PRELIMINARY REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

JOINT BOARD-SENATE TASK FORCE ON EQUITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION
I. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We acknowledge that the land on which Bishop’s University sits and the place where we gather is the Traditional and Unceded Territory of the Abenaki people and the Wabanaki Confederacy.

II. BACKGROUND/CONTEXT/PREAMBLE

Bishop’s University, as a place of higher education and a centre for academic inquiry, is built on strong values and principles. As a community of learning, the University has a responsibility not only to the intellectual development and academic support of its members, but also to the provision of a safe, equitable, and compassionate environment for all those who populate it. It is necessary for all members of the University community – from students to faculty to staff to administration to governors – to participate actively in the creation and maintenance of an environment free from discrimination of all kinds.

The Task Force recognizes that Bishop’s, founded by the Anglican church, has come a long way since its origins, and is now a secular institution which does not privilege any particular religion or creed. At the same time, however, the institution has much further to go. We recognize that systemic racism is at work in all institutions in this country, and Bishop’s University is no exception to this rule. Members of the Black, Indigenous and People of Colour (BIPOC) community have been consistently underrepresented and under-supported in this and all major institutional structures. Furthermore, we are not immune to modes of discrimination towards other equity-seeking groups, including discrimination on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religious practice, and ability.

On July 22, 2020, Principal Michael Goldbloom presented to the community two key communications: first, a clear statement of the University’s need to recognize the systemic racism of our institution and the danger of our complacency towards it; second, the introduction of a Joint Board-Senate Task Force on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, the first of its kind at the University. Before the creation of the Task Force, a great deal of work had already been done to shine a light on discrimination at the University, as well as to diversify the University and make it more equitable. This work, however, rested primarily on the actions of individuals or small clusters of interested persons. The formation of this Task Force is done in clear recognition of the need for institutional leadership in this work.

We find ourselves in a political and historical moment that we must not ignore. As an institution of higher learning, we have the capacity and energy to push beyond the status quo and to lead
the way towards a more inclusive community. Indeed, as an institution of higher learning, it is
our moral obligation to do so. The Task Force members hope that the University community
will receive its recommendations as a necessary step to righting the wrongs in which we are all
complicit.

III. TASK FORCE MANDATE AND WORK PLAN

A) MANDATE
The Task Force was mandated to identify structural or systemic barriers, injustices and biases at
the University and to make recommendations about any actions which it deems appropriate to
dismantle these barriers and advance equity, diversity and inclusion at Bishop’s.

The Task Force was also charged with making recommendations as to what data should be
collected, how it should be collected and communicated, and what metrics should be used to
measure the University’s progress.

A preliminary report is to be circulated to Senate and the Board on December 11 and December
18 respectively.

The Task Force’s mandate was to examine practices, policies, and barriers in the following
areas:
1. Hiring, promotion and retention objectives and practices for faculty, research chairs,
   staff, librarians and management;
2. Training for faculty, research chairs, librarians, staff, managers, students and governors;
3. Governance;
4. The academic curriculum including research programs and activities;
5. The University’s policies, procedures and guidelines.

B) SUBGROUP FORMATION
In order to best address these five areas of the University, the Task Force members organized
themselves into nine subgroups, each of which reflect particular areas of concern at the
institution. These subgroups are:
1. Visible Minorities and Racialized Persons;
2. Gender/LGBTQIA2S+;
3. Indigenous Persons;
4. Persons Living with Disabilities;
5. Student Life;
6. Training;
7. Curriculum & Research;
8. Athletics;
9. Recruitment and Retention.

Each of these subgroups offer their own recommendations, as below.

C) MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

The Task Force met for the first time September 8, 2020 and met four more times between that time and November 30. Subgroups met weekly or bi-weekly and managed their own data collection (surveys) and information gathering. Preliminary surveys were distributed by the Curriculum & Research Subgroup and the Athletics Subgroup, and Sufia Langevin (Vice-Chair) coordinated a Student Survey with all subgroups.

The Indigenous Persons Subgroup held a number of broader listening sessions with members of the Indigenous Cultural Alliance (ICA), the Indigenous Students Association (ISA), and the Indigeneity and Race Research Axis (IRRA), with particular regard to Kwígwámna and to more general issues affecting the Indigenous student population.

Some members also participated in an Indigenous Awareness Training workshop, the first of what will hopefully be many training opportunities both for Task Force members and the broader University community. A workshop for LGBTQIA2S+ Awareness is scheduled for the new year.

D) OPERATING DURING COVID-19

Due to the ongoing pandemic, communication, collaboration, and the ability to gather has been limited or restricted. Conversations about race, discrimination, and bias are difficult at the best of times and not being able to meet in person has presented distinct challenges. The already time-consuming process of information gathering has taken even longer, given the amount of stress and extra workload shouldered by all members of our community. Timelines have had to be adjusted, especially with regard to the administration of large-scale surveys for faculty and staff. More realistic markers had to be set for short-, medium- and long-term goals. This being said, the amount of work each member of the Task Force has contributed is extraordinary, and to be commended.
IV. TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Task Force is as follows, with the originating body of their election or appointment:

Jenn Cianca, Faculty Council (Chair)
Nikki Baribeau, Indigenous Cultural Alliance (Vice-Chair)
Sufia Langevin, Students’ Representative Council (Vice-Chair)

Abel Bosum, Board of Governors
Tova White, Board of Governors
Darren Bardati, Senate
David Webster, Senate
Layachi Bentabet, Association of Professors of Bishop’s University
Genève Juneau, Bishop’s University Pride Alliance
Sabrina-Binta Kone, Students’ Representative Council
Naomie Mazzola, Carribean African Student Association
Kailey Tye Karahkwinéhtha Nicholas, Indigenous Student Association
Monika Mitchell, Staff Council
Theresa Gagnon, Managers’ Council
Heather Thomson, Bishop’s Council
Junior Sirivar, Bishop’s Council
Nick Andrews, Executive Committee
Stine Linden-Andersen, Executive Committee
Heather Lawford, Joint Board-Senate Task Force
Cherif Nicolas, Joint Board-Senate Task Force
Yolande James, Principal
Michael Goldbloom, ex officio

The Task Force has been generously supported by Denise Lauzière and Maëli Emond.
V. KEY THEMES OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

As will be evident from the recommendations below, the Task Force has highlighted a great number of areas in which work must be done. These recommendations vary in type, from relatively easy fixes to large-scale culture change. There are, however, a few key themes which emerge from the recommendations.

First, it is clear that there must be a central office for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (hereafter EDI) concerns, led by an EDI expert. A destination for EDI-related inquiries or concerns is much needed. Data gathered must be analyzed and kept on file to benchmark and assess our institutional progress. Committee-driven EDI work is helpful, but committee memberships rotate and continuity is lost. Thus, the primary recommendation from the Task Force is that a permanent hire of an EDI expert be made. Many of the recommendations from Subgroups are predicated on the successful appointment of an EDI Specialist.

Second, it is apparent that there is a lack of racial diversity in the University's employees. Many of the issues noted by the Subgroups of the Task Force are the natural outgrowth of a faculty, staff, and administration that is overwhelmingly white. Training in EDI issues and unconscious bias are a good first step, but without recruitment and retention of BIPOC employees, our existing BIPOC students and employees will continue to bear both alienation and the burden of representation. Recommendations, therefore, will make a strong case for the hiring of BIPOC candidates and the creation of a culture and infrastructure that supports and champions them.

Third, the Task Force would like to see a stronger integration of EDI into the Strategic Framework of the University overall. There are pockets of the institution where EDI is already incorporated and centred (such as the Research Office), but it needs to be present at all levels of institutional vision and planning. A statement of commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion should be drafted and posted clearly on the institutional website. This statement should reflect not only the need for racial diversity, as above, but also for the prevention of discrimination on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religious practice, and ability. EDI language should be central to the institutional mission statement and incorporated into every facet of the Strategic Framework, not as a standalone concern, but as a guiding principle for all decision making.
VI. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations below are forwarded by all Subgroups and the overall membership of the Task Force. They are of particular note and priority.

1. THE CREATION OF AN OFFICE OF EQUITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION

We recommend the permanent hiring of an EDI Specialist, whose office will serve as repository and destination for a broad range of EDI concerns. This office should serve as a safe space for students, faculty, and staff to share their lived experiences and receive support. The mandate of this position should include:

a) the review and implementation of policies and initiatives aimed at enhancing the on-campus experience of BU’s Visible Minorities students, professors and staff;

b) consultation with the SRC, the Ombudsperson, and Student Services to ensure clear pathways to available resources and services;

c) consultation with the broader University community through workshops and focus groups on an annual or more frequent basis;

d) consultation with departments to offer advice on the development of EDI content in courses;

e) gathering EDI related data and reporting on progress in reaching set targets for underrepresented groups;

f) advising Senate and the Board of Governors on how best to take EDI into account in planning and procedures;

g) providing guidance and ensuring EDI best practices are followed by hiring committees;

h) developing and disseminating EDI training tools and organizing events to promote and sustain an inclusive culture and a diverse environment on campus;

i) developing and disseminating EDI training tools and organizing events to promote and sustain an inclusive culture and a diverse environment on campus.

As is apparent from the above mandate, this position will necessitate support. Senate and the Board of Governors may determine that this recommendation would be best met with multiple positions, possibly including a Black Student Advisor, an Indigenous Student Advisor, an athlete-specific advisor, and support staff. The Task Force does not recommend a specific home for this position or office but does recommend it be separate and distinct from Human Resources.

Ideally, the hiring process for this person would begin in early 2021, with a view to having someone in place July 1, 2021.
2. THE INTRODUCTION OF MANDATORY EDI TRAINING FOR ALL EMPLOYEES OF THE UNIVERSITY

Each subgroup of the Task Force has encountered the need for training in all facets of EDI and in all corners of the institution. The Task Force recommends that the University begin its process of training its employees by including EDI training in the orientation of all new faculty (full-time and part-time) and staff, to be rolled out eventually to the rest of the faculty and staff. Ideally, training would be offered annually or bi-annually, and ideally in a workshop setting, rather than in a pre-recorded webinar or slide deck. The cost of this training should be covered by the institutional operating budget (or EDI-earmarked funds), rather than by individual departments or faculty members.

This training may include unconscious bias, general anti-discrimination training, and training targeted towards the understanding of particular equity-seeking groups. This training should be developed, implemented, and overseen by the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion.

There is of course precedent for mandatory training, with the provincially-mandated training on the prevention of sexual violence, implemented this calendar year.

3. A REVIEW OF HIRING PRACTICES

There is a strong need to diversify the faculty, staff, and administrative population. The current recruitment policies as per the Collective Agreements, Senate regulations and the Statutes of Bishop’s University do not reflect the best EDI hiring practices. It is therefore necessary to engage a discussion with the concerned parties to remedy the situation. Further recommendations related to this point below, come from the Visible Minorities and Recruitment and Retention subgroups.
In addition to the general recommendations above, subgroups have also contributed the following recommendations.

1. Visible Minorities/Racialized Persons Subgroup

Hiring Practices and Representation

a) Hiring of BIPOC employees needs to be prioritized. The student survey results indicate a need for Visible Minorities to be better represented across campus, especially, but not limited to, Security and the Communications Department.

b) The Communications Office would be well served by the appointment of a BIPOC/visible minority staff member.

2. Student Life and Related Policies

a) Add a cultural day which could eventually become a cultural week/festival in order to promote and encourage understanding of other cultures. This should include the sharing of food (without contractual barriers), dance, music etc.

b) Review and amend the Student Code of Conduct (see Appendix A):
   a. Adding section 4.13: offenses regarding EDI;
   b. Correcting all language to be gender inclusive.

c) Review and amend other policies such as, but not limited to, the Alcohol Policy, the Residence Handbook, the Calendar, the Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities, HIV/AIDS Policy, the Policy on Harassment, the Smoking Policy, the Bishop’s University Computing Acceptable Use Policy, the Policy for Students with Special Needs.

d) Establish a mandate to review the current Communications Office practices and, in collaboration with students of various minority groups, create a document with commitments and calls to action, to enhance their current practices and content to reflect the diverse University community that we have.
3. **Gender/LGBTQIA2S+ Subgroup**

**Prevention of Sexual Harassment and Sexual Health**

a) The Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Harassment exists but does not meet. This Subgroup recommends that the committee meet immediately and thereafter, consistently. This committee should examine whether the policies relating to its mandate are current.

b) There is a need for transparency and education on process for incidents and complaints of sexual harassment and assault. Ensure that there are clear pathways to resources and process for reporting. This reporting should be available online and should be clearly indicated on the website.

c) The Association of Professors of Bishop’s University (APBU) should consider amending the current three-strikes policy on harassment to a zero-tolerance policy for sexual harassment. We also suggest examining all harassment-related disciplinary policies to determine whether zero tolerance is possible across the board.

d) Tracking and community metrics for assault and harassment needs to be centralized and consistently updated.

e) Training for Security officers must be updated on an annual basis;

f) Bystander Intervention Training must be made available every year, preferably in Orientation Week;

g) Rape kits should be available at the on-campus Health Clinic;

h) Pregnancy support for students should be more readily available on campus.

**Pay Equity**

a) Transparent and regular reporting on compliance is necessary;

b) Communication of what does and does not constitute pay equity is necessary, as there are broad-based misconceptions in our community.

**Self-Identification**

a) An audit of all places where student name/gender identifiers are able to be modified (or not), such as email addresses, unofficial and official transcripts, class lists, and contracts is necessary;

b) Those places where changes are permissible (i.e. not requiring legal documentation) should be catalogued and this should be communicated to students, in order to enable them to change their names and pronouns to reflect their gender identity.
4. **INDIGENOUS PERSONS SUBGROUP**

The Indigenous Persons Subgroup has carried out consultations with Indigenous students and faculty working on Indigenous studies topics. We are also informed by the experience of Kwigw8mna this term and our own discussions. Members of the Indigenous Subgroup have also drafted a letter outlining the process and recommendations specific to Kwigw8mna, attached as Appendix B. Further context for this subgroup’s recommendations can be found in the Appendices C-F. The subgroup also draws Senate’s attention to the October 2018 report, “Research and Recommendations for Reconciliation and Decolonization at Bishop’s University,” prepared by Drs. Avril Aitken, Mary Ellen Donnan, and Jean Manore.

**Consent and Inclusion of Indigenous people in University Structures**

a) Assess how decision-making structures can be adapted to include and obtain consent from Indigenous voices, to encourage shared ownership and transparency.

b) Indigenous students (as well as staff and faculty, when hired) require adequate space as a requirement to do this necessary work.

c) The University should consider inviting the Abenaki community to nominate a member to the Board of Governors, with paid compensation.

**Indigenization Strategy**

a) We recommend the University create an Indigenization/Decolonization plan as counterpart to the strategic plan.

b) This plan should link with that of other universities and with our own experiences at Bishop’s.

c) The group writing or overseeing the plan should be chosen based on knowledge and support for Indigenous issues, and not necessarily elected. A draft of an Indigenization plan is attached (Appendix F).

**Resources**

a) The library should curate a specific Indigenous studies collection, to be housed in Kwigw8mna after it is completed.

b) Additional financial resources are required for the specific needs of Indigenous students.

c) Stipends should be offered for consultations with Indigenous communities.

d) Dedicated support for Indigenous students in Orientation Week, particularly those from remote communities. This could include access to elders, an Indigenous support team, and peer or Indigenous alumni support.

e) Secure funding so that the Abenaki language courses can be offered every year.
Training

a) Mandatory, specifically Indigenous awareness training for all employees, especially those who will include Indigenous studies topics in the classroom, in extra-curricular activities, or research.

b) Training can be conceived of in three layers: (1) awareness; (2) cultural safety; (3) unconscious bias.

Teaching, Hiring, and Faculty Awareness

a) Departments should be encouraged to develop Indigenous-specific directions, supported by administrative structures, and awarded outside the usual competition-based resource allocation structure.

b) Craft job descriptions to appeal to BIPOC candidates, with the help of the EDI Specialist.

c) Specific guidance should be offered to departments re: the Indigenization of faculty, including advice and support to bridge between departmental priorities and broader institutional needs.

d) When hiring and moving towards Indigenization, it may be necessary to start with hiring an elder, building research partnerships and other preliminary steps as a precondition for a CRC type hire.

e) In hiring processes that seek Indigenous candidates, means beyond self-identification must be found.

Community Collaborations

1. Bishop’s should strengthen cooperation with, and understanding of, Abenaki and other Indigenous communities.

2. A standing committee to aid in these relationships, would be an invaluable resource to advise and help in understanding when reaching out to Indigenous communities and peoples.

3. Bishop’s should take note of other universities and institutions who have Indigenous centres that are working effectively.
Research

a) Researchers on Indigenous topics should have support in place that gives time to establish relationships, followed by collaboration and development.

b) A researcher should be hired, on a short-term basis, to review and share literature on Indigenous studies.

c) Support is needed for a shared ownership model of research findings, rather than one of “extractive” research, including discussions of who owns data gathered in partnership with communities.

d) The Business Office should offer alternative reimbursement methods for Indigenous contributors, including community members, elders, and chiefs.

e) In projects submitted to the Research Ethics Bureau (REB), an Indigenous person should be funded to offer comments if REB members are not fully versed in appropriate protocols. Research protocols of the communities being studied ought to supersede Bishop’s protocols.

4. PERSONS LIVING WITH DISABILITIES SUBGROUP

a) There should be professional representation (Student Services) at Senate for consultation in regard to the implication and impact of decisions on persons living with disabilities.

b) Clarification is necessary on the relationship between academic freedom and human rights, especially with regard to student accommodations (SAAS). A common understanding or working definition is needed.

c) All committees involving academic space, including allocation of offices, renovation and design of new and existing structures, and all other spatial decisions, should include consultation with and sensitivity to faculty, staff, and students living with disabilities.

5. STUDENT LIFE SUBGROUP

Financial Equity

a) Students who participate on the Task Force or other relevant committees, and who share their expertise derived from lived experiences, should be compensated with an honorarium.

b) Fair and adequate funding should be provided for all groups/clubs across campus allowing for further diversity.

c) The University website should be updated regularly with funds available to students/groups such as scholarships, funds for presenters, etc. There should be transparency with those funds and an annual accountability that includes a report with the following information: which funds are available, how many applicants, what funds were used and what impact it had.
Student Services and Recruitment

a) A cultural activity or discussion panel should be added to Open House events in order to attract a more diverse student body.

b) Community education is needed with regard to particular resources available to students, including, but not limited to, career counselling, the Ombudsperson, and chaplaincy. Students are less aware of these resources than they might be, and these resources clearly support EDI efforts. Therefore, we recommend that these groups are more actively supported in their attempts to build relationships and engage with students in multiple spaces. Where relevant, managers (supervisors) could consider building time and resources for this into staff mandates.

c) There seems to be disproportionate number of students who identify as visible minorities reporting discomfort participating in university services/activities. A lack of representation among the leaders of these activities is a major contributing factor. We recommend prioritizing ways to increase the representation of leaders in these activities.

d) We invite the Dean of Student Affairs to analyze relevant data (e.g., staffing, budget) and present what she anticipates is possible in concretely increasing the number of visible minorities hired in various positions across her mandate for the next three years, and report back to the Task Force.

6. CURRICULUM AND RESEARCH SUBGROUP

Course Design and Curriculum

a) All curriculum-related documents, including Senate Program Academic Review Committee documents, New Program and New Course Proposal documents, and the University’s Strategic Framework, should include EDI language, questions, and benchmarks.

b) An EDI focus and clear mission to improve the equity, diversity, and inclusivity of the institution should be weighed alongside RAM-score, adherence to mission, and survival of the department when allocating resources at the Senate Planning Committee level (with regard both to part-time credit allocations and to tenure-stream appointments).

c) All departments should require their students to take at least one three-credit course with specific EDI content, to be housed either in their own department or, if they are unable to offer a field-specific course, to free up three credits in their programs to allow students to fulfil this requirement in another department.

d) All departments and programs should work towards creating a plan (with the help of the aforementioned EDI Specialist) to diversify and decolonize their offerings, so as to embed inclusivity in all disciplines.
Research

a) Internal granting bodies (such as the Senate Research Committee) should include an EDI-related question in their application process, similar to that used by the CRC selection committee.

b) At least one to two SRC grants per year should be awarded to a proposal with strong EDI content.

c) All recipients of grants, internal and external, must complete mandatory training on unconscious bias in relation to research, labs, and fieldwork. This training should be offered by and housed in the Research Office.

7. Athletics Subgroup

a) Once an EDI Specialist is appointed, specific Athletics liaison should be established with a member of athletics staff.

b) If a standing committee on EDI is created, a member of Athletics staff should sit on the committee.

c) A student-led EDI initiative (ADRC committee right now dealing with Racialized/Visible Minority but could have larger scope) in order to ensure safe space for discussion on EDI issues specific to athletics is ongoing but needs to be maintained and supported.

d) A revision of all policies (Student-Athlete Code of Conduct, Coaches’ Code of Conduct) is necessary, to ensure inclusive language.

e) More data should be gathered on the composition of the student-athlete body (Our survey yielded 137 respondents out of approximately 300 student-athletes). The Athletics Subgroup’s survey questions are attached as Appendix G. The preliminary survey report is attached as Appendix H.

8. Recruitment and Retention Subgroup

Data Collection and Analysis

The lack of a strategy for quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis is a significant barrier for EDI advancement. For instance, the Registrar’s Office surveys the students’ applications for country of origin, gender and Indigenous status. Except for Indigenous status and gender, no additional useful observations can be inferred regarding the members of underrepresented groups. Thus this group recommends that the EDI Specialist be mandated to:

- Establish a common definition for the underrepresented groups.
- Collect self-identification data on underrepresented groups for all sectors (Students, Employees and Board members).
• Provide guidance on policy and legal ramifications of data collection and use.

Projected Image and Values

The University should present an accurate image of itself to the students, faculty and staff it hopes to recruit. We should not present ourselves as being more diverse than we are.

Nonetheless, if we are to be successful in recruiting people from diverse communities, we must present inclusive and welcoming messages and this includes the images we use. The iconography of the University includes significant references to the Anglican heritage of the University.

We should honour the history of the University but we should also recognize that we have been a public and secular institution since 1947. Thus, we recommend that the University consider developing new iconography, which is not religiously inspired.

Student Recruitment and Retention

Recruitment from non-diversified pools:

The student body of the University is geographically and linguistically diverse but it does not reflect the full diversity of Canada. The University should take steps to increase the number of students from underrepresented groups.

a) The Recruitment Office should be mandated to develop and implement a plan to increase the number of students from underrepresented groups. It should undertake a targeted outreach to attract students from underrepresented groups.

b) The Recruitment Office should have a diversified recruiting team. Ideally, the team should have an Indigenous recruiter responsible for recruiting Indigenous students; this recruiter should have knowledge of the necessary protocols for reaching out to and/or responding to invitations from Indigenous communities.

Academic Support and Student Services

The lack of staffing diversity, cultural competency and EDI training is a barrier for some students seeking counseling and support. Thus, we recommend:

a) An increase in diversity in Faculty and Staff hiring, while ensuring appropriate EDI training.

b) An investigation in ways to accommodate the specific academic needs of students from the under-represented groups. This might include, but not limited to, flexible timetable scheduling and on-line course offering.

c) An identification of trained key members of the community who can serve as mentors. In particular, the mentors would help guide the students through University life, provide frontline help and direct them to the available professional resources.
Faculty, Staff and Administrators

The current recruitment policies as per the Collective Agreements (CA), Senate regulations and the Statutes of Bishop’s University do not reflect the best EDI hiring practices. It is therefore necessary to engage a discussion with the concerned parties to remediate the situation. Thus, we recommend that the University:

a) Set diversity recruitment targets that align with regional, provincial and national equity group populations.

b) Develop guidelines for EDI principles and best practices and integrate them into regulations and policies at all levels, from recruitment to promotion.

c) Review the Collective Agreements from an EDI standpoint and strengthen the language where needed to consider best EDI practices.

Board of Governors

The composition of the Board of Governors is governed by the University’s Statutes, which provides for seven internal and ten external members (Div I, 1.2) and includes specific mention of three criteria:

- Gender balance (there should be no more than 60% women or men, and no less than 40% of each gender group) (Div III, 1.1).
- Alumni (at least four of the external governors must be graduates of the University) (Div I, 1.2.6)
- At least one external governor must be a member of one of the professional orders of accountants (Div I, 1.2.6).

According to the Statutes:

- The Governance and Ethics Committee is responsible for developing expertise and experience profiles to be used by the Nominating Committee when recruiting Board members (Div IV, 1.3.3).
- The Nominating Committee of the Board should consult with the Governance and Ethics Committee about potential Board composition (Div I, 2.3.3).

Thus, we recommend that the Nominating Committee of the Board and the Governance and Ethics Committee be mandated to prepare a proposal with respect to how to increase diversity on the Board of Governors.
VIII. TASK FORCE: NEXT STEPS

It is the opinion of the Task Force membership that our work has only just begun. A good deal of energy has been expended determining where and how to gather data most effectively. With limited time, not all of the data-gathering processes were able to be executed, nor was there adequate time for training sessions, an essential underpinning of effective work. At the same time, this group has a much better sense now than in September of what needs to happen next and, as a result, recommends that the group continue in a similar capacity.

In order to work most effectively, however, the Task Force recommends the following:

a) that the Task Force be supported by an external consultancy firm or participate in externally-led training on EDI (e.g. with a firm such as the Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion);

b) that the Task Force be empowered to modify its membership and composition as it sees fit throughout the course of the work, adding members by election, appointment, and invitation according to need (especially with regard to representation), without seeking lengthy approval processes by the Senate and the Board;

c) that the Task Force act as advisory body to the hiring process of the aforementioned EDI Specialist;

d) that, once the hiring of the aforementioned EDI Specialist occurs, the Task Force be modified to a permanent structure, with a more streamlined membership, to act as advisory body for ongoing processes and in the proposal and implementation of institutional planning, both short- and long-term;

e) that the membership of this advisory body be composed of elected or appointed members of the University community, with service periods of one year (or 18 months).

In addition to the hiring of an EDI Specialist, the Task Force sees the following tasks as priorities for next term:

a) the administration of a staff survey;

b) the administration of a faculty survey;

c) the drafting of an EDI statement for inclusion in University documentation and on the institutional website;

d) the implementation of training modules for Task Force members and interested community members, either on an ad hoc basis or in partnership with an external firm.