

**Memorandum**

**To:** Members of the Academic Board  
**From:** Adel Sedra  
**Date:** April 3, 2002

**Item Identification**

Employment Equity Annual Report, 2000-2001

**Sponsor**

Adel Sedra, Vice-President and Provost

**Jurisdictional Information**

The Academic Board is responsible for policies and procedures on academic appointments.

**Highlights**

1. Among new hires to the full time tenure-stream faculty in 2000-2001, women were represented in proportion to their representation in the pools of potential applicants in four of five discipline groupings. In the group of disciplines in which women represent 45-59 percent of recent PhDs in Canada, women were under-represented among new hires. Women accounted for 26.1 percent of tenure/ tenure-stream faculty overall in 2001.
2. The representation of visible minorities among new appointments to the tenure-stream is estimated at between 16.1% (according to the self-reported employment equity survey which had a 80.5% response rate) and 24.3% (according to comprehensive reporting by department chairs). This proportion according to the chairs' survey ranged from 20.0% in the humanities to 44.4% in the physical sciences. Although these proportions are within or above the 15-20 percent range that the Provost has indicated to be the minimum level to be expected in the appointment of members of visible minorities into tenure-stream positions at the University of Toronto, we need to continue to assess the proportions that should be expected on the basis of new information from various sources regarding the pool of potential candidates.
3. The representation of people with disabilities among the tenure/ tenure-stream faculty was 3.3% in 2001, as compared with 3.5 percent in 2000.
4. No tenure-stream appointments of aboriginal people were made in 2001. The representation of aboriginal people among the tenure/ tenure faculty as a whole was 0.5%, or 6 faculty members.
5. The representation of women and visible minorities among new appointments exceeded their representation among those who exited the University. The reverse was true, however, for aboriginal people and persons with disabilities.

**Action Sought**

The Report is submitted annually for information.

# **Employment Equity Report**

## **2000-2001**

**University of Toronto**



# Table of Contents

## Executive Summary

1. Equity and Diversity at the University of Toronto .....	1
2. The Report Framework .....	1
3. The Workforce Analysis .....	2
3.1 New Hires and Net Gains in the Tenure Stream .....	2
3.2 Representation of Assistant Professors in SGS Division .....	4
3.3 New Administrative Staff Hires .....	4
3.4 Promotions .....	4
3.5 Workforce Representation of Selected Groups .....	5
4. Discussion and Directions .....	6
4.1 Proactive Faculty Recruitment .....	6
4.2 Proactive Administrative Staff Recruitment and Development .....	8
4.3 Data and Reporting .....	9
4.4 Proactive Outreach and Development Projects .....	10
5. Summary of Recommended Initiatives .....	10

Appendix 1 Selected Summary Tables, 1996 - 2001

Appendix 2 Chairs Survey of New Hires, 2000 - 2001

Appendix 3 Detailed Employment Equity Tables, 2000 - 2001



# 2000 - 2001 Employment Equity Report

## Executive Summary

The University of Toronto is poised for enrollment expansion and unprecedented levels of faculty retirements in the next several years. This presents the opportunity to enhance the representation of underrepresented groups among faculty and staff and become one of the world leaders as a diverse and inclusive institution of higher learning and research. Our student body is already one of the most diverse in the world; its diversity is reflected in its excellence. Increasing the diversity of our faculty and staff can become one of our central means of achieving excellence.

Each year the outcomes of employment practices like recruitment, promotion and retention and the representation levels of women, Aboriginal persons, members of visible minorities and people with disabilities are reported. The key findings are summarized below.

The representation of women among tenure stream faculty has increased gradually since 1996. Most hiring units have reflected the availability of women among

new PhDs in their hiring during the last year. For the last two years, those units which hired from pools estimated at 45 - 59% women fell short of that proportion in their aggregate hires. The rates at which women applied and were interviewed were at the low end of this graduate pool range.

The rate of hire of women has not been higher than their representation among assistant professors since 1997. While the representation of women is low among professors, the pool of associate professors is higher. The proportion of women among assistant professors has declined in the sciences where they are already least represented. Changes in women's representation will slow unless there are higher rates of new hires. In recent years, the resignations of women faculty have accounted for a disproportionate share of their exits. Women are relatively well represented among both managers and staff.

According to the 2001 employment equity data, members of visible minorities constitute 16.1% of the new tenure stream faculty hires. This is down from last

year when they accounted for 23% of the new hires but almost double the 1999 rate of 8.9%. Members of visible minority groups have declined among assistant professors in the humanities. The data from a survey of Chairs indicate that 24.3% of the new hires are members of visible minorities. These are two independent data sets, which are generated separately by different methods. They are not necessarily expected to yield the same result.

At 16.1%, the rate of new hiring of members of visible minorities in 2000-2001 is within the range of 15 – 20% estimated in the 1999 – 2000 Employment Equity Review. The Chairs survey data exceeds this range. New data from the National Graduate Survey suggests that the proportion of visible minorities among PhD graduates is higher than this range. In light of these data, this pool estimate could be revised.

Members of visible minorities are moving through staff professional and administrative jobs but, as yet, have little access to senior levels. When compared to the external workforce as measured by the 1996 Census data, the internal workforce is reflective. However, the demography of the Toronto region has changed dramatically since 1996. To make changes of the magnitude reflected by our community estimates and our student body requires a proactive recruitment and development strategy for administrative managers and staff.

The proportion of people with disabilities continues to decline in all segments of the university workforce. An organization's ability to hire people with disabilities is central to its capacity to develop equitable practices. Hiring more people with disabilities requires proactive outreach recruitment, selection and accommodation strategies.

While there have been successes in establishing academic and support programs that reflect the needs of Aboriginal persons, there has been little success in recruitment, retention and promotion of Aboriginal faculty and staff. Aboriginal persons are poorly represented throughout most segments of the internal workforce. Specific outreach activities, targeted at Aboriginal scholars, researchers, professionals and community organizations will be necessary in order to recruit, develop and retain more Aboriginal persons on the faculty and staff.

## **1. Equity and Diversity at the University of Toronto**

The University of Toronto recognizes the strengths that a diverse student body, faculty and staff bring to its mission of excellence. The goal of equity and diversity initiatives is to create an inclusive environment in which we remove barriers, ensure opportunities and recognize and value the ways in which people of different races, ancestries, Aboriginal origins, ethnic origins, creeds, sexes, sexual orientations, ages, family, marital and same-sex partnership statuses, gender identities and disabilities enable our excellence and support the university's stature at home and abroad. When faculty and staff provide both windows and mirrors for students and each other, the experience of all groups is enriched. In our local and international environment, we cannot expect to be excellent without being diverse.

The university is poised for enrollment expansion and for unprecedented levels of retirements in the next several years. These opportunities to enhance the representation of underrepresented groups provide an opportunity for the University of Toronto to become a world leader as a diverse and inclusive institution of higher learning and research.

The university is also a contractor bidding on and receiving significant funds from the Canadian government. Attendant on these funds is the obligation to maintain an employment equity plan, which provides

for ongoing monitoring and planning that ensures that the workplace is equitable.

## **2. The Report Framework**

The representation of underrepresented groups, Aboriginal persons, members of visible minorities, people with disabilities and women, has been monitored annually since the early 1990s. The results discussed here are a product of a complex network of commitments and activities on the part of senior leaders, faculties and departments, search committees, administrative staff and equity advisors.

The report summarizes the notable results of recruitment, promotion and retention practices as well as the overall faculty and administrative staff representation of Aboriginal persons, members of visible minority groups, people with disabilities and women. Selected tables spanning 1996 - 2001, which are derived from the detailed tables for each year, are contained in Appendix 1; these appear in the report for the first time this year. Appendix 3 contains the detailed 2000 - 2001 tables. Detailed data and reports for previous years are available for each year between 1996 and 2000 at <http://www.utoronto.ca/hrhome/vphr/eequity.htm>.

In the last two years, new full-time hires into the university have been surveyed at a rate that exceeds 80% (Table 12A, Appendix 3). In 2001, it is somewhat higher for new hires to the administrative staff (82.5%) than

for tenure stream faculty (80.5%). The overall returned survey rate (Table 1A, Appendix 3) of 81.5% is higher than most published recent rates of return at Canadian universities though recent experience with on-line strategies hold promise for generating higher return rates at lower costs.

### **3. The Workforce Analysis**

#### **3.1 New Hires and Net Gains in the Tenure Stream**

Since 1996, tenure stream faculty recruitment has almost doubled. In 2001, 108 tenure stream faculty were hired. At the same time, the proportion of faculty resignations relative to all faculty exits has doubled in the last three years. Between 1996 and 1998, resignations accounted for between 14% and 17% of faculty exits while between 1999 and 2001, they accounted for between 27% and 40%.

Members of Visible Minority Groups (Tables 11A Exits, 12A New Hires, Appendix 3)

In 2001, members of visible minorities made up 16.1% of the new faculty hires (n=108 total hires). This is down from last year when they accounted for 23% of the new hires but almost double the hire rate of 8.9% in 1999 (Table 1, Appendix 1). Women who are members of visible minorities were hired in a proportion (35.7%) similar to the hiring of all women.

The survey of Chairs was repeated again this year and the data are presented in Appendix 2. Once again there is a substantial difference with respect to the percentage of members of visible minorities among the new faculty hires in the Employment Equity data and in the survey. According to the Chairs survey, 24.3% of the new hires in 2000 - 2001 are members of visible minorities (Table 1, Appendix 2). While these data sets cover the same period of new faculty hiring, they use different methods and would not necessarily be expected to yield the same result.

In the 1999 - 2000 Employment Equity Report, it was estimated that members of visible minorities could continue to constitute 15-20% of the new hires and that this range approximated the representation of visible minorities in the pool. The Employment Equity data on new hiring of members of visible minorities is in the low end of this range, while the data from the Chairs is somewhat higher than this range.

Since 1997, there is a net gain of 27 members of visible minorities among the tenure stream faculty. Twenty-one (77.7%) of those faculty members have been hired in the last two years.

This net gain is a function of increased representation of members of visible minorities among new faculty hires and an increase in volume of hiring activity coupled with stabilized exits. Numbers are small but resignations of faculty who are members of visible minority groups

have been relatively stable and proportional except in 1999 when a disproportionate number resigned.

Women (Tables 11A Exits and 12A New Hires, Appendix 3)

Women accounted for 35.2% of the new hires in 2001. This rate is consistent with previous years – 33% in 2000 and 37.3% in 1999. The representation of women among new hires has not exceeded the representation of women among assistant professors since 1997 (Table 1, Appendix 1).

Since 1997, there is a net gain of 69 women among the tenure stream faculty; 88.4% of that gain occurred in the past three years when women's exits were more than offset by the hiring of new women.

Women appear to exit faculty positions at a rate that is proportionate with the overall faculty rate of exits. In some recent years, however, resignations account for a disproportionate number of women's exits. The rate at which women resigned exceeded the overall rate of resignations by a low of 6% in 1996 and 2001 and a high of 20% in 2000 (Table 3, Appendix 1).

Since the early 1990's, the proportion of new women faculty hires has been compared to their representation among new PhDs. Disciplines are grouped according to the proportion of women among their recent Canadian PhDs and shown in Table 13, Appendix 3.

Hiring units have reflected the availability of women among new PhDs in most groupings. However, for the last two years, those disciplines that hired from pools that were 45 - 59% women fell short of that proportion in their aggregate new hires even though the proportion of women among their applicants (47% and 49%) and their interviewees (47% and 45%) was within the graduate range, albeit at the low end. This group of disciplines includes Anthropology, Botany, Community Health, English, Germanic Languages and Literature, Linguistics, Slavic Languages and Literature, Sociology, Spanish and Portuguese. (Table 13, Appendix 3).

Aboriginal Persons (Tables 11A Exits, 12A New Hires, Appendix 3)

Since 1996, there is a net gain of only 1 Aboriginal faculty member even though four Aboriginal persons have been among the new faculty hires since 1998. Three have been among the exits in 2001. In 2001, there are 6 Aboriginal persons among the tenure stream faculty.

People with Disabilities (Tables 11A Exits, 12A New Hires, Appendix 3)

In the last three years, two people with disabilities have been among the new hires. In 6 years, 8 people with disabilities have been hired to the full-time faculty while 22 have left. In 2001, there are 26 people with disabilities among the full-time tenure stream faculty. The disabilities indicators are the most time sensitive



and, therefore, most likely to change if these data were updated.

### **3.2 Representation among Assistant Professors by SGS (Table 2.2A, Appendix 3)**

In the humanities in 1997 and 1998, members of visible minority groups comprised 11.1% and 9.8% of the assistant professors. In 2000 and 2001, they comprised 7% and 7.3%. The representation of women among the assistant professors in the sciences was 31.9% and 30.6% in 1997 and 1998 and has declined to 17.6% and 16.7% in 2000 and 2001 (Tables 4 and 5, Appendix 1).

### **3.3 New Administrative Staff Hires (Table 12A, Appendix 3)**

Women are reflected among new staff hires at rates that are reflective of their internal workforce representation; their internal representation generally matches or exceeds their external representation. The proportion of members of visible minorities among new hires is lower than their internal representation. A small number of Aboriginal persons and a small number of persons with disabilities were hired.

### **3.4 Promotions (Table 10, Appendix 3)**

#### **Faculty**

The representation of women among professors has increased from 12.4% in 1996 to 15.5% in 2001 (Table 6, Appendix 1). In 2001, women account for 23.1% of promotions to full professorships (n=26) while they account for 37.8% of the pool, i.e. associate professors. This relatively higher proportion of associates will be reflected in an increased proportion of professors in among in the next several years.

The years to promotion are tracked for women because they provide an indication of the length of time that is required for change to be reflected in all ranks and in the academic administration. The 3-year rolling average of the years to professorship increased from 6.7 years in 1999 to 8.13 years in 2001. For men, this average dropped from 8.29 years to 7.35 years during the same period.

In the past year, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities where among those promoted to full professors. Aboriginal persons were not.

#### **Senior Management (Table 10, Appendix 3)**

Members of visible minorities account for 12.5% of the promotions (n=16) in the senior management group last year. While this marginally exceeds their overall

representation in senior management (11.2%), it is short of their representation in the Administrative Non-unionized group (21.2%) which might be viewed as a candidate pool.

Women account for 63.2% of the promotions in this group and 58.2% of the employees in this group.

Staff (Table 10, Appendix 3)

Rates of promotions of women and members of visible minorities were generally reflective of the university's workforce representation. Among the non-unionized administrative staff, which include professional and administrative jobs, 32.6% of those promoted were members of visible minorities while they are 21.2% of that staff.

### **3.5 Workforce Representation of Selected Groups**

#### **Visible Minorities**

Senior Academic Leadership  
(Table 3, Appendix 3)

Since 1999, visible minorities have been represented among academic directors, chairs and associate deans at rates (5-8)% that are close to their representation among full professors (7-8%) (Table 8, Appendix 1). Members of visible minorities are only recently represented among principals and deans. The

representation of members of visible minorities in senior administration in related sectors like health and education in the external workforce ranges between 5.3 and 6% in the 1996 Census. There is a small representation of women who are members of visible minorities among the academic directors, chairs and associate deans.

Faculty (Table 2A, Appendix 3)

The representation of members of visible minorities in the tenure stream faculty stands at 9.9% for tenure stream faculty and 10.8% for all faculty.

Senior Managers (Table 6, Appendix 3) and  
Staff (Tables 7 – 8, Appendix 3)

The representation of members of visible minorities among senior managers has declined from a high of 14.9% in 2000 to 11.2% in 2001. Administrative staff representation of members of visible minority groups compares to the 1996 external workforce.

#### **Women**

Senior Academic Leadership  
(Table 3, Appendix 3)

The representation of women among principals and deans has increased from 13.6% in 1996 to 17.4% in 2001 (Table 7, Appendix 1). Their representation among academic directors, chairs and associate deans ranges

from 19.8% in 1996 to 26.6% in 2000. In 2001, women make up 22.7% of this group. Since 1996, the representation of women among academic directors, chairs and associate deans has exceeded their representation among full professors by 6-11%. On the other hand, the representation of women in senior administration in related sectors like health and education in the external workforce ranges between 47.4 and 50.1%.

#### Tenure Stream Faculty (Table 2A, Appendix 3)

The representation of women has increased incrementally from 21.9% in 1996 to 26.6% in 2001. As women have been promoted, their representation among assistant professors has decreased from 43-44% in 1997 and 1998 to 38-39% in 2000 and 2001.

#### Senior Managers (Table 6, Appendix 3)

The representation of women among senior managers has increased from 44.3% in 1996 to 58.2% in 2001. Their representation has increased or remained stable at all levels. The drop at the 2MS level noted in last year's report because it suggested a depletion of the pool for the most senior ranks, has been eliminated in 2001. While the numbers are small, women who are members of visible minority groups are represented at relatively similar levels.

#### Staff (Table 7 - 8, Appendix 3)

In most staff groups, women are well represented.

#### Aboriginal Persons

Aboriginal persons are poorly represented throughout the university's workforce.

#### People with Disabilities

The representation of people with disabilities appears to be declining throughout the university's workforce.

### **4. Discussion and Directions**

#### **4.1 Proactive Faculty Recruitment**

##### Initiatives and Resources

A range of activities including faculty recruitment orientation sessions for new academic administrators and provostial assessors, and orientation workshops for search committees, decanal assessors and chairs in most departments and faculties are part of the proactive recruitment efforts. More recently, best practices for faculty recruitment visits, appointment and training of administrative staff to support recruitment and electronic web outreach resources have been developed.

The outreach resources enable departments to make on-line contact with a large selection of academic and professional organizations in order to distribute job information to underrepresented groups. The goal is to make known the Faculty Recruitment website, to invite applications from a diverse pool of candidates and to ensure that the intensity of our recruitment efforts becomes well known across the academic communities that provide our future teachers and scholars. Continuing development of the electronic networking capacity will support hiring efforts by sending notices about our web site and faculty positions to widening pools of schools, organizations and candidates. The web outreach resources are found at <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/outreach/>.

#### Networking and Outreach Challenges

While our recruitment strategies are gradually increasing the representation for women and visible minorities among the tenure stream faculty, there are a number of indicators that challenge us to engage in more diverse outreach and networking. For example, making “conditional hires” in faculty positions is a strategy for recruiting scholars who show early promise by recruiting them before they are fully ‘on the market’. This strategy will support the diversification of the faculty if it is pursued avidly through a variety of professional networks and institutions that are diverse and excellent.

We have noted that representation of women and members of visible minorities is declining among

assistant professors in the SGS divisions that have the lowest representation of these groups. Specifically, there is a small and declining representation of faculty members who are members of visible minorities among the assistant professors in humanities and, similarly, among women who are assistant professors in sciences. Specifically planned outreach and networking strategies could support an increase in the proportion of women in the applicant pools.

#### Retention Challenges

The data analysis raises issues of retention of faculty across the four groups. In recent years, probably for different reasons, resignations spiked for different groups. In a highly competitive recruitment market, these spikes, which do not involve large numbers, are nevertheless costly to our efforts to develop a diverse faculty.

Exit interviews with a representative number of faculty including all women, visible minorities, Aboriginal persons and people with disabilities who resign could inform our retention strategies. As well, specific evaluations of the impact of proposed initiatives, like increasing years to tenure, on each of the four groups could usefully inform our decision-making.

#### Identifying Estimates of the Canadian Pools

The 1999 – 2000 Employment Equity Report suggested that the current proportion of members of visible

minorities among new appointees – about 15 – 20% — should at least be maintained, and that this estimate of the pool should be reassessed as we gain better understanding of the potential applicant pool<sup>1</sup>. This range is constructed from a variety of estimates of the proportion of members of visible minorities in candidate pools. These include our own hiring experience, the 12% representation among university professors and the 18% among PhDs in the workforce according to the 1996 Census.

We have identified a new data source in the National Graduate Survey (NGS) conducted by Statistics Canada that suggests that the pool has a higher proportion of members of visible minority groups. The NGS surveys Canadian university graduates two years after graduation. From the data on PhDs who graduated in 1990 and who were surveyed in Canada in 1992, it is estimated that 18% were members of visible minorities<sup>2</sup>. The most recent NGS survey of PhDs who received their degrees in 1995 and were surveyed in 1997 estimates that members of visible minorities constitute 29% of the new PhDs<sup>3</sup>.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender and Queer Persons (Members of Sexual Minority Groups)

The employment equity statement on our job ads, which has welcomed women, Aboriginal persons, members of visible minority groups, people with disabilities and others who can contribute to the diversification of

knowledge, has been expanded to explicitly include members of sexual minority groups. Discussions are underway to identify ways in which we can determine whether this initiative and others, which have been incorporated into best practices, are effective. This could include conducting focus groups with faculty who come forward on their own initiative and monitoring the implementation of best practices.

#### **4.2 Proactive Administrative Staff Recruitment and Development**

##### **Estimating the Regional Workforce**

The 1996 Census data are now five years out of date. The recent period has been one of continued growth in the representation of visible minority communities in the regional population. Since the short and medium term is one of growth for the university, it is prudent to estimate the changes that are likely to show up in our external comparison data in the next several years.

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Toronto, Employment Equity Report, 1999-2000, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Don Little and Louise Lapierre, The Class of '90, The First Report of the 1992 National Graduates Survey, Human Resources Development Canada, 1996.

<sup>3</sup> Jacques Taillon and Mike Pajh, Class of '95: Report of the 1997 National Survey of 1995 Graduates, Human Resources Development Canada, 2000.

In 1995, it was estimated that members of visible minorities would comprise 54% of the population of the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) in 2001<sup>4</sup>. Applying a crude strategy of averaging this population estimate with the 1996 occupational representation produces estimates of occupational representation that hover around 40% for most occupations. Against these estimates, the internal representation of members of visible minorities among administrative staff is low in most occupations.

A proactive administrative staff recruitment and development strategy, which includes a local action-planning process, could take advantage of the opportunities that expansion will provide to develop a staff that reflects the community.

#### Demonstration Projects

Three projects designed to enhance the administrative staffs' ability to participate in the equity and excellence goals, have been initiated this year. While each project addresses the issues of representation of groups within the university, each project explores how diversity strategies add value to the ongoing administrative work and identifies ways that administrative staff contribute to the overall mission of excellence, equity and diversity. The three projects are located at Hart House, University of Toronto Mississauga and Staff Development, University of Toronto Scarborough and will provide best practice models for recruitment and staff and management training that will be tested and adapted to

other organizational units. These best practice models will provide resources for administrative staff action plans.

### 4.3 Data and Reporting

#### Managers and Professionals

During 2001, the Senior Management Group was merged with other managers and professionals to create a Managers and Professionals group. To maintain our capacity to monitor changes over time, it will be necessary to develop a senior management analysis.

#### Refreshing the Employment Equity Data

In the past two years, the process for collecting employment equity identifiers has yielded relatively higher rates of return for new full-time faculty and administrative hires. At the same time, our original survey data gathered in the early 1990's is increasingly stale. At the very least, updating the disability identifiers, which are the most subject to change over time, would provide a means to better understand and respond to people with age-related disabilities. Cost effective electronic strategies, which protect confidentiality can be used to minimize both the cost and intrusion of a full update of the data, are increasingly available.

---

<sup>4</sup> Tana Turner, *The Composition and Implications of Metropolitan Toronto's Ethnic, Racial and Linguistic Populations, 1991*, Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Access and Equity, 1995.

#### **4.4 Proactive Outreach and Development Projects**

The overall poor representation of people with disabilities and of Aboriginal persons in the university's workforce requires specific attention in order to ensure a welcoming environment and equitable access for both administrative staff and faculty. A working group, led by a senior staff member and including relevant equity offices, faculty, staff and managers from selected departments, will develop action plans to address the outreach, recruitment, accommodation and development issues for Aboriginal persons and people with disabilities. Other communities that require specific outreach recruitment may be identified in the course of continuing discussions.

#### **5. Summary of Recommended Initiatives**

The proactive initiatives that have been established to support the university's commitment to equity and diversity in recruitment and employment practices will continue with support from the Office of the Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-President – Human Resources. The following new initiatives would provide deeper support in specific areas:

a) Establish exit interviews for selected faculty and include all women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal persons and people with disabilities who resigned since 2000 - 2001. These interviews can be implemented immediately.

b) Develop a specific action plan for supporting women and visible minorities in senior academic administrative roles.

c) Develop a specific action plan for hiring and retaining Aboriginal faculty and staff in collaboration with First Nations House, Aboriginal Studies and selected departments.

d) Develop a specific action plan for hiring and retaining people with disabilities among the new faculty and staff in collaboration with Accessibility Services and selected departments.

e) Develop a Proactive Recruitment and Development Plan for administrative staff which includes review methodology, incorporates best practices for recruitment and promotion, and utilizes outreach resources. The plan will be developed in collaboration with the decentralized Human Resources offices.

Each of these initiatives will begin early in 2002 and is expected to be a multi-year project. Progress will be reported in the Annual Employment Equity Reports over the next 3-5 years

**Appendix 1: Selected Summary Tables, 1996 – 2001**

**Table 1  
Representation of Visible Minorities  
Among New Hires and Assistant Professors, 1997 - 2001**

Year	# of New Hires	Visible Minorities (%*)	
		New Hires	Assistant Professors
2001	108	16.1	14.8
2000	94	23.0	14.1
1999	102	8.9	14.3
1998	83	20.9	16.2
1997	57	10.0	16.7

\* Based on the proportion of completed EE surveys



**Table 2**  
**Representation of Women**  
**Among New Hires and Assistant Professors, 1997 – 2001**

Year	# of New Hires	Women (%)	
		New Hires	Assistant Professors
2001	108	35.2	38.5
2000	94	33.0	38.4
1999	102	37.3	39.6
1998	83	22.9	43.3
1997	57	29.8	43.9

**Table 3**  
**Resignations as a Proportion of Exits, 1996 - 2001**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Resignations as a % Of All Exits</b>	<b>Resignations as a % of Women's Exits</b>
2001	27.0	33.3
2000	26.5	46.2
1999	35.9	46.7
1998	17.2	35.7
1997	14.5	28.6
1996	14.1	20.0

**Table 4**  
**Representation of Women**  
**Among Assistant Professors by SGS Division, 1997 - 2001**

Year	Women (%)				Total	N
	Humanities	Social Science	Science	Life Science		
2001	40.8	45.3	16.7	41.9	37.0	330
2000	35.3	47.3	17.6	43.9	37.3	292
1999	32.7	44.3	23.2	46.8	38.3	269
1998	37.5	50.0	30.6	48.6	43.5	253
1997	40.9	50.0	31.9	53.3	45.2	217

**Table 5**  
**Representation of Visible Minorities**  
**Among Assistant Professors by SGS Division, 1997 - 2001**

Year	Visible Minorities (%*)				Total	N
	Humanities	Social Science	Science	Life Science		
2001	7.3	15.3	21.2	17.5	16.1	330
2000	7.0	14.5	18.5	14.8	14.1	292
1999	8.9	17.5	17.1	13.1	14.2	269
1998	9.8	19.7	19.4	15.3	16.2	253
1997	11.1	17.0	24.3	11.3	15.6	217

\* Based on the proportion of completed EE surveys

**Table 6**  
**Representation of Women in Tenured Faculty, 1996 – 2001**

Years	# of Promotions	Women (%)			Years to Professorship	
		Full Professors	Associate Professors	Promotions to Professors	Men	Women
2001	26	15.5	37.8	23.1	7.35*	8.13*
2000	44	15.5	36.5	18.2	8.03*	7.26*
1999	27	15.4	34.1	37.0	8.29*	6.7*
1998	29	14.7	32.2	17.2	7.8	6.6
1997	38	13.9	32.3	10.5	8.5	9.5
1996	37	12.4	30.1	29.7	not available	

\* Three year rolling averages

**Table 7**  
**Representation of Women**  
**Among Officers and Academic Administrators, 1996 – 2001**

Year	Total All	Women (%)			
		All Senior Academic Administrators	Principals and Deans	Academic Directors, Chairs & Associate Directors	Professors
2001	175	22.3	17.4	22.7	15.5
2000	172	25.0	17.4	26.6	15.5
1999	173	21.4	12.0	23.0	15.4
1998	159	20.1	12.0	21.6	14.7
1997	145	19.3	13.0	20.2	13.9
1996	147	19.0	13.6	19.8	12.4

**Table 8**  
**Representation of Visible Minorities**  
**Among Officers And Academic Administrators, 1996 – 2001**

Year	Total All	Visible Minorities (%)			
		All Senior Academic Administrators	Principals and Deans	Academic Directors, Chairs & Associate Directors	Professors
2001	175	6.5	5.9	5.4	7.1
2000	172	7.0		7.8	7.9
1999	173	5.9		6.5	7.1
1998	159	2.4		2.0	7.4
1997	145	2.7		2.2	8.0
1996	147	4.3	5.3	3.4	8.9

\* Based on the proportion of completed EE surveys

## Appendix 2: Chairs Survey of New Hires

**Table 1**  
**Representation of Visible Minorities**  
**Among New Faculty Hires, 2000 – 2001\***

SGS Division	# of New Hires	Visible Minorities	
		#	%
I Humanities	20	4	20
II Social Science	36	5	13.9
III Science	27	12	44.4
IV Life Science	24	5	20.8
Total	107	26	24.3

\*Tenure stream academics hired between October 1, 2000 and September 30, 2001 as reported by Chairs.



## Appendix 3: Detailed Employment Equity Tables, 2000 - 2000

**Table 1(A)**  
**EMPLOYMENT EQUITY WORKFORCE SURVEY: RETURN RATES**  
**AND COMPLETION RATES FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES**

September 30, 2001 Data

EMPLOYEE GROUPS IN THE WORKPLACE	ALL EMPLOYEES		SURVEY RESPONDENTS			
	# in EMPLOYEE GROUP <sup>1</sup>	% OF WORKFORCE REPRESENTED	# RETURNED	% OF SURVEYS RETURNED	# COMPLETED	% COMPLETED
FACULTY <sup>2</sup>	2205	31.74%	1723	78.14%	1594	72.29%
CLINICAL FACULTY <sup>3</sup>	407	5.86%	272	66.83%	262	64.37%
LIBRARIANS	129	1.86%	115	89.15%	105	81.40%
RESEARCH ASSOCIATES	138	1.99%	108	78.26%	104	75.36%
SENIOR MANAGEMENT GROUP	119	1.71%	109	91.60%	106	89.08%
NON-UNIONIZED ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF	561	8.07%	516	91.98%	497	88.59%
USWA	2530	36.41%	2123	83.91%	2044	80.79%
LIBRARY WORKERS (CUPE 1230)	194	2.79%	170	87.63%	111	57.22%
SERVICE WORKERS (CUPE 3261)	483	6.95%	382	79.09%	354	73.29%
OPERATING ENGINEERS (U. OF T. WORKERS, Local 2001)	69	0.99%	63	91.30%	55	79.71%
POLICE (OPSEU, Local 519)	37	0.53%	28	75.68%	25	67.57%
TRADES & SERVICES <sup>4</sup>	62	0.89%	53	85.48%	47	75.81%
RESEARCH ASSOCIATES & OFFICERS (OPSEU, L. 578)	14	0.20%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>6948</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>5662</b>	<b>81.49%</b>	<b>5304</b>	<b>76.34%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Total Population is based on the number of employees as of September 30, 2001.

<sup>2</sup>Faculty are defined as all faculty (tenure-stream and non-tenure stream) except for clinical faculty.

<sup>3</sup>"Clinical Faculty" are defined as non-tenure stream academic staff in the Faculty of Medicine who are health professionals actively involved in the provision of health care in the course of discharging their academic responsibilities. Only clinical faculty members who are part of the University payroll system are reflected in these data.

<sup>4</sup>Includes Electricians (IEBW, Local 353), Plumbers (UA 46), Sheet Metal Workers (SMMWA, Local 30), Carpenters (CCAW, Local 27), Machinists/Locksmiths (IAMAW, Local 235), and Painters (District Council 46, Local 557).

Table 1(B)

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY WORKFORCE SURVEY: RETURN RATES  
AND COMPLETION RATES FOR PART-TIME EMPLOYEES

(Excludes casual employees and appointed staff with less than 25% F.T.E.)

September 30, 2001 Data

EMPLOYEE GROUPS IN THE WORKPLACE	ALL EMPLOYEES		SURVEY RESPONDENTS			
	# IN EMPLOYEE GROUP <sup>1</sup>	% OF WORKFORCE REPRESENTED	# RETURNED	% OF SURVEYS RETURNED	# COMPLETED	% COMPLETED
FACULTY <sup>2</sup>	213	29.67%	151	70.89%	148	69.48%
CLINICAL FACULTY <sup>3</sup>	108	15.04%	63	58.33%	62	57.41%
LIBRARIANS	22	3.06%	20	90.91%	19	86.36%
RESEARCH ASSOCIATES	17	2.37%	15	88.24%	15	88.24%
SENIOR MANAGEMENT GROUP	3	0.42%	1	33.33%	1	33.33%
NON-UNIONIZED ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF	29	4.04%	26	89.66%	24	82.76%
USWA	273	38.02%	214	78.39%	206	75.46%
LIBRARY WORKERS (CUPE 1230)	27	3.76%	23	85.19%	23	85.19%
SERVICE WORKERS (CUPE 3261)	16	2.23%	6	37.50%	6	37.50%
RESEARCH ASSOCIATES & OFFICERS (OPSEU, L. 578)	10	1.39%	2	20.00%	2	0.00%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>72.56%</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>70.47%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Total Population is based on the number of employees as of September 30, 2001.

<sup>2</sup>Faculty are defined as all appointed faculty (tenure-stream and non-tenure stream) except for clinical faculty.

<sup>3</sup>"Clinical Faculty" are defined as non-tenure stream academic staff in the Faculty of Medicine who are health professionals actively involved in the provision of health care in the course of discharging their academic responsibilities. Only clinical faculty members who are part of the University payroll system are reflected in these data.

**Table 2(A)**  
**FACULTY (FULL-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP WITHIN TYPE OF APPOINTMENT<sup>1</sup> AND RANK AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**  
**September 30, 2001 Data**

TYPE OF APPOINTMENT		UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE																				
		All Employees										Survey Respondents										
		RANK					Aboriginal Peoples					Visible Minorities					Persons With Disabilities					
		Total#	Men	Women	% Men	% Women	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>3</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>3</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>3</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>3</sup>
Professoriate: Tenure/Tenure Stream:		890	752	138	84.5	15.5	0.2	**	**	7.1	44	39	5	4.2	26	21	5	5.7	17	13	4	3
Professors		540	336	204	62.2	37.8	401	0.5	**	10.5	42	25	17	3.2	3	10	3	5.6	17	13	4	3
Associate Professors		327	201	126	61.5	38.5	250	1.2	**	14.8	37	24	13	0.8	**	**	**	1.1	13	10	3	**
Assistant Professors		18	13	5	72.2	27.8	12	0.0	**	33.3	4	**	**	8.3	**	**	**	1.1	4	**	**	**
Asst Professor(Cond)		1775	1302	473	73.4	26.6	1282	0.5	6	9.9	127	92	35	3.3	42	32	10	4.5	35	27	8	5
total		123	106	17	86.2	13.8	78	0.0	**	9.0	7	**	**	2.6	**	**	**	3.4	7	**	**	**
Professoriate: Clinical:		137	108	29	78.8	21.2	94	1.1	**	13.8	13	10	3	2.1	**	**	**	2.9	10	**	**	**
Professors		138	85	53	61.6	38.4	88	0.0	**	20.5	16	12	6	1.1	**	**	**	1.5	12	**	**	**
Associate Professors		9	3	6	33.3	66.7	2	0.0	**	50.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.2	**	**	**	**
Assistant Professors		407	302	105	74.2	25.8	262	0.4	**	14.9	39	29	10	1.9	5	**	**	2.3	29	**	**	**
Asst Professor(Cond)		28	22	6	78.6	21.4	18	0.0	**	11.1	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.4	**	**	**	**
total		40	27	13	67.5	32.5	27	0.0	**	11.1	3	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.3	**	**	**	**
Professoriate: Non-TS CLIA/Other:		70	39	31	55.7	44.3	48	2.1	**	10.4	5	**	**	2.1	**	**	**	2.6	5	**	**	**
Professors		25	12	13	48.0	52.0	19	0.0	**	10.5	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.4	**	**	**	**
Associate Professors		163	100	63	61.3	38.7	112	0.9	**	10.7	12	**	**	0.9	**	**	**	0.6	**	**	**	**
Assistant Professors		148	67	81	45.3	54.7	117	0.9	**	13.7	16	11	5	1.7	**	**	**	1.2	11	**	**	**
Asst Professor(Cond)		69	30	39	43.5	56.5	46	4.3	**	10.9	5	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	4.7	5	**	**	**
total		50	15	35	30.0	70.0	37	0.0	**	5.4	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	5.4	**	**	**	**
Other Academics <sup>4</sup>		267	112	155	41.9	58.1	200	0.0	**	10.5	21	11	5	0.0	**	**	**	10.5	21	11	5	0.0
Senior Tutors/Lecturers		2612	1816	796	69.5	30.5	1856	0.6	11	7	4	10.8	201	144	57	2.7	50	37	13	3.7	13	13
Tutors/Lecturers		65.6	34.4	31.2	51.8	48.2	34	0.5	**	12.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	12.0	**	**	**	**
Instructors/Lecturers		<b>Totals: All Faculty:</b>																				
Total		267	112	155	41.9	58.1	200	0.0	**	10.5	21	11	5	0.0	**	**	**	10.5	21	11	5	0.0
EEOG-NOC		1816	69.5	796	30.5	69.5	1856	0.6	11	7	4	10.8	201	144	57	2.7	50	37	13	3.7	13	13
EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS:																						
03-4121 University Professors		65.6																				

<sup>1</sup> Academic administrators are included in the tenure stream group according to their rank.

<sup>2</sup> Based on number of surveys completed.

<sup>4</sup> Includes Teaching Stream staff

Table 2(B)

FACULTY (PART-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP WITHIN  
JOB CATEGORY<sup>1</sup> AND RANK AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA

September 30, 2001 Data

JOB CATEGORY		UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE																
		All Employees							Survey Respondents									
		RANK			Aboriginal Peoples				Visible Minorities			Persons With Disabilities						
		Total	# Men	# Women	% Men	% Women	%	Total Completed	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>3</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>3</sup>		
Professoriate: Tenure/Tenure Stream:		8	8	0	100.0	0	0.0	6	0.0	**	**	16.7	**	**	**	33.3	**	**
Professors		8	7	1	87.5	1	12.5	6	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Associate Professors		0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Assistant Professors		16	15	1	93.8	1	6.3	12	0.0	**	**	8.3	**	**	**	16.7	**	**
Total		27	23	4	85.2	4	14.8	17	5.9	**	**	23.5	4	**	**	5.9	**	**
Professoriate: Clinical: (Non-IS in Medicine)		42	34	8	81.0	8	19.0	25	4.0	**	**	4.0	**	**	**	8.0	**	**
Associate Professors		36	27	9	75.0	9	25.0	17	0.0	**	**	5.9	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Assistant Professors		3	3	0	100.0	0	0.0	3	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Asst Professor(Coord)		108	87	21	80.6	21	19.4	62	3.2	**	**	9.7	6	**	**	4.8	**	**
Total		8	5	3	62.5	3	37.5	7	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Professoriate: Non-IS CLTA/Other:		18	13	5	72.2	5	27.8	11	0.0	**	**	18.2	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Associate Professors		44	17	27	38.6	27	61.4	35	0.0	**	**	11.4	4	**	**	0.0	**	**
Assistant Professors		11	5	6	45.5	6	54.5	7	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Asst Professor(Cond)		81	40	41	49.4	41	50.6	60	0.0	**	**	10.0	6	**	**	0.0	**	**
Total		14	7	7	50.0	7	50.0	10	0.0	**	**	10.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Other Academics <sup>4</sup>		92	45	47	48.9	47	51.1	64	0.0	**	**	3.1	**	**	**	1.6	**	**
Senior Tutors/Lecturers		10	3	7	30.0	7	70.0	2	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**
Tutors/Lecturers		116	55	61	47.4	61	52.6	76	0.0	**	**	3.9	**	**	**	1.3	**	**
Instructors/Lecturers		321	197	124	61.4	124	38.6	210	1.0	**	**	7.6	16	8	8	2.9	6	**
Total: All Faculty:		65.6					34.4		0.5			12.0				3.7		
EEOG-NOC EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS:																		
03-4121 University Professors																		

<sup>1</sup> Academic administrators are included in the tenure stream group according to their rank.

<sup>3</sup> Based on number of surveys completed.

<sup>4</sup> Includes Teaching Stream staff.

Table 2.1(A)

September 30, 2001 Data

FACULTY (FULL-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP WITHIN TYPE OF APPOINTMENT<sup>1</sup> AND SGS DIVISION

JOB CATEGORY	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE																	
	All Employees										Survey Respondents							
	SGS DIVISION		Total		Aboriginal Peoples		Visible Minorities		Persons With Disabilities		Total		Response of "Yes"					
	Total#	Men	Men	Women	Women	%	#	% <sup>3</sup>	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women				
Professoriate: Tenure/Tenure Stream:																		
I: HUMANITIES	335	237	70.7	98	29.3	240	0.0	**	**	**	5.4	13	7	6	4.6	11	**	
II: SOCIAL SCIENCE	508	340	66.9	168	33.1	345	0.9	**	**	**	10.4	36	26	10	2.0	7	**	
III: SCIENCE	436	394	90.4	42	9.6	318	0.3	**	**	**	13.2	42	37	5	2.8	9	**	
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	440	300	68.2	140	31.8	342	0.6	**	**	**	9.4	32	20	12	4.1	14	7	
Total	1719	1271	73.9	448	26.1	1245	0.5	6	**	**	9.9	123	90	33	3.3	41	31	10
Professoriate: Clinical (Non-IS Mec):																		
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	407	302	74.2	105	25.8	262	0.4	**	**	**	14.9	39	29	10	1.9	5	**	**
Professoriate: Non-IS CLIA/Other: <sup>2</sup>																		
I: HUMANITIES	37	16	40.5	22	59.5	29	0.0	**	**	**	13.8	4	**	**	0.0	**	**	**
II: SOCIAL SCIENCE	20	13	65.0	7	35.0	10	10.0	**	**	**	10.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**
III: SCIENCE	26	20	76.9	6	23.1	23	0.0	**	**	**	13.0	3	**	**	0.0	**	**	**
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	73	50	68.5	23	31.5	47	0.0	**	**	**	8.5	4	**	**	2.1	**	**	**
Total	156	98	62.8	58	37.2	109	0.9	**	**	**	11.0	12	**	**	0.9	**	**	**
Other Academics <sup>4</sup>																		
I: HUMANITIES	31	12	38.7	19	61.3	27	3.7	**	**	**	7.4	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**
II: SOCIAL SCIENCE	38	17	44.7	21	55.3	26	0.0	**	**	**	11.5	3	**	**	3.8	**	**	**
III: SCIENCE	69	36	55.1	31	44.9	60	0.0	**	**	**	21.7	13	6	7	1.7	**	**	**
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	49	15	30.6	34	69.4	39	0.0	**	**	**	7.7	3	**	**	0.0	**	**	**
Total	187	82	43.9	105	56.1	152	0.7	**	**	**	13.8	21	11	10	1.3	**	**	**
Totals: All Faculty <sup>2</sup>																		
I: HUMANITIES	403	264	65.5	139	34.5	296	0.3	**	**	**	6.4	19	9	10	3.7	11	**	**
II: SOCIAL SCIENCE	566	370	65.4	196	34.6	381	1.0	4	**	**	10.5	40	29	11	2.1	8	**	**
III: SCIENCE	531	452	85.1	79	14.9	401	0.2	**	**	**	14.5	58	46	12	2.5	10	**	**
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	969	667	68.8	302	31.2	690	0.4	3	**	**	11.3	78	56	22	2.9	20	11	9
Total	2469	1753	71.0	716	29.0	1768	0.5	9	6	3	11.0	195	140	55	2.8	49	36	13

<sup>1</sup> Academic administrators are included in the tenure stream group according to their division.

<sup>2</sup> Of 2612 Full-Time Faculty represented in Table 2(A), 143 are uncategorized in terms of SGS Divisions.

<sup>3</sup> Based on number of surveys completed

<sup>4</sup> Includes Teaching Stream staff.

Table 2.2(A)  
 September 30, 2001 Data  
 ASSISTANT PROFESSORS<sup>4</sup> (FULL-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP WITHIN TYPE OF APPOINTMENT<sup>1</sup> AND SGS DIVISION

JOB CATEGORY	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE														
	All Employees							Survey Respondents							
	SGS DIVISION			Aboriginal Peoples			Visible Minorities			Persons With Disabilities					
	Total#	# Men	% Men	# Women	% Women	Total	% <sup>3</sup>	# Men	# Women	Total	% <sup>3</sup>	# Men	# Women	Total	% <sup>3</sup>
Professoriate: Tenure/Tenure Stream:															
I: HUMANITIES	49	29	59.2	20	40.8	41	0.0	**	**	**	7.3	3	**	**	4.9
II: SOCIAL SCIENCE	117	64	54.7	53	45.3	85	2.4	**	**	**	15.3	13	9	4	0.0
III: SCIENCE	78	65	83.3	13	16.7	66	0.0	**	**	**	21.2	14	**	**	0.0
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	86	50	58.1	36	41.9	63	1.6	**	**	**	17.5	11	6	5	1.6
Total	330	208	63.0	122	37.0	255	1.2	3	**	**	16.1	41	28	13	1.2
Professoriate: Clinical (Non-TS Med):															
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	147	88	59.9	59	40.1	90	0.0	**	**	**	21.1	19	13	6	1.1
Professoriate: Non-TS CLTA/Other: <sup>2</sup>															
I: HUMANITIES	29	13	44.8	16	55.2	22	0.0	**	**	**	9.1	**	**	**	0.0
II: SOCIAL SCIENCE	12	6	50.0	6	50.0	7	14.3	**	**	**	14.3	**	**	**	0.0
III: SCIENCE	17	12	70.6	5	29.4	15	0.0	**	**	**	13.3	**	**	**	0.0
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	33	19	57.6	14	42.4	21	0.0	**	**	**	9.5	**	**	**	4.8
Total	91	50	54.9	41	45.1	65	1.5	**	**	**	10.8	7	**	**	1.5
Totals: All Faculty <sup>2</sup>															
I: HUMANITIES	78	42	53.8	36	46.2	63	0.0	**	**	**	7.9	5	**	**	3.2
II: SOCIAL SCIENCE	129	70	54.3	59	45.7	92	3.3	**	**	**	15.2	14	10	4	0.0
III: SCIENCE	95	71	81.1	18	18.9	81	0.0	**	**	**	19.8	16	**	**	0.0
IV: LIFE SCIENCE	266	157	59.0	109	41.0	174	0.6	**	**	**	18.4	32	21	11	1.7
Total	568	346	60.9	222	39.1	410	1.0	4	**	**	16.3	67	47	20	1.2

<sup>1</sup> Academic administrators are included in the tenure stream group according to their division.

<sup>2</sup> Of 587 Full-Time Faculty represented in Table 2(A), 19 are uncategorized in terms of SGS Divisions.

<sup>3</sup> Based on number of surveys completed

<sup>4</sup> Both "Assistant Professors" and "Assistant Professors (Conditional)" are included.

Table 3

September 30, 2001 Data.

OFFICERS AND ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS (FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME<sup>1</sup>) BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA

JOB CATEGORY	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE																	
	All Employees						Survey Respondents											
	Total#	#		%		Total Completed	Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"			Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"			Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"					
		Men	Women	Men	Women		Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total		
President, Vice President, Deputy/Vice Provost	11	8	72.7	3	27.3	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	**	**	**	0	0	0	**	
Principals & Deans	23	19	82.6	4	17.4	17	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	**	**	**	1	1	2	**	
Academic Directors & Chairs, & Associate Deans	141	109	77.3	32	22.7	112	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	6	**	**	3	3	6	**	
<b>Totals:</b>	175	136	77.7	39	22.3	139	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	9	**	**	4	4	8	**	
EEOG-NOC	EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS:																	
01-0014 Senior Mgrs-Health, Educ, social & Community Svcs & Membership Orgs	52.6						2.0						5.3					
02-0312 Administrators in Post-Secondary Education & Vocational Training	49.9						1.5						6.0					

<sup>1</sup> All but three are Full-Time.

<sup>2</sup> Based on number of surveys completed.

Table 4

September 30, 2001 Data

**PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS  
BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

JOB CATEGORY	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE																		
	All Employees						Survey Respondents												
	Total#	#		%		Total Comp- leted	Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"			Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"			Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"						
		Men	Women	Men	Women		Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total			
<b>Professional Librarians</b>																			
Full-time	33	96	25.6	74.4	105	1.0	**	**	11.4	12	**	**	2.9	3	**	**	**	**	
Part-time	22	19	13.6	86.4	19	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	5.3	**	**	**	**	**	
TOTAL	151	115	23.8	76.2	124	0.8	**	**	9.7	12	**	**	3.2	4	**	**	**	**	
<b>EEOG-NOC EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS:</b>																			
03-5111 Librarians			17.8	82.2		1.0			7.6				3.7						

<sup>1</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed



Table 5

September 30, 2001 Data

**RESEARCH ASSOCIATES  
BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

JOB CATEGORY	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE															
	All Employees							Survey Respondents								
	Total#		# Men		% Men		% Women		Total Comp.leted		Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"		Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"		Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	% <sup>1</sup>	#	% <sup>1</sup>	#	% <sup>1</sup>	#	% <sup>1</sup>	#
<b>Research Associates</b>	138	99	71.7	39	28.3	104	0.0	**	**	**	37.5	39	28	11	1.9	**
Full-Time	17	9	52.9	8	47.1	15	0.0	**	**	**	20.0	3	**	**	0.0	**
Part-Time	155	108	69.7	47	30.3	119	0.0	**	**	**	35.3	42	29	13	1.7	**
<b>TOTAL</b>																
EEOG-NOC EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS:																
03-4122 Post-Secondary Teaching and Research Assistants			50.8		49.2		1.2				24.3				3.7	

<sup>1</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed

**SENIOR MANAGERS (FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP**

**Table 6**  
September 30, 2001 Data

		UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE																	
		All Employees						Survey Respondents											
Management Group	Level	#		%		Total	Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"			Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"			Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"						
		Men	Women	Men	Women		% <sup>1</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>1</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>1</sup>	Total			
		Total	#	Men	Women	%	Completed	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>1</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>1</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>1</sup>
Senior Mgmt Gp	OMS	2	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	0.0	**	**	0.0	0.0	**	**	0.0	0.0	**	**	**
	3MS	25	13	52.0	12	48.0	21	0.0	**	**	4.8	4.8	**	**	0.0	0.0	**	**	**
	2MS	45	23	51.1	22	48.9	40	2.5	**	**	15.0	15.0	6	3	5.0	5.0	**	**	**
	1MS	50	15	30.0	35	70.0	44	0.0	**	**	11.4	11.4	5	**	0.0	0.0	**	**	**
	Totals:	122	51	41.8	71	58.2	107	0.9	**	**	11.2	11.2	12	4	1.9	1.9	**	**	**

<sup>1</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed

Table 7.1(A)  
 September 30, 2001 Data  
**ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF: (FULL-TIME)<sup>1</sup> NON-UNIONIZED  
 BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE										EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS													
	All Employees					Survey Respondents					Population Aged 15-64 Who Worked in 1995 or 1996 (1986-1991 for PWD) Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)					Population Aged 15-64 Who Worked in 1995 or 1996 (1986-1991 for PWD) Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)								
	Total#		%		Total Comp- leted	Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"		Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"		Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"		Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"		Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"		Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"		Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"		Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"		Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"		
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
01 Senior Managers	7	4	57.1	3	42.9	6	0.0	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
02 Middle and Other Managers	243	120	49.4	123	50.6	213	0.5	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)	128	70	54.7	58	45.3	110	0.9	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)	20	13	65.0	7	35.0	16	5.3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
05 Super. Cler/Sale/Serv (Skill B)	44	16	36.4	28	63.6	39	2.6	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
06 Super. Man/Pro/Trad-Prim Ind (Skill B)	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	7	0.0	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
07 Admin & Senr Cler (Skill Level B)	181	27	14.9	154	85.1	168	0.6	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
08 Sales and Service (Skill Level B)	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	5	0.0	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)	41	3	7.3	38	92.7	39	0.0	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
13 Sales and Service (Skill Level D)	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
ALL TOTALS	680	286	39.1	414	60.9	603	0.8	5	**	19.4	117	46	71	2.8	17	12	5	**	**	**	**	**	**	**

<sup>1</sup>Includes Senior Management Group.

<sup>2</sup>Based on a number of surveys completed

**ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF (PART-TIME):<sup>1</sup> NON-UNIONIZED  
BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE													EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS								
	All Employees						Survey Respondents															
	#			%			Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"			Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"			Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"			Aboriginal Peoples Visible Minorities		Persons With Disabilities				
	Total#	Men	Women	Men	Women	%	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>2</sup>	Total	Men	Women	% <sup>2</sup>	Total	Men	Women	%	Total	Men	Women	%
02 Middle and Other Managers	10	0	10	0.0	100.0	7	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	64.4	35.6	1.0	9.6	3.4
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)	7	1	6	14.3	85.7	7	0.0	**	**	14.3	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	50.1	49.9	1.2	12.2	3.7
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)	6	2	4	33.3	66.7	3	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	46.6	53.4	0.4	33.1	5.8
07 Admin & Serv Cler (Skill Level B)	8	0	8	0.0	100.0	7	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	13.1	86.9	0.4	20.0	3.4*
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)	1	0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	19.6	80.4	0.4	31.2	4.6
<b>ALL TOTALS</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>					

<sup>1</sup>Includes Senior Management Group.

<sup>2</sup>Based on a number of surveys completed

**Table 7.2(A)**  
**September 30, 2001 data**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF<sup>1</sup> (FULL-TIME) ON TERM<sup>2</sup> APPOINTMENTS: NON-UNIONIZED**  
**BY SOURCE OF FUNDING BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

SOURCE OF FUNDING: EEOC OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE										EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS								
	All Employees					Survey Respondents					Population Aged 15-64 Who Worked In 1995 or 1996 (EEOC 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)			Canada (EEOC 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)					
	Total#	# Men	# Women	% Men	% Women	Total Completed	Aboriginal Peoples			Visible Minorities			Persons With Disabilities						
							Response of "Yes" <sup>3</sup>	Men	Women	Response of "Yes" <sup>3</sup>	Men	Women	Response of "Yes" <sup>3</sup>	Men	Women				
						% <sup>3</sup>	#	#	% <sup>3</sup>	#	#	% <sup>3</sup>	#	#	% Total	#	#	% Total	
Operating	4	2	2	50.0	50.0	3	0.0	**	**	33.3	**	**	0.0	**	**	2.0	52.6	47.4	5.3
01 Senior Managers	16	9	7	56.3	43.8	13	0.0	**	**	15.4	**	**	0.0	**	**	1.0	64.4	35.6	9.6
02 Middle and Other Managers	11	4	7	36.4	63.6	10	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	50.1	49.9	12.2	
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)	1	1	0	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	46.6	53.4	33.1	
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)	1	0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	48.3	51.7	27.1	
05 Super. Cler/Sale/Serv (Skill B)	12	2	10	16.7	83.3	10	0.0	**	**	10.0	**	**	10.0	**	**	13.1	86.9	20.0	
07 Admin. & Serv. Cler (Skill Level B)	1	0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	19.6	80.4	31.2	
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)	46	18	28	39.1	60.9	38	0.0	**	**	10.5	4	**	2.6	**	**				
Subtotal	3	1	2	33.3	66.7	3	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	64.4	35.6	9.6	
Grant	4	3	1	75.0	25.0	3	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	50.1	49.9	12.2	
02 Middle and Other Managers	7	4	3	57.1	42.9	6	16.7	**	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**				
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)	53	22	31	41.5	58.5	44	2.3	**	**	9.1	4	**	2.3	**	**				
Subtotal																			
Total Full-Time																			

<sup>1</sup> Includes Senior Management Group.

<sup>2</sup> "Term" is defined as a staff appointment having an established date on which the appointment will terminate.

<sup>3</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed

**Table 8(A)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF: UNIONIZED (FULL-TIME)**  
**BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

September 30, 2001 Data

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE										EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS Population Aged 15-64 Who Worked In 1995 or 1996 (1986-1991 for PWD) Toronto															
	All Employees					Survey Respondents					Aboriginal Peoples					Visible Minorities					Persons With Disabilities					
	#		%		Total Completed	Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)	13	4	30.6	9	69.2	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.7	
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)	137	38	27.7	99	72.3	77	1.3	8.3	26	8	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.8	
05 Super. Cler/Sale/Serv (Skill B)	16	16	100.0	0	0.0	12	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	
06 Super. Man/Pro/Trac-Prim Ind (Skill B)	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5*	
07 Admin & Senr Cler (Skill Level B)	1	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4*	
08 Sales and Service (Skill Level B)	42	32	76.2	10	23.8	30	0.0	0.0	10.0	3	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1*	
09 Skilled Crafts & Trades (Skill Level B)	134	131	97.8	3	2.2	103	3.9	4	21.4	22	0.0	0.0	9.7	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)	108	55	50.9	53	49.1	66	0.0	0.0	39.4	26	12	14	6.1	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	
11 Sales and Service (Skill Level C)	19	13	68.4	6	31.6	11	9.1	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	
12 Semi-skilled Manual Workers (Skill C)	15	14	93.3	1	6.7	11	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	
13 Sales and Service (Skill Level D)	139	76	54.7	63	45.3	101	5.0	5	5.9	6	0.0	0.0	5.0	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.8	
14 Other Manual Workers (Skill Level D)	227	113	49.8	114	50.2	171	2.9	5	18.7	32	20	12	5.3	9	5	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	
ALL TOTALS	859	500	58.2	359	41.8	592	3.2	19	19.9	116	68	50	6.1	36	26	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

\* Based on a number of surveys completed

**Table 8(B)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF: UNIONIZED (PART-TIME)**  
**BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE														EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS Population Aged 15-64 Who Worked In 1995 or 1996 (1986-1991 for PWD)						
	All Employees						Survey Respondents								Toronto						
	Total#			%			Total Completed		Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes"		Visible Minorities Response of "Yes"		Persons With Disabilities Response of "Yes"		Aboriginal Peoples Total		Visible Minorities Total		Persons With Disabilities		
	#	Men	Women	#	Men	Women	%	Men	Women	%	Men	Women	%	Men	Women	%	Men	Women	%	Men	Women
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)	9	3	33.3	6	66.7	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.7
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.3	57.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	5.8
05 Super. Cler/Sale/Serv (Skill B)	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.2	29.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	n/a
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)	26	11	42.3	15	57.7	22	0.0	0.0	40.9	9	4	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.0	42.0	0.4	0.4	0.4	n/a
13 Sales and Service (Skill Level D)	15	10	66.7	5	33.3	6	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.5	52.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	4.6
ALL TOTALS	53	26	49.1	27	50.9	31	0.0	0.0	35.5	11	5	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.8	35.8	0.4	0.4	0.4	4.9

<sup>1</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed

Table 8.1(A)

September 30, 2001 Data

USWA (FULL-TIME)  
BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE										EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS										
	All Employees					Survey Respondents					Population Aged 15-64 Who Worked in 1995 or 1996 (1986-1991 for PWD) Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)					Persons With Disabilities					
	Total#		#		%	Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	%	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
02 Middle and Other Managers	41	25	16	61.0	39.0	0.0	**	**	**	**	15.2	5	**	**	12.1	4	**	**	7.3	26.8	3.4
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)	477	232	245	48.6	51.4	0.3	**	84	45	39	22.7	84	45	39	4.6	17	7	10	12.4	54.7	3.7
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)	461	219	242	47.5	52.5	0.8	3	113	55	58	31.8	113	55	58	3.7	13	8	5	26.7	45.3	5.8
05 Super. Cler/Sale/Serv (Skill B)	81	31	50	38.3	61.7	3.0	**	28.1	18	4	14	18	4	14	1.6	**	**	**	26.7	56.8	n/a
06 Super. Man/Pro/Exec-Firm Ind (Skill B)	7	7	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	**	50.0	3	**	50.0	3	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	29.5	7.0	6.5*
07 Admin & Sentr Cler (Skill Level B)	628	75	553	11.9	88.1	0.8	4	26.6	137	16	121	137	16	121	1.6	8	**	**	20.8	84.6	3.4*
08 Sales and Service (Skill Level B)	2	0	2	0.0	100.0	2.0	**	50.0	**	**	50.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	25.0	23.9	3.1*
09 Skilled Crafts & Trades (Skill Level B)	29	29	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	**	14.3	3	**	14.3	3	**	**	9.5	**	**	**	30.8	6.7	5.1
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)	744	131	613	17.6	82.4	1.7	11	30.8	196	41	155	196	41	155	3.8	24	7	17	31.0	75.6	4.6
11 Sales and Service (Skill Level C)	47	1	46	2.1	97.9	0.0	**	25.0	8	**	25.0	8	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	31.8	80.8	3.8
12 Semi-skilled Manual Workers (Skill C)	3	3	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	46.0	11.0	8.7
13 Sales and Service (Skill Level D)	9	6	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	**	28.6	**	**	28.6	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	36.0	18.6	4.9
14 Other Manual Workers (Skill Level D)	1	1	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	**	0.0	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	0.0	**	**	**	36.1	9.8	6.3
ALL TOTALS	2530	760	1770	30.0	70.0	0.9	19	27.9	570	173	397	570	173	397	3.4	69	29	40			

\* Based on a number of surveys completed



**USWA (PART-TIME)  
BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE										EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS										
	All Employees					Survey Respondents					Population Aged 15-64 Who Worked In 1995 or 1996 (1986-1991 for PWD) Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)										
	Total#		#		%	Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	%	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
02 Middle and Other Managers	2	1	1	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)	58	12	46	79.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)	47	11	36	76.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
05 Super: Cler/Sale/Serv (Skill B)	3	0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
07 Admin & Senr Cler (Skill Level B)	69	3	66	95.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
09 Skilled Crafts & Trades (Skill Level B)	1	1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)	84	8	76	90.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 Sales and Service (Skill Level C)	8	0	8	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12 Semi-skilled Manual Workers (Skill C)	1	1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ALL TOTALS	273	37	236	86.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

<sup>1</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed

Table 8.2(A)

September 30, 2001 data

USWA (FULL-TIME) ON TERM<sup>1</sup> APPOINTMENTS:  
BY SOURCE OF FUNDING BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA

SOURCE OF FUNDING	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE													EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS															
	All Employees						Survey Respondents						Population Aged 15-64 Who Worked in 1995 or 1996 (1986-1991 for PWD) Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)																
	Total#		%		#		%		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Response of "Yes"		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women
Operating	EMPLOYMENT EQUITY																												
	EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP																												
	03 Professionals (Skill Level A)																												
	04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)																												
	05 Super. Cler/Sales/Serv (Skill B)																												
	07 Admin & Senr Cler (Skill Level B)																												
	09 Skilled Crafts & Trades (Skill Level B)																												
	10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)																												
	<b>Subtotal</b>																												
	02 Middle and Other Managers																												
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)																													
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)																													
07 Admin & Senr Cler (Skill Level B)																													
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)																													
<b>Subtotal</b>																													
<b>Total Full-Time</b>																													
Grant	02 Middle and Other Managers																												
03 Professionals (Skill Level A)																													
04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)																													
07 Admin & Senr Cler (Skill Level B)																													
10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)																													
<b>Subtotal</b>																													
<b>Total Full-Time</b>																													

<sup>1</sup>Term is defined as a staff appointment having an established date on which the appointment will terminate.  
<sup>2</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed

**Table 8.2(B)**

September 30, 2001 data

**USWA (PART-TIME) ON TERM<sup>1</sup> APPOINTMENTS:  
BY SOURCE OF FUNDING BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA**

SOURCE OF FUNDING	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE											EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS													
	Aboriginal Peoples											Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)													
	Total#		# Men		# Women		% Men		% Women		Total Comp-leted	Response of "Yes" <sup>2</sup>		Response of "Yes" <sup>2</sup>		Response of "Yes" <sup>2</sup>		Response of "Yes" <sup>2</sup>		Response of "Yes" <sup>2</sup>		Response of "Yes" <sup>2</sup>			
Operating	EMPLOYMENT EQUITY																								
	EEOC OCCUPATIONAL GROUP																								
	03 Professionals (Skill Level A)																								
	5	4	0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Operating	04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)																								
	4	0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	8	0	0	0.0	8	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Operating	07 Admin & Senr Cler (Skill Level B)																								
	2	0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	19	4	2	10.5	15	78.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Grant	Subtotal																								
	8	2	2	25.0	6	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	4	2	0	50.0	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	2	0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Grant	03 Professionals (Skill Level A)																								
	3	1	1	33.3	2	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	17	5	2	29.4	12	70.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Grant	Subtotal																								
	36	7	7	25.0	27	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	36	7	7	25.0	27	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Grant	04 Semi-Pro & Tech (Skill Level B)																								
	4	2	0	50.0	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	4	2	0	50.0	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Grant	07 Admin & Senr Cler (Skill Level B)																								
	2	0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	2	0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Grant	10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)																								
	3	1	1	33.3	2	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	3	1	1	33.3	2	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Grant	Subtotal																								
	17	5	2	29.4	12	70.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	17	5	2	29.4	12	70.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Grant	Total Part-Time																								
	36	7	7	25.0	27	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	36	7	7	25.0	27	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

<sup>1</sup>"Term" is defined as a staff appointment having an established date on which the appointment will terminate.  
<sup>2</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed

**Table 9(A)**  
**TRAINING (MAJOR TRAINING TOPIC) FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF: NON-UNION**  
**AND UNION (FULL-TIME) BY STAFF CATEGORY AND DESIGNATED GROUP**

Staff Category	Type of Seminar	Total # of Participant Days for Workforce <sup>3</sup>		# of Participant Days for Staff Who Completed Surveys	Aboriginal Peoples		Visible Minorities		Persons with Disabilities	
		%Workforce	%Days		%Workforce	%Days	%Workforce	%Days	%Workforce	%Days
Senior Management Group	Staff Development	8	0.0	8	0.0	0.0	93.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Computer Skills	7	69.2	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Admin Mgmt Systems	7	61.5	7	7.7	15.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mgmt Development	92	56.5	84	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	113	58.2	105	0.9	0.5	11.2	19.1	1.9	0.0
	AVG DAYS <sup>1</sup>	0.92	0.85		0.50		1.67		0.00	
Admin, Non-union	Staff Development	249	93.4	239	0.8	0.0	22.6	3.3	0.0	0.0
	Computer Skills	95	84.7	94	0.0	0.0	25.7	9.1	0.0	0.0
	Admin Mgmt Systems	208	87.7	183	0.5	0.5	22.7	1.4	0.0	0.0
	Mgmt Development	613	76.8	519	2.1	2.1	21.5	2.8	0.0	0.0
	Career & Life Planning	10	70.0	10	0.0	0.0	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0
	Env Health & Safety	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Student Records System	20	85.0	17	5.9	44.1	22.6	3.0	3.3	0.0
	TOTAL	1184	61.5	1081	0.8	1.4	21.2	22.6	3.0	3.3
	AVG DAYS	2.14	2.89		3.75		2.29		2.30	
USWA	Staff Development	545	93.1	481	2.0	0.0	33.5	0.9	0.0	0.0
	Computer Skills	86.4	459	1.2	0.7	30.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Admin Mgmt Systems	578	90.3	507	0.0	0.0	27.0	1.9	0.0	0.0
	Mgmt Development	421	73.4	340	0.0	0.0	12.1	2.2	0.0	0.0
	Career & Life Planning	31	83.9	28	3.6	26.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Env Health & Safety	4	50.0	3	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Student Records System	233	81.7	195	1.5	26.7	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	2373	70.0	2012	0.9	1.1	27.9	26.8	3.4	2.2
	AVG DAYS	0.94	1.15		1.18		0.95		0.64	
Administrative, Unionized	Staff Development	21	47.6	16	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Computer Skills	25	22.0	17	0.0	0.0	45.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Admin Mgmt Systems	4	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	2.3	14.0	0.0	0.0
	Mgmt Development	30	6.8	22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Career & Life Planning	2	75.0	2	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Env Health & Safety	6	9.1	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	87	41.8	60	3.2	0.0	19.9	19.2	6.1	10.0
	AVG DAYS	0.10	0.05		0.00		0.10		0.11	
ALL ADMIN STAFF	Staff Development	822	91.2	743	1.5	0.0	30.3	2.1	0.0	0.0
	Computer Skills	689	83.7	576	1.0	0.0	29.6	3.3	0.0	0.0
	Admin Mgmt Systems	795	89.0	696	0.7	0.0	25.8	1.7	0.0	0.0
	Mgmt Development	1155	72.2	965	1.1	0.0	17.1	2.6	0.0	0.0
	Career & Life Planning	43	80.2	39	2.6	2.6	21.8	2.6	0.0	0.0
	Env Health & Safety	10	25.0	8	0.0	0.0	31.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Records System	253	82.8	212	1.9	1.9	28.1	5.7	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	3765	62.5	3237	1.3	1.2	24.9	25.0	3.8	2.6

<sup>1</sup>Percentages shown in "% Days" are weighted by the number of participant days within each cell.

<sup>2</sup>"AVG DAYS" shows, within a given staff category, the average number of training days taken by the entire relevant workforce, which may be compared to the average number of training days taken by designated group members.

<sup>3</sup>Data on Participant Days has been collected from AMS Education and Training module in HRIS.

Data for Computer Skills, Admin Mgmt Systems, and Mgmt Development is incomplete.

**Table 9(B)** TRAINING (MAJOR TRAINING TOPIC) FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF: NON-UNION AND UNION (PART-TIME) BY STAFF CATEGORY AND DESIGNATED GROUP

Staff Category	Type of Seminar	All Employees											
		Total # of Participant Days for Workforce <sup>1</sup>		Women		# of Participant Days for Staff Who Completed Surveys		Aboriginal Peoples		Visible Minorities		Persons with Disabilities	
		%Wkforce	%Days	%Wkforce	%Days	%Wkforce	%Days	%Wkforce	%Days	%Wkforce	%Days	%Wkforce	%Days
Admin, Non-union	Staff Development	17	100.0			17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Computer Skills	8	100.0			8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Admin Mgmt Systems	5	100.0			4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Mgmt Development	29	100.0			26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	59	90.6	100.0		55	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	AVG DAYS <sup>2</sup>	1.83	2.02			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
USWA	Staff Development	26	91.8			19	0.0	0.0	10.6	0.0	10.8	0.0	
	Computer Skills	48	95.6			30	0.0	0.0	15.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Admin Mgmt Systems	43	83.7			35	0.0	0.0	26.1	0.0	18.8	0.0	
	Mgmt Development	13	100.0			12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.8	0.0	
	Career & Life Planning	2	100.0			2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Student Records System	17	100.0			15	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	10.3	0.0	
	TOTAL	146	86.4	92.5		110	0.0	0.0	15.0	15.0	4.9	14.1	
	AVG DAYS	0.53	0.57			0.00	0.00	0.53	1.35	0.00	1.35	0.00	
ALL ADMIN STAFF	Staff Development	42	95.2			36	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.6	0.0	
	Computer Skills <sup>3</sup>	57	96.5			39	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Admin Mgmt Systems	48	86.3			38	0.0	0.0	23.7	0.0	17.1	0.0	
	Mgmt Development	41	100.0			37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.9	0.0	
	Career & Life Planning	2	100.0			2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Student Records System	18	100.0			15	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	10.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	205	81.6	94.6		165	0.0	0.0	16.4	10.0	3.8	9.4	

<sup>1</sup> Percentages shown in "% Days" are weighted by the number of participant days within each cell.  
<sup>2</sup> AVG DAYS shows, within a given staff category, the average number of training days taken by the entire relevant workforce, which may be compared to the average number of training days taken by designated group members.  
<sup>3</sup> Data on Participant Days has been collected from AMS Education and Training module in HRIS; data for Computer Skills, Admin Mgmt Systems, and Mgmt Development is incomplete.  
<sup>4</sup> Computer Skills Total includes 1 participant day for a part-time Unionized staff member.

**Table 10 PROMOTIONS BY STAFF CATEGORY BY DESIGNATED GROUP**

STAFF CATEGORY	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE												
	All Employees						Survey Respondents						
	Total#	# Men	% Men	# Women	% Women	% <sup>3</sup> Wkforce	Total Completed	# Yes	% <sup>4</sup> Yes	# Yes	% <sup>3</sup> Wkfrnc	# Yes	% <sup>4</sup> Yes
Academic: Promotions <sup>1</sup> to Full Professor	26	20	76.9	6	23.1	37.8	19	**	5.3	0.5	10.5	**	5.3
Clinical: Promotions <sup>2</sup> to Full Professor	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	21.2	5	**	0.0	1.1	13.8	**	0.0
Senior Management Group	19	7	36.8	12	63.2	58.2	16	**	0.0	0.9	11.2	**	6.3
Administrative, Non-Unionized	98	23	23.5	75	76.5	61.5	89	**	0.0	0.8	21.2	3	3.4
USWA	242	65	26.9	177	73.1	70.0	191	**	0.5	0.9	27.9	3	1.5
Administrative, Unionized	65	36	55.4	29	44.6	41.8	40	**	0.0	3.2	19.9	**	0.0

<sup>1</sup> Promotions are defined by: (c) Academics: only promotions to Full Professor in Tenure Stream are shown (all but one are from Associate Professor); (b) Clinical: promotion to Full Professor only; (c) Admin Non-Union staff & SMG: by upward movement in salary grade; (d) Unionized staff: a salary increase.

<sup>2</sup> Promotions are determined by comparing September 2000 to September 2001 data only. Of the 462 promotions shown, 433 are full-time.

<sup>3</sup> % Wkfrnc shows % of relevant full-time workforce, to be used as a comparator. For Academic, the comparator is Associate Professors in Tenure Stream. For Clinical, the comparator is Associate Professors holding clinical appointments in the Faculty of Medicine.

<sup>4</sup> Based on a number of surveys completed

**Table 10.1 REPRESENTATION OF AVERAGE YEARS FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

STAFF CATEGORY	Total		Men		Women	
	#	Avg Years	#	Avg Years	#	Avg Years
Academic: Promotions to Full Professor	26	6.38	20	5.25	6	10.18
Clinical: Promotions to Full Professor	9	7.70	8	7.79	1	7.01

Table 11(A)

EXIT DATA (REASON FOR LEAVING)<sup>1</sup> BY STAFF  
CATEGORY (FULL-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP

September 30, 2001 Data

STAFF CATEGORY	REASON FOR LEAVING	All Employees				Survey Respondents				Persons with Disabilities	
		Total # of Exits	Women % of Exits	# of Exits with Completed Surveys	Aboriginal Peoples % of Exits	Visible Minorities % of Exits	% of Workforce Exits	% of Workforce Exits	% of Workforce Exits	% of Workforce Exits	% of Workforce Exits
Faculty, tenure stream	Normal Retirements	49	26.6	26.1	0.5	6.1	9.9	10.2	3.3	4.1	
	Early Retirements	8	25.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Expiry of Appointment	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	19	31.6	13	15.4	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Deceased	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Faculty, Non-15	Normal Retirements	41	38.6	39.0	0.9	0.0	12.9	14.3	1.4	0.0	
	Early Retirements	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Expiry of Appointment	7	42.9	5	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	17	40.0	8	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Deceased	1	41.2	13	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Professional Librarians	Normal Retirements	9	74.4	55.6	1.0	0.0	11.4	40.0	2.9	0.0	
	Early Retirements	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Expiry of Appointment	2	50.0	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	4	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Research Associates	Normal Retirements	21	28.3	23.8	0.0	0.0	37.5	43.8	1.9	0.0	
	Early Retirements	1	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	16	18.8	13	0.0	0.0	46.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Layoff	3	33.3	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Deceased	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Senior Management Group	Normal Retirements	7	58.2	42.9	0.9	0.0	11.2	40.0	1.9	0.0	
	Early Retirements	3	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	3	66.7	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Layoff	1	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Admin, Non-union	Normal Retirements	55	61.5	61.8	0.6	2.6	21.2	25.6	3.0	0.0	
	Early Retirements	5	20.0	4	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Terminations for Cause	13	61.5	10	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	32	71.9	22	4.5	31.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Layoff	3	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Deceased	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Admin, Unionized	Normal Retirements	71	41.8	35.2	3.2	0.0	19.9	10.9	6.1	4.3	
	Early Retirements	17	29.4	12	0.0	8.3	16.7	8.3	16.7	0.0	
	Expiry of Appointment	2	47.1	12	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Terminations for Cause	3	50.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Resignations	24	33.3	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Layoff	3	0.0	1	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Deceased	5	40.0	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
URWA	Normal Retirements	214	70.0	69.6	0.9	1.2	27.9	24.7	3.4	3.1	
	Early Retirements	8	50.0	7	0.0	0.0	67.1	16.7	0.0	0.0	
	Expiry of Appointment	17	70.6	12	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Terminations for Cause	14	76.9	9	0.0	0.0	63.6	18.2	2.8	2.8	
Resignations	144	64.3	11	1.9	19.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Layoff	15	72.2	13	0.0	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Deceased	3	53.3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

<sup>1</sup> Reason for Leaving<sup>2</sup> is based on coding on Action Forms by departments, which may not be consistently applied in all cases.

Table 11(B)

EXIT DATA (REASON FOR LEAVING)<sup>1</sup> BY STAFF  
CATEGORY (PART-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP

September 30, 2001 Data

STAFF CATEGORY	REASON FOR LEAVING	All Employees			Survey Respondents			Persons with Disabilities		
		Total # of Exits	Women % of Exits	# of Exits with Completed Surveys	Aboriginal Peoples % of Workforce	Visible Minorities % of Workforce	Persons with Disabilities % of Workforce			
Faculty: Tenure Stream	Early Retirements	1	6.3	1	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	
	Expiry of Appointment	1	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Faculty: Non-TS	Normal Retirements	25	40.3	12	1.0	7.6	25.0	2.0	0.0	
	Early Retirements	2	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Expiry of Appointment	15	40.0	5	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	7	57.1	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Professional Librarians	Expiry of Appointment	1	86.4	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	
Research Associates	Expiry of Appointment	3	47.1	2	0.0	20.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	
Admin, Non-university	Resignations	2	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Layoff	1	90.6	1	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Admin, Unionized	Terminations for Cause	9	50.9	2	0.0	35.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	7	71.4	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Layoff	1	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
USWA	Normal Retirements	30	86.4	22	0.0	4.3	15.0	22.7	4.9	
	Early Retirements	1	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Expiry of Appointment	3	100.0	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Terminations for Cause	2	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Resignations	18	94.4	15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Layoff	5	80.0	3	0.0	26.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	

<sup>1</sup> Reason for Leaving<sup>2</sup> is based on coding on Action Forms by departments, which may not be consistently applied in all cases.

<sup>2</sup> % of Workforce<sup>2</sup> represents percentage of relevant part-time workforce only.



**Table 12(A)**  
**NEW HIRES BY STAFF CATEGORY (FULL-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP**

September 30, 2001 Data

STAFF CATEGORY	All Employees			Survey Respondents											
	# of New Hires	% of Workforce		# of New Hires with Completed Surveys	Aboriginal Peoples			Visible Minorities			Persons with Disabilities				
		Men	Women		% of Workforce	New Hires	Men	Women	% of Workforce	New Hires	Men	Women	% of Workforce	New Hires	Men
Faculty	183	30.5	41.0	135	0.6	1.5	10.8	14.8	15	5	2.7	1.5	**	**	
Tenure Stream	108	26.6	35.2	87	0.4	0.0	9.9	14.1	9	5	3.3	1.1	**	**	
Clinical Non-IS in Medicine	16	25.8	31.3	8	0.4	0.0	14.9	12.5	**	**	1.9	0.0	**	**	
Non-IS CLIA/Other <sup>2</sup>	25	38.7	52.0	18	0.9	5.6	10.7	16.7	**	**	0.9	0.0	**	**	
Other Academics <sup>3</sup>	34	58.1	55.9	22	1.5	4.5	11.5	9.1	**	**	1.0	4.5	**	**	
Professional Librarians	4	74.4	87.5	5	1.0	0.0	11.4	0.0	**	**	2.9	0.0	**	**	
Research Associates	34	28.3	35.3	32	0.0	0.0	37.5	56.3	11	7	1.9	0.0	**	**	
Senior Management Group	9	58.2	66.7	7	0.9	0.0	11.2	0.0	**	**	1.9	0.0	**	**	
Continuing Term <sup>3</sup>	8		62.5	6											
Administrative, Non-unionized <sup>4</sup>	1		100.0	1											
Continuing Term <sup>3</sup>	62	61.5	59.7	57	0.8	0.0	21.2	12.3	4	3	3.0	5.3	**	**	
USWA	11		72.7	10											
Administrative, Unionized <sup>5</sup>	339	70.0	74.9	290	0.9	0.7	27.9	23.1	19	48	3.4	2.4	**	**	
ALL STAFF	713	41.8	43.6	61	3.2	4.9	19.9	19.7	7	5	6.1	4.9	**	**	
			59.6	587	1.2	1.2	21.1	56	68			2.6	7	8	

<sup>1</sup> New hires are defined as employees hired externally, i.e. from outside University of Toronto, for Oct. 1, 2000 to Sept. 30, 2001 inclusive.

<sup>2</sup> "CLIA/Other" faculty positions include Contractually Limited Term Appointments, Sessionals, Lecturers, and Associates in Dentistry.

<sup>3</sup> "Term" is defined as a staff appointment having an established date on which the appointment will terminate.

<sup>4</sup> "Administrative, Non-Unionized" totals exclude SMG.

<sup>5</sup> For unionized staff, new hires includes temporary staff hired for periods of up to one-hundred-and-twenty (120) working days.

<sup>6</sup> Includes Teaching Stream staff.

Table 12(B) NEW HIRES BY STAFF CATEGORY (PART-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP

STAFF CATEGORY	All Employees				Survey Respondents												
	# of New Hires <sup>1</sup>	% of Workforce		# of New Hires with Completed Surveys	% of Workforce		% of Visible Minorities		% of Persons with Disabilities		% of Workforce		% of Workforce		% of Workforce		
		Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Faculty	95	38.6	53.7	61	1.0	0.0	7.6	4.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tenure Stream	2	6.3	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clinical Non-TS in Medicine	2	19.4	0.0	0	3.2	0.0	9.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-TS CLTA/Other <sup>2</sup>	14	50.6	43.8	12	0.0	0.0	10.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Academics <sup>3</sup>	75	52.6	58.7	47	0.0	0.0	3.9	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Professional Librarians	3	86.4	66.7	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Research Associates	5	47.1	40.0	4	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Senior Management Group Term <sup>3</sup>	1	58.2	100.0	0	0.9	0.0	11.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Administrative, Non-unionized <sup>4</sup>	1	90.6	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Term <sup>3</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
USWA	34	86.4	73.5	26	0.0	0.0	15.0	23.1	4.9	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Administrative, Unionized <sup>5</sup>	14	50.9	35.7	9	0.0	0.0	35.5	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ALL STAFF	153	56.9	56.9	103	0.0	0.0	12.6	8	1.0	0.0	0.0	17.6	8	5	0.0	0.0	0.0

<sup>1</sup> New hires are defined as employees hired externally, i.e. from outside University of Toronto, for Oct. 1, 2000 to Sept. 30, 2001 inclusive.

<sup>2</sup> CLTA/Other<sup>2</sup> faculty positions include Contractually Limited Term Appointments, Sessions, Lecturers, and Associates in Dentistry.

<sup>3</sup> Term<sup>3</sup> is defined as a staff appointment having an established date on which the appointment will terminate.

<sup>4</sup> Administrative, Non-Unionized<sup>4</sup> totals exclude SMG.

<sup>5</sup> For unionized staff, new hires include temporary staff hired for periods of up to one-hundred-and-twenty (120) working days.

<sup>6</sup> Includes Teaching Stream staff.

Table 13

FEMALE/MALE TENURE-STREAM APPLICANTS, INTERVIEWEES AND  
NEW HIRES FROM OCTOBER 1, 2000 SEPTEMBER 30, 2001  
BY DEPARTMENTAL GROUPS\*

Group	Positions	# Applicants			# Interviewed			# Hired F/M		Goals for Hiring %	% of Female PhDs
		Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male		
1	16	197	113	310	36	11	47	14	2	60+	64%
2	23	256	289	545	27	31	58	9	14	45-59	53%
3	40	410	1105	1515	55	124	179	14	26	30-44	36%
4	15	105	451	556	13	26	39	3	12	15-29	23%
5	26	106	969	1075	23	138	161	3	23	less than 15	11%
Totals:	120	1074	2927	4001	154	330	484	43	77		
% Total 00/01:		26.8%			31.8%			35.8%			

\* Departmental groups were established by placing together fields with a similar percentage of doctorates awarded to women in Canadian Graduate Schools from 1996 - 1998.

**Key to Departmental Groups:**

- Group One: Education, Drama, Fine Art, Information Studies, Nursing, Occupational Therapy, Psychology, Social Work
- Group Two: Anthropology, Botany, Community Health, English, Germanic Languages & Literatures, Linguistics, Slavic Languages & Literatures, Sociology, Spanish & Portuguese
- Group Three: Basic Medical Sciences, Biochemistry, Dentistry, Geography, History, Law, Management, Music, Pharmacy, Philosophy, Political Science, Study of Religion, Zoology
- Group Four: Architecture, Chemistry, Economics, Forestry, Mathematics, Statistics
- Group Five: Computer Science, Engineering, Physics