



**Dean’s Follow-up to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Equity**

October 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of Faculty Council

Dear fellow Faculty Council members;

At the last meeting of Faculty Council, I had committed to provide a follow-up to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Equity, which had then been tabled. I had struck this ad hoc committee in the Fall of 2015 to examine our faculty complement and practices and to assess whether we as a Faculty are doing enough to remedy historical gender and racial imbalances in the faculty ranks.

After its consultations and reflection, the Committee, in its report, produced a number of thoughtful recommendations clustered into three categories: short term improvements to the Faculty’s diversity, medium/long term policy changes, and strategies for change. I will respond to the recommendations using the same typology.

**I. Short Term: The Changing Gender & Diversity Profile of the Daniels Faculty**

**Table 1: Faculty Complement by Gender, Longitudinal Trends**

		2008-09	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15	2016-17
Core - Continuing	Male FTEs	14.65	12.50	11.90	14.90	16.00
	Female FTEs	5.50	7.50	7.50	12.50	12.50
	Female %	<b>27%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>44%</b>
Core - Contractual	Male FTEs	6.56	7.39	9.21	15.74	17.31
	Female FTEs	1.48	2.18	1.94	4.15	7.52
	Female %	<b>18%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>30%</b>
Adjuncts & Sessionals	Male HC	48	34	36	32	34
	Female HC	27	15	17	21	19
	Female %	<b>36%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>36%</b>

The Core Faculty’s gender balance has been steadily improving, with women’s share of the complement up from 8% of continuing faculty twelve years ago to 27% eight years ago to 44% today. Similar improvements are noted with contractual (ie, CLTA and part-time) core faculty. With adjuncts and sessionals, however, the proportion of women has been remained at around 36% over the past eight years. This is in part because as several female instructors were hired as sessionals, and then, on the basis of their teaching strengths, were promoted to core faculty.

Just since last year, the Faculty has hired three full-time continuing faculty members, one of whom is a women with the other two from racialized groups. The Faculty also hired two full-

time contractual faculty members (excluding a visiting professorship), both of whom are women.

**Table 2: Faculty Complement by Race, Longitudinal Trends**

		2008-09	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15	2016-17
Core - Continuing	White FTEs	16.65	14.50	13.90	21.90	22.00
	Minority FTEs	3.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	6.50
	Minority %	17%	28%	28%	20%	23%
Core - Contractual	White FTEs	7.54	8.83	10.41	16.84	20.33
	Minority FTEs	0.50	0.74	0.74	3.05	4.50
	Minority %	6%	8%	7%	15%	18%
Core - Total	White FTEs	24.19	23.33	24.31	38.74	42.33
	Minority FTEs	4.00	6.24	6.24	8.55	11.00
	Minority %	14%	21%	20%	18%	21%

In terms of race and racialized groups, we do not have any data on adjunct and sessional faculty, although we note that the University is now collecting this information starting this year, which will eventually allow us to build trend data. For core faculty, minority individuals have increased in numbers, but mostly kept pace with the overall growth in the faculty complement (Table 2).

**Table 3: M.Arch, MLA and MUD Studio & Thesis Instructors, by Gender**

		2015-16		2016-17				2015-16		2016-17								
M.Arch	Studio 1	Male HC	2	3	LAN	Studio 1	Male HC	0	0	URD	Studio	Male HC	1	1				
		Female HC	3	3			Female HC	1	1			Female HC	0	0				
	Studio 2	Male HC	5	4		Studio 2	Male HC	0	0		Studio Options	Male HC	2	0	Thesis	Male HC	4	5
		Female HC	0	2			Female HC	2	1			Female HC	0	2		Female HC	6	4
	Studio 3	Male HC	4	4		Studio 3	Male HC	2	2		Thesis	Male HC	2	2	Thesis	Male HC	2	2
		Female HC	1	2			Female HC	0	1			Female HC	0	0		Female HC	0	0
	Studio 4	Male HC	3	2		Studio 4	Male HC	2	1		Total	Male HC	49.5	46	* VS Studios are not included because they are delivered by the VS faculty as a collective.			
		Female HC	2	3			Female HC	0	0			Female HC	16.5	24				
	Studio 5	Male HC	4.5	2.5		Studio Options	Male HC	2	0		Female %	25%	34%					
		Female HC	0.5	0.5			Female HC	0	2									
	Studio 6	Male HC	9	5		Thesis	Male HC	4	5									
		Female HC	0	2			Female HC	6	4									
	Thesis Prep	Male HC		5		Studio	Male HC	1	1									
		Female HC		2			Female HC	0	0									
Studio 7	Male HC	8	8	Studio Options	Male HC	1	1.5											
	Female HC	1	0		Female HC	0	0.5											
Thesis	Female HC	1	0	Thesis	Male HC	2	2											
				Female HC	0	0												

Studio and thesis instruction (Table 3) is more gender imbalanced than the overall faculty complement, but has improved this year compared to last year.

**Table 4: Fall & Winter Ext. Reviewers by Headcount**

	2014-15	2015-16		
Male HC	101	78		
Female HC	51	56		
Female %	34%	42%		

The Faculty has also improved the gender balance of external reviewers (Table 4) during the last two years for which we have complete data.

**Table 5: Public Programming (ie, non-credit) Speakers by Headcount**

	Winter		Winter	
	Fall 2015	2016	Fall 2016	2017
Male HC	13	17	9	6
Female HC	9	27	6	4
Female %	41%	61%	40%	40%
* For 2016-17 there will be fewer, but larger events.				
2016-17 figures do not include Mid-day Lectures.				

The data on Public Programming (Table 5), which includes all of the Faculty’s non-credit symposia, lectures series and speakers’ series, shows that except for an anomalous semester in Winter 2016, the gender mix has been stable, with women representing approximately 40% of speakers.

Overall, the charts above portray a Faculty that is growing more diverse. What policies, if any, might we consider to sustain this trend?

## II. Policy Recommendations & Decanal Responses

1. *Develop an advance list of staffing needs at all levels of appointment including sessional, contract and tenure-stream faculty members and a plan for searches over the next five years.*

This is not a diversity issue, per se, but one of how the search for, appointments and reappointment of faculty occurs. There is an assumption in this recommendation that faculty planning does not occur- it does. Within the faculty hiring needs and succession planning is done by the Associate Deans, Program Directors, and faculty leading subject areas and themes, all in consultation with the Dean. Our hiring plans put a priority on ongoing/continuing ‘core’ appointments, as sessional and part time appointments allow for more (needed) flexibility, and adjustments over time. Core appointments are made

in accordance with our academic needs, and balance our goals in teaching and research.

As part of the budgeting process, each year the number of current 'Full Time Equivalent' faculty are calculated, and needs are projected into the future, including how many new FTE's might be needed and possible to approve and fund. Both the number and kind of new positions requested must be reviewed and approved by the Provost. Following this, each time a specific new search is proposed, the logic for the search, including any disciplinary specialization, and the rank and stream (teaching or research) must be articulated in writing, vetted internally at the Faculty, and then by several areas of the Provost's Office. By the time any position has been advertised, it has been reviewed many times, by many people. Again, any faculty search is subject to laws ensuring equity, and requiring us be very attentive to issues of diversity.

*2. Ensure that hiring practices for appointments at all levels incorporate awareness of the need for diversity.*

In all of its hiring practices, our Faculty, on its own, and as part of the University of Toronto is required to follow University, provincial and federally mandated laws, policies, procedures that are dedicated to equity, equal treatment, and the promotion of a diverse society. Note that many of these policies are legally binding, and require reporting (both narrative and statistical) on our part, for example, as part of any search. We are not entirely free to enact processes and procedures for hiring in an ad hoc manner.

*3. Establish a committee process for renewable contract appointments and contractually limited term appointments.*

A University mandated process and committee for renewing contract appointment is in place, and has been for five years. Contractually limited term appointments require an international search, with a Faculty committee, and a Provostial observer, and must follow the processes, laws and policies alluded to above.

*4. Ensure that leadership positions are filled by people of diverse backgrounds. For instance, we recommend that our new undergraduate program director should be a tenure-stream diversity and equity hire.*

The undergraduate program director is part of a new generation of academic leaders who are contributing to the Faculty's diversity. This faculty position required a search, and the results have been announced.

*5. Establish a standing Faculty committee on diversity and equity with representation from the*

*student body and the University's offices for Diversity and Equity.*

Agreed. As a two-year pilot project, I propose to extend the term of the Ad Hoc Committee on Gender & Diversity, to develop ways and means to continue advancing our approaches and commitment to diversity. We will update the committee's terms of reference to add student seats to this committee, nominated by the student associations. If, after this two year pilot, the committee can provide sustained, value-added advice, we will review the committee's structure, membership and terms of reference and, in collaboration with Faculty Council's Executive Committee, explore whether this committee should become a permanent committee of Faculty Council.

[Post-script: At its Oct. 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, Faculty Council decided to establish a standing diversity and equity committee through a by-law amendment, to be presented to Council for final approval as soon as the approvals process allows.]

*6. Survey students, faculty members and staff about their experience related to equity and diversity.*

Agreed. We will need to establish a proper protocol and procedures for undertaking such a survey. I have asked the office of the registrar to develop a process by the end of the 2016-17 academic year.

### **III. Strategies for Change**

*1. Appointing more diverse practitioners, including women and landscape architects, to the Gehry International Chair*

Sharon Johnston-Lee, a prominent practitioner, has been co-appointed to this year's Gehry Chair. Several other prominent women practitioners have been approached to consider the chair in upcoming years.

*2. Re-examining the requirement that thesis instruction and preparation are done only by core faculty members.*

We must separate the issue of any temporary or ongoing lack of diversity in aspects of the core faculty, from questions of pedagogy and curriculum. The organization, and faculty assignments to thesis advising is a pedagogical issue to be reviewed and considered by those leading and teaching in the professional programs. The requirement that those advising theses at the Master's level be core faculty, appointed to the School of Graduate Studies is a University of Toronto-wide policy. We can review 'bending' the policy, but the principle behind the policy is not without merit.

*3. Establishing diversity guidelines for guest critics at final reviews and issuing invitations well in advance of the date.*

Great improvements were made for the most recent, spring 2016 reviews. Yet, the assumption should not be that efforts and even percent-based goals for gender and other forms of diversity at our juries were not in place prior to this year, and the recommendations of this report. The organization of final juries, and the invitations to external critics are not controlled by one individual, but depend on the time, and effort, conscientiousness of many individual members of the faculty. With regard to schedule, final review dates are established at the outset of each semester, and leadership and faculty have been encouraged to begin the invitation process as early as possible. If we wish to change this process, to ensure across-the-board compliance to a certain diversity standard, this will require a longer and more considered discussion and deliberation at the Faculty.

*4. Expanding the range of student interaction with post-doctoral fellows.*

This is not a diversity issue, as such.

*5. Increasing the diversity of content in courses and public programs to address non-Western and Aboriginal cultures and the global south.*

We will report on the approach to diversity in our Curriculum and Public Programming once this year's courses and public programming is fully finalized. Other progress in these areas is being made in our undergraduate and graduate curricula and can be reported in more detail.

*6. Developing instructional offerings that engage students with design firms currently at work on University of Toronto projects.*

This is not a diversity issue, as such.

*7. Developing intensive courses that bring leading and diverse experts in the fields of technology, sustainability and contemporary practice to the faculty for short periods.*

This is a diversity of ideas, disciplinary orientation and curricular format issue. The Faculty is committed to innovations of this kind (which are already occurring) but they will take time to implement in a broader and more holistic way.

*8. Increasing the diversity of guests invited to present their work in our public programs, including evening, lunchtime, BEST and forum presentations; conferences; and symposia.*

We will report on the diversity of our Public Programming. We must also be aware that several aspects of our public programming are not 'centrally' controlled, i.e. individual members of the faculty, students or other affiliated individuals hold public events and symposia at our school.

*9. Increase diversity of guests invited to midterm and final studio and thesis reviews.*

Addressed above. Any outside guests to midterm reviews are typically invited on an ad hoc basis by individual faculty members