

Strategic Employment Systems Review

Promoting diversity, supporting the Mission of the University of British Columbia

April 23, 2012

*Office of the Associate Vice-President, Equity
Together with the
Associate Vice-President, Human Resources*

Ajit Mehat
Principal Consultant

1. Preamble

In 2010 the Associate Vice-President, Equity, in partnership with the Associate Vice-President Human Resources at the University of British Columbia (UBC) tasked me to design a review of the employment systems pertaining to faculty and staff in the Faculty of Arts at the Vancouver campus (“the Review”). Given the size and complexity of the University as an employer (the fourth or fifth largest employer in British Columbia), the design was positioned as a pilot project to be tested in one Faculty which could then be applied, after a consideration of lessons learned, to other Faculties.

The design phase was completed in the fall of 2010. In the spring of 2011, I was given the responsibility for leading the Review with the assistance of the Equity Office and of Human Resources. This document reports on the results of the Review. Ideally, it should be read in conjunction with the report on the design of the Review; however, recognizing that time may not permit such an approach, crucial parts of the project design report are summarized or reproduced in this report to assist the reader.

An employment systems review is typically undertaken to ensure compliance with the Federal Contractors Program Requirements.¹ However, UBC decided to take a more strategic approach to the Review to address the current and future needs of the University. After due consultation with key stakeholders at UBC it was determined that an employment systems review should be an opportunity to support the new strategic directions outlined in *Place and Promise, the UBC Plan*, and further elaborated in *Focus on People: Workplace Practices at UBC* and in *Valuing Difference: A Strategy for Advancing Equity and Diversity at UBC*. Thus, such an approach would, on the one hand, address the narrow, regulatory requirements of the Federal Contractors Program and, on the other, it would fundamentally support the mission of the University as it seeks to position itself globally. Further discussion on this approach can be found in Appendix A (Background).

The Faculty of Arts is among the largest of Faculties at the University’s Vancouver campus. It is organized into 22 Departments, Schools and Programs. The Faculty has a

¹ The Requirements apply to any organization which contracts to provide goods and services to the Federal Government valued at two hundred thousand dollars or more annually and employs more than one hundred employees. The Review usually begins with an analysis of the representation of four designated groups (women, aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and visible minorities) in the occupational groups existing in the employer’s relevant workforce compared with their availability in the general workforce. To the extent that gaps in representation are identified, a review of employment systems, policies and practices is undertaken to identify barriers which may be contributing to the under-representation. Thereafter, a plan is developed to overcome the barriers. For greater detail of the requirements are available at www.hrsdc.gc.ca.

complement of approximately 500 faculty, 200 sessional faculty and 400 staff members. A new Dean was appointed to lead the Faculty in 2010.

2. Setting the Stage for the Review – A Best Practice

It needs to be acknowledged at the outset that the Review at UBC represents a best practice in at least three important ways. First, as previously noted, the University chose to position the Review as one element of a broad approach to inclusion and diversity rather than simply a “one off” activity to satisfy a narrow regulatory requirement. Such an approach has several advantages, including that of providing substance for the vision of the University, leveraging limited resources to greater effect, and of providing participants with a leaning opportunity to “connect the dots” on activities which otherwise appear to be disparate and unrelated.

Second, the University decided to take an incremental approach to the Review. Rather than conducting one review for the whole of UBC, the results of which would be challenging to interpret, the University chose to begin with a review of one Faculty. The lessons learned from reviewing one Faculty could then be assessed prior to proceeding with a roll out of the review in a subsequent Faculty. Such an approach recognizes the uniqueness of each Faculty and yet acknowledges the importance of building a body of knowledge in support of diversity one Faculty at a time.

Third, a substantial amount of preliminary and necessary work was undertaken to design the review. Preparatory work entailed a broad set of consultations with key stakeholders including heads of departments and programs, representatives of faculty and staff and representatives of central functions such as human resources including faculty relations. This preliminary work was a necessary, early investment which followed from a deep commitment to inclusion and respect for the diverse views of different stakeholders.² Using this approach, the University was able to anticipate and evaluate preliminary issues and, thereby, build a cohesive foundation for the Review itself. A design phase for review of subsequent Faculties would still be a necessary precursor; however, it need not replicate all the steps in the initial version. For example, Department Heads and Heads of Programs could be canvassed in one focus group rather than individually. In a similar vein, Union and Faculty Association leaders (since they are already aware of the nature of the review) could be advised that a review of a particular Faculty is about to be undertaken and provided with an opportunity to provide input by writing or in person as it pertains to the Faculty under review.

² A detailed list of those consulted is available in *Designing a Strategic Employment Systems Review*.

3. Methodology

The design phase of the Review was instrumental in putting into sharp focus the key issues which the review needed to address. Based on that work, the University made several key decisions which effectively crystalized the Review methodology for the Faculty of Arts.

As a preliminary matter, the University determined that the Review would be carried out on two parallel but equal tracks, one to address the employment systems in relation to faculty and the other in relation to staff. This approach was taken to address strong concerns expressed by staff and their representatives during the design phase to the effect that their contribution to the work of the University is undervalued when juxtaposed with the high profile work of scholarship and teaching. They further posited that the University will not be able to achieve the goals outlined in *Place and Promise* unless the aspirations of all stakeholders are accommodated. In response to these concerns the University decided to proceed with the two tracks in parallel rather than in serial fashion to ensure comparable treatment of both employment systems.

Additional critical components of the methodology were resolved as follows:

- The Review was predicated on significant senior level engagement. Thus, the President, the Provost, and the Dean of Arts demonstrated their commitment during the launch of the Review by playing an active role in communicating key messages and receiving periodic updates on progress. The President and the Dean officially launched the Review on 11 April 2011. This launch was followed by a message (12 April 2011) from the Associate Vice President, Equity sent to all members of the Faculty of Arts. Thereafter, reminder messages were sent and individual encouragement provided by the Associate Dean, Faculty Equity and by the Assistant Dean to stimulate greater participation in focus groups. In addition, at least one faculty member reported that she requested an individual interview because of direct encouragement provided by the President;
- Day to day guidance for the Review was provided by a Planning Committee consisting of: the Associate Vice President, Equity (Chair of the Committee); the Associate Dean, Faculty Equity, Faculty of Arts; the Assistant Dean, Faculty of Arts; the Director, HR (Advisory Services); and, the Director, Faculty Relations;
- The Review was led by an external consultant, supported by the Equity Office, HR (Advisory Services), Faculty Relations, and by the Dean's Office.
- Two Steering Committees (one for the faculty track and one for the staff track) provided advice on preliminary issue identification and provided advice and assistance in the course of the Review when required. In addition the Steering Committees helped refine standardized questions used for focus groups and individual interviews. These standardized questions were applied consistently

during focus group discussions. Discussions during individual interviews were more flexible in order to address the individual's needs; nevertheless, the standardized questions provided a useful framework for eliciting individual, experiential responses. Key components of the employment system probed during this process are outlined in Appendix B (staff) and Appendix C (faculty);³

- Data, both quantitative and qualitative, was gathered and analyzed for each of the two tracks of the project by:
 - Reviewing and analyzing the representation of the four employment equity designated groups in the relevant employment equity occupational categories for faculty and staff compared with their availability in those occupational categories at the national level. This work was led by the Equity Office in consultation with central human resources functions;
 - Reviewing the written policies and procedures (led by the Equity Office); and,
 - Conducting focus groups (primarily organized according to occupational affinity and length of association with the University) and individual interviews to obtain qualitative data (led by the consultant).
- The Planning Committee met periodically to receive reports of progress of the Review and decide on any necessary course correction.

4. Results

4.1 Workforce Representation of Employment Equity groups

This segment of the report presents and discusses quantitative data which, by its nature, has a certain allure. Numbers, used as a symbolic representation of physical reality, tend to convey a degree of certitude about that which is being measured. Yet, caution is a useful guide even when interpreting numeric data representing the physical world. As Tony Heagerty of Manchester University remarks, “If you torture data long enough it will give you the answer you want.”⁴ With this in mind, caution becomes *sine qua non* when interpreting data used to measure social reality.

The Equity Office has produced a detailed compilation of the degree to which members of the four employment equity designated groups are represented in the workforce of the Faculty of Arts, categorized according to the Employment

³ It should be noted that focus groups and individuals interviewed were asked to identify groups, other than the four designated groups, which may be marginalized. This was in keeping with the stated goal of ensuring a more inclusive approach during the Review.

⁴ “Scientists wage modern-day salt war”, *The Vancouver Sun*, September 3, 2011.

Equity Occupational Group (EEOG) relevant to UBC.⁵ This data is presented in the attached report of the Equity Office, *Overview of the Representation of Faculty and Staff by Designated Equity Group*, at Appendix D.⁶

The report should be read with some caveats in mind:

- First, the data presented is a snapshot of the degree to which members of the four designated groups are actually represented in an EEOG compared with their national availability as calculated by Statistics Canada from the most recent national census. In this case, the most recent data on availability (the denominator in the equation) is derived from the 2006 census update (the full census data from 2011 is not yet available). Yet, the actual representation of members of designated groups in the workforce (the numerator) is derived from the University's databases which are current as of October 2010. The effect of this lag is that it may distort (over represent) the situation of those designated groups which are experiencing a more rapid growth than the general population. For example, according to Statistics Canada, the visible minority population grew at a rate of 27% between census points at 2001 and 2006. For the same time period the population of Aboriginal Peoples increased at a rate of 20.9% and that of Persons with Disabilities increased at a rate of 21.2% (the latter primarily as a result of an aging population). The general population growth during this time was 5.4%. It is unlikely that this trend will be different for the census period from 2006 to 2011. That said, it is important to note that the increase in the population of designated groups does not necessarily translate into a direct increase in their availability rate; however, it is indicative.
- Second, the workforce representation data is more reliable for determining representation on the basis of gender. It is less so for determining the representation of the other three designated groups. The source of data on gender is the Human Resources Management System and is accurate. The source for the other three designated groups is the University's Employment Equity Census Questionnaire. The latter is a voluntary, self-identification survey which has a low response rate (54% in 2010 for the Faculty of Arts).⁷ Particularly troubling is the response rate for new hires (23%). The low response rate is an ongoing issue and also one that vexes other employers.

⁵ The Government of Canada's employment equity scheme organizes the national workforce into 14 EEOGs, not all of which apply to a university setting.

⁶ The UBC Equity Office has prepared an update to the *Overview of the Representation of Faculty and Staff by Designated Equity Group for the Faculty of Arts*. This report for 2011 replaces the original 2010 version in Appendix D.

⁷ Note: A return may not necessarily contain self-identification information.

Key Observations Regarding Representational Data for Staff:

- Staff members are distributed among five EEOGs (Middle and Other Managers, Professionals, Semi-Professionals and Technicians, Administrative and Senior Clerical, and Clerical).
- Women are represented at or above availability figures in all five EEOGs. Of the 42 new hires in the Faculty of Arts in 2010, 70% were women.
- Visible Minorities are represented above availability level in the Clerical group only. No one self-identified in the Middle and Other Managers group. Representation is below availability in the remaining groups. Four of the 42 new hires (9.5%) in 2010 self-identified as Visible Minorities.
- Persons with Disabilities are represented only in three EEOGs. Their representation is higher than availability in the Clerical group only. Of the new hires, one self-identified in this designated group.
- Aboriginal Peoples are represented in only two groups (Professionals and in Administrative and Senior Clerical). No one self-identified in this group.

Key Observations Regarding Representational Data for Faculty:

- Women account for 45% of all professors at the Faculty of Arts.⁸ Their representation is above the national availability level of 39.6%. However, when the availability data is adjusted for field of study, women are under-represented in seven departments. In the past three years, women have been hired in tenure-track positions at a rate greater than the national availability. Significantly, women constitute 68% of all Lecturers on non-tenure track.
- For the period 2007 to 2011, women accounted for 43.4% of promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor. During the same period, women accounted for 39.4% of promotions from Associate Professor to Full Professor.
- For the period 2007 to 2011, women accounted for 40% of resignations at the Assistant Professor level and 57% of resignations at the Associate Professor level.⁹
- For Aboriginal Peoples, Persons with Disabilities, and for Visible Minorities, the issue of self-identification skews the data on representation. As such, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions on whether members of these designated groups are hired, promoted or separated in relation to their availability or representation in the workplace.

⁸ This includes lecturers and sessionals.

⁹ The issue of resignations is discussed further in the report.

- Aboriginal Peoples tend to be represented slightly above national availability levels; however, they are clustered in five of the 23 units of the Faculty. Moreover, no one self-identified at the Full Professor level.
- Persons with Disabilities are represented in all academic ranks except at the Assistant Professor level. Overall, they are represented at a slightly lower rate than their national availability (3% /4.5%) and are clustered in 9 of the 23 units.
- Visible Minorities are represented in all ranks albeit at a lower rate than their national availability (8.9% compared to 15.1%). They are significantly clustered with one department accounting for approximately 40% of the total for Visible Minorities.

4.2 Policies and Procedures

The Equity Office conducted a critical review of written policies and procedures that apply to the employment systems for faculty and for staff. That review concluded that written policies and procedures did not present barriers to the employment of any of the designated groups.

Guidelines and information packages used by the Faculty of Arts, in particular for hiring and promoting faculty, were presented to the consultant during interviews with the administration at the Faculty. A review of these documents similarly indicates that they do not present employment equity barriers.

4.3 Qualitative Information Gathering in relation to Practices

Qualitative information gathering, using a human interface, is a time consuming yet critical part of any review process. In this Review, focus groups and individual interviews provided an essential mechanism for validating the application of policies and procedures at the ground level. Moreover, they created an indispensable opportunity for a safe, quality conversation not otherwise available in an impersonal world of e-mail and on-line surveys. During focus group discussions, it was heartening to hear Heads of Departments and Programs as well as Administrators comment on the positive value of the discussions. They had an opportunity to provide their views and experience on sensitive employment equity issues. In addition, they learned from each other regarding human resources management issues they faced. Crucially, they learned they were not alone in struggling with those issues.

4.3.1 Key Observations from Focus Groups and Individual Interviews - Staff

Table 1 below outlines the information source and the role played by that source as well as providing a breakout of participants by gender.

Table 1

Information Source	Men	Women
Focus Groups (2)	1	5
Administrators		
Individuals	1	6
Administration (Including Dean's Office and HR)	3	3
Employee Representatives ¹⁰	1	3
Total	6	17

Based on discussions with the above-noted individuals, the following themes emerged:

1. There is a significant belief among Staff that their contribution to the success of the University is undervalued and their status is that of “second class” partners. This belief is consistent among members of all three bargaining units (CUPE 116, CUPE 2950, and AAPS¹¹). At the same time, the administrator function (carried out by members of AAPS) is important in providing ongoing and transition support to Department Heads because the latter change approximately every three to five years and the incoming Department Head may or may not have administrative experience. Yet, for a number of reasons, there is a prevailing sense of insecurity when Administrators have to “speak truth to power”. Administrators are carriers of corporate management history by their function and training. From time to time this role places them in a potential conflict with a new Department Head. When this happens, the Administrator, or other members of AAPS, may feel their role or position is vulnerable. . Indeed, data obtained from Human Resources indicates that the number of “not for cause” terminations has increased since 2007. While other factors such as overall growth in the number of AAPS members as well as an increased focus on budget constraints may be contributing to this increase, it is worth monitoring in the future.

The issue of feeling undervalued and of feeling vulnerable is usually the domain of general human resources policies. There is, however, an employment equity dimension to these issues. To the extent that members of designated groups feel vulnerable, issues such as the ones discussed above

¹⁰ CUPE 116, CUPE 2950, AAPS.

¹¹ Association of Administrative and Professional Staff

will add to their sense of being precarious and likely to negatively affect their aspirations and sense of belonging.

2. There is some perception that social connections with the hiring and promoting authority is a more significant factor than applicant's qualifications. This issue was also connected with concern that short term hiring and "internal riders" may reduce access to jobs. For example, the collective agreements with CUPE 116 and CUPE 2950 require a job vacancy to be posted unless its duration is of less than three months. AAPS vacancies need to be posted unless their duration is of less than one year. In both cases, extensions are possible and, it is suggested, routine.

Taken together, these practices create a situation where "word of mouth", together with social connection, may have the effect of limiting access to jobs for members of under- represented groups.

3. Focus group and individuals expressed concern that departmental orientation for new staff was non-existent, or where it did exist, it was meager. New staff expressed the view that they were left to fend for themselves to try to get a sense of how their department was organized and how it worked. Some were dismayed that they were not even introduced to other staff or faculty on their arrival. Similarly, new and existing staff expressed a strong desire to have an experienced person as a mentor. While these issues can be seen as general human resources issues, they have a particular impact when members of designated groups are recruited. Left on their own, new staff will seek help and guidance where they are comfortable. Ironically, in some departments where visible minority clerical staff constitute a majority, this issue may be a source of tension when new staff who are not members of the same visible minority are hired and seek to integrate into the department or program.
4. While new or recent staff professed frustration at not "knowing the ropes" when it comes to promotion and career development, it was somewhat surprising to hear some longer term staff admit to the same dilemma. Some experienced staff observed that the lack of diverse, senior role models may be de-motivating for a new generation of junior staff who do not seem themselves reflected in the organizational hierarchy.
5. It is inevitable that conflict will arise in any workplace and, therefore, it is not surprising that this issue surfaced in focus group and individual discussions. Participants gave examples of conflict arising out of role definition, out of disrespect by faculty of the contribution of staff (see item 1, above) and, out of the pressure experienced by faculty in the academic world. Participants were aware of the usual recourse in such circumstances: discuss the matter with the individual concerned; raise it with a supervisor; seek advice from the Equity Office or Human Resources; or, file a grievance. They felt that the usual approaches were either ineffective (including seeking advice from

Strategic Employment Systems Review – Faculty of Arts - UBC

Human Resources and the Equity Office) or too blunt (grievance process). They expressed a desire for a “softer” way to resolve emerging differences or disputes before these became conflicts. Participants recognized that at the end of the day, they would, most likely, have to continue to work with the individual concerned.

6. On the general issue of inclusion and diversity, participants were hopeful but wary of the undertaking envisioned in *Place and Promise*. In their view, there is a need to earmark dedicated resources to support *Place and Promise* and to support key central human resources functions which will enable delivery on the promise. The Administrators in particular recognized Human Resources, including Faculty Relations, as a critical support but lamented the fact that resources were lacking for quick response to their daily needs. Such a lag becomes critical especially when dealing with mental health issues.

4.3.2 Key Observations from Focus Groups and Individual Interviews – Faculty:

Tables 2 to 6 below summarize the source of information on faculty employment system issues and breaks out the information source according to gender.

Table 2 – Heads of Departments and Directors of Programs

Information Source	Men	Women
Focus Groups (2)	10	2
Individuals	3	1
Total	13	3

Table 3 – Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty Focus Groups

Information Source	Men	Women
Assistant Professors (2 Focus Groups)	2	9
Associate Professors (2 Focus Groups)	1	8
Full Professors (2 Focus Groups)	6	2
Total	9	19

Table 4 – Individual Faculty – Tenure Track and Tenured

Information Source	Men	Women
Assistant Professors	2	3
Associate Professors	2	0
Full Professors	1	1
Senior Instructor	0	1
Total	5	5

Table 5 – Sessional Faculty

Information Source	Men	Women
Focus Groups (3)	0	6
Individuals	0	2
Total	0	8

Table 7 – Other Key Opinion Leaders

Information Source	Number of Participants
Administration	8
Faculty Association	2
Total	10

4.3.3 Key Observations from Focus Groups and Individual Interviews – Faculty:

Based on discussion with the above-noted focus groups and individuals, the following themes emerged:

1. *Place and Promise* as it speaks to diversity is generally well received; nevertheless, there is ambiguity and some skepticism about whether it is a re-branding of former plans or a substantial point of departure for the University. A substantial number of longer term faculty felt somewhat detached from *the UBC Plan* since they had no involvement in shaping it. A few Department Heads stated outright that *Place and Promise* was not a factor in their own planning; however, they referenced relevant parts when seeking approval for recruitment. Many participants are waiting to see whether efforts to promote *the UBC Plan* will be sustained in the short term. Some are waiting to see whether resources will be committed to give life to the plan.
2. Since the Faculty of Arts has a new Dean, various participants (especially some Department Heads) are looking for a clear signal from the Dean that diversity matters. Some suggested that it could take the form of ensuring that diversity and inclusion be a part of the emerging effort by the Dean's Office to move to require longer term management plans from Department Heads and Directors of Programs.
3. Several Department/Program Heads discussed the significance of the connection between educational equity and employment equity. They saw the importance of addressing the needs of a diverse student population and of a diverse community by including employment equity as one part of a coherent whole. Indeed, one department undertook a self-reflection by asking why female students were dropping out of its senior year student population. This has led to further study to examine whether low representation of female faculty could be contributing to lower participation rates for female students in senior years.

4. Work/life balance is a concern for established female faculty aspiring to be Department Heads. It is also of general concern for new tenure track faculty, for both men and women, as they embark on their new career. On the other hand, sessional faculty cited the flexibility offered by sessional work as a key reason for not seeking a tenure track position.
5. A number of participants, including Department Heads, raised the practice of the previous Dean not to hire PhD graduates of UBC (upon graduation) as an issue. The Equity Office reports that this practice is consistent with that of other Faculties in the University and, indeed, with other universities nationally and internationally. Such an approach exposes the graduate to approaches and perspectives of other institutions thereby broadening his or her thinking. Notwithstanding this goal, the practice was cited as creating a hardship for women and for men and women who have children. It was also cited by sessional faculty who chose to accept sessional work at UBC upon graduation rather than move elsewhere for their first tenure track position.
6. A majority of new hires expressed the need for enhanced support during orientation. They recognize that the University has a day set aside for orientation and further information is provided online; however, the issue for them is having the right information at the right time. Many felt so overwhelmed on initial hiring, given the adjustment to a new home (see item 5 above) and a new workplace, that they were not even sure they were asking the right questions during the first several months.
7. Similarly, a majority of participants, across all ranks and roles, voiced dissatisfaction with the mentoring process. Newly hired faculty saw this gap as continuation of the weakness in orientation and felt the two issues combined to impede their early progress towards tenure. Women and visible minority participants in particular expressed frustration at lack of access to quality mentoring. A number reported the mentoring session consisted of little more than an occasional lunch together and did not provide useful information on where to publish, how often to publish, or content of publications (books, papers, etc.).
8. Women faculty welcomed the new emphasis on teaching as criteria for tenure. They stated that, traditionally, teaching has been seen as “women’s work” and undervalued in contrast to research and scholarship.
9. Spousal hiring practices continue to present challenges. This is particularly the case since there is no explicit policy to guide decisions in this area. While this practice is widely used in the academic world, the lack of a framework leads to controversy when someone is hired pursuant to this practice or when someone is refused hiring in this context.

10. A number of participants expressed a strong desire for alternative means of resolving nascent disputes. They recognize that debate and challenge is part and parcel of the academic world and mind set. Yet, it is sometimes difficult to prevent legitimate debate from crossing the boundary to personal affront. This is a cross cutting issue, but was flagged particularly by women and new faculty (men and women).
11. Participants generally expressed the need for more training on diversity/equity/human rights issues in order to better understand the issues arising out of an increasingly diverse workplace. While a minority of participants (Department Heads in particular) indicated they were comfortable with consulting with Human Resources, i.e. Faculty Relations on an issue by issue basis, a plurality of participants want a deeper understanding in order to anticipate and prevent issues from reaching a critical point. In other words, they want to prevent problems from arising rather than undertaking damage control after the fact.
12. There was general consensus on the need for additional funding to support a more timely assistance from Human Resources, i.e. Faculty Relations. The need for timely advice comes into sharp focus (for Department Heads) when dealing with issues of reasonable accommodation and mental health issues.

5. Recommendations

In analysing all of the information gathered for this Review it is reasonable to conclude that no specific systems barriers have been identified. However, some general areas for continued vigilance lead to a number of recommendations.

It is tempting to take a piecemeal approach to recommendations by attaching a prescription to each observation made in the forgoing section. There is a certain amount of attraction to proceeding in this manner since it presents an opportunity for quick action on some issues. Used exclusively, such an approach, however, would ignore the systemic nature of the issues, that is, their interconnected nature, and risk having little or no impact in relation to resources expended. On balance, a practical approach would suggest that both approaches be used prudently.

With this in mind, the recommendations are organized according to those which can be acted upon quickly and those which may require some further development. Moreover, some recommendations can respond to issues common to both the staff and faculty tracks of the Review and others that, necessarily, are particular to each track.

5.1 Recommendations to address common issues in the short term:

1. There is a clear need for reliable representational data on designated groups other than women given the low return rate of the self-identification questionnaire. The Equity Office has this issue well in hand and should be encouraged to continue with its plans to improve return rates and the robustness of the data in general.
2. The Dean undertakes to communicate to Department Heads and Directors of Programs that diversity and inclusion are important policy issues for the Faculty of Arts. Further, he should direct them to ensure that Departmental and Program plans include initiatives designed to improve the inclusion of the designated groups.
3. The Equity Office and Human Resources should undertake measures to increase the delivery of diversity/employment equity/human rights training to faculty and staff.
4. The University undertake to examine the resourcing levels for Human Resources Advisory Services and for Faculty Relations to allow for increased support to the faculty as it relates to the implementation, development, and maintenance of effective and pro-active Human Resources measures and non-discriminatory HR practices. Given the synergy between human resources and equity issues, this proposed role needs to be coordinated with that of the Equity Office.

5.2 Recommendations to address common issues in the medium term:

1. The University examine ways and means to re-shape existing conflict resolving mechanisms or, where necessary, create new ones with an emphasis on early detection and prevention.
2. The Dean's Office examines the current initiatives related to orientation and mentoring staff and faculty and undertakes to improve these two initiatives.
3. The Dean's Office should strengthen the exit interview process and ensure that it becomes a management priority. Manager's one level above that of the departing employee should be directly involved in the exit interview.

5.3 Recommendations to address issues specific to Staff:

1. Human Resources monitor those staff dismissed without cause to determine whether there is any disproportionate impact on members of the four designated groups.

2. Human Resources monitor short term hiring, and extensions thereof, to determine whether there is any disproportionate impact in relation to membership in the four designated groups.

5.4 Recommendations to address issues specific to Faculty:

1. The University examine its approach to spousal hiring to ensure validity, transparency and consistency.
2. The Dean should examine the best mechanism to create a safe and informal opportunity for Department Heads and Directors of Programs to share information and best practices to foster diversity and inclusion within the Faculty of Arts.
3. The Dean should consider the under representation of Women, Visible Minorities, Aboriginal Peoples, and Persons with Disabilities, identified in particular areas of the Faculty of Arts (see Key Observations), and identify appropriate methods for outreach and consideration.

Appendix A

BACKGROUND¹²

Can You Imagine UBC in 2020?

In 2020 ... UBC is known by name around the world. Leading-edge teaching and learning practices prevail across the University, creating an exceptional learning environment to which students, staff, faculty, and alumni are drawn from all over the globe. A diverse University community embraces the full spectrum of Canadian society, and Aboriginal perceptions and experiences are reflected in the curriculum and on campus. UBC research is seen by British Columbians as vital to their social and economic well-being, and citizens look to the University as a place for dialogue on the issues of the day. UBC is known by its contributions: to the people of British Columbia, Canada and the world.

- Place and Promise: The UBC Plan

The University of British Columbia has committed itself to an ambitious plan which would place it among the leading universities of the world within a decade. The University sees itself as an inclusive and diverse center of excellence for teaching, learning, and research relevant to the current and future needs of Canadians and of the world.

While breathtaking in scope and inspiring in its reach, the strategic plan is, nevertheless, informed by a stark understanding of the reality the University would face in the alternative. The Plan incorporates a set of concrete commitments which outline short and medium term steps to its implementation. Each of these commitments¹³ recognizes, explicitly or implicitly, the need to mobilize internal and external constituencies in support of the Plan. By their very nature, these constituencies, whether they are students, staff and faculty, alumni, communities and community groups, or funders, are as diverse as the individuals of whom they are composed. Yet, as important as all these constituencies are, the primary actors, those who will have the most critical effect on the success or failure of the Plan, are the faculty and staff of the University. It is

¹² This Appendix is replicated from *Designing a Strategic Employment Systems Review* and is meant to provide a convenient context for the employment systems review.

¹³ Student Learning, Research Excellence, Community Engagement, Aboriginal Engagement, Alumni Engagement, Intercultural Understanding, International Engagement, Outstanding Work Environment, Sustainability

Strategic Employment Systems Review – Faculty of Arts - UBC

imperative, therefore, for this group represent, embrace and model the commitment to diversity¹⁴ and excellence to which the vision statement speaks.

In this context, the University has developed a Human Resources Strategic Plan (*Focus on People: Workplace Practices at UBC*) and an Equity and Diversity Strategy (*Valuing Difference: A Strategy for Advancing Equity and Diversity at UBC*) to further align efforts in support of *Place and Promise*. The themes of inclusion and diversity run throughout the narrative of *Focus on People* starting with its vision statement and ending in specific goals and actions. In particular, the goals of developing a sustainable and healthy workplace and that of retaining faculty and staff speak directly to the issue of inclusion and diversity. Specifically, in the context of the retaining faculty and staff, a key action items outlines the need to, “Review policies and practices to ensure that there are no barriers that may impede some people from advancing or enriching their careers because of characteristics unrelated to their ability to perform the job.”

Normally, an employment systems review is undertaken to ensure compliance with the Federal Contractors Program Requirements. The Requirements apply to any organization which contracts to provide goods and a service to the Federal Government valued at two hundred thousand dollars or more annually and employs more than one hundred employees. The review usually begins with an analysis of the representation of four designated groups (women, aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and visible minorities) in the occupational groups existing in the employer’s relevant workforce compared with their availability in the general workforce. To the extent that gaps in representation are identified, a review of employment systems, policies and practices is undertaken to identify barriers which may be contributing to the under-representation. Thereafter, a plan is developed to overcome the barriers. For greater detail of the requirements are available at www.hrsdc.gc.ca.

In the context of the imperatives identified above, the Vice-President, Equity and the Vice-President, Human Resources, decided that a two stage process would best address their needs: the first stage would, through a consultant, design the methodology and process of the review after a thorough consultation with representatives of management, faculty and staff at the Faculty of Arts; the second stage would implement the review.

Consultations took place from July 20, 2010 to October 6, 2010. During this period, the Consultant conducted interviews with ten department heads, representatives of the faculty, and representatives of staff. The Consultant also reviewed a number of internal documents and considered diversity related practices at leading North American universities.

These consultations informed the design of the review and were helpful in addressing the issue of whether to take a narrow, traditional approach to an employment systems review or to take a more strategic approach which would assist the University in its strategic plan. A majority of individuals were comfortable with the notion that the review ought to be more expansive, beyond only addressing barriers to inclusion of the four designated groups. They reasoned that a broader

¹⁴ For the purposes of this discussion, diversity refers to all the myriad of ways in which human beings are unique in their lives and identities. This includes, and is not restricted to, the individual’s gender, race, colour, aboriginal status, physical or mental disability, age, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, transgender status, marital and family status, religious belief, social and economic status, political belief.

Strategic Employment Systems Review – Faculty of Arts - UBC

approach to diversity would be inherently fairer, consistent with the University values of excellence and integrity, and, would address the current and future needs of the University. These individuals also viewed this broader approach to diversity as providing an opportunity to connect the SESR project to the new strategic directions of the University.

Appendix B

POINTS OF FOCUS FOR EXAMINATION Staff

- 1. Recruitment**
- 2. Selection**
- 3. Orientation and Mentoring**
- 4. Training and Development**
- 5. Performance Evaluation (where applicable), Probation Etc.**
- 6. Promotion**
- 7. Retention and Succession Planning**
- 8. Handling of Conflict**
- 9. Departures**
- 10. Reasonable Accommodation**
- 11. Equity, Diversity and Human Rights Training**
- 12. Other Marginalized Groups**

Appendix C

POINTS OF FOCUS FOR EXAMINATION Faculty

- 1. Recruitment**
- 2. Selection**
- 3. Orientation and Mentoring**
- 4. Professional Development**
- 5. Promotion and Tenure**
- 6. Performance Evaluation**
- 7. Retention and Succession Planning**
- 8. Handling of Conflict**
- 9. Departures**
- 10. Reasonable Accommodation**
- 11. Equity, Diversity and Human Rights Training**
- 12. Other Marginalized Groups**

Appendix D

Overview of the Representation of Faculty and Staff by Designated Equity Group
Faculty of Arts

May 11, 2012 (Replaces October 4, 2011 version)



a place of mind

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

OVERVIEW OF THE REPRESENTATION OF FACULTY AND STAFF BY DESIGNATED EQUITY GROUP

FACULTY OF ARTS

May 11, 2012 (draft 5)

Prepared by

Equity Office

2306 Brock Hall, 1874 East Mall, Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z1

T 604.822.6353 F 604.822.3260

Email: equity@equity.ubc.ca

www.equity.ubc.ca

Workforce Analysis and Equity Hiring Report 2011

Faculty of Arts, UBC

SUMMARY

The Faculty of Arts is one of the largest faculties on UBC's Vancouver campus. There are close to 1,300 faculty and staff working across 22 departments, schools and programs. For this brief overview – as of October 31, 2011 – there were approximately 500 faculty, over 200 sessionals, and 400 Staff.¹ There have been 88 new tenure track appointments in the past 4 years – 16 in 2011. There were 61 new staff hires in 2011, an increase of 19 from 2010.

Representation of Faculty

- Women faculty are represented across all Departments in the Faculty of Arts. Women are also represented across all academic ranks. Among Full Professors – their representation is at 27.7%, which remains higher than for the UBC Vancouver campus – which is at 22%.²
- Based on availability data related to field of study, women faculty remain under-represented in Anthropology, Classical, Near Eastern and Religious Studies, Geography and Music (which is the only Department where the gap increased in the past year). In addition, women are also under-represented in English (although the gap decreased by 1/3 in the past year) and Social Work, in these fields of study the concentration of women is particularly higher than the overall availability of 39.6% in the national workforce.
- Women faculty were hired at rates greater than their overall availability of 39.6% from 2008-2010: 34 of 72 – or 47.2% – of tenure-track hires have been women. This trend stopped in 2011 when women accounted for 5 of 16 – or 31.3% of appointments at the rank of Associate and Assistant Professor.
- The representation of Aboriginal peoples who have self-identified among the faculty is just above their availability of 0.9%. They remain represented in five of the 22 departments, schools and programs. There are no Full Professors who have self-identified among this designated equity group.
- Faculty who self-identify as visible minorities are represented across all academic ranks and although there has been a slight increase to 10.1% it is lower than the national availability of 15.1% and that of UBC Vancouver at 16.4%. Visible minorities have self-identified in 17 of the 22 departments, schools and programs, although in most instances there is only one person who has self-identified in a particular field of study. The percentage of all visible minorities who have self-identified in Asian Studies has decreased significantly from almost 40% to 18% in the past year.
- Persons with disabilities are represented across most academic ranks. They are represented among 9 of the 22 departments, schools and programs. Their representation, while increasing to 4% is lower than the national availability data for university professors at 4.5%.

¹ For information on the data collection, analysis and references, refer to Appendix 1.

² This percentage was recorded incorrectly in 2010 at 37.1%, it should have been 27.1%.

Representation of Staff

- Staff work primarily in one of the five of 15 Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOGs). Clarification on changes in the distribution of staff among the various EEOGs - from 2010 to 2011 is underway (the distribution cannot be accounted for based on number of recent hires).

EEOG	2010	2011
Middle and Other Managers:	11	16
Professionals	162	119
Semi-Professionals and Technicians	66	101
Administrative and Sr. Clerical	66	69
Clerical	55	62

- Women are represented across all five EEOGs; in fact, they are over-represented in most – particularly Middle and Other Managers, Administrative and Senior Clerical and Clerical. Their representation in the Semi-Professional and Technician category decreased from 53% to 41% this year.
- Aboriginal people have self-identified in three EEOGs; overall, their representation is low.
- The representation of visible minorities who have self-identified remains uneven across EEOGs. Representation is low in the Professional, Semi-Professional and Technician and Administrative and Senior Clerical positions and above availability in Clerical.
- Person with disabilities have self-identified in five EEOGs, compared to three last year. Their representation is low in the Professional category, slightly above availability in Semi-Professional and Technical as well as Administrative and Senior Clerical positions – and in Clerical, it is substantially higher than workforce availability data at 16.2%.
- There were 61 new staff hires in the Faculty of Arts in 2011. Almost 70% of the new hires were women, and in most EEOGs where there were new hires, women were represented above availability. No Aboriginal people or persons with disabilities self-identified in any of the new staff hires. There was an increase in the percentage of new hires who self-identified as visible minorities. Note that the response rate of new staff hires to the UBC Employment Equity Self-Identification Questionnaire while increasing, remains low at 30%.

Equity Hiring Report: The primary purpose of this report is to focus on equity in hiring. Equity in hiring has the greatest impact when it is integrated into a broader vision of equity and diversity. That vision is articulated in [Place and Promise](#), the [Equity and Diversity Strategic Plan](#) as well as UBC's [Employment Equity Plan](#). The questions on the following page are intended to provide an opportunity for you to address equity hiring in the broader context of your Faculty's commitment to equity and diversity. However, you are welcome to provide your report in a different format if it is more convenient or you wish to focus on different questions or issues.

The following questions are linked to themes within the UBC Equity and Diversity Strategic Plan:

1. What did your faculty do to advance equity and diversity over the past year?

2. What does your faculty plan to do to address issues concerning equity and diversity in the future? Please focus on areas where under-representation or systemic barriers are identified.

3. Curriculum and academic inquiry are powerful tools for promoting diversity and equity. How is your Faculty supporting advances in research and curriculum in these areas?

4. Classroom climate and respect are fundamental to fostering debates that welcome new ideas, diverse and marginalized viewpoints. How is your Faculty working to advance an inclusive learning environment?

5. A diverse community of excellent students brings a variety of perspectives to curriculum, research, scholarship and innovation. Has your Faculty undertaken a review of admission procedures – (particularly at the graduate/professional levels where your Faculty has direct input) are there any systemic barriers that negatively impact the participation of students from equity groups – and if so what plans will be undertaken to improve their admission rates?

Figure 1
Representation of Staff and Faculty by Gender and by Employment Equity Occupational Group in the Faculty of Arts and UBC V

EEOG	Gender						
	Faculty of Arts					% UBC V	Availability Data
	Women	Men	Total	% Women			
				2010	2011		
Senior Managers		1	1			37.1%	24.2%
Middle and Other Managers	12	4	16	82%	75%	52.2%	38.1%
University Professors (*)	383	448	831	45%	46%	38.4%	39.6%
Professionals	79	40	119	62%	66%	64.0%	50.6%
Semi-Professionals & Technicians	41	60	101	53%	41%	62.0%	50.5%
Supervisors	3		3		100%	64.8%	52.5%
Administrative & Senior Clerical	63	6	69	97%	91%	88.4%	80.5%
Clerical Personnel	57	5	62	91%	92%	71.6%	71.6%
Intermediate Sales and Service	1	1	2	80%	50%	66.2%	66.2%
Semi-Skilled Manual Workers	1	1	2	66.6%	50%	11.9%	20.4%
Other Sales and Service	62	22	84		74%	48.4%	55.7%
Total Faculty of Arts	702	588	1290	53%	54%		
Total UBC	6660	5326	11986	55.5%		55.6%	
National Workforce Population 2006							47.9%
Vancouver Workforce Population 2006							48.4%

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2010, 2011

(*) Includes Sessionals

Figure 2
Representation of Staff and Faculty by Designated Equity Group and by Employment Equity Occupational Group in the Faculty of Arts and UBC V

EEOG	Aboriginal Peoples					Visible Minorities					Persons with Disabilities					
	Faculty of Arts			% UBC V	Availability Data	Faculty of Arts			% UBC V	Availability Data	Faculty of Arts			% UBC V	Availability Data	
	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire				Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire				Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire				
		2010	2011				2010	2011				2010	2011			
Senior Managers					2.4%				3.3%	8.7%				6.9%	3.2% (*)	
Middle and Other Managers				1.8%	1.0%	1		9%	22.9%	34%				4.6%		
University Professors(**)	8	2.2%	2.1%	1.3%	0.9%	45	12%	12%	16.8%	15.1%	13	3.6%	3.4%	3.9%	4.5%	
Professionals	2	1.1%	2.6%	1.4%	1%	20	26%	26%	33.2%	33.2%	3	3.3%	3.8%	5.0%	4.5%	
Semi-Professionals & Technicians				1.3%	2.1%	10	24%	23%	39.6%	33.3%	3	13.5%	6.8%	6.4%	6.8%	
Supervisors	*	*	*		1.9%	*	*	*	56.9%	38.0%	*	*	*	4.7%	(-)	
Administrative & Senior Clerical	1	2.1%	1.9%	1.7%	1.4%	8	19%	15%	31.5%	30.8%	3	6.3%	5.7%	4.6%	5.6% (***)	
Clerical Personnel	1		2.7%	0.5%	2.1%	16	42%	43%	46.6%	38.9%	6	18.4%	16.2%	7.5%	6.2% (***)	
Intermediate Sales & Service				2.3%	1.7%				49.2%	43.1%	1		50%	7.4%	5.6% (***)	
Semi-Skilled Manual Workers				0%	2.2%				33.3%	47.6%				13.3%	4.5% (***)	
Other Sales and Service				1.5%	2.2%	4		44%	63.8%	51.3%	1		11.1%	12.1%	8.7%	
Total Faculty of Arts	12	1.7%	1.9%			106	17%	17%			30	5.2%	4.8%			
Total UBC	90			1.5%		1859			31.9%		308			5.3%		
National Workforce Population 2006					3.1%						15.3%					4.9%
Vancouver Workforce Population 2006					1.8%						38.4%					6.2%

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2010, 2011

Response Rate to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire in the Faculty of Arts: 54 % (2010) 48 % (2011)

(*) Senior Managers and Middle and Other Managers are combined.

(**) Includes Sessionals

(***) Figure should be used with caution. The coefficient of variation of the estimate is between 16.5% and 33.3%.

(-) Amount too small to be expressed.

(*) data suppressed, total number in position 5 or less

Figure 3i
Representation of Faculty by Gender and by Rank
Faculty of Arts and UBC V³

Rank	Gender					
	Faculty of Arts					%UBC
	Women	Men	Total	% Women		
2011	2010	2011	2011			
Full Professor	49	128	177	27.1%	27.7%	22%
Associate Professor	79	95	174	47.5%	45.4%	42%
Assistant Professor	52	63	115	41.4%	45.2%	38%
Instructor II	1	1	2	28.6%	50%	
Senior Instructor	10	8	18	55.6%	55.6%	49%
Instructor I	7	4	11	75%	63.3%	58%
Faculty of Arts Tenure-Track (Subtotal)	198	299	497	39.3%	39.8%	32.6%
Lecturer	35	19	54	68%	64.8%	58%
Instructor without Review	1	1	2		50%	67%
Sessional	149	129	278	51%	53.6%	50%
Faculty of Arts	383	448	831	44.8%	46.1%	
UBC V 2011						34%
Availability Data ⁴						39.6%

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2010, 2011

³ See Appendix 2 for revised 2010 data.

⁴ Availability Data is drawn from the Employment Equity Data Report 2006 unless noted (see Appendix 1).

Figure 3ii
Representation of Faculty by Designated Equity Group and by Rank
Faculty of Arts and UBC V

Rank	Aboriginal Peoples					Visible Minorities					Persons with Disabilities				
	Faculty of Arts				%UBC	Faculty of Arts				%UBC	Faculty of Arts				%UBC
	Total		% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire			Total		% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire			Total		% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire		
	2011		2010	2011		2011		2010	2011		2011		2010	2011	
	W	T				W	T				W	T			
Full Professor					0.7%	1	9	8.3%	8.7%	14.2%	1	5	5.2%	4.8%	2.4%
Associate Professor		3	2.2%	2.9%	1.8%	5	11	7.6%	10.7%	16.7%	3	3	2.2%	2.9%	4.6%
Assistant Professor	4	4	1.3%	3.5%	2.7%	3	7	11.7%	6.1%	20%		1	1.3%	0.9%	3.2%
Instructor II	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	33.3%
Senior Instructor						1	2	7.7%	15.4%	12.1%	1	1		7.7%	8.6%
Instructor I										25.6%					4.7%
Faculty of Arts Tenure-Track (Sub-total)	4	7	1.4	2.4%	1.4%	10	29	8.7%	10.1%	16.4%	5	11	2.7%	3.8%	3.7%
Lecturer						6	7		24%	27.5%					
Instructor without Review															
Sessional	1	1				6	9				2	2			
Faculty of Arts (Total)	5	8	2.2%	2.1%		22	45	12%	11%		7	13	3.6%	3.4%	
UBC V (2011)					1.3%					16.7%					3.7%
Availability Data ⁵					0.9%					15.1%					4.5%

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2011

Response Rate to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire: 45% (2010) 46% (2011)

(*) data suppressed, total number in position 5 or less

⁵ Availability Data is drawn from the Employment Equity Data Report 2006 unless noted (see Appendix 1).

Figure 4
Representation and Gap Analysis of Women Faculty⁶ by Department, Faculty of Arts 2011

Department	Gender					Availability Data ⁷			Gap	
	Women	Men	Total	% Women		%	# Based on Availability		#	
				2010	2011		2010	2011	2010	2011
Anthropology	8	15	23	31.8%	35%	55.0%	12	13	-5	-5
Art History, Visual Art & Theory	11	9	20	52.6%	55%	51.0%	10	10	0	1
Asian Studies	10	14	24	41.7%	41.7%	28.6%	7	7	3	3
Classical, Near Eastern & Religious Studies	7	14	21	35.0%	33%	47.1%	10	10	-3	-3
Creative Writing Program	4	4	8	57.1%	50%	39.6%	3	3	1	1
European Studies	4	6	10	45.5%	40%	39.6%	4	4	1	0
Economics	8	29	37	25.7%	22%	26.9%	10	10	1	-2
English	29	26	55	51.9%	52.7%	70.1%	37	39	-15	-10
French, Hispanic & Italian Studies	13	15	28	48.1%	46.4%	39.6%	11	11	2	2
Geography	6	19	25	26.9%	24%	36.8%	10	9	-3	-3
History	11	20	31	33.3%	35%	38.0%	13	12	-2	-1
Journalism, School of	2	2	4	40.0%	50%	39.6%	2	2	0	0
Library Archives & Info Studies, School of	9	3	12	75.0%	75%	39.6%	5	5	4	4
Linguistics	6	8	14	42.9%	43%	39.6%	6	6	0	0
Music, School of	6	24	30	24.1%	20%	40.7%	12	12	-5	-6
Philosophy	5	15	20	19.0%	25%	35.3%	7	7	-3	-2
Political Science	8	21	29	32.3%	28%	34.3%	11	10	-1	-2
Psychology	21	25	46	44.4%	46%	49.7%	22	23	-2	-2
Social Work, School of	6	9	15	43.8%	40%	72.2%	12	11	-5	-5
Sociology	13	11	24	54.2%	54%	50.0%	12	12	1	1
Theatre and Film	7	10	17	41%	41.2%	39.6%	7	7	0	0
Women and Gender Studies	1		1	100%	100%	39.6%	1	1	0	0
Faculty of Arts Total	195	299	494	40.4%	39.5%		224	224	-27	-29

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2010, 2011

⁶ Faculty includes the ranks of Full, Associate, Assistant Professors and Instructor II, Senior Instructor and Instructor I. Faculty in the Arts One Program and the Dean's Office are not included in this table.

⁷ The representation of women faculty in the various disciplines in Arts may be higher or lower than the average representation of women in all disciplines across academia. In the Statistics Canada "University and College Academic Staff Survey" (released 2008-02-13) the representation of women in their respective fields of study is used when possible, if there is no other data, the average representation of women in faculty - at 39.6% across all disciplines is noted (from the Employment Equity Data Report, Census 2006).

Figure 5
Representation of Faculty⁸ by Designated Equity Group and by Department, Faculty of Arts 2011⁹

Department	Gender				Aboriginal Peoples		Visible Minorities		Persons with Disabilities	
	Women	Men	Total	% Women	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire
Anthropology	8	15	23	35%	2	13%	1	6%		
Art History, Visual Art & Theory	11	9	20	55%			1	16.6%	2	33.3%
Asian Studies	10	14	24	41.7%			5	38.5%		
Classical, Near Eastern & Religious Studies	7	14	21	33%			1	16.6%		
Creative Writing Program	4	4	8	50%						
European Studies	4	6	10	40%						
Economics	8	29	37	22%			3	17%		
English	29	26	55	52.7%	2	5.1%	2	5.1%	1	2.6%
French, Hispanic & Italian Studies	13	15	28	46.4%					2	18%
Geography	6	19	25	24%			2	11%	1	6%
History	11	20	31	35%			3	14%	1	5%
Journalism, School of	2	2	4	50%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Library Archives & Info Studies, School of	9	3	12	75%					1	10%
Linguistics	6	8	14	43%			1	13%	1	13%
Music, School of	6	24	30	20%			1	6%	1	6%
Philosophy	5	15	20	25%			1	10%		
Political Science	8	21	29	28%	1	6%	2	11%		
Psychology	21	25	46	46%			1	3%		
Social Work, School of	6	9	15	40%	1	14%	1	14%	1	14%
Sociology	13	11	24	54%			2	12%		
Theatre and Film	7	10	17	41.2%			1	9%		
Women and Gender Studies	1		1	100%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Faculty of Arts Total	195	299	494	39.5%	7	2.4%	29	10.1%	11	3.9%
UBC V Total (2011)				34%		1.3%		16.7%		3.7%
Availability Data				39.6%		0.9%		15.1%		4.5%

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2011

Response Rate of Faculty to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire: 57.9 %

(*) data suppressed, total number in position 5 or less

⁸ Faculty includes the ranks of Full, Associate, Assistant Professors and Instructor II, Senior Instructor and Instructor I.

⁹ See Appendix 3 for 2010 data.

Figure 6
New Tenure-Track Hires by Gender and by Rank 2009-2011
Faculty of Arts and UBC V

Rank	2009					2010					2011				
	Faculty of Arts				% UBC V	Faculty of Arts				% UBC V	Faculty of Arts				% UBC V
	Women	Men	Total	% Women		Women	Men	Total	% Women		Women	Men	Total	% Women	
Full Professor	0	3	3		22%	1		1	100%	44.4%					8.3%
Associate Professor	1	1	2	50%	16.7%	1		1	100%	80%	1	2	3	33.3%	60%
Assistant Professor	7	15	22	31.8%	32.7%	6	8	14	42.9%	53.0%	4	9	13	30.8%	23.5%
Faculty of Arts Tenure-Track (Subtotal Total 2011)											5	11	16	31.3%	
<i>Instructor II</i>	2	2	4	50%		1	2	3	33%						
<i>Senior Instructor</i>															
<i>Instructor I</i>	2	0	2	100%		1	1	2	50%			2	2		50%
<i>Instructor w/o Review</i>											1	1	2	50%	66.6%
<i>Lecturer</i>											3	1	4	75%	50%
Faculty of Arts (Totals)	12	21	33	36.4%		10	11	21	48%		9	15	24	37.5%	
UBC V	39	63	102	39%		35	29	64	55%		26	63	89	29%	

Source: UBC Equity Office: October 31, 2009, 2010, 2011

Of the 16 tenure-track faculty¹⁰ appointments in Arts last year, four self-identified as visible minorities. One in the rank of Associate Professor and three Assistant Professors. The response rate to the UBC Self-Identification Questionnaire was 29.4% among new faculty appointments.

In 2011, the Faculty of Arts appointed Associate and Assistant Professors in the following Departments:

Art History, Visual Art and Theory	(1)
Classical, Near Eastern and Religious Studies	(3)
Economics	(3)
English	(2)
French, Hispanic and Italian Studies	(1)
School of Music	(3)
Philosophy	(1)
Political Science	(1)
Psychology	(1)

¹⁰ Tenure track faculty appointments to the rank of Assistant, Associate and Full Professor.

Figure7
New Hires by Gender and Employment Equity Occupational Category
Faculty of Arts and UBC V

EEOG	Gender						
	Faculty of Arts					% UBC V	Availability Data
	Women	Men	Total	% Women			
				2010	2011		
Senior Managers						50%	24.2%
Middle and Other Managers						40%	38.1%
University Professors (*)	63	49	112	51.5%	56%	48.7%	39.6%
Professionals	8	3	11	58.8%	73%	62.6%	50.6%
Semi-Professionals & Technicians	10	11	21	60%	73%	68.3%	50.5%
Supervisors						44.4%	52.5%
Administrative & Senior Clerical	2	1	3	100%	67%	84.8%	80.5%
Clerical Personnel	8		8	66.7%	100%	72.8%	71.6%
Intermediate Sales and Service				100%		70.6%	66.2%
Semi -Skilled Manual				100%		25%	20.4%
Other Sales and Service	13	5	18		72%	42.2%	55.7%
Total	104	69	173	71.5%	60%	62%	53%
National Workforce Population 2006							47.9%
Vancouver Workforce Population 2006							48.4%

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2011
 (*) Includes Sessionals

Figure 8
New Hires by Designated Equity Group and Employment Equity Occupational Category
Faculty of Arts and UBC V

EEOG	Aboriginal Peoples				Visible Minorities				Persons with Disabilities			
	Faculty of Arts		% UBC V	Availability Data	Faculty of Arts		% UBC V	Availability Data	Faculty of Arts		% UBC V	Availability Data
	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire			Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire			Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire		
Senior Managers				2.4%				8.7%				
Middle and Other Managers			3.3%	1.0%			16.7%	34%			3.3%	3.2%(*)
University Professors (**)	1	4%	.96%	0.9%	8	30%	26%	15.1%	1	4%	2.7%	4.5%
Professionals			1.8%	1%			34.5%	33.2%			1.2%	4.5%
Semi-Professionals & Technicians				2.1%	2	40%	39.1%	33.3%			7.6%	6.8%
Supervisors				1.9%			50%	38.0%				(-)
Administrative & Senior Clerical				1.4%			25.3%	30.8%			1.3%	5.6%(***)
Clerical Personnel				2.1%	1	50%	48.6%	38.9%			5.7%	6.2%(***)
Intermediate Sales & Service				1.7%			62.5%	43.1%				5.6%(***)
Semi -Skilled Manual				2.2%				47.6%				4.5%(***)
Other Sales and Service				2.2%			57.1%	51.3%			28.6%	8.5%(***)
Total	1	3%	2%		11	28%	33%		1	3%	4%	
National Workforce Population 2006				3.1%								
Vancouver Workforce Population 2006				1.8%								

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2011

2010 Response Rate to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire: Faculty of Arts 23%; UBC V 30%

(*) Senior Managers and Middle and Other Managers are combined.

(**) Includes Sessionals

(***) Figure should be used with caution. The coefficient of variation of the estimate is between 16.5% and 33.3%.

(-) Amount too small to be expressed.

Appendix 1: Notes on the Data

UBC Data

The UBC Equity Office prepares the data for distribution on employment equity for the UBC's Vancouver and Okanagan campuses. The equity data used at UBC is from two sources. Data on the representation of women comes from the HRMS database, which includes all employees and is therefore highly reliable. Data for the other designated equity groups: Aboriginal peoples, visible minorities and persons with disabilities – is based on self-identification on the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire and, since many employees have not responded to the census, this data is incomplete¹¹. The Equity Office works with Planning and Institutional Research and Human Resources in ensuring the integrity and confidentiality of the data. There may be some variation across tables, due to such factors as the sorting of data and the assignment of codes. The Equity Office is engaged in ongoing research to evaluate inconsistencies.

Availability Data/Workforce Availability/Canadian Labour Force

The term "Canadian labour force" (or "labour force") is used to describe people 15 years of age or older who worked in Canada at any time from January 1, 2005 until May 2006 (the time of the last Census). Canadian labour force data is drawn from the 2006 Canadian Census Employment Equity Data Report (EEDR), except for persons with disabilities.

UBC uses availability data at the national level for Senior Managers and University Professors for all four designated equity groups. Vancouver data is used for Women, Aboriginal peoples and Visible Minorities across all remaining EEOGs, and in the calculation of workforce population. For persons with disabilities, data from the 2006 Participation and Activity Limitation Survey (PALS) conducted by Statistics Canada is used. In this case, the data refers to people aged 15 to 64 years and who worked sometime in the reference period, October 30, 2006 to February 28, 2007. This provides a higher degree of accuracy for the workforce analysis.

The availability data provides a reference point by which it is possible to compare the representation of UBC's internal workforce with the labour force from which UBC recruits. Interpreting the representation of designated equity groups is a challenge when the workforce availability is low. This is particularly so for organizations with a small workforce, or a small number of workers in a particular EEOG, generally for Aboriginal peoples and persons with disabilities and, in rural communities, for visible minorities. When applicable, UBC also uses specific availability data for University Professors particularly for women. This data may draw on research related to a field of study, thereby providing more accurate availability data. In addition, UBC may also use Statistics Canada "University and College Academic Staff Survey" (released 2008-02-13). When applicable, these instances are noted in the body of the text.

Further information on external data sources:

- EEDR: Employment Equity Data Report
<http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/labour/publications/equality/eedr/2006/page00.shtml>
- EEOG: Employment Equity Occupational Group
<http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/labour/publications/equality/eedr/2006/page20.shtml>

Further information on equity initiatives at UBC, please visit these websites:

- <http://equity.ubc.ca/> and <http://diversity.ubc.ca/>

¹¹ In 2011, the response rate of staff and faculty in the Faculty of Arts to the UBC EE Census Questionnaire was 48%.

Appendix 2: Representation of Faculty by Designated Equity Group and by Rank
Faculty of Arts and UBC V
Revised 2010 Data

Rank	Gender				Aboriginal Peoples		Visible Minorities		Persons with Disabilities	
	Women	Men	Total	% Women	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire
Full Professor	46	124	170	27.1%			8	8.3%	5	5.2%
Associate Professor	76	84	160	47.5%	2	2.2%	7	7.6%	2	2.2%
Assistant Professor	55	78	133	41.4%	1	1.3%	9	11.7%		1.3%
Instructor II	2	5	7	28.6%	1	16.6%			1	16.6%
Senior Instructor	10	8	18	55.6%			1	7.7%		
Instructor I	6	2	8	75%						
Faculty of Arts Tenure-Track (Subtotal 2010)	195	301	496	39.3%	4	1.4%	25	8.7%	8	2.7%
Lecturer	17	8	25	68%			4	23.5%		
Sessionals	111	107	218	51%	1	2%	13	20%	2	3%
UBC V Total (2010)	720	1502	2222	32.4%	12	1.1%	171	15.7%	40	3.7%
Availability Data				39.6%		0.9%		15.1%		4.5%

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2010

Response Rate of Tenure-Track Faculty to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire: 58%

**Appendix 3: Representation of Faculty by Designated Equity Group and by Department,
Faculty of Arts
2010 Data**

Department	Gender				Aboriginal Peoples		Visible Minorities		Persons with Disabilities	
	Women	Men	Total	% Women	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire	Total	% Respondents to UBC EE Questionnaire
Anthropology	7	15	22	31.8%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%		0.0%
Art History, Visual Art & Theory	10	9	19	52.6%		0.0%	1	12.5%	2	25.0%
Asian Studies	10	14	24	41.7%		0.0%	9	50.0%		0.0%
Classical, Near Eastern & Religious Studies	7	13	20	35.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Creative Writing Program	4	3	7	57.1%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%
European Studies	5	6	11	45.5%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Economics	9	26	35	25.7%		0.0%	3	17.6%		0.0%
English	27	25	52	51.9%	1	2.3%	2	4.5%	1	2.3%
French, Hispanic & Italian Studies	13	14	27	48.1%		0.0%		0.0%	2	14.3%
Geography	7	19	26	26.9%		0.0%	2	10.5%	1	5.3%
History	11	22	33	33.3%		0.0%	3	12.5%	1	4.2%
Journalism, School of	2	3	5	40.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Library Archives & Info Studies, School of	9	3	12	75.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	10.0%
Linguistics	6	8	14	42.9%		0.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%
Music, School of	7	22	29	24.1%		0.0%	1	6.3%	1	6.3%
Philosophy	4	17	21	19.0%		0.0%	1	10.0%		0.0%
Political Science	10	21	31	32.3%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%		0.0%
Psychology	20	25	45	44.4%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Social Work, School of	7	9	16	43.8%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%
Sociology	13	11	24	54.2%		0.0%	2	11.8%		0.0%
Theatre and Film	7	10	17	41%		0.0%	1	11.1%		0.0%
Women and Gender Studies	1		1	100.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Faculty of Arts Total	200	295	495	40.4%	6	1.9%	30	9.7%	11	3.6%
UBC V Total (2010)	720	1502	2222	32.4%	12	1.1%	171	15.7%	40	3.7%
Availability Data				39.6%		0.9%		15.1%		4.5%

Source: UBC Equity Office, October 2010

Response Rate of Faculty to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire: 58%

(*) data suppressed, total number in position 5 or less