



CRC EDI Survey Report 2021

FOR
Memorial University

PROPRIETARY AND CONFIDENTIAL

PREPARED BY
Heather Peters
Senior Associate
KBRS (Knightsbridge Robertson Surette)
10 Fort William Place
Baine Johnston Centre, Suite 101
St. John's, NL
A1C 1K4

Email: hpeters@kbrs.ca
Phone: 709-722-6996

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL OVERVIEW	1
POPULATION OVERVIEW	9
OVERALL RESPONDENT DATA AND FINDINGS	11
CRC-Specific Questions	11
Rank and Faculty/Home (Q10-Q11)*	12
Education Trends (Q12-Q14)	13
Questions Relating to Self-Identification Process and Employment Equity (Q22-Q29)	14
Recruitment (Q30-Q32)	16
Interviewing and Selection (Q33-Q41, Q45)	17
Onboarding, Integration and Support (Q42-Q60)	21
Final Summary Questions	26
APPENDIX A: ALL OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS	27

Introduction and General Overview

The survey was launched on August 27th, 2021 and closed on September 13th, 2021. The survey was sent out to all active CRC's as well as 50 members of Memorial's Administration. A total of 37 responses were collected; 18 of whom identified as current CRC's and 12 identified as part of Administration and some may also identify as Faculty.

In addition, 9 Canada Research Chairs and 2 members of the Administration were interviewed by KBRS to provide additional context, detail, clarity and suggestions to supplement the survey data. These interviews were confidential and participants were notified that unless agreed upon by the interviewee, no direct quotes would be utilized by the interviewer for reporting purposes, however themes and suggestions would be included in the report as deemed appropriate.

Notes on Content from the Survey

For questions pertaining to confidential self-identification data, when the number of respondents was less than five, we have indicated "number withheld" in keeping with CRCP guidelines. We have also, when necessary, withheld the number of responses in other categories so as not to allow readers to deduct the representation and to ensure confidentiality is protected – in those cases, we have noted we have done so.

For each section of the report, we have provided an overview of the data collected from all respondents. For those responses where a qualitative, open-text response was requested, we have provided a short summary paragraph. We have then provided any notable correlations based on self-identification data with specific focus on equity deserving groups, CRC vs Administration, Tier I and Tier II and finally any shifts from the previous survey for related questions however all self-identification data was reviewed for correlations.

Appendix A provides the full-text verbatim responses of respondents. We have redacted any identifying information, and the order of respondent answers has also been randomized to mitigate any risk of making connections between answers. Typos and spelling errors have been edited for clarity.

Overview of Responses

The survey gathered responses from individuals across 11 faculties and/or Schools at Memorial. The majority of respondents were Full Professors (15), with Associate Professors (11), and Assistant Professors (5) completing the survey and 12 identifying as members of the Administration. Almost all respondents indicated they held PhD's with the average amount of time respondents held their PhD's prior to taking up their current roles at Memorial being 9.8 years. Of the 18 CRC respondents, the majority indicated they were Tier II, with a smaller number of Tier I's responding.

High Level Themes & Trends

Below we highlight some high-level themes and trends. More detailed reporting and context is provided in the body of the report.

Overarching Themes

There are a number of themes that surfaced relating to how the CRC Program and University is viewed through both the survey responses and more in-depth interviews.

Firstly, a consistent theme across many interviews and from various comments, relates to the lack of perceived accountability when actions, words or other behaviours are viewed as sexist, racist, ableist or otherwise considered harassment, bullying or discriminatory. It has been commented that these do exist and 'seemingly' nothing is done. In

addition, many comments were made in interviews about colleagues and leadership not speaking up to defend inappropriate behaviour and a belief that there is fear to do so leading to a 'culture of silence'.

Secondly, specific to the CRC's views and perspectives, Memorial is viewed as promoting itself as having both a research and teaching focus however upon hire, it is viewed that teaching is prioritized in many areas over research and there is a worry this will become more pronounced with continued budgetary restrictions. It is viewed by many interviewees that this differs by faculty, level and individual and a clear understanding of the current focus needs to be communicated internally and to candidates within the recruitment process, and must be aligned with 'at the top' and at the Faculty/School and department level with regard to decision making, support offered and accommodates made.

Thirdly, as reported by respondents and interviewees, the view of CRC positions and how it 'feels' to be a CRC differs by Faculty/School and Department with some areas providing adequate support, communications, mentoring and resources while more offer the base minimum. This results in some CRCs not feeling valued for their expertise and a belief that the Program and CRCs do not provide added value to the Faculty/School. A couple of suggestions included better understanding successful approaches, leadership and support being currently offered to CRCs in various Faculties/Schools and integrating these learnings and accountabilities within the University, specific to the CRC Program to elevate feelings of inclusion, belonging, trust and safety.

Fourthly, there is a clear theme with regard to the lack of support with regard to having a specific contact(s) within a department to ask questions regarding processes, policies, make connections and understand administrative requirements and timelines to better navigate the Memorial system, reduce elevated administrative 'burdens' and allow for more time dedicated to research and teaching priorities. Additional information with regard to Onboarding and Support can be seen below.

Finally, CRCs and Administrative staff members generally 'like to live here' and want this position and opportunity to work for them and for the University.

Self-Identification and Disclosure

Detailed numerical data can be found within this report.

In comparison to the 2019 survey, respondents continue to respond with fears of discrimination, stereotyping and lack of confidentiality with regard to self-identification and disclosure due to the limited amount of diversity and appreciation of diversity currently at Memorial. The survey results showed that over 80% of respondents who self-identified in equity deserving groups would not feel safe to disclose and formally self-identify.

In addition, it is viewed by a number of survey respondents and interviewees that this identification will 'follow you' throughout your employment and may affect hiring and promotional opportunities, how peers view you, being viewed as a 'diversity hire' and being thereby judged as having received preferential treatment, additional committee work, as all being barriers to formally self-identifying or disclosing to peers. Finally, for those that did identify in multiple categories, there is a continued concern that self-identification options do not accurately capture desired identification.

Both respondents who self-identified as persons with a disability and others that did not, all specifically mentioned fear of being judged as 'incapable' to perform in the role. When probing further with regard to mental disabilities including learning disabilities, 10% less respondents would disclose quoting fear of being seen as 'incapable' to perform the role.

Respondents suggested that Memorial should better promote the benefits of self-identification including supports, accommodations, and recognition of the time and impact of working on committees and mentoring others, including its value and consideration in reviews and during promotional evaluations. Furthermore, respondents commented on the need to speak about and reduce bias through training focused on open, non-judgmental dialogue. Finally,

suggestions included references to helping the Administration know how to support those who disclose through 'checking in', being inclusive and providing organizational resources for support.

Recruitment

There is the belief by quite a number of survey respondents and interviewees that targeted hiring is not only beneficial, but it is necessary to elevate diversity and reduce tokenization. Suggestions include expanding beyond just the Four Designated Groups and not assuming equity deserving groups are found in specific areas of study, ensure clarity of process ensuring timelines and requirements are not beyond a 'normal' expectation, ensuring diverse hiring committees, opening up more tenure track positions, and ensuring financial resources for more expansive promotion, advertising, or other methods including one suggestion of enabling current, often travelling recruiters, to know how and where to look for prospective CRC, academic and administrative hires from equity deserving groups.

With regard to the general centralized fund that Memorial has developed, all survey respondents found this either highly or somewhat beneficial and respondents who self-identified as Women and Racialized were more likely to see the general centralized fund as Highly Beneficial than all respondents or all equity deserving groups. In addition, CRCs were less likely to see this as 'Highly Beneficial' with Tier 1's seeing the least benefit.

Finally, a number of comments were made regarding the need to mentor and recruit at the student level. One suggestion involved inviting early career scholars from equity deserving groups to visit and speak at Memorial to increase awareness of Memorial and create contacts, especially as a 'remote' university.

Selection

One key theme, not only for recruitment, is with regard to having a diverse hiring committee for selection. When asked within the survey about the impact of the choice and mix of hiring committee members/Chair in hiring success in relation to hiring candidates from equity deserving groups, 88% of reported survey respondents see this as having a fair to significant impact while almost all comments from respondents self-identifying from equity deserving groups referred to a committee's impact as 'significant', 'really important' and 'very strong impact'.

As to the compilation of this committee there were differing opinions. Most respondents referenced the need to have members of equity deserving groups on the committee, some referencing 'most' committee members or some committee members while a couple of other comments referenced a need for balance as long as there is an appreciation and understanding of EDI systemic issues and the impact of bias. One respondent suggested a 'balanced' group being 2:3 or 50:50 equity seeking groups to minimize tokenistic representatives while allowing member allyship, burden sharing and coalitions. Finally, it is proposed by a number of respondents that the Chair role is crucial in ensuring open dialogue and holding committee members accountable. To this end, it is proposed by respondents to ensure the Chair has appropriate skills and experience in facilitation and providing feedback. It has been noted by respondents however that until Memorial has a more diverse workforce, there will be a continued 'burden' on scholars and administration from equity deserving groups to be committee members and accommodations, support and recognition is needed.

Due to issues of limited resources and support being reported by many respondents and interviewees, it is proposed by a number of respondents that there needs to be transparency and communications during the recruitment, selection and negotiation stages to truly understand what is being provided, the timelines for these provisions, and what will be provided to new hires and what the new hire will need to 'push' or 'fight' for during the onboarding stage and how this should occur. In the same vein, it is viewed by a number of CRCs that there is an inequity when it comes to contracts for CRCs within the University. As reported, requirements for teaching, research deliverables and resources and supports for CRCs were viewed as differing significantly causing frustration and a sense of inequity within the CRC program.

With regard to unconscious bias training for committees, most respondents who have taken the training do find it at least somewhat beneficial. Comments were made with regard to the efficacy, challenges were reported in both the method and approach of the training, that it should be mandatory and the training is only as effective as the ability of the committee and Chair specifically to hold others accountable and promote open dialogue.

Onboarding, Mentoring, Support & Integration

In terms of the onboarding process, most respondents and interviewees found this process to be lacking or nonexistent and there were significant comments and responses as to the need for a formalized process to be implemented. As reported as well in the 2019 survey, CRC respondents mentioned encountering issues of varying degrees in relation to office and lab space, lab resources, office maintenance on equipment or equipment missing. In addition, as seen in 2019, the speed with which funding, equipment or resource requests are processed and met was mentioned as a concern. As well, many comments refer to the lack of support in terms of navigating the Memorial system, policies, procedures and overall bureaucracy and 'how things get done', how to 'speed them up' and who can support during that process. Respondents within various faculties/schools reported there were very few formal integration efforts made by their departments. As in 2019, several respondents mentioned needing to take the lead in their own integration and "find their own way."

Finally, there are frequent comments from survey respondents and interviewees on the lack of communication and 'checking in' that was done by others in including those in Administration roles. These challenges were reported, especially by interviewees, as heavily contributing to their 'disconnection' to Memorial and their 'hope that things will get better but fear that it won't' without formalized processes and alignment with top leadership on how to engage and retain current CRCs and others who are part of equity deserving groups.

Some key aspects suggested by respondents and interviewees include:

- A formalized mentorship program with required touchpoints and responsibilities to enhance the onboarding process and thereby reduce frustrations and create a more effective, engaging, open, inclusive and efficient work environment. Most respondents found mentoring to be 'very important' and 'crucial' despite the 'utter lack of mentoring that we currently have'.
- A mentor or contact to assist in helping acclimatize new hires from outside the province and country to the university but also to the community in terms of understanding local culture, geography, and even such topics as weather, where to live and schools for children, and helping create connections within the community to further professional as well as personal requirements and expectations. There is view that 'locals' or those from the province will have 'doors open' easier and more quickly than those 'from away' and this is viewed as being compounded should there be any perceived language barriers. As a note as well, a couple of comments were made regarding the communication of a leader's origin, such as the President's origin from Newfoundland and Labrador as promoting local and minimizing those 'from away', leading to more marginalization.
- A departmental administrative support or at least contact to help with challenges, find answers or at least forward the new hire to the required contact. 'Locals' or longer tenured employees and CRCs were reported as being viewed as having an unfair advantage by being able to better navigate the system and Memorial contacts. It should be noted that the CRCP and CFI contact, Manager, Institutional Research Programs was commented upon by a number of respondents as being extremely beneficial in offering support regarding proposals and other CRC program specific requirements.
- A mentor and/or Administrative contact to ensure resources, as per the negotiated contract, are provided and if delays occur, communication is provided as to the length of delay and rationale. It has been proposed by respondents that this will significantly reduce frustration and elevate trust.

- Introduction by the mentor or related departmental representative to other CRCs, Administrative and Faculty leadership and colleagues.
- Check in by Administrative leadership with CRCs to ensure their needs are met or the Administration advocates for agreed upon needs to be fulfilled within a reasonable period. Many respondents and interviewees had limited or no contact from leadership until well into their first six to 12 months. There were comments and responses however as to the significant ‘burden’ currently on the Administrative team and a true ‘understanding’ of why delays are occurring despite the need to do so.

Training

When asked about the awareness and benefit of various training provided by Memorial, there are differing views and perspectives. When asked about unconscious bias training for hiring committees, 66% were aware of the training and over 80% of respondents find this offering to be at least somewhat beneficial. It may be noted however that CRCs were significantly less likely to be aware of the training than the Administration.

When asked about other topics (than unconscious bias training) including, but not limited to, Increasing Cultural Competence, Combatting Tokenism, the Importance of Intersectionality in EDI and Exploring Privilege, only 26% of respondents were aware of the training, however 80% of the respondents believe the training topics to be at least somewhat beneficial. Respondents identifying as within an equity deserving group were more likely to see ‘no impact’ of the identified training courses with respondents identifying as Racialized seeing the least benefit.

Another question addressed training that was developed and offered to increase the knowledge and understanding of accommodations, inclusive of both religious and cultural accommodations, available to new hires and existing staff. Only 15% were aware of the training while 69% believed the topics are at least somewhat beneficial. Respondents self-identifying as belonging to a Racialized group were more likely to find this training to be ‘Highly Beneficial’ and CRCs were more likely to find this training Highly Beneficial and Somewhat Beneficial compared to that of the Administration.

Suggestions to enhance training included better promotion of training and how training can be accessed, possibly making training mandatory and also that this sort of training is developed by and from the lens of ‘Europeans and North Americans and can be ‘tokenizing itself’ and one respondent cited research suggesting this training is ineffective and can create a ‘backlash’. Other respondents commented on training being a ‘bandaid’ to systemic problems and that other efforts must support the training including elevated accountability and that those taking the training ‘practice what they learn’. Finally, delivery methods of training were challenged by survey respondents and interviewees suggesting that online training or other less interactive methods are less effective and that attendees just need a space to ‘talk about it’.

Review and Promotion

Comments were made by survey respondents and interviewees regarding the ‘overburdening’ of members of equity deserving groups through their involvement in committees and mentoring opportunities and this time based commitment reduces their time to commit to research and elevates the level of ‘burnout’. This not only creates issues with work-life integration and meeting deliverables, but it reportedly does not feel ‘valued’ by the organization as it is not considered in review and promotion evaluations. Finally, this is therefore viewed as reducing the ability of members of equity deserving groups to succeed and feel supported in shifting the level of diversity and inclusion within the University.

It is suggested by a number of respondents and interviewees that Memorial needs to understand and communicate their view of ‘excellence’ and be sure to communicate this during recruitment and retention processes and align to evaluation processes.

Benefit of Ongoing Initiatives

Survey respondents were asked to rate how beneficial 8 ongoing initiatives are as part of Memorial's EDI Action Plan. Specific responses by grouping can be found within the detailed responses however the following can summarize main takeaways:

Gender based pay equity review and adjustments

- Seen as the most highly beneficial of all initiatives with all groupings of All, Administration, Equity Deserving Groups and CRCs responding from 69% (CRCs) to 100% (Administration) as Highly Beneficial
- Members of Equity Deserving Groups found this initiative as the most Highly Beneficial initiative.
- Respondents self-identifying as Racialized, all agreed that completing a Gender based pay equity review and making adjustments was Highly Beneficial

Revision of equity and diversity complaints process

- 54% reporting Highly Beneficial, with the Administration the highest at 78% and CRC the lowest at 50%, and 8% total reporting No impact
- Respondents self-identifying as a Woman, reported Highly Beneficial at 75%

Review and revision of academic application process for barriers to accessibility

- 50% of respondents view as Highly Beneficial with CRCs reporting 58%, and a total of 8% reporting No Impact while 11% of CRCs reported No Impact

Reviewing ways to better integrate Indigenous ways of knowing in the selection process

- 50% of respondents view as Highly Beneficial with CRCs reporting 33%, and a total of 12% reporting No Impact while 8% of CRCs reported No Impact

Review/revise CRC financial arrangements to improve consistency of resources

- 54% of respondents view as Highly Beneficial with CRCs reporting 58%, and a total of 4% total reporting No Impact while 0% of CRCs reported No Impact
- 100% of Administration see as Highly Beneficial
- Respondents self-identifying as a Woman, reported Highly Beneficial at over 80%

Hiring a Vice Provost EDI

- 29% of respondents view as Highly Beneficial with CRCs reporting 8% and a total of 25% reporting No Impact while 42% of CRCs reported No Impact
- This is seen as the least beneficial by all groups; Administration rated this lower than other groups however it did not see it as having No Impact

Targeted cluster hiring process for five, full-time tenure or tenure track positions for Indigenous persons

- 68% of respondents view as Highly Beneficial with CRCs reporting 62% and a total of 4% total reporting No Impact while 8% of CRCs reported No Impact

Continue to Review and revise policies and procedures to ensure inclusive, unbiased, ungendered language

- 60% of respondents view as Highly Beneficial with CRCs reporting 46% and a total of 12% total reporting No Impact while 16% of CRCs reported No Impact

Responding Members of the Administration did not report any initiatives having No Impact.

Career Interruptions

There were limited responses with regard to career interruption. It may be noted however that for those that did respond there was a noted slow down of research and although teaching was re-allocated, no support was offered with regard to research support.

Final Suggestions from Respondents and Interviewees

It was further reiterated by respondents in the final survey questions and during interviews that sexism, racism, ableism and harassment does exist and needs to be better acknowledged, discussed and prioritized and Memorial needs to make 'some fundamental changes'. Very specifically articulated by CRCs is the fact that hiring is considered important to elevate diversity however this was qualified by the even higher priority being retention, 'being the larger issue'.

Resourcing continued to be highlighted, specifically by CRCs with regard to the provision of trained support staff, lab and office resources and appropriate space to avoid feeling 'forgotten and devalued' and often that these resources were 'promised' and these promises were not kept. As per the results in 2019, respondents and interviewees also recommended an increase in tenure-track positions (and corresponding decrease in contract work and precarious employment) and improved clarity and consistency in the fulfillment of employment agreements which would ideally result in less burden on candidates to negotiate equitable packages.

Other final suggestions included the creation of informal networks for equity deserving groups, having an 'anonymous' way to report issues of sexism, ableism, racism, harassment and bullying and that 'drastic action' needs to occur to ensure both accountability and learning for unacceptable behaviour. A number of respondents refer to the need for increased engagement and communication to support retention efforts. Another suggestion relates to promoting within the University what has improved to date, while finally another is concerned that all 'groups' are being treated as 'substitutable' and similar to other equity deserving groups and not appreciated for their unique needs and perspectives.

Highlighted Respondent Driven Recommendations

Respondents through the survey responses and written responses, coupled with interview comments, provided many tangible and practical recommendations. Many of these provide focused approaches and actions that can be reviewed and considered by Memorial within the shorter term and include:

- Review current CRC onboarding and engagement best practice that does currently occur within various departments to better replicate across the University;
- Identify and promote the benefits of self-identification and its related supports;
- Explore how Memorial can recognize and support the work of committee members, especially those of equity deserving groups, that are often tasked the time consuming work of elevating EDI within the University often resulting in a reduction in time for research and thereby impacting evaluations and promotional opportunities;
- Helping members of the Administration know how to support and accommodate those who disclose;
- Continue and possibly expand financial resources for more expansive promotion and advertising in recruiting members of equity deserving groups; opening more tenure track positions and continue targeting hiring;
- Ensure Hiring Committees are diverse and Chairs have appropriate skills including experience in facilitation and providing feedback;
- Ensure consistency in what is being promised during the recruitment and selection process and within the contract and how this can be delivered in a timely fashion with regard to support, resources and teaching load;
- Consider exploring the implementation of a formalized onboarding and mentorship program for CRCs ensuring immediate support and mentoring regarding local acclimatization, administrative processes, office and lab requirements and setup, and to better understand 'how things are done' and the contacts needed for success;

- Increasing the awareness of current training programs more broadly through additional and targeted promotion;
- Modifying or developing new training programs which include and promote interactive, open, non-judgmental dialogue; learning from each other's unique perspectives to elevate awareness, appreciation and understanding.

Although these respondent suggestions do not directly address the broader themes of accountability and Memorial's perspective on the importance of research to that of teaching, the direct, open and often extensive responses, opinions and suggestions appear to indicate a general hope for both change and Memorial's ability to respond.

Population Overview

Q1: Are you a member of the Administration Staff at Memorial?

Answered: 36

- Yes = 12
- No = 24

Q2: Did you complete the CRCP Equity Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) survey launched in 2019?

Answered: 23

- Yes = 19
- No = 4

Q15: Gender, Gender Identity and Expression, and Sexual Orientation

Answered: 36

- A woman = 16
- A man = number withheld*
- Transgender = 0
- Intersex = 0
- Gender queer = number withheld
- Non-binary = number withheld
- Gender-fluid = number withheld
- Two-spirit = number withheld
- I prefer not to respond = 1
- I prefer to self-describe as = 0

**This number was withheld to prevent the deduction of other numbers in the set.*

Q16: Do you identify as part of the 2SLGBTQIA+ community?

Answered: 34

- Yes = number withheld
- No = 18*
- No, but I identify as an ally = 13*
- I prefer not to respond = number withheld
- I prefer to self-describe as = number withheld

**Numbers were not withheld because respondents can identify in more than one "No" category.*

Q17: Members of a Racialized Group For the purpose of employment equity at Memorial "racialized people" replaces "visible minority". The Employment Equity Act defines visible minorities as "persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour, regardless of birthplace". The term racialized is preferred because it acknowledges the fact that race and ethnicity are social constructs and that barriers are rooted in historical and contemporary racial prejudice. Racialization can also be based on designated membership in certain cultural and religious groups. Individuals may experience discriminatory treatment based on their designation as a "race" or ethnicity. Racialized people includes those who may experience differential treatment on the basis of their racial and ethnic identity.

Do you self-identify as a member of a racialized group?

Answered: 35

- Yes = 8*
- No = 25*
- I prefer not to respond = number withheld

**Despite being able to deduce the number who "prefer not to respond," these numbers were not withheld as this was not considered a confidential data point.*

Q18: Race and Ethnicity

Answered: 36

- Indigenous = number withheld
- Arab = number withheld
- Black African = number withheld
- Black Caribbean = number withheld
- Black American = number withheld
- Black Canadian = number withheld
- East Asian = number withheld
- South Asian = number withheld
- Southeast Asian = number withheld
- Asian, other Background = number withheld
- Latin American = number withheld
- White = 28
- Other = number withheld

**These data points were withheld as the specificity of reply provided would likely identify respondents.*

Q19: The Employment Equity Act defines an Aboriginal person as a North American Indian or a member of a First Nation, a Métis, or Inuit. North American Indians or members of a First Nation include status, treaty or registered Indians, as well as non-status and nonregistered Indians. An Indigenous person is a descendant of the original inhabitants of Turtle Island/North America or original inhabitants of other countries including First Nation (status or non-status), Métis (member or non-member), Inuit, American Indian/Alaska Native/Pacific Islander, and Indigenous from outside Turtle Island/North America.

Are you an Indigenous Person?

Answered: number withheld

- First Nation = number withheld
- Métis = number withheld
- Inuit = number withheld
- Other (did not specify further) = number withheld

Q20: Persons with disabilities is defined as persons who have a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric or learning impairment and/or who experience barriers to participation due to the design of social or built environments that do not reflect diverse abilities. People with disabilities may experience: disadvantage in employment by reason of that impairment, or an employer or potential employer who is likely to consider them to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment and includes persons whose functional limitations owing to their impairment have been accommodated in their current job or workplace.

Do you self-identify as a person with a disability?

Answered: 36

- Yes = number withheld
- No = number withheld
- Mental-health related = 0
- I prefer not to respond = number withheld

Overall Respondent Data and Findings

CRC-Specific Questions

Q3: Are you a current Canada Research Chair (CRC) holder?

Answered: 25

- Yes = 18
- No = 7

Q4: What Tier is your CRC?

Answered: 18

- Tier I = 7
- Tier II = 11

Q5: When did you become a CRC?

Answered: 16

- Respondents became a CRC between the years of 2006 and 2019.

Q6: Have you been through a renewal process since previously completing the survey in 2019?**Answered:** 14

- Yes = 5
- No = 9

Q7: When did you go through the renewal process?**Answered:** 0

There were no responses.

Q9: Please describe the CRC renewal process as you experienced it, including which aspects you appreciated and those you disliked.**Answered:** 6**Overall Summary:**

- Overall positive responses mentioning adequate to good guidance, support and organization.
- One respondent did comment on lack of clarity around internal deadlines.
- One respondent appreciated the increase in the allocation of funds toward research support.
- Two respondents commented on good support from MUN staff with one appreciating specifically Pam White.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- No notable variances in responses by self-identification groupings.

Rank and Faculty/Home (Q10-Q11)***Q10: Please identify your faculty rank.****Answered:** 37

- Full Professor = 15
- Associate Professor = 11
- Assistant Professor = 5
- Other = 4*
- Prefer not to answer = 1**

**The specificity of reply to 'What is your role?' is withheld as if provided would likely identify respondents.*

***This number was not withheld as this was not considered a confidential data point.*

Q11: What Faculty/School are you in?**Answered:** 37

- Faculty of Science = 6
- Faculty of HSS = 8
- Faculty of Medicine = 6
- School of Pharmacy = number withheld
- School of Music = number withheld
- School of Social Work = number withheld
- School of Business = number withheld
- School of Human Kinetics and Recreation = number withheld
- Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science = number withheld
- Faculty of Education = number withheld
- Other = number withheld

Education Trends (Q12-Q14)**Q12: Do you have a PhD?****Answered:** 24

The majority of respondents indicated they held a PhD (number withheld).

Q13: In what year was your PhD granted?**Answered:** 23

- Respondents obtained their PhD's between the years of 1990 and 2016 with the average of graduation being 2006.
- Most respondents received their PhD between the years of 2007 and 2016 (76%)

Q14: How many years had it been since your PhD completion when you took up your role at Memorial?**Answered:** 21

- Respondents had held their PhD between 0 and 36 years before obtaining their current roles at Memorial, with an average of 9.8 years and many respondents having held their PhD for between 0 and 8 years prior to obtaining their current roles at MUN (71%)

Groups included as Equity Deserving Groups for comparative purposes relate to those respondents identifying as Women Indigenous, Persons with Disabilities, Racialized and members of the 2SLGBTQIA+ community.

Questions Relating to Self-Identification Process and Employment Equity (Q22-Q29)

Q22: From your perspective, what do you see as the potential dilemmas of self-disclosure during the application or post-hiring process?

Answered: 8

Overall Summary:

- Respondents suggested fear of discrimination, stereotyping and lack of confidentiality.
- A number suggested there are no dilemmas.
- One respondent commented on 'significant effort' in identification however limited support pre and post hiring.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- 75% of respondents self-identified in equity deserving groups of which most respondents commented on issues of discrimination, stereotyping and lack of confidentiality.

Q23: What do you believe would stop Indigenous persons from self-identifying during the recruitment process?

Answered: 28

Overall Summary:

- There was significant belief, by over half of respondents, this is due to fear of discrimination and marginalization.
- A number of respondents referenced systemic problems.
- Some respondents referred to biases within the hiring committee.
- Finally, a number of respondents commented on the pressure placed on Indigenous Administration and Academics to Indigenize the University, attract other Indigenous students and staff and serve on EDI committees.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- 80% of respondents that self-identified in equity deserving groups commented on issues of discrimination, bias and marginalization.

Q24: If you were a person with a disability, would you feel safe to disclose to the University?

Answered: 34

- Yes = 15
- No = 14
- I prefer not to respond = 5

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings & CRCs:

- Over 80% of respondents self-identified in equity deserving groups would not feel safe to disclose.

- Respondents who identified as Racialized, were more likely to feel safe to disclose than other equity deserving groups.
- CRCs were less likely to respond to this question.

Q25: More specifically, if you were a person with a mental health or learning related disability currently employed with Memorial, would you feel safe to disclose within the University?

Answered: 33

- Yes = 11
- No = 18
- I prefer not to respond = 4

Over 10% more respondents would not disclose if their disability if it was related to mental health inclusive of learning related disabilities.

CRCs were more likely to disclose than members of the Administration and Tier II is more likely to disclose than Tier I.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Over 70% of respondents who self-identified in equity deserving groups would not feel safe to disclose in relation to a mental health disability.

Q26: What helps you feel safe to disclose?

Answered: 9

Overall Summary:

- A number of respondents did comment that they do see Memorial as having a 'safe, inclusive environment'.
- Other comments related to the need for additional supports and resources, understanding, and seeing others being treated fairly for them to disclose.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- No notable trends in response based on equity deserving groups.

Q27: What would stop you from disclosing?

Answered: 18

Overall Summary:

- Over 65% of respondents fear 'discrimination', 'marginalization', and 'stigmatization'.
- A number of respondents fear being viewed as 'less productive' or 'incapable' or limited in their role.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Respondents who did not self identify in one of the equity deserving groups were less likely to answer this question.

- Almost all respondents who self-identified in equity deserving groups noted fear of discrimination, marginalization, perception of being less capable, and fear of ‘exhaustion’ from having to continuously disclose.

Q28: What needs to happen or change to feel safe or comfortable to disclose?

Answered: 18

Overall Summary:

- Many respondents commented on the need for Memorial to visibly accommodate ‘all’, having ‘systems to allow integration’, ‘better culture’ and understanding and disclosure at the leadership level.
- A number of respondents commented on ‘ineligibility’ perceptions of candidates with mental illness/learning disabilities.
- Other comments surrounded creating a ‘more respectful community’ and having ‘open discussion about these topics’.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Respondents who did not self identify in one of the equity deserving groups were less likely to answer this question.
- Respondents who identified as Women more commonly spoke of a need for a cultural shift needing to happen at Memorial.

Q29: Do you have any further ideas for how Departments, Faculties, or the University more broadly can support disclosure related to any equity deserving groups?

Answered: 23

Overall Summary:

- There is a wide variation on what may work however comments included the need to develop a culture of inclusion and respect, being ‘visible’, ‘fair’ and transparent about efforts, having ‘clear rules for assisting ‘administrators how to support employees who disclose’, elevating emotional intelligence, defining the ‘benefits of disclosure’, and reducing the ‘culture of silence’.
- A number of respondents believe in the need for ‘education’ and ‘serious training’ beyond an online course and question the efficacy of training such as ‘implicit bias training’.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- No notable trends in response based on equity deserving groups.

Recruitment (Q30-Q32)

Q30: How did you hear about the opportunity at Memorial you currently hold?

Answered: 4

- AUCC website
- Unspecified online advertisement
- Email and direct contact and/or recruitment firm

- University Affairs
- Mathjobs
- MUNFA
- CAUT Academic Jobs Website
- It was the CRC position that brought me to Memorial = 1
- Through a colleague or friend/word of mouth = 2
- Don't recall = 1

Q31: Did anyone from the University discuss the position with you to encourage you to apply?**Answered:** 4

- Yes = 2
- No = 2

Q32: Do you have suggestions for how academic job advertisements could be better worded to encourage applicants from equity deserving groups to apply?**Answered:** 3**Overall Summary:**

- Comments included 'wording that the position seeks applications from "equity seeking groups", concerns that "faculty fit" considerations lead to a white applicant being accepted', and that many job ads do not get sent to underrepresented groups, partly because of embedded networks in academia (white faculty send to white applicants)' and ads need to be more 'widely published', and increase in cluster hiring.
- One comment referred to ensuring 'people know this is a safe and rewarding place to work'.

Interviewing and Selection (Q33-Q41, Q45)**Q33 With regard to your interview process with Memorial, please tick all activities that occurred during the process?****Answered:** 4

- I prefer not to respond = 0
- You gave a job talk = 4
- You gave a sample class lecture = 3
- Your interview process lasted more than 1 day = 4
- You met with grad students = 4
- You met with the Dean or equivalent in your unit and/or Vice-President (Research) = 4
- You had a formal, standardized interview = 3
- You had a casual interview = 1

Q34: Was there anything during the interview process that you particularly appreciated?**Answered:** 3

Overall Summary:

- Comments were made regarding 'They made it sound like having children was seen positively in the department' and 'made quite welcome'.

Q35: Was there anything during the interview process that you did not like or that made you uncomfortable?**Answered:** 4**Overall Summary:**

- There was a comment regarding 'promises' about the position that 'were later not realized' and a further comment regarding a discriminatory question that was asked.

Q36: Memorial University has undertaken targeted searches, with the support from the Human Rights Commission Newfoundland and Labrador, such as for an Indigenous Scholar and Persons with Disabilities. What do you believe Memorial could do in this process to ensure success?**Answered:** 26**Overall Summary:**

- Significant suggestions were offered with limited themes however some suggestions included:
 - Increase funding and promotion of the search to ensure it 'reached potential candidates'.
 - Ensure supports are available.
 - Have inclusive and representative search committees.
 - 'Justification on how EDI was considered'
 - 'Streamline the process' for targeted hires to ensure 'does not leave applicants waiting longer than others would, ensure clarity of process, ensure applicants not expected to do more than those not in targeted hires'.
 - 'Prove that the University will give them the tools to succeed. Equal pay, mentorship and protection from being over-serviced' and 'let them decide what they need to succeed'.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Respondents who did not self identify in one of the equity deserving groups were less likely to answer this question.
- Respondents who did identify within the equity deserving groups strongly suggested ensuring search committees are inclusive and representative.

Q37: Memorial has developed a general centralized fund to minimize financial barriers to academic units and assist in advertising more broadly and creatively to diverse organizations and groups. How beneficial will this process be, in your perspective, to increase the number of applicants to Memorial from equity deserving groups?**Answered:** 32

- Highly Beneficial = 12

- Somewhat Beneficial = 20
- No Impact = 0

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings and CRCs:

- Respondents who self-identified as Women and Racialized were more likely to see the general centralized fund as Highly Beneficial than all respondents or all equity deserving groups.
- CRCs were less likely to see this as 'Highly Beneficial' with Tier I's seeing the least benefit.

Q38: From your perspective, what impact does the choice and mix of hiring committee members/chair play in hiring success as it relates to selecting and hiring candidates from equity deserving groups? What other suggestions do you have?

Answered: 26

Overall Summary:

- 88% or 23 respondents see the choice of hiring committee members playing a fair to significant impact on selecting and hiring candidates from equity deserving groups.
- A few variations occur with regard to what that mix should be with regard to number of members who are from equity deserving groups, the 'mix'.
 - 'A more diverse committee is not necessarily better – it is the individuals, and their respective approach to tackling and understanding EDI, not their specific identities that matter'.
 - 'It is very hard to assess the impact of different barriers when not encountered by the people in the committee.'
 - 'Need to have a person whose role it is to think about diversity on the search identified right away. That way, there is a specific role, rather than just everyone supposed to be doing this in general.'
 - 'Skewed groups that have only tokenistic representatives result in harm for those members' and 'balanced groups' such as 50/50 are 'better'.
- A couple of comments referred to the need to 'minimize overly burdening' members from various groups.
- A suggestion included that due to Memorial's geographic isolation, 'direct support to recruit early career BIPOC scholars to visit and speak about their research here at Memorial would go a long way (if done right)' as 'familiarity is important and contacts can make a difference'.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Respondents who did not self-identify in one of the equity deserving groups were less likely to answer this question.
- Almost all comments from respondents self-identifying from equity deserving groups referred to a committee's impact as 'significant', 'really important' and 'very strong impact'.

Q39: Memorial University has developed and deployed a training module for hiring committees inclusive of a section on unconscious bias. Were you aware of this training?

Answered: 32

- Yes = 21
- No = 11

CRCs were significantly less likely to be aware of this training.

Q40: Have you taken this training?

Answered: 21

- Yes = 18
- No = 3

Of those aware of the training, 16% have not completed the training.

Q41: How beneficial will this unconscious bias training be, from your perspective, to enhance the recruitment and hiring of employees of the FDGs or other equity deserving groups?

Answered: 31

- Highly Beneficial = 9
- Somewhat Beneficial = 16
- No Impact = 6

Over 80% of respondents find the unconscious bias training to be at least somewhat beneficial.

Tier I CRCs were less likely than Tier II CRCs to see this training as 'Highly Beneficial'.

No notable trends in response based on equity deserving groups.

Q45: Do you have any suggestions about wider Recruitment and Selection practices?

Answered: 10

Overall Summary:

- Additional comments were made regarding:
 - Expanding job announcements to 'automatically post on different sites targeting minorities' and 'putting more resources into the advertising process'.
 - One respondent commented with regard to Memorial's continued focus on racialized groups leading to tokenism and Memorial's notion of 'excellence' will result in discrimination 'against people from lower income backgrounds and support people from multi-generational academic backgrounds'.
 - Increasing transparency and 'place the rubrics for the selection process online so applicants can see how they are going to be evaluated' and 'EDI should be an important criterion for selection'.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Respondents who did not self-identify in one of the equity deserving groups were less likely to answer this question.
- No notable trends in response based on equity deserving groups.

Onboarding, Integration and Support (Q42-Q60)

Q42: Memorial has also introduced training on other topics including, but not limited to, Increasing Cultural Competence, Combatting Tokenism, the Importance of Intersectionality in EDI and Exploring Privilege. Were you aware of these training courses?

Answered: 31

- Yes = 8
- No = 23

No notable trends in response based on equity deserving groups.

CRCs were more aware of this training than members of the Administration and Tier II being most aware.

Q43: How beneficial would you consider these training topics to be?

Answered: 30

- Highly Beneficial = 9
- Somewhat Beneficial = 15
- No impact = 6

Respondents identifying as within an equity deserving group were more likely to see ‘no impact’ of the identified training courses with respondents identifying as Racialized seeing the least benefit.

CRC Tier I found these topics to be more beneficial than Tier II’s or the Administration.

Q44 What suggestions can you offer to enhance this training? What other training would you suggest? What would assist in improving the transfer of learning into tangible change at Memorial?

Answered: 21

Overall Summary:

- There were a wide variety of suggestions from respondents including:
 - The need for ‘better promotion’, knowing ‘how to access them’ and ‘more outreach to units’.
 - A number of respondents suggested the training be mandatory.
 - Some respondents commented that it is not training that is needed, but ‘jobs, good jobs’ and ‘Memorial needs to invest in creating positions for underrepresented groups’.
 - A couple of respondents referenced research, citing that this research ‘suggests that overall they are not effective and in some cases they can be counterproductive’ or ‘has a backlash’.
 - The depth, content and delivery of the training was discussed by a few respondents commenting, ‘training is developed by white Europeans and North Americans, from their lens of other groups and often is tokenizing itself’, the training is ‘superficial’, ‘not at a sophisticated enough level’, ‘they need to be better than just some online courses’ and ‘open forums can be organized, where people can have discussions on the topic’.

- Other comments included, 'having just implicit bias training is really just a band-aid to a much bigger and systemic problem', 'other measures must support this effort' and 'people get training but they do not practice what they learn'.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Respondents who did not self-identify in one of the equity deserving groups were less likely to answer this question.
- No notable trends in response based on equity deserving groups.

Q46: The University has developed and provided training to increase the knowledge and understanding of accommodations, inclusive of both religious and cultural accommodations, available to new hires and existing staff. Were you aware of this training?**Answered:** 26

- Yes = 4
- No = 22

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings and CRCs:

- Respondents self-identifying as belonging to a Racialized group were more likely to be aware of this training.
- CRCs were more aware of this training with Tier II's more aware.

Q47: Have you taken this training?**Answered:** 5

- Yes = 1
- No = 4
- Prefer not to say = 0

Q48: How beneficial will this accommodation training be, from your perspective, to enhance the recruitment, selection and retention of CRC Chairs?**Answered:** 29

- Highly Beneficial = 8
- Somewhat Beneficial = 12
- No Impact = 9

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings and CRCs:

- Respondents self-identifying as belonging to a Racialized group were more likely to find this training to be 'Highly Beneficial'.
- CRCs were more likely to find this training Highly Beneficial and Somewhat Beneficial.

Q49: What suggestions can you offer to enhance this accommodations training?**Answered:** 18

Overall Summary:

- A number of respondents referred to the need for additional promotion to create awareness of the training.
- Respondents referred to the need for either mandatory training, with one respondent suggesting 'the entire department would have to take the training'.
- Respondents commented on the fact that those completing the training may not be the ones needing the training.
- One respondent questioned whether there will be additional funding for accommodations.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- No notable trends in response based on equity deserving groups.

Q50: Other than standard research funds, what type of support and resources did you receive upon coming to Memorial?**Answered:** 4**Overall Summary:**

- A number of respondents commented on promises or requirements needed which were not delivered.

Q51: What kind of mentoring did you receive during your first few years in your current position?**Answered:** 4**Overall Summary:**

- Most respondents did not receive any mentoring.

Q52: Was the mentoring sufficient?**Answered:** 4

- Yes = 0
- No = 3
- Prefer not to say = 1

Q53: How important is mentoring to success at Memorial? What suggestions do you have?**Answered:** 16**Overall Summary:**

- Most respondents found mentoring to be 'very important' and 'crucial' despite the 'utter lack of mentoring that we currently have'.
- Respondents commented on the desire for informal mentoring to happen naturally however suggesting a formal program may be required.
- A number of respondents highlighted the importance of mentoring as 'Academia is a very different environment than any other job environment' and 'many underrepresented groups will be first generation'.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- No notable trends in response based on equity deserving groups.

Q54: Have you ever mentored a fellow faculty member?**Answered:** 4

- Yes = 1*
- No = 2*
- Prefer not to say = 1*

**This number was not withheld as this was not considered a confidential data point.*

Q55: What suggestions can you provide to other mentors?

- There are no responses.

Q56: Have you experienced any career interruptions as a faculty member?**Answered:** 4

- Yes = Number withheld
- No = Number withheld

Q57: Since completing the survey in 2019, have you experienced any career interruptions as a faculty member?**Answered:** 14

- Yes = Number withheld
- No = 11
- I prefer not to respond = Number withheld

Q58: Have you disclosed the career interruptions that you experienced?**Answered:** 5

- Yes = Number withheld
- No = Number withheld

Q59 What stopped you from disclosing?**Answered:** 1 (this response is withheld)**Q60 Other initiatives as part of the CRCP's and Memorial's overall EDI Action plan that are in progress include: (please rate as to whether you see the following as Highly Beneficial, Somewhat Beneficial or having No Impact)****Answered:** 25

In White: All Respondents

In Light Grey: Administration

In Dark Grey: Respondents Self-Identifying in Equity Deserving Groups

In Black: CRC Respondents

Initiative	Highly Beneficial				Somewhat Beneficial				No Impact			
Gender based pay equity review and adjustments	80%	100%	90%	69%	16%	0%	10%	23%	4%	0%	0%	8%
Revision of equity and diversity complaints process	54%	78%	72%	50%	38%	22%	22%	42%	8%	0%	6%	8%
Review and revision of academic application process for barriers to accessibility	50%	67%	61%	58%	42%	33%	28%	42%	8%	0%	11%	0%
Reviewing ways to better integrate Indigenous ways of knowing in the selection process	50%	89%	56%	33%	38%	11%	33%	59%	12%	0%	11%	8%
Review/revise CRC financial arrangements to improve consistency of resources	54%	67%	72%	58%	42%	33%	22%	42%	4%	0%	6%	0%
Hiring of a Vice-Provost EDI	29%	56%	28%	8%	46%	44%	61%	50%	25%	0%	11%	42%
Targeted cluster hiring process for five, full-time tenure or tenure track positions for Indigenous persons.	68%	78%	68%	62%	28%	22%	32%	30%	4%	0%	0%	8%
Continue to review and revise policies and procedures to ensure inclusive, unbiased, ungendered language.	60%	100%	69%	46%	28%	0%	26%	38%	12%	0%	5%	16%

Other Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Respondents self-identifying as Racialized, all agreed that completing a Gender based pay equity review and making adjustments was Highly Beneficial.
- Respondents self-identifying as a Woman, reported Highly Beneficial at 75% and over 80% respectively for Revision of equity and diversity complaints process and Review/revise CRC financial arrangements to improve consistency of resources.

Final Summary Questions

Q61: Do you have any suggestions for Memorial with regards to how to improve the retention and engagement of under-represented faculty members and/or CRCs with particular attention to issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion?

Answered: 20

Q62: Is there anything not covered you would like to add?

Answered: 14

Combined Overall Summary:

- Hiring is considered important however a number of respondents commented that retention, 'seems to be the larger issue'. In addition, upon hire a few respondents referred to a need for increased engagement and communication to support retention.
- With regard to resourcing, it is believed by a number of respondents that resourcing in terms of trained support staff, lab resources and appropriate space is essential to avoid feeling 'forgotten and devalued' and furthermore, that resource 'promises' were not kept and Memorial should 'stick to contracts'.
- It is believed by a number that sexism, racism, ableism and harassment does exist, it needs to be 'acknowledged', 'backlash' exists, a 'culture change needs to happen' and 'MUN needs some fundamental changes'.
- Suggestions by one respondent include the 'creation of informal groups of members of under-represented groups being given space/time to gather to bolster informal networks' and to have an 'anonymous way to report'.
- One respondent is concerned that all 'groups' are being treated as 'substitutable'.
- One respondent commented that academic 'excellence usually discriminates based on race and class'.
- One respondent commented that Memorial needs to treat unacceptable behaviour with 'drastic action' such as increasing 'reprimands' to that of 'penalties or demotion' and 'reduced teaching' would not be a 'consequence' while sensitivity training should not be made 'optional'.
- One respondent commented on increased acknowledgement for what has been accomplished, 'often informally' as 'some of us are pretty tired' while only acknowledging 'ground breaking initiatives'.
- One respondent commented on the 'effort and funding' for unconscious bias training which 'research shows is not effective and potentially counterproductive'.
- One respondent suggested 'reaching out to students' 'to attract minorities' who can then become 'role models'.

Comparative/Notable Variances by Self-Identification Groupings:

- Over 80% of responses were from members of equity deserving groups.

Appendix A: All Open Ended Questions

Q22: From your perspective, what do you see as the potential dilemmas of self-disclosure during the application or post-hiring process?

- There may be a fear of discrimination or unconscious bias.
- Discrimination and stereotyping. Assumptions that identity and expertise are interchangeable. Presumptions on/limitations of areas of research (assumed/pushed to research areas related to identity).
- Revealing a weakness for being 'different', or lesser than your potential colleagues (white/male)
- There is significant effort in identifying different groups; however, there is little support available pre or post employment
- None
- Nil
- Insufficient understanding of EDI principles
- Identification a lack of confidentiality
- I do not see any problem

Q23: What do you believe would stop Indigenous persons from self-identifying during the recruitment process?

- I feel unqualified to answer this question.
- It will happen if the self-identification questionnaire is not designed in a proper and friendly way, or the recruitment is not processed in a fair manner.
- Marginalization
- Inadequate supports to ensure that the individual would not be given the task of Indigenizing the university and educating settler colleagues without paying attention how this impacts their own research and career. Being used to Indigenize alone, and being seen as a resource to exploit because of that.
- Fear of being judged negatively for being Indigenous (racism in academia)
- How they will be treated. The identification is poorly linked how the system treats such identification. There are other identifications or biases that play and continue to play a dominant role in hiring and further progression at Memorial
- As I am not Indigenous, I am not qualified to answer this. Perhaps they feel that their cultural background is not relevant to the job, and they prefer to be hired based on their academic credentials... However, what I "believe" doesn't really matter.
- Nothing
- A long history in Canada of systemic discrimination against people who identify as Indigenous. It was only a few decades ago that Indigenous children could be taken away for 're-education' only because the parents were Indigenous.
- N/A
- I don't know
- Prejudice
- Bad experiences?
- I have no idea. I think the point is that we are trying to deal with systemic problems. It's maybe not the recruitment per se, but the fact that Indigenous people are much less likely to have a chance of being recruited in the first place because of colonialism. Racism at the hiring stage

- Biases held by the hiring committee. Issues of perceived "fit" in the department. Perceptions that interests wouldn't be sufficiently "academic" or generate research funding
- Fear of being treated differentially by peers. I suspect all the various barriers that they have experienced would often lead some Indigenous scholars to not self-identify. It could be a strategy that has worked in the past despite it possibly perpetuating those systemic barriers they have often faced.
- No idea
- I am not Indigenous, so I am not qualified to answer this question.
- Not sure
- Why would you ask me to speculate?
- I would hope nothing.
- Not sure
- Concern over bias and discrimination
- Racism
- Safety concerns, frustration with EDI initiatives, privacy
- I see no reason.
- Fear of being discriminated against, preconceived notions of those doing the hiring
- In surveys like these, where you also ask enough identifying information such as faculty and year of PhD, Indigenous people are not anonymous in disaggregated data. in terms of face to face recruitment, I did not ID as Indigenous for several reasons: 1. One of the faculty members interviewing me was known to be racist and published racist things. Still does. 2. If you get hired, people tell you that you were only hired because you are Indigenous and that your position isn't earned. 3. I don't want to be the department's Indigenous saviour to enrich their courses, recruit or retain Indigenous students, serve on all the EDI committees, etc.

Q26: What helps you feel safe to disclose?

- The working environment is friendly and supportive.
- I would like to see assurance that no discrimination will take place following disclosure and supportive measures are provided
- I think that MUN attempts to foster an environment of support.
- I believe Memorial to be a safe inclusive environment that supports all of its employees
- Acceptance and understanding
- Current public discourse on these systemic issues. I have to say, however, that I do not feel that systems, supports or infrastructure is in place to actually address those issues that people with disabilities or mental illness face. The institution simply does not have the current resources in place.
- Seeing other people receiving fair treatment
- I would feel pretty safe about this as is.
- EDI

Q27: What would stop you from disclosing?

- Marginalization
- Stigma and discrimination
- The lack of support from my colleagues and the discrimination I would face
- The way I will be treated.

- Fear of future discrimination. I wouldn't want to be on any list that identifies me as being a member of a disadvantaged community, particularly in this era of increasing fascism in politics (trump'ism, etc...)
- Fear of stigma
- The information is too personal, and I would be required to disclose repeatedly at various stages (application, hire, academic review, tenure, etc.)
- Fears that perceptions about me would indicate I would be less productive or prestigious
- Not sure about confidential handling
- I would stop disclosing that I am
- Fear of discrimination.
- Since academia is grounded in cognitive and language capacity, mental health diagnoses could be construed as incapacity
- Perception about my personal activity affecting my professional capacity
- Potential discrimination
- Safety, discrimination
- As typically, people would think that I would experience limitations in my daily activities due to the mental health disability.
- Judgement of senior administration, fear of being discriminated against
- Mental and learning disabilities are extremely stigmatized at universities. Also, it's not like there are any supports that would make it worth it. Finally, there is something called disclosure exhaustion, where every time you disclose you have to do a lot of emotional labour, explaining, citing the law, etc, and that is exhausting and often not worth it.

Q28: What needs to happen or change to feel safe or comfortable to disclose?

- There needs to be some assurance that there will be no repercussion for disclosure.
- Show how the university is a welcome place that accommodates all, not just invisibly accommodates the majority.
- Major systematic change and building a more respectful community
- A confidence building that self identification is not to isolate but to better integrate through required support.
- I see-change in the attitudes of a large minority of people in this country and around the world.
- I don't know
- Seeing higher up disclose
- To date EDI does not even work for white woman at MUN. I can't imagine what the experience of minorities would feel like
- A way of anonymizing the information so that disclosing a disability does not need to be done repeatedly by the individual, nor convey too detailed information to colleagues and superiors.
- The university needs to re-evaluate the circular concepts of "excellence" that elevates models based on white males in heterosexual relationships and not facing health challenges. The university also needs to rapidly diversify the composition of faculty and not do so piecemeal and marginally. Comfort is a product of the social circles, and it is hard to feel welcomed by a collection of people from very narrow sociodemographic segments of society that cannot empathize with you.
- Open discussion about these topics.
- The entire culture of the university. There were people on my search committee that were vocal about how knowledge of mental illness in a candidate would cause them to vote against a candidate. There were also other

people on the committee who were vocal about supporting people with mental illness. The university culture as a whole is not a safe place to disclose these types of things.

- It would need to be stated clearly that such diagnoses would not make the candidate ineligible
- Greater societal awareness and acceptable, beyond the university.
- Better culture in the university
- A shift in mentality. Also, an accommodating working environment.
- more visibility for minority groups, more universal design systems to allow integration, better understanding from leadership
- I wouldn't. I would want the university to start making disability accommodations like this normal so people don't have to disclose.

Q29: Do you have any further ideas for how Departments, Faculties, or the University more broadly can support disclosure related to any equity deserving groups?

- It is important to develop a culture of inclusion regardless of position, education, race, gender, and so on. People need to feel that they can speak openly and honestly in a respectful way and that they will receive respect in return.
- From the operational point of view, Departments, Faculties, or the University can process any policy/regulation fairly and respectfully.
- Build and promote a strong culture of support and no discrimination, through frequent messaging and concrete actions.
- Visibility of efforts made, visual representations in the use of symbols for different groups, evidence of reparative work being done (like the \$\$ to address gender inequity in pay, but have it not leave out admin folks) Acknowledgment of how the system already accommodates some, but does so invisibly--make that visible, address what inequities that visibility creates. Ensure working elevators and accessible doors. Flexible work scheduling not by unit, but universally available when possible. Evidence of universal design in all programs and policies.
- Including a union rep or a member from DEI office/support. Clear rules (esp for confidentiality and accommodations) for administrators how to support employees who disclose.
- More need to be done not on disclosure but remove the bias and develop support.
- No, in fact I think MUN over-emphasizes EDI at the expense of actual qualifications, and that may make applicants uncomfortable. But, as someone that does not belong to an under-represented group, I really have no idea.
- A definition of what the benefits of disclosure are and alleviate fears of being labelled
- No
- No
- It needs a lot of good training and oversight to change deeply ingrained behaviour patterns
- Improved emotional intelligence, checking in with faculty, providing resources dedicated to supporting EDI outside the department or faculty.
- Find interventions and strategies that work, and not those that are popular. For example, "implicit bias training" does not work, yet is implemented everywhere
- Make the process simpler, more well known and understood and back up the process with real action. Report on both reported issues and those actions so that those seeking assistance understand that their complaints and issues will be addressed. As it stands there really is a culture of silence and complacency that continues. I

have tried to help students' navigate such resources and found it necessary to look far outside of Memorial for help. Furthermore, those who have reported on harassment and discrimination that I am aware of got no where and no action was taken and in some cases this lead to individuals leaving the institution. Note: this is an oddly worded question given that all groups are equity deserving - here I am answering solely for those that face systematic barriers to equity.

- Increase the amount of employees having disabilities and support the hiring such a person
- Serious training about equity beyond silly online courses. The administration needs to actually show that they are supportive of this. So far, I have not seen the level of support required from any of the many administrative levels.
- No
- No
- Unfortunately I don't.
- Education & Information
- We need to create a larger community of edge
- Work with people who are marginalized to find solutions.
- How is this my job to tell you this?

Q32: Do you have suggestions for how academic job advertisements could be better worded to encourage applicants from equity deserving groups to apply?

- Other than direct wording that the position seeks applications from "equity seeking groups" I'm not sure. Something racialized groups get discouraged about is even when there are statements "supporting" underrepresented groups, often "faculty fit" considerations lead to a white applicant being accepted. A bigger issue than wording is networking. Many job ads do not get sent to underrepresented groups, partly because of embedded networks in academia (white faculty send to white applicants)
- Calls should be more widely published and include attractive packages
- More cluster hires, more open hires with less specific disciplinary parameters, more EDI
- Activity in the community that makes people know this is a safe and rewarding place to work.

Q34: Was there anything during the interview process that you particularly appreciated?

[REDACTED]

- I was made to feel quite welcome and faculty were excited to meet and talk with me
- No

Q35: Was there anything during the interview process that you did not like or that made you uncomfortable?

- No
- There were many spoken promises about the position that were later not realized. Both in terms of my ability to shape my role as well as efforts for retention
- No

[REDACTED]

Q36: Memorial University has undertaken targeted searches, with the support from the Human Rights Commission Newfoundland and Labrador, such as for an Indigenous Scholar and Persons with Disabilities. What do you believe Memorial could do in this process to ensure success?

- I believe that all members of the university should do unconscious bias training.
- Promotion of this initiative would be very important to ensure the search can be reached to the potential candidates.
- Make sure that MUN departments are capable of supporting them. Not all departments have the infrastructure (physical or resource based) to support those with disabilities. Nor are all departments ready to receive minorities as their colleagues.
- The lens of EDI is one of significant importance, we need to do more than post a commitment to EDI in an advertisement. It is incumbent on the process, to answer a question with justification on how EDI was considered.
- Instead of university wide, do them by faculty, to better streamline the process. Ensure that this new process does not leave applicants waiting longer than any others would. Ensure clarity of process. Ensure applicants not expected to do more than those not in targeted hires (i.e. make sure that the unspoken reality of target groups having to work harder to achieve the same rewards is not institutionalized as the accepted norm for these hires).
- Prove that the University will give them the tools to succeed. Equal pay (e.g. HSS vs. Science starting salaries), mentorship and protection from being over-served - let them decide what they need to succeed (course remissions, or salary increase, research grant, full-time support staff).
- Develop policy and implement. The work place and interview panel should be inclusive.
- Depends how you define success. To me, success would be hiring a person that thrives and excels in their position. This requires that there is no compromise with respect to the level of scholar achievement that would be expected of a regular hire. Only then will these targeted hirings be successful.
- Start this process earlier, and dedicate jobs to those involved. For example, Indigenous persons could be provided dedicated spaces in undergrad and grad school that lead directly to a tenure-track faculty position. Opening up dedicated tenure-track faculty lines without supporting their training is missing an important step - ensuring that people from diverse groups can get into university programs.
- Innovative interview and search parameters.
- I don't know
- These efforts are noteworthy. Making the process more transparent at least to the people part of the search committees.
- Open rank positions for any field. I think we assume that Indigenous Scholars or Persons with Disabilities will be in specific fields. I think that's incorrect to assume.
- These should not be one-off or individual. They become tokenizing, and because they are so rare they set underrepresented groups against each other. Memorial should be more proactive rather than simply referring to CRC categories, for example. Simply because Memorial is searching for an Indigenous scholar does nothing for scholars of South Asian heritage, for example.
- Increase funding for these hires.
- Put financial resources into advertising across diverse venues that would reach these scholars worldwide. Invest in campus wide support for these individuals. This could take the form of financial support for those recruited to recruit HQP to their research group as well as funds to participate in Indigenous or Person with Disabilities

specific research organizations in order for them to maintain community connection which would enable them to obtain feedback and assistance that may be quite difficult to find at Memorial where there are so few individuals they can identify with.

- No idea since I am not really in that business
- I don't know. Do they have anything in place to support these people after they get here? Or is it just a superficial effort at the search level only?
- I do not know
- Need to reach out to universities in Canada, there are likely PhD grads looking for jobs that have disabilities. MUN is ranked rather low compared to jobs in other provinces so need to work harder on the frontlines.
- Persist.
- Better advertisement for the search.
- Targeted searches are overly complicated in the way they are implemented. clearer understanding and direction on the constraints around a target search is necessary. this needs to be communicated in a way that is appropriate to the audience involved. HR language to academics is problematic.
- Have more people in the designated groups on hiring committees
- It takes years to ensure success in attracting minorities in general. Minorities would need to see themselves represented in the classroom first (students, not only professors) and in the workplace.
- Make sure that there are significant numbers (ie, more than 2) Indigenous people or people with disabilities on the search committee, including the chair of the committee. *Additionally,* ensure that the entire committee is from equity seeking groups, so even if they aren't fluent in some aspects of discrimination specific to Indigenous people or disability, they get the gist. This might mean you have to include people on the committee in decision-making roles who aren't at the university.

Q38: From your perspective, what impact does the choice and mix of hiring committee members/chair play in hiring success as it relates to selecting and hiring candidates from equity deserving groups? What other suggestions do you have?

- I think this would play a major role as it relates to selecting and hiring candidates from equity deserving groups.
- The choice and mix of hiring committee members/chair play a significant role in hiring success to ensure the EDI is well-reflected. That is why the university-wide EDI training of faculty and staff members are important.
- Diversity in hiring committees is essential but this also increases the burden for those few minorities that MUN already employs. This additional service should be taken into account and EDI approaches should be broadly developed and adopted to optimize time and reduce bias.
- Selection committees need to aim for the diverse representation we aim to achieve in our communities where practical.
- Can have a very strong impact.
- Hiring committees should have representation from equity deserving groups. Hiring committees should ensure that no one who is a minority is faced in a meeting alone (for example, all male hiring committees when hiring a female faculty member)
- Very important
- The make-up of the hiring committee is extremely impactful regardless of if the position is specifically targeted for EDI or an open position. For EDI-specific hiring, a more diverse committee is not necessarily better - it is the individuals, and their respective approach to tackling and understanding EDI, not their specific identities that matter.

- The hiring process will always favour people from dominant groups because it is based on measures that favour those groups. These include training at highly ranked universities, publishing papers/books, giving academic presentations, etc... Each of these 'measures' have barriers for many people, and lead to unfair hiring (and tenure for that matter).
- High impact. Could be much more transparent and inclusive.
- A significant difference. It is very hard to assess the impact of different barriers when not encountered by the people in the committee.
- Really important. Needs to start at the post-doc level, or below, which currently is up to the PIs. Creating fellowships for post-docs where PI-minority candidate can apply for PDF funding may help.
- Plays a big role. You need people who are going to recognize and advocate for diversity and inclusion. Need to think about have a person who's role it is to think about diversity on the search identified right away. That way, there is a specific role, rather than just everyone supposed to be doing this in general.
- If "mixing" means diversifying it could be very important. Considerations of "fit" often go against underrepresented groups, and ensuring that hiring committees are more diverse can ensure that "fit" doesn't mean fitting norms comfortable to overrepresented groups.
- Would like to comment on question #21 as well: Highly beneficial but currently not enough. Recent hiring process I was involved with we availed of the funds but found it was very limited. Really, what is this worth? Why couldn't another \$1000 be found to support advertising across a number of BIPOC scientific organization/venues? I was disappointed particularly knowing that this is the very first step in recruiting diverse faculty. For this #22 - Make up of the committee is important - there needs to be a good number of individuals fully aware of the problem and the systemic issues that pervade the process. There needs to be more established procedures for the recruitment/advertisement, application reviews/selection and interview/selection process in order to avoid systemic bias. The isolation of Memorial is a particular issue and I feel strongly that direct support to recruit early career BIPOC scholars to visit and speak about their research here at Memorial would go a long way (if done right) in recruiting efforts. Familiarity is important and contacts can make a big difference.
- The more diverse the better
- This likely has a big impact. But the problem is the entrenched culture at the university. When faculty members make "jokes" about other faculty members being "equity hires" (something that I personally have heard) it certainly does not suggest that true equity is actually valued in the departments.
- I think this is a good idea.
- I think that hiring committees are usually diverse enough. the key is getting enough candidates to choose from. we need to work harder by reaching out to PhDs and PDFs elsewhere- more personal approach.
- I don't have enough experience to answer intelligently.
- Not much. All the search committee members must have an open mind.
- This is a significant aspect of producing better knowledge around EDG. However, it is important to recognize and minimize overly burdening the very members of the community with the work of others
- Mixed is good as long as people are not marginalized on the committee by others
- For academic positions in particular, hiring committees make a big difference. They basically act as gatekeepers to define the position and who is qualified.
- Great impact.
- [REDACTED] "skewed" groups that have only tokenistic representatives from equity-seeking groups result in harm for those members. But "tilted" groups with 16% equity-seeking membership allowed allyship, coalitions, burden sharing, and eased the culture of the dominant group (usually White, male,

cis, straight, and abled). Even better were “balanced” groups, where ratios were 2:3 or 50:50. This is called the Kanter theory, and it applies to the health and operation of committees rather than that committee’s outcomes.

Q44: What suggestions can you offer to enhance this training? What other training would you suggest? What would assist in improving the transfer of learning into tangible change at Memorial?

- Perhaps Memorial could increase awareness of these various training opportunities.
- The university should encourage these pieces of training as part of professional development units to be reflected in the performance evaluation document, and as the prerequisite for being involved in related committees/activities.
- People who care about EDI will take part in training and develop EDI committees and engage. Those who don't, wont so you are not reaching those who may need it most.
- Better promotion of the training and significant communication of it's availability
- More awareness of availability of training. Training on gender and sexual diversity (basics, 101, and targeted materials available for people to review on supporting a transitioning individual at work, and basic info for people to review as needed)
- It should be mandatory for administrators and those who do not support it should face a reprimand.
- Training is helpful, but too much training is not. At some point the University must recognize that its Faculty are not completely clueless when it comes to these issues. Sometimes it feels like this is not the case. But, at the same time, training, if done well, is very important for raising awareness. Reaching the right balance is difficult.
- We don't need training - university faculty are generally one of the most socially progressive. We need jobs for people. We need good jobs for people. It is unethical to offer 2 year contracts that pay marginally above minimum wage for people with doctoral degrees. MUN needs to stop all non-tenure track hires (except in emergency situations). People from marginalized communities are more likely to be hired in these 'bad jobs', which further perpetuates inequality.
- I don't know
- Training like that is ONE piece of the puzzle, and can help to change the culture. Other measures must support this effort. Possibly internship funds for specific minorities where PI's and candidates can co-apply, possibly in person training with role plays and discussions that are required.
- More outreach to units. My class did the cultural competence training but only because someone reached out to me.
- Meta-analysis and other research on these kinds of training suggests that overall they are not effective, and in some cases they could be counterproductive. Because they focus on interpersonal relationships and not structural issues, they focus on agents that individually have limited influence, and also make it about the person with potentially racist/sexist/etc thoughts. This can lead to backlash effects if people are confronted with some notion that they are discriminatory. "Cultural competence" training is also often developed by white Europeans and North Americans from their lens of other groups and often is tokenizing itself. Instead of these interpersonal training Memorial needs to invest in creating positions for underrepresented groups
- Requirements of units to have specific procedures in place - that is to enact steps that reduce barriers explicitly. Training sessions are okay but it depends upon volunteers to take them and even if required does not always guarantee an uptake. There really needs to be support from the highest levels within the institution to reduce barriers - e.g. bring BIPOC scholars in for talks/workshops; support BIPOC students through

scholarships/internships; given BIPOC faculty direct research support. These are things that reduce barriers and have been proven to work at other institutions. Having just implicit bias training and so forth is really just a band-aid to a much bigger and systemic problem.

- No suggestions
- The unconscious bias training that is given to search committees prior to evaluation of candidates is superficial. Some of the search committee takes it seriously, but I don't think it is everyone. I had no idea about any of the other courses, I don't know how to access them. These need to be mandatory for all faculty. And they need to be better than just some online courses through Brightspace that people barely pay attention to (for ex. the supervisor training module).
- I first would have to see this training!
- None. Sorry.
- The impact of the training needs to be evaluated before suggestions for improvements can be made.
- The training does not speak specifically to intended audiences. It must be tailored to the needs of particular groups. I have done the bias training and did not feel it was at a sophisticated enough level.
- It is not just about training. people get training but they do not practice what they learn.
- The problem is that those who need this training most are not going to take it.
- Besides training, some open forums can be organized, where people can have discussions on the topic.
- More marketing so employees know what is available
- Research is mixed on these trainings. Some show that it helps a little for those who are already in track, and other research says it has a backlash effect where some people become more committed to certain biases (Kulik et al. 2000). Moderating managerial bias through extended diversity trainings and evaluations show very modest effects (Kaley et al., 2006).

Q45: Do you have any suggestions about wider Recruitment and Selection practices?

- No
- No
- Start, move it forward. Get people in, working and give them the tools and support to be successful. Action is the biggest draw.
- None
- Irrespective for EDI targets, for Memorial to be successful, more emphasis should be placed on finding the people that want to live and stay in Newfoundland - this is MUN's biggest challenge.
- No more short-term contract positions. Hire everyone on the tenure track.
- No
- Providing a platform where a job announcement for a graduate students or PDF are automatically posted on different sites targeting minorities without the PI having to individually post and take down the announcement on each site.
- As long as Memorial treats underrepresented groups as minorities (offering few positions) this issue will persist. As long as Memorial follows notions of "racialized groups" it will discriminate through tokenization (calls for a single black scholar may block out brown scholars but add a check to its CRC obligations). As long as Memorial supports circular notions of "excellence" it will discriminate against people from lower income backgrounds and support people from multi-generation academic backgrounds.
- More transparency and formalized processes. Place the rubrics for the selection process online so applicants can see how they are going to be evaluated. To improve recruitment, put more resources into the advertising

process and require that it goes out to all possible BIPOC organizations in the related field. This is not hard to do but with the current funds available is not quite possible. Bring BIPOC scholars, particularly early career, to campus to give talks and participate in workshops related to their research. That familiarity will help with recruitment it will also bolster BIPOC student participation and training.

- No
- The administration needs to truly believe in these practices for them to have any real effect at the department level.
- Not at this point.
- No
- To meet EDI, cluster searches/hires should be considered more often.
- No
- Yes, make sure that people see themselves reflected at MUN more widely
- Hiring head hunting companies for positions of department heads, associate deans, not only deans and higher administration. EDI should be an important criterion for selection.
- I recommend that decisions are based on research and expertise, not the opinions of diverse people.

Q49: What suggestions can you offer to enhance this accommodations training?

- I was unaware of the training and therefore feel unable to answer this question.
- To offer these training on a regular basis to facilitate enrollment.
- Promotion
- Hire more tenure track faculty members
- When it comes to retention, the entire department would have to take these training.
- All these on line training, although somewhat helpful are tedious and often boring. In person events and activities could complement these. Moreover, the people who most need these training sessions usually are the ones NOT doing them.
- This is unit level challenge because ultimately chairs are recruited at the Unit level. Need them to come up with solutions are actually use the things that are available centrally.
- This sounds like another training based on interpersonal relationships. Will people from religious minorities be supported structurally? Will there be accommodations in infrastructure and funding regarding issues around their job?
- Include specific information on reporting incidences and describe clearly how the reporting works and is followed up on. I believe this is not working at all here at Memorial given examples of students and faculty that I know sought out the mechanisms to report on incidences of discrimination and harassment. These training sessions do not help at all in recruitment, selection or retention often because those perpetuating the problems do not attend and if they do it does no good. That will not check. BUT the system can change if there is support to change it [REDACTED] Financial support as noted in successful institutions that have come a very long way with EDI (U Maryland at Baltimore and Penn State) is needed.
- They is a huge need of a better strategy to integrated new faculty members particular from abroad to the community.
- It needs to be mandatory for all administrative levels. Including Dept Heads and Deans and Associate Deans.
- None at this point.
- N/A
- Gather more information

- As with all training, it must be tailored to the specific audience. and greater awareness of its existence would be helpful.
- I am not sure. I don't know the training but it is the same people who are making decision who get the training so something needs to change.
- The CRC Chair positions are very few, while we have excellent candidates from all categories. First of all, the excellence of the researcher should be considered in decisions, while avoiding bias. Accordingly, more training on conscious and unconscious bias should be provided, such that people become aware at least of the latter.
- [REDACTED] The answers don't change a lot between different types of diversity seeking groups.

Q50: Other than standard research funds, what type of support and resources did you receive upon coming to Memorial? Was it sufficient?

- Access to technician [REDACTED], a lab with desks, access to network licenses for very expensive software.
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- Start up package. [REDACTED] but this is not the case.
- None, no.

Q51: What kind of mentoring did you receive during your first few years in your current position?

- None as I was the only one in my department, my department head was very supportive.
- I got some meetings with the dean's office on the grants team and office. Other than that, I received none, except for when I reached out. [REDACTED], I feel as though memorial treats me in an extractive way.
- No
- None

Q53: How important is mentoring to success at Memorial? What suggestions do you have?

- Very important. We should build a culture of mentoring within the department, faculty, and university. It will significantly help newcomers, young scholars, and under-represented groups to well adapt to Memorial.
- It is crucial.
- Very important
- It is very important for new hires, especially mentorship that is external to the P&T process, and is therefore relatively consequence free. However, that should be an informal expectation at the departmental level, and not something that the University needs to formally mandate. However, sadly, in many cases a formal mandate may be required.
- "Mentoring to success at Memorial" I don't know what this means.
- It would have been great to have, I have had to learn by making mistake instead. It seems ridiculous that there is not a more formalized approach to make sure new faculty learn what there position entails and what the university processes are.
- Mentoring who?
- Mentoring is very beneficial for people who are first generation academics. Academia is a very different environment than any other job environment. Many underrepresented groups will be first generation.
- Very important.

- Particular for young faculty members a "supervisor" would be of great value.
- Any sort of formal mentoring would be an improvement over the utter lack of mentoring that we currently have.
- Somewhat
- Mentoring can be helpful anywhere. Usually it happens organically, but that may not support members of non-hegemonic groups. Also, it generally isn't recognized or supported well.
- Very IMPORTANT. Instead of mentoring men and white people mentor a wide group of people all the time.
- It is quite important. More important is that "mentors" understand their role and can give real advice.
- It's a university, so pretty crucial. This questions is much to vague to answer. Do you mean equity seeking folks mentoring other equity seeking folks? or do you mean students?

Q59: What stopped you from disclosing?

- Stigma, and there's nothing that would happen anyhow. [REDACTED]

Q61: Do you have any further suggestions for Memorial with regards to how to improve the retention and engagement of under-represented faculty members and/or CRCs with particular attention to issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion?

- No
- The university has \$500 million in differed maintenance. If you want to attract energetic researchers they need to have the resources to hit the ground running. When you [REDACTED] you feel forgotten and devalued. Feelings that are already impacting people from underrepresented groups. [REDACTED] Fulfill the commitments within the CRC contracts and stop being so slow to act on issues of harassment.
- No
 [REDACTED] I wonder about the creation of informal groups of members of under-represented groups being given space/time to gather to bolster informal networks. I also think it could be helpful to have some anonymous way to report the kinds of things we encounter in our working lives, so that those who will not be impacted by calling attention to it (i.e. those with privilege, categorically or by role at the university) could make known what some of those issues are that are so visible to us when we experience them, but that we encounter disbelief or backlash for mentioning. Queer and trans folk, for example are consistently infantilized, as are those with non-english speaking accents, or those with disabilities. It is homophobia and transphobia to consistently treat people with experience and expertise as 'developing' or 'junior'--even in a positive context. It would be helpful if we knew that the upper admin have training in recognizing how racism, ableism, sexism, homophobia and transphobia play out in things like P&T reviews and applications for positions/reviews, so that we can better trust these processes to be equitable. And it would be helpful when racism, transphobia, homophobia, ableism, and sexism happen, that it be called what it is, that it be acknowledged. That in our interactions with upper administration we are able to see experiences acknowledged. It would help if we had somewhere to put it all, if that makes sense. It would help if the university, structurally, [REDACTED]
- Full-time, qualified and properly trained support staff. Lab technicians, research assistants, etc.

- More tenure track hires. Ensure committees value hiring locally produced talent. Many people from diverse groups are not able to relocate for work, thus focusing on hiring locally produced PhDs, we can reduce inequality
- You need to not only consider recruitment, retention seems to be the larger issue at the moment and that would require steps to change the attitude of entire departments.
- Follow own rules, stick to contracts, do not break promises, engage one to one with new people after 6 months, after 1 year.
- Need mentorship and training once people start. [REDACTED].
- I'm concerned with how academia and admin treats BIPOC as monolithic and substitutable between groups (following CRC, this would be "visible minority" or "racialized groups"). For example, hiring a black faculty doesn't really help underserved Asian Canadians. So long as these calls are kept at minor levels they will not address the EDI issues. Further, academic insistence on "excellence" usually discriminates based on race and class since the only way to know what "excellence" means is to be immersed in academic culture and this is a bias towards multi-generation academics.
- A full culture change needs to happen. First, I have received so many discouraging comments that are blatantly sexist. I have no doubt that there are blatantly racist things going around as well. "Don't worry, women always get tenure, you can be totally mediocre" is not the kind of encouragement or environment that retains highly qualified women. Constant fighting for basic accommodations while watching/hearing [REDACTED] male colleagues get these things handed to them without even asking is infuriating. Having to argue for years for space to do research in is not acceptable. It is especially unacceptable as a CRC. Hiring equity is very important, but retention is also important. What good is it to hire excellent diverse people, if their working conditions are so difficult that they leave in a couple of years?
- Provide real support for BIPOC recruitment and retention - honestly would rather see funds going to those efforts then yet another large administrator salary and those salaries supporting further administration. The formula is really not that complex particularly given that there are many successful examples out there BUT it does require money be diverted to these supports. So far it seems that structures/offices (Provost of EDI; Office of Sexual Harassment; Joint Equities Committee) are set up at Memorial such that externally it looks like we are doing a lot. However, real change has yet to happen because the support is not being funnelled into the right mechanisms which will in fact improve recruitment and retention. Hard to get people here because we don't often bring them here to visit and enrich our community. Hard to get people to stay because they simply don't get the support they need and they face huge barriers to their success such that it is better to go elsewhere where they are in fact supported.
- No
- No
- No
- Open and ongoing discussions are necessary. looking at the ways that the Collective Agreement intersects with issues of EDI, especially with regard to P&T and workload.
- N/A
- [REDACTED] sessions about bias would be beneficial. Also, to promote its own people who have achieved excellence in research. Otherwise, Memorial will not be able to retain top researchers, regardless of their race, color, ethnicity, national origin, religion, disability, sex, gender, expression, gender identity, etc.
- I think Memorial is in the stage of needing quotas and targeting hires. Once there is a critical mass that normalizes certain things, then we can move to another phase.

Q62: Is there anything not covered you would like to add?

- No
- I don't think MUN is ready to embrace EDI initiatives. There are a number of faculty and staff that are decades behind on EDI and have no intention of treating people from underrepresented groups as equals. If they are [REDACTED] calling [REDACTED] "diversity hires" in public with no fear of reprimand, they are not ready to see them as equals. MUN needs some fundamental changes. I am not necessarily suggesting removal but I am suggesting drastic action like penalties or demotion for creating unhealthy working environments for others. People who are toxic are often asked to teach less or serve on fewer committees. Reduced teaching and committee service is not a consequence, it is a benefit. Sensitivity training should be required for these individuals not optional. They are way past optional.
- No
- Many of us have been doing work on EDI, often informally, for a long time. It is helpful to have that work acknowledged. The work that comes now comes as a result of the work we have been doing for years, and some of us are pretty tired. We keep going, of course, but having it acknowledged that there has been work happening to sustain each other as best we could/can with a lack of institutional supports is important as we build those institutional supports in order to avoid it being, a 'white/cis/straight/able saviour' moment for upper admin, that ignores the value of the informal work we've been forced to do to survive, that colonized that work by talking only about 'ground breaking initiatives' when many of us have been working that ground for years, ensuring the ground could be broken by larger institutional-level possibilities.
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] so much effort and funding goes into unconscious bias training, yet meta analyses and other research shows it is not effective and potentially counterproductive (see previous comments on backlash effects)
- Memorial should focus on retention as well as hiring.
- The conflict of interest needs to be adjusted since a lot of more senior faculty having partners in the same area and work together. This is very complicated and time consuming to get this settled at MUN.
- No
- Questions that the current survey participants are unaware of, require an answer key of "not applicable".
- No
- Not sure
- EDI is very important and the culture would need to be changed step-by-step. Certainly, efforts can be made to attract more staff and faculty members from the minority pool. This being said, my opinion is that a parallel process needs to start reaching out to the junior high and high school students, attract students [REDACTED] (minorities are very important to be seen in the class - think how to attract minorities [REDACTED] and then how they can become successful professors and be role models for students. They represent the new generation and fundamental change typically takes time; one cannot force it.