



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

### Complete Full Report

#### Important Note

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Contact information

**Please complete the fields below.**

**Name of Institution:**

Concordia University

**Contact Name:**

Eli Friedland

**Position Title:**

Advisor, Institutional Equity and Recognition Initiatives

**Institutional Email:**

eli.friedland@concordia.ca

**Institutional Telephone Number:**

15148482424 ext. 8046

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

Yes

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

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

09/27/2019

Rating given action plan in most recent review process:

Fully satisfies

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

Paula Wood-Adams

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

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

**Key Objective 1**

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

"To take concrete steps towards decolonizing and Indigenizing the University, including recalibrating and transforming the University's internal and external relationships with Indigenous Peoples and communities."

**Systemic barriers -**

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

"Insufficient representation and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and communities within the University (in addition to the CRC program)." How identified: See Concordia's Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan for the Canada Research Chair Program, 2019, Sections 1 and 2.

**Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:**

1) Responding to Indigenous Directions Action Plan Action 6.5, the Indigenous Futures Research Centre (IFRC) was launched on November 17, 2021: The IFRC evolved from the Indigenous Futures Cluster, formed in 2015 within the Milieux Institute for Arts, Culture and Technology. Milieux formerly served as an incubator for the IFRC's co-directors' labs, Aboriginal Territories in Cyberspace, and Inuit Futures in Arts Leadership. 2) Addition of a third stream, Strategic Priorities, to internal Individual Seed Grant Program, one key Priority of which is "Indigenous Research/Creation: research by and with Indigenous communities that addresses community research needs and priorities". The Seed Grant Program provides \$10,000 over two years to support the development of Innovative Research/Creation (research, research-creation, and creation) projects to attract external funding to the University for continuation of the research. First call for proposals announced September, 2021.

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

1) IFRC: The Centre's founding members come from the Faculty of Fine Arts, Faculty of Arts and Science, and John Molson School of Business, and diverse programs and departments such as Applied Human Sciences, Sociology and Anthropology, Art History, Design and Computation Arts, English, Geography, Planning, and Environment, First Peoples Studies, History, Studio Arts, Theatre, and Management. As of December 2021, they were supervising 31 undergraduate research assistants, 16 master's students and 11 PhD students. The IFRC is anchored by four Chairs in Indigenous research areas, including a Canada Research Chair, two Concordia University Research Chairs, and a FRQSC Youth Network Chair.

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

1) IFRC: The jump to University-recognized status provides additional access to funding support for general operations, infrastructure and management, and a recognition of a robust cross-disciplinary research program, a critical mass of Concordia researchers, significant training of graduate students and other highly qualified personnel, as well as extensive research output and substantial external funding. 2) Seed Grant Program: Indigenous research, research-creation, and creation as a Strategic Priority developed and approved by Office of the Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies; first call for proposals announced September 2021.

**Challenges encountered during the reporting period:**

See general "Challenges" section, COVID-19.

**Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):**

1) IFRC: First annual IFRC Annual Symposium, November 10, 2022. Important to the goals of the Indigenous Futures Research Centre is supporting the growth of future generations of Indigenous researchers who can integrate their communities' knowledge, values, and priorities into their careers. Using a mentorship model, the IFRC will bring students into an active research environment where they can learn what research is, understand how it might be of interest to them and their communities, and help them develop the skills necessary to conduct that research. 2) Seed Grant Program: The first call for the Individual Seed Grant Program including Indigenous Research/Creation as a Strategic Priority was launched in September 2021; applications will be evaluated and recipients announced in March 2022. For the next call (Fall 2022), follow-up will be introduced based on: 1-3 months post-award: Advisors, Research Development will proactively work with recipients to identify federal and provincial research funding tracks for collaborative research (e.g. NSERC Alliance, SSSHRC Partnership Engage); starting 6 months post-award: researchers and Advisors develop fulsome grant applications to external grant agency for submission to next competition.

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

No

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

**Do you have other key objectives to add?**

Yes

**Key Objective 2**

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

"To recruit, engage and hire exceptional Indigenous graduate students to work on innovative Indigenous research."

**Systemic barriers -**

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

"Insufficient representation and inclusion of Indigenous graduate students." How identified: See Concordia's Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan for the Canada Research Chair Program, 2019, Sections 1 and 2.

**Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:**

The Concordia University Indigenous Graduate Scholarship is an entrance scholarship designed to provide more incentivizing offers to Indigenous students considering graduate studies at Concordia. The scholarships – 10K for research based-Master's students and \$40k (\$10k per year for 4 years) for PhD students – are designed to provide an added financial incentive to any base package offered by departments in order to "increase the recruitment, admission, retention, and graduation of Indigenous learners" as specified in Concordia's Indigenous Directions Action Plan. These scholarships respond to IDAP Action 6.4. For each of the 2020 -2021, and 2021-2022 academic years, 10 doctoral scholarships and 20 Master's scholarships were centrally allocated at the Graduate Awards Office. The scope of these scholarships are top-ups, and are added on top of competitive offers from the program/department/Faculty that are made to Indigenous students.

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

Concordia's Graduate Awards Office collects and tracks data on the number of incoming Indigenous Master's and PhD students who are accessing entrance scholarships, with additional competitive funding from individual departments.

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

The number of Indigenous PhD students accessing entrance scholarships increased from under 5 in 2020-2021 to 6 in 2021-2022, while the number of Indigenous Master's students accessing entrance scholarships fell from 13 in 2020-2021 to 5 in 2021-2022 (see "Challenges" below).

**Challenges encountered during the reporting period:**

The major challenge encountered is that the pool of eligible applicants is not large enough to exhaust available entrance scholarships. This is an at least bi-directional challenge, particularly in STEM areas (the Graduate Awards Office has never received an application for this scholarship from an applicant in a STEM-field department): 1) Limited access to high-quality STEM education at the secondary level heavily impacts Indigenous access to post-secondary STEM education; in addition, the relevance of STEM education for Indigenous students is greatly limited by colonized curricula that ignore or suppress Indigenous ways of knowing and the crucial vitality of community. Together, these create enormous hurdles for potential Indigenous undergraduate applicants, and very substantially decrease Indigenous access to university education at its point of entry. 2) The accumulated effects of social, economic, environmental, and political circumstances on Indigenous undergraduate students significantly increases attrition at the graduate level (see Jaiden Herkimer's 2021 Indspire Report, Holding Our Ground: Indigenous Student Post-Secondary Persistence & Early Leaving: <https://indspire.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Holding-Our-Ground-Report-EN-Final-WEB1.pdf>).

**Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):**

Concordia's Gina Cody School of Engineering and Computer Science and Office of Indigenous Directions are together developing a pilot Indigenous students bridging program that will have no minimum GPA requirement for Indigenous applicants to the undergraduate engineering and computer science program, and provide decolonized CÉGEP-level bridging courses rather than requiring them as prerequisites. Initial roll-out is anticipated for the 2023-2024 academic year. The pilot project will thereafter be expanded to STEM fields in the Faculty of Arts and Science, and to the John Molson School of Business. Anticipated roll-out, 2024-2025 academic year.

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

No

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

**Key Objective 3**

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

"To ensure that mentorship is available and responsive to the unique experiences and needs of CRCs, and particularly members of underrepresented groups."

**Systemic barriers -**

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

"Mentorship is lacking, unstructured, and sub-optimal for CRCs." How identified: See Concordia's Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan for the Canada Research Chair Program, 2019, Sections 1 and 2.

**Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:**

Canada Research Chairholders' meeting convened on mentorship, with the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies (OVPRGS) and Associate Deans, Research (May 2021); testimonies collected and reviewed; literature review on mentorship (general and university-specific).

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

In addition to a comprehensive literature review conducted by the OVRPGS, a total of 24 written surveys from Concordia's CRCs were collected (2019), 21 in-person, hour-long interviews with CRCs were conducted (2019), and a meeting with 16 CRCs was held on the topic of mentorship needs to solicit feedback and discussion (2021).

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

1) Preliminary needs assessment conducted. 2) Environmental scan of existing (formal and informal) faculty mentorship arrangements at Concordia initiated. 3) Existing administrative capacities assessed. Importantly, the progress made during this period is in understanding the scope of the needs involved, which is substantial, multifaceted, and presents an enormous administrative challenge. Concordia is committed to implementing an equitable, beneficial, and functioning mentorship program for our CRCs and other faculty, a commitment that entails, to begin with, comprehensive awareness of the range and extent of needs to be met. In this respect, the challenges we faced during this period were in fact also progress made.

**Challenges encountered during the reporting period:**

Several challenges emerged from the hugely heterogeneous needs expressed by Concordia's CRC cohort: scope, mentor guidelines and pairing choices, funding sources and continuity, investment ("buy-in") by departments and Faculties, and evaluation and course-correction. In addition, while CRCs have identified CRCP-specific mentorship needs, there is also a reluctance among some to be singled out for "elite" treatment to meet those needs.

**Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):**

In 2022, Concordia will apply for the CRCP's EDI Stipend, for a mentorship implementation project involving an experienced mentorship and equity consultant (June 2022 – March 2023). In collaboration with the OVRPGS, the Equity Office, Office of Indigenous Directions, Black Perspectives Office, and Associate Deans of Research for Concordia University's four Faculties, the consultant will:

- Engage in consultation with CRCs and other stakeholders to understand mentorship needs and assess pathways to mentorship opportunities.
- Gather and collate available information with respect to mentorship at Concordia and post-secondary institutions to determine needs as well as best practices in mentorship programming.
- Develop a prioritized plan (immediate, medium, and long-term) with timelines and recommendations for the development of mentorship programming and its key aspects such as career progression, leadership, peer mentorship and networking.
- Collaborate with units across the University to ensure alignment of diversity, inclusivity, equity, and accessibility efforts.
- Develop and deliver a training plan with respect to the mentorship program's implementation.
- Issue recommendations with respect to credentialing and recognition for mentors and participants in mentorship training and programming.

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

No

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

**Key Objective 4**

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

"- To embed accessibility considerations in University processes, and facilitate communication between faculty/staff with disabilities and University administration - Involve federal granting agencies, and other federal and provincial government stakeholders, in investing in the financial costs of accessibility and accommodation - Attain specific, thorough knowledge of extent and priority of accessibility challenges"

**Systemic barriers -**

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

"Limited access and accommodation of the needs of disabled faculty and staff members" How identified: See Concordia's Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan for the Canada Research Chair Program, 2019, Sections 1 and 2.

### Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

Concordia's Accessibility Policy Advisory Group (APAG) reviewed and made recommendations to update the Policy on accessibility for students with disabilities (PRVPA-14), with the goal of integrating all persons with disabilities in the same policy and reinforcing our University commitment to accessibility. The process started with a review of accessibility policies for students and employees at Canadian universities as well as a variety of relevant legislative requirements. Prior to the start of the review process an extensive list was generated from feedback already received concerning accessibility from students and employees, including: • Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Working Group Report and Recommendations (2020) • Secretary General • Office of the Provost • Office of Rights and Responsibilities • Ombuds Office • Access Centre for Students with Disabilities • Human Resources and Employee Relations • Centre for Gender Advocacy – Revision Recommendations: Student Accessibility Policy • A review of Policies on Accessibility at Canadian Universities The members of the policy review group included undergraduate and graduate students, staff and faculty. The APAG met weekly from January to May 2021 and each week, a section of the policy was reviewed. Between each meeting, members of APAG were encouraged to send feedback and suggestions. Stakeholders from different areas of the University were invited to meet with the APAG, including: Student Advocates; the Graduate Student Association; Office of Community Engagement; Hospitality; Centre for Teaching and Learning; Vice-Provost, Innovation in Teaching and Learning; Office of Rights and Responsibilities; Ombuds Office; and the Vice-President, Services and Sustainability. Sub-groups from the Access Centre for Students with Disabilities (ACSD) and Human Resources (HR) met to work on procedures.

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

See Section D, below, for detailed discussion of qualitative and quantitative data gathered, and indicators for this objective.

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

January 18, 2021 Topics discussed: • Review of the working group's mandate and the 2003 policy (PRVPA-14) January 25, 2021 Topics discussed: • Review of the feedback already received from various sources • Review of title, preamble, scope and purpose of the policy Guests invited to discuss student concerns and recommendations for the policy specific to students: • Lisa White, Director and Senior Advisor, Office of Rights and Responsibilities • Amy Fish, Ombudsperson, Ombuds Office • Sophie Stone, Advocacy Coordinator, Student Advocacy Centre, CSU February 1, 2021 Topics discussed: • Continued discussion of feedback collected and updated the list from the feedback of guests at previous meeting • Continued discussion on the purpose, preamble and scope of the policy Guest invited to discuss concerns, issues and recommendations for the policy related to teaching and learning and supporting students and faculty: • Sandra Gabriele, Vice-Provost, Innovation in Teaching and Learning, Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic February 8, 2021 Topics discussed: • Finalized the sections on preamble, scope, and purpose • Discussed format of the policy and the order, including how to address students and employees in the same policy in a way that makes it clear for the users of the policy • Review of the roles and responsibilities and education training sections of the policy Guest invited to discuss accessibility of communications: • Philippe Beauregard, Chief Communications Officer, University Communications Services February 15, 2021 Topics discussed: • Continued review of roles and responsibilities section of the policy Guests invited to discuss accessibility of events: • Petra Alves-Noonan, Manager, Conference Services • Andrea Clarke, Senior Director, Community Engagement and Social Impact, Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic • Susan Edey, Interim Program Manager, SHIFT, Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic February 22, 2021 Topics discussed: • Continued review of roles and responsibilities section of the policy • Review of student section Guest invited: • Naveena Kumaresan, President – Graduate Students' Association March 1, 2021 Topics discussed: • Began review of employee section March 8, 2021 Topics discussed: • Review of definitions section March 15, 2021 Topics discussed: Guests invited to discuss facilities: • Michal Di Grappa, Vice-President, Services and Sustainability March 22, 2021 • Information session for students registered with the Access Centre for Students with Disabilities March 29, 2021 • Information session for faculty and staff April 12, 2021 Topics discussed: • Continued review of draft policy; incorporating feedback from information session April 19, 2021 Topics discussed: • Update from the follow-up conversation with students • Discussion on procedures for employees April 26, 2021 Topics discussed: • Continued review of draft policy • Update from the follow-up conversation with staff May 3, 2021 Topics discussed: • Continued review of draft policy • Review of employee procedures document May 10, 2021 Topics discussed: • Continued review of draft; has been reviewed by Legal Counsel with the goal of shortening the policy to be more in line with other Concordia policies May 17, 2021 Topics discussed: • Draft policy was uploaded to the Concordia website for community review and feedback • Continued review of employee procedures document • Review of student procedures document May 31, 2021 Topics discussed: • Review of feedback from community • Draft policy is ready to be forwarded to the appropriate offices for approval • Final meeting of committee June to August, 2021 Topics discussed: • Draft policy reviewed by the Office of the Secretary-General • Continued revisions to the procedures document for employees and students by subgroups in HR and ACSD • Policy discussion at the President's Executive Group

### Challenges encountered during the reporting period:

Concordia is a highly diverse community and every effort to address accessibility must be grounded in an understanding that each person's experience is impacted by many factors. The University recognizes that a person's perspective or circumstance (such as ethnicity, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, religion, faith, indigeneity, immigration status, language ability and/or socio-economic factors) could impact their needs, options and choices. The University also recognizes that systemic oppression, including, but not limited to, sexism, racism, colonialism, ableism, homophobia and/or transphobia, can impact the accommodation and/or resources a member of our community with a disability may feel comfortable to request. The needs of each member with a disability vary, and corresponding consideration will be taken regarding the types and forms of support and accommodation.

**Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):**

A new DRAFT Policy on Accessibility and Accommodation for Students and Employees was developed. The DRAFT Policy on Accessibility and Accommodations for Students and Employees was updated with feedback from graduate and undergraduate students, faculty and staff, and submissions to the accessibility review email. The updates reflect significant revisions including a new introduction, scope, purpose and updated definitions and roles and responsibilities. The updated draft policy also includes a detailed list of support services, resources, and contacts. Senate will review the Policy for approval in May 2022. The Accessibility Policy Review Group is also developing procedures on accommodations for students and employees, which will be made available in May 2022. Following the official release of the policy, staff from the Equity Office, Human Resources, and other implicated units will visit departments across the University, including academic departments, services, and facilities. The goal of each visit will be to provide an overview of the updated policy, to expand on employees' rights and obligations with respect to it, and to respond to any questions or concerns. In late 2021, Concordia's Facilities Management team conducted a physical accessibility audit with the help of third-party experts. Though the physical audits provided some key data, hearing from community members is just as important for the facilities improvement process. Therefore in 2022, all students, staff and faculty will be invited to provide input in a number of ways: three 90-minute participatory sessions (inclusive and accessible washrooms; expanded scope – accessible routes, signage and wayfinding; inclusive and accessible teaching and learning spaces), and the online Accessible and Inclusive Facilities survey.

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

No

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

**Key Objective 5**

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

Key Objective 5:

"To ensure that EDI considerations are fully applied from the earliest stages of CRC planning and allocation."

**Systemic barriers -**

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

"As with all research chairs, the stated criteria for allocation of available CRCs are research excellence and fit with the University's Strategic Research Plan. As such, the allocation of chairs is susceptible to systemic bias in the resourcing and advocacy pool." How identified: See Concordia's Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan for the Canada Research Chair Program, 2019, Sections 1 and 2.

**Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:**

The core action taken was to require mandatory training for Faculty Research Committee (FRC) and the University Research Committee (URC) members involved in CRC allocations and place a greater emphasis on EDI in the assessment of LOIs. This would contribute to ensuring that equity considerations are fully applied from the earliest stages of CRC planning and allocation. Briefly, the Faculty Research Committee (FRC), or its equivalent, is a Faculty-based committee which makes recommendations to the URC with consideration to the Faculties' context, culture and strategic priorities. For the purposes of this action item, the FRC in each Faculty (Fine Arts, the Gina Cody School of Engineering and Computer Science, the John Molson School of Business, and Arts and Science) make strategic recommendations to the URC regarding the internal allotment of available Research Chairs, selection of candidates, and evaluation of Chairholders. The University Research Committee (URC) is a central committee which oversees procedures for the internal allocation, nominations and renewals of Research Chairs, ensuring an institutional perspective. To realize these objectives, two new training sessions were developed for the FRCs and URC, respectively. The goals for both sessions were to align with the University EDI strategy; meet specific needs of committee members, and to avoid a "check-box" approach; to expand upon the online training provided by the Tri-council; to allow for discussion and knowledge exchange, which online modules do not allow for; and to open up communication with the Equity Office in the event that further support is needed. Of note, members of the FRCs and URC had completed the required Tri-council unconscious bias training module upon appointment. Though well received, the consensus was that campus-based sessions would be instrumental in meeting both institutional needs as well as needs specific to each committee and Faculty. An important aspect for preparation for the FRC sessions was to meet individually with each Associate Dean, Research or equivalent in each of the four Faculties prior to the workshop. Those meetings included an overview of the session, and discussion on particular needs and concerns, past experiences engaging equity considerations in adjudication, and dynamics of representation of applicants within the specific Faculty in question. Following the meetings with the Associate Deans, Research, a general module was created that provided an overview of the issues and addressed the main needs that arose in prior consultations. The topics included were the following: Equity in Canadian Higher Education; Equity at Concordia, including recommendations for supporting innovative and inclusive teaching and research from the EDI Working Group Final Report; Equity in research awards processes; Unconscious Bias; Experiences that support and advance inclusive excellence; Barriers to inclusive adjudication process; and Designing the adjudication process. The URC session involved close collaboration between the Advisor, Institutional Recognition Initiatives, Office of Research and the Senior Equity Advisor, Equity Office regarding the development of content and the delivery of the session itself. The Manager, Operations, Research and Graduate Studies sector was also consulted regarding the needs and past experiences of the URC, and scheduling. As compared to the FRC sessions, the URC session had less content due to participants' more extensive experience with equity issues (the committee includes two CRCs and five Concordia University Research Chairs, in addition to senior leadership). This afforded more time for in-depth and targeted discussion of issues involved.



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

As of December 2021, the FRCs for Fine Arts, the John Molson School of Business (one session each) and the Gina Cody School of Engineering and Computer Science (two sessions) have completed the required workshop. Feedback based on discussions is integrated into the sections on progress and/or outcomes, challenges and next steps. The sessions for the FRC in Arts & Science (two sessions) and the URC are planned for January 2022.

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

The inaugural sessions for the FRCs (with the Arts and Science FRC and URC scheduled for January 2022) were welcomed opportunities for the Equity Office to open the conversation with these particular committees, learn about their specific concerns, and plan for additional engagement in the future, including updated content for these sessions. One benefit of the session was the opportunity to learn about select Faculty-specific equity initiatives, which resulted in some opportunities for follow-up conversations and feedback on drafts of working documentation. Some Faculties are arranging their own equity-focused workshops and educational events, which open up further opportunities for consultation, collaboration and alignment. From the sessions completed thus far, it is apparent that committee members are well aware of the Tri-council unconscious bias module, suggesting a shared level of familiarity and understanding of the nature of unconscious bias on processes we engage in. Further, in addition to the present sessions, this module will continue to be required for new committee appointees to ensure that this familiarity is sustaining and can be integrated in future discussions.

**Challenges encountered during the reporting period:**

A major challenge was the need to address Faculty-specific, and at times discipline-specific, needs with a given research sector. This issue is made more complex due to the different dynamics of underrepresentation across disciplines. For example, some committee members report extensive difficulties identifying candidates from certain underrepresented groups in disciplines in which there are longstanding barriers to participation. Another factor was the extent to which equity issues manifest within the research topics in question themselves, which is more common in the social sciences, humanities and the arts. For areas where engaging with equity questions in research is less common, such as some areas of engineering and business, there can be more difficulty envisioning how equity can be integrated in the process. These are questions which have arisen during the required campus-based training for members of hiring committees, and are clearly ongoing concerns. A frequently mentioned challenge is that involving evaluation criteria. A major recommendation for equitable processes, including adjudication, is the integration of inclusive excellence considerations into the criteria. A major counterpoint was that for some competitions, external agencies set criteria which do not include inclusive excellence explicitly. Some suggested that considering equity at this stage was too late in the process, referring to the cumulative impact of barriers to inclusion in addition to the limitation presented by the required criteria. There was a suggestion to incorporate this discussion of equity in the vetting of criteria, at least for internal competitions, to partially address this issue. Another challenge was the ongoing need to incorporate discussion of the impact of the pandemic on research and its intersection with issues of equity. There is common understanding that the pandemic impacted members of underrepresented groups disproportionately. However, there remain questions about how this should be addressed. A frequently referenced example is how the requirement of pandemic-impact statements from applicants presents additional work and is less feasible for those who are most impacted, including those from underrepresented groups. Of note, the University has offered accommodations for some faculty members via an application process, which a significant number have been able to take advantage of. The variation in experience with and desire to engage equity, including some continued resistance to the relevance of inclusive excellence to the research sector, in addition to reported "equity fatigue", was an additional challenge. There is a diversity of responses to equity in this context, including faculty who are well-versed in the area and may be considered champions of EDI, faculty who have intermediate EDI knowledge and are looking to deepen their understanding, others who are less familiar with the topic and issues, but are open/eager to learn more, and finally, those who do not feel that EDI is applicable to research and/or are resistant to incorporating equity considerations in this area. Addressing both practical and conceptual concerns directly as well as additional strategies to further communicate institution commitment, priorities and expectations will be important. Finally, more discussion on the consequences of not incorporating equity into research in different fields is an aspect we have begun to incorporate in offerings and is a consideration that is worthwhile to further explore, both with respect to internal repercussions as well as possible repercussions through granting agencies. We elaborate on these strategies in the "Next Steps" section below. Finally, scheduling the sessions was an occasional challenge due to the limited availability of committee members. The main approaches included being invited to an existing meeting or scheduling two separate meetings in order to accommodate all committee members.

**Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):**

As mentioned, the sessions for the Arts and Science FRC and the URC are planned for January 2022. Following the completion of all sessions, the content for both respective workshops will be revisited and feedback from each session will be carefully considered and integrated into an updated module where possible and appropriate. Additionally, each committee will be required to devote the same time to the session. The time allotted ranged from 45 minutes to 1 hour depending on the committee, which resulted in certain sessions feeling rushed and/or limited in terms of discussion time. Regarding content, consideration will be given to consequences of not incorporating inclusive excellence perspectives and practices, in addition to the current approach focusing on the benefits of doing so. This approach may support participants in their understanding of the centrality of inclusive excellence in the research sector. Finally, the intention is to maintain ongoing conversation with FRC and URC members across the four Faculties, addressing long-standing issues in addition to new concerns as they arise.

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

No

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

**Key Objective 6**



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

Key Objective 6:

"To sensitize hiring committees to the importance of EDI at earlier stage in hiring discussions and decisions."

#### Systemic barriers -

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

"The primacy granted to collegial decision-making in the recruitment process means there is little room for formal interventions on EDI grounds prior to the formulation of a hiring recommendation, when doing so might be more formative. This makes interventions on EDI grounds (i.e., the rejection, by the Dean or OPVPA) more drastic—and makes them far more costly in terms of delays and lost candidates—risking resentment and adversity between colleagues and senior administration." How identified: See Concordia's Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan for the Canada Research Chair Program, 2019, Sections 1 and 2.

#### Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

There has been ongoing, productive discussion within the Concordia University Faculty Association (CUFA) regarding approaches to embedding equity into the processes outlined in the association's collective agreement, including expanding the role of the Joint Employment Equity Committee (JEEC). The initial objectives of this action item were to increase the engagement of JEEC in the recruitment process to serve as observing equity champions throughout the entire DHC process, as opposed to the current model which focuses on later stages only. Though discussions on this are ongoing, an adjacent approach was developed via a partnership between the Equity Office, the Office of the Provost, the Deans of the four Faculties, and the University Librarian. Specifically, the Faculty Equity Advocate Program was launched and is in its pilot phase for the 2021-2022 academic year. The overarching goal of the program was to engage members of the professoriate and librarians in the processes that centre equity via appointments as Equity Advocates, within a context of collegiality and co-definition of participation. The program strives for an interdisciplinary focus, which, for example, encourages the appointment of equity advocates to recruitment exercises outside of their own Faculty/area to support in-depth, authentic discussion on equity matters free of disciplinary-specific frameworks and language and unit-specific relational dynamics. The goal is to provide Equity Advocates with ongoing training and support, in addition to prioritizing opportunities to provide their feedback given the high level of engagement they would have had in the past and will have as a result of participation in the program. The program forms part of an integrated approach to embedding equity engagement within all units at the University, with the intention of eventually extending support efforts to other faculty processes, such as reappointment, promotion and tenure, and to non-academic staff processes as well. The launch of the program involved senior leadership at all phases. An initial draft of the proposed program was developed in August 2021 by the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Faculty Development and Inclusion, the Executive Director, Equity Office, and the Senior Equity Advisor, Equity Office. The proposal focused on: the timeliness of wider adoption of the Equity Advocate process that had been required for the recruitment of past CRCs, and was an option increasingly requested by committees for other full-time faculty searches; the Faculty Equity Advocate selection and appointment process; the role of Equity Advocate, and the training and support strategy. The proposal was presented to Academic Cabinet for extensive comments and discussion later that month. In September 2021, a revised proposal was developed and assistance from the four Deans and University Librarian was provided in developing a list of potential nominees from across the units in question. In October, Department Chairs and Associate University Librarians were notified of the launch of the program, and asked to submit their materials (evaluation criteria, interview questions, and interview schedules) to the Equity Office. Nominees were invited to participate in the program, initial one-on-one interest meetings were held, and final appointments were made. In November 2021, a two-part orientation for appointees was held, covering topics on inclusive excellence, Canadian higher education, University-specific activity and action plans, an overview of the program including relevant policies, best practices and support, in-depth discussion on equity challenges within academic recruitment including personal experiences, and further exploration of the nature and impacts of unconscious biases, and strategies to mitigate them. In December 2021, equity advocates were given their inaugural assignments to support specific tenure-track processes in progress. Regarding recruitment challenges, it was emphasized that participation in the program was flexible and would be co-designed in order to fit within the limited schedules of appointees. Finally, particular attention was given to processes specific to the Library, including clarifying where processes were identical, similar, and/or differed from processes in academic departments.

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

In October 2021, 22 nominations for the program were extended to colleagues across the four Faculties and the Library. In total, 11 appointments were made following meetings with nominees. In addition, the Associate Dean, Faculty Relations and Inclusion, Faculty of Fine Arts elected to participate in the group meetings and trainings as an observer. In December 2021, 10 of the 11 appointees were assigned as Faculty equity advocates for a specific tenure-track search. In addition, the Senior Equity Advisor served as the equity advocate for eight searches, including for six CRCs. Materials were received for 25 of the open searches, which ranged from drafts to final versions. In total, there were 53 regular tenure-track positions and six CRC positions posted in Fall 2021, with deadlines ranging from September 20 to December 31.

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

The core content for the program was developed. This included templates for notification to unit heads and invitation to nominees, outlines for individual meetings with nominees, educational training content for the orientations, and a system (albeit very manual) for tracking hiring committee materials. In 2022, content for monthly meetings and evaluation of the program will be developed. In addition, given the rich discussions had at the orientation meetings, detailed notes are being kept, including on aspects of program development and growth. In particular, content and topic suggestions for future meetings are being recorded, with corresponding resources being compiled, in order to meet the training desires of the participants. A list of colleagues who have been identified as particularly committed to and experienced in matters of equity is being compiled, in the event that they are invited to participate in the program in the future. Relatedly, even with a relatively small number of appointees (11), two sessions of each of the two orientation meetings were necessary due to limited availability of appointees. This is likely to be the case moving forward with the planned monthly meetings. As the program and number of appointees grows, scheduling, and the number of repeat meetings, will continue to be a major consideration.

**Challenges encountered during the reporting period:**

An initial barrier was the identification, recruitment, and appointment of qualified appointees. It was important to identify invitees who had experience engaging issues of equity in some aspect of their work, including research, teaching, and service, and to avoid nominating colleagues who were actively resistant to EDIA efforts. An important consideration was that of transferable skill-sets. For example, a good candidate did not necessarily require previous equity engagement as we would train them, but a commitment to fairness and other principles could be transferable to this undertaking and we considered this accordingly. Once invited to participate in the program, all nominees were given the opportunity to meet with Equity Office staff for an overview of the program, clarifications of commitment and expectations, and to answer questions. Almost all nominees expressed time constraints as a major concern, which was expected due to heavy commitments of faculty being commonplace. In addition, junior faculty nominees expressed the need to focus on their tenure process, with those from designated groups reporting feeling particularly vulnerable. Ultimately, half of the nominees accepted their invitations to join the program. In addition, highlighting processes specific to the Library was an occasional barrier given that the vast majority of appointees were professors with no experience in librarian recruitment. A major overall challenge for the program was its relatively late start in the academic year compared to the actual recruitment cycle of tenure-track faculty. Most faculty positions were posted between late September and early October. In contrast, the program was launched in mid-October, with assignments to hiring committees finally made in December. In future iterations of the program, it will be important to engage in important program touch-points earlier in the academic year, for example appointment to the program in late-September/early-October, orientation in mid-to-late-October, and assignments to a specific recruitment exercise in early-to-mid November. This will increase the opportunities for equity advocates to contribute to conversations on equity, many of which take place at the beginning of the hiring committee's processes. Another major overall challenge, some of which can be attributed to the newness of the program, was to track, file, and review materials sent by hiring committees. Impediments included the large number of searches, the lack of response from a significant proportion of searches after follow-up messages, the volume and variability of inquiries and submitted materials, and the labour-intensive nature of the filing, all taking place within the context of the academic year with various peak periods for this and other programs in the office. The participation of the four Deans and University Librarian, the Associate Dean, Faculty Relations and Inclusion, Faculty of Fine Arts, and other administrative leaders contributed significantly to discussions, and continued to ensure that faculty were aware of the program and requirements for participation. In the future, it will be important to build in more clarity of expectations regarding participation in the program and to streamline the administrative processes around tracking, filing, and responding to inquiries in order to build on the early successes of the program.

**Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):**

Most immediately, the scheduling and development of monthly meetings are a priority for the beginning of 2022. The goal will be to have one meeting each month from January until April. In addition to monthly meetings, continued personalized support will be available for equity advocate appointees, for both specific recruitment assignments and general equity concerns and development. Relatedly, the goal will be to assign equity advocates to searches for faculty members with limited term appointments (LTAs). Positions for LTAs are typically posted in March/April, with most committee deliberations taking place in May. This would allow equity advocates to be assigned to searches at the outset, thereby maximizing opportunities to contribute to and influence the processes. In addition, the University will be recruiting two Canada Excellence Research Chairs (CERCs), one in Empowered aging: Well-being, technology, and creativity in everyday lives and another in Sustainable, Smart and Resilient Aerospace, opening additional opportunities for assignments. A repository of resources for appointees will be compiled in order to support their development and their work with particular committees. In addition to making all program presentations and documentation available, the repository will also include noted articles, books, videos, websites, key figures, and other resources. Finally, feedback on the program will be gathered from both equity advocates and hiring committees who interacted with the program. Advocates will have the option of providing feedback in a final meeting with the Senior Equity Advisor, or in written form in response to standard questions, depending on their availability. Hiring committee chairs who submitted materials to the program and/or otherwise interacted with the program via inquiries or other means will be invited to provide their thoughts on how the program can best support their future recruitment efforts.

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

No

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

## Challenges and Opportunities

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

Opportunity: Equity Office. The launch of Concordia's Equity Office was announced on October 22, 2020. The office now serves as an umbrella unit to develop and implement the EDI action plan, coordinate and harmonize EDI resources and initiatives across the University, and provide services and support to the community, including working with groups whose mandate includes addressing systemic discrimination. The search for the Equity Office's inaugural Executive Director was completed in January 2021. The Executive Director is responsible for developing and implementing University-wide strategies and an institutional action plan, and collaborating with other leaders and offices to address the complexity and nuances of equity, diversity, accessibility and inclusion. The position reports to the Deputy Provost, with a dotted reporting line to the Associate Vice-President of Human Resources. Opportunity: President's Task Force on Anti-Black Racism. Following the resurgence of the Black Lives Matter movement in response to police violence and persistent inequities impacting Black communities, Concordia University committed to the work of addressing race-related issues among its members and in its institutional fabric. The creation of the President's Task Force on Anti-Black Racism is a testament to that commitment. On November 30, 2020, the task force finalized the subcommittees' membership, defined their terms of reference and presented a workplan to the interim provost. In June 2021, the task force presented Concordia's provost with a progress report on the work of the subcommittees that identifies immediate action items. In Fall 2021, the task force presented the provost with its preliminary recommendations resulting from the progress report that was submitted in June. In June 2022, Concordia's president will receive a comprehensive set of recommendations from the task force, and an action plan to combat anti-Black racism at Concordia. Challenges: With respect to the pandemic's effects on the implementation of the institution's Action Plan, the impacts have been pervasive and have required the institution to develop acute strategies to deal with the move to remote working for the vast majority of staff. With respect to our EDI Action Plan, two processes that experienced major impacts were the Equity Census and our faculty recruitment efforts. The launch of the Equity Census was originally planned for Winter 2020 but was postponed and launched instead in February 2021. In addition, the intended format of a paper-based instrument, supported by visiting departments in-person to maximize response rates was replaced with a revised strategy of hosting the census online. With respect to faculty recruitment, all in-person processes were moved to the virtual environment, including trainings, committee meetings and all interviews, which required significant adjustment on the part of hiring committees and staff. Difficulties encountered for both committee members and candidates included challenging remote workspaces (e.g., interruptions, small or otherwise limited physical space, suboptimal internet connectivity, etc.), personal effects of dealing with pandemic (e.g. being personally impacted, mental health impacts, gender and other group-based inequities, etc.), and scheduling interviews across a range of different time zones.

## Reporting on EDI Stipend objectives not accounted for in Part A

### Instructions:

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

### Objectives associated with your institution's EDI Stipend application

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

#### EDI Stipend Objective 1

Indicate the S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) objective(s) towards which this funding has been directed:

To shift the onus of responsibility for accessibility from individual CRC applicants with disabilities to Concordia's recruitment and allocation processes themselves.

Indicator(s): Describe indicators, as presented in the EDI Stipend application, and how they are calculated.

- Review Concordia's materials, policies, and processes associated with PWDs and the CRC recruitment and allocation processes;
- Identify barriers to PWDs and recommend modifications within these same materials, policies, and processes;
- Develop best practice guidelines for individuals and committees involved in the recruitment and allocation processes. The consultant gathered, reviewed, and analyzed a wide body of Concordia and external documentary texts, as well as textual and visual images associated with disability, for procedural clarity and coherence, and a communicated understanding of the construct of disability. Six models of disability were analyzed, as were national disability rates in comparison both with types of disability and rates of employment. Longitudinal methods were employed using the 2006 Employment Equity Data Report, the 2017 Canadian Survey on Disability, and 2021 CRCP aggregate program self-identification data, with qualitative reflective methodologies employed to provide coherence to these heterogeneously collected datasets; a small set of focused interviews was also employed. Provincial and federal legislative and human rights frameworks were analyzed and compared.

**Progress:** Describe results observed, including indicator results, outcomes, impacts. Include timelines (start and end dates).

Much of the consultant's focus was on the perception, on the part of potential, reasonably diligent CRC applicants, of Concordia's commitment to accessibility as a whole. Many recommendations and best practices were therefore folded into Concordia's new, University-wide Draft Policy on Accessibility and Accommodations for Students and Employees, undertaken by the Accessibility Policy Advisory Group (APAG) in 2021 with the goal of integrating all persons with disabilities in the same policy and reinforcing our University commitment to accessibility. The new Draft Policy has been updated with feedback from graduate and undergraduate students, faculty and staff, and submissions to the accessibility review email. The updates reflect significant revisions to its precursor, the Policy on Accessibility for Students with Disabilities (2003), including a new introduction, scope, purpose and updated definitions and roles and responsibilities. The updated draft policy also includes a detailed list of support services, resources, and contacts. The consultant's timeline was January 2021 - June 2021. Final internal report completed June 2021.

Outline the total expenditures below:

Total funds of EDI stipend spent on the objective: 40000

Total funds spent:

### Table C2. EDI Stipend Impact Rating

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this objective as identified in your application, for the reporting period:

Major impact (the EDI Stipend had a major impact on achieving progress)

Provide a high level summary of how the stipend was used:

Concordia contracted with a Canadian EDI consultant with extensive experience in the field of employment and disability for a six-month period (January – June, 2021) to: • Review Concordia's materials, policies, and processes associated with PWDs and the CRC recruitment and allocation processes; • Identify barriers to PWDs and recommend modifications within these same materials, policies, and processes; • Develop best practice guidelines for individuals and committees involved in the recruitment and allocation processes. The consultant was tasked with a detailed review of current CRC materials and hiring processes. These include applicable public-facing documents and materials that have been developed and implemented by Concordia in its efforts to attract successful applications by individuals with self-declared disabilities to its various Canada Research Chair postings. The consultant was also tasked with making recommendations that will assist in shifting the onus of accessibility from individuals to the recruitment and allocation processes themselves.

Do you have other objectives to add?

No

### Additional Objectives (if applicable)

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

**EDI Stipend Objective 2**

**EDI Stipend Objective 3**

**EDI Stipend Objective 4**

**EDI Stipend Objective 5**

**EDI Stipend Objective 6**

## Part D: Engagement with individuals from underrepresented groups

Outline how the institution has engaged with underrepresented groups: e.g., racialized minorities, Indigenous Peoples, persons with disabilities, women, LGBTQ2+ individuals, during the implementation of the action plan (during the reporting period), including how they have been involved in identifying and implementing any course corrections/adjustments, if applicable. For example, how was feedback gathered on whether the measures being implemented are resulting in a more inclusive research environment for chairholders of underrepresented groups? How has intersectionality been considered in developing and implementing the plan (if applicable)? Have new gaps been identified? How will members of underrepresented groups continue to be engaged? (limit: 10 200 characters)

In addition to those engagements with members of underrepresented groups described throughout this report, the following engagements were vital to Concordia's equity progress in 2021. A point of pride for Concordia is striving continually for a person-centred approach to inclusivity, which aims to ensure that all students, faculty, and staff can fully participate in University life through expanding accessibility for people with disabilities. Creating meaningful change on campus requires a culture of openness and closely listening to diverse community voices. We recognize that our check-ins and consultations empower us to re-think, re-imagine and re-emerge as an even better University. To continue moving forward in the right direction, in 2021, Concordia undertook a series of University consultations, policy reviews and improvements to the University's digital and physical spaces to create more inclusive teaching, learning, research and work environments for people with disabilities. Highlights of some of the work completed in 2021 and still underway are: Completion of our accessibility policy review. The Accessibility Policy Advisory Group (APAG) completed work on an updated University-wide accessibility policy. The group's mandate included consulting with the community to review and make recommendations to update the Policy on Accessibility for Students with Disabilities (PRVPA-14) with the goal of outlining procedures, resources, and options available to all University members with disabilities (students, faculty, and staff) in the same policy. The newly revised policy includes important new updates and procedures that address and expand accessibility and accommodations for students, faculty, and staff. The revised policy also underlines the importance of considering the impact of intersectionality for people with disabilities. The policy is under the purview of the Office of the Provost and with the support of the Equity Office, Concordia will continue to support and advance accessibility University-wide. This includes rolling out a series of best practice workshops and working directly with individual departments and units to support positive change. The APAG's review process included careful consideration of the Centre for Gender Advocacy's monumental reports on its Mapping Project. The Mapping Project was a one-of-a-kind research project that ran from 2018 until the end of 2020. The project was supported and coordinated mainly by Concordia alumni who identify as LGBTQ2+ and/or disabled. It used surveys, interviews, and focus groups to highlight the experiences of Trans, Queer, and Disabled Concordia students. In the end, the Project heard from over 300 Concordia community members including students, staff, and faculty. Students shared recommendations for the University and these along with their experiences were compiled into the Mapping Project report. Complementing the larger project, a review was undertaken of Concordia's Student Accessibility policy, providing recommendations for a much-needed update to the 16-year-old policy. The project focused on the following barriers faced by students: Attitudinal (i.e. lack of knowledge, prejudice, etc.), Structural (i.e. physical access, washroom access, etc.); and Systemic (i.e. policies, training, pedagogical approaches, etc.) Making teaching and learning more accessible: With a specific focus on the educational experience, in summer 2021, Concordia's Vice-Provost of Innovation in Teaching & Learning and chair of the Teaching and Learning Accessibility Advisory Committee (TLAAC), invited Concordia students and faculty to participate in surveys on their University experiences with accessibility. The committee includes students and faculty with disabilities working alongside the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the Access Centre for Students with Disabilities. Rollout of a pilot project on accessible teaching: In summer 2021, the CTL invited students and faculty to take part in a pilot project to help make their Moodle pages more accessible. Following training they received as accessibility change agents, students worked with faculty to develop a variety of best practices in accessible teaching. These practices include performing accessibility audits of Moodle courses and of commonly used teaching tools such as Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF), Microsoft PowerPoint and Word documents. The results of the pilot informed both the recommendations that TLAAC released in Fall 2021 and the work of the CTL in supporting our faculty to make their course sites and teaching more accessible. Identifying, assessing and removing physical barriers to accessibility and inclusivity: Starting in 2016, Concordia undertook a series of audits to determine how it could render 14 of its main buildings more accessible for people with disabilities by identifying, assessing, and removing barriers that can limit access to our campuses. In late 2021, Concordia's Facilities Management team conducted a physical accessibility audit with the help of third-party experts. They evaluated buildings from several vantage points, including getting to and around spaces and looking at how well they serve those with diverse access needs.

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

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

<https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/02/10/concordias-newly-formed-equity-office-appoints-its-inaugural-executive-director.html>  
<https://www.concordia.ca/provost/about/areas/black-perspectives-office/about.html>  
<https://www.concordia.ca/cunews/main/stories/2021/11/15/the-president-s-task-force-on-anti-black-racism-releases-its-preliminary-recommendations.html>  
<https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/04/21/concordia-places-among-the-world-s-top-100-universities-for-its-support-of-the-un-sustainable-development-goals.html>  
<https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/09/21/concordia-joins-other-institutions-to-deliver-the-cirodd-summer-school-in-societal-transformation.html?rootnav=news/stories>  
<https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/11/05/concordia-course-tackles-the-uns-sustainable-development-goals.html>

In addition to the initiatives discussed in Concordia's EDI Action Plan for the Canada Research Chairs Program, and those listed in previous progress reports thereon, the following initiatives at Concordia bear noting: • Concordia launches Pikiskwétân (Let's Talk) — an Indigenous learning series for faculty and staff, January 11, 2021, <https://www.concordia.ca/cunews/main/stories/2021/01/11/concordia-launches-pikiskwetan-let-s-talk-an-indigenous-learning-series-for-faculty-and-staff.html?rootnav=news/stories> • Concordia's newly formed Equity Office appoints its inaugural executive director, February 10, 2021, <https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/02/10/concordias-newly-formed-equity-office-appoints-its-inaugural-executive-director.html> o Appointment of Office Assistant, Equity Advisor, and Senior Equity Advisor to their roles in the Equity Office, <https://www.concordia.ca/equity/about/team.html> • Appointment of the Black Perspectives Office Facilitator, <https://www.concordia.ca/provost/about/areas/black-perspectives-office/about.html> • Concordia's John Molson School of Business earns a gender-parity certification, April 6, 2021, <https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/04/06/concordias-john-molson-school-of-business-earns-a-gender-parity-certification.html> • Increasing accessibility in Concordia's teaching, learning, research and working environments, October 18, 2021, <https://www.concordia.ca/cunews/main/stories/2021/10/18/increasing-accessibility-in-concordias-teaching-learning-research-and-working-environments.html> • The President's Task Force on Anti-Black Racism releases its preliminary recommendations, November 15, 2021, <https://www.concordia.ca/cunews/main/stories/2021/11/15/the-president-s-task-force-on-anti-black-racism-releases-its-preliminary-recommendations.html> • Sustainable Development Goals o Concordia places among the world's top 100 universities for its support of the UN Sustainable Development Goals, April 21, 2021, <https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/04/21/concordia-places-among-the-world-s-top-100-universities-for-its-support-of-the-un-sustainable-development-goals.html> o Concordia joins other institutions to deliver the CIRODD Summer School in Societal Transformation, September 21, 2021, <https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/09/21/concordia-joins-other-institutions-to-deliver-the-cirodd-summer-school-in-societal-transformation.html?rootnav=news/stories> o Concordia course tackles the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, November 5, 2021, <https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/11/05/concordia-course-tackles-the-uns-sustainable-development-goals.html>

<https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/02/10/concordias-newly-formed-equity-office-appoints-its-inaugural-executive-director.html>

<https://www.concordia.ca/provost/about/areas/black-perspectives-office/about.html>

<https://www.concordia.ca/cunews/main/stories/2021/11/15/the-president-s-task-force-on-anti-black-racism-releases-its-preliminary-recommendations.html>

<https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/04/21/concordia-places-among-the-world-s-top-100-universities-for-its-support-of-the-un-sustainable-development-goals.html>

<https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/09/21/concordia-joins-other-institutions-to-deliver-the-cirodd-summer-school-in-societal-transformation.html?rootnav=news/stories>

<https://www.concordia.ca/news/stories/2021/11/05/concordia-course-tackles-the-uns-sustainable-development-goals.html>

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

I have reviewed my responses and I am ready to submit my report.

A reminder that institutions are required to post a copy of this report (as submitted) on their public accountability and transparency web pages within 7 working days of the deadline for submitting the report to TIPS.

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

Jointly administered by:

