



EDI Action Plan: 2019 – 2022
Assessment and Evaluation
Implementation Team Terms of Reference
September 2020

EDI Strategy Implementation Teams have been constituted to advance a set of assigned strategic priorities. The Teams will report activities and recommendations to the EDI Strategy Steering Committee for endorsement and engagement of appropriate leadership and governance bodies as appropriate.

1. Mandate

The Implementation Team is tasked with advancing a set of assigned strategic priorities, which support relevant Strategic Objectives listed in the 2019 – 2022 EDI Action Plan (See Strategic Alignment and Tasks section below).

2. Responsibilities

The Team will:

- Develop a task list with timelines and assigned team members and;
- Discuss historical and contemporary challenges and opportunities;
- Identify and review relevant resources and contextual information;
- Conduct environmental scan and comparative review of best practices;
- Develop models of initiatives that could be enhanced or piloted at McMaster;
- Engage appropriate campus partners for consultation and endorsement; and
- Report activities and recommendations to the EDI Strategy Steering Committee.

3. Constituting Teams

The Teams are constituted after a broad call for nominations, including self-nomination.

Nominees should demonstrate a commitment to advancing inclusive excellence and some expertise in an area that would advance the work of the Team. Additionally, experience implementing similar initiatives and an ability to share challenges and successes is an asset.

Nominees will be contacted by the AVPEI and invited to submit a paragraph describing how they meet the criteria for membership, and they will also be asked to select one or more Implementation Teams to which they would consider contributing.

The EDI Strategy Steering Committee will review nominations and appoint members accordingly, giving consideration to establishing diverse memberships.

Membership terms may be one, two, or three years in duration depending on the availability and interest of individual members.

The Team lead(s) may determine that additional members are required to support the work, in which case they may initiate a call for expressions of interest. If endorsed by the membership, the Team lead(s) may target their invitation if a particular set of experiences or expertise is required.

4. Operation

The Team lead(s) will:

- Obtain endorsement of the Terms of Reference from the Steering Committee;
- Establish the agendas for, convening, and facilitating meetings; and
- Submit a semi-annual brief of progress on tasks to the Steering Committee.

The Team will meet regularly on a schedule that is agreed by the membership.

Formal minutes are not required. A semi-annual brief on progress will be submitted. A final report and any recommendations will be submitted to the Steering Committee upon completion of all tasks assigned for the 2019 – 2022 EDI Action Plan time horizon.

5. Stakeholder Groups

To ensure that historically and contemporarily underrepresented, under-utilized, and under-served groups are consulted, meaningfully engaged, and part of the decision-making through the implementation process, the Team will include among its membership the voices and lived experiences of relevant equity-seeking community members, and meaningfully engage key institutional and community-organized groups, including: the Indigenous Education Council, the President's Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community, the African and Caribbean Faculty Associate of McMaster, Women in Science and Engineering, Academic Women's Success & Mentorship Network, and the Disability Employee Network, for example.

6. Strategic Alignment and Tasks

The Faculty Retention and Promotion Implementation Team is tasked with advancing the following strategic priorities under *Objective 2: to enhance systems and resources to support more data-informed and evidence-based EDI-related planning and decision-making* of the 2019 – 2022 EDI Action Plan:

- To identify metrics, select Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and develop to mechanisms to track and report on progress towards desirable goals;
- To benchmark institutional status in relation to desirable goals; and
- To develop integrated EDI planning and reporting tools for unit leaders.

The Team will:

- Identify and recommend a selection of qualitative and quantitative Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to measure institutional EDI progress towards broad goals and impacts desired, guided by the Sample Outputs and Outcomes Measures (Appendix I)
- Review and explore the value in adopting or adapting, with permission, existing institutional EDI assessment tools and scorecards, to enable periodic institutional audits of high-level descriptive indicators of EDI progress (See examples listed under Relevant Resources and Contextual Documents).
- Identify existing mechanisms and, where necessary, recommend new or enhanced systems or tools, for collecting, analyzing, and reporting on the quantitative and qualitative data needed for effective EDI planning and performance management.

Note:

The Team will ensure that any deliberations regarding demographic data, to assess quantitative compositional diversity or qualitative experiences of inclusion, are aligned with best practices the institution is undertaking to enhance and centralize student and employee self-identification data collection, analysis and reporting through the Student Diversity Census Workforce and the Employment Equity Census.

7. Membership

Co-Leads:

Arig al Shaibah, AVP Equity and Inclusion

Joanne Gittens, Director, Institutional Research and Analysis (IRA)

Partners:

Kim Dej, Acting Vice-Provost, Faculty

Wanda McKenna, Assistant Vice President/Chief Human Resources Officer (HRS)

Melissa Pool, University Registrar

Advising Members:

Rob Whyte, Assistant Dean, UG Med (FHS EDI Advisory)

Matheaus Grasselli, Math Dept Chair

Mark Rumbles, Senior Manager, IT, Mosaic Sustainment Organization, UTS

May-Marie Duway-Sowa, Employment Equity Specialist, HRS

Celeste Licorish, Manager, Student Access Strategy, Office of Community Engagement

Eric Amaral, Statistician and Programmer, IRA

Jennifer Vallbacka, Manager, Research Information Systems & Analysis, ROADS

Relevant Resources and Contextual Documents

- New England Resource Centre for Higher Education (NERCHE) [Self-Assessment Tool for the Institutionalization of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion](#); [Self-Assessment Rubric](#) and [Worksheet](#)
- Queen's University [Diversity and Equity Assessment Planning \(DEAP\) Tool](#); User Manuals for [Academic Units](#) and [Administrative Units](#)
- Smith, Daryl G. (2009). Part IV: What will it take? In *Diversity's promise for higher education: Making it work*, (pp. 227 – 272). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. ProQuest E-book Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/mcmu/detail.action?docID=3318562>.
- Ramos, H. & Li, P.S. (2017). Differences in representation and employment income of racialized university professors in Canada, In Henry, F., Dua, E., James, C.E., Kobayashi, A., Li, P.S., Ramos, H., & Smith, M., *The equity myth: Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian universities*, (p. 46 – 64). Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press. Available online: <https://books-scholarsportal-info.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/uri/ebooks/ebooks3/upress/2017-07-24/1/9780774834902>
- SPS A1 Search Summary Report (Appendix II)

Appendix I Sample EDI Output and Outcome Measures

| Outputs (Products, Deliverable, Conditions) | Outcomes (Knowledge, Awareness, Behaviour, Skills) | Impacts (Aspirational Goals) |
|---|---|--|
| Institutional Commitment and Capacity | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of unit EDI plans submitted annually • # and % polices and processes reviewed using EDI analysis • % strategic institutional documents articulating EDI priorities • % senior leaders and members of governing bodies EDI trained • % self-identified equity-seeking groups among senior leadership • # self-identified equity-seeking groups on governing bodies • # and engagement of alumni in EDI priorities • President’s Office Webpage/definitions and case • # recognition awards with EDI criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # donors supporting EDI priorities • \$ value of donor fund designated to EDI priorities • campus understanding of EDI/inclusive excellence • # EDI pilot initiatives seeded with soft/one-time funds • # EDI initiatives sustained with hard/base funds • \$ value and proportion of funds allocated for EDI priorities • Senior leadership visibility driving inclusive excellence • Extent of EDI analysis in strategic decision-making, policy development, resource allocation | <p>McMaster’s systems, structures, policies, and processes enable and sustain EDI priorities.</p> |
| Academic and Educational Content and Context | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDI benchmarks in Institutional Quality Assurance Program process • # of courses with EDI related Learning Outcomes • % of academic programs integrating EDI in curriculum • % of faculty employing inclusive teaching strategies • # of students pursuing African and African Diaspora Minor Program • % equity-seeking research chairs • % of research chair committees receiving EDI training • # and breadth of interdisciplinary academic and research programs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of EDI integration in academic programs • Self-reported EDI student learning • top-box or top-2-box* student experience (e.g., National Survey of Student Engagement, Canadian University Survey Consortium, etc.) • Extent of EDI integration in research and scholarship • Extent of interdisciplinarity in teaching and research • # research grants accepted on basis EDI considerations • # research grants rejected on basis of EDI considerations • Self-reported faculty and TA EDI capabilities <p style="color: red; font-size: small;">* “Boxes” refer to a score and the number of people who chose the number score (or box) on a Likert scale. Top-Box or Top-2-Box refer to the number of people choosing the highest or the highest and second highest scores/boxes.</p> | <p>McMaster’s educational and academic programs and practices exemplify inclusive excellence as well as societal impact on a global scale.</p> |

| Outputs (Products, Deliverable, Conditions) | Outcomes (Knowledge, Awareness, Behaviour, Skills) | Impacts (Aspirational Goals) |
|---|--|---|
| Interactional Capabilities and Climate | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of training/education opportunities • # of participants in training/education • completion rates of required online training modules: Accessibility for Ontarian with Disabilities Act, Sexual Violence Prevention and Response, Human Rights & Equity, etc. • # of complaints of discrimination, harassment, sexual violence • # of complaints resolved using voluntary resolution • # TMG** participating in EDI training • % of TMG job descriptions incorporating EDI • # student leaders/groups participating in EDI training <p>** The Management Group – category of professional employees (non-unionized)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive change in attitudes, knowledge, skills • “top box” report positive climate and intergroup relations • EDI profile/reputation in the public eye • Self-reported TMG staff EDI capabilities • Timeliness of complaint resolution | <p>McMaster’s climate is positive, respectful, and inclusive, and all members feel a sense of dignity and belonging.</p> |
| Community and Compositional Diversity | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # & % self-identified equity-seeking job applicants and interviewees • # and % of search committee members EDI trained • # and % equity-seeking Managers, Directors, Chairs, Deans • # and % tenure-track and tenured equity-seeking faculty • % of selection committee members trained • % of tenure and promotion committee members trained • % of research chair committees receiving EDI training • # and breadth of employment equity facilitators • # and % self-identified student applicants and offers • \$ and % of financial aid/awards to under-represented students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress closing workforce gaps • Efficacy of search, appointment, and nomination processes • “top-box” employee satisfaction, inclusion, engagement • “top-box” student belonging and flourishing (e.g., National College Health Assessment, etc.) • Census response rates for student and employee self-identification • EDI analysis of admissions policies and processes • Quality of local community partnerships • Student retention, persistence, progression • Equity-seeking student enrolment, completion, further study • equity-seeking employees hired, retained, promoted | <p>McMaster’s community reflects local and national demographic diversity, including proportionate representation of groups historically and contemporarily marginalized in higher education.</p> |

Appendix II SPS A1 Search Summary Report

Position Information

Position Title: (drop down) Posting #: (drop down)
 Faculty: (drop down) Department: (drop down)
 Department Chair: _____
 Committee Chair: _____
(if not Department Chair)
 Candidate of Choice: _____
 Starting Date: (drop down)

Process Checklist

1. *In the Preparation Phase...*

- Employment Equity Facilitator participated throughout the search process
- Committee included members of equity-seeking groups:

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Women (at least 30%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> UNK |
| <input type="radio"/> Indigenous person(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> UNK |
| <input type="radio"/> Racialized person(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> UNK |
| <input type="radio"/> Persons with disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> UNK |
| <input type="radio"/> 2SLGBTQ+ person(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> UNK |
- Search Committee members received recruitment and selection training

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Chair and all members | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="radio"/> Over 50% including Chair | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="radio"/> Less than 50% including Chair | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
- Committee reviewed institutional/faculty/department employment equity gaps

2. *In the Recruitment Phase...*

- Institutional Statement of Commitment to EDI/Inclusive Excellence included in Job Ad
- A consistent process for recommendation letters was communicated and followed
- Invitation to complete Diversity Survey included in the Job Ad
- Statement of contribution to EDI and inclusive excellence requested in Job Ad
- Diverse venues and strategies were used to attract applicants from equity-seeking groups.
List: _____

3. In the Assessment Phase...

- Contributions to EDI and inclusive excellence integrated into job criteria evaluation rubric
 - Upload job criteria evaluation rubric
- Committee discussed candidate evaluations and examined possible biases/barriers
- Long/shortlisted candidate diversity profile was reviewed and competitive equity-seeking applicants included
- Questions about contributions to EDI and inclusive excellence were included in the interview

Upload rubric template

4. In the Selection Process...

There were more than one finalists who were relatively equal in qualification: Yes No

If yes:

- Diversity gaps and goals were considered, and employment equity principles were applied when recommending candidate of choice
- It was unknown whether finalists were members of equity-seeking groups

A member of an equity-seeking group was recommended for hire: Yes No UNK

Narrative Comments:

Briefly discuss any challenges encountered in applying any of the above listed employment equity best practices and strategies attempted to overcome the challenges.

Dean's Approval:

Dean: _____

- The Dean has reviewed the Search Summary Report and endorses the candidate of choice
- The Dean was provided the Checklist for Offer Negotiations