

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

You may complete sections individually by selecting them from the table of contents. At the end of each section, you will be redirected to this table of content to select another section to complete or to review. Alternatively, you may complete the full report, without going back to this table of content between each section, by selecting the option "Complete Full Report".

### Complete Full Report

#### Important Note

(Once you have read the statement below, click the radio button beside it.)

Please note that the information you enter in your report is only saved when clicking on the "Save and Next" button at the bottom of the page. Using the browser navigation buttons or the "Continue Later" button at the bottom of the page **will not save** the information entered on the page. If after clicking "Save and Next" you see a "Page has errors" message in red, near the top of the page, it means that at least one field is missing information. In such an instance, the empty field will have the words "Answer is incomplete" underneath it, in red.

This report includes mandatory reporting on 1) the CRCP institutional equity, diversity and inclusion action plan (IEDIAP) and 2) the \$50,000 EDI Stipend.

Your institution must submit the report by the deadline date indicated by the program, and must cover the reporting period identified by the program.

Institutions are required to post the most up to date version of their EDI action plan on their [public accountability web pages](#).

Each year, institutions must also publicly post a copy of this report to their public accountability web pages within 7 working days after the deadline for submitting the report to TIPS. TIPS will review the report each year; in addition, the annual report(s) will be provided to the external EDI Review Committee, when it is convened every few years, to evaluate the progress made in bolstering EDI at the respective institution and to provide context for future iterations of the EDI action plan.

All sections of the form are mandatory (unless otherwise noted).

#### Contact information

#### Please complete the fields below.

**Name of Institution:**

Brandon University

**Contact Name:**

Kerry Murkin

**Position Title:**

Manager of Research Services

**Institutional Email:**

murkink@brandonu.ca

**Institutional Telephone Number:**

204-727-7445

**The link for the EDI progress report and EDI Stipend report:**

<https://www.brandonu.ca/research/policies-programs/canada-research-chairs-program-at-brandon-university/canada-research-chairs-equity-diversity-and-inclusion/>

Does your institution have an EDI Action Plan for the CRCP?

Yes

**PART A: EDI Action Plan** - Reporting on Key Objectives Analyses, Systemic Barriers, Objectives and Indicators

Date of most recent plan (e.g. latest revision of the public plan):

03/01/2019

Rating given action plan in most recent review process:

n/a

Name of vice-president level representative responsible for ensuring the implementation of the plan:

Dr. Heather Duncan, Associate VP (Research)

In developing their action plans, institutions were required to conduct: 1) an employment systems review; 2) a comparative review; and 3) an environmental scan (see program requirements [here](#)). These assessments were required in order to identify the specific systemic barriers and/or challenges that are faced by underrepresented groups (e.g. women, persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples and racialized minorities at the respective institution; institutions were then required to develop key S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) objectives and actions to address them.

Indicate what your institution's key EDI objectives are (up to six) as outlined in the most recent version of your action plan (either the one approved by TIPS or the one current under review by TIPS), as well as the systemic barriers/challenges identified that these objectives must address. Please note that objectives should be S.M.A.R.T. and include a measurement strategy. List the corresponding actions and indicators (as indicated in your institutional EDI action plan) for each objective, and outline: a) what progress has been made during the reporting period; b) what actions were undertaken; c) the data gathered; and d) indicators used to assess the outcomes and impacts of the actions. Please note that indicators can be both quantitative and qualitative and should be specific. Outline next steps and use the contextual information box to provide any additional information (e.g. course correction, obstacles, lessons learned, etc.) for each objective.

**Key Objective 1**

Brief description of S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) Key Objective 1:

Collection of Employee Self-Identification (SELF-ID) Data and Comprehensive Workforce Analysis A campus-wide communication plan was implemented to encourage existing faculty and staff to complete the Employment Equity Self-Identification (Self-ID) questionnaire, with a goal to have a minimum 80% response rate. The institution also mapped all of the University's employment positions to the National Occupation Classification (NOC) Codes, in order for an accurate and appropriate workforce analysis to be conducted and gaps in representation identified. The University ensured the Self-ID form was collected from all existing Chairholders.

**Systemic barriers -**

Please provide a high-level description of the systemic barriers (e.g. summarize what the barriers are and how they were identified):

NOC information had never been collected by the institution which created challenges to assessing and addressing under-representation and gaps in employment areas.

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

In May 2021, Brandon University began a trial run to send out Self-ID forms to all applicants in a postdoctoral fellow position. The University will move to collect Self-ID data from all applicants for University positions following the completion and analysis of the postdoctoral trial run. Using data provided by Brandon University, all employees were assigned a four digit NOC code based on broad occupational category, skill type, skill level, and minor/major group association. Each employee was reviewed individually using the Government of Canada's 2016 NOC system. This process took into consideration the job title, position description, location description, union description, and general understanding of roles and responsibilities within a post-secondary institution to appropriately assign the NOC of best fit. Based on the NOC, faculty and staff positions at Brandon University were grouped into one of the 14 Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOGs). Detailed reports based on the Four Designated Groups were generated to highlight representation across EEOGs and NOCs and determine the internal representation percentage.

**Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative:**

Self-ID information gathered from all BU Employees increased from 20% to 51%, with 6% of those choosing not to provide equity data. Self-ID data were also requested from all Chairholders who had not yet submitted. Faculty and staff positions at the University of Brandon have been grouped into 14 EEOGs and compared to corresponding external workforce data drawn from the 2016 Census. Based on results, we have identified that 88% of Faculty and Staff are primarily concentrated within professional and administrative EEOGs. Professional and administrative functions typically require incumbents to have relevant college or university education and experience working within a similar professional environment, which may present barriers to recruiting members of Designated Groups. Reviewing statistics from Canadian University comparators, Brandon University leads almost all comparators in representation for Women but representation of the other three Designated Groups lags behind. Brandon University's lower response rate on the SELF-ID survey may be the primary reason for significant gaps in representation for individuals that identify as Indigenous, Visible Minority, and living with a Disability. Seeking to increase overall participation rates may have a positive impact on representation of the Four Designated Groups within the workforce analysis.

**Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period:**

The institution was not requesting Self-ID information from all employment positions of the University, such as student hires and postdoctoral fellows. That is currently being remedied. Designated groups comparison and analysis to 12 other Canadian Universities revealed several themes: Indigenous representation is the second highest in the comparator group; Brandon University lags other Canadian Universities in staff identifying as a member of a Visible Minority or as Persons with a Disability; Brandon University's representation of staff that identify as Women is approximately the median of the range within the comparator group.

**Challenges encountered during the reporting period:**

Progress, in terms of Self-ID form completion was not as high as projected but the completion rate more than doubled, which is a positive outcome. We will continue to work towards increasing the completion rate.

**Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):**

Brandon University plans to provide the Self-ID forms to student research assistants in the near future. We have also started to revise internal CRC procedures that will incorporate a process for requesting Self-ID forms from all CRC applicants. This will be in place before our next call for applications, likely for 2022. The designated group of People with Disabilities and what is included in the definition is not well-known by employees. The University will be looking into a communication that addresses this concern and will allow for employees to update their information. The results of the workforce analysis guided Brandon University in the next steps of the employment systems review, with a focus on: understanding the facilitators and barriers within Brandon University for Indigenous Peoples, Members of Visible Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities; reviewing the facilitators and barriers for Women entering non-professional and clerical roles; identifying barriers to advancement for all EEOGs; identifying barriers to Self-ID status relating to EEOGs and generating a strategy to increase response rates. Detailed NOC/EEOG information will enable Brandon University to manage data moving forward by providing the structured data that can be continually updated for future reports. Brandon University has joined the 50-30 Challenge under the Government of Canada in an effort to decrease gaps in representation. The 50-30 Challenge acts as a framework to accelerate diversity actions already taking place in many Canadian organizations and to encourage other Canadian organizations in adopting practices to improve equity.

**Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?**

Yes

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective:

74001

If an amount was entered in the previous question, indicate specifically what the funds were spent on.

A consultant was hired to conduct the NOC/EEOG identification and analysis. The total amount paid to the consultant was \$74,001 for a number of deliverables. Key objectives were not specifically priced out at time of payment.

**EDI Stipend Impact Rating**

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this key objective:

Extensive impact (the EDI Stipend had an extensive impact on achieving progress)

**Indicate in the table below any leveraged cash or in-kind contributions provided by the institution**

Leveraged cash or in-kind contributions from your institution (if applicable):

	Amount \$	Source / Type (cash or in-kind)
1	24001	cash
2	0	n/a

**Do you have other key objectives to add?**

Yes

## Key Objective 2

Brief description of S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) Key Objective 2:

In-Depth Brandon University Employment Systems Review The employment systems review included a three-pronged approach comprised of surveys, focus groups, and policy and procedure analysis. The desired outcomes included identifying gaps in representation throughout the institution and barriers to success of employees for research funding opportunities, application for tenure and promotion, and through barriers found within policies and procedures.

### Systemic barriers -

Please provide a high-level description of the systemic barriers (e.g. summarize what the barriers are and how they were identified):

The survey of all Brandon University employees identified common barriers that informed the focus group topics, including: • Perspectives on Accommodations in the Workplace: Barriers, Stigmas, and Opportunities; • Diversity and Inclusion in Academia and Research; • Perceptions and Experiences with Harassment and Discrimination; • Recognition, Career Advancement, and Influencing Leadership; and • Building an inclusive and Diverse Workplace.

### Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

The survey generated insight into barriers to full participation and success that faculty and staff experienced in the workplace. As a neutral third party, the HR Consultant provided a safe and confidential space for employees to share feedback and experiences and all information collected was reported in aggregate format. The employment systems review examined formal and informal policies and practices of Brandon University and how they impact the workplace experience and careers of Woman, Indigenous Peoples, People of Visible Minorities, and People with Disabilities. Additionally, the employment systems review sought insight into prevalent attitudes, workplace cultures, and norms that support or present barriers to the full participation and success of all faculty and staff.

### Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative:

Survey: 176 survey responses were received from University employees for an approximate response rate of 42%. Representation was received from each area of the University and respondents were clustered within three areas of the University: academic faculty, administration, and library/IT services. Academic faculty were highly represented at 56% of respondents, followed by administration at 14%, Library/IT Services at 8.5%, and 1-4% for all other areas. Focus Groups: Following the survey, the consultant conducted campus-wide focus groups on five key subjects arising from the survey data collected. The following themes were consistent across all discussion topics and can be viewed as central barriers to EDI perceived by faculty and staff participating in the facilitated discussions. In addition to themes, the University identified whether or not the feedback was related to a policy, practice, or workplace culture. A summary of key areas outline the primary contributing factors to address: • Women in faculty and staff roles at all levels expressed feeling marginalized and unheard when attempting to express ideas or challenges with colleagues, leaders, and senior leadership. Several examples were provided where women had to engage male colleagues to present their ideas for them in order for those ideas to be recognized. These concerns are experienced within overall culture and workplace attitudes towards women and are sustained by conscious and/or unconscious bias. • Ageism was identified in nearly all discussions as a prominent concern for faculty. Younger faculty members expressed that they experience pressure to take on heavy workloads and take on responsibilities that belong to other faculty members. Younger faculty members shared they often feel dismissed or treated as less competent. These challenges may be impacted by long-standing practices within their faculty and factors within workplace culture and attitudes. • Faculty and staff cited challenges with navigating microaggressions and expressed desire for stronger policy or strategies to address microaggressions in the workplace. These concerns are impacted by factors relating to overall awareness, training, or gaps in current policy and factors relating to workplace culture that either sustain or fail to adequately address negative behaviors. • Faculty and staff generally seem to have low knowledge or awareness of policies and processes relating to EDI, specifically: harassment, discrimination, and accommodation. Factors relating to communication, training, and implementation of workplace policies and practices that facilitate awareness and compliance and the implementation of those practices are likely contributing to low awareness of policies. • Faculty and staff consistently identified a desire for EDI training to improve knowledge and skills at all levels. A common perception among faculty and staff was that individuals that needed training the most, were the least likely to attend voluntary training. Workplace culture and long-standing practices that prevent all faculty and staff from attending training and development opportunities are the main contributing factors. • Too many of the same individuals are relied upon to participate in committees or provide feedback. • Faculty and staff have low awareness and understanding of policies. Policies are Review and Analysis of Campus-Wide Policies and Procedures: Gaps in promotion and tenure were identified for those from designated or equity seeking groups. Gaps were identified in individuals working at Brandon University for all yearly benchmarks (i.e., 0-2 years, 2-5 years, and 5-10 years) for those in equity seeking groups. A summary with recommendations to be followed-up on with an anticipated start date of July 2021.

### Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period:

The major part of the employment systems review was conducted by the consultants hired via the EDI Stipend.

### Challenges encountered during the reporting period:

The focus groups had lower than anticipated participation.

### Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):

Development of new and revision of existing policies and procedures, ongoing over the next few years.

### Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

Yes

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective:

50000

If an amount was entered in the previous question, indicate specifically what the funds were spent on.

This objective was part of the EDI Consultant Contract. Total amount of the contract was \$74,002.

### EDI Stipend Impact Rating

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this key objective:

Extensive impact (the EDI Stipend had an extensive impact on achieving progress)

### Indicate in the table below any leveraged cash or in-kind contributions provided by the institution

Leveraged cash or in-kind contributions from your institution (if applicable):

	Amount \$	Source / Type (cash or in-kind)
1	24001	cash
2	0	n/a

### Key Objective 3

Brief description of S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) Key Objective 3:

EDI Training and Education Develop training and workshops focused on how to factor EDI into institutional decision making processes and to address bias and unconscious bias. Training for new and existing employees. Training will help ensure that employees are educated in EDI matters which will directly and indirectly impact the BU workforce representation and overall success of the institution in meeting its diversity targets.

### Systemic barriers -

Please provide a high-level description of the systemic barriers (e.g. summarize what the barriers are and how they were identified):

Employee participation in EDI training needs to increase and be ongoing. Access to sessions and workshops needs to increase through availability, frequency, and variety. Employees may need encouragement and time to attend training sessions.

### Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

EDI training is provided three times a year in Unconscious Bias Training interactive sessions and the institution is currently developing recorded sessions for onboarding employees to review before the interactive session. The session is mandatory part of the onboarding process at Brandon University. All new employees have the opportunity to fill out the Self-ID during onboarding as well, which the majority of employees complete. Unconscious Bias Training is mandatory for all CRC Selection Committee members and the Equity Officer (Diversity and Human Rights Officer) presents and trains all Committee members in good EDI and recruitment policies and procedures. The Diversity and Human Right Officer is also a non-voting ex-officio member of the Committee, who ensures a fair and transparent process during recruitment and answers questions and provides guidance when needed. Disability, accessibility, and accommodations training is provided annually (Ableism Training via external facilitator) and the Sexuality Education Resource Center with Queer Support Services Network offer training and days of visibility annually. Training given for onboarding that explains the importance of the self-id information. This is also articulated to all selection committees through Human Resources. Information clearly on website. Yearly requests for updated Self-ID forms requested to ensure all members are given the opportunity to declare.

### Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative:

Approximately 64% of Brandon University Faculty Association Members have taken EDI training and 100% of all new employees completed EDI training. 100% of research adjudication committees are required to have unconscious bias training. Self-ID information and questionnaire is on the Brandon University Human Resources website.

### Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period:

HR will keep track of individuals required and recommended to take the EDI training, as well as maintain a record of participation and completion. Training will be open to all.

### Challenges encountered during the reporting period:

Increasing employee participation in EDI training is always a challenge due to a variety of circumstances.

### Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):

A train-the-trainer session will be developed and provided by the HR Consultant so institution can move forward with training employees at Brandon University. The Consultant will also be providing training resources, estimated timeline June 2021.

### Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

Yes

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective:

50000

If an amount was entered in the previous question, indicate specifically what the funds were spent on.

This objective was part of the EDI Consultant Contract. Total amount of the contract was \$74,002.

#### **EDI Stipend Impact Rating**

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this key objective:

Moderate impact (the EDI Stipend had moderate impact on achieving progress)

### **Key Objective 4**

Brief description of S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) Key Objective 4:

Management of the Brandon University Canada Research Allocation Efforts to strengthen the management and administration of the institutional CRC allocation processes are ongoing. This includes the review and revision of existing policies and procedures at Brandon University to ensure compliance with both institutional and CRC Program guidelines, particularly regarding EDI.

#### **Systemic barriers -**

Please provide a high-level description of the systemic barriers (e.g. summarize what the barriers are and how they were identified):

EDI was not addressed in the previous institutional Strategic Research Plan (SRP) which became apparent with the onset of the CRCP EDI requirements. The lack of inclusion added to systemic barriers towards EDI considerations in institutional research goals and objectives.

Corresponding actions undertaken to address the barriers:

Review of the previous Brandon University SRP, CRCP and Tri-Agency guidelines, and institution-wide consultations identified gaps in the and reinforced the importance of including EDI in the new SRP.

Data gathered and Indicator(s) - can be both qualitative and quantitative:

Feedback from SRP consultations, review of various Canadian university SRPs, and current guidelines informed the development of the institutional strategic research plan, CRCP research processes, moving forward.

Progress and/or Outcomes and Impacts made during the reporting period:

The new Brandon University Strategic Research Plan (2021-2025) included five Research Principles. Each principle addresses EDI directly or indirectly: 1. Research Excellence 2. Indigenous Perspectives and Truth and Reconciliation 3. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion 4. Responsible Conduct of Research 5. Transparency and Impact The University CRC EDI public accountability webpage was updated to reflect CRCP and institutional updates.

Challenges encountered during the reporting period:

The revision and creation of CRCP EDI policies and procedures are not solely a research matter. The entire institution needs to be engaged and supportive of EDI and changes must be made for the entire institution. Brandon University is very supportive of EDI initiatives and recognizes that for some areas, the institution is in the beginning stages, which takes time and consultation.

Next Steps (indicate specific dates/timelines):

The institutional administrative CRC policies and procedures document is under review and revision, and is expected to be ready for implementation in fall 2021. It will form a major part of the planned University CRC Manual, a document that will include all associated CRC information.

Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

No

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

### **Key Objective 5**

Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

No

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

### Key Objective 6

Was funding from the CRCP EDI stipend used for this key objective?

No

If the answer to the previous question was 'yes', indicate how much of the funding was spent on this key objective and specifically what the funds were spent on.

### Challenges and Opportunities

Other than what has been outlined in the section above, outline any challenges and opportunities or successes regarding the implementation of the EDI action plan, as well as best practices that have been discovered to date. If COVID-19 has had an impact on the implementation of the institution's action plan, please outline how below. How has or will the institution address these challenges and opportunities? (limit: 5100 characters):

Challenges The COVID-19 Pandemic has been a challenge for Brandon University and we understand this is not a unique situation across all Canadian institutions. While the time and effort needed to conduct normal institutional business has increased, the CRCP EDI Action Plan remains a priority and has made reasonable progress. In terms of the Action Plan, small institutions have the same expectations from the CRCP as larger institutions, which is fair in terms of the goals and objectives to be accomplished but not as equitable when timelines and capacity are taken into consideration. Small institutions are given the same tasks with less people and resources than larger institutions and the same time frame and deadlines are expected. This comes at a great expense to small institutions and the individuals responsible. Opportunities The Human Resources Consultant hired with the CRCP EDI Stipend was invaluable to Brandon University. The time and person-power allotted allowed the institution to conduct an in-depth analysis of current practices and undertake the research required to determine where we are at with EDI and where we need to go.

### Reporting on EDI Stipend objectives not accounted for in Part A

#### Instructions:

- Institutions with EDI Action Plans, use this section to report on EDI Stipend objectives that are not accounted for in Section A.
- Institutions without EDI Action Plans, use this section to report on EDI Stipend objectives.

#### Objectives associated with your institution's EDI Stipend application

**Table C1.** Provide information on the objectives associated with your institution's EDI Stipend application, including the funding and timelines, for the reporting period.

#### EDI Stipend Objective 1

Indicate the S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) objective(s) towards which this funding has been directed:

The CRC EDI Stipend covered the major portion of the cost of a Human Resources Consultant hired to undertake an in-depth workforce analysis, employment systems review, and provide training resources.

Indicator(s): Describe indicators, as presented in the EDI Stipend application, and how they are calculated.

Covered in Action Plan section.

Progress: Describe results observed, including indicator results, outcomes, impacts. Include timelines (start and end dates).

Covered in Action Plan section.

Outline the total expenditures below:

Total funds of EDI stipend spent on the objective:	50000
Institutional commitment (if applicable):	24001
Total funds spent:	

Indicate in the table below any leveraged cash or in-kind contributions provided by your institution:

	Amount \$	Source / Type (cash or in-kind)
1	24001	cash
2	0	n/a

**Table C2. EDI Stipend Impact Rating**

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this objective as identified in your application, for the reporting period:

Extensive impact (the EDI Stipend had an extensive impact on achieving progress)

Provide a high level summary of how the stipend was used:

Covered in Action Plan section.

Do you have other objectives to add?

No

**Additional Objectives (if applicable)**

**Table C1.** Provide information on the objectives associated with your institution's EDI Stipend application, including the funding and timelines, for the reporting period.

**EDI Stipend Objective 2**

Indicate the S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) objective(s) towards which this funding has been directed:

d

Indicator(s): Describe indicators, as presented in the EDI Stipend application, and how they are calculated.

d

Progress: Describe results observed, including indicator results, outcomes, impacts. Include timelines (start and end dates).

d

Outline the total expenditures below:

Total funds of EDI stipend spent on the objective:	50000
Institutional commitment (if applicable):	24001
Total funds spent:	

Indicate in the table below any leveraged cash or in-kind contributions provided by your institution:

	Amount \$	Source / Type (cash or in-kind)
1	24001	cash
2	0	n/a

**Table C2. EDI Stipend Impact Rating**

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this objective as identified in your application, for the reporting period:

Major impact (the EDI Stipend had a major impact on achieving progress)

Provide a high level summary of how the stipend was used:

d

**EDI Stipend Objective 3**

Indicate the S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, aligned with the wanted outcome, realistic and timely) objective(s) towards which this funding has been directed:

Develop and Provide EDI Training Tools and Workshops - Develop training and workshops focused on how to factor EDI into decision making processes, and address bias and unconscious bias. A train-the-trainer session will be provided by the EDI/HR consultant so the institution can move forward with training employees at Brandon University.

Indicator(s): Describe indicators, as presented in the EDI Stipend application, and how they are calculated.

d

Progress: Describe results observed, including indicator results, outcomes, impacts. Include timelines (start and end dates).

d

Outline the total expenditures below:

Total funds of EDI stipend spent on the objective:	50000
Institutional commitment (if applicable):	24001
Total funds spent:	

Indicate in the table below any leveraged cash or in-kind contributions provided by your institution:

	Amount \$	Source / Type (cash or in-kind)
1	24001	cash
2	0	n/a

**Table C2. EDI Stipend Impact Rating**

Please rate the extent of the impact the EDI Stipend has had on your institution in meeting this objective as identified in your application, for the reporting period:

Major impact (the EDI Stipend had a major impact on achieving progress)

Provide a high level summary of how the stipend was used:

d

**EDI Stipend Objective 4**

**EDI Stipend Objective 5**

**EDI Stipend Objective 6**

#### Part D: Engagement with individuals from underrepresented groups

Outline how the institution has engaged with underrepresented groups: e.g. racialized minorities, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, women, LGBTQ2+ individuals, during the implementation of the action plan (during the reporting period), including how they have been involved in identifying and implementing any course corrections/adjustments, if applicable. For example, how was feedback gathered on whether the measures being implemented are resulting in a more inclusive research environment for chairholders of underrepresented groups? How has intersectionality been considered in developing and implementing the plan (if applicable)? Have new gaps been identified? How will members of underrepresented groups continue to be engaged? (limit: 10 200 characters)

Underrepresented groups at Brandon University were engaged through surveys and facilitated discussions. Surveys were developed based on the experiences of individuals within the Four Designated Groups within post-secondary institutions and gap analysis from the workforce analysis. The survey provided members of underrepresented groups an opportunity to share barriers, both experienced and perceived, regarding their success in research, work, and over their careers. Facilitated discussions were held with Chairholders, faculty, and staff to discuss experiences of under-representation, where gaps of challenges were identified within the workforce analysis and surveys. The goal of the discussions was to understand, from the perspective of the employee, the day-to-day and career barriers experienced by members of underrepresented groups. Invitations to participate were sent to all faculty and staff at Brandon University, with the expressed goal of understanding the experiences of members of underrepresented groups to develop strategies to reduce barriers. Invitations were also sent from the Diversity and Human Rights Advisor to encourage participation from members of underrepresented groups. Participants at both the survey and focus group stage were invited to contact the Consultant directly to ensure a higher level of privacy and confidentiality. Results of the in-depth workforce analysis, surveys, and facilitated discussions informed a series of recommendations that support corrective actions or adjustments to reduce barriers in the workplace. Recommendations fell within two key themes: 1. EDI culture and practices and 2. conflict management (based on major themes that occurred during the engagement process). The recommendations addressed actions to be taken at the senior leadership level and within the institution's strategic plans, actions, policies and processes, and at an individual employee levels.

#### PART E: Efforts to Address Systemic Barriers More Broadly within the Institution

Briefly outline other EDI initiatives underway at the institution (that are broader than those tied to the CRCP) that are expected to address systemic barriers and foster an equitable, diverse and inclusive research environment. For example, are there projects underway that underscore the importance of EDI to research excellence? Is there additional training being offered to the faculty at large? Are there initiatives to improve the campus climate? Please provide hyperlinks where possible. Note that collecting this information from institutions is a requirement of the 2019 Addendum to the 2006 Canadian Human Rights Settlement Agreement and provides context for the work the institution is doing in addressing barriers for the CRCP. (limit: 4080 characters)

BU has many initiatives underway. Already mentioned is the 50-30 challenge to have 50% gender diversity and 30% racial diversity. We are also working on an Accommodations Policy for those with a disability and returning to work post-COVID-19 protocols. Brandon University is committed to ensuring that all employees feel safe and secure in the workplace and recognize that this may be a greater challenge for those who have a visible or not-visible disability. The institution is currently looking into removing the medical document requirement to move to a justice and cultural perspective rather than a legal and medical one. Brandon University is working on recommendations from the National Dialogues and action on Anti-Black Racism and Black Inclusion, spearheaded from the University of Toronto. We are forming a Presidents task Force against Racism, and a Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee. The institution is also implementing Black Lives Matter Murals, wraps, and messaging to promote visibility, kindness, understanding, and love. Brandon University believes in social justice and participated in three Black Lives Matter marches in the wake of Georgy Floyd's murder by police violence. We participate in the Transgender Day of Visibility and have implemented a platform for safety and security for the entire University community called the REES platform, and especially to provide safety and security to women and LGBTQ2S+. The initiative also included bystander training. REES stands for respect, educate, empower survivors; an interactive platform with sexual assault reporting and third party reporting available to protect the survivors identity. The University started Community Outreach and has used Unconscious Bias Training as a starting point. The presentation was given to Brandon Realtors and included attendance from the entire Westman area. Brandon University and partners began a series of four Community Voices Celebrations in partnership with Brandon Local Immigration Partnership, Westman Immigrant Services, and Brandon Friendship Centre. This local forum explored the topics of inclusivity, belonging, and anti-racism in Brandon. The report is expected in June 2021. The Brandon University Employment Equity Working Group consists of faculty from all departments in the University to address inequities that may be presented through work in the Collective Agreement for the Brandon University Faculty Association. The Group facilitates education and visibility through training sessions on various topics. The first session, for example, focused on ableism and other sessions focused on other equity-deserving groups such as Women, Indigenous Peoples, Visible Minority and 2SLGBTQIA+.

**Before submitting your report, please ensure that your responses are complete. You will not be able to edit the information after it is submitted.**

I have reviewed my responses and I am ready to submit my report.

A reminder that institutions are required to post a copy of this report (as submitted) on their public accountability and transparency web pages within 7 working days of the deadline for submitting the report to TIPS.

**This information will be sent to the Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat when you click 'Submit.'**

Jointly administered by:

