



MEMORANDUM

To: Executive Committee of Faculty Council (March 20, 2018)
Faculty Council (April 11, 2018)

From: Professor Edgar Acosta
Chair, Community Affairs and Gender Issues (CA&GI)

Date: March 6, 2018

Re: **FASE Diversity Climate Survey Update**

REPORT CLASSIFICATION

This is a routine or minor policy matter that will be considered by the Executive Committee for approving and forwarding to Faculty Council for information.

BACKGROUND

At its April 12, 2016 meeting, Faculty Council approved a mandate for the Community Affairs & Gender Issues (CA&GI) Committee to develop the Diversity Climate Survey (DCS) as per the terms of reference described in Report 3499 Revised.

The dimensions of diversity included in Report 3499 Revised were:

1. Ethnicity
2. Gender and sexual orientation
3. Religion
4. Age
5. Disability
6. Legal status (marital, visa vs. residence/citizen, First Nations status)
7. Socio economic background

Furthermore, the objectives of the survey, as per Report 3499 Revised, are:

1. Assess the diversity of our community, including students, faculty and staff
2. Help identify groups facing marginalization, discrimination, disparagement or alienation

3. Assess if current FASE practices/policies provide support to identified groups, inviting comments on specific practices and policies and potential recommendations for changes
4. Increase awareness of diversity as a fundamental value for our FASE community

To address these objectives, a series of meetings took place throughout the 2016-2017 academic year to develop a first draft of the DCS. The committee considered DCS surveys conducted at UCLA, U. Maryland, and Texas A&M to identify potential questions that would align with the survey objectives, and a student experience survey from Ms. Cori Hanson (Chem. Eng., U of T), and June 2016 (revised) version of the U of T employment equity survey.

The 2017-2018 CA&GI Committee conducted a further review of the first draft of the DCS and prepared a consultation presentation to gather feedback from various groups of the FASE community. The consultation, still ongoing, has led the committee to develop a proposed structure and set of question priorities for the survey, as described below.

DIVERSITY CLIMATE SURVEY STRUCTURE AND PRIORITIES

The Diversity Climate Survey (DCS) will consist of two parts: the first will focus on diversity climate assessment (addressing objectives 2, 3 of the survey), and the second on diversity demographics (objective 1 of the survey). The results of the DCS will be compiled into a report that will identify the composition our community, and bring awareness of the current diversity climate in the Faculty, as well as issues faced by members of our community (objective 4).

The CA&GI Committee initially proposed for the two parts of the survey to be separated (minimizing chances of identification through demographics). However, the consultation feedback has shown overwhelming support for linking the two parts. The main reason argued for the proponents is that it is the only way to pinpoint specific groups that have been the subject of adverse behaviors. Others point to linking the two parts as a way to simplify the survey.

Part I – Priorities to Assess Diversity Climate

The following set of priorities (resulting from the question selection process) will be developed into questions that will be validated by survey consultants, and discussed with the office of Research Ethics of the University, as indicated in the implementation plan section of this report.

Priority #1. Identify participant’s status as a member of FASE community.

The current version of this question asks the participant to self-identify as:
Full-Time Undergraduate Student, Part-Time Undergraduate Student, Full-Time Graduate Student, Part-Time Graduate Student, Postdoctoral scholar, Sessional Instructor, USW Staff, Casual Staff, Tenure-Track Faculty, Tenured Faculty
Part I – Diversity climate

Priority #2. Assess overall opinion on current climate.

The current version of this question asks if one’s opinion, members of the FASE community are treated equitably regardless of their diversity dimension (Age, Gender, Cognitive disability, Ethnic Background, Nationality, Perceived socioeconomic status, Physical Disability, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Language).

Priority #3. Identify diversity climate issues –experienced incidents.

The current version of this question asks if the person, within the last four years has experienced any of the following incidents within the FASE community: Apathy/Being Ignored, Bias, Discrimination, Exclusion, Isolation, Insulting or disparaging remarks, harassment. Each of these incidents will have, associated with it, a severity scale.

Priority # 3.1. Examine the bases of the experienced incident(s).

This question will be prompted only if an incident is identified in Priority #3. The current version of the question for priority 3.1 asks, if a person has experienced adverse incidents, to indicate the bases of the incident (Age, Gender, Cognitive disability, Ethnic Background, Nationality, Perceived socioeconomic status, Physical Disability, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Language).

Priority # 3.2. Determine if any support was provided.

The current version of this question asks that if a person experienced an incident, if there was any form of support or accommodation provided. The current answers include yes, no, and did not seek assistance.

Priority #4. Identify diversity climate issues –witnessed incidents.

The current version of this question asks if the person, within the last four years has witnessed any of the following incidents within the FASE community: Apathy/Being Ignored, Bias, Discrimination, Exclusion, Isolation, Insulting or disparaging remarks, harassment. Each of these incidents will have, associated with it, a severity scale.

Priority # 4.1. Examine the bases of the witnessed incident(s).

This question will be prompted only if an incident is identified in Priority #3. The current version of the question for priority #4.1 asks, if a person has witnessed adverse incidents, to indicate the bases of the incident (Age, Gender, Cognitive disability, Ethnic Background, Nationality, Perceived socioeconomic status, Physical Disability, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Language).

Priority #5. Identify top initiatives to improve diversity climate at FASE.

The current version of the question asks to indicate the top three initiatives FASE could implement to improve its current practises/policies to support an integrated diverse community. The question has lines for open suggestions, but will also include, among the list of possibilities: improving communications relating to diversity/inclusion, Introducing changes in curriculum/course content that includes diversity issues, promote events focused on diversity and inclusion, recruitment of diverse faculty, recruitment of diverse staff, recruitment of diverse students, providing diversity training for faculty, providing diversity training for staff, providing diversity training for students, introducing student organizations dedicated to diversity/inclusion, providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts.

Priority #6. Provide an opportunity for open comments.

The current version of this question invites the participant to expand on any of the topics of priorities 2 through 5, or in relation to a topic not covered in the survey. While we do not expect statistical data coming from this question, this open-ended question was introduced to help provide some context to the data provided through the questions of priorities 2 through 5.

It must be clarified that for all questions, the option of choosing not to answer is included as an option.

Part II – Diversity Demographics

Most of the questions in this part of the survey were adapted from the demographic questions of the June 2016 U of T employment equity survey. The identification of the different groups in the U of T employment equity survey was taken, in great part, from the definitions in the Federal Contractors Program.

Priority #7. Identify participant’s gender and gender identity.

The current version of the question asks the participant to self-identify as Woman, Man, Trans, Two-Spirit or other.

Priority #8. Identify participant’s sexual orientation.

The current version of the question asks the participant to self-identify as (all that apply) Gay, Lesbian, Straight/Heterosexual, Bisexual, Queer, Two-Spirit, or other.

Priority #9. Determine if the participant self-identifies as person with disabilities.

The current version of the question asks if the participant self-identifies as a person with a disability (yes or no).

Priority #9.1. Assess impact of disability on the experience as a member of FASE.
This question is asked if the participant self-identifies as a person with disabilities. The current version of the question asks if the disability has represented a disadvantage in the participant's experience as a member of FASE (yes or no)

Priority #9.2. Determine if any accommodation has been provided.
The current version of the question asks if the disability has received any form of support or accommodation (yes or no)

Priority #9.3. Assess the type of disability.
The current version of the question asks to indicate the type(s) of disability, with the possibilities of visible, non-visible, or both. Note that this question was discussed at length within the committee, as we saw that this gross classification might be insufficient. However, after considering that this is an introductory survey, we consider that a more in-depth probe of this topic alone is required in the future. However, the result from this first survey can help guide those future efforts.

Priority #10 Determine Indigenous/Aboriginal People of North America status.

The question, in its current version asks if the participant self-identifies as an Indigenous/Aboriginal person of North America (yes or no)

Priority #10.1. Identify the specific group.
The current form of the question asks the participant, if previously self-identified as indigenous/aboriginal person, to identify which of the following group(s) applies: First Nations, Métis, Inuit, Native American/North American Indian (US), Another)

Priority #11 Determine race and ethnicity.

The current form of the question asks what racial and ethnic origins best identify the participant (checking all that apply):

- Asian: Asian Caribbean (e.g. Guyanese, Trinidadian), East Asian (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean), European (e.g. British, French, Spanish, Portuguese), South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan), South East Asian (e.g. Malaysian, Filipino, Vietnamese), Another.
- Black: African (e.g. Ghanaian, Kenyan, Somali), Caribbean (e.g. Barbadian, Jamaican, Grenadian), European (e.g. British, French, Spanish, Portuguese), North American (e.g. Canadian, American), South and Central American (e.g. Brazilian, Panamanian), Another.
- Latin/Hispanic: Caribbean (e.g. Cuban, Haitian), Central American (e.g. Mexican, Honduran), European (e.g. Spanish, Portuguese), South American (e.g. Brazilian, Argentinian), Another.
- Middle Eastern and North African: North African (e.g. Libyan, Moroccan), Middle Eastern (e.g. Syrian, Lebanese), West Asia (e.g. Iran, Afghani), Another.
- White: European (e.g. British, French, Polish, Russian), North American (e.g. Canadian), South American (e.g. Argentinian, Chilean), Another.

- **Mixed Race:** if a combination of the groups above does not represent the participant's race/ethnicity, then write which racial or ethnic origins best describe the participant.

Priority #12. Ascertain religious or spiritual identity.

The current form of the question asks first if the participant self-identifies as a member of a church, denomination or a religious community (yes or no). If yes, then to identify the group (Protestant, Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Islamic, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, Other (write in)).

Priority #13. Assess impact of socioeconomic status on experience as a member of FASE community.

The current form of the question asks if the participant's socioeconomic status has represented a disadvantage in the participant's experience as a member of the FASE community (yes or no).

Priority #14. Assess the age range of the participant.

The current form of the question asks the participant to self-identify its age range. The amplitude of each range is still under consideration.

Priority #15. Assess the participants' legal status.

The current form of the question asks the participant to self-identify its legal status in Canada: Canadian Citizen, Permanent resident, Visa/Study permit holder, Refugee status, Other legal status.

Priority #16. Assess the participants' familial status.

The current form of the question asks the participant to self-identify its familial status as: single, without children, single with children, married/common law/long-term relationship without children, married/common law/long-term relationship with children.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Throughout the remainder of the 2017-2018 term, additional consultation will be undertaken with stakeholders, which will be used to help finalize the wording of the questions associated with each priority.

In parallel, the committee plans to explore engaging Campus Labs to assist in the final development and implementation of the survey, as well as exploring other options to deploy the survey through web-based survey tools.

The University's office of Research Ethics and office of the Vice-President & Provost will also be consulted in the process before deployment.

The survey is expected to be deployed during the 2018-2019 term.

The summary of the results of the survey, and final report is expected to be ready for the 2019-2020 term.

PROCESS AND CONSULTATION

The DCS priorities were developed after a set of consultations were undertaken in the 2016-2017 term. Through our meetings, we decided that the DCS should be considered a first step towards more targeted surveys, which will be identified based on the data collected from this first survey. As such, the current version only contains the most important set of questions we could identify from all the sources cited above.

The following groups/organizations were consulted at different stages of development of the DCS survey:

- CAGI committee 2016-2017: Edgar Acosta, Keryn Lian, Linda Drisdelle, Tobin Filleter, Peter Weiss, Namya Syal, Zhenglin Liu, Cori Hanson, Berj Bardakjian, Marianne Hatzopoulou, Cuilian Fang, Marina Reny, Dawn Britton, Jason Foster.
- CAGI committee 2017-2018: Edgar Acosta, Tobin Filleter, Julie Audet, Eli Sone, Dawn Britton, Peter Weiss, Katharine Armstrong, Sam McCull, Berj Bardakjian, Cori Hanson, Teresa Nguyen, Marianne Hatzopoulou, Neha Mahmood, Don MacMillan, Tom Coyle, Micah Stickel, Michelle Beaton, Lee Clement, Sylvie Spraakman.
- Engineering Engagement & Development Network group (January 31, 2018)
- Graduate Engineering Council of Students (GECoS) (February 9, 2018)

Additional consultation engagements with various stakeholders are planned to help finalize the wording of the questions and bring awareness of the impending implementation of the survey.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FACULTY COUNCIL

For information.