

The Faculty of Engineering stands out among other McGill faculties in that it has not only seen particular problems in regards to equity, but that it also has taken a proactive approach to improving equity within the Faculty. As of Fall 2014, women made up 26.5 per cent of the Faculty’s student population – a number far from achieving parity. However, that number is even lower when looking at academic staff: as of March 2014, women made up 16.5 per cent of total academic staff.

**Table 4: Employment equity by the numbers in the Faculty of Engineering (March 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Aboriginal</th>
<th>Visible Minority</th>
<th>Persons With Disabilities</th>
<th>Ethnic Minority</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation &amp; Gender Identity Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Academic Staff</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Track Academic</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2009, a report was submitted as a memorandum to the Advisory Committee for the Selection of a Dean of Engineering. The report outlined the state of representation among women in Engineering from 2005 to 2009, and found that McGill lagged seriously behind its counterparts in hiring and retaining academic staff who are women.

In particular, the report found that in Architecture and Mechanical Engineering, McGill seriously lagged when compared to a survey of top departments in their respective fields

---

42 Data compiled by SEDE.
43 Data not included due to non-collection by McGill.
The report found that Mechanical Engineering had a population of 2.8 per cent women, whereas the mean across surveyed departments was 10.5 per cent, and the top-performing school (Caltech) had 22.2 per cent women in Mechanical Engineering (At the time, there was only one woman faculty member in Mechanical Engineering. Today, there are two). These numbers clearly disprove the hypothesis that the low numbers of women faculty in engineering are solely due to the number of available candidates.

**Figure 1: Women Faculty in McGill Engineering (2009)**

![Women Faculty in McGill Engineering (2009)](image)

**Figure 2: Women Faculty in Comparable Programs (2009)**

![Women Faculty in Comparable Programs (2009)](image)

The report also found that the numbers of women professors did not correlate with the percentage of the student body: in Architecture, women made up 66 per cent of students, but 7.1 per cent of faculty. This number once again represented the lowest among top-surveyed departments, and depicted a serious concern for the experience of women students in particular.
Notably, the Faculty of Engineering has been more proactive in its approach to equity: it has been collaborating with the SEDE Office to offer equity education to its faculty, which has been cited as an important step forward up to this point. However, there are concerns within the faculty that McGill projects an unwelcoming image, especially for women. This is evidenced by the fact that McGill’s applicant pool has fewer women than other universities, despite theoretically targeting the same potential pool. Many women in the faculty have reported that this is because of McGill’s unwelcoming image to women – that to succeed in McGill Engineering, it’s better to ‘pretend to be a man.’

The Faculty is paying close attention to promoting women in its ranks. However, this focus on women appears to hinder attention to other members of designated groups.

The current Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs, Fabrice Labeau, spoke to the Faculty’s efforts to encourage more women to apply for positions and ensure a diverse pool of applicants to open positions. Such strategies include advertising with associations promoting the presence of women in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) and sending a letter about the position to all department chairs in Canada.

**Faculty of Law**

The following information on the Faculty of Law has been gathered primarily through confidential interviews with three faculty members and an interview with the Dean of Law, Daniel Jutras.

The Faculty of Law at McGill is a faculty that focuses on both teaching and research and has both undergraduate and graduate studies. Fall 2014 saw 737 undergraduate students and 157 graduate students enrolled in the Faculty of Law. According to the website, “McGill’s Faculty of Law has a strong international reputation for its highly distinctive approach to legal research. Our students and faculty members produce research that is relevant, critical and pluralist.”

The research themes of the faculty are: Law and Society; Foundations of Law; Social Policy; and Human Rights, International Law, and Diversity.

In 2012, SEDE staff held two sessions with the Faculty of Law to discuss what employment equity requires under Quebec law. SEDE staff went over some best practices to employment
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44 Interview with Fabrice Labeau, March 3, 2015.
equity, including how to evaluate CVs, how to minimize bias in interviews and how to increase the applicant pool. But this session was only attended by the hiring committee of that year and has not been recurrent.48

The hiring committee for the Faculty of Law, selected by the Dean on an annual basis, is comprised of 3 professors, an Associate Dean, and a student appointed by the Law Students’ Association (LSA). The committee goes through all the files to develop a long list of candidates and then, based on reference letters, develops a shortlist of candidates. The initial requirements are that the candidate be bilingual and that they have a doctorate in law. These requirements have been waived at times for the purposes of employment equity. The committee looks at the candidate’s area of research and teaching, publication record, teaching experiences, and conference presentations. The chair has access to the self-identification forms. The committee decides on the shortlisted candidates; the rest of the faculty only has access to who the shortlisted candidates are, not the entire pool of candidates. For shortlisted candidates, there is a series of evaluation sessions with members of the Faculty: an on-site visit, a presentation on a topic of their research (the main evaluation component), a meeting with students, 2 periods of open meetings, and a meeting with the Dean.49

Faculty members who interact with the candidates (such as viewing their presentation) send in their evaluation grids to review the candidate. They make clear on what their basis of selection is and indicate what their interaction with the candidate was. These forms are circulated to the hiring committee. Based on these forms and their own feedback, the committee members make a report on hiring recommendations. The report details all of the candidates, their strengths and weaknesses and the summary of the hiring process. The Dean has ultimate decision-making power. The committee also writes a report to the Faculty Council regarding the applicants, offers, and general hiring process.50

Job openings are advertised on Canadian University Affairs, the Faculty website, and the Scholarly Service Distribution of Research Legal Scholarship Network Announcements, and among the Faculty’s own doctoral students. There are currently no efforts of targeted advertising for particular demographics.51 Like other job postings, there is an Employment Equity statement that reads: “McGill University is committed to equity in employment and diversity. It welcomes applications from indigenous peoples, visible minorities, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, women, persons of minority sexual orientations and gender identities and others who may contribute to further diversification.”

48 Interview with Genevieve Saumier, March 10, 2015.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
51 Ibid.
From our interviews with three members on current or previous hiring committees, a significant issue that came up is that there is no guidance on how to use self-identification forms in the hiring process. According to one interviewee, there is “no guidance on how they come in proactively to promote diversity” and there “needs to be clearer guidelines.” According to this hiring committee member, there should be a training on the best practices of employment equity that demonstrates how diversity and excellence are mutually enhancing and how diversity is a reflection of excellence. The member also added that the training should instruct on how to evaluate an application, and how to provide a welcoming work environment.

The interviewee expressed that “equity is not an informal matter”, as these jobs are “publicly funded” and “can virtually lead to lifetime employment at the institution.” Thus, decision making bodies (Deans, Chairs, hiring committees) need to be proactive in their efforts to seek out candidates of designated groups.

The interviewee also noted that the way entry requirements are designed can be a barrier for designated groups. For example, having doctorate experience can be a barrier for entire groups of people. As a result, the faculty has hired candidates who have not completed doctorates, providing them with the opportunity to complete it.

Because the applicant pool is already limited in representation, an important undertaking that the Faculty of Law discussed is student mentorship. The Dean of Law emphasized that active recruitment at earlier stages of education, such as high school, is an important undertaking for the recruitment of Aboriginal faculty. The Faculty intends to develop an institutionalized student mentorship program to support students of designated groups to advance their academic education and work. As another interviewee stated, merely interviewing a member of a designated group does not satisfy the employment equity policy.

The Faculty seems to be aware of the employment equity issues it faces, especially in their approach to ‘fit’ as a qualification for employment. As one interviewee discussed, ‘fit’ often connotes white middle class. It relies on inside knowledge, inside resources, and inside networks. Critical of the use of ‘fit’ as ‘looks like us’, another interviewee saw ‘fit’ in the Faculty of Law not in terms of demographics but more teaching methods. Thus, a candidate that ‘fits’ the Faculty is someone who has interesting pedagogy; as the interviewee noted, there should be no one model that people are meant to ‘fit’.
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52 Interview with Daniel Jutras, June 21, 2015.
Generally, the Faculty comprehends the importance of prioritizing equitable hiring practices but has much more work to do for an actual transformation in representation. The commitment to equity in the Faculty would not be possible without the few faculty members and students who are vocalizing employment and labour issues within the Faculty. Inasmuch as the Faculty is taking small measures to change their employment practices, it is evident that there needs to be a larger shift towards institutionalizing equitable practices. A significant example is that there are no Indigenous professors despite the Faculty’s commitment to Indigenous issues.53

**Peer Universities**

Looking at the employment equity initiatives of several other Canadian universities, including Dalhousie, York, Western, Queen’s, and Windsor, we found that in comparison McGill’s efforts around employment equity are shortsighted and trivial. Queen’s, Dalhousie, and Western are all part of U15, Canada’s group of 15 research-intensive universities, along with McGill. Because these universities play an important role in the broader practices of national policy research and development, issues of equity at these universities become wide reaching and prominent.

All the examined universities (Dalhousie, York, Western, Queen’s, and Windsor) have put into place structures and plans to remain accountable to the principles of employment equity. Notably, all the examined universities have installed equity offices that play collaborative roles in decision making and upholding policy. McGill only has the Social Equity and Diversity Education Office, which has limited influence on upper administrative decisions and agendas.

Dalhousie University has an affirmative action plan, beyond just an employment equity policy. They “recogniz[e] the need to remedy the effects of past discrimination on specific groups by society in general.”54 Affirmative treatment is given to “aboriginal peoples (especially Micmacs), visible minorities (especially people of black African descent indigenous to Nova Scotia), women, and disabled persons.”55 At the Office of Human Rights, Equity and Harassment Prevention, there is a Human Rights & Equity Advisor who is in

---


charge of implementing the Employment Equity Policy. The advisor has to be from at least one of the designated groups and is responsible for reporting data, monitoring progress, creating goals, and coordinating with administration. There is also a Council on Employment Equity Through Affirmative Action that works with the advisor to fulfill the responsibilities of employment equity.56

Queen's University has an Employment Equity Policy that outlines all the individuals and bodies responsible for carrying out the policy and all the necessary practices for carrying out the policy.57 Unlike McGill's employment equity plan, Queen's employment equity plan has a clear timeline, tasks, and actor for different initiatives: Communication and Training; Recruitment and Hiring; Climate and Retention; Accommodation; and Accountability and Monitoring.58 Queen's has also created working groups (Communication, Training, and Awareness; Climate and Work-life Cycle; and Accountability) led by senior administrators as a strategy to prioritize and remain accountable to the university.59 In Queen's current practices, the appointment committee for faculty must complete a familiarization and training workshop which covers the principles, objectives, recent history, best practices, and rules and institutional expectations with respect to employment equity. One member of the committee is designated as the Equity Representative, which has the explicit responsibility for the Committee adhering to rules and expected practices that assure equity.60 Queen's also has a Council on Employment Equity, consisting of staff, faculty and student representatives.61

University of Western Ontario has a wealth of employment equity resources, including “Appropriate Questions to Ask in an Interview”, “Checklist: Best Practices in Employment Equity”62 and a comprehensive “Employment Equity Guide”63 that must be read by all members of faculty hiring committees. The guide outlines important instructions, considerations, and recommendations in making the hiring process as equitable as possible,

examples including: having members of designated groups on the hiring committee, taking into account candidates’ experiences outside the job market, and being mindful of the possible biases that informal activities can perpetuate in the evaluation period. There is financial support available to Faculties to assist with the recruitment and retention of tenured/probationary female academics. These funds may cover special expenses as well as support general recruitment and retention programs (e.g. mentoring programs in teaching or research).64 While the President is the ultimate actor in carrying out the employment equity policy, the President’s Standing Committee for Employment Equity (PSCEE) assists with implementation.65

At the University of Windsor, all hiring committees must have a non-voting Employment Equity/Procedures Assessor (EE/PA) present. Windsor is one of a few universities that uses the services of academic volunteers known as EE/PAs who monitor the procedures of appointments, renewal, tenure, promotion, and other special processes as listed in the University of Windsor Employment Equity Infrastructure. The EE/PA ensures that pre- and post-interview grids are filled out with EE in mind and that designated groups are considered. To further ensure the practicing of EE, there is also the Presidential Commission on Employment Equity (PCEE). The PCEE reviews all documentation submitted, reviews the evaluation grid and determines if there are any areas of concern. They may identify candidates from one of the designated groups: Aboriginal, visible minorities, women, persons with disabilities, and sexual minorities. The PCEE may also recommend that the hiring committee add an additional candidate to the shortlist if they deem the candidate equal to the third candidate. Appointments and search committees must obtain PCEE approval for the position advertisement, the shortlisted candidates and the recommended candidates.66 Windsor also has the Employment Equity Coordinating Committee (EECC), the governing body which implements employment equity. The committee is made up of representatives from each bargaining unit on campus and an equal number of representatives from the administration. The Committee meets four times during each academic year.67

York University also has an Affirmative Action Agreement that prioritizes the hiring of women over all other designated groups. It reads: “In units where 40% or more of the tenure-stream faculty/librarian positions are filled by women, a candidate who is a member of a visible/racial minority, an aboriginal person or a person with a disability shall be offered

65 Ibid.
the appointment unless a candidate who does not belong to these groups can be demonstrated to be superior.\textsuperscript{68} To carry out Affirmative Action, there is a Joint Affirmative Action Committee that organizes workshops to inform unit Chairs, Affirmative Action Representatives, all members of hiring committees, and members of tenure and promotion committees on Collective Agreement provisions, principles, objectives, recent history and best practices with respect to employment equity. On hiring committees, there is an Affirmative Action Representative that must complete a workshop for their position. Representatives will be responsible for monitoring and reporting the hiring process and helping in the development of the unit equity plans. Academic unit(s) must have Affirmative Action Plans approved by the Committee. The Joint Affirmative Action Committee will approve academic unit affirmative action plans in order to ensure that policies already established are implemented.

These peer universities reveal the myriad of Employment Equity initiatives that have been developed and implemented by other Canadian universities. The development of these initiatives elsewhere demonstrates the lack of effort undertaken by McGill University in matters related to Employment Equity. The institutionalization of equity at these universities better enable the practice of equitable hiring because there are mechanisms to hold people accountable. McGill University should further examine the EE initiatives implemented at other universities (initiatives that go beyond fulfilling legal obligations). Such examination of set precedents can provide some ideas for a future course of action.

**Concerns**

Lack of commitment, formalized practice, and transparency in regards to employment equity

While the University’s Employment Equity Policy\textsuperscript{69} was passed and ostensibly implemented beginning in 2007, it has produced few results over the past eight years that it has been in effect. Research demonstrates that the Policy has often acted solely as a tool to meet legal obligations, as opposed to actually addressing inequities. These policies rarely take hold institutionally and instead work on a superficial level to maintain a university’s reputation.\textsuperscript{70}


Beyond the Policy, there is no guidance or formalized practice regarding employment equity, making it difficult for departments to pursue implementation. Though the Academic Personnel Office (APO) technically oversees the hiring of faculty across departments, it has little direct contact with hiring committees; instead, the APO largely communicates with deans and chairs, who then pass on information to their committees. There is thus no reliable channel of communication between the APO and the many different hiring committees that continue on an annual basis.

This lack of communication makes it extraordinarily difficult to address equity concerns in the hiring process. The formalized equity practices that have been implemented consist of the optional Equity and Diversity survey, which allows candidates to self-identify as a member of one of the University's six categories of designated groups. Even this measure, however, is uneven in its implementation: individual professors in some departments reported being able to see the survey, whereas others did not. Furthermore, any other practices explicitly related to equity in the hiring process are largely at the discretion of individual deans or chairs.

This speaks to a larger point about the lack of transparency regarding hiring processes. Faculty hiring processes, which have a direct impact on student well-being and success, are unclear and opaque when looking in from the outside. There is no centralized location in which interested persons can view the progress of employment equity at McGill; instead, the governance documents regarding employment equity are scattered throughout the University website and thus inaccessible. Complicating this, there is a great deal of overlap between departments, the APO, Human Resources, and other actors, leading efforts to comprehend hiring practices to become a difficult and often overwhelming task.

As outlined in the Policy, deans/chairs must report to the APO if a member of a designated group does not make the shortlist, justifying that decision. However, there are no tangible sanctions for failing to include designated groups in a shortlist of candidates.

This lack of formality, guidelines, commitment and resources to employment equity has led to little change or progress in representation from designated groups over the past few years despite the passing of the Employment Equity Policy in 2007, particularly within higher ranks such as tenure-track professors. According to data collected by the University and summarized by the SEDE Office in March 2014, only 31.6% of all tenure track academics are women, 0.1% Aboriginal, 10.1% visible minorities, 1.6% persons with disabilities, and 15.3% ethnic minorities.

Lack of leadership within the administration on equity
Support from the upper levels of the McGill administration is crucial in regards to improving equity at the University. In research on anti-racist policies at Canadian universities, it has been found that the effectiveness of implementing policies is dependent on the support from the administration.\textsuperscript{71} However, we have seen little support and a lack of accountability for shortcomings from the administration on matters of employment equity.

The last meaningful University-wide equity initiative was the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement, in which a 2011 report\textsuperscript{72} stressed the importance of diversity within the university setting. Since that report, and the administration's 2012 response to it,\textsuperscript{73} there has been little visible work done on equity on a campus-wide level.

The University's lack of commitment to employment equity manifests itself in a variety of ways. Since the Employment Equity policy was first passed in 2007, despite including people of "minority sexual orientations and gender identities" as a designated group, the employee self-identification survey has failed to include that very category in its list of options. While complications in the IT department are to be expected, this particular case involves an eight year delay to fulfill a crucial aspect of McGill's own Policy.

Furthermore, this lack of commitment has a major impact on Faculties and departments. Because the core components of employment equity are largely decentralized and only come into effect at the individual initiative of deans, chairs, and departments, the University's lack of commitment promotes a lack of accountability to equitable hiring at the departmental level. Individual faculty members bear the responsibility of speaking to equity-related issues and carrying out equity-related practices. Such individualization of responsibility contributes to the discountenance of discrimination as a systemic issue. The lack of a campus-wide dedication and commitment to equity leads members at the departmental level to disagree on foundational equity-related matters, such as what equity is and why it is important.

Moreover, any kind of equitable hiring practice on the departmental level is informal, since hiring committees have no guidance nor training on minimizing systemic bias for any step of the hiring process (how job openings are publicized, how applications should be looked at, how applicants are shortlisted, how candidates are interviewed and chosen). Currently, the

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 192.
composition of the hiring committee (with some necessitating an outside professor, a woman, etc.) and the interview process varies from department to department.

The only departmental obligation around employment equity is reporting the data of applicant self-identification forms. As a result, any practices beyond reporting are at the discretion of the department’s dean and hiring committee.

In this way, the overarching importance of employment equity is undermined. Individualized equitable hiring practices can hardly address systemic discrimination in the workplace. Employment equity is not only a policy on paper; it is a commitment that requires leadership and mandated progress from the upper levels in order to effect any sort of real culture change. In this context, leadership from upper administration is crucial.

Lack of equity and diversity training for key actors
Currently, there is no mandatory or optional equity training for those involved in academic hires. As a result, there are diverse understandings of equity among individuals within departments. Equity needs to be formalized in the University setting to address the historical role of academic institutions in shaping social relations. There must be an understanding that extends beyond common misconceptions of employment equity as hiring quotas.

Without any kind of equity training, unconscious biases and microaggressions will remain unexamined and thus, will persist in hiring practices. Ideas on ‘fit’ as a qualification for evaluation need to be questioned. Solely hiring people ‘like us’, people ‘who we get along with’, or people ‘who fit well into the institution’ affirms the status quo. At other universities, such as Queen’s and Western, employment equity training is mandatory for hiring committees. These trainings instruct hiring committee members on the principles, objectives and best practices of employment equity.

Effects of under-representation at the faculty level on students
The lack of commitment to equity on the level of academic hires has serious repercussions on students.

Shaina Agbayani, SSMU Equity Commissioner of 2012-2014, produced a film entitled Race at McGill about the experiences of racism faced by students of colour at McGill. It was screened in Fall 2014 as a part of QPIRG McGill and SSMU’s Culture Shock, an annual event series dedicated to exploring the myths surrounding immigrants, refugees, Indigenous people and
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communities of colour. The film features interviews with students of colour, who voice their concerns on the lack of diversity among McGill faculty. Students of colour are limited in seeking out mentorship, supervision and/or support from faculty members, particularly on matters related to race and racism. As a result, the few faculty members of colour bear the burden of supporting a disproportionate number of the student population.

Another student, Mahteb Nazemi, wrote a Master’s thesis in the Department of Integrated Studies in Education (DISE) entitled, “Beyond Racism: Mapping Ruling Relations in a Canadian University from the Standpoint of Racialized Women Student Activists,” which also highlights the under-representation of visible minorities among university professors. Through interviews with students, Nazemi also demonstrates that students identify under-representation as a major issue and have brought it up as a concern, only to be faced with the denial of racism as a response from the upper administration.75

In the research of Lisa Spanierman, a professor in the Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, there is a focus on microaggressions experienced by students in the university setting of McGill. Indigenous students have voiced their experiences of isolation on campus because of the lack of Indigenous peers and faculty.76 Racial microaggressions faced by students on campus are not unrelated from the organization of broader inequities in the academic institution, especially regarding academic hiring, retention, and promotion.

The research presented here on the effects of faculty under-representation on students is not exhaustive. There is much more that must be done to provide a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of how students are affected by systemic discrimination and marginalization on campus. The research here is indicative of the need to take seriously and respond to the concerns of students. Employment equity does not only affect academic and non-academic staff of McGill, but also students.

Lack of resources and infrastructure for equity
There is no exclusive employment equity designate or office within the university’s structures, either within the APO or Human Resources.77 There is an Associate Provost of Policies, Procedures, and Equity, but such an overstretched portfolio sets limits on the work that can be done on equity. A specific equity designate or office allows for a full-time

77 Human Resources does have an Employment Equity Administrator, but that person’s role focuses largely on compiling statistics.
commitment to equity, a tangible leadership plan, a clear set of objectives and targets, and adequate equity education – all of which McGill currently lacks, despite the initiative of other universities in these areas.

At Dalhousie, the Human Rights & Equity Advisor, an employee institutionalized to be of one of the designated groups, has the responsibility of overseeing the implementation of the employment equity policy. Also, Western, Dalhousie, Windsor, and York all have employment equity committees to help carry out the principles and objectives of employment equity.

Moreover, Dalhousie, Queen’s, Western, York, and Windsor all have equity offices with clear mandates to promote equity across all campus levels. While McGill’s Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office does important work on equity education around the University, SEDE has limited decision-making power and is rarely consulted in hiring-related matters. It appears that the upper administration has yet to take full advantage of the opportunities that the SEDE Office provides.

Technological limitations in implementing employment equity
When implemented correctly, employment equity policies are a useful tool in working toward an equitable institution; however, adequate implementation requires accurate, comprehensive statistics. This is hindered by McGill’s current technological limitations, a problem that is often ascribed to budgetary concerns.

No applicant tracking system has been created: many departments go through their application process via the post; even if applications are submitted electronically, they do not go into a centralized database. Furthermore, the self-identification survey sent to prospective employees is often distributed via mail and thus yields lower response rates. These limitations result in the lack of clear understanding of and explanation for significant under-representation at the University. Furthermore, there is no mechanism for measuring progress through hires. There is currently no information on retention or success rates according to identity category, nor is there information on who doesn’t come to McGill, doesn’t get hired, or chooses to go elsewhere.

This has led to confusion and misinformation on what the statistics are collected for and how to appropriately use these statistics.

Concerns with institutional and departmental culture

---
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Many professors additionally addressed troubling aspects of the institutional and departmental cultures at McGill.

Many spoke to an informal emphasis on “dealing with the women question first” – in other words, working toward hiring and retaining more women over other designated group members. This is not only a very narrow view of diversity, it also advances white women over other groups and can harm equity. This has been the most common pattern thus far, as rates of women in upper-level positions have gradually crept up, while other designated group categories have stagnated.

Furthermore, when people are hired at McGill, there can be a certain expectation of assimilation. One Engineering professor spoke to the culture within Engineering as one of assimilation: “in order to be a woman and succeed in Engineering, it is necessary to act like a man.”

The 2010 report from the Equity Subcommittee on Race & Ethnic Relations reads:

“The culture of McGill University, which can be unfortunately described as a culture of whiteness, needs to be immediately deconstructed and reconstituted in a more racially inclusive and practically democratic fashion. This culture of whiteness is a structural problem that invades the classrooms in the forms of curriculum and white student attitudes, lunch rooms and departmental meetings in the form of surveillance and policing and it has serious, profound and often life-altering and health-impairing effects upon those who are on the receiving end of this oppression.”

Lack of academic diversity
Ultimately, intellectual diversity facilitates diversity in hires. On this note, McGill is sorely lacking. The Indigenous Studies program was recently instituted as a minor program, after years of students pushing for this area of focus. Establishing programs such as Black Canadian Studies or Equity Studies, for example, would not only advance McGill’s institutional standing, but would also be a means of attracting a more diverse group of scholars.

---

Recommendations

Establishing an employment equity committee

Like other universities, McGill should establish groups and individuals that are dedicated to work specifically on monitoring employment equity issues. Designates can mitigate many of the existing problems detailed throughout the report - namely the lack of accountability, consistency, and implementation of the Employment Equity Policy. The employment equity committee and designate should be responsible for overseeing, developing, and implementing the employment equity policy. This committee should be made up of representatives from the SEDE Office, Human Resources, the APO, equity-related subcommittees, students, and other parties interested in promoting equity.

Creating and making mandatory employment equity trainings for heads of hiring committees, APO members, and chairs and deans

Equity trainings are a relatively simple institutional practice to implement. With input from students and others with knowledge about equity on campus, equity trainings similar to those in the Faculty of Engineering should be implemented on a broader scale. In particular, implementing such trainings for those in positions of authority - such as members of the APO, faculty deans, and department chairs - would have not only a powerful symbolic effect but also a practical one. Such training could help safeguard against questionable instances of equitable hiring, as there is no official process for disputing these hiring practices. This would also place chairs and deans in a stronger position to advise on matters such as unconscious biases, which play a large role in hindering equitable hiring practices. These practices should also be extended to those who chair hiring committees, as committee chairs often change from depending on the open position.

Creating and making mandatory an employment equity guide for all members of hiring committees

Considering the structure and constitution of hiring committees are dynamic and vary across faculties and departments, creating a framework for equity trainings for all committee members is understandably challenging. However, this should not inhibit the development of a guide outlining the Employment Equity Policy, to be made available and mandatory for hiring committee members.
This is not an uncommon practice: for instance, the University of Western Ontario has a faculty hiring rubric that outlines common questions and practices for hiring someone in an equitable and fair manner, and safeguards against unconscious biases.80

Greater leadership on equity from the upper administration
While “diversity” is a popular and frequently used buzzword, institutions often treat diversity too lightly. In reality, diversity and inclusion promote excellence, as more diversity in thought and practices can lead to stronger research and a more dynamic institution. It is in the University's interest to practice diversity, equity, and inclusion through a meaningful commitment to employment equity.

Leadership in employment equity, in this sense, is not only a rhetorical commitment. It is also a commitment to implementing policy and consulting outside parties on proactively improving equitable hiring at the University. Upper-level administrators, chairs, and deans should develop strategic plans and targets, and their performances should be tied to an ability to carry out these strategic plans and targets.

Finally, the symbolic importance of emphasizing equitable hiring as part of the University's commitment to diversity is not to be taken lightly. If the McGill administration took on this commitment, it would be joining its peers at other top Canadian universities in actively embracing employment equity.

Creating and developing more accountable structures for employment equity
There are few disincentives for the University to take a more proactive stance toward employment equity, namely by making employment equity more accountability-based than the current model. As noted above, this would involve creating short-term and long-term action plans that account for employment equity across all levels of the University.

At the moment, there are few institutionalized mechanisms to address problems in equitable hiring, aside from filing a human rights complaint, a costly and time-consuming legal endeavour. The University should create an adequate framework to address such concerns, which are being voiced not only by candidates, but also by hiring committee members and department faculty members. This would demonstrate that the University is working proactively to address concerns.

Facilitating stronger faculty-student mentorship and faculty-faculty mentorship
Creating spaces for faculty of designated groups to support each other and their students will help with retention and addressing isolation. Older faculty can shared resources and experiences with newer faculty and undergraduate students who might be interested in pursuing academia as a career.

Paying attention to, and working to actively increase, intellectual diversity
Diversity and inclusion are not solely quantifiable concepts; they cannot be adequately measured only by the number of members of designated groups. While this is one aspect of diversity, intellectual diversity also has a crucial role to play. For instance, McGill only recently implemented an Indigenous Studies program, and no Black Studies program exists to date. Considering not only to what departments and programs exist, but also which are hurt most by budget cuts, is paramount.

Conducting an EE assessment of all employee levels, looking at representation and pay equity
A more comprehensive assessment will paint a picture of which departments need more resources and support in practicing employment equity. This assessment will also provide an overview of the kinds of labour concerns that the University will have to address in pay, retention, promotion, and tenure. This assessment should also include non-academic staff.

Establishing an effective applicant tracking system
As it stands, the hiring process is very disorganized and decentralized, varying greatly across faculties and departments. Most departments accept applications via email rather than a centralized electronic tracking system. While a potentially costly endeavour, the establishment of an applicant tracking system would make the numbers and information on applicants and hired candidates more accessible and useful, and vastly improve the quantifiable data available on equitable hiring. Statistics can be generated more easily and progress can be monitored more closely.

Conclusion
Ultimately, the central problems facing equitable hiring at McGill are twofold. One the one hand there is disorganization and decentralization in equitable hiring practices, and on the other hand there exists a passive approach to equity on behalf of the University. Disorganization and decentralization allow employment equity measures to remain either unclear, non-existent, and/or difficult to access. A passive approach by the senior administration inhibits McGill from actively combatting known problems with employment equity – such as applicant tracking and equity training – as well as more abstract and
difficult-to-solve problems, such as unconscious biases on hiring committees and limited intellectual diversity.

Improving employment equity is a daunting and complex task, and one that requires constant consultation with a diverse array of groups. Regardless, the University should take on the short- and long-term measures outlined above in order to establish itself as a leader in employment equity, and, ultimately, as a progressive and boundary-pushing institution that lives up to its reputation of academic excellence.
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