

INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN:

A.2) Provide any contextual details, such as empty chairs for which recruitment processes have started (limit 200 words):

PART B: Results of the institution's Employment Systems Review, Comparative Review and Environmental Scan

In developing their action plans, institutions were required to develop objectives that were S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely), and include a measurement strategy for monitoring, reporting on progress, and course correcting if necessary, based on: 1) an employment systems review; 2) a comparative review; and 3) an environmental scan (see Appendix A for the requirements that the program stipulated to develop the action plans).

B.1) Outline the key findings of the employment systems review that was undertaken when drafting the action plan limit 250 words:

B.2) Outline the key findings of the comparative review that was undertaken when drafting the action plan (limit 250 words):

B.3) Outline the key findings of the environmental scan that was undertaken when drafting the action plan (limit 250 words):

B.4) Provide an overview of who was consulted in the drafting of the action plan. What form did the consultation/engagement with members of the four designated groups (i.e. women, persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples and visible minorities) and other underrepresented faculty

Key Objective 3:

!()*+,*+-%./0+1%,)2!3+*+- %

!#\$%&'% %

Key Objective 5:
Corresponding actions:
Indicator(s):
Progress:
Next Steps:
Contextual information (e.g., course correction, obstacles, early wins, etc.) (limit 80 words):

Key Objective 6:

PART D: Challenges and Opportunities

Other than what has been outlined in the section above, outline any challenges and opportunities/successes, as well as best practices ~~list (see)~~ T 1 Tf [

Appendix A - Institutional Equity, Diversity, Inclusion Action Plan Requirements

To remain eligible for the program, all institutions w

- x objectives should be S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely), and include a measurement strategy for monitoring,

- x the decision-making process for determining what level of support is provided to chairholders (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.), and who within the institution is involved in these decisions;
- x safeguards taken to ensure that individuals from the FDGs are not disadvantaged in negotiations related to the level of institutional support provided to them (e.g., protected time for research, salary and benefits, additional research funds, office space, mentoring, administrative support, equipment, etc.);
- x