

**Reflecting the Mosaic:  
An investigation of diversity at academic  
institutions**

**by**

**Ginny Victoria Van Pelt**

B.Sc., Simon Fraser University, 2015

Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Public Policy

in the

School of Public Policy

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

**© Ginny Victoria Van Pelt 2017**

**SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

**Spring 2017**

All rights reserved.

However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for Fair Dealing. Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, education, satire, parody, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

# Approval

**Name:** Ginny Victoria Van Pelt  
**Degree:** Master of Public Policy  
**Title:** *Reflecting the Mosaic:  
An investigation of diversity at  
academic institutions*

**Examining Committee:** **Chair:** Doug McArthur  
Professor, School of Public Policy, SFU

**Olena Hankivsky**  
Senior Supervisor  
Professor

---

**John Richards**  
Supervisor  
Professor

---

**Jennifer Scott**  
Internal Examiner  
Adjunct Professor

---

**Date Defended/Approved:** March 22, 2017

## Ethics Statement



The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library  
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

## **Abstract**

This study aims to identify barriers to diversity in academic institutions and recommend policies to reduce these barriers, using Simon Fraser University (SFU) in Burnaby, British Columbia, as a case study. SFU is lagging compared to similar Western Canadian Universities regarding policies that support diversity on a broader intersectional scale, despite recommendations put forth by an SFU committee on gender salary equity in the fall of 2016. This study aims to provide direction to SFU on how to support diversity through an intersectional lens. Using qualitative interviews from subject matter experts, this Capstone analyzes fifteen short, medium, and long-term policy options and recommends seven to the SFU senior leadership. The core of this recommendation is the development of a strategic plan for diversity that reinforces commitment of the senior leadership and provides guidelines for future development of policies and programs that support diversity.

**Keywords:** academic diversity; academic equity; intersectionality; diversity policy; inclusion; campus culture

## **Dedication**

To my Mom, who believed that everyone deserves an education and the right to pursue a dream, no matter how big or how small.

And, to all the teachers, educators, and faculty who strive towards the same goal.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would first like to thank my Capstone supervisor, Dr. Olena Hankivsky of the School of Public Policy at Simon Fraser University. Professor Hankivsky was a passionate and engaged resource and I very much appreciated her thorough knowledge on intersectionality and higher education diversity policies.

I would also like to thank the experts who agreed to participate in my research through interviews. I enjoyed meeting each one and learning more about the work being done at SFU, UVIC, and UBC on diversity policies. Without their valuable input, the outcome of this project would not be as rich or as practicable to the SFU context.

I would like to acknowledge Jennifer Scott of the SFU Faculty Association as my external reviewer and I am gratefully indebted to her for her beneficial comments.

I must express my profound thanks to all my friends and family who have been by my side with encouragement and support through this entire process. Love and thanks go in particular to: my Dad, for his thoughtful care and guidance, and for worrying about me even when I don't ask for it; my sisters, for their honesty, humour, and grace; my 'forever' friends, who still make time for adventures, big and small, despite our careers taking us in different directions; and, my choir family, for being a constant source of creativity and a reminder of the power of human connection.

And, finally, to the MPP class of 2017- congrats, everyone... we did it! I wish you all the best in your future ventures.

# Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Ethics Statement.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Acronyms.....	x
Executive Summary.....	xi
<b>Chapter 1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Policy Problem.....	1
1.2. Study Objectives.....	5
1.3. Capstone Overview.....	6
<b>Chapter 2. Background.....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1. Barriers to diversity in academia.....	7
2.2. Historical policies and a call to action on diversity.....	11
2.3. Diversity at Simon Fraser University.....	14
2.4. An intersectional approach.....	18
<b>Chapter 3. Methodology.....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1. Interview information.....	22
3.2. Limitations of the research.....	23
<b>Chapter 4. Interview results.....</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1. Findings on the Salary Equity Reports.....	25
4.2. Theme 1: Institutional resources.....	27
4.3. Theme 2: Administration and leadership.....	29
4.4. Theme 3: Data collection and use.....	31
4.5. Theme 4: Hiring, recruitment, and retention.....	33
4.6. Theme 5: Education and training.....	36
4.7. Theme 6: Campus climate and culture.....	37
4.8. Theme 7: Sexual Violence Policy.....	40
<b>Chapter 5. Policy Criteria.....</b>	<b>41</b>
5.1. Effectiveness.....	41
5.2. Equity.....	42
5.3. Cost.....	42
5.4. Administrative Complexity.....	43
5.5. Stakeholder Acceptance.....	43

5.6. Criteria and Measures.....	43
<b>Chapter 6. Policy Options and Analysis .....</b>	<b>46</b>
6.1. Short-term options .....	46
6.2. Medium-term options .....	51
6.3. Long-term options .....	53
<b>Chapter 7. Recommendations.....</b>	<b>57</b>
7.1. Short-term recommendations .....	57
7.2. Medium-term recommendations .....	59
7.3. Long-term recommendations .....	60
<b>Chapter 8. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Appendix A. Interview Questions.....</b>	<b>74</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1:	Summary of Evaluation Criteria.....	41
Table 2:	Criteria and measures assessment.....	44

## List of Acronyms

CAUT	Canadian Association of University Teachers
HRSDC	Human Resources Skills Development Canada
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
SFU	Simon Fraser University
SFUFA	Simon Fraser University Faculty Association
UBC	University of British Columbia
UVIC	University of Victoria

## **Executive Summary**

Faculty in academia who are members of diverse groups face barriers to success due to their social identities. These inequities occur due to, but not limited to, biases against gender, ethnicity, Aboriginal status, disability, sexual orientation, age, rank, and experience. Additionally, experiences of discrimination include decreased well-being, harassment, and lower rates of hiring, promotion, and salaries compared to the rest of the faculty.

Simon Fraser University (SFU) experiences these same issues in regards to diversity. However, like the majority of Canadian institutions, SFU's diversity policies historically have focussed largely on gender equity, which provide an inadequate representation of the full diversity that is present within the institution. This Capstone argues that an intersectional approach to diversity policies is consequently needed to incorporate the complete experiences of SFU faculty that arise from the interactions between their identity as a member of multiple social locations, which includes, but is not limited to, gender.

Drawing on existing literature and thirteen expert interviews from SFU, the University of British Columbia, and the University of Victoria, I generated fifteen policy options that aim to overcome barriers at SFU to implementing intersectionality-informed diversity policies to support its faculty. Each policy option was evaluated based on its performance across nine criteria, including its effectiveness in supporting diversity, its inclusion of an intersectional lens, cost, and acceptability to the SFU administration as well as its faculty.

Drawing on best practices in the field, I recommend SFU develop a comprehensive, intersectional diversity strategy that solidifies the commitment of the SFU administration to diversity. This strategic plan paves the way for future development of diversity policies, including the better collection of data, resource allocation, education and outreach, and ongoing reviews of salary disparities.

# **Chapter 1. Introduction**

## **1.1. Policy Problem**

Diversity is currently at the forefront of political discussion across the globe. For example, Canada's last federal election had racist undertones as the Conservatives ran on a platform supporting a ban on niqabs and a hotline to report 'barbaric cultural practices'. This was soon followed by Brexit in the European Union, which is commonly seen as being fuelled by growing intolerance towards higher immigration and integration. Members of diverse, underrepresented groups are fighting for a voice under the Trump administration in the United States where new policies are actively repressing members of certain ethnic groups, genders, sexual orientations, and more.

Inequities are present throughout society. Human resource professionals in the corporate sector have been focussed on diversity and inclusion in workplaces for decades as a method of improving business performance, as employees who feel more accepted and included are more successful and productive (Deloitte, 2013; Center for Talent Innovation, 2014). Inequities are also present in academia. As societal institutions, universities reflect society, and consequently reflect issues of societal inequity as well (Havergal, 2015). However, these inequities manifest in ways that are specific to higher educational institutions. For example, in Canada, student populations are increasingly diverse, yet these levels of compositional diversity are not reflected in academic faculty, resulting in a less welcoming, supportive, and inclusive environment for these students (Lee, 2010). At Simon Fraser University (SFU), preliminary findings from the SFU Undergraduate Survey show that SFU's undergraduate population is 61% female and 39% male in 2016 (SFU, 2016c). However, in 2013 women only made up 33% of all research faculty at SFU (Kessler and Pendakur, 2015).

SFU is heralded across the country as being one of Canada's best employers (SFU News, 2016). However, at SFU diversity has predominantly focussed on issues of gender, which is an inadequate approach to diversity issues and contrasts with this title, as well as SFU's values towards supporting its employees. The current approach does not adequately address broader needs of the faculty as a whole. Consequently, the policy problem for this Capstone is that SFU lacks a progressive, intersectional approach to diversity that can best represent multiple social identities that each faculty member on campus belong to in a variety of ways. This lack of comprehensive policy is resulting in a lack of diversity among faculty<sup>1</sup> at Simon Fraser University, a problem that is echoed in most other academic institutions. It is not, however, simply compositional diversity that is lacking; it is additionally a lack of support for diversity within the climate and day-to-day interactions within the institution (Bonawitz and Andal, 2009; Gutiérrez y Muhs, Niemann, and González, 2012; Thompson et al., 2015; Paulus et al., 2016; Subbaye and Vithal, 2016). This lack of diversity is resulting in reduced well-being and success due to the intersecting social identities that contribute to the experiences of each faculty member. In order for SFU to maintain its reputation as one of Canada's best employers, much more work needs to be done to advance equity and to develop progressive and transformative diversity policies.

Diversity is not just a story about gender, although advancing gender equality has been the focus of most of SFU's efforts towards diversification. For example, SFU is one of the few campuses in Western Canada with a specified Women's Centre, and SFU has a comprehensive Childcare Society. Even among many other Canadian universities that champion and value diversity, their policies and practices are largely targeted towards supporting gender equality (UBC 2009, CAUT, 2010). This is a problem because faculty can face discrimination because of their gender, but also because of other intersecting social locations, including (but not limited to) being a visible minority, having a disability, having Aboriginal status, or their sexual orientation (Mohammed and Angell, 2004; Ely and Roberts, 2008; Ramarajan and Thomas, 2010; Desivilya Syna, 2015; Desivilya Syna et al., 2017). Paying attention to such intersections

<sup>1</sup> While this Capstone predominately focuses on diversity issues for faculty, the diversity problem also extends to staff and students at academic institutions.

is key to understanding the range of experiences of faculty at SFU. This is what makes an intersectionality framework, which also explicitly prioritizes social justice, such a valuable resource for developing progressive diversity policies within higher education. While some Canadian universities, such as the University of Alberta (2013), are innovating diversity policies to include an intersectional lens and thus capture these complex interactions of social identities, SFU's diversity policies currently fall short of a comprehensive and effective approach to diversity and thus capture the full experiences of faculty. This is interesting because many of my interviewees, whose discussions are discussed in Chapter 4, use intersectional language when elaborating on their aims and goals for diversity at SFU.

Additionally, detailed data is not often collected and reported for diversity groups other than gender in academic institutions. Most institutions, SFU included, collect information on their faculty's gender consistently but collect similar data inconsistently for other social identities. Statistics Canada collected information on faculty on ethnicity, Aboriginal status, and gender in the 'University and College Academic Staff System' Survey until 2006, and collected gender data until 2011, when the survey was terminated. The most recent Canadian data shows that in 2006, 37.9% of full-time professors were women, 14.9% identified as a visible minority, and 1% identified as Aboriginal (CAUT, 2014). In 2011, 36.6% of full-time professors were women (StatsCan, 2011). However, in this same decade 51.2% of working Canadians were women, 19.1% of Canadians were a visible minority, and 4.3% were Aboriginal, (StatsCan, 2011), showing that the make-up of universities do not necessarily reflect the make-up of society.

While in Canada there is a lack of current information on diversity among the faculty in academic institutions, similar underrepresentation of diverse groups is seen around the world (Bonawitz and Andel, 2009; Cantor, Mack, McDermott, and Taylor, 2014; Campbell-Whatley, Wang, Toms, and Williams, 2015; Desivilya Syna et al., 2017). In the UK, for example, 2.2% of full-time professors were identified as Black, 6.8% as Asian, 9.4% as mixed or unknown ethnicity, 40% as women, and 4.7% had a disability (HESA, 2015). It is not implausible to assume similar disparities occur in Canadian academia given the global nature of the field (Castano Rodriguez, 2015). Additionally,

those of underrepresented races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and/or disabilities have been shown empirically to progress less up the academic ladder than those who are not members of marginalized groups (CAUT, 2010; Acker, Webber, and Smyth 2012; Tate, 2014; Hartlep et al. 2016). Faculty who are members of diverse groups face barriers in hiring, promotion that impede their success compared to others, and work in an environment that may not always be welcoming, safe, and inclusive (Bertschinger, 2015; Dunn & Olivier, 2011; Rodriguez, 2015). Additionally, those of diverse groups tend to have worse representation in faculty positions of higher rank and greater representation in lower rank positions such as sessional instructors or assistant professors (Hartlep, N. et al., 2016).

And yet, universities have a unique ability to implement their own institutional policies on pressing societal issues to advance inclusiveness and safety. A recent example is the aftermath of Bill 23: The Sexual Violence and Misconduct Policy Act, passed by the Government of British Columbia in March 2016. This governmental policy requires BC post-secondary schools to devise and implement a policy on sexual violence, and was a response to growing concerns over universities' responses to sexual violence across the province (Legislative Assembly of BC, 2016). While governmental policy is leading changes in institutional policy, each university, including SFU, creates its own policy within the framework of Bill 23. SFU launched its review of its Sexual Violence and Misconduct Policy in May 2016. Since then, there have been townhall meetings, the creation of an advisory group, consultations with targeted groups, preparation of a draft policy, and feedback processes on the draft policy. The feedback is currently being reviewed and the policy is being amended and is due to be approved by the SFU Board of Governors in Spring 2017 (SFU, n.d.).

In addition to working on new policy for sexual violence, SFU is making advancements in salary equity policies. Based upon the recommendations of the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Committee, released in the fall of 2016, SFU is increasing the salary of all female faculty by 1.7% and providing a pay award of 1.7% to female faculty retroactive to 2009 to correct for salary disparities that have arisen due to gender inequity (SFU, 2016b). A group salary increase and/or a group award for female professors has been instituted at other academic institutions in Canada (such as the

University of British Columbia, the University of Victoria, the University of Saskatchewan, McMaster University, the University of Manitoba, and the University of Waterloo; Loriggio, 2016; SFU 2016d). UBC offered a salary increase similar to SFU of 2%, and a group award retroactive to three years (Bigam, 2013). At UVIC, a one time retroactive award was used to correct the 2011-2012 salaries of women faculty with more than 6.5 years of experience and men faculty with less than 6.5 years of experience (UVIC, 2014). SFU's retroactive award is historic because of its basis on longitudinal data. No other Canadian university has been able to quantitatively show such a historical pay disparity. This proof has allowed SFU to negotiate an impressive retroactive settlement that includes salary disparities as well as back pay and pension loss.

Because of the recent advancements in policies relating to gender equity, SFU is perfectly situated to expand diversity efforts beyond gender to include an intersectional approach that includes, but is not limited to, gender. With the administration still considering some of the institutional changes recommended by the Salary Equity Recommendation Committee, this study on academic diversity is extremely timely to the SFU context, and the results of this study are meant to inform the university on how to deepen its commitment to diversity. The recommendations put forward in this Capstone are specifically intended to complement and build on the institutional recommendations put forward by the Salary Equity Recommendation Committee. While the results and recommendations made in this project are specific to SFU, it is hoped that some of these findings will be generalizable to other academic institutions as well, particularly in the Canadian context, and consequently will provide a useful and actionable contribution to the literature on academic diversity.

## **1.2. Study Objectives**

This Capstone aims first to identify barriers and challenges to fostering an intersectional approach to faculty diversity at SFU, using qualitative interviews to gain knowledge in this area. Following this, this study explores policies that support solutions to these challenges and work to improve the overall diversity of faculty at SFU through the implementation of an intersectional framework. However, these recommendations may be also applicable to other academic institutions looking to improve diversity on

their campuses. This includes both improving the compositional diversity of faculty at SFU as well as improving the culture and climate of diversity for those who work in this environment in their daily lives. These policy options are analysed based on their effectiveness and equity with administrative costs, resources, and support from various stakeholders in the academic community in order to make recommendations specific to the diversity context to SFU.

### **1.3. Capstone Overview**

This capstone begins with a literature review in Chapter 2 to outline the background of diversity research in academia, the diversity context at Simon Fraser University, and the field of intersectionality. In Chapter 3, the methodology process is discussed, before analysing the results of my original research in Chapter 4. I then source fifteen short, medium, and long-term policy options from the literature review and research. Chapter 5 outlines the criteria and measures that are used to analyse these options, and then Chapter 6 presents the analysis of each of these against these criteria. My final recommendations are presented in Chapter 7. Chapter 8 ends with some concluding remarks and directions for future research.

## **Chapter 2. Background**

### **2.1. Barriers to diversity in academia**

The diversity gap in higher education institutions has been well documented. The statistics outlined above show that groups such as women, Aboriginals, and visible minorities lack representation as faculty. While arguments have been made (Gundermand and Moore, 2008; Rivera-Nieves and Abreu, 2013) that this may be a pipeline issue (ie: members of this groups are not pursuing higher education and consequently are not becoming faculty) the statistics show that diverse representation is actually better among university students than faculty. For example, in 2010 the Canadian University of University Teachers (CAUT) published a report that outlines student statistics of post-secondary education. In the 2012-2013 school year, 58% of undergraduate students across Canada were women, and 5%, 24%, and 9% self-identified as Aboriginal, members of a visible minority, and as having a disability, respectively (CAUT, 2014). More women and visible minorities are actually present in undergraduate programs than in the make-up of Canadian society as a whole.

However, this diversity becomes lower in graduate and doctoral programs, as well as at the faculty level of academia (Acker, Webber, and Smyth, 2012; Crede and Borrego, 2013; Wray, Aspland, and Barrett, 2013). In 2012-2013, women made up 55% of Master's programs and 48% of doctoral programs across Canada (CAUT, 2014), although CAUT does not collect other equity information for graduate and doctoral students. Because diversity decreases as one progresses higher into academia, it is not possible that the lack of diversity in faculty is simply a pipeline problem. There must be factors of inequity that are driving these disparities among different groups of social identities. Some of the factors that have been identified and researched in the literature are discussed in the following section.

### ***Human resource issues: Salaries, promotions, tenure, and retention***

Studies have shown that human resources practices can result in unconscious discrimination in hiring outcomes and impact the diversity of a university's faculty (Hartlep et al., 2016; Rivera and Ward, 2008; Acker, Webber, and Smyth, 2012; Bonawitz and Andal, 2009; Gutiérrez y Muhs, Niemann, and González, 2012; Thompson et al., 2015; Paulus et al., 2016; Subbaye and Vithal, 2016). Some of the key issues here is that diversity has been found to decline from lower-level, part-time faculty positions to senior-level, full-time faculty positions and that implicit biases in hiring can affect salaries, promotion rates, tenure positions, and retention of minority groups (Hartlep et al., 2016; Rivera and Ward, 2008; Acker, Webber, and Smyth, 2012).

For example, a Canadian study by Acker, Webber, and Smyth (2012) found that although faculty members who were a member of a minority group often had equal success at gaining tenure once in the applicant pool, there were barriers to minority groups to being in the pool in the first place. The study found that faculty experiences under promotion review were strongly influenced by a variety of interactions between applicant's race, gender, sexuality, home life, and field of study (Acker, Webber, and Smyth, 2012). Further studies in this area have predominately focussed on single social identities, but have identified challenges to hiring in advancement, promotion, and retention based on race, gender, and cultural group that are related to factors such as self-efficacy, imposter syndrome, low confidence, and working in academic disciplines outside of the traditionally successful ones (Bonawitz and Andal, 2009; Gutiérrez y Muhs, Niemann, and González, 2012; Thompson et al., 2015; Paulus et al., 2016; Subbaye and Vithal, 2016).

A national American study done by Hartlep et. al (2016) found that gender, race, and prestige of the university that faculty received their PhD from were all significant explanatory factors of who held a research or department chair. Specifically, white males with degrees from high-prestige universities made up about 80% of the chair positions surveyed (Hartlep et al., 2016).

***Responsibility: Whose job is diversity, anyways?***

Universities, like all federally regulated institutions in Canada, are subject to the Employment Equity Act, which aims:

to achieve equality in the workplace so that no person shall be denied employment opportunities or benefits for reasons unrelated to ability and, in the fulfillment of that goal, to correct the conditions of disadvantage in employment experienced by women, aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities by giving effect to the principle that employment equity means more than treating persons in the same way but also requires special measures and the accommodation of differences. (Employment Equity Act, 1995, c. 44)

Under this Act, legal backing is given to members of the four designated groups who believe they have been treated inequitably at work due to their social identity. However, there are some criticisms to this act. Some see it as having been ineffective in improving representation of these groups (Jain et al., 2010). This may be due to a lack of compliance and enforcement of the act, as it is difficult to prove discrimination occurred unless it was a blatantly obvious act (Grundy and Smith, 2010). Additionally, as the mechanisms for reaching employment equity are unclear, some believe it may be more effective for an institution to take proactive steps related to culture and implicit biases (Mentzer, 2002; Falkenberg and Boland, 1997). Finally, this act also does not account for anyone outside or within the four groups designated, which excludes many people who may also be experiencing discrimination at work.

Employment discrimination is also protected under the BC Human Rights Code. Section 12 covers wage discrimination and states that:

An employer must not discriminate between employees by employing an employee of one sex for work at a rate of pay that is less than the rate of pay at which an employee of the other sex is employed by that employer for similar or substantially similar work. (BC Human Rights Code, section 12)

Additionally, Section 13 on employment discrimination states:

A person must not (a) refuse to employ or refuse to continue to employ a person, or (b) discriminate against a person regarding employment or any term or condition of employment; because of the race, colour, ancestry, place of origin, political belief, religion, marital status, family status, physical or mental disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or age of that person or because that person has been convicted of a criminal or summary conviction offence that is unrelated to the employment or to the intended employment of that person. (BC Human Rights Code, section 13).

The statistics show that disparities exist despite the existence of this Act and the BC Human Rights code, which is often used more as legal backing for cases of harassment and discrimination than to manage subtle and implicit behaviour that may impede the success of faculty of diverse groups (StatsCan, 2011, CAUT, 2014). Consequently, proactive behaviour to tackle such diversity issues is left up to the will of the institution and, in many cases, is not taken up as a priority at many universities.

***Measuring diversity: Can you put a number on it?***

Measuring diversity can also hinder the advancement of it. Without data, it is difficult for an institution to see what its demographic looks like, which issues it should focus on, and concerns that might be institution-specific. As discussed above, the availability of data on diversity is an issue of particular prominence in Canadian academia. CAUT highlights in an equity review report that the availability of national-level equity data is low in Canada (CAUT, 2007). The University and College Academic Staff System (UCASS) survey (collected by Statistics Canada) is the only major survey that collects equity information for faculty at institutions across Canada, yet was suspended from 2012 to 2016 (Government of Canada, 2016). Additionally, this survey only collects information on gender and citizenship status, neglecting ethnicity, sexual identities, disabilities, and Aboriginal status, although it previously did collect this data until 2006 (CAUT, 2007). Consequently, national-level diversity data is irregular and unreliable over consistent time scales.

I learned through my interviews that at SFU, gender information is collected at the time of hiring from all faculty. SFU's collection of gender data is more longitudinal than other institutions, which is why SFU was able to provide such a comprehensive study on its gendered salary disparity. However, information regarding ethnicity, disability, and Aboriginal status is only collected through an optional survey sent after hiring, which results in it being completed only by faculty who self-select into it. Additionally, information regarding membership in other groups, such as sexual orientation, is not collected.

Because there is a lack of diversity data across institutions, comparisons between universities are difficult. This can make it difficult to judge the diversity climate of academia as a whole. There have been some advances in this area. For example, Ng et. al (2013) recommend a new framework for measuring diversity in academic institutions that includes the assessment of attitudes towards diversity, career activities and professional norms, environment conducive to diversity, and social interactions with diverse groups. A climate survey completed by the UBC Faculty of Science makes a good attempt to follow these principals at a faculty level. In this assessment, qualitative results from focus groups are combined with quantitative survey data of science faculty to determine both compositional diversity issues as well as faculty concerns and issues regarding their working climate (UBC, 2007; Condon and Peacock, 2009). While such an assessment only provides data for one institution, it investigates diversity through a broader approach and would be comparable to other institutions that completed a similar survey.

## **2.2. Historical policies and a call to action on diversity**

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) began a landmark investigation in 1999 on the status of women in the science faculty at their institution (MIT, 1999). This status report acted as an exposé to the underrepresentation of women and a catalyst for many other academic institutions across North America to further research and implementation of policies to improve the issue. MIT soon moved from beyond the issue to gender to broader issues in academia such as race, diversity, and equity (MIT, 2002; MIT, 2010). These studies have shown that diversity is not only a representation

issue but also an issue of equal opportunity, inclusivity, and well-being for those who identify as part of underrepresented groups. Recently, MIT completed a “Quality of Life” survey (Bertschinger, 2015) that identified other diversity challenges on campus, such as satisfaction and perception of the university experience and collegial environment. The survey finds that these metrics are lower among members of underrepresented groups such as women faculty and faculty who identify as LGBT. In doing so MIT has been a North American leader in first championing gender diversity in academia and then moving to a more broad and intersectional approach.

Many universities across the United States and Canada have since followed the leadership of MIT and worked to investigate various aspects of diversity in academia more fully. In 2005, the University of Calgary completed a gender salary equity review and a project on gender equity that outlined barriers that women in academia face regarding representation, salary disparities, promotion, funding, work-life balance, and teaching and service loads (Joldersma, 2005). More recently, the University of Toronto completed a two-year survey project on faculty engagement entitled “Speaking Up”. This survey gathered faculty responses in five areas of interest: Equity & Diversity, Communication, Faculty & Staff Development, Recognition, and Work-Life Integration (UoT, 2014). Additionally, The University of Alberta has implemented “Project Catalyst” to increase the number of women in their Faculty of Science (UoA, 2017). Gender salary analyses have also been done at a variety of Canadian institutions such as the University of Calgary (2005) University of Lethbridge (2008), and UBC (2012).

However, researchers at the University of British Columbia (UBC) note that many diversity initiatives in Canada have focussed solely on women’s issues in academia or, to a lesser extent, race (UBC, 2009). There is a lack of both data collected and research on other underrepresented groups in academics, such as those of Aboriginal status, with disabilities, differing sexual orientations, age, and/or academic field, and particularly a lack of intersectional research on those who may belong to more than one of these groups, including gender (CAUT, 2010). While it is evident that the field of diversity research has been advancing quickly in the area of gender, more work needs to be done to include the experiences of academics that are part of other diversity groups or multiple groups.

Diversity is necessary in academia for a variety of reasons. The motivations behind MIT's mission to support diverse faculty includes a desire to maintain competitive advantage, be inclusive of humanity, and support communal scholarship (MIT, 2010). The University of Alberta cites similar competitive reasons of "foster[ing] further excellence" and "attract[ing] outstanding faculty" for its implementation of Project Catalyst (UoA, 2017). Research has suggested that engagement with diversity in academia fosters complex thinking in through introducing students, faculty, and researchers to diverse ideas, thus preparing them for a more global world (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Dalton & Crosby, 2010; Madkins, 2011; Poloma, 2014). In one American study, being in a diverse classroom environment was shown to significantly improve measures of students' intellectual engagement and self-assessed academic skills. The same study showed that interaction with diversity improved students' citizenship engagement (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). A second study in the United States argues in favour of diversity as a component of curriculum to guide learning on moralities, ethical problem solving, and leadership (Dalton & Crosby, 2010). Finally, having teachers from diverse groups has been shown to provide a role model for students from those groups, and can share different forms of knowledge to all their students (Madkins, 2011; Poloma, 2014). Furthermore, research in the private sector has shown that working in diverse teams and collaborations can improve productivity by up to 80%, and it is theorized similar productivity improvements would occur among faculty teams as well (Horwitz and Horwitz, 2007; Deloitte, 2013; Center for Talent Innovation, 2014). Consequently, supporting a diverse faculty is just as important of an educational tool as any other that an academic institution can provide.

Beyond the benefits to university competitiveness and to specific members of the community, including faculty, staff, and students, the advancement of diversity is inherently an issue of social justice. It is unjust that some groups in academia face barriers to success, well-being, and inclusivity, and consequently face inequitable treatment in their workplace. The United Nations describes social justice in the context of workplace equity as:

...an underlying principle for peaceful and prosperous coexistence within and among nations. ... We advance social justice when we remove barriers that

people face because of gender, age, race, ethnicity, religion, culture or disability. ... The Declaration [on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization] focuses on guaranteeing fair outcomes for all through employment, social protection, social dialogue, and fundamental principles and rights at work. (UN, 2017)

For those who work in academia, advancing diversity is necessary to provide fair outcomes to all. Despite the Employment Equity Act, there is a complex set of social and power relations that are perpetrated in academia and result in stereotypes, prejudice, acts of exclusion, oppression, or discrimination based on demographics as well as values, expertise, and attitudes (Mohammed and Angell, 2004; Ely and Roberts, 2008; Ramarajan and Thomas, 2010; Desivilya Syna, 2015; Desivilya Syna et al., 2017). There is a need to raise awareness of this issue among those who do not face barriers and teach them how to become allies to diversity for faculty (Boutte and Jackson, 2013). These inequalities exist at SFU as well, for those of multiple and various social identities. If SFU wishes to truly be an equal opportunity employer and to maintain its national reputation as a great employer, these inequities must be addressed.

### **2.3. Diversity at Simon Fraser University**

The case study used in this capstone is Simon Fraser University (SFU). SFU is a mid-sized public Canadian university with three campuses in Burnaby, Surrey, and Vancouver, British Columbia. It serves approximately 30,000 students and has 1,100 faculty. SFU's strategic vision is to engage with students, research, and the community; additionally, this vision is exemplified in the school's motto, 'Be Engaged'. Through this, SFU aims to help students gain "practical experience, social aptitudes and civic understanding" (SFU, 2016a) to encourage career and life preparedness, foster research that provides benefit to society, and to celebrate service to the community.

In addition to these three core values, SFU's vision statement declares that it supports six underlying principles: academic and intellectual freedom; diversity; internationalization; respect for Aboriginal peoples and cultures; supportive and healthy work environment; and, sustainability. Two of these are particularly pertinent to diversity and are further defined as follows:

Diversity: SFU will foster a culture of inclusion and mutual respect, celebrating the diversity and multi-ethnic character reflected amongst its students, staff, faculty, and [its] society.

And,

Supportive and healthy work environment: SFU will recognize, respect, and value the essential contribution made by staff and faculty, and will seek to build and sustain a work environment that is equitable, supportive, rewarding, and enjoyable. (SFU, 2016a)

At SFU, the responsibility of these principles is mostly coordinated under the Office of Human Rights and Equity under the oversight of the University Secretary. The Office is comprised of one staff member- the Director of Human Rights- and is advised by the Human Rights Policy Board and the University Equity Advisory Committee. SFU's Human Rights Policy covers discrimination, harassment based on a prohibited ground of discrimination, sexual harassment, and personal harassment. Finally, SFU is also a member of the Federal Contractor's Program. As such, the Human Rights and Equity Office also manages the Employment Equity Policy, which aims "to ensure that no individual is denied access to employment opportunities for reasons unrelated to ability or qualifications, such as gender or race" (SFU Employment Equity Policy, 1992). This specifically includes the four nationally designated groups of Aboriginal people, persons with disabilities, visible minorities and women.

In 2008 the Labour Program of Human Resources Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) completed an Employment Equity Audit at SFU (SFU, 2008). This audit used surveys and focus groups from university staff and faculty to examine formal and informal policies and practices regarding barriers to the success of diverse members of the universities workforce. The audit revealed a number of barriers to diversity present at SFU. These included under-representation of all four designated groups, particularly visible minorities; passive recruitment practices; misconceptions about the definition of employment equity; lack of representation on hiring committees; unreliable data; no policy for disability accommodation; an uneven focus on women over the other designated groups; insufficient attention to work-life balance issues; non-transparent

hiring and promotion practices; lack of coordination with SFU Career Services; structural barriers in collective agreements; and, physical barriers for those with mobility issues (SFU, 2008). While the report also made recommendations to deal with these barriers, there is little evidence on the Office of Human Rights and Equity webpage that these recommendations were implemented. Additionally, this report is now eight years old, and although the Office of Human Rights and Equity releases an annual report, the subsequent reports to the most recent (released for 2016) make little to no reference to addressing the barriers identified in the Employment Equity Audit.

Despite this audit, members of the SFU community have shown concern for the gender disparities among faculty. In 2013, the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association (SFUFA) passed a motion requesting the prioritization of a salary equity audit following research done at UBC that showed a gendered gap in salaries (SFUFA, 2017). Similar research was being done across Canada and the United States in this time period that showed this gap was not an isolated issue (such as the University of Calgary, 2005; University of Lethbridge, 2008; UBC, 2012; University of California Santa Barbara, 2013) and needed to be addressed at SFU.

In 2015, the SFU Salary Equity Working Group released a report on salary equity generated from quantitative analysis of gender differences in faculty salaries at SFU from 2004-2013. The key finding of the report was that there was a gender salary gap amongst full-time research faculty that had grown to 1.7% in 2013 from 0% in 2004 (Kessler and Pendakur, 2015). Consequently, these results were taken into account to develop recommendations developed and released in September 2016 by the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Committee. This second report makes recommendations to alleviate the salary disparity by increasing the salary of female full-time research faculty by 1.7%, and to deliver a group award to all female faculty retroactive to 2009. It also makes institutional recommendations to give further resources to the Equity portfolio at SFU, which it found to be under-resourced compared to other similarly-sized institutions. The recommendation also includes splitting the current Director of Human Rights and Equity roles into two roles, each individually designated for Human Rights and Employment Equity (SFU, 2016b).

These recommendations are a promising step towards gender wage equity at SFU. In December 2016 the SFU administration committed to the salary pay award as presented by the recommendation committee. Additionally, the University has committed to reviewing the institutional recommendations presented and is scheduled to report its response to this component of the recommendation by June 30, 2017 (SFUFA, 2016). However, gender and wage are just two components of the diversity and equity conversation. As outlined in the literature and in SFU's HRDC review, SFU and other Canadian universities tend to over-focus on women out of the four nationally designated groups (SFU, 2008). However, equity issues are present due to gender as well as many other social identities that are marginalized but may not be recognized under the national designation (CAUT, 2010). Additionally, the diversity conversation does not yet address the intersection of inequities some may face by being part of one or more marginalized groups.

There is a need to draw on broader frameworks that better capture diversity that includes, but is not limited to, gender. There are a few academic institutions that have moved their diversity policies and practices towards such a framework. The University of California Berkeley, for example, conducted a salary equity study similar to the gender salary equity study completed at SFU, except that it also includes an analysis of salaries by ethnicity, as well as the intersections of ethnicity and gender (University of California Berkeley, 2015). While this study doesn't explicitly use an intersectional framework, it uses a series of regression analyses to determine the varying effects of gender, ethnicity, as well as a number of professional criteria such as rank, "time-off-the-clock", field, and experience on salary in a way that is consistent with intersectionality.

In the Canadian context, the University of Alberta is particularly notable for its inclusion of an intersectional framework in its diversity strategy (University of Alberta 2016). An equity report released in 2013 uses an intersectional lens to show disparities are present due to gender, ethnicity, rank, faculty, and discipline (University of Alberta 2013). Through using intersectional language in their analysis and showing the disparities that arise through the joint effects of the factors analysed, this study is revolutionary in the field. Additionally, the University of Alberta is able to proceed with such a detailed study due to its Employment Equity Census, which has been deployed

since 1990 and collects information from faculty on women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal people, and persons with disabilities (University of Alberta 2016). Consequently, there is precedence for an intersectional framework to be used at academic institutions, though it has yet to be done at SFU. Given the growing interest and traction of an intersectional approach within higher education, it is important to provide a brief overview of this framework before looking at its potential contributions to SFU.

## **2.4. An intersectional approach**

Intersectionality is a term first used by Kimberlé Crenshaw in her 1989 paper 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex'. In her paper, Crenshaw argues that the employment experiences felt by Black women could not be explained fully by either feminism or antiracism. Rather, their experiences were based upon the intersections of their social identities of both race and gender (Crenshaw, 1989). However, intersectionality has roots that stem long before Crenshaw's coining of the term. The concept arose throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century by advocates of black feminism, who felt alienated by black men's and white women's movements and sought an outlet to overcome the classism, racism, and sexism that they experienced (Collins, 1990; Hooks, 1981). From there, black feminist scholars realized that while they had a particular set of issues facing them, these were also similar to others who were part of multiple marginalized groups. Intersectionality was then created to encompass both "the particularity and universality of their social condition" (Gopaldas, 2013, p. 90).

Since then, intersectionality has become understood as a way to understand the complex relationships between any number of identities. It is often used in health research as well as sociology, criminology, social work, population health, and environmental research (Campbell, 2015). While there are numerous definitions of intersectionality, one possible way of defining it has been proposed by Hankivsky (2014):

Intersectionality promotes an understanding of human beings as shaped by the interaction of different social locations (e.g., 'race'/ethnicity, Indigeneity, gender, class, sexuality, geography, age, disability/ability, migration status, religion).

These interactions occur within a context of connected systems and structures of power (e.g., laws, policies, state governments and other political and economic unions, religious institutions, media). Through such processes, interdependent forms of privilege and oppression shaped by colonialism, imperialism, racism, homophobia, ableism and patriarchy are created. (Hankivsky, 2014, p. 2)

Intersectionality has a growing importance in higher education research and is a promising framework because of its ability to reflect the diversity of an institution and give space for the stories of those often left on the margins to be heard (Griffin and Museus, 2011). Additionally, intersectionality gives researchers a better idea of how multiple social identities can lead to varying levels of inequality, and allows for recommendations that limit side effects of inequality that may be perpetrated in one group in the effort to improve equality in another (Cole, 2009). As discussed above, higher education actions on diversity have tended to focus primarily on gender and, sometimes, race (UBC, 2009; CAUT, 2010). Davis, Brunn-Bevel & Olive (2015) conducted a review of diversity action plans at universities across the United States and conclude that they predominantly take into account only single social identities (most often gender and race) which results in “intersectional invisibility” (Davis, Brunn-Bevel & Olive, 2015, p. 223) for those outside of these defined social boundaries. Intersectional frameworks challenge this common notion that a lack of diversity in academia is simply an issue of a lack of gender equity (Cantor et al., 2014). In reality, the story of diversity is much more complicated, and intersectional approaches aim to bring light to those who have historically been ‘invisible’ in diversity research. For example, the intersectional approach has been particularly useful researching the experiences of queer students and faculty on university campuses, who historically have often been left out of the diversity discussion (Tate, 2014; Pitcher, Secrist, and Camacho, 2016).

It is because of the ability of intersectionality to incorporate the inequities one may face from multiple social identities that an intersectional lens is ideal for this project. In order for diversity policies to be effective for faculty, the interactions of multiple social identities must be accounted for in any recommendations for diversity. As outlined previously, SFU has not been completely idle with initiatives from the Office of Human Rights and Equity. However, most of the more substantive actions that have been taken

focus on gender (SFU, 2008). Looking at gender alone does not represent an adequate view of diversity. Additionally, a diversity strategy that monitors specific groups (like SFU monitoring women, Aboriginals, visible minorities, and those with disabilities) does not capture the experiences of any person outside of those groups or between them. Hancock (2007) outlines the variances between unitary, multiple, and intersectional approaches to studying categories of difference, and emphasizes that intersectionality allows for the relationships between categories to be fluid. In this way intersectionality is separate even from studying multiple categories at once while assuming the relationship, and certainly separate from studying only one category, such as gender. Through using intersectionality, individual stories and experiences can be captured that would not have been revealed through a unitary or multiple category approach. For this Capstone, an intersectional framework is used to inform recommendations for policies that support diversity for all faculty at SFU, including, but not limited to, gender.

## Chapter 3. Methodology

The purpose of my research was two-fold: first, to investigate the barriers to diversity for faculty within academic institutions as well as challenges in implementing policies that support diversity, and second, to research promising practices in this field. The ultimate goal is to use the information collected in my research to provide recommendations to SFU, and to provide information that could be of use to other institutions of higher learning interested in supporting diversity.

This study used qualitative research methods. A qualitative approach was appropriate for this Capstone because it “stem[s] from experience and/or observation... [and] produces knowledge about perspectives, settings, and techniques” (Kozleski, 2017). Social interactions, such as the ones that occur among faculty at universities, are ultimately cultural interactions, which can be captured through the use of qualitative research methods (Kozleski & Artiles, 2014). Additionally, qualitative methods help illuminate context, which is needed in this study to determine the diversity context at SFU, and make visible the everyday activities that lead to the creation of this context (Morningstar et al., 2015; Shogren, Gross, et al., 2015). Finally, qualitative methods have been a strong resource for education and diversity research because it recognizes values and differences through providing rich research content (Waitoller & Kozleski, 2013).

It additionally used a theoretical framework of intersectionality, discussed in further detail in the previous chapter, to analyse policy options and inform the final recommendations. Consequently, a key focus was a focus on social justice, which is a vital tenant of intersectionality research and a motivating factor for this Capstone.

I conducted interviews with representatives who have worked on diversity projects at SFU as well as experts in the field of diversity research and practice at

academic institutions. This research was conducted under approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics.

### **3.1. Interview information**

Interviews were conducted with thirteen (13) members of the SFU and wider academic community who have participated in diversity initiatives at their institution. The purpose of these interviews was to investigate SFU-specific barriers to diversity and explore potential options for improving diversity both at SFU specifically and at academic institutions in general. The thirteen interviewees were chosen due to having working knowledge on the subject of diversity research or management. This knowledge came from a variety of sources, including research on diversity, participation in diversity initiatives, committee work surrounding diversity, and/or being a member of an institution's equity office.

My interviewees come from a diverse set of backgrounds, from a range of positions in faculty from SFU, UBC, and the University of Victoria (UVIC). Departments represented include Mathematics, Environment, Economics, Public Policy, Science, Academic Relations, and the Human Rights and Equity Office, as well as campus groups such as Academic Women and the SFU Faculty Association (SFUFA). This group of interviewees includes members of visible minorities, as well as both male and female participants. Interviewees were not asked to self-identify as members of any other potentially discriminated-against groups.

Requests for participation from the interviewees were sent out via email. Consent for each interview was collected prior to each interview. The interviews took place either in person at the SFU Burnaby campus or over the phone and were approximately 30-45 minutes in length. Each interview was audio recorded and then transcribed. The interviews followed a semi-structured interview approach that allowed me to guide the conversation while still allowing for open dialogue from the participants. The interview schedule is included in Appendix A.

## 3.2. Limitations of the research

Throughout my research I made every attempt to apply rigorous methods to achieve meaningful results. However, there are still limitations that arise throughout my research, which may be a function of the qualitative method itself, my data collection process, and normative assumptions that are made within the policy analysis process.

This study used qualitative methods to interview participants. I used the results of this research to first provide a narrative analysis of the conversations had with my research participants, following Kvale's framework of building a storyline from the responses of a variety of interviewees (1996). Next, I used thematic analysis to draw out both implicit and explicit ideas that emerged through the interview process. For this, I used Guest, MacQueen, and Namey's approach to thematic analysis to identify common phrases and connotations and further explore the implications of these themes (2012). Although these methods are grounded in theory and are commonly used in other research, there are inherent limitations to these methods. Primarily, qualitative research is naturally normative in nature and is subject to the assumptions of the researcher. Consequently, my theoretical views of the topic have unavoidably affected my analysis of the results. In order to ameliorate this bias as much as possible, I have clearly laid out my methodological framework in both this section and throughout the analysis in order to make any assumptions made by myself evident to the reader.

The process of using transcribed interviews in my analysis introduces another limitation. Kvale argues that this process removes verbal intonations, hand gestures, and other non-verbal, in-person types of communication that add meaning to the participant's statements (Kvale, 1996). While the interviews have been transcribed carefully, there is no way to include these subtle forms of communication in the transcription and thus some of the participants' meaning may have been lost.

Another limitation to my research is the possibility of selection bias. I chose to contact participants that I knew had already either participated in the diversity conversation at SFU and/or were experts in this field. Through participation in this field already it is likely that these participants already view academic diversity as an issue of importance and the views of those who are less aware of the issue are

underrepresented. Additionally, this study does not capture the experiences and perceptions of academics that are members of diverse groups, although these are the people who are directly affected.

Finally, the process of my policy analysis may limit the dependability of my findings and recommendations. My analysis relies on hypothesis and assumptions of how the policy options will play out in the real world, which, while grounded in research and theory, may not be represented as accurately as actually implementing policies and monitoring them for success.

These limitations are present in my research, but my research does provide a meaningful and insightful look into approaches to diversity at both SFU and other academic institutions. The following two chapters explore the results of my interviews.

## Chapter 4. Interview results

### 4.1. Findings on the Salary Equity Reports

Interviewees based at SFU were asked to comment on what they felt were the strengths and weakness of the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Report and its preceding research. They were also questioned on how they viewed the feasibility of the recommendations put forth by the committee in the context of SFU.

Overall, the feelings toward the report submitted by the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Committee were positive. Numerous respondents commented on the “*very collegial and collaborative process*” (Anonymous, 2017) of the committee, which is reportedly rare for academic committees. Some interviewees were members of the committee, and reported that for the most part all those sitting on it felt they were working towards a common goal with common purpose. Those I interviewed who sat on the committee said they felt the results were “*best set of recommendations [they] could come up with given some of the constraints set out in the terms in reference*” and that they were “*not be constrained by some kind of pre-set budget that the university was going to allocate to them*” because the university “really wanted to do what was right” (Anonymous, 2017).

Although some interviewees explained they originally had concerns with the recommendation to award all female faculty the same amount because it had the potential to harm some men in departments with a smaller wage disparity, all were ultimately convinced that the across the board reward was worth the trade-off compared to the alternative option of case-by-case review, which is more resource intensive and results in subjective outcomes. However, one interviewee was hopeful that an anomaly review process could be looked further into to create a more robust process for both

men and women who could benefit from undergoing an anomaly review, depending on their home department.

Another strength of the report that was cited often by interviewees is that it is backed by very strong data. While other universities such as UBC, the University of Waterloo, and McMaster University (Loriggio 2016), have given similar awards, they were based upon less data than SFU's, whose dataset went back to 2009. The evidence of the wage disparity was evident and conclusive, which many interviewees believed would make the committee's recommendations even more pressing to the SFU administration to accept.

The largest constraint was that the committee was struck with the goal of focussing only on the gender-wage gap. Those in all underrepresented groups were not considered in the recommendation, as well as forms of discrimination against these groups other than wage disparity. While for some this was a necessary condition of the terms of reference given to the Salary Equity Committee and a function of the data available to SFU, to others it was an oversight that seemed too easily glossed over by the administration. A few interviewees mentioned that without an intersectional lens the focus on gender felt slightly incomplete. One interviewee felt that controlling for academic department ignored the entire issue of some academic departments having higher wages than others and the fact that lower paid departments tend to have higher percentages of women faculty.

In terms of feasibility, most interviewees felt fairly optimistic about the possibility of the report's recommendations being taken up by SFU, despite the recommendations (particularly on the institutional side) being often described as ambitious and comprehensive. In particular, it was felt that the salary award to correct for wage disparity in the past ten years had a high likelihood of being carried out exactly as the report recommended (as it has been since these interviews took place). As for the institutional recommendations, responses on how the SFU administration might respond to those were varied. Some felt certain that the administration would at least implement the core recommendations of instating the new VP of Human Rights and Equity position and the retitling of the current Directorship to Director of Human Rights and Equity, and

that further advancements would soon follow. Others felt that institutional action might not be strong enough under the current SFU administrative climate. However, almost all felt that the real strength of the recommendations were in the institutional changes, which would be necessary in order to prevent the wage disparity reforming in the future.

The following sections outline six themes that arose throughout interviews with both SFU and external institution interviewees. The themes describe barriers, challenges, and essential components of solutions to supporting diversity at academic institutions.

## **4.2. Theme 1: Institutional resources**

One key theme that arose from the interviews was the importance of giving institutional resources to supporting diversity. Resources include funding from the administration, as well as qualified staff in a human rights, equity, and/or inclusion office. Many interviewees from SFU remarked that compared to similar institutions, SFU falls behind on this aspect. SFU's Human Rights and Equity office has only one staff member and no secretarial support. Comparatively, UBC's Equity and Inclusion Office has seven staff members, with senior and mid-level administration positions as well as administrative support. UVIC, an institution two thirds of SFU's size, similarly has an Equity and Human Rights Office with seven staff members ranging from senior administration to administrative support. One interviewee noted: *"I was impressed, and continue to be impressed, by the group that [UVIC has]- it's about 7 people. And UVIC's about 2/3 of SFU's size"* (Anonymous, 2017).

These additional resources have enabled UVIC and UBC to move their diversity efforts from a reactive approach to a proactive approach. Additionally, these offices are attempting to create centralised support for diversity initiatives for faculty, staff, and students. Having this capacity allows the UVIC and UBC offices to manage the Employment Equity Plan and personal conflicts much in the same way as SFU does; however, they also facilitate education programs, provide guidance on equitable hiring practices, monitor campus climate, and coordinate the institution's long-term strategic

goals in relation to diversity. This provides an effective way to bring the institutions' strategic goals to life on campus.

UVIC stands out through the use of its resources in educational content. For example, last year a welcome video was created for new UVIC faculty that describes its goals in relation to diversity and a welcoming campus. One of UVIC's staff members is specifically in charge of educational workshops around a variety of diversity themes, and they are planning on hiring another educational coordinator for education and campus climate programs specifically around sexualised violence.

UBC also divests significant funding into its equity office. Of note is the recent announcement of the UBC Commitment to Diversity Fund announced in the spring of 2016 by the Board of Governors. This fund is created to support diversity in various UBC systems and operations, and from 2019 onwards is expected to be \$2 million year. The establishment of such a fund is ground-breaking in Canadian universities. The University of Michigan, however, has a similar fund valued at \$85 million (according to one interviewee, although I was unable to verify this number. It is possible that the \$85 million, if correct, is divided over the 5 year timeline of the strategic plan released in the fall of 2016; University of Michigan, 2016). One interviewee also pointed to the University of Oregon as optimizing on this commitment of resources by offering trauma counselling to sexual assault victims and has even built specific student residences for students in trauma recovery. These actions show that the institution's commitment to student well-being is not just stated on paper- it is being acted upon.

Again, numerous interviewees echoed that such resources are not seen currently at SFU. This might be a limiting factor in the potential for the intuitional recommendations of the salary equity report to be taken up, unless this is changed at the administrative level. Switching to a proactive and comprehensive approach to diversity management will require "*ongoing additional resources to fund new offices, new positions, do training, [and] do outreach in ways that don't currently exist at SFU*" (Olena Hankivsky, Director, Institute of Intersectionality Research and Policy, SFU).

The theme of resources is not one that has been explicitly stated as a barrier to diversity in the literature. However, in some cases it is implicit that some of the best

practices being identified are practices that would require more resources than have been traditionally devoted to human rights offices. Traditionally diversity efforts are focussed around compositional diversity, meaning diversity is considered through having a student, faculty, and staff representation that reflects society as a whole through the numerical and proportional representation of designated groups (Milem, Chang, and Antonio, 2005). However, diversity includes compositional diversity as well as the perceptions, experiences, and well-being of the staff, faculty, and students in these underrepresented groups. In order to tackle the more complex measures of well-being, more resources must be required in order to tackle these goals.

### **4.3. Theme 2: Administration and leadership**

Building upon the need for a commitment of larger resources at SFU, numerous interviewees stressed the importance of a committed leader. One UVIC interviewee responded that their recommendation to an institution would be to get senior commitment to diversity, and credits the success of UVIC's equity office to having a senior leadership office and president that prioritizes and supports diversity by listening and having open discussions about the issue. From there, *"[UVIC has] probably spent a lot of time and effort developing a plan, and now our attention really needs to focus on establishing a set of practices... so that we can kind of make the plan now come alive"* (Mary Ellen Purkis, Acting Director, UVIC Office of Equity and Human Rights).

The SFU Human Rights office does currently report to the University Secretary through the Human Rights Policy Board. This is not as direct a link as many other equity offices and most interviewees seconded the need to instate a VP of Human Rights and Equity as recommended in the Salary Equity Report. Having a designated senior administration with a commitment to diversity would facilitate and lead the coordination of diversity policies between the many different groups on campus, such as SFUFA, faculty deans, advocacy groups, and the Human Rights and Equity Office. At UVIC, *"getting the support of senior administration for a variety of coordinating mechanisms"* (Anonymous) is seen as critical to the success of diversity management.

A number of interviewees also mentioned the importance of having a president who is a diversity champion and that in order for diversity management to work *“there absolutely has to be meaningful buy-in and participation all the way up to the president”* (Elise Chenier, President, Academic Women). A couple heralded presidents at other institutions (like the University of Michigan, University of Oregon, University of Victoria) for being active and outspoken diversity champions. However, several noted a lack of such a champion for diversity at SFU and that some did not *“have a lot of faith in SFU’s ability to effectively create administrative structure that does the work that needs doing”* (Anonymous, 2017).

While the impacts of having a committed leadership on equity is not a topic commonly explored in the current literature on higher education, it is explored in other disciplines such as gender equity in governmental policy (Taylor-Gooby and Waite, 2013; McNutt and Béland, 2015; Gladu, 2016). The anecdotal evidence of the importance of leadership from my interviewees shows it to be an important consideration in steps needed to foster diversity. One interviewee directed me to an illuminating piece of literature in this area is written by the president of a Californian community college, Francisco Rodriguez (2015). In this article, Rodriguez outlines what he believes to be the role of an institutional leader in fostering diversity, and his points echo many of those discussed by my interviewees. For example, he argues for an active shift towards diversity support, which includes resources and funding for underrepresented students and faculty, a willingness to take a risk and publicly stand up for diversity, being a mentor and diversity champion, and setting a tone and strategic direction for diversity strategies (Rodriguez, 2015). He is not the only Californian president to think so. In 2001, University of California President Richard Atkinson wrote to the nine academic chancellors stating *“Continued academic excellence will require increased attention to issues such as multiculturalism, economic opportunity, and educational equity to ensure that they are reflected strongly in the University’s teaching, curriculum, and research”* (University of California, 2001).

While there are some noteworthy diversity champions at senior levels of academic administration, much more work needs to be done in order to make this a priority at all institutions. SFU in particular, according to my interviewees, does not

currently have a diversity champion at the senior leadership, although this is necessary to support diversity at the institutional level.

#### **4.4. Theme 3: Data collection and use**

A barrier to diversity commonly discussed by the interviewees is the collection and use of data. As mentioned previously, one of the strengths of the Salary Equity Report on gender wage disparity was the strong longitudinal dataset that clearly showed the wage disparity between women and men for the past ten years. Such detailed information is rare for an institution to have. This data resulted in “*a very strong report*” but many on the committee felt “*there was very much a feeling after that we’ve only looking at such a narrow problem, and that issues of equity and diversity go so much broader than just the gender pay gap*” (Mary-Catherine Kropinski, Professor/Associate Chair, Department of Mathematics, SFU).

SFU, and many other academic institutions, do not have such detailed data on other underrepresented groups, even those protected from discriminatory harassment under the federal contractor’s policy (person with a disability, member of a visible minority, member of a First Nations). This is largely because this information is not mandatory to supply to the university- new faculty can opt-in to self declare as being part of one or more of these groups. However, not all do, because they may not “*trust enough to reveal [their social identity] to their employer... because they’re concerned with what will happen with the information*” (Brenda Taylor, Director of Human Rights and Equity, SFU). If they think it might harm their job or promotion prospects, a faculty member might be unwilling to provide this information. It is also possible that one might not feel marginalized and find it unnecessary to self-designate into one of those groups. Finally, some may not self-designate if the group they identify with is not an option on the faculty survey. This is seen often with members of the LGBTQ community, as this is not a designated group under the federal contractors program (Tate, 2014).

Whatever the reason, a lack of data was visible challenge for most of the interviewees. Because the representation of these designated groups (not to mention others, such as the LGBTQ population) are a smaller proportion of the SFU faculty

population than women (who make up about 30% of the total SFU population), the sample size of these groups is so small that *“it’s really hard to get very precise estimates, and it’s very challenging to compare [an] estimate, for ... black women compared to non-black non-women”*. Additionally, another issue with small sample sizes is the *“maintain[ance] [of] everyone’s privacy when you’re looking at a very small number of people”* (Bertille Antoine, Associate Professor, Department of Economics, SFU). Because of these issues, it would likely be difficult to come up with a significant finding as was done with the gender wage disparity at SFU. Because of the optional survey to self-designate as Aboriginal, a member of a visible minority, or someone with a disability, we know that there are very few faculty members at SFU who identify in these groups (although this sample is likely underrepresented due to some not completing the survey). Additionally, using an intersectional lens to find relationships for people who belong to more than one of these groups would create an even smaller sample size, making precise data predictions difficult.

Generally, institutions want the data to move forward with any new initiatives. Many interviewees pondered how to get administrative action despite not having such detailed data for groups other than just those who are women, and regardless of other groups those women may be a part of, because *“Just because the data doesn’t exist doesn’t mean that the problem doesn’t exist”* (Olena Hankivsky, Director of the Institute of Intersectionality Research and Policy, SFU). One stated: *“the thing that concerns me the most is there are other underrepresented groups, or significantly more underrepresented groups, for which we don’t gather data, for which we aren’t [going to] have this kind of hard scientific evidence to establish the problem, and argue that we need to do something about it”* (Mary-Catherine Kropinksi, Professor/Associate Chair, Department of Mathematics, SFU).

One possible solution to this problem could involve a policy to make the faculty census mandatory and taking extra precautions to ensure anonymity and privacy of responses. There are, however, ethical and moral justifications for not making demographic information mandatory on surveys. Another option would be to try and unveil the issue in a more qualitative way, such as having focus groups or community meetings to discuss people’s experiences. One problem with this method though is that

they historically have low attendance. One interviewee even suggested that you could expand the sample size by doing a cross-institutional collection of data in collaboration with a number of universities. With a larger sample size the data would be able to yield significant results. However, Canada has historically done poorly in this area (UBC, 2009; CAUT, 2010).

Another form of data collection is the type of indicators used to measure the success of equity programs. Currently, SFU reports indicators such as number of cases worked on, number of complaints received, and number of cases sent to external review. These are the same indicators that UVIC and UBC use, as these are required to be reported to the government as well as part of the federal contractors program. However, a few interviewees responded by saying that they are not convinced these are the most effective indicators of success or progress because *“engag[ing] in an informal complaint process doesn’t actually tell us very much about how in depth and complicated that process might have been”* (Mary Ellen Purkis, Acting Director, UVIC Equity and Human Rights).

UVIC, for example, has begun distributing surveys after events or workshops to receive input from the participants. This feedback is used to inform future events and needs for new events. UVIC is also looking into tracking more rigorous metrics tied more closely to their strategic goals, although these have yet to be developed. Research does show that campus surveys of campus climate and well-being provide meaningful insights into the barriers and challenges faced by those of diverse groups (Dunn and Olivier, 2011).

#### **4.5. Theme 4: Hiring, recruitment, and retention**

Hiring policies that impact diversity was a topic of interest to many of the interviewees. Considering that many of the more quantitative research surrounding compositional diversity for faculty centre on recruitment, hiring, retention, and promotion outcomes, this was not a surprising result (see Hartlep et al., 2016; Rivera and Ward, 2008; Acker, Webber, and Smyth, 2012).

As discussed in more detail in the background section, SFU protects the equitable treatment of federally designated groups through the Employment Equity Policy and the Disability Accommodation Policy. While the Human Rights and Equity Office currently will occasionally advise departments on equitable hiring processes for these groups, this is a request-only basis and is not a set priority for hiring. However, representatives interviewed from other institutions (UBC and UVIC) note that these institutions offer more comprehensive workshops and education on diverse hiring for these groups.

Interviewees expressed interest in policies that would support diversity at the institutional level such as mentoring as well as requiring diversity training for all hiring committee members, for department chairs and deans, and in drafting up job ads to attract a diverse pool of applicants. Such training is currently done at UVIC to varying levels across departments. One interviewee also discussed the possibility of asking applicants a question related to diversity in their interview, although research suggests that those in different fields may respond differently to such a question (Schmaling et al., 2015).

One issue that a couple of interviewees discussed is that some departments, in an attempt to create diverse hiring committees, have implemented soft quotas for maintaining members of underrepresented groups on hiring (and other) committees. However, in departments where these groups are underrepresented, these people end up being overtaxed on committee work compared to others in their department, simply because they are in demand due to being a member of a designated group. This has been seen at SFU when these policies *“tend to mean targeting people who are in those equity groups to be on committees. And one of the things that were recognized is that for instance, Aboriginal faculty and Aboriginal staff are over taxed because they get tapped constantly to be on these various committees”* (Ronda Arab, Director, SFUFA Executive Committee). For this reason, training all members of a hiring committee on diversity and bias awareness was seen as a more favourable policy.

Quotas in terms of ensuring to hire a certain number of faculty from different designated groups were also discussed by one interviewee. However, this interviewee

similarly thought that quotas do not necessarily address the root problem, and suggested that if it really is an issue of supply then there should be more support (such as scholarships) for these designated groups while they are still students to encourage them to continue in academia to the faculty level. Literature on the success of quotas is mixed. In the private and public sphere, gender and race quotas are known as the “Nordic model” of managing diversity for corporate boards and government committees due to their popular implementation in many areas of Europe. They have been viewed with some success in the corporate and governmental sector (Sweigart, 2012). However, quotas have also been viewed as “blunt tool to solve a complex and tangled problem” (Lansing and Chandra, 2012, pp. 4) because in some cases those who receive positions due to demographics may be viewed as superseding the required qualifications and may not be as likely to succeed as those who received the position due to merit alone.

Such training would also be important for deans and department chairs when assessing for tenure and promotion. This is essential because different groups experience different barriers to diversity and hiring. For example, Aboriginal faculty would benefit from having hiring and promotion committees that were more adept at “*recognizing non-traditional forms of scholarship*” (Jennifer Scott, Member Services Officer, SFUFA). In order to support these types of faculty better, deans and department chairs need to be trained in assessing and valuing these other forms of scholarship as well. As well, it is important to consider “*service work when giving steps upon promotion and salary increase because there are certain committees in the university ... that there needs to be representation from equity groups*” (Jennifer Scott, Member Services Officer, SFUFA). Those who belong to under-represented groups on campus end up being involved in more service work than the average faculty member.

A few interviewees also discussed embedding diversity more into the hiring process and procedures. For example, currently deans and department chairs are required to write a report after a faculty hire discussing why they choose the candidate they did against the other candidates. Instead of doing this after the action has already occurred, one interviewee suggested that they could be required to have a check in place at the short-list stage that halts the hiring search from proceeding unless the short-

list is sufficiently diverse. The hiring committee would be required to prove that they could not find qualified diverse candidates for the short-list if they wished to proceed.

Finally, a final hiring topic was salaries. Notably, one interviewee was concerned that *“it’s pretty clear that we don’t have equal pay for equal work. We value work differently according to what you know that position could get on the market and that in and of itself just leads to a sexist system”* (Ronda Arab, Director, SFUFA Executive Committee). Some examples discussed by interviewees were the Economics department, which has little wage disparity between genders, but on average pays a much higher salary than the sociology department. On the other hand, the Geography department has a much higher wage disparity between genders, due largely to the use of market differentials on top of base pay. This interviewee discussed a need across all of academia to look into the use of market differentials and salary differences across faculty, with the ultimate goal of reaching equal pay for equal work. Equal pay for equal work involves looking at the teaching, research, and committee loads of every faculty member to assess pay, as opposed to the market rate in their field. However, this interviewee noted that *“there isn’t much political will”* (Ronda Arab, Director, SFUFA Executive Committee) to change this system as it stands currently. While there may be a lack of political will for such a model, attempts at salary equity regimes do exist. For example, Smith (2008) outlines a process developed for the University of Houston-Victoria, which includes the consideration of academic discipline, job title, years teaching, and recommended salary targets for the institution. Smith notably remarks that *“no plan can reconcile the ideal of uniform salary equity across all disciplines with the reality of the market-driven disparities among them”* (Smith, 2008). However, his developed plan works to minimize and hold accountable the salary disparities between faculty members. Such a plan also minimizes disparities between research, service, and teaching loads, and compensates equally for years of experience and education level across the university.

#### **4.6. Theme 5: Education and training**

As mentioned in the previous section, most interviewees called for diversity training for hiring committees and senior leadership. Another common component was

devising diversity educational resources and opportunities for new faculty and students. However, most interviewees also emphasize the need for on-going training and education. One-time educational efforts are not effective because *“you can’t just bring in faculty and talk to them for an hour about how you should you know treat diverse students in the classroom. These have to be ongoing efforts because the way we see the world and our biases that we carry with us, these develop over a lifetime”* (Olena Hankivsky, Director of the Institute of Intersectionality Research and Policy, SFU). For example, faculty training has proven to be effective in improving diversity and inclusion for students in the classroom setting (Moriña, Cortés-Vega & Molina, 2015), and it is not a far stretch to hypothesize that it would similar benefit for senior leadership and hiring committees.

UVIC is currently looking into how to make this happen, and is planning on using their Equity and Human Rights Office to assess the various initiatives being done by a variety of groups across campus. From there, the goal is to use the Equity Office as a central hub to coordinate core messaging that can be strategically delivered through these groups already acting on campus.

To expand the education and training past a hiring focus, one interviewee discussed the need to educate and train everyone on campus, from program managers to HR people to the communications department to student leaders in residence, clubs, and athletics. In this way, everyone in the university is trained to understand diversity, why it is important, and how they can support it in their own environment at the university. If done in a coordinated fashion, the core messaging of diversity would be very effective across campus.

#### **4.7. Theme 6: Campus climate and culture**

Campus climate and culture was another important theme, described as a function of day-to-day interactions at an institution. As respondents explained, it can often be characterised by one’s ability to feel safe and welcome on campus.

There are many components of healthy and inclusive campus climate (UBC, 2008; Condon and Peacock, 2009; Bertschinger, 2015; Desivilya Syna et al. 2017). For example, a number of interviewees discussed the importance of having an overall strategic plan as a baseboard for guiding actions at an institution in a way that will lead to the construction of a healthy campus.

For example, in 2008 UBC created a Respectful Environment Statement that applies to faculty, staff, and students. The statement “provides the guiding principles to support [UBC] in building an environment in which respect, civility, diversity, opportunity and inclusion are valued” (UBC, 2008). As opposed to only addressing harassment and discrimination, as most harassment policies do, this policy includes those issues plus other guiding principles to creating a positive, safe space on campus. This statement was used in consideration to building the equity and inclusion action plan that UBC is currently in the process of implementing through the various Equity and Inclusion Office initiatives.

A robust, overarching strategy is set out in UVIC’s Employment Equity Plan. At UVIC this plan has been revisited throughout the years and modified so that it includes goals and accountabilities beyond what is usually found in an employment equity plan, such as goals for hiring targets, leadership and accountability, messaging and consultation, consultation and participation, training and education, and accommodation policy. Through this plan priorities are set and clear, and give an excellent starting point to those working on diversity initiatives. This strategy is built upon the principle that “*it helps having an overall vision and plan from the top, especially when that’s linked, if possible to other priorities of the university*” (Anonymous).

Interviewees also noted that while it is invaluable to have resources to back up strategic diversity initiatives to get away from the model of “*starved equity and inclusion and human rights offices it is equally important to have the allocation of these resources specifically laid out in action plans built upon diversity strategic plans and mission statements*” (Jude Tate, Director of Equity and Inclusion, UBC).

SFU is not wholly behind in terms of having a strategic diversity plan to guide the formation of a healthy campus climate. While SFU does not have a diversity, equity,

and/or inclusion plan in the same sense that UVIC and UBC do, the motto of “engaging the world” has great potential for creating an action plan and specifically considering what it means to be a welcoming, engaged university, not only with the world and surrounding community but to its own population. Diversity and a healthy work environment are already two of the six pillars that make up SFU’s vision statement; this simply needs to be developed further to create more actionable goals. Having such an action plan was identified by numerous interviewees as being critical to focussing diversity initiatives and fostering conversation through a centralized office.

The interviewees at SFU seemed to agree that campus climate is important, and SFU is doing some work in this area. For example, an important part of climate culture is “*manifested in things like the curriculum, the holdings in the library, the people who are recipients of honorary degrees...gender neutral bathroom space...the art on your wall*” (Brenda Taylor, Director of SFU Human Rights and Equity Office).

However, some interviewees anecdotally shared feelings of marginalization for some groups on campus, in the form of unconscious biases and attitudes and values that “*simmer below the surface*”. These biases are reflections of the norms of society, yet institutions have the ability to try and change these attitudes and values. Additionally, these still exist despite diversity being set in policy such as the Employment Equity Policy as a common belief is that “*because we have human rights legislation we have human rights policies that people think that because it’s in policies it’s taken care of*” (Jude Tate, Director of Equity and Inclusion, UBC).

Some interviewees expressed a feeling that many take equity and diversity for granted, in the sense that those who do not feel marginalized believe it is not a significant problem, and that a more proactive approach is needed to address this. Similar feelings have been echoed in numerous campus climate studies (Campbell-Whately, Wang, Toms, and Williams, 2015; Examining Women’s Status: Campus Climate and Gender Equity, 2011; Simmons, 2017). However, universities have “*very specific power relations ... that are both administrative ... and between faculty and staff and faculty and students*” that need to be addressed (Mary Ellen Purkis, Acting Director, UVIC Equity and Human Rights Office, 2017).

To further embed diversity at SFU, the university needs to explore questions such as *“what does it mean to be a welcoming, engaged university with the entire population and a welcoming community to the entire population, because a lot of the ways in which people discriminate are really embedded in culture, they’re really embedded in a lot of unquestioned assumptions, and we need changes in attitudes, we need changes in behaviours, and we also need the institutional infrastructure to support all of those”* (Olena Hankivsky, Director of the Institute of Intersectionality Research and Policy, SFU).

#### **4.8. Theme 7: Sexual Violence Policy**

While it was not a goal of these interviews to discuss the advancements in sexualised violence policy at universities, I think it is important to note that the topic did come up at least briefly in the majority of my interviews. The overall consensus is that *“the university has an opportunity to think about not just these issues but some of the other issues that have been present on campus, especially around the sexual harassment and anti-violence policies, that we need to see all of these as pieces of a puzzle”* (Olena Hankivsky, Director of Intersectional Research and Policy, SFU, 2017)

As SFU, UBC, UVIC, and many other institutions consult and prepare new policies around sexualised violence, many of those working in the diversity sphere see these discussions *“as sort of a catalyst to have that same sort of conversation more widely about diversity and equity issues and how we educate and promote those values within the university”* (Mary-Ellen Purkis, Acting Director, UVIC Equity and Human Rights Office). UVIC’s Equity and Human Rights Office is planning on hiring an education coordinator for sexualised violence specifically, thus including it in the equity and diversity sphere. These two topics are closely intertwined and ought to be considered together, not separately, as both sexualised violence and diversity conversations move forward.

## Chapter 5. Policy Criteria

In evaluating the policy options to increase faculty diversity at SFU, five criteria were used: effectiveness, equity, cost, administrative complexity, and stakeholder acceptance. Table 1 further describes these criteria below.

**Table 1: Summary of Evaluation Criteria**

<b>Societal Objectives</b>	
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>
Effectiveness	Does it aim to increase faculty diversity at SFU?
Equity	Does it provide an intersectional lens to support groups who are faring worse than others at academic institutions?
<b>Governmental Objectives</b>	
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>
Cost	What is the cost to the provincial government?
	What is the cost to the academic institution, SFU?
Administrative Complexity	How simple is it to administer?
Stakeholder Acceptance	Does it have support from academic administration at SFU?
	Does it have support from academic faculty at SFU?

In the following section, I explain each of the criteria in depth.

### 5.1. Effectiveness

The purpose of this criterion is to evaluate how well each policy option increases faculty diversity at an academic institution. The policy problem that this study is addressing is that there is a lack of diversity at academic institutions. This criterion then is the primary consideration for all of the policy options being evaluated. The evaluation of this criterion is based on predictions I make about the effectiveness of each

policy option based the descriptions and opinions provided by my interviewees in both groups.

The effectiveness criterion will be evaluated through the measure of how explicitly the policy option aims to increase faculty diversity at academic institutions. Because this criterion is the primary objective of my research, it will ultimately be weighted more heavily than the other criterion in my analysis. I believe this weighting is important because a policy option that scores well on all other criteria but is not actually effective in increasing diversity defeats the goal of the study and ultimately should not be recommended. The other criteria are expected to balance the weighting of effectiveness so as not to skew the final recommendations in favour of effectiveness only.

## **5.2. Equity**

Because of the problem definition for this capstone, equity is partially captured already in the criterion of effectiveness. However, the purpose of the equity criterion is to capture the use of an intersectional approach in the policy options being evaluated. Including this as a separate criterion is important because it measures the degree that the potential policy options take into account the interactions of multiple identities in forming possible inequities at academic institutions as opposed to perpetrating the inequities into targeted groups. This criterion is also meant to take into account substantive equity; that is, that certain groups in academia are disadvantaged and ought to be given more supports than others in order to succeed at an equal level, although this is not always done in practice.

## **5.3. Cost**

SFU, like many other academic institutions, is a public university, meaning it receives funding and strategic guidance from the provincial government. It also receives funding from private donations. Given this, there is the implementation of potential policy options may have a cost to the provincial government, to SFU itself, or to both. This criterion is measured in two forms, then: cost to the government and cost to the

academic institution. Although some policy options may not have costs under both categories, it is important to keep these costs separate as it may influence the feasibility of implementing the option. For these costs, costs used are qualitative estimates as exact numbers are not available.

#### **5.4. Administrative Complexity**

It is also important to consider administrative complexity in the analysis of policy options. If options are difficult to implement, either due to multiple layers of departments or governments being involved, being resource (staff or time) intensive, or requiring significant changes to the administrative system, then the likelihood of them being implemented and maintained is less. This makes these options less feasible than ones that are easier to implement.

#### **5.5. Stakeholder Acceptance**

The last criterion evaluated is stakeholder acceptance, which includes measures for acceptability from two stakeholders: academic administrative and academic faculty. Since the academic administrative bodies will have to be involved in any policy implementation their support in a successful policy option is essentially. Additionally, as any policy option will most strongly affect academic faculty, their opinions on policy options ought to be valued and heard. This criterion is evaluated using information and opinions gained from my interview participants.

#### **5.6. Criteria and Measures**

A qualitative criteria and measures matrix is used to evaluate each policy option against the criteria described above. Each measure uses a high-medium-low assessment to determine how well the policy option fulfills the ideal requirements of the measure. Table 2 below outlines the details regarding the assessment of each criterion.

**Table 2: Criteria and measures assessment**

Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Measure	Assessment
Effectiveness	Does it aim to increase faculty diversity at academic institutions?	Degree to which policy explicitly aims to improve institutional diversity. High is favourable.	High: Policy specifically targets institutional diversity.
			Medium: Policy moderately targets diversity.
			Low: Policy does not target diversity (diversity may be a side effect).
Equity	Does it provide an intersectional lens to support groups who are faring worse than others at academic institutions?	Degree that supports are given to those facing challenges achieving academic success through an intersectional approach. High is favourable.	High: Full consideration of intersectionality in supporting disadvantaged groups.
			Medium: Moderate consideration of intersectionality- multiple groups may be considered without intersections.
			Low: No intersectionality is considered- policies are targeted towards specific groups.
Cost	What is the cost to the provincial government?	Qualitative cost estimation. Low is favourable.	High: Substantial cost required.
			Medium: Low to moderate cost required.
			Low: No cost required.
	What is the cost to academic institutions?	Qualitative cost estimation. Low is favourable.	High: Substantial cost required.
			Medium: Low to moderate cost required.
			Low: No cost required.
Administrative Complexity	How simple is it to administer?	Number of organizations or departments involved in implementation. Low is favourable.	High: Coordination across more than two organizations required for implementation.
			Medium: Two organizations involved in implementation (ex: government and institution).
			Low: Only one organization involved.

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Stakeholder Acceptance	Does it have support from academic administration?	Proportion of academic administration members in favour of option. High is favourable.	High: Moderate or high administrative support for the option.
			Medium: Low or unclear administrative support for the option.
			Low: No administrative support for option.
	Does it have support from academic faculty?	Proportion of academic administration members in favour of option. High is favourable.	High: Moderate or high faculty support for the option.
Medium: Low or unclear faculty support for the option.			
Low: No faculty support for the option.			

## **Chapter 6. Policy Options and Analysis**

Based upon the literature review and interview results, I generated fifteen policy options that aim to improve faculty diversity at SFU. These options span the short, medium, and long-term. Each option was analysed according to the criteria and measures outlined above. The following section details each option and discusses the strengths and weaknesses of each that were identified.

### **6.1. Short-term options**

#### ***Option 1A: Quotas for hiring committees***

This option was discussed by some of my interviewees, and is also present in the literature as an affirmative action method that is commonly used to address a lack of diversity. Hiring committees are formed every time a new faculty member is hired at the university, and are charged with the responsibility of running the search for candidates to short-list as well as interviewing the candidates and making a final recommendation to the dean or department chair. Implementing a quota system for hiring committees would mean stipulating that every hiring committee must have a certain amount of representation from the federally-designated diverse groups, such as women, visible minorities, Aboriginals, or those with a disability. The literature that supports such quotas suggests that ensuring a hiring committee is made of diverse groups will increase the possibility of a diverse hire, as people unconsciously tend to want to hire people who are like them (Meziani, 2013).

This option is easy for an institute to implement by embedding in hiring policies and procedures. Additionally, as it follows the same framework for hiring that is already practiced, there is a low cost of implementing a new quota system in the formation of hiring committees.

However, the interview results show that there are some drawbacks to such a system. While diverse hiring committees are expected to be somewhat successful at increasing the number of diverse faculty at an institution, this option only improves compositional diversity at the institution and does not address the issue of diversity within the institutional climate. Additionally, according to my interviewees quotas are generally unable to take into account intersectional diversity, as quotas are most commonly set only for specified and identified diversity groups. People who are members of underrepresented groups not designated by the university, or those who are members of more than one group, would still have difficulty finding representation on hiring committees, and consequently may face intersectional invisibility in new hires as well (Davis, Brunn-Bevel & Olive, 2015). Thus, while this option aims to support diverse groups through affirmative action, this support may not extend to all those who are marginalized, or may only support them based on one aspect of their identity. Finally, faculty members who are members of the groups wanted on hiring committees may be over-taxed to serve on these committees, as there are fewer of them on campus but they would be in demand to serve.

### ***Option 1B: Quotas for hiring representation***

Similar to quotas on hiring committees, some literature also suggests implementing quotas for new hires as a possible method for managing diversity (Jensenius, 2016). An institution would likely want to try to hire faculty in the same proportions that diverse groups are found in the surrounding location. Implementing quotas for diverse groups would ensure that members of these groups are more visible and present among a university's faculty.

Quotas are generally fairly easy for an institution to implement, as they would simply fit in to the current recruiting and hiring framework. Costs to search for faculty from diverse groups may be slightly higher than current search efforts, but likely would not be greatly different.

Like the hiring committees quotas, though, quotas have an inherent inability to improve perceptions and opinions about diversity on campus. While compositional diversity would be unquestionably improved, faculty may still hold the implicit biases

against those in diverse groups. Additionally, quotas would likely only be set for members of those in designated diversity groups, and those outside of these groups would still struggle to get hired as there is a risk some would see those hired under a quota-system as second-rate academics. Consequently, the affirmative action for some who are marginalized may leave out others.

### ***Option 1C: Mentoring for diverse hires***

Setting up a mentoring program for new faculty hires that are members of diverse groups was recommended by several of my interviewees. It was thought by most that mentoring could create a more welcoming space for faculty who are members of underrepresented groups, and is corroborated in literature (Golbeck, 2015; Pololi and Evans, 2015; Ensor, 2016). This option is also highlighted as a priority in the SFU Salary Equity Recommendations Committee Report (SFU, 2016b).

Both university faculty and administration generally view such a program positively. It is a common framework that is easy to implement and low cost to the university as mentors are usually volunteers who spend their own time checking in with their mentee. However, some of my interviewees felt that because mentees are often paired with mentors from similar background to themselves, these members of diverse groups could be siloed from the rest of the faculty as opposed to interacting with everyone. Additionally, the unconscious bias that may be present from faculty members who are not members of designated groups with mentoring programs are not addressed.

### ***Option 1D: Optional self-designation for diversity data collection (status quo)***

SFU, and many other academic institutions, collects diversity data from faculty in an anonymous survey. This survey allows the university to gain knowledge on the make-up of its faculty, which can be used to determine areas of need for diversity initiatives. The information collected can be intersectional as well, because faculty are able to self-designate themselves into multiple groups. Currently, the provision of this information is optional for faculty.

Some faculty are in favour of keeping the collection of this data optional. Because some departments are small, those in diverse groups may be able to be identified from the information collected, and so some choose not to provide this information because they fear that it may be used against them in some way (despite the fact that this information is not actually available to their supervisors). Currently, this information is only available to a select few at the university, but if released for research purposes some fear they may still be identified due to being a minority in their department. Additionally, others note that because the data is made optional, not enough data is collected to provide a significant analysis, and the data that is collected is not necessarily accurate. This may hinder diversity research at the institutional level.

### ***Option 1E: Mandatory self-designation for diversity data collection***

Another option is to make the collection of this data mandatory for all new faculty. The need for such robust data collection is highlighted in the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Committee's Report, and consequently this option corroborates with the committee's recommendations (SFU, 2016b). This would involve the same survey being sent to faculty, but with insurance that only a select few people on campus have access to this information to ensure that everyone feels comfortable and safe providing it.

Making the collection of this information mandatory would improve the ability of diversity researchers to analyse the make-up of the university, which would be expected to help diversity in the long run. It is particularly important that this information may allow for intersectional analysis of diversity, as this is not really known at SFU currently. However, because these groups are so small within faculty, it is possible that even with mandatory designation significant results such as those seen in the salary equity report may not be able to be reached. Some faculty are also concerned that they may be identifiable in the data. Consequently, this option would have to occur alongside education to ensure that faculty are made aware of the reasons this data was being collected and that only a small number of those at SFU would have access to it.

Making the collection of this data mandatory would also be slightly more complex administratively, as those responsible for the survey would also have to be responsible

to ensuring that all new faculty had completed it. Increasing administrative support to this program would incur slightly more costs as well.

### ***Option 1F: Creation of a strategic plan for diversity***

A number of interviewees discussed the need for strategic, senior-level leadership to improve diversity at SFU. One option to combat this would be to create a strategic diversity plan, similar to what has been done at other universities like UBC and UVIC. The creation of such a plan would show a serious commitment to diversity with trackable, quantifiable indicators of success under a variety of types of initiatives, such as education, campus climate, compositional diversity, and data collection and research.

This option is favourable because it can be tailored to SFU's needs and resources, and designed to meet needs specific to SFU and follow an intersectional lens. Faculty strongly support the creation of a diversity strategy because it shows an effort on the part of the administration to take a proactive and coordinated approach to improving diversity. Once a plan is built, delegating tasks among the equity office and departments within the university becomes a lot clearer. However, interviewees did note that the SFU administration has been historically hesitant to push such a proactive diversity agenda, although many hoped that the recent action in terms of salary equity and sexual violence policy may push them into action.

This option would require collaboration across departments and across the SFU community. This will require moderately high resources and time on the part of the administration. However, it would be a worthwhile investment into diversity management because it represents a proactive on behalf of the administration and offers an opportunity for a member of the senior administration to step up as a diversity champion. Almost all of my interviewees discussed the need and importance of such a champion to embedding diversity at academic institutions.

### ***Option 1E: Hiring of an Education Coordinator***

An education coordinator is a position in the equity department that is seen in the departments at both UVIC and UBC. The role of this position is to coordinate education efforts across the campus, in terms of faculty, staff, and students. In UVIC's case, not all

of the education initiatives will come from the equity office, but the equity office will work with other groups on campus to ensure coordinated messaging.

While hiring an education coordinator does not in itself improve compositional diversity at the university, this position can be very effective at improving cultural diversity and helping erode away unconscious and implicit biases across campus. A well-developed education plan would incorporate discussions of intersectional diversity and work to have education efforts that are sustained throughout the lifetime of students, faculty, and staff during their time at the university to make these efforts the most effective at changing university culture. While the creation of such a position would require financial resources from the administration for the coordinators salary, as well as a project development budget, the costs are moderate and support for such an option is fairly high among all stakeholders. The outcomes of this option are quite high relative to the cost of implementation.

## **6.2. Medium-term options**

### ***Option 2A: Creation of a fund for diversity management***

A couple of interviewees discussed the option of creating a renewable fund earmarked for diversity initiatives. Such a fund has been created at UBC at the value of \$2 million a year. In practice diversity funds can be used for a variety of purposes. Oxford (2014) has a £1 million fund to support pay equity, and uses it to provide grants of up to £5,000 for women returning from leave. Linköping University (2016) in Sweden has a 40,000 SEK fund that is used to support innovative projects that foster equity from students and faculty. SFU could use such a fund to dedicate to the Human Rights and Equity office for education, training, outreach, and other programs meant to support diversity.

This option is costly, but the cost is up to the determination of the administration. It is possible that the government may help with such costs down the road in terms of funding, but most institutions come up with these resources themselves. Doing so would require budget coordination across departments. Traditionally, the SFU administration

has not been in favour of such proactive approaches to diversity, but as mentioned previously, many interviewees remained hopeful that this attitude was changing. While a fund does cost money, it definitely shows commitment to diversity from the senior leadership.

### ***Option 2B: Diversity training for hiring committees***

An option frequently discussed by my interviewees was training hiring committees about how to manage their own unconscious biases while hiring to improve the chances of them hiring qualified and diverse applicants. Such a process directly targets unconscious bias and campus climate while also leading to the outcome of improving compositional diversity. Effective training would be expected to incorporate an intersectional lens. This option is also recommended in the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Committee Report (SFU, 2016b), with the aim of ensuring those on hiring committees are trained to comply equity policies and best practices.

Administration and faculty generally view such an option favourably. Some change in the hiring process would be required to implement this training across departments, and there would be costs to develop and deliver the training to members of hiring committees, but overall this option is viewed as a more effective alternative to the quota system.

### ***Option 2C: Diversity training for new employees***

Similarly, many interviewees also were interested in implementing diversity-related training for new faculty. While such an option does not improve compositional diversity, it is seen as being an effective start to improving campus climate and perceptions about diversity.

Such training would be most effective when delivered equally across all departments, which would require some coordination and a change in the onboarding process for new hires university-wide. The development of the training material would also require some moderate input of resources. However, faculty and administration seem willing to take part in such training and view this option favourably.

### ***Option 2D: Redevelopment of the hiring reporting process***

One interviewee also discussed the option of building accountability in the hiring process by requiring more reporting throughout the stages of the process. Currently, deans and department chairs write a final report after a hire outlining the reasons for their choice against the other choices. In this option, those on the hiring committee would be required to write such a report at the short-list stage of hiring, interview stage, and final stage. These reports would also outline efforts to recruit diverse applicants. If there is a lack of diversity, they would also explain why and be required to get approval before proceeding with a search without diverse applicants.

This option aims to improve compositional diversity, but brings only a little awareness in terms of the campus climate. It has the potential to be implemented with an intersectional lens, but great care would have to be taken to ensure that the diversity requirements for proceeding with a hiring search are not quota-like or prescriptive in terms of specific diversity groups, which has the potential of keeping out those of non-identified groups or those of two or more groups. This process can be built in to the current hiring structure, but would require more steps to the process and more administrative and HR resources to maintain an approval process on the various stages of reporting. This has the potential to increase the workload and involvement of deans and department chairs in the hiring process.

## **6.3. Long-term options**

### ***Option 3A: Canada-wide diversity study***

One interviewee recommended this option as a possibility to gain more robust data about diversity at academic institutions. Because underrepresented groups usually make up small proportions of university populations, completing an intersectional analysis of things like salary, recruitment, retention, and promotion disparities with significant results often proves difficult to do. One solution to this is to increase the sample size by collecting and analysing data from multiple universities across Canada. While the Statistics Canada (Government of Canada, 2016) survey was withdrawn, this was done by CAUT with the support of institutions across Canada. Now that the survey

is being reinstated it is likely that this information will be collected in a more robust fashion and will be available to diversity researchers.

While this option does not necessarily improve either compositional diversity or target unconscious biases, it provides the means in the long term to do so by providing much more detailed research than is currently available to institutions to use in decision making. Because the sample size is larger, privacy and anonymity concerns that some have when information is collected at the institutional level are diminished, making this option more favourable to faculty who identify within diversity groups. However, researchers should note that institution-specific findings would not be available under this model. Additionally, such a large-scale project would likely not be able to proceed without at least some designated funding from the government; consequently, while there may be some institutional costs related to this option the majority of the cost is born by governmental bodies.

### ***Option 3B: Equal pay for equal work***

Another interviewee was strongly in favour of implementing an equal pay for equal work system, in which each faculty members' salary was devised based upon metrics for their experience, qualifications, teaching load, research load, and service load. In theory such a system increases compositional diversity by reducing unconscious bias present in those hiring faculty and minimizes inequitable salary disparities. In a sense this is similar to pay scale and grades used by unions to calculate salaries for their members; however, such standardization is not currently seen even within departments at academic institutions, never mind within schools and across academia, due to market differentials.

This option likely provides the most equitable treatment of all those who identify in one or more diverse groups. However, despite the Employment Equity Act and the BC Human Rights Code, which still allows for inequitable salary distributions due to market differentials, this pay system is vastly different than the current pay systems in place at academic institutions, and the will to change towards such a system is very low because it eliminates competition for very high talented faculty hires. Additionally, such a drastic change to the pay system would require much research, resources, and

coordination across departments to determine the rates of pay to assign to the variety of metrics considered. Finally, implementing this process at just one institution would likely not benefit SFU in attracting talented faculty, as other institutions that continued to use the current pay model would be able to offer higher, more competitive salaries. The only way to avoid this would be government intervention to maintain a strict and collaborated equal pay for equal work framework at all academic institutions across the country; yet, with so many across-border academics even this wouldn't fully account for this problem.

### ***Option 3C: Develop salary equity plan***

An alternative to equal pay for equal work is to develop a salary equity procedure that still accounts for metrics such as experience and work loads, but also allows for some variations in salary using market differentials. Such a plan would be similar to that devised at the University of Houston-Victoria (Smith, 2008). The benefit of this option is that qualification-based hiring is still involved, which is expected to benefit diversity. However, inequitable salary discrepancies may occur due to the discretionary use of moderate market differentials. As shown at the University of Houston-Victoria, it is possible to implement such a plan at an institutional scale and have no lack of talent recruitment primarily through maintaining average market differentials based on academic field. However, such a framework would require resources and research similar to that for equal pay for equal work to properly implement the new pay system university-wide. The University of Houston-Victoria maintains a staff member year-round to make recommendations on salary and wage adjustments (Smith, 2008). With all this in mind, this option is essentially a less extreme version of equal pay for equal work. The administrative will to move to such a system may not be in place, although its presence in some universities such as the University of Houston-Victoria in the United States shows that it is viable in some situations.

### ***Option 3D: Review market differentials and anomalies process***

Finally, a third option regarding salary pay is to review and adjust the current market differentials and anomalies process in place. With this option, it is still possible to award market differentials, but there would be more checks in place for the awarding of these to ensure that their distribution is not discriminatory against diverse groups. As a result, it is expected that job and salary offers would be more equitable than the current

system, although it is possible that discriminatory awards (even if unconsciously done) may occur. Revision of this process is recommended in the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Committee Report, which suggests revision is necessarily in order for this process to be able to accurately correct for individual salary disparities (SFU, 2016b). The Committee recommends looking into processes that consider total salary as opposed to step-placement salary, as well as transparent and data-driven salary comparators (SFU, 2016b).

Institutional resources will be needed to review the current system of awards and determine how best to incorporate checks and reviews into the hiring procedures and policies. A review ought to also consider the differential awarding systems across departments, as market differentials are used in vastly different ways in different departments, which is perpetrating the salary disparity issue. While there is low political will to switch to a completely new pay system, it is likely that there is more administrative support for reviewing and updating the existing pay structure. While it is not the idealized equal pay for equal work, many faculty would still be in favour of this option because they feel a need for these pay structures to be reconsidered.

## **Chapter 7. Recommendations**

Of the fifteen options analysed, I ultimately am choosing seven to recommend as a suite of options. These recommendations are specific to Simon Fraser University, but may be transferrable to other institutions hoping to improve the diversity of their faculty. It is important to note that these recommendations are built upon the assumption that the SFU administration will at least accept and implement the key institutional recommendations of the Salary Equity Recommendations Report- to institute two senior-level positions in the Human Rights and Equity Office. This recommendation reflects a commitment of more capacity to SFU's Human Rights and Equity portfolio, and my further recommendations reflect actions that can be taken by the newly structured office. The salary increase and group award have already been accepted by the administration as recommended (SFUFA, 2016).

### **7.1. Short-term recommendations**

The key recommendation of this Capstone is for SFU to develop an intersectional strategic plan for diversity. Out of all of the short-term options analyzed, this option stands out as the most impactful in terms of improving both compositional diversity and improving the campus climate. Such a strategic plan, if designed with an intersectional framework, could act as grounding for SFU to build strong diversity policies and practices on, and to guide future directions for the Human Rights and Equity Office. Through doing so, faculty would benefit from having their diverse needs of social location met. Additionally, many interviewees discussed the need for SFU's administration to take a proactive lead in terms of diversity to help launch SFU's commitment to diversity forward. Through the creation of a strategic plan, the administration would acknowledge that diversity for faculty is an issue that needs to be supported while at the same time give leadership power, strategy, and direction to the Human Rights and Equity Office. This is needed to give the office tangible and

measurable goals in terms of improving diversity at SFU and bringing the conversation beyond one of gender and towards one of intersectional diversity. The strategic plan ought to cover aspects of education, hiring, research, and campus climate. Some potential models to follow include the UVIC 2015-2020 strategic plan, in which their equity, inclusion, diversity goals are embedded (UVIC, 2012), and UBC's Action Plan on renewing its commitment to diversity (UBC, 2014). This option was ultimately chosen for its effectiveness in promoting diversity among faculty (and, if done thoroughly, the entire campus), its inclusion of a comprehensive intersectional framework, and the strong support from SFU faculty.

The second component of the short-term recommendation is to hire an Education Coordinator for the Human Rights and Equity Office. This position, seen both in UBC and UVIC's equity portfolios, has proven to be essential to coordinating the variety of groups on campus that have an interest in diversity and strategizing intersectional, diversity related messaging across these groups. While an Education Coordinator may not start a lot of projects in the short-term, hiring someone promptly to start engaging with the various groups in the SFU community would help this position become very effective more quickly. Additionally, an education coordinator would be very useful in organizing community and stakeholder engagement, which will be necessary in the process of creating the strategic diversity plan. Education for diversity is strongly supported by the SFU faculty and is seen as having strong outcomes relative to the costs of educational programming.

The final recommendation for the short-term relates to data collection. The lack of diversity data, both at an institutional level as well as nation-wide, was repeated consistently throughout the research for this Capstone. Additionally, the need better data was highlighted in the SFU Salary Equity Recommendations Committee Report (SFU, 2016d). While SFU cannot control the nationwide collection of diversity data, it can control its own data collection. Consequently, I recommend, similar to the Committee's previous recommendation that SFU make the faculty census mandatory for all faculty to assist in providing robust, intersectional data that will be able to aid the institution in making policy decisions in the future. This census can begin by collecting information on the representation of the four federally designated groups: women,

Aboriginals, visible minorities, and those with disabilities. However, more groups (notably groups of sexual orientation) ought to be added as well, beyond the minimum requirements of the Employment Equity Act. Additionally, the main concerns with making the faculty census mandatory were ones of privacy and anonymity. To compensate for this, an educational campaign on the use and accessibility of the information collected ought to be run prior to the instatement of the census. Only select members of the Human Rights and Human Resources offices have access to this information, and this ought to be made known so that faculty and are aware that their supervisors would not have access to this information. Additionally, research using this data ought to be limited to those within the Human Rights and Equity Office and to researchers who request permission for access for diversity-related research.

## **7.2. Medium-term recommendations**

The benefit of making a strategic plan a number one priority is that it allows the medium and long-term recommendations to flow easily from it and build upon this strategy. While the short-term options recommended aim to establish an intersectional framework to diversity as a priority within the institution and start building relationships across the SFU community, the medium-term options are meant to start introducing projects to tackle compositional and social diversity issues for all faculty.

First of all, I recommend setting up a renewable fund for diversity. While the amount of this fund is up to the decision of the administration, I recommend an amount up to the \$2 million, which is the amount annually being set into the diversity fund at UBC, as UBC is SFU's closest competitor in location and size. While this is a large cost, it is needed to begin to fund the implementation of a variety of diversity projects across SFU, such as diversity education, training, outreach, and staffing for the Human Rights and Equity Office. UBC is a larger institution than SFU, so a smaller amount for SFU could be justified- however, should SFU wish to catch up to its competitors in terms of diversity it may wish to set a more ambitious target than UBC and UVIC.

Once funding has been established, the next focus ought to be on education in the terms of diversity-specific training. Both mandatory training for hiring committees

and training for new employees is recommended, as ultimately they serve two different purposes. Training for hiring committees is necessary because it teaches current faculty and leadership how to recognize their own unconscious biases and learn how to hire outside of it to increase the representation of diverse groups among new faculty being hired. This recommendation echoes that of the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Committee (SFU, 2016d). Training for new employee hires is additionally important to establish diversity as a priority and to minimize unconscious biases towards diverse groups from the beginning of their time at the university. Implementation of these training programs would be an ideal responsibility for the Education Coordinator position that I recommend for the short-term.

While the beginning of these training programs might be a one-stop workshop or event, it is important to note that such training is most effective when delivered more than once, consistently, over one's lifespan at an institution. Over time, it is expected that diversity will grow and develop into a program that reaches faculty various times over their career to effectively educate everyone on how to support a diverse and inclusive campus space for themselves and their peers; additionally, the power of a strategic diversity plan is that it can also be used to support diversity among other stakeholders on campus, such as staff and students. Eventually, plans to implement diversity themes within the school curriculum could be made as well.

### **7.3. Long-term recommendations**

Following these recommendations, the long-term recommendations aim to tackle more deep-rooted issues of diversity among faculty. To do so, more accurate and robust diversity data is needed. Because the 'University and College Academic Staff System' Survey was recently re-instated by Statistics Canada (StatsCan, 2016), it is hoped that this information will be more available for diversity researchers to access and use to further diversity policy at academic institutions.

For SFU specifically, I finally recommend a review of the market differentials and salary anomaly process. While diversity would ultimately benefit the most from an equal pay for equal work salary policy, this is unlikely to occur due to resistance from both the

SFU administration and faculty. Instead, the current salary and market differential award process ought to be reviewed and updated to reflect a renewed commitment to diversity and an awareness that historically these awards have not always been given out equitably, to the detriment of those from diverse groups. Some of this analysis has already been captured in previous reports (SFU, 2016b; SFU, 2016d) but a more thorough analysis to determine the appropriate processes is necessary, and was beyond the scope of this Capstone.

Overall, this suite of recommendations over the short, medium, and long term are meant to create a building block for SFU to begin a more proactive approach to diversity and encompass the use of an intersectional framework. Through the strategic implementation of education, training, research, and campus climate initiatives, the ultimate aim is to create a campus where diverse groups among the faculty feel welcome and represented, which will ultimately improve the learning environment for the university students as well.

## **Chapter 8. Conclusion**

Simon Fraser University is at a stage that could be the start of a new diversity regime on campus. Recent advancements in sexual violence policy and gender equity policy have showed a renewed interest in diversity from the SFU administration. However, the diversity conversation must extend beyond simply gender to include all social identities, and there is a need for this to be shown in the institutional policies that are implemented. Many across the SFU community are hopeful that these recent actions will lead to further investment, resources, and policies towards a broader, intersectional approach to diversity on campus.

This Capstone investigated barriers to implementing an intersectional approach to diversity for faculty in a context specific to SFU. Such research is essential to developing a methodology for individual institutions to assess their individual needs in supporting diversity on campus. While there are common barriers to diversity across all of academia, some are more pertinent to certain institutions than others. In the case of SFU, the key barriers to diversity that differ from similar institutions such as UBC and UVIC are a lack of a strategic diversity policy and a lack of a diversity champion in the senior administration. Through revealing these barriers it is hoped that the senior administration will realize the vital role they have to play and take prompt action. If possible, this Capstone will be shared with the SFU senior administration through whom this research could benefit the SFU community the most. Additionally, my interviewees at the UVIC Equity and Human Rights Office expressed interest in these findings, and so it is likely that this research will be disseminated outside of the SFU community among diversity practitioners as well.

From the recommendations provided in this study, the first step to furthering diversity is preparing a strategic plan for diversity specific to SFU that is integrated within SFU's mission to be an 'Engaged' university and embeds an intersectional framework

within its goals and practices. Preparing to approach diversity from a strategic and coordinated angle, with the support of the SFU administration, leads to the possibility of a host of other policies that can support both compositional diversity on campus as well as the creation of a welcoming and inclusive space for faculty who are members of diverse and underrepresented groups. These recommendations complement those made by the SFU Salary Recommendation Report, which highlight the need for institutional changes at SFU to support diversity policy, as well as the need for more robust data to move forward. Additionally, diversity can be made a priority across campus by next including students in the diversity conversation in outreach as well as embedded within the curriculum. Students are powerful motivators of change and their involvement can only lead to good changes in the diversity environment at SFU.

Should the recommendations in this Capstone be implemented, in time more robust data on diversity will become available to SFU to be used in future research. Because of this, SFU's next plan for research ought to be a more detailed analysis of the various inequities being experienced by faculty on campus, taking into account an intersectional lens, when this data becomes available and more robust. To further enrich this research, quantitative analyses could be accompanied by focus groups and individual interviews.

In order for the recommendations of this report to be effective, SFU requires the push and drive of a diversity champion in the senior leadership. Once this is done, many of the policies recommended can be spearheaded by a newly refreshed, supported, and resourced Human Rights and Equity Office. However, this can only occur if the university commits time, effort, expertise, and resources to diversity. To this cause, I put out a call to action to the SFU administration that is echoed by many on campus, among faculty, staff, and students: engage the campus. 'Engage the World' is an excellent mission for a research-driven institution like SFU, and it can be done to an even greater effect if the university is also engaged with its own community. Support those who are seeking representation and a voice. Each and every member of the SFU community has experiences that will only improve the innovation on campus if given a chance.

## References

- Association of American Colleges and Universities (2011). Core Commitments: Educating Students for Personal and Social Responsibility. Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from: [http://www.aacu.org/core\\_commitments/PSRI.cfm](http://www.aacu.org/core_commitments/PSRI.cfm).
- Acker, S., Webber, M., and Smyth, E. (2012). Tenure troubles and equity matters in Canadian academe. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 33(5): 743-761.
- BC Human Rights Code (2017). Victoria, BC, Canada.
- Bertschinger, E. (2015). Advancing a Respectful and Caring Community: Learning by Doing at MIT. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Bigam, S. (2013). Women's Supplement: Pay equity comes to UBC, other BC schools consider the same. *The Ubyyssey*: 2013, March 6. Retrieved from: <http://old.ubyssey.ca/features/womens-supplement-pay-equity456/>
- Bonawitz, M., and Andel, N. (2009). The Glass Ceiling is Made of Concrete: The Barriers to Promotion and Tenure of Women in American Academia. *Forum on Public Policy*. 1–16.
- Boutte, G.S. and Jackson, T.O. (2013). Advice to White allies: insights from faculty of color. *Race Ethnicity and Education*. 17(5): 623-642.
- Bowleg, L. (2012). The Problem With the Phrase Women and Minorities: Intersectionality- an Important Theoretical Framework for Public Health. *American Journal of Public Health*. 102(7): 1267-1273.
- Campbell, M.L. (2015). Intersectionality, Policy-Oriented Research and the Social Relations of Knowing. *Gender, Work, and Organization*. 23(3): 248-260.
- Campbell-Whatley, G.D., Wang, C., Toms, O., and Williams, N. (2015). Factors Affecting Campus Climate: Creating a Welcoming Environment. *New Waves Educational Research & Development*. 18(2): 40-52.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers (2007). A Partial Picture: The representation of equity-seeking groups in Canada's universities and colleges.

- Canadian Association of University Teachers (2010). Almanac of Post-Secondary Education 2010-2011: Students.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers (2014). Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada: 2013-2014.
- Cantor, N., Mack, K.M., McDermott, P., and Taylor, O.L. (2014). If not now, when? The promise of STEM intersectionality in the twenty-first century. *Association of American Colleges and Universities*. 16(2): 29-31.
- Castano Rodriguez, C. The dilemma of inclusivity in the globalization of academia. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*. 10(4): 1057-1062.
- Center for Talent Innovation (2014). *How Diversity Drives Innovation: A Compendium of Best Practice*.
- Cole, E. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist*. 64(3): 170-180.
- Collins, P.H. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Condon, A. and Peacock, S. (2009). *Towards a Diverse Faculty of Science at UBC Vancouver*. University of British Columbia.
- Crede, E. and Borrego, M. (2013). Understanding retention in US graduate programs by student nationality. *Studies in Higher Education*. 39(9): 1599-1616.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*. 1(8).
- Dalton, J. and Crosby, P.C. (2010). How We Teach Character in College: A Retrospective on Some Recent Higher Education Initiatives The Promote Moral and Civic Learning. *Journal of College and Character*. 11(2).
- Davis, D.J., Brunn-Bevel, R.J., Olive, J.L. (2015). *Engaged Research and Practice for Social Justice in Education: Intersectionality in Educational Research*. Stylus Publishing: Sterling, Virginia.
- Deloitte (2013). *Waiter, is that inclusion in my soup? A new recipe to improve business performance*. Deloitte Australia and the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission.
- Desivilya Syna, H. and Raz, M. (2015). Managing diversity and social divisions in nurses' work teams. *EuroMed Journal of Business*. 10(2): 264-278.

- Desivilya Syna, H. et al. (2017). Engaging diversity in academia: manifold voices of faculty. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*. 36(1): 90 - 104
- Dunn, W., & Olivier, C. (2011). Creating Welcoming and Diverse University Communities. *Canadian Diversity / Canadian Diversité*, 8(5), 35-38.
- Ely, R. and Roberts, L.M. (2008). Shifting frames in team-diversity research: from difference to relationships. in Brief, A.P. (Ed.). *Diversity at Work*. Cambridge University Press. New York, NY: 175-201.
- Ensor, K. (2016). The Value of Professional Champions and Mentors in an Academic Environment. In Golbeck, A.L., Olkin, I., and Gel, Y.G. (eds.) *Leadership and Women in Statistics*. Chapman and Hall / CRC Press.
- Examining Women's Status: Campus Climate and Gender Equity. (2011). ASHE Higher Education Report, 37(1), 65-92.
- Evans, L. (2013). Diversity in Canada: An overview. *Canadian Immigrant*. 2013, June 4. Retrieved from: <http://canadianimmigrant.ca/guides/moving-to-canada/diversity-in-canada-an-overview>
- Falkenberg, L.E., Boland, L. (1997). Eliminating the barriers to employment equity in the Canadian workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 16(9): 963–75.
- Gladu, M. (2016). Implementing Gender Based Analysis Plus in the Government of Canada. Report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. House of Commons, Canada.
- Golbeck, A.L. (2015). Mentoring Faculty Women in Statistics. Exploring Challenges and Opportunities for Leadership Development. *The American Statistician*.
- Gopaldas, A. (2013). Intersectionality 101. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*. 32(Special Issue): 90-94.
- Government of Canada (1995). Employment Equity Act. Retrieved from: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/E-5.401/>
- Government of Canada (2016). News Release: Government of Canada welcomes survey on university researchers and faculty members. Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada. Retrieved from: <http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=1124939>
- Grundy, J. and Smith, M. (2010). Evidence and equity: Struggles over federal employment equity policy in Canada, 1984–95. *Canadian Public Administration / Administration Publique de Canada*. 54(3): 335–57.

- Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., and Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Gundermand, R.B. and Moore, M. Increasing Diversity: Underrepresented Minorities. *American College of Radiology*. 57-59.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72: 330–367.
- Gutiérrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y. F., and González, C. G. (2012). *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Utah State University Press.
- Hancock, A. (2007). When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*. 5(1): 63-79.
- Hankivsky, O. (2014). *Intersectionality 101*. The Institute for Intersectionality Research & Policy: Simon Fraser University.
- Hartlep, N. et al. (2016). A National Analysis of Endowed Chairs and Distinguished Professors in the Field of Education. *Educational Studies*. 52: 2.
- Havergal, C. (2015). We are 'diverse and open' but we must reflect society, too. *Times Higher Education*. 2194: 16-24.
- Higher Education Statistics Agency (2016). *Staff in Higher Education: 2014/2015*. Retrieved from: <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/publications/staff-2014-15>
- Hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Boston: South End Press
- Horwitz, S. and Horwitz, I. (2007). The Effects of Team Diversity on Team Outcomes: A Meta-Analytic Review of Team Demography. *Journal of Management*. 33: 987-1015.
- Jain, H.C., Lawler, J.J., Bai, B., and Lee, E.K. (2010). Effectiveness of Canada's employment equity legislation for women (1997-2004): Implications for policy makers. *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*. 65(2): 304–29.
- Jensenius, F.R. (2016). Competing Inequalities? On the Intersection of Gender and Ethnicity in Candidate Nominations in Indian Elections. *Government and Opposition*. 51(3): 440-463.
- Joldersma, H. (2005). *Next Steps: Report of the Gender Equity Project*, University of Calgary. University of Calgary.

- Kessler, A. and Pendakur, K. (2015). Gender Disparity in Faculty Salaries at Simon Fraser University. Simon Fraser University.
- Kozleski, E.B. (2017). The Uses of Qualitative Methods: Powerful Methods to Inform Evidence-Based Practice in Education. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*. 42(1): 19-32.
- Kozleski E. B., and Artiles A. J. (2014). Beyond psychological views of student learning in systemic reform agendas. In Kozleski E. B., Thorius K. K. (Eds.). *Ability, equity, and culture: Sustaining inclusive urban education reform* (pp. 63-79). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Writing*. Thousand Oaks, CA. SAGE Publications.
- Lansing, P., & Chandra, S. (2012). Quota Systems as a Means to Promote Women into Corporate Boardrooms. *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 38(3), 3-14.
- Lee, J.A. (2010). Students' perceptions of and satisfaction with faculty diversity. *College Student Journal*. 44(2): 400-412.
- Legislative Assembly of British Columbia (2016). Bill 23- 2016: Sexual Violence and Misconduct Policy Act. Retrieved from: <https://www.leg.bc.ca/parliamentary-business/legislation-debates-proceedings/40th-parliament/5th-session/bills/first-reading/gov23-1>
- Linköping University (2016). Equal Opportunities Strategy and Action Plan 2016. Retrieved from: [http://liu.se/om-liu/strategi/ett-liu-for-alla/lika-villkor/policy-och-planer-hoger-spalt/1.675742/EqualOpportunitiesactionplan2016\\_B.pdf](http://liu.se/om-liu/strategi/ett-liu-for-alla/lika-villkor/policy-och-planer-hoger-spalt/1.675742/EqualOpportunitiesactionplan2016_B.pdf).
- Loriggio, P. (2016). University of Waterloo boosts female faculty pay after wage gap uncovered. *The Globe and Mail*. 4 August 2016. Retrieved from: <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/university-of-waterloo-boosts-female-faculty-salaries-after-gender-pay-gap-found/article31272503/>
- Madkins, T. (2011). The Black teacher shortage: A literature review of historical and contemporary trends. *Journal of Negro Education*, 80, 417–427.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1999). *Women Faculty in the School of Science*. School of Science.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2002). *Overview: The Status of Women Faculty at MIT*. Council of Faculty Diversity.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2010). *Report on the Initiative for Faculty Race and Diversity*.

- McNutt, K. and Béland, D. (2015). Implementing an Integrated Governance Strategy: the Quest for Gender Mainstreaming in Canada. *American Review of Canadian Studies*. 45(4): 467-485.
- Mentzer, M. S. (2002). The Canadian experience with employment equity legislation. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*. 15(1): 35–50.
- Meziani, Y. (2013). From “reversed quota” to “invisible quota” in the recruitment of the decedents of immigrants for public service jobs. *Journal in Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology*. 4(2): 227-232.
- Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. L. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research based-perspective*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Mohammed, S. and Angell, L.C. (2004). Surface-and deep-level diversity in workgroups: examining the moderating effects of team orientation and team process on relationship conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 25(8): 1015-1039.
- Moriña, A., Cortés-Vega, M. D., & Molina, V. M. (2015). Faculty training: an unavoidable requirement for approaching more inclusive university classrooms. *Teaching In Higher Education*, 20(8), 795-806. doi:10.1080/13562517.2015.1085855
- Morningstar M. E., Shogren K. A., Lee H., and Born, K. (2015). Preliminary lessons about supporting participation and learning in inclusive classrooms. *Research and Practice for Persons With Severe Disabilities*. 40: 192-210.
- Museus, S. and Griffin, K. (2011). Mapping the margins in higher education: On the promise of intersectionality frameworks in research and discourse. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 151: 5-13.
- Ng, J. et al. (2013). ACES: The Development of a Reliable and Valid Instrument to Assess Faculty Support of Diversity Goals in the United States. *Research & Practice in Assessment*. 8: 29-41.
- Oxford, University of (2014). Gender Equality Scheme, 2007-2010. Retrieved from: <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/eop/gender/scheme/ges/>.
- Paulus, J.K., Switkowski, K.M., Allison, G.M. et al. (2016). Where is the leak in the pipeline? Investigating gender differences in academic promotion at an academic medical centre. *Perspectives on Medical Education*. 5(2): 125-128.
- Pitcher, E.N., Secrist, S.M., and Camacho, T.P. (2016). *Critical Concepts in Queer Studies and Education: An International Guide for the Twenty-First Century*. Palgrave Macmillan US. 329-339.

- Pololi, L.H. and Evans, A.T. (2015). Group Peer Mentoring: An Answer to the Faculty Mentoring Problem? A Successful Program at a Large Academic Department of Medicine. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*. 35(3): 192-200.
- Poloma, A.W. (2014). Why Teaching Faculty Diversity (Still) Matters. *Peabody Journal of Education*. 89: 336-346.
- Ramarajan, L. and Thomas, D. (2010). A positive approach to studying diversity in organizations. Working Paper No. 11-024. Harvard Business School. Cambridge, MA.
- Rivera, M. and Ward, J. (2008). Employment Equity and Institutional Commitments to Diversity: Disciplinary Perspectives from Public Administration and Public Affairs Education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*. 14(1): 9-20.
- Rivera-Nieves, J. and Abreu, M.T. (2013). A Call for Investment in Education of US Minorities in the 21st Century. *Gastroenterology*. 144:863-867.
- Rodriguez, F. C. (2015). Why Diversity and Equity Matter: Reflections from a Community College President. *New Directions for Community Colleges*. 172: 15-24.
- Schmalig, K.B. et al. (2015). Diversity Statements: How Faculty Applicants Address Diversity. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. 8(4): 213-224.
- Shogren K. A., Gross J. M. S., Forber-Pratt A. J., Francis G. L., Satter A. L., Blue-Banning M., Hill C. (2015). The perspectives of students with and without disabilities on inclusive schools. *Research and Practice for Persons With Severe Disabilities*, 40, 243-260.
- Simon Fraser University (n.d). SFU Sexual Violence Policy Input. Retrieved from: <https://www.sfu.ca/sexual-assault/policy-law/SFU-Sexual-Violence-and-Misconduct-Policy.html>
- Simon Fraser University (1992). Employment Equity Policy. University Secretary. Retrieved from: [https://www.sfu.ca/univsec/equity/employment\\_equitypolicy.html](https://www.sfu.ca/univsec/equity/employment_equitypolicy.html)
- Simon Fraser University (2008). Employment Systems Review: For HRSDC. Human Rights Office.
- Simon Fraser University (2016a). Simon Fraser University: Strategic Vision. Retrieved from: <http://www.sfu.ca/engage/background.html>
- Simon Fraser University (2016b). Salary Equity Recommendation Committee: Final Report. Simon Fraser University.

- Simon Fraser University (2016c). Fall 2016 Undergraduate Survey- Preliminary Report. Institutional Research and Planning.
- Simon Fraser University (2016d). Salary Equity Recommendation Committee: Background Policy Research.
- Simon Fraser University Faculty Association (2016). Salary Equity Agreement. 2016, December 19. Retrieved from: <http://www.sfufa.ca/salary-equity-agreement/>
- Simon Fraser University News (2016). SFU ranked again as top Canadian employer. 2016, Nov. 23. Retrieved from: <https://www.sfu.ca/sfunews/stories/2016/sfu-again-ranked-as-a-top-canadian-employer-.html>
- Simmons, S. L. (2017). A thousand words are worth a picture: a snapshot of trans\* postsecondary educators in higher education. *International Journal Of Qualitative Studies In Education (QSE)*, 30(3), 266-284.
- Smith, D. N. (2008). Achieving Equity in Faculty Salaries: A Proven Model. *Planning For Higher Education*, 36(3), 56-66.
- Statistics Canada (2011). National Housing Survey: Canada Profile, 2011. Retrieved from: <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=01&Data=Count&SearchText=Canada&SearchType=Begin&SearchPR=01&A1=All&B1=All&Custom=&TABID=1>
- Statistics Canada (2013). Immigration and Ethnocultural Diversity in Canada: National Household Survey 2011. Minister of Industry.
- Styhre, A. and Eriksson-Zetterquist, U. (2008). Thinking the multiple in gender and diversity studies: examining the concept of intersectionality. *Gender in Management*. 23(8): 567-582.
- Subbaye, R., and Vithal, R. (2016). Gender, teaching and academic promotions in higher education. *Gender and Education*. 1-26.
- Sweigart, A. (2012). Women on Board for Change: The Norway Model of Boardroom Quotas As a Tool for Progress in the United States and Canada. *Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business Ambassador*. 32: 81A-569.
- Tate, J. (2014). A Thin Veil of Inclusion: Sexual and Gender Minorities in Ontario Universities. Dissertation: The Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. and Waite, E. (2013). Toward a More Pragmatic Multiculturalism? How the U.K. Policy Community Sees the Future of Ethnic Diversity Policies. *Governance*. 27(2): 267-289.

- Thompson, G.L., Bonner, F.A., and Lewis, C.W. (Eds.). (2015). Reaching the mountaintop of the academy: Personal narratives, advice, and strategies from Black distinguished and endowed professors. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- United Nations (2017). 2017 Theme: "Preventing conflict and sustaining peace through decent work". World Day of Social Justice. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/en/events/socialjusticeday/>
- University of Alberta. (2013). Opening Doors, Closing Gender Gaps. Retrieved from: [http://www.aasua.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Equity\\_OpeningDoors\\_ClosingGenderGaps\\_18May2013.pdf](http://www.aasua.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Equity_OpeningDoors_ClosingGenderGaps_18May2013.pdf).
- University of Alberta. (2016). Employment Equity. Retrieved from: <http://www.hrs.ualberta.ca/MyEmployment/EmploymentEquity.aspx>.
- University of Alberta (2017). Faculty and Staff Resources- Project Catalyst. Faculty of Science. Retrieved from: <https://www.ualberta.ca/science/about-us/faculty-and-staff-resources/project-catalyst>
- University of British Columbia (2007). An Assessment of the Working Climate for Science Faculty at the University of British Columbia (UBC) – December 2007. Faculty of Science Assessment Advisory Committee.
- University of British Columbia. (2012). Report of the Gender Pay Equity Recommendation Committee. Retrieved from: [http://www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca/docs/news/GenderPayEquity\\_UBCV%20Report%20Recommendation%20Committee2012-07.pdf](http://www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca/docs/news/GenderPayEquity_UBCV%20Report%20Recommendation%20Committee2012-07.pdf)
- University of British Columbia (2014). Renewing our Commitment to Diversity: UBC's response to the Task Force Recommendations. Retrieved from: <http://equity.ubc.ca/files/2014/05/RENEWING-OUR-COMMITMENT-TO-EQUITY-AND-DIVERSITY-FINAL-02.pdf>
- University of Calgary. (2005). The Salary Equity Report and Next Steps: Report of the Gender Equity Project. Retrieved from: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/president/files/president/equity-cover-memo.pdf>.
- University of California (2001). Personal memo from University of California President Richard Atkinson to University of California Chancellors. Office of the President.
- University of California Berkeley. (2015). Report on the UC Berkeley Faculty Salary Equity Study. Retrieved from: <http://vpf.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/Equity%20Study%20Report%20final%201-26-15%20--revised.pdf>.

- University of California Santa Barbara. (2013). Salary Equity Analysis. Retrieved from: <https://evc.ucsb.edu/salary.equity.reports/2013.salary.equity.report.pdf>
- University of Lethbridge Faculty Association & The University of Lethbridge. (2008). Salary Equity Committee Report to the University of Lethbridge Community
- University of Michigan (2016). Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Strategic Plan: October 2016. University of Michigan. Retrieved from: <http://diversity.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/strategic-plan.pdf>
- University of Toronto (2014). Wrapping up 'Speaking Up'- news release. Human Resources and Equity. Retrieved from: <http://www.hrandequity.utoronto.ca/news/2016-wrapping-speaking/>
- University of Victoria (2012). A Vision for the Future – Building on Excellence: A Strategic Plan for the University of Victoria. Planning and Priorities Committee. UVIC. Retrieved from: <https://www.uvic.ca/strategicplan/assets/docs/strategicplan.pdf>
- University of Victoria (2014). Summary Report of the Joint Committee on Gender Pay Equity at the University of Victoria. Retrieved from: [https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/genderpayequity/FINALGET\\_SummaryJuly14th2014.pdf](https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/genderpayequity/FINALGET_SummaryJuly14th2014.pdf)
- Waitoller, F. R., and Kozleski, E. B. (2013). Working in boundary practices: Identity development and learning in partnerships for inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 31(3): 35-45.
- Wray, J., Aspland, J., and Barrett, D. (2013). Choosing to stay: looking at retention from a different perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*. 39(9): 1700-1714.

## **Appendix A.**

### **Interview Questions**

How did you become involved with the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Committee?  
(or: How did you become involved in your role with \_\_\_\_\_?)

If at SFU: What are some strengths and weaknesses of the SFU Salary Equity Recommendation Report released this fall?

If at SFU: How do you view the feasibility of the recommendations submitted by the committee in the context of SFU?

How is your organization involved with diversity and equity polices on campus?

In what ways do you think the variety of groups on campus can work together to further diversity?

What are some barriers or challenges to bringing an intersectional lens to the equity conversation at SFU (or at UBC/UVIC)?

If at UBC/UVIC: What policies/procedures/interventions has your institution implemented with the goal of improving equity and/or diversity?

If at UBC/UVIC: Have these policies/procedures/interventions been successful? How was success measured?

Are you aware of any promising practices in managing equity and diversity at other institutions?

What would be your recommendation moving forward to improve diversity at SFU and other institutions?