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### 1.0 Introduction

The University of Toronto has a long-standing commitment to equity and diversity: "We will proactively seek to increase diversity among our community members, and it is our aim to have a student body and teaching and administrative staffs that mirror the diversity of the pool of potential qualified applicants for those positions." ${ }^{1}$ In fulfilling this commitment, the University pays particular attention to the participation and advancement of members of five designated groups: women, visible minorities, Aboriginal people, persons with disabilities and sexual minorities. The first four groups have been designated groups by the federal Employment Equity Act, while the University of Toronto has included sexual minorities among its internally designated employment equity groups since 2001.
All parts of the University community contribute to an inclusive and welcoming environment based on equity and diversity. The University's comprehensive approach to equity and diversity is partly reflected by the number of specialized individuals, offices, and departments that serve the needs of the University's diverse workforce. These offices include the:

- Special Advisor on Equity Issues
- Status of Women Office
- Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Officer
- Director, Academic Human Resources
- Health and Well-being Programs and Services
- LGBTQ Resources and Programs Office
- Quality of Work-Life Advisor
- Family Care Office
- Sexual Harassment Education, Counselling and Complaints Office
- UTSC Special Advisor to the Principal on Equity Issues
- Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Officer
- Human Resources Aboriginal Initiatives Co-ordinator
- Employment Equity Office ${ }^{2}$

The contribution to equity by all members of the University community was recognized in 2007 when the University was named, for the third year in a row, one of Canada's Top 100 Employers and one of the Top 50 Employers in the GTA for the second year. ${ }^{3}$
The University, as part of its employment equity commitment, participates in the Federal Contractors Program (FCP) which provides guidance on the development, implementation and maintenance of an employment equity plan for the designated equity groups.
The University Employment Equity Office, in cooperation with the Office of the VicePresident and Provost, monitors the representation of designated equity groups in the University workforce and tracks progress with various employment equity initiatives. This

[^0]report outlines the progress of the University of Toronto's employment equity programs and presents the workforce data for the period October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2007.

### 1.1 General Overview of the Report

The Employment Equity Report 2007 is organized in four sections:
Section 1 provides background to the University's Employment Equity program, summary information for 2007 and general trends over 2005 to 2007.

Section 2 presents the workforce data for faculty, other academic positions, non-unionized administrative employees and unionized employees.

Section 3 summarizes the University's recent employment equity initiatives, coordinated primarily through the Offices of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity and the Vice-President and Provost. This section also makes reference to the Annual Report of the Equity Offices, which details the work and goals of the University Equity Officers.

Section 4 includes an update on the progress of the University's accomplishments against the five employment equity objectives.

For the purposes of this report, the University's employment positions are classified using the fifteen Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOGs) established by the Federal Contractors Program. This allows us to compare the University workforce representation with external labour force availability data, derived from the last national census (2001) for women, visible minorities and Aboriginal people, and against the Participation Activity Levels (PALS) survey (2001) for persons with disabilities. ${ }^{4}$ Individual privacy is protected by the federal requirement that data be suppressed where results for three or fewer employees would otherwise be reported.

The workforce data is presented so as to mirror the employment cycle of an individual staff or faculty member during their time at the University: from point of hire, retention (including training and promotion), to eventual departure. Faculty representation, promotion and retention are examined by School of Graduate Studies Division I-IV (Humanities, Social Sciences, Life Sciences and Sciences respectively) with data provided by the Office of the Vice-President and Provost.

Workforce data is accessed through two sources. Information with respect to gender is provided through the Human Resources Information System (HRIS). Information on Aboriginal people, visible minorities, persons with disabilities and sexual minorities is compiled from data provided voluntarily in the University's Employment Equity Questionnaire. All employees are requested to complete an Employment Equity Questionnaire at the time of hiring. In 2006, all employees were resurveyed as part of a University-wide initiative to update and improve the employment equity data. The Employment Equity Census reflects the collective data compiled through the questionnaires.

[^1]
### 1.2 Employment Equity Representation Overview

### 1.2.1 Response to Employment Equity Census

The resurvey completed in 2006 resulted in a higher percentage of participation in the census compared to that in previous years. Strong participation in completing the equity questionnaire by new hires since the resurvey has positively impacted the overall percentage of surveys returned and completed for 2007. For the total of 8,128 full-time employees, $91.04 \%$ of surveys were returned and $90.22 \%$ completed ${ }^{5}$. Furthermore, the gap between surveys returned and completed has been narrowed considerably with the resurvey in 2006.


### 1.2.2 Summary Data on Representation Rates

The 2007 employment equity data is summarized in Table 1. All designated groups are represented at higher rates among the administrative staff. For academic and administrative positions together, women are represented at $52.6 \%$, Aboriginal people at $0.9 \%$, visible minorities at $24.5 \%$, persons with disabilities at $3.0 \%$ and sexual minorities at $4.5 \%$.

| Staff Category | Total | Women |  | Total Completed Surveys | Aboriginal People |  | Visible Minorities |  | Persons with Disabilities |  | Sexual Minorities |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# | \% |  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |
| Total Academic Positions | 3447 | 1283 | 37.2\% | 2948 | 13 | 0.5\% | 455 | 15.4\% | 58 | 1.97\% | 131 | 4.4\% |
| Faculty | 3014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Librarians | 145 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research Associates | 288 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Administrative Staff | 5407 | 3374 | 62.4\% | 4984 | 55 | 1.1\% | 1489 | 29.9\% | 176 | 3.5\% | 227 | 4.6\% |
| Administrative Non-Union | 928 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Unionized | 4479 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Staff | 8854 | 4657 | 52.6\% | 7932 | 68 | 0.9\% | 1944 | 24.5\% | 234 | 3.0\% | 358 | 4.5\% |

[^2]
### 1.2.3 Trends in Representation Rates 2005 to 2007

Table 2 depicts the patterns in number of employees in designated groups and their representation over the past three years. Representation of women has slightly increased from $52.3 \%$ to $52.6 \%$. Representation of visible minorities has increased from $21.8 \%$ to $24.5 \%$; representation of persons with disabilities has risen slightly from $2.6 \%$ to $3.0 \%$. The representation of Aboriginal people has fallen from $1.3 \%$ to $0.9 \%$. Representation of sexual minorities has increased slightly. Changes in the representation rates were more pronounced from 2005 to 2006, likely related to the resurvey. Very little change has occurred from 2006 to 2007, which is expected considering relatively small turnover (exits at $5.7 \%$ of all employees; new hires at $8.3 \%$ of all employees).

Table 2: Representation Rates All Employees 2005-2007

|  | 2005Total Employees 8,533(CompletedQuestionnaires 6,720) |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$Total Employees 8,628(CompletedQuestionnaires 7,657) |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$Total Employees 8,854(CompletedQuestionnaires 7,932) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |
| Women | 4459 | 52.3 | 4517 | 52.4 | 4557 | 52.6 |
| Aboriginal Persons | 88 | 1.3 | 65 | 0.8 | 68 | 0.9 |
| Visible Minorities | 1466 | 21.8 | 1875 | 24.5 | 1944 | 24.5 |
| Persons with Disabilities | 172 | 2.6 | 231 | 3.0 | 234 | 3.0 |
| Sexual Minorities | N/A | N/A | 317 | 4.1 | 358 | 4.5 |

Table 3 provides a further level of detail, reporting the representation rates for academic staff and administrative staff separately.

Table 3: Representation Rates for Academic and Administrative Staff Categories 2005 to 2007

|  |  | 2005Total Employees 8,533(CompletedQuestionnaires 6,720) |  | 2006Total Employees 8,628(CompletedQuestionnaires 7,657) |  | ```2007 Total Employees 8,854 (Completed Questionnaires 7,932)``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |
|  | Academic | 1215 | $\begin{aligned} & 36.2 \\ & 62.7 \end{aligned}$ | 1229 | 36.5 | 1283 | 37.2 |
| Women | Admin | 3244 |  | 3288 | 62.5 | 3374 | 62.4 |
| Aboriginal People | Academic Admin | 1672 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \\ & 1.7 \end{aligned}$ | 1154 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.4 \\ 1.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 13 | 0.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 55 | 1.1 |
| Visible Minorities | Academic <br> Admin | $\begin{array}{r} 353 \\ 1113 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.4 \\ & 26.1 \end{aligned}$ | 432 | 15.2 | 455 | 15.4 |
|  |  |  |  | 1443 | 30.0 | 1489 | 29.9 |
| Persons with Disabilities | Academic <br> Admin | $\begin{array}{r} 51 \\ 121 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2.0 \\ & 2.8 \end{aligned}$ | 58 | 2.0 | 58 | 2.0 |
|  |  |  |  | 173 | 3.6 | 176 | 3.5 |
| Sexual Minorities | Academic <br> Admin | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { N/A } \\ & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | 116 | 4.1 | 131 | 4.4 |
|  |  |  | N/A | 201 | 4.2 | 227 | 4.6 |

### 2.0 Workforce Representation by Employee Group

### 2.1 Faculty

This year, women accounted for $51 \%$ of new faculty hires ( $\mathrm{n}=55$ ) which is their highest representation in the last 5 years. There is improvement in the number of women hires in the Social Sciences, Physical Sciences and Life Sciences. Even in some of the traditionally 'masculine' disciplines (e.g. mathematics or computer science), hires of new female faculty exceeded the available pool of Canadian PhD candidates by more than $20 \%$.

In terms of overall representation, we continue to see an increase in the tenure stream in the total number of women, visible minority faculty and faculty who identify as belonging to a sexual minority. There continues to be a decline in the faculty who identify as disabled and the number of Aboriginal faculty has remained fairly static over the last ten years. Women continue to take on leadership roles at the University, representing almost $35 \%$ of academic administrators.

In some areas, the number of new faculty maybe quite small and what appear to be large percentage changes may actually refer to a small number of positions. When this is further broken down by SGS division, we may be speaking of a small number of faculty even though the percentage change for that group may seem quite large. For instance, a total of 21 new faculty were hired who identified as visible minorities; 5 of these new hires were in the Life Sciences division, resulting in a $20 \%$ change in the representation of visible minorities in Life Sciences. This becomes even more significant when we examine the limited representation of those who identify as Aboriginal or as having a disability.

### 2.1.1 Faculty Recruitment

A total of 107 new hires were made between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007. Table 4 summarizes the origin of new hires (for assistant and associate professors, the location of the PhD granting institution; for full professors, the location of their previous appointment). This may not necessarily represent the nationality or citizenship of the individual hired, although immigration requirements allows us to identify all Canadian citizens.
Table 4 indicates that the majority of new faculty hired came from the U.S, though this number declined $8 \%$ from last year. There was a $9 \%$ increase in faculty coming from institutions outside the U.S. and Canada to $23 \%$. Fifteen percent of new faculty hires came from Canadian institutions other than $U$ of $T$, while those coming directly from $U$ of $T$ represented $13 \%$ of the new hires. This year $47 \%$ of new hires were Canadian citizens which is a slight increase from last year ( $44.1 \%$ ). Understanding the international origin of new hires provides important context when examining the hiring of women faculty and comparison with Canadian applicant pools.

Table 4: Origin of New Hires July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007

| Origin of New Hires (N=107) | New <br> Hires | Canadian | Non- <br> Canadian | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| New faculty originating from US <br> Institutions | 52 | $13 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| New faculty originating from <br> international institutions | 25 | $6 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| New faculty originating from <br> Canadian institutions (other than <br> U of T) | 16 | $15 \%$ | 0 | $15 \%$ |
| New faculty originating from <br> U of T | 14 | $13 \%$ | 0 | $13 \%$ |
| Total | 107 | $47 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

## Women

Data is collected on the representation of women amongst new hires at the University. Women accounted for $51 \%$ of new hires $(\mathrm{n}=55)$ which is their highest representation in the last 5 years. As Figure 1 indicates, there is improvement in the number of women hires in all divisions except the Humanities where there was a decline of $14 \%(n=11)$ from 2005/06. In both the Social Sciences and Physical Sciences divisions, the percentage of women hires rose $16 \%(\mathrm{n}=21$ and $\mathrm{n}=9)$ from the previous year to $57 \%$ and $43 \%$ of new hires respectively. In the Life Sciences women accounted for $64 \%(n=14)$ of new hires, an increase of $18 \%$ from 2005/06.

Figure 1: Trend Analysis of New Women Faculty 2002/03-2006/07


Table 5 compares the new women faculty ( $\mathrm{N}=55$ ) beginning employment between October 1 , 2006 and September 30, 2007 to the proportion of PhDs awarded to women in different
disciplines in Canada from 2002-2004 ${ }^{6}$. Disciplines are grouped by the percentage of PhDs awarded to women. Subjects where more than $60 \%$ of PhDs are awarded to women include Anthropology, Education, Nursing, Social Work and Visual and Performing Arts, while in Computer Science and Engineering women receive less than 20\% of the PhDs. It is useful to compare our success in hiring women faculty to their availability in the broader pool of qualified PhDs available in Canada. An abbreviated form of Table 5 follows.

Table 5: Women Faculty Hires and \% Female PhD Graduates by Discipline Group

| Discipline | \% Females <br> Hired 1/10/06 <br> to 30/9/07 | \% of Female <br> PhDs 2002- <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Group One (60\% or more): Anthropology, Classics, College Programs, <br> Education, French, German, Linguistics, Music, Nursing, Nutritional Sciences, <br> Psychology, Public Health Sciences, Rehab Sciences (Physical Therapy, Speech- <br>  <br> Performing Arts. | $49 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Group Two (40 to 59\%): Architecture, Area Studies (East Asian Studies), <br> Dentistry, English, Geography, Law, Medical Sciences, Pharmacy, Sociology. | $62 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Group Three (20 to 39\%): Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Economics, History, <br> History \& Philosophy of Science \& Technology, Management, <br> Mathematics/Statistics, Philosophy, Physical Education \& Health, Political <br> Science, Religious Studies. | $50 \%$ |  |
| Group Four (less than 20\%): Computer Science, Engineering. |  |  |

The percentages of women hired in the disciplines found in Groups Two, Three and Four are significantly higher than the availability of women in the external pool, while the percentage in Group One is close to $50 \%$. The percentages above represent the pool of graduates from Canadian institutions and, while the University certainly recruits from this pool, we also recruit Canadian and international scholars who have graduated from outside Canada (see Table 4).

Table 6 compares the percentage of women applicants to the percentage of women interviewed and shows that the University is interviewing, in some cases, a higher proportion of women than is reflected in the applicant pool, particularly in groups where women receive a low proportion of PhDs in Canada. The University will continue to work to improve applicant levels among women.

[^3]Table 6: Provost's Data: Women Applicants to Women Interviewed (1 October 2006-30 September 2007)

| Discipline | Applicants |  | Interviewed |  | PhD Pool Across Canada 2002-2004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group One (60\% or more): Anthropology, Classics, College Programs, Education, French, German, Linguistics, Music, Nursing, Nutritional Sciences, Psychology, Public Health Sciences, Rehab Sciences (Physical Therapy, SpeechLanguage Pathology), Slavic Languages \& Literatures, Social Work, Visual \& Performing Arts. | 440 | 45\% | 65 | 55\% | 69\% |
| Group Two (40 to 59\%): Architecture, Area Studies (East Asian Studies), Dentistry, English, Geography, Law, Medical Sciences, Pharmacy, Sociology. | 454 | 35\% | 46 | 45\% | 48\% |
| Group Three (20 to 39\%): Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Economics, History, History \& Philosophy of Science \& Technology, Management, Mathematics/Statistics, Philosophy, Physical Education \& Health, Political Science, Religious Studies. | 945 | 37\% | 78 | 35\% | 32\% |
| Group Four (less than 20\%): Computer Science, Engineering. | 117 | 15\% | 11 | 24\% | 16\% |

This is a good indication that our proactive recruitment policies are having a positive impact on overall hiring statistics. Considering the international competition for excellent women faculty, these results are encouraging.

## Visible Minorities

Where possible, data is also collected during the search process on the representation of visible minorities. There are some limitations to the identification of visible minorities as search committees must rely on their own judgment in determining whether a candidate qualifies as a visible minority. In the next year, the University will implement an online recruitment system for applicants to faculty positions that will include the option of participating in a diversity survey ${ }^{7}$.

[^4]Figure 3: Visible Minority Hires by SGS Division


Figure 3 indicates that the number of visible minorities hired between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007 remained constant at approximately $20 \%$ ( $\mathrm{n}=21$ hires). Life Sciences shows an increase of $20 \%(\mathrm{n}=5)$ over 2005/2006, bringing it more in line with previous years. Humanities experienced a decline in the number of visible minority hires from previous years. Both Social Sciences and Physical Sciences had smaller declines from 2005/2006, but remain above the overall average by about $4 \%$. All new visible minority candidates were hired at the rank of assistant professor.

### 2.1.3 Faculty Retention

Figure 5 profiles the representation rates for all tenured/tenure stream faculty for the last ten years. There was a total of 1,929 tenure/tenure stream faculty in 2007. The proportion of faculty who are persons with disabilities has decreased by half since 1997, now at $2.0 \%$ and half the level of the external availability data for University Professors (4.1\%).


The representation of women in the tenure stream exceeded $30 \%$ for the third year, although they remained slightly under-represented in comparison with the external availability data ( $36.2 \%$ ). The representation of visible minorities increased to $13.3 \%$ which matches the external availability data of $13.3 \%$. A total of $5.1 \%$ of faculty self-identified as a sexual minority.


Figure 6 shows the representation of people from equity groups among all full-time faculty, tenured and non-tenured (total number of 2,676), at the University in 2007 compared to the external availability data. Women comprised $34.8 \%$ of faculty, which is close to the external levels of $36.2 \%$. Persons with disabilities and Aboriginal people were underrepresented among all faculty groups when compared with external levels; both of these groups were extremely small in number. Visible minority faculty levels (14\%) slightly exceeded the external availability data (13.3\%). A total of $4.4 \%$ of all faculty self-identified as a sexual minority.


Figure 7 provides a cluster analysis of women faculty by rank. Of all faculty, women represented $34.8 \%$, comparing well with the external availability rate of $36.2 \%$. Women accounted for $21.9 \%$ of tenured full professors, $41.3 \%$ of tenure stream assistant professors and $38.5 \%$ of tenured/tenure stream associate professors. Women held the majority of senior lecturer/lecturer and tutor positions ${ }^{8}$ ( $54.2 \%$ ).

Figure 8 is a cluster analysis of the proportion of visible minority faculty by rank. A total of 323 faculty self-identified as a visible minority which represents $14 \%$ of all full-time faculty and compares well with the external availability rate of $13.3 \%$. Visible minorities were well represented among tenure stream assistant professors at $18.5 \%$ and among tenured/tenure stream associate professors at $15.5 \%$. Overall, $14 \%$ of senior lecturers and lecturers were members of visible minority groups. ${ }^{9}$ Visible minority representation remained the lowest at the rank of full professor.


Figure 9, below, shows the representation of faculty in designated groups across the SGS divisions. Women were well represented in the Humanities, Social Sciences and Life Sciences, exceeding the external availability ( $36.2 \%$ ). Across all SGS divisions, women were $34.1 \%$ of all faculty ${ }^{10}$. Representation of visible minority faculty in the Sciences (19.1\%) and Social Sciences ( $15.1 \%$ ) exceeded external availability of $13.3 \%$. The Life Sciences approached external levels (11.3\%), while the Humanities had the lowest levels of visible minority faculty at $11.0 \%$.

[^5]

The percentage of faculty who identify as Aboriginal or disabled represent a very small number of individuals. Aboriginal faculty were represented in the Humanities ( $0.6 \%$ ) and Social Sciences ( $1.3 \%$ ); there were no Aboriginal faculty in the Sciences and Life Sciences. The higher representation in the Social Sciences reflects the Aboriginal Studies programs included in this division. Across all SGS divisions, Aboriginal faculty were $0.5 \%$ of all faculty, approaching external availability levels of $0.7 \%$. Persons with disabilities who are full-time faculty were under-represented in all four divisions. The Humanities (2.6\%) and Social Sciences (2.5.\%) were marginally higher than the Sciences (1.9\%) and Life Sciences $(1.9 \%)$ in comparison to an external availability of $4.1 \%$. Among faculty who identified as sexual minority, the highest levels of representation were in the Humanities (7.1\%) and Social Sciences (7.5\%). Representation was lower in the Life Sciences (2.7\%) and in the Sciences (1.4\%).

### 2.1.4 Faculty Promotion

Career advancement provides a good predictor of retention levels among faculty from designated groups. In 2007, there were a total of 49 promotions to full professor. The percentage of women promoted was $36.7 \%$ which compared well with the workforce representation of women faculty at $38.5 \%$ (associate professors tenure stream). There were only a very small number of promotions across the other designated groups (total of 6).

For the promotions in 2007, the average number of years for promotion to full professor for men was 6.6 years and for women was 9.7 years. This fluctuates year-on-year depending on the number and disciplines of men and women coming forward for promotion.

Figure 10 shows the levels of representation for all equity groups in positions of academic leadership over a ten year period. In 2007, there were a total of 187 individuals in academic leadership positions, which includes the positions of President, Vice-President, Deputy/ViceProvost, Principals and Deans, and Academic Directors, Chairs and Associate Deans.


Women held a total of $33.9 \%$ of the academic leadership positions. In 2007 the percentage of visible minority academic leaders declined slightly to $7.4 \%$. Previously steady progress had been made from a low of $2.4 \%$ in 1998 to $9.3 \%$ in 2005. These percentages represent a small number of actual positions and what appears to be a significant decline may simply represent one person whose term is completed. Persons with disabilities in academic leadership decreased to $0.6 \%$. Sexual minorities held $2.9 \%$ of academic leadership positions in 2007. Aboriginal people had no representation in this group.

### 2.1.5 Exit Data for Tenure Stream Faculty

The percentage of tenure stream faculty in each equity group who had left the University is compared with their workforce representation in Figure 11. To maintain stable levels of representation among each of the groups, the percentage of exits should not exceed current representation.


In both visible minority and sexual minority groups, the percentage of exits was lower than their representation in the workforce. Visible minority faculty represented $13.3 \%$ of the workforce and $4.8 \%$ of exits. Women were $32.2 \%$ of the faculty and accounted for $32.6 \%$ of exits. Federal restrictions on employment equity reporting of three or fewer employees preclude discussion on the number of exits for each of the remaining designated groups to protect privacy. Percentage differences may appear large yet represent very few individuals (e.g. $4 \%$ of exits may represent 2 faculty exits).

### 2.1.6 Conclusions about Employment Equity and Faculty

Employment equity at the University is assessed through the analysis of data for faculty recruitment, hiring, retention, promotions and exits.

Reaching a five year high, women accounted for $51 \%$ of new hires ( $\mathrm{n}=55$ ). There was improvement in all divisions except the Humanities who traditionally have strong female representation. Ongoing initiatives to improve representation levels among women faculty are undertaken by the Director, Academic Human Resources, the Vice-Provost Academic and the Office of the Vice-President Human Resources and Equity as outlined in Section 3.

Hiring of visible minority faculty members was stable this past year in two of the SGS Divisions. There was a decline in hires in the Humanities, while hiring in the Life Sciences saw an increase from the previous year. Visible minority faculty candidates were more likely to decline offers of employment this year in comparison with 2006. Overall representation levels of visible minority faculty at the University exceeded external availability data in the SGS Divisions of Sciences and Social Sciences and approached these levels in the Humanities and Life Sciences divisions.

Persons with disabilities and Aboriginal people were represented in very small proportions of faculty at the University. Ongoing efforts to improve representation levels will continue for both of these groups as part of the employment equity process. Strategies to encourage the recruitment of faculty with disabilities will be explored in addition to ongoing initiatives related to accommodation and return-to-work through the Health and Well-being Programs and Services and the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (2005) planning process. Details of initiatives for each group are outlined in Section 3.

### 2.2 Other Academic Positions

### 2.2.1 Professional Librarians

The Professional Librarian classification is predominantly held by women at the University. In 2007, $70 \%$ of the 145 Professional Librarians (full-time and part-time) were women, slightly lower than in 2006 and than the external availability data.


Women were also the majority of new hires, slightly exceeding their external availability (81.5\%). Exits by women were slightly higher than the level of new hires and exceeded their representation in the workforce. Visible minorities were represented at $11.6 \%$ percent of Professional Librarians. Representation among this group has been increasing with new hires of visible minority librarians ( $25 \%$ ) and no exits. Representation of visible minorities was higher than the external availability rate of $9.4 \%$.

Aboriginal people were not yet represented in the Professional Librarian classification; external availability was $1.5 \%$. Persons with disabilities made up $2.2 \%$ of librarians, approximately half the rate of the external availability data (4.1\%); however these percentages reflect very small numbers of employees. Representation for persons with disabilities remained constant and there were no new hires or exits in 2007. Professional Librarians who identified as sexual minorities made up $8.0 \%$ of the workforce; new hires and exits will be reported in future years as comparative data becomes available.

Figure 13 shows the trends in representation of the designated groups among Professional Librarians over a ten year period. There was a marginal increase in the percentage of visible minority librarians to $11.6 \%$, higher

than external availability of $9.4 \%$ in this classification. Representation of women remained constant over the past four years at $70 \%-72 \%$ following a slow trend downwards from $79 \%$ in 1996.

### 2.2.2 Research Associates

Research Associates are individuals hired to work on specific research projects. There are two categories - Research Associate and Senior Research Associate. Research Associates are appointed on a limited term that is renewable up to a maximum of five years. Senior Research Associates are continuing positions where it is expected that grant funding will continue. Figure 14 compares proportions of Research Associates by designated group through the career cycle (hires, representation in U of T workforce and exits) and with external availability.


In 2007, there were 288 research associates (full-time and part-time). Women were represented at $34.7 \%$ which is lower than external availability data ( $52.2 \%$ ). This representation level is expected to increase as hires exceeded exits. The representation of visible minorities ( $35.2 \%$ ) was higher than the external availability data ( $25.9 \%$ ). In this group, there were more hires than exits, although the numbers are relatively small. There was no representation of Aboriginal people and only a small representation of sexual minorities ( $2.1 \%$ ). Figure 15 shows the representation levels among Research Associates for each of the designated groups as a trend over the past ten years.


Representation of women and visible minorities have been fairly stable, while representation of persons with disabilities declined. Aboriginal people have had no representation among research associates for nine of the past ten years.

### 2.2.3 Conclusions on Employment Equity and Other Academics

Representation among Professional Librarians remained stable in 2007 for women, visible minorities and persons with disabilities. Positions in this classification are predominantly held by women continuing a historic trend in the profession. Aboriginal people were not yet represented in this group however external availability for this group, like that of persons with disabilities, is extremely low. Sexual minorities were $8.0 \%$ of Professional Librarians.

Following a pattern, Research Associates showed a continuing trend of under-representation among women by more than $20 \%$ compared with external availability data. Research Associates who identified as a visible minority had stable levels of representation, at a higher rate than external availability comparators. Representation among persons with disabilities declined in 2007 and Aboriginal people were not represented.

### 2.3 Overview of Administrative Employees

This section of the report examines the recruitment, retention and exits of the designated groups among administrative employees by Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOG) in comparison with external data and previous years. Each EEOG includes a variety of skill levels, reflecting the type of training or educational level required to work in an occupation (e.g., Clerical Workers (Skill Level C)).

In 2007 the University's administrative unionized and non-unionized staff totaled 5,407. Table 7 profiles the overall representation of designated groups in both administrative non-unionized employees and administrative unionized employees.

Table 7: Summary of Representation of Designated Groups among Administrative Employees (FT \& PT)

| Staff Category | Total | Women |  | Total <br> Completed <br> Surveys | Aboriginal <br> People |  | Visible <br> Minorities |  | Persons with <br> Disabilities | Sexual <br> Minority |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\#$ | $\%$ |  | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ |
| Administrative <br> Non-Union | 928 | 573 | $61.7 \%$ |  | 867 | 5 | $0.6 \%$ | 182 | $21.4 \%$ | 30 | $3.5 \%$ | 58 |
| Administrative <br> Unionized | 4479 | 2801 | $62.5 \%$ | 4117 | 50 | $1.2 \%$ | 1307 | $31.7 \%$ | 146 | $3.5 \%$ | 169 | $4.1 \%$ |
| All Staff | 5407 | 3374 | $62.4 \%$ | 4984 | 55 | $1.1 \%$ | 1489 | $29.9 \%$ | 176 | $3.5 \%$ | 227 | $4.6 \%$ |

Section 2.3.1 analyzes data for non-unionized staff; section 2.3.2 assesses all unionized staff groups combined. Each section reviews the U of T workforce representation, levels of hiring, promotion rates, and participation levels in training and proportions of exits for each of the equity groups.

As with faculty, external availability data is not available for administrative employment equity occupational classifications for sexual minorities. Classifications with fewer than three employees are not reported for reasons of privacy, in accordance with federal requirements. These groups frequently include persons with disabilities and Aboriginal people.

### 2.3.1 Non-Unionized Administrative Employees and External Availability Data

### 2.3.1.1 Representation

## Women

Representation of women amongst the non-unionized administrative staff remained high at $61.7 \%$ out of a total of 928 full-time and part-time positions. Figure 16 indicates the representation of women in each of the non-unionized administrative EEOGs compared to the external availability of women for each group.

There was strong representation of women in the three most senior occupational classifications, well exceeding external data. Women represented 38.5\% (up from 36.4\% in 2006) of Senior Managers exceeding the external availability rate of $31 \%$. Among Middle and Other Managers, women held $50.8 \%$ of positions, more than $10 \%$ above external levels.

Finally, women represented 55.2\% of the Professionals group, above the external rate of 49.3\%.

While women continued to dominate the Administrative and Clerical groups, reaching 80\% representation in each, there was movement in the ranks to more senior positions, demonstrated by the rate of promotions for women (65\%).

While women were not represented in the Supervisory

(Manufacturing/ Professional/Trades - Primary Industries) and Sales and Service classifications, both classifications represent very small numbers of employees.

Visible Minorities A total of 182 individuals (full-time and part-time) identified as visible minorities (21.7\%). Representation of visible minorities (Figure 17) was strong among the senior administrative classifications. A total of $28.3 \%$ of the University's 183 fulltime non-unionized employees who were in the Professionals
 of visible minorities, compared to the external availability data of $16 \%$. Of the 360 nonunionized Middle and Other Managers at the University, $17.1 \%$ were visible minorities. Notably, $59 \%$ of visible minority employees in all non-unionized administrative jobs worked in one of these two senior classifications ( $\mathrm{N}=105$ ).

The Administrative and Senior Clerical classification had 23\% representation of visible minority employees. Among Clerical Workers, the representation of visible minorities was $33 \%$, very close to external levels. Other classifications, such as Semi-Professional and Technical, included only small numbers of individuals overall.

## Aboriginal People

Aboriginal people represented $0.6 \%$ of all non-unionized administrative employees and held positions in four classifications. Overall, numbers were very small and fell below external comparator statistics.

## Persons with Disabilities

In 2007, a total of 29 persons with disabilities occupied non-unionized administrative positions (3.6\%). Persons with disabilities were represented in six classifications, four of which exceed external availability levels (Middle and Other Managers, SemiProfessional and Technical, Sales and Service, and Clerical Workers). These data
 represented very small
total numbers of employees such that the addition of one or two persons with disabilities into positions where there is currently no representation would enable the University to match external levels.

## Sexual Minorities

A total of 56 non-unionized employees self-identified as belonging to a sexual minority group and were represented in six occupational classifications. The highest levels of representation were in two categories: Senior Managers (18.2\%) and Middle and Other Managers (10.1\%). Among Professionals, representation rate was 7.5\%, and in the SemiProfessional and Technical category, 7.7\%.

### 2.3.1.2 Recruitment of Non-Unionized Administrative Employees

## Applicants

In 2006, an online application system for administrative job postings was implemented. The application system includes a voluntary employment equity styled survey that invites applicants to identify if they are in any of the designated categories (Appendix A includes the questionnaire). This past year of 2006-07 is the first year of compiled data on applicants and their representation among equity categories. The data reflects both internal and external applicants for job

| Table 8: Non-Unionized position applicants and representation among equity groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Applicants |  | Interviewed | Postings Filled |  |  |
|  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |
|  | 3,804 | $64.7 \%$ | 206 | $62.6 \%$ | 51 | $56.7 \%$ |
|  | 47 | $0.8 \%$ | 5 | $1.5 \%$ | 1 | $1.1 \%$ |
|  | 2,743 | $49.9 \%$ | 114 | $38.3 \%$ | 32 | $37.2 \%$ |
|  | 175 | $3.1 \%$ | 7 | $2.2 \%$ | 3 | $3.4 \%$ |
|  | 247 | $4.5 \%$ | 24 | $7.9 \%$ | 6 | $7.1 \%$ | postings. Individuals may self-identify in more than one category. For all employment equity categories, with the exception of visible minorities, their representation among applicants interviewed and postings filled closely matched or exceeded their representation among applicants.

New Hires
From October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2007 there were 64 new hires into administrative non-unionized positions. Table 9 shows the percentage of new hires by designated groups in comparison to the representation in the University's non-unionized administrative workforce. Hiring levels for each group should meet or exceed their percentage in the University workforce to maintain stable

| Table 9: Percentage New Hires Among Non-Unionized <br> Administrative Staff <br> Designated Group \% New Hires <br> \% University <br> Workforce  <br> Aboriginal People $1.8 \%$ <br> Persons with Disabilities $3.6 \%$ <br> Visible Minorities $23.2 \%$ <br> Women $56.3 \%$ <br> Sexual Minorities $12.5 \%$\begin{tabular}{l}
\hline
\end{tabular} |
| :--- | representation levels. The representation of Aboriginal people, visible minorities and sexual minorities was higher among new hires than their representation in the University workforce.

### 2.3.1.3 Retention of Non-Unionized Employees (Training and Promotions)

Career development and advancement opportunities can be measured through participation rates in training as well as promotion rates of the designated groups. The University offers a number of programs and courses for administrative staff covering topics such as leadership, computer and technical skills, career and life management, and environmental health and safety.
Training for Non-Unionized Employees

Training participation rates are compiled by the Organizational Development and Learning Centre and represent the total number of days of training taken by an employment category and the proportion of each of these training days taken by each designated group. Administrative non-unionized staff members participated in an overall average of 1.24 days of training last year with women and visible minorities participating in a higher percentage of training days than their workforce

| Table 10: Training Participation Rates of Non-Unionized <br> Administrative Staff <br> Administrative Staff <br> Designated Group \% Days <br> Training \% University <br> Workforce <br> Aboriginal People $0.5 \%$ $0.6 \%$ <br> Persons with <br> Disabilities $3.3 \%$ $3.6 \%$ <br> Visible Minorities $28.5 \%$ $21.7 \%$ <br> Women $73.7 \%$ $60.9 \%$ <br> Sexual Minorities $5.2 \%$ $6.9 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | representation. Aboriginal people, persons with disabilities and sexual minorities participated in training at rates lower than their workforce representation. While the relatively high percentage of training days taken by women in relation to their representation is positive, it does raise a question about the participation of male employees in development opportunities.

## Promotions for Administrative Non-Unionized Employees

There were a total of 100 promotions ${ }^{11}$ in the administrative non-unionized employee group. Of the promotions, women accounted for $65 \%$ and visible minorities $31.5 \%$, with promotions exceeding the representation in the workforce in both groups.

Figure 19 shows the percentage of promotions among the designated groups
 since 2003. The percentage of promotions for women and visible minorities increased overall during this period. Promotions among those who identified as disabled and as a sexual minority were very small in number and were lower than in 2006.

With respect to the two largest groups, women and visible minorities, analysis of promotions over the past ten years show that in eight of these years, including 2007, the percentage of promotions exceeded workforce representation. Similarly, promotions of individuals identifying as visible minorities have exceeded respective workforce representation for eight out of ten years, including 2007.

### 2.3.1.4 Exits - Non-Unionized Administrative Staff

[^6]Figure 20 shows the percentage of exits for each of the designated groups in comparison with their representation in the University workforce. To maintain, or preferably increase representation levels, exits should be lower than workforce levels.

The rate of exits among women was lower than their representation in the workforce. There was a slightly higher rate of exits among visible minorities (22.6\%) than their workforce representation (21.7\%). Persons with disabilities had an exit rate
 of $3.8 \%$ which is very close to their workforce representation at $3.6 \%$. Exits for those identifying as a sexual minority were at a rate ( $3.8 \%$ ) that was lower than their representation in the workforce ( $6.9 \%$ ).

### 2.3.2 Unionized Employees

### 2.3.2.1 Representation

In 2006-07, there were 4,479 employees at the University represented by twenty unions. The United Steelworkers represented 3,373 administrative employees; the remaining 1,106 staff were represented by locals of CUPE and OPSEU, UNITE HERE, the Canadian Auto Workers, plus a number of specialized skilled trade unions. (Detailed information about unionized employees is available on the HR \& Equity website at http://www.hrandequity.utoronto.ca/groups/union.htm).

## Women

Figure 21 compares the representation of women by EEOG with external availability for all unionized groups combined. In the most senior occupational group, Middle and Other
Managers, the representation of women exceeded the external availability data by $20 \%$. Women represented over 50\% of the other senior groups -
Professionals, SemiProfessionals and Technical Occupations, and Supervisor: Clerical, Sales and Service groups, and representation rates closely matched external availability rates.


Unionized women were clustered in traditional clerical, administrative and sales and service occupational groups (all skill levels), which represented the majority of unionized positions at the University ( $\mathrm{N}=2275$ ). All groups matched or exceeded external availability levels, except Sales and Service (Skill Level D). There was slight under-representation of women among Skilled Crafts and Trades and the related supervisory occupational group.

## Visible Minorities

A total of 1,254
individuals identified as visible minorities among the unionized administrative employee group. Representation of visible minority employees exceeded external levels in three of the senior occupational groups (Figure 22). Visible

minority unionized employees were clustered in the Sales and Services streams and Administrative and Senior Clerical group with good opportunities for advancement among the large Supervisor Clerical, Professionals, and Middle and Other Managers groups.

## Aboriginal People

A total of 48
individuals identified as Aboriginal people among the unionized administrative employee group (1.2\%). Among the small proportion of Aboriginal people, representation rates exceeded external availability data in the Sales and Service groups (all streams) and among the Supervisory (Clerical/ sales/service) group. Representation of Aboriginal people among Professionals is lower than external availability levels. More effort is required
 to provide representation among the Middle and Other Managers stream.

Persons with Disabilities
A total of 134 individuals identified as persons with disabilities in the unionized administrative employee group (3.5\%). While persons with disabilities were also a small percentage of unionized employees, their representation rates exceeded external availability data in the Skilled Crafts and Trades, Sales and Service (Levels $B \& C$ ) and the two supervisory groups. Comparisons with external data indicate more focus is required to improve representation among the Professionals group and Administrative
 and Senior Clerical Workers.

## Sexual Minorities

A total of 159 individuals identified as a sexual minority among unionized administrative employees (4.1\%). Representation was highest among Middle and Other Managers at $11.6 \%$. Overall, sexual minorities were represented in many of the EEOG categories.

Figure 25: Unionized Employees - Sexual Minorities


### 2.3.2.2 Recruitment - Unionized Groups

## Applicants

The online application system invites applicants to complete a voluntary employment equity styled survey to identify if they are in any of the designated categories. Table 11 reflects the applicants who self-identified as represented in one of the equity categories, the number interviewed and number of positions filled by individuals in the equity categories. The data includes both internal and external applicants for USW position postings only. Individuals may selfidentify in more than

Table 11: Union (USW) position applicants and representation among equity groups

|  | Applicants |  | Interviewed |  | Positions Filled |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |
| Women | 21,326 | $71.04 \%$ | 1,244 | $73.26 \%$ | 398 | $71.97 \%$ |
| Aboriginal People | 243 | $0.82 \%$ | 7 | $0.41 \%$ | 2 | $0.36 \%$ |
| Visible Minorities | 11,507 | $40.69 \%$ | 748 | $46.37 \%$ | 222 | $42.37 \%$ |
| Persons with <br> Disabilities | 976 | $3.39 \%$ | 59 | $3.63 \%$ | 12 | $2.27 \%$ |
| Sexual Minorities | 1,367 | $4.83 \%$ | 109 | $6.87 \%$ | 44 | $8.53 \%$ | one category. For all employment equity categories, with the exception of Aboriginal people, the proportion of applicants interviewed and postings filled closely matched or exceeded the representation among applicants.

## New Hires

Among unionized employees, there were 371 new hires (full-time). Figure 26 shows the percentage of new hires for each of the designated groups compared to their percentage representation in the University workforce. To maintain or improve representation levels, hiring rates should be on par with or exceed representation levels. In three of the groups, women, visible minorities and sexual minorities, hiring
 rates exceeded representation in the workforce. Persons with disabilities closely match the proportion of the existing workforce with new hires at extremely small levels. For sexual minorities the rate of new hires was $10.6 \%$, higher than the representation levels.

### 2.3.2.3 Retention - Unionized Staff (Training and Promotions)

Levels of training and promotion measure career development opportunities for employees. Figures below are for full-time unionized staff.

## Training - Unionized staff

Unionized staff participated in a combined total of 2,346 training days. Table 12 compares percentages of training days attended with representation levels for each group. Visible minorities, women and sexual minorities had higher rates of participation in training than their representation rates. Aboriginal people and persons with disabilities had training rates that matched their representation in the workforce.

## Promotions - Unionized staff

In 2007, there were 371 promotions in the unionized staff; up $9 \%$ from 330 promotions in 2006. Table 13 indicates that the rate of promotions was slightly higher than representation in the workforce for Aboriginal people, visible minorities, women and sexual minorities. Persons with disabilities were promoted at lower rates than their representation.

### 2.3.2.4 Exits - Unionized Staff

In 2007, there were 271 exits among unionized staff, approximately $6.5 \%$ of the unionized workforce. Table 14 compares exit rates in each of the designated groups with their representation rates in the workforce. It is desirable to see exit rates below the overall workforce representation in order to maintain or enhance representation rates.

The exit rates for Aboriginal people and persons with disabilities were lower than their representation in the University workforce. Exit rates were only slightly higher than representation rates for visible minorities, women and sexual minorities.

| Table 12: Training Participation Rates for All <br> Unionized Staff |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Group | \% Days <br> Training | \% University <br> Workforce |
| Aboriginal People | $1.2 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Persons with <br> Disabilities | $3.4 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Visible Minorities | $38.2 \%$ | $32.6 \%$ |
| Women | $75.9 \%$ | $61.4 \%$ |
| Sexual Minorities | $5.2 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ |


| Table 13: Promotions - All Unionized Staff |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Group | \% of <br> Promotions | \% University <br> Workforce |
| Aboriginal People | $1.5 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Persons with <br> Disabilities | $2.9 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Visible Minorities | $39.3 \%$ | $32.6 \%$ |
| Women | $64.7 \%$ | $61.4 \%$ |
| Sexual Minorities | $5.0 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ |

Table14: Exits - All Unionized Staff

| Designated Group | \% of Exits | \% University <br> Workforce |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Aboriginal People | $1.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |  |
| Persons with <br> Disabilities | $2.5 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |  |
| Visible Minorities | $33.3 \%$ | $32.6 \%$ |  |
| Women | $62.4 \%$ | $61.4 \%$ |  |
| Sexual Minorities | $5.0 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 2.3.3 Conclusions about Employment Equity and Administrative Staff

Overall, several of the designated employment equity groups were well represented among both non-union and unionized administrative staff compared to external availability data. Women were well represented at all the senior occupational classifications across both administrative staff groups in comparison to external representation rates. Recruitment, promotions, training and exit data reflected patterns that were consistent with their representation in the workforce.

Visible minority employees were also well represented at all the senior occupational classifications across both administrative staff groups, in comparison to external data. Recruitment, promotions, training and exit data also reflected patterns that were consistent with their workforce representation. While visible minority employees were highly represented in the Sales/Service and Administrative/Clerical categories, the results do show movement into more senior job streams.

Aboriginal employees were under-represented in the administrative non-union group but had greater representation in the unionized administrative group. Representation exceeded external availability data for several job categories, including Sales and Service and Supervisory (Clerical/Sales/Service); however, more effort is required to improve representation in the Senior Manager and Professional categories.

Representation of persons with disabilities varied across EEOG categories. Representation exceeded external availability data for Sales and Service and Supervisory categories. Representation among Middle and Other Managers was comparable to external availability data. Representation in the Professionals category was lower than external data, and is an area that should be targeted for attention. Promotion and exit rates were lower than the representation of persons with disabilities in the workforce; however, overall numbers in this group were relatively small.

Sexual minorities were represented across most classifications with the highest rates reported among the Managers and Professionals group.

### 3.0 Summary of Recent and Planned Employment Equity Initiatives

Employment equity is grounded within a comprehensive framework that is central to our commitment to equity, diversity and excellence in pursuit of our academic mission and the University continues to work diligently to weave equity into the fabric of $U$ of $T$. A network of offices has responsibility for advancing equity initiatives and reducing barriers that might arise. For example, the Quality of Work-Life Advisor works in collaboration with the Family Care Office, Health and Well-being Programs and Services, and the Director, Academic Human Resources to support employee work/life experience. Similarly, advisory positions are in place at UTSC and UTM to support senior academic administrators and foster cultural diversity.

The Annual Report of the Equity Offices, detailing the vast array of equity initiatives carried out at the University, is being prepared for Governing Council. In this Employment Equity Report, therefore, we simply highlight a small number of the initiatives that focus more directly on employment equity.

### 3.1 University-wide Initiatives

In December 2006, Governing Council unanimously approved the Statement on Equity, Diversity and Excellence. This Statement reflects the University's commitment to an equitable and inclusive community.

A comprehensive communications strategy ("EQ_ITY - We need U in it") was launched in 2006 to raise awareness of the University's values related to equity and diversity and to communicate the centrality of equity in our everyday lives. In early 2008, new equity posters were introduced across campus. In addition, a new network of equity officers and people responsible for equity matters in their divisions and faculties was established to share best practices and expertise.

The University-wide employee experience survey, Speaking UP was conducted in the fall 2006. A total of $52.2 \%$ of the University's appointed workforce participated in Speaking UP. Overall, the University's results were very positive. The questionnaire included a set of questions related to diversity and equity. Well over $80 \%$ of employees indicated that they did not feel they had been treated unfairly over the past two to three years due to gender, ethnic or cultural origin, religious affiliation, disability or sexual orientation. Across these groups, between 3 and $10 \%$ of employees felt that that they had been treated unfairly. Slightly more than three-quarters of employees did not feel "left out" in their work units due to their backgrounds or orientation. When issues of gender, ethnic or cultural origin, religious affiliation, disability or sexual orientation had occurred, about $70 \%$ of employees felt their work units make appropriate efforts to address them; and, just over three-quarters felt their unit heads/managers were committed to practices that support diversity. While these results are positive overall, they do indicate that there is some concern with respect to fair treatment and inclusion in the workplace.

In follow-up to the Speaking UP survey, four working groups have been established to undertake more detailed examinations of the Speaking UP survey results and develop recommendations for systematic improvements and/ or supports to address identified concerns.

- Working Group on Equity
- Working Group on Workload and Work/Life Balance
- Working Group on Training, Development, Feedback and Recognition
- Working Group on Appointments, Transfers and Promotions

The Working Group on Equity will address issues pertaining to both staff and faculty; the remaining three working groups will focus on staff concerns in the areas listed. In July, 2006 the Human Resources Division launched an online application system that includes a voluntary employment equity-styled questionnaire for administrative job applicants. The survey includes options for individuals to self-identify by ethnic group. This information is being used to facilitate development of an HR Toolkit that will provide information and resources to inform hiring managers of ways to reach out to diverse communities in the recruitment of administrative applicants.

With respect to disability, research into best practices is underway through attendance at employer conferences and consultations with non-profit disability employment agencies to improve recruitment from the disability community. A communication is being created to inform faculty and librarians of a number of issues related to disability accommodation, including the definition of disability, the employer's duty to accommodate a disability, and the mechanisms and processes to arrange for accommodation. As reported in the University's Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act 2007-08 Plan (http://www.hrandequity.utoronto.ca/Assets/2007-08+ADOA.pdf?method=1), a significant initiative is in development to ensure that staff (and students) with mental health issues are supported and have access to services; to ensure that staff are better informed and more able to respond to colleagues facing mental health problems; and to identify ways in which the University can continue to build capacity regarding the needs of employees with mental health difficulties. The focus in the coming year is on the development of an awareness campaign to address attitudes and lack of awareness regarding mental health issues.

With respect to Aboriginal persons, the Aboriginal Initiatives Co-ordinator continues to develop programs and strategies to encourage the hiring, retention and promotion of Aboriginal staff. The job posting project launched in September 2006 to advertise external administrative positions on several Aboriginal listservs is ongoing. Other new outreach efforts to the Aboriginal community include attendance at career fairs and at the Canadian Aboriginal Festival to promote the University as a welcoming workplace for aboriginal people. The Aboriginal Initiatives Co-ordinator continues to interview Aboriginal employees for their views on their recruitment and work experience. The results of these interviews are assisting the HR and Equity portfolio in developing strategies to improve hiring and retention from the Aboriginal community. A career development pilot program for Aboriginal employees is in development. It is intended to create opportunities for current Aboriginal employees to gain work experience across other University divisions.
In addition, the Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Officer has initiated workshops across
divisions related to operationalizing self-awareness around race and culture. Similar programs are offered by the Co-ordinator of LGBTQ programs and services.
Finally, with respect to leadership development, we continue to focus on mentoring as an important development strategy. The University runs two formal mentoring programs for administrative staff - one for mid-level leaders, one for staff at more junior levels. Diversity among both the mentors and mentees is one of the selection criteria for this program. In 2007 the University renewed its commitment to mentoring internationally trained professionals through the Toronto Regional Immigrant Employment Council (TRIEC) program. Approximately 12 senior U of T staff members are mentoring immigrant professionals to assist them to successfully enter the Toronto workplace in their fields of expertise. At the same time the U of T mentors are developing their leadership skills in creating and supporting a more diverse workplace.

### 3.2 Initiatives Related to Academic Appointments

A number of offices and programs address equity and diversity at the faculty level. The Vice-Provost, Academic, Prof. Edith Hillan, oversees support for faculty and academic leaders through symposia on teaching, research and academic administration. Her office facilitates an ongoing review of data for academic applicant pools and new faculty data. A major focus is the training provided to new academic administrators which includes a twoday retreat in the summer during which issues of equity, diversity and proactive recruitment are discussed. This is complimented by a series of six half-day workshops offered between September and December which include topics such as managing people, financial management, advancement, conflict management and research issues. In addition, focused lunchtime sessions for all academic administrators are offered throughout the year and cover topics such as organizational structure and job descriptions, knowledge transfer, sick leave and the hiring of sessionals.

Within the Provost's Office, the Director, Academic Human Resources provides key supports for faculty and academic administrators on issues of recruitment, integration, and retention. The Director, Sara-Jane Finlay, is also responsible for areas of policy development, research on the faculty 'lifespan', and education and training for faculty and academic administrators with a focus on equity and diversity. Working with the Family Care Office, the Director administers the Faculty Relocation Service and Faculty Recruitment Kits which integrate "quality of life" factors such as LGBTQ, culture and faith, maternity/parental/adoption leaves and other family-friendly policies that attract faculty candidates. Starting in January 2008, faculty with children are eligible to receive up to $\$ 2000$ for childcare expenses; a new benefit provided by the University to faculty members.

An ongoing series of workshops, entitled Stepping In, continues to assist new faculty integrating to the University. The workshops are designed to introduce new faculty to the University, to senior academic administrators and to the demands and pleasures of an academic career. For mid-career faculty, the Stepping Forward workshops focus on issues for tenured faculty including research development, academic leadership and becoming a mentor.

The online proactive faculty recruitment toolkit, developed in 2005, provides an extensive array of information including summaries of best practices and research on recruitment from universities across North America and is supplemented as new resources become available. In spring 2007, the University joined the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) which administers a job satisfaction survey to pre-tenure faculty to assess their experiences. The survey closed in January 2008 and results will be provided in spring 2008. These results, along with those from the Speaking UP Employee Experience survey conducted in 2006 will augment ongoing research into trends in faculty recruitment and questions of integration, promotion and retention.

The Status of Women Officer/ Special Advisor on Equity has initiated several activities to promote dialogue on issues of equity and climate. In conjunction with the Director, Academic Human Resources, the Status of Women Officer hosted a gathering of senior women lecturers to discuss matters of climate including workload. To better identify challenges associated with climate, workload and retention, the Status of Women Officer began meeting with recently tenured women faculty to understand their experiences of the tenure process. Furthermore, a series of sessions has been launched for senior women graduate students to more effectively prepare them for applying for a career in academia. These sessions have addressed topics such as preparing the application package, interview 'do's and don'ts', and negotiating the first contract. One of the sessions included a panel of women faculty of varying seniority (from the four Divisions) discussing strategies to address challenges affecting women in their field. These efforts for graduate students are intended to assist the successful recruitment and retention of women faculty at $U$ of $T$ and elsewhere. A further initiative has been introduced for pre-tenure women faculty, providing sessions on the "Top 10 Tips to Tenure".

In summary, a broad number of initiatives have been launched in 2006-07 and others are in the planning stage for implementation in 2007-08. These initiatives reach out to women, Aboriginal persons, visible minorities, people with disabilities and sexual minorities, and are illustrative of the wide-ranging commitment of the University to equity and diversity.

### 4.0 Progress on Recommendations for 2006-2007

This section details the accomplishments and ongoing actions with respect to the five major objectives of the University's employment equity work plan. They reflect the University's progress towards full employment equity and identify areas where additional efforts may be required.
The broad-based objectives, established in 1989, are as follows:

1. Inform, educate and sensitize the University community about the University's Employment Equity Policy.
2. Eliminate or modify employment policies or practices that may present barriers to employment equity.
3. Increase the number of designated group members in the occupational categories where they are under-represented.
4. Encourage the promotion of designated group members by identifying, developing and utilizing their skills and potential, in relation to objective 3.
5. Monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Employment Equity Policy at the University of Toronto.

Annually, a number of action points are updated and revised based on the findings of the Employment Equity Report.
Objective 1: Inform, educate and sensitize the University community about the University's Employment Equity Policy.
(a) The University approved an institutional Statement on Equity, Diversity and Excellence. (December 2006)
(b) The University-wide employee survey, Speaking UP, included a set of questions related to diversity and equity. In follow-up to the survey, a Working Group on Equity was established to address issues of concern to both staff and faculty.
(c) The communications strategy on equity ("EQ_ITY - We need U in it") launched in 2006 continues to be refined to bring attention to the University's values to equity and diversity.

|  | ACTION | TIMETABLE |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1. | Maintain and updated an Orientation Guide for <br> Academic and Administrative staff with additional <br> information about the University's equity practices <br> and resources. | Completed - ongoing |
| 2. | Present information on employment equity at the <br> annual Orientation for Newly Appointed Academic | Completed - ongoing |
| 3. | Administrators. <br> Present information on the University's employment <br> equity goals and objectives to heads of Divisions. <br> Speak to campus groups, interest groups and employee | Completed - ongoing |
| 4. | Completed - ongoing <br> associations and unions about employment equity. <br> Refine and provide employment equity information <br> sessions for employees at all levels within the | Completed - ongoing |
| University. |  |  |

6. Prepare an annual Employment Equity Report, present Ongoing - annually it to the Business and Academic Boards of Governing Council and release it to the University community.
7. Continue communications for disseminating Completed - ongoing information about employment equity at the University of Toronto (e.g., posters, Bulletin and eBulletin articles, web-link).
8. Publish an Annual Report of the Equity Offices for Completed - ongoing information.

Objective 2: Eliminate or modify employment policies or practices that may present barriers to employment equity.
(a) The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act planning process continues to involve consultation with a broad range of community stakeholders. The University's Plan (http://www.hrandequity.utoronto.ca/Assets/2007-08+ADOA.pdf?method=1) outlines a number of barriers and the steps taken to remove them.
(b) The Human Resources portfolio offers training sessions to managers on the management of disability and illness in the workplace.

## ACTION

TIMETABLE

1. Ongoing review of employment practices and policies Ongoing affecting the recruitment, selection, promotion, and terms and conditions of employment, including training, development, compensation and termination of administrative staff, with a view to ensuring equity.
2. Implement a methodology to ensure monitoring of new or revised employment policies to prevent inclusion of potential barriers to the participation and advancement of designated group members.
3. Address the issues and concerns related to diversity and equity identified in the employee experience survey, Speaking UP.
4. Ensure that the performance appraisal system for the Professional/Managerial group continues to assess participation and performance related to diversity initiatives, including career development and succession.

Objective 3: Increase the number of designated group members in the occupational categories where they are under-represented.
(a) The Director, Academic Human Resources and the Vice-Provost Academic host regular workshops for faculty at the start and mid-point of their careers that highlight equity and diversity. New learning opportunities to develop future academic leadership have been developed and the annual academic administrators training
program has been updated.
(c) Return to work programs and accommodation of employees with disabilities continued through the Health and Well-being Programs and Services Office. Accommodation training sessions for HR generalists and departmental managers were provided in 2007.
(d) The HR Equity Toolkit is under development to maintain and improve equity in the recruitment process.
(e) A job posting initiative to advertise to local and national First Nations populations is ongoing. Non-profit agencies representing persons with disabilities met with senior HR representatives to discuss ways to improve recruitment for this designated group.

## ACTION

TIMETABLE

1. Continue use of the proactive recruitment toolkit Ongoing for faculty, providing information on recruitment for diversity and best practices across North America.
2. Deliver presentations to heads of divisions on employment equity principles and practices to follow in the recruitment and hiring of staff.
3. Provide information to the Divisions on Completed - ongoing strategies, tools, techniques and resources to meet their employment equity goals.
4. Integrate employment equity principles and Completed - ongoing objectives into hiring process for all academic and administrative positions.
5. Maintain and refine career resources for current and prospective employees to inform them of possible jobs and career paths at the University, the nature of generic positions in those areas and the necessary qualifications.
6. Identify and implement proactive recruitment and outreach strategies and techniques to attract applicants from designated groups to administrative staff positions.
7. Collaborate with staff at First Nations House at the University of Toronto to identify ways in which we can make $U$ of $T$ a more inclusive work environment. Establish a career development program for Aboriginal employees.

## ACTION

9. Establish review process for human resources representatives to review outstanding accommodation cases before posting job vacancies. Provide intensive training to generalists and information sessions to academic leadership and employee groups.
10. Strengthen our links with community groups and organizations to increase the profile of the $U$ of $T$ as an employer of choice.

TIMETABLE
Completed - ongoing:
Health \& Well-being liaises
with HR Generalists to review outstanding accommodation cases where individuals must be placed in positions other than their pre-disability position. Completed - ongoing: national Top 100 Employer (2005, 2006, 2007)

Objective 4: Encourage the promotion of designated group members by identifying, developing and utilizing their skills and potential, in relation to Objective 3.
(a) An online application system that includes a voluntary employment equity styled survey has been implemented for administrative job postings. The applicant survey data will enable us to identify potentially under-represented designated groups among applicant pools and those interviewed and respond via resources in the HR Equity Toolkit. The online recruitment system will be implemented for faculty in 2008.
(b) The Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Officer, Status of Women Office and the Office of LGBTQ Resources and Programs provide confidential support to individual staff and faculty. In collaboration with other equity offices, they also provide special programming to raise awareness of diverse groups on campus.
(c) The Organizational Development and Learning Centre provides a number of leadership training programs for staff at various levels of development. The Health and Well-being Programs and Services Manager provides educational training and awareness throughout the University to enhance the integration of faculty and staff who are persons with disabilities. The HR Aboriginal Initiatives Co-ordinator assists Human Resources to develop strategies to improve recruitment, career development and retention of Aboriginal employees. Professional faculties, divisions and programs create programs and positions advancing equity and diversity among underrepresented groups.

## ACTION

TIMETABLE

1. Post all promotional/job opportunities electronically and at designated sites for new or vacant administrative positions.
2. Provide a variety of skills training courses and workshops, and disseminate across campus via the web and Divisional Human Resources offices the Guide to Training and Career Development.
3. Provide career planning seminars and individual job and career counselling to employees through an onsite career centre accessible to all staff.
4. Develop cross-cultural and disability awareness training or information sessions.
5. Deliver management, supervisory and leadership development programs to various levels of staff, to improve skills and prepare employees for promotions.
6. Maintain and update the career resources to include a current set of core skills and profiles for all functional groups including senior levels.

Completed - ongoing: Taleo
system implemented for Administrative staff; forthcoming for faculty Completed - ongoing

Completed - ongoing

Completed - ongoing
Completed - ongoing

Completed - ongoing

## ACTION

TIMETABLE
7. Make educational assistance for credit and Completed - ongoing career or job related non-credit courses available to employees.

Objective 5: Monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Employment Equity Policy at the University of Toronto.
(a) The Employment Equity Officer and the Director, Academic Human Resources monitor and review the implementation of the employment equity policy on an ongoing basis.
(b) The Working Group on Equity, created in follow-up to the Speaking UP survey, will examine issues of equity identified in the survey pertaining to both staff and faculty.

ACTION TIMETABLE

1. Distribute the Employment Equity Self-identification Completed - ongoing Questionnaire to all new employees to complete.
2. Identify and implement steps to improve response rate to Employment Equity Self-Identification Questionnaire from new employees.
3. Review and refine criteria for Provostial review committees to assess divisional effectiveness in contributing to achievement of University's employment equity goals.
4. Conduct 'exit' interviews to understand why people Ongoing from designated groups leave the University of Toronto.

Completed: Post
resurvey in 2006
response rates have improved to $90 \%$
Completed - ongoing

### 5.0 Appendices

A. Taleo Online Application Diversity Survey
B. Data Tables
1A Employment Equity Workforce Survey: Return Rates and Completion Rates for Full-timeEmployees
1B Employment Equity Workforce Survey: Return Rates and Completion Rates for Part-timeEmployees
2A Faculty (Full-time) by Designated Group Within Type of Appointment and Rank andExternal Availability Data
2B Faculty (Part-time) by Designated Group Within Job Category and Rank and ExternalAvailability Data
2.1A Faculty (Full-time) by Designated Group Within Type of Appointment and SGS Division
2.2 A Assistant Professors (Full-time) by Designated Group Within Type of Appointment andSGS Division
3 Officers and Academic Administrators (Full-time and Part-time) by Designated Group andExternal Availability Data
4 Professional Librarians by Designated Group and External Availability Data
5 Research Associates by Designated Group and External Availability Data
7.1A Administrative Staff(Full-time) Non-Unionized by Designated Group and External Availability Data
7.1B Administrative Staff (Part-time) Non-Unionized by Designated Group and ExternalAvailability Data
8 Administrative Staff Unionized (Full-time) by Designated Group and External AvailabilityData8.1 Administrative Staff Unionized (Part-time) by Designated Group and External AvailabilityData
9A Training (Major Training Topic) for Administrative Staff Non-Union and Union (Full-time) byStaff Category and Designated Group
9B Training (Major Training Topic) for Administrative Staff Non-Union and Union (Part-time) byStaff Category and Designated Group
10 Promotions by Staff Category by Designated Group
10.1 Representation of Average Years for Promotion to Full Professor
11A Exit Data (Reason For Leaving) by Staff Category (Full-time) by Designated Group
11B Exit Data (Reason For Leaving) by Staff Category (Part-time) by Designated Group
12A New Hires by Staff Category (Full-time) by Designated Group
12B New Hires by Staff Category (Part-time) by Designated Group

## 5-A Taleo Online Application Diversity Survey

## Diversity Survey

## Diversity

Please provide the information requested in the fields below regarding diversity

## Important - Applicants Please Read

The University of Toronto is strongly committed to the principles of excellence, equity and diversity and welcomes applications from all qualified candidates. To further this commitment and help to evaluate the effectiveness of our recruitment processes, the University requests that you complete the following questionnaire. Your response is voluntary and the information that you provide is strictly confidential. None of the individual responses will be made available to the department or faculty to which you are applying.

Definitions
Aboriginal peoples are those persons who identify as First Nations (Status, non-Status, Treaty), Métis, Inuit, or North American indian
Persons with disabilities are persons who have a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric or learning impairment(s)
The categories listed in Question 5 are taken from Canada's Census 2006.

1. Are you:

Female $\boldsymbol{\sim}$
Female
Male
2. Based on the information in the definitions section, do you consider yourself an aboriginal person?

Not Specified -
Not Specified

| Yes | s' to |
| :--- | :--- |

3. If you answered 'yes' to question 2, please identify which of the following categories best applies to you:

| Not Specified |
| :--- | :--- |
| 筷ot Specified |
| First Nations or North American Indian <br> Métis <br> Inuit |

4. Based on the information in the definitions section, do you consider yourself a person with a disability?

No -
Yes
No
5. Are you:
$\square$ White
$\square$ Chinese
$\square$ South Asian (e.g. East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc).
$\square$ Black
$\square$ Filipino
$\square$ Latin American
$\square$ Southeast Asian (e.g. Vietnamese, Cambodian, Malaysian, Laotian, etc).
$\square$ Arab
$\square$ West Asian (e.g. Iranian, Afghan, etc).
$\square$ Korean
$\square$ Japanese
6. Do you identify as a sexual minority (e.g. lesbian, gay, bisexual, two-spirited, queer or transgender)?

Not Specified -
罍ot Specified
Yes
No

5-B Tables
EMPLOYMENT EQUITY WORKFORCE SURVEY: RETURN RATES

## September 30, 2007 Data

| September 30, 2007 Data <br> EMPLOYEE GROUPS IN THE WORKPLACE | ALL EMPLOYEES |  | SURVEY RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# in EmpLoyee GROUP ${ }^{1}$ | \% OF WORKFORCE REPRESENTED | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \# \\ \text { RETURNED } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \% OF SURVEYS RETURNED | ANY QUESTIONCOMPLETED |  | ABORIGINAL |  | VISIBLE MINORITIES |  | PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES |  | SEXUAL MINORITY |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | COMPLETED |  | COMPLETED |  | COMPLETED |  | COMPLETED |  | COMPLETED |  |
| FACULTY ${ }^{2}$ | 2389 | 29.39\% | 2134 | 89.33\% | 2113 | 88.45\% | 2057 | 86.10\% | 2062 | 86.31\% | 2084 | 87.23\% | 1695 | 70.95\% |
| CLINICAL FACULTY ${ }^{3}$ | 287 | 3.53\% | 201 | 70.03\% | 201 | 70.03\% | 193 | 67.25\% | 193 | 67.25\% | 201 | 70.03\% | 5 | 1.74\% |
| LIBRARIANS | 128 | 1.57\% | 124 | 96.88\% | 123 | 96.09\% | 122 | 95.31\% | 122 | 95.31\% | 120 | 93.75\% | 114 | 89.06\% |
| RESEARCH ASSOCIATES | 260 | 3.20\% | 216 | 83.08\% | 216 | 83.08\% | 216 | 83.08\% | 214 | 82.31\% | 214 | 82.31\% | 144 | 55.38\% |
| NON-UNIONIZED ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF | 874 | 10.75\% | 827 | 94.62\% | 815 | 93.25\% | 800 | 91.53\% | 806 | 92.22\% | 805 | 92.11\% | 759 | 86.84\% |
| USW | 3111 | 38.28\% | 2900 | 93.22\% | 2881 | 92.61\% | 2827 | 90.87\% | 2835 | 91.13\% | 2839 | 91.26\% | 2390 | 76.82\% |
| LIBRARY WORKERS (CUPE 1230) | 158 | 1.94\% | 150 | 94.94\% | 149 | 94.30\% | 138 | 87.34\% | 139 | 87.97\% | 148 | 93.67\% | 134 | 84.81\% |
| SERVICE WORKERS (CUPE 3261) | 581 | 7.15\% | 534 | 91.91\% | 525 | 90.36\% | 518 | 89.16\% | 517 | 88.98\% | 522 | 89.85\% | 358 | 61.62\% |
| OPERATING ENGINEERS (U. OF T. WORKERS, Local 2001) | 82 | 1.01\% | 82 | 100.00\% | 81 | 98.78\% | 78 | 95.12\% | 78 | 95.12\% | 80 | 97.56\% | 56 | 68.29\% |
| POLICE (OPSEU, Local 519) | 50 | 0.62\% | 44 | 88.00\% | 44 | 88.00\% | 44 | 88.00\% | 43 | 86.00\% | 43 | 86.00\% | 33 | 66.00\% |
| TRADES \& SERVICES ${ }^{4}$ | 76 | 0.94\% | 65 | 85.53\% | 64 | 84.21\% | 64 | 84.21\% | 63 | 82.89\% | 64 | 84.21\% | 58 | 76.32\% |
| RESEARCH ASSOCIATES \& OFFICERS (OPSEU, L. 578) | 7 | 0.09\% | 6 | 85.71\% | 6 | 85.71\% | 6 | 85.71\% | 6 | 85.71\% | 6 | 85.71\% | 5 | 71.43\% |
| ESL | 24 | 0.30\% | 24 | 100.00\% | 24 | 100.00\% | 24 | 100.00\% | 24 | 100.00\% | 24 | 100.00\% | 10 | 41.67\% |
| EARLY LEARNING CENTRE CUPE L2484 | 25 | 0.31\% | 19 | 76.00\% | 19 | 76.00\% | 19 | 76.00\% | 18 | 72.00\% | 19 | 76.00\% | 12 | 48.00\% |
| 89 CHESTNUT HERE L75 | 76 | 0.94\% | 74 | 97.37\% | 72 | 94.74\% | 72 | 94.74\% | 72 | 94.74\% | 72 | 94.74\% | 69 | 90.79\% |
| TOTALS: | 8128 | 100.00\% | 7400 | 91.04\% | 7333 | 90.22\% | 7178 | 88.31\% | 7192 | 88.48\% | 7241 | 89.09\% | 5842 | 71.88\% |

[^7]Table 1(B)
EMPLOYMENT EQUITY WORKFORCE SURVEY: RETURN RATES
(Excludes casual employees and appointed staff with less than 25\% F.T.E.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| September 30, 2007 Data | ALL EMPLOYEES |  | SURVEY RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EMPLOYEE GROUPS IN THE WORKPLACE | EMPLOYEE GROUP ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { OF } \\ \text { WORKFORCE } \\ \text { REPRESENTED } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|\|} \hline \# \\ \text { RETURNED } \end{array}$ | \% OF SURVEYS RETURNED | ANY QUESTION COMPLETED |  | ABORIGINAL PEOPLES |  | VISIBLE MINORITIES |  | PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES |  | SEXUAL MINORITY |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | COMPLETED |  | COMPLETED |  | COMPLETED |  | COMPLETED |  | COMPLETED |  |
| FACULTY ${ }^{2}$ | 255 | 35.12\% | 220 | 86.27\% | 219 | 85.88\% | 217 | 85.10\% | 217 | 85.10\% | 219 | 85.88\% | 162 | 63.53\% |
| CLINICAL FACULTY ${ }^{3}$ | 83 | 11.43\% | 41 | 49.40\% | 41 | 49.40\% | 41 | 49.40\% | 41 | 49.40\% | 41 | 49.40\% | ** | 1.20\% |
| LIBRARIANS | 17 | 2.34\% | 16 | 94.12\% | 15 | 88.24\% | 14 | 82.35\% | 15 | 88.24\% | 15 | 88.24\% | 13 | 76.47\% |
| RESEARCH ASSOCIATES | 28 | 3.86\% | 20 | 71.43\% | 20 | 71.43\% | 20 | 71.43\% | 20 | 71.43\% | 20 | 71.43\% | 13 | 46.43\% |
| NON-UNIONIZED ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF | 29 | 3.99\% | 27 | 93.10\% | 27 | 93.10\% | 26 | 89.66\% | 26 | 89.66\% | 27 | 93.10\% | 23 | 79.31\% |
| USW | 262 | 36.09\% | 236 | 90.08\% | 234 | 89.31\% | 229 | 87.40\% | 230 | 87.79\% | 232 | 88.55\% | 182 | 69.47\% |
| LIBRARY WORKERS (CUPE 1230) | 17 | 2.34\% | 17 | 100.00\% | 17 | 100.00\% | 16 | 94.12\% | 16 | 94.12\% | 16 | 94.12\% | 13 | 76.47\% |
| SERVICE WORKERS (CUPE 3261) | 22 | 3.03\% | 17 | 77.27\% | 17 | 77.27\% | 17 | 77.27\% | 17 | 77.27\% | 17 | 77.27\% | 10 | 45.45\% |
| RESEARCH ASSOCIATES \& OFFICERS (OPSEU, L. 578) | 6 | 0.83\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% |
| ESL | ** | 0.14\% | ** | 100.00\% | ** | 100.00\% | ** | 100.00\% | ** | 100.00\% | ** | 100.00\% | ** | 0.00\% |
| EARLY LEARNING CENTRE CUPE L2484 | 6 | 0.83\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% | 4 | 66.67\% | ** | 33.33\% |
| TOTALS: | 726 | 100.00\% | 603 | 83.06\% | 599 | 82.51\% | 589 | 81.13\% | 591 | 81.40\% | 596 | 82.09\% | 423 | 58.26\% |

${ }^{1}$ Total Population is based on the number of employees as of September 30, 2007.
${ }^{3}$ "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; they are not in the tenure stream.
Table 2(A)
September 30, 2007 Data

|  |  | UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All Employees |  |  |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total\# | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Men } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Women } \end{gathered}$ | \% Women | Total Completed | Aboriginal Peoples |  |  |  | Visible Minorities Response of "Yes" |  |  |  | Persons With DisabilitiesResponse of "Yes" |  |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | espons | se of " | Yes" |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  | Men Women |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  | Men Women |  | Total |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Men } \\ \hline \# \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Women } \\ \hline \# \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total |  | Men | Women |
| TYPE OF APPOINTMENT | RANK |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\%^{3}$ | \# | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{3}$ | \# | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{3}$ | \# | \% ${ }^{3}$ | \# |  |  | \# |  |
| Professoriate: Tenure/Tenure Stream: | Professors |  | 830 | 648 | 78.1 | 182 | 21.9 | 753 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 8.6 | 65 | 55 | 10 | 2.1 | 16 | 13 | ** | 3.3 | 25 | 16 | 9 |
|  | Associate Professors |  | 641 | 394 | 61.5 | 247 | 38.5 | 581 | 0.7 | 4 | ** | ** | 15.5 | 90 | 63 | 27 | 1.9 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 4.5 | 26 | 15 | 11 |
|  | Assistant Professors | 441 | 259 | 58.7 | 182 | 41.3 | 390 | 0.8 | ** | ** | ** | 18.5 | 72 | 40 | 32 | 2.1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 9.2 | 36 | 19 | 17 |  |
|  | Asst Professor(Cond) | 17 | 7 | 41.2 | 10 | 58.8 | 14 | 7.1 | ** | ** | ** | 35.7 | 5 | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 7.1 | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Total | 1929 | 1308 | 67.8 | 621 | 32.2 | 1738 | 0.5 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 13.3 | 232 | 160 | 72 | 2.0 | 35 | 24 | 11 | 5.1 | 88 | 50 | 38 |  |
| Professoriate: Clinical: (Non-TS in Medicine) | Professors | 117 | 93 | 79.5 | 24 | 20.5 | 83 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 13.3 | 1 | 10 | ** | 1.2 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Associate Professors | 114 | 79 | 69.3 | 35 | 30.7 | 87 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 14.9 | 13 | 10 | ** | 2.3 | ** | ** | ** | 1.1 | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Assistant Professors | 54 | 31 | 57.4 | 23 | 42.6 | 30 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 20.0 |  | 4 | ** | 3.3 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Asst Professor(Cond) |  | ** | 50.0 |  | 50.0 | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | * | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Total | 287 | 204 | 71.1 | 83 | 28.9 | 201 | 0.0 | *** |  | ** | 14.9 | 30 | 24 | 6 | 2.0 | 4 ** |  | ** | 0.5 | **** |  | ** |  |
| Professoriate: Non-TS CLTA/Other: | Professors | 28 | 22 | 78.6 | 6 | 21.4 | 23 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 8.7 |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 4.3 | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Associate Professors | 27 | 17 | 63.0 | 10 | 37.0 | 25 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 4.0 |  | ** | ** | 4.0 | ** | ** | ** | 4.0 | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Assistant Professors | 98 | 53 | 54.1 | 45 | 45.9 | 69 | 1.4 | ** | ** | ** | 13.0 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 2.9 | ** | ** | ** | 8.7 | 6 | ** | ** |  |
|  | Asst Professor(Cond) | 12 | 6 | 50.0 | 6 | 50.0 | 7 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 28.6 |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | * | ** | 14.3 | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Total | 165 | 98 | 59.4 | 67 | 40.6 | 124 | 0.8 | *** |  | ** | 11.3 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 2.4 | **** |  | ** | 7.3 | 9 | 5 | 4 |  |
| Other Academics ${ }^{4}$ | Senior Tutors/Lecturers | 144 | 76 | 52.8 | 68 | 47.2 | 130 | 0.8 ** |  | ** | ** | 14.6 | 19 | 13 | 6 | 2.3 ** | ** | * | ** | 6.9 | 9 |  | ** |  |
|  | Tutors/Lecturers | 120 | 48 | 40.0 | 72 | 60.0 | 104 | 1.0 ** |  | * | ** | 26.0 | 27 | 8 | 19 | 4.8 | 5 ** |  | ** | 1.9 ** | ** | ** | ** |  |
|  | Instructors/Lecturers | 31 | 11 | 35.5 | 20 | 64.5 | 17 | 0.0 ** |  | ** | ** | 5.9 ** ** ** |  |  |  | 0.0 ** |  | * | ** | 0.0 ** |  |  | ** |  |
|  | Total | 295 | 135 | 45.8 | 160 | 54.2 | 251 | 0.8 | ** |  | ** | 18.7 | 47 | 22 | 25 | 3.2 | 8 |  |  | 4.4 | 11 | 8 | ** |  |
|  Totals: All Faculty: <br> EEOG-NOC EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS: <br> $03-4121$ University Professors |  | 2676 | 1745 | 65.2 | 931 | 34.8 | 2314 | 0.5 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 14.0 | 32 | 216 | 107 | 2.2 | 50 | 33 | 17 | 4.7 | 109 | 64 | 45 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 63.8 |  | 36.2 |  | 0.7 |  |  |  | 13.3 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^8]Table 2(B)

## September 30, 2007 Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | UNIV | ERSITY | F TOR | ON | O | WOR | KFFORCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | All Emplo | loyees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sur | vey Resp | ondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Abor | rigina | al Peop | ples |  | isibl | Mi | inoriti |  | Perso | ns | With Dis | abilities |  | Sexu | al Min | rity |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Resp | pons | e of "Y | Yes" |  | espo | e | of "Y | Yes" |  | espo | nse of "Y | Yes" |  | espon | se of | "Yes" |
|  |  |  | \# | \% | \# | \% | Comp- | Total |  | Men | Women |  |  |  | Men | Women | Total |  | Men | Women | Total |  | Men | Women |
| JOB CATEGORY | RANK | Total\# | Men | Men | Women | Women | leted | \% ${ }^{3}$ | \# | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{3}$ | \# |  | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{3}$ | \# | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{3}$ \# | \# | \# | \# |
| Professoriate: Tenure/Tenure Stream: | Professors | 33 | 27 | 81.8 | 6 | 18.2 | 28 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 3.6 |  |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** |  |
|  | Associate Professors | 15 | 6 | 40.0 | 9 | 60.0 | 15 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 13.3 |  |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 6.7 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Assistant Professors |  | ** | 50.0 * |  | 50.0 | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Total | 50 | 34 | 68.0 | 16 | 32.0 | 45 | 0.0 | ** | * | ** | 6.7 |  |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 2.2 | ** | ** | ** |
| Professoriate: Clinical: | Professors | 33 | 30 | 90.9 * |  | 9.1 | 18 | 5.6 | ** | ** | ** | 11.1 |  |  | ** | ** | 11.1 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** |  |
| (Non-TS in Medicine) | Associate Professors | 25 | 19 | 76.0 | 6 | 24.0 | 14 | 7.1 | ** | ** | * | 7.1 |  |  | ** | ** | 7.1 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Assistant Professors | 25 | 14 | 56.0 | 11 | 44.0 | 9 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 22.2 |  |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Asst Professor(Cond) |  | ** | 0.0 * |  | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Total | 83 | 63 | 75.9 | 20 | 24.1 | 41 | 4.9 | ** | ** | ** | 12.2 |  |  | ** | ** | 7.3 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |
| Professoriate: Non-TS CLTA/Other: | Professors | 11 | 8 | 72.7 * |  | 27.3 | 9 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 11.1 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** |  |
|  | Associate Professors | 31 | 21 | 67.7 | 10 | 32.3 | 29 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 27.6 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Assistant Professors | 56 | 20 | 35.7 | 36 | 64.3 | 49 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 12.2 |  |  | ** | 4 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 4.1 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Asst Professor(Cond) | 4 | ** | 75.0 * |  | 25.0 | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Total | 102 | 52 | 51.0 | 50 | 49.0 | 90 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 16.7 |  |  | 6 | 9 | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 2.2 | ** | ** | ** |
| Other Academics ${ }^{4}$ | Senior Tutors/Lecturers | 12 | 5 | 41.7 | 7 | 58.3 | 11 | 0.0 ** |  | ** | ** |  |  | ** |  | ** | 0.0 ** |  | ** | ** | 9.1 ** |  | ** | ** |
|  | Tutors/Lecturers | 84 | 31 | 36.9 | 53 | 63.1 | 70 | 0.0 | ** |  | ** | 14.3 |  |  | ** | 8 | 1.4 | ** | ** | ** | 2.9 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Instructors/Lecturers | 7 | ** | 28.6 | 5 | 71.4 | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  |  | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | ** | ** |
|  | Total | 103 | 38 | 36.9 | 65 | 63.1 | 84 | 0.0 ** |  | ** | ** | 11.9 |  |  |  | 8 | 1.2 ** |  | ** | ** | 3.6 ** |  | ** | ** |
|  | Totals: All Faculty: | 338 | 187 | 55.3 | 151 | 44.7 | 260 | 0.8 | ** | ** | ** | 12.7 |  |  | 11 | 22 | 1.5 | 4 | ** | ** | 2.3 | 6 | * | ** |
| EEOG-NOC EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS:$03-4121$ University Professors |  | 63.8 36.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  | 13.3 |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^9]FACULTY (FULL-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP WITHIN TYPE OF APPOINTMENT ${ }^{1}$ AND SGS DIVISION

${ }^{1}$ Academic administrators are included in the tenure stream group according to their division.
${ }^{2}$ Of 2676 Full-Time Faculty represented in Table 2(A), 51 are uncategorized in terms of SGS Divisions. ${ }^{3}$ Based on number of surveys completed
${ }^{4}$ Includes Teaching Stream staff.
ASSISTANT PROFESSORS ${ }^{4}$ (FULL-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP WITHIN
TYPE OF APPOINTMENT ${ }^{1}$ AND SGS DIVISION

|  |  | UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All Employees |  |  |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total\# | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Men } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \# & \% \\ \text { Women } & \text { Women } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | TotalComp-leted | Aboriginal Peoples |  |  |  |  | Visible Minorities |  |  |  |  | Persons With Disabilities |  |  |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Response of "Yes" |  |  |  |  | Response of "Yes" | Response of "Yes" |  |  |  |  | Response of "Yes" |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  | Men | Women | Total |  |  | Men Women |  | Total |  | Men |  | Women | Total |  |  | Men | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Women } \\ \hline \# \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| JOB CATEGORY | SGS DIVISION |  |  |  |  |  | $\%^{3}$ | \# |  | \# | \# | $\%^{3}$ | \# |  | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{3}$ | \# |  | \# | \# |  | \% ${ }^{3}$ |  | \# | \# |
| Professoriate: Tenure/Tenure Stream: | I:HUMANITIES |  | 96 | 55 | 57.3 | 41 |  | 42.7 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 87 \\ 137 \\ 82 \\ 97 \\ 403 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.0 $* *$ $* *$ $* *$ <br> 2.9 4 $* *$ $* *$ <br> 0.0 $* *$ $* *$ $* *$ <br> 0.0 $* *$ $* *$ $* *$ <br> 1.0 4 $* *$ $* *$ |  |  |  |  | 12.6 11 6 5 <br> 24.8 34 14 20 <br> 28.0 23 17 6 <br> 9.3 9 5 4 <br> 19.1 77 42 35 |  |  |  |  | 3.4 $* *$ $* *$ $* *$ <br> 2.9 4 $* *$ $* *$ <br> 0.0 $* *$ $* *$ ${ }^{* *}$ <br> 1.0 $* *$ $* *$ $* *$ <br> 2.0 8 4 4 |  |  |  |  | 10.3 9 5 4 <br> 13.1 18 7 11 <br> 3.7 $* *$ $* *$ $* *$ <br> 7.2 7 5 $* *$ <br> 9.2 37 19 18 |  |  |  |  |
|  | II: SOCIAL SCIENCE |  | 161 | 81 | 50.3 | 80 |  | 49.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | III: SCIENCE | 93 | 73 | 78.5 | 20 | 21.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | IV: LIFE SCIENCE | 105 | 56 | 53.3 | 49 | 46.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 455 | 265 | 58.2 | 190 | 41.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professoriate: Clinical (Non-TS Med): | IV: LIFE SCIENCE | 56 | 32 | 57.1 | 24 | 42.9 | 31 | 0.0 |  | *** |  | ** | 19.4 |  | 6 |  | ** | 3.2 |  | **** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | *** |  | ** |
| Professoriate: Non-TS CLTA/Other: ${ }^{2}$ | 1:HUMANITIES | 36 | 24 | 66.7 | 12 | 33.3 | 28 | 0.0 |  | * | * | ** | 17.9 |  | 5 | 4 | ** | 7.1 |  | ** | ** | ** | 14.3 |  | 4 | 4 | ** |
|  | II: SOCIAL SCIENCE | 26 | 11 | 42.3 | 15 | 57.7 | 17 | 5.9 |  | * | ** | ** | 17.6 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 5.9 |  | * | ** | ** |
|  | III: SCIENCE | 11 | 10 | 90.9 |  | 9.1 | 10 | 0.0 |  | * | ** | ** | 20.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | * | ** | ** |
|  | IV: LIFE SCIENCE | 33 | 13 | 39.4 | 20 | 60.6 | 19 | 0.0 |  | * | ** | ** | 5.3 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 5.3 |  | * | ** | ** |
|  | Total | 106 | 58 | 54.7 | 48 | 45.3 | 74 | 1.4 |  | * | ** | ** | 14.9 |  | 11 | 7 | 4 | 2.7 |  | ** | ** | ** | 8.1 |  | 6 | 4 | ** |
| Totals: All Faculty ${ }^{2}$ | 1:HUMANITIES | 132 | 79 | 59.8 | 53 | 40.2 | 115 | 0.0 |  | * | ** | ** | 13.9 |  | 16 | 10 | 6 | 4.3 |  | 5 | ** | ** | 11.3 |  |  | 9 | 4 |
|  | II: SOCIAL SCIENCE | 187 | 92 | 49.2 | 95 | 50.8 | 154 | 3.2 |  |  | ** | 4 | 24.0 |  | 37 | 15 | 22 | 2.6 |  | 4 | * | ** | 12.3 |  |  | 7 | 12 |
|  | III: SCIENCE | 104 | 83 | 79.8 | 21 | 20.2 | 92 | 0.0 |  |  | ** | ** | 27.2 |  | 25 | 19 | 6 | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 3.3 |  | * | ** | ** |
|  | IV: LIFE SCIENCE | 194 | 101 | 52.1 | 93 | 47.9 | 147 | 0.0 |  | * | ** | ** | 10.9 |  | 16 | 9 | 7 | 1.4 |  | ** | ** | ** | 5.4 |  | 8 | 5 | ** |
|  | Total | 617 | 355 | 57.5 | 262 | 42.5 | 508 | 1.0 |  | 5 | ** | 4 | 18.5 |  | 94 | 53 | 41 | 2.2 |  | 11 | 6 | 5 | 8.5 |  |  | 23 | 20 |

[^10]OFFICERS AND ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS (FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME ${ }^{1}$ ) BY
All but one are Full-Time.
Based on number of surveys completed.
September 30, 2007 Data
Table 4
BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA

| JOB CATEGORY | UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Employees |  |  |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total\# | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Men } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Women } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Women } \end{gathered}$ | Total Completed | Aboriginal Peoples Response of "Yes" |  |  |  | Visible Minorities Response of "Yes" |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Persons With Disabilities } \\ \hline \text { Response of "Yes" } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  | Men Women |  |  |  | Men | Women | Total |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { se of "Yes" } \\ \hline \text { \|Men Women } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Total |  | Men Women  <br>  $\#$ $\#$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | \# | \# | \# | \% | \# | \# | \# | \% | \# | \# | \# | \% | \# |  |  |
| Professional Librarians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-Time | $\begin{gathered} 128 \\ 17 \text { ** } \end{gathered}$ | 41 | 32.0 | 87 | 68.0 | 123 | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | 11.4 | 14 | 5 |  | 1.6 | * | ** | ** | 8.1 | 10 | 8 | ** |
| Part-Time |  |  | 17.6 | 14 | 82.4 | 15 | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | 13.3 | * | * | ** | 6.7 | * | ** | ** | 6.7 | * | ** | ** |
| TOTAL | 145 | 44 | 30.3 | 101 | 69.7 | 138 | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | 11.6 | 16 | 5 | 11 | 2.2 | * | ** | ** | 8.0 | 11 | 8 | ** |
| EEOG-NOC EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03-5111 Librarians |  |  | 18.5 |  | 81.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  | 9.4 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


${ }^{1}$ Based on a number of surveys completed
Table 7.1(A)
September 30, 2007 Data

| EMPLOYMENT EQUITY EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP | UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ```EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS Population Aged 15+ Who Worked In 2000 or 2001 (Age 15-64, 1996-2001 for PWD) Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13)``` |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Employees |  |  |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Comp- } \\ \text { leted } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | Visible Minorities |  |  |  | Persons With Disabilities |  |  |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Women } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Response of "Yes" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\%$MenWomen |  | Aboriginal Peoples | Visible Minorities |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Persons With } \\ \text { Disabilities } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Women } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Total |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Men } \\ \hline \# \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Women | Total |  | Men ${ }^{\text {Women }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  | Men ${ }^{\text {W }}$ Women |  |  | \% |  | \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% ${ }^{2}$ | \# |  | \# | \% ${ }^{2}$ | \# | \# | \# |  |  | \% ${ }^{2}$ | \# | \# |  | * | \% ${ }^{2}$ | \# |  |  | \# | \# | Total |  | Total |
| 01 Senior Managers | 13 | 8 | 61.5 | 5 | 38.5 | 11 | 0.0 | * | * | * | 9.1 | $*$ | ** | $*$ | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * | 18.2 |  |  | * | * |  | 69.0 | 31.0 | 1.2 |  | 8.8 | *2.1 |
| 02 Middle and Other Managers | 360 | 177 | 49.2 | 183 | 50.8 | 328 | 0.3 | * | $* *$ | ** | 17.1 | 56 | 31 | 25 | 4.3 |  |  | 10 | 4 | 10. |  |  | 22 | 11 | 59.3 | 40.8 | 1.4 |  | 12.4 | 2.5 |
| 03 Professionals (Skill Level A) | 183 | 82 | 44.8 | 101 | 55.2 | 173 | 1.2 | * | * | * | 28.3 | 49 | 19 | 30 | 3.5 |  |  | 4 | * | 7.5 |  |  | 10 | ** | 50.7 | 49.3 | 1.2 |  | 16.4 | 4.1 |
| 04 Semi-Pro \& Tech (Skill Level B) | 13 | 7 | 53.8 | 6 | 46.2 | 13 | 0.0 | * | $*$ | * | 15.4 | * | ** | $*$ | 7.7 |  |  | ** | $*$ | 7.7 |  |  |  | $*$ | 48.1 | 51.9 | 0.8 |  | 35.1 | 3.9 |
| 05 Super: Cler/Sale/Serv (Skill B) | 23 | 10 | 43.5 | 13 | 56.5 | 22 | 0.0 | * | ** | * | 18.2 | 4 | ** | $*$ | 0.0 |  |  | ** | $*$ | 0.0 |  |  |  | * | 44.0 | 56.0 | 0.4 |  | 31.3 | *2.0 |
| 06 Super: Man/Pro/Trad-Prim Ind (Skill B) | 7 | 7 | 100.0 | ** | 0.0 | 7 | 14.3 | * | * | ** | 14.3 | ** | ** | $*$ | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  | * | * | 86.0 | 14.0 | 0.4 |  | 23.0 | *4.2 |
| 07 Admin \& Senr Cler (Skill Level B) | 224 | 37 | 16.5 | 187 | 83.5 | 213 | 0.5 | * | * | ** | 23.0 | 49 | 12 | 37 | 2.3 |  |  | ** | * | 2.8 |  |  |  | $*$ | 16.5 | 83.5 | 0.4 |  | 24.9 | 4.0 |
| 08 Sales and Service (Skill Level B) | 11 | 11 | 100.0 | ** | 0.0 | 10 | 0.0 | * | ** | $*$ | 30.0 | ** | ** | $*$ | 10.0 |  |  | ** | $*$ | 0.0 |  |  |  | $*$ | 84.5 | 15.5 | 0.8 |  | 31.0 | 4.2 |
| 09 Skilled Crafts \& Trades (Skill Level B) | ** | ** | 100.0 | ** | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | * | * | * | 0.0 | * | ** | ** | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  |  | $*$ | 89.7 | 10.3 | 0.5 |  | 50.0 | 4.2 |
| 10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C) | 38 | ** | 5.3 | 36 | 94.7 | 36 | 0.0 | * | ** | ** | 33.3 | 12 | ** | 11 | 5.6 |  |  | ** | * | 2.8 |  |  |  | * | 14.5 | 85.5 | 0.4 |  | 34.9 | 4.4 |
| 13 Sales and Service (Skill Level D) | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | 100.0 |  | 0.0 | * | * | ** | 0.0 | * | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  |  | * | 79.4 | 20.6 | 0.4 |  | 45.8 | 4.9 |
| ALL TOTALS | 874 | 342 | 39.1 | 532 | 60.9 | 815 | 0.6 | 5 | * |  | 21.7 | 177 | 70 | 107 | 3.6 |  |  | 17 | 12 | 6.9 |  |  | 37 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7.1 (B)
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF (PART-TIME): NON-UNIONIZED
BY DESIGNATED GROUP AND EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY DATA

| EMPLOYMENT EQUITY EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP | UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EXTERNAL AVAILABILITY STATISTICS Population Aged 15+ Who Worked In 2000 or 2001 (Age 15-64, 1996-2001 for PWD) Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Employees |  |  |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (tatal\# Men |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Men } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \# Women | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Women } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Comp- } \\ \text { leted } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Aboriginal Peoples |  |  |  | Visible Minorities Response of "Yes" |  |  |  |  | Persons With DisabilitiesResponse of "Yes" |  |  |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{cc}\% & \% \\ \text { Men } \\ \text { Women }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Aboriginal Peoples |  | Visible Minorities | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Men | Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vomen |  |  |  |  | Nomen |  |  |  | Me |  | Vomen | \% |  | \% | Persons With |
|  |  |  | \% ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | \# | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{2}$ | \# | \# |  | \# | \% ${ }^{2}$ | \# |  |  | \# | \% |  |  | \# |  | \# | Total |  | Total | Disabilities |
| 02 Middle and Other Managers | 8 | ** |  |  |  | 0.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 7 | 0.0 | * | ** | ** | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  | ** | ** |  |  |  |  | ** | $*$ | 59.3 | 40.8 | 1.4 |  | 12.4 | 2.5 |
| 03 Professionals (Skill Level A) | 14 | ** |  |  | 21.4 | 11 | 78.6 | 13 | 0.0 | * | ** | ** | 23.1 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  | ** | ** |  |  |  |  | * | $*$ | 50.7 | 49.3 | 1.2 |  | 16.4 | 4.1 |
| 04 Semi-Pro \& Tech (Skill Level B) | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | 100.0 | * | 0.0 | * | ** | ** | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  | ** | ** |  |  |  |  | ** | * | 48. | 51.9 | 0.8 |  | 35.1 | 3.9 |
| 07 Admin \& Senr Cler (Skill Level B) | 5 | ** | 20.0 | 4 | 80.0 | 5 | 0.0 | * | ** | $*$ | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * |  |  |  |  | ** | $*$ | 16.5 | 83.5 | 0.4 |  | 24.9 | 4.0 |
| 10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C) | ** | ** | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | * | ** | ** | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * | 0.0 |  |  | ** | * |  |  |  |  | ** | * | 14.5 | 85.5 | 0.4 |  | 34.9 | 4.4 |
| ALL TOTALS | 29 | 4 | 13.8 | 25 | 86.2 | 27 | 0.0 | * | ** |  | 11.1 |  |  | ** |  | 0.0 |  |  | ** |  |  |  |  |  | ** | * |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^11]

| EMPLOYMENT EQUITY <br> EEOG OCCUPATIONAL GROUP | UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Employees |  |  |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Population Aged 15+ Who Worked in 2000 or 2001 (Age 15-64 Worked Anytime In 1996-2001 for PWD) Canada (EEOG 01-03) / Toronto (04-13) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Totall M | $\stackrel{\text { \# }}{\text { Men }}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Women } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Women } \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Comp } \\ \text { leted } \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | Aboriginal Peoples |  |  |  | Visible Minorities Response of "Yes" |  |  |  |  | Persons With Disabilities |  |  |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { Women } \end{aligned}$ | Aboriginal Peoples | Visible Minorities <br> $\%$ <br> Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Persons With } \\ \text { Disabilities } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  | Men | Women |  |  | Total |  |  |  | Men | Women | Total |  |  | Men | Women | Total |  | MenWomen <br> $\#$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% ${ }^{1}$ | \# | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{1}$ |  | \# |  |  |  | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{\prime}$ | \# |  | \# | \# | \% ${ }^{1}$ | \# |  |  |  | Men | Total |
| 02 Middle and Other Managers | 4 ** |  | 0.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 4 | 0.0 | * | ** | *** | 25.0 |  | ** |  | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 61.9 | 38.1 | 1.4 | 13.1 | 2.5 |
| 03 Professionals (Skill Level A) | 73 | 12 | 16.4 | 61 | 83.6 | 66 | 1.5 |  | ** | *** | 21.2 |  | 14 | 4 | 10 | 4.5 |  | ** | ** | ** | 3.0 |  | ** | * | ** | 46.1 | 53.9 | 1.6 | 16.0 | 4.1 |
| 04 Semi-Pro \& Tech (Skill Level B) | 42 | 13 | 31.0 | 29 | 69.0 | 38 | 0.0 | * |  | * | 23.7 |  | 9 | ** | 6 | 5.3 |  | ** | ** | ** | 2.6 |  | ** | * | ** | 51.1 | 48.9 | 0.5 | 34.0 | 3.9 |
| 05 Super: Cler/Sale/Sern (Skill B) |  |  |  |  | 100.0 | * | 0.0 |  |  | *** | 33.3 |  | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** |  | ** | 45.0 | 55.0 | 0.5 | 33.3 | *2.0 |
| 07 Admin \& Senr Cler (Skill Level B) | 65 |  | 9.2 | 59 | 90.8 | 58 | 0.0 |  |  | *** | 22.4 |  | 13 |  | 12 | 8.6 |  | 5 | ** | 5 | 5.2 |  | ** |  |  | 16.3 | 83.7 | 0.4 | 25.8 | 4.0 |
| 10 Clerical Workers (Skill Level C) | 97 | 22 | 22.7 | 75 | 77.3 | 84 | 0.0 |  |  | *** | 10.7 |  | 9 | ** | 8 | 2.4 |  | ** |  | ** | 4.8 |  | 4 |  |  | 29.2 | 70.8 | 0.5 | 38.0 | 4.4 |
| 11 Sales and Service (Skill Level C) |  |  | 0.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 6 | 0.0 |  |  | ** | 33.3 |  | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** |  |  | 0.0 |  | ** |  |  | 41.0 | 59.0 | 0.5 | 32.1 | 4.6 |
| 12 Semi-skilled Manual Workers (Skill C) |  |  | 100.0 |  | 0.0 | * | 0.0 |  |  | *** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | $* *$ |  | ** | 89.1 | 10.9 | 0.7 | 31.5 | 5.3 |
| 13 Sales and Service (Skill Level D) | 21 | 15 | 71.4 | 6 | 28.6 | 16 | 6.3 |  | ** | *** | 25.0 |  | 4 | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | ** | ** | 45.7 | 54.3 | 0.5 | 41.7 | 4.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL TOTALS | 313 | 69 | 22.0 | 244 | 78.0 | 276 | 0.7 | * | ** | ** | 19.2 |  | 53 | 12 | 41 | 4.3 |  | 12 | 4 | 8 | 3.6 |  | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ 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 | All Employees |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total \# of Participant Days for Workforce ${ }^{3}$ | Women | \# of Participant <br> Days for Staff Who Completed Surveys | Aboriginal Peoples | Visible <br> Minorities | Persons with Disabilities | Sexual Minority |
|  |  |  | \%Wkforce \%Days ${ }^{\text {² }}$ |  | \%Wkforce \%Days | \%Wkforce \%Days | \%Wkforce \%Days | \%Wkforce \%Days |
| Admin, Non-union ${ }^{4}$ : | Staff Development | 53 | 76.2 | 48 | 2.1 | 22.1 | 5.3 | 3.2 |
|  | Computer Skills | 125 | 70.3 | 121 | 0.8 | 33.1 | 2.5 | 8.3 |
|  | Admin Mgmt Systems | 246 | 79.0 | 230 | 0.0 | 44.2 | 2.6 | 4.4 |
|  | Mgmt Development | 508 | 72.2 | 480 | 0.4 | 22.2 | 3.4 | 5.4 |
|  | Career \& Life Planning | 102 | 80.4 | 96 | 1.0 | 21.5 | 3.1 | 4.7 |
|  | Env Health \& Safety | 51 | 54.5 | 49 | 0.0 | 25.8 | 5.2 | 3.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 1083 | $60.9 \quad 73.7$ | 1022 | 0.6 | $21.7 \quad 28.5$ | 3.6 | $6.9 \quad 5.2$ |
|  | AVG DAYS | 1.24 | 1.50 |  | 1.00 | 1.65 | 1.16 | 0.96 |
| USW | Staff Development | 195 | 87.9 | 185 | 1.4 | 38.2 | 5.1 | 3.8 |
|  | Computer Skills | 638 | 83.7 | 570 | 0.5 | 38.7 | 2.3 | 6.8 |
|  | Admin Mgmt Systems | 563 | 87.3 | 521 | 2.4 | 47.1 | 2.7 | 5.8 |
|  | Mgmt Development | 277 | 80.7 | 263 | 1.9 | 35.2 | 2.9 | 7.4 |
|  | Career \& Life Planning | 247 | 88.5 | 236 | 0.2 | 39.4 | 5.1 | 4.7 |
|  | Env Health \& Safety | 148 | 69.2 | 141 | 1.8 | 30.5 | 3.5 | 5.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2067 | 68.6 84.2 | 1916 | $1.0 \quad 1.4$ | $33.9 \quad 39.9$ | $3.3-3.2$ | $0.0 \quad 5.9$ |
|  | AVG DAYS | 0.66 | 0.82 |  | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.64 | 113.00 |
| Administrative, Unionized | Staff Development | 14 | 25.9 | 12 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.2 | 12.5 |
|  | Computer Skills | 46 | 21.7 | 45 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Admin Mgmt Systems | ** | 50.0 | ** | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Mgmt Development | 15 | 16.7 | 12 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Career \& Life Planning | 6 | 63.6 | 5 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Env Health \& Safety | 198 | 9.9 | 171 | 0.6 | 28.4 | 2.6 | 5.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 279 | $40.1 \quad 14.2$ | 245 | $1.9 \quad 0.4$ | $29.5 \quad 25.1$ | $4.0 \quad 4.9$ | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ |
|  | AVG DAYS | 0.26 | 0.09 |  | 0.06 | 0.22 | 0.32 | 0.00 |
| ALL ADMIN STAFF | Staff Development | 261 | 82.4 | 244 | 1.4 | 33.2 | 6.4 | 4.1 |
|  | Computer Skills | 808 | 78.1 | 736 | 0.5 | 36.8 | 2.2 | 6.6 |
|  | Admin Mgmt Systems | 810 | 84.7 | 752 | 1.7 | 46.3 | 2.7 | 5.3 |
|  | Mgmt Development | 800 | 74.1 | 755 | 0.9 | 26.4 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
|  | Career \& Life Planning | 355 | 85.8 | 337 | 0.4 | 34.3 | 4.8 | 4.6 |
|  | Env Health \& Safety | 396 | 37.7 | 361 | 1.0 | 28.8 | 3.3 | 4.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 3428 | 61.3 75.2 | 3183 | 1.1 | $30.8 \quad 35.1$ | $3.5 \quad 3.3$ | $4.7-5.5$ |

'Percentages shown in "\% Days" are weighted by the number of participant days within each cell.
"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. ${ }^{3}$ Data on Participant Days has been collected from AMS Education and Training module in HRIS.
${ }^{4}$ Note 4 training days for ESL staff are included in Admin, Non-union totals.
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 <br> Participant <br> Days for Workforce ${ }^{3}$ | Women | \# of Participant Days for Staff Who Completed Surveys | Aboriginal Peoples | Visible Minorities | Persons with Disabilities | Sexual Minority |  |
|  |  |  | \%Wkforce \%Days' |  | \%Wkforce \%Days | \%Wkforce \%Days | \%Wkforce \%Days | \%Wkforce | \%Days |
| Admin | Staff Development | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Computer Skills | ** | 100.0 | ** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Admin Mgmt Systems | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Mgmt Development | 8 | 93.3 | 8 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Career \& Life Planning | ** | 100.0 | ** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Env Health \& Safety | ** | 100.0 | ** | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 13 | 86.2 96.2 | 13 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | AVG DAYS ${ }^{2}$ | 0.45 | 0.50 |  | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |
| USW | Staff Development | 16 | 100.0 | 11 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Computer Skills | 43 | 84.7 | 40 | 0.0 | 34.2 | 0.0 |  | 15.2 |
|  | Admin Mgmt Systems | 26 | 100.0 | 18 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 8.6 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Mgmt Development | 16 | 100.0 | 8 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |  | 6.7 |
|  | Career \& Life Planning | 18 | 100.0 | 14 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 25.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Env Health \& Safety | ** | 50.0 | ** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 119 | 82.1 94.1 | 90 | 0.40 | $20.9 \quad 30.0$ | $5.1 \quad 5.6$ | 4.3 | 7.2 |
|  | AVG DAYS | 0.45 | 0.52 |  | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.42 | 0.00 |  |
| ALL ADMIN | Staff Development | 18 | 100.0 | 12 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| STAFF | Computer Skills | 45 | 85.4 | 42 | 0.0 | 32.5 | 0.0 |  | 14.5 |
|  | Admin Mgmt Systems | 26 | 100.0 | 18 | 0.0 | 27.8 | 8.3 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Mgmt Development | 23 | 97.8 | 15 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 0.0 |  | 3.3 |
|  | Career \& Life Planning | 19 | 100.0 | 15 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 23.3 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Env Health \& Safety | ** | 75.0 | ** | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 132 | 78.7 94.3 | 104 | 0.7 0.0 | $21.1 \quad 27.5$ | 4.6 | 4.0 | 6.3 |

"Percentages shown in "\% Days" are weighted by the number of participant days within each cell.
"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.
${ }^{3}$ Data on Participant Days has been collected from AMS Education and Training module in HRIS.

| September 30, 2007 data | UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WORKFORCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Employees |  |  |  |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total\# | \# Men | \% <br> Men | \# \% <br> Women Women |  | $\%^{3}$ <br> Wkforce Women | Total Completed | Aboriginal Peoples |  |  | Visible Minorities |  |  | Persons With Disabilities |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |
| STAFF CATEGORY |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ Y \mathrm{Yes} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \%^{4} \\ \text { Yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \%^{3} \\ \text { Wkfrc } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ \text { Yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \%^{4} \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \%^{3} \\ \text { Wkfrc } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \%^{4} \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \%^{3} \\ \text { Wkfrc } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ \mathrm{Yes} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \%^{4} \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \%^{3} \\ \text { Wkfrc } \end{gathered}$ |
| Academic: Promotions ${ }^{1}$ to Full Professor | 49 | 31 | 63.3 | 18 | 36.7 |  | 38.5 | 45 | ** | 0.0 | 0.7 | ** | 4.4 | 15.5 | ** | 2.2 | 1.9 | ** | 6.7 | 4.5 |
| Clinical: Promotions ${ }^{2}$ to Full Professor | 10 | 8 | 80.0 | ** | 20.0 | 30.7 | 7 | ** | 0.0 | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | 14.9 | ** | 0.0 | 2.3 | ** | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Administrative, Non-Unionized | 100 | 35 | 35.0 | 65 | 65.0 | 60.9 | 92 | ** | 0.0 | 0.6 | 29 | 31.5 | 21.7 | ** | 1.1 | 3.6 | ** | 3.3 | 6.9 |
| USW | 268 | 77 | 28.7 | 191 | 71.3 | 68.6 | 249 | ** | 0.0 | 1.0 | 89 | 35.7 | 33.9 | 6 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 11 | 4.4 | 4.5 |
| Administrative, Unionized | 103 | 54 | 52.4 | 49 | 47.6 | 40.1 | 92 | 5 | 5.4 | 1.9 | 45 | 48.9 | 29.5 | 4 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 6 | 6.5 | 3.2 |

[^12]
## September 30, 2007 data

Table 10.1 REPRESENTATION OF AVERAGE YEARS FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Table 11(A)
GROUP


[^13]Table 11(B)
EXIT DATA (REASON FOR LEAVING) ${ }^{1}$ BY STAFF CATEGORY (PART-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP

|  |  | All Employees |  |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Women |  |  | \# of Exits with | Aboriginal Peoples |  |  | Visible Minorities |  |  | Persons with Disabilities |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STAFF } \\ & \text { CATEGORY } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { REASON } \\ & \text { FOR LEAVING } \end{aligned}$ | \# of <br> Exits | \% of Workforce ${ }^{2}$ |  | \% of <br> Exits | Completed Surveys | \% of Workforce | \# | \% of <br> Exits | \% of Workforce | \# | \% of Exits | \% of Workforce | \# | \% of Exits | \% of Workforce | \# | \% of <br> Exits |
| Faculty: Tenure Stream |  | ** | 32.0 | ** | 50.0 | ** | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | 6.7 | ** | 0.0 | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | 2.2 | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Early Retirements | ** |  | ** | 50.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
| Faculty: Non-TS |  | 20 | 46.9 | 12 | 60.0 | 15 | 0.9 | ** | 0.0 | 14.0 | ** | 0.0 | 1.9 | ** | 0.0 | 2.3 | ** | 13.3 |
|  | Early Retirements |  |  |  | 0.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 50.0 |
|  | Expiry of Appointment | 8 |  | 7 | 87.5 | 6 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Resignations | 10 |  | 5 | 50.0 | 7 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 14.3 |
| Professional Librarians |  | ** | 82.4 | ** | 100.0 | ** | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | 13.3 | ** | 0.0 | 6.7 | ** | 0.0 | 6.7 | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Early Retirements | ** |  | ** | 100.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
| Research Associates |  | * | 46.4 | ** | 66.7 | ** | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | 20.0 | ** | 0.0 | 5.0 | ** | 0.0 | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Expiry of Appointment | ** |  | ** | 0.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Resignations | ** |  | ** | 100.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
| Admin, Non-union |  | 7 | 86.2 | 6 | 85.7 | 5 | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | 11.1 | ** | 20.0 | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 | 0.0 | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Expiry of Appointment | ** |  | ** | 50.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Resignations | 4 |  | 4 | 100.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 50.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Deceased | ** |  | ** | 100.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
| Admin, Unionized |  | 6 | 56.9 | ** | 50.0 | 6 | 2.4 | ** | 0.0 | 28.6 | ** | 16.7 | 4.8 | ** | 0.0 | 4.8 | ** | 16.7 |
|  | Early Retirements | ** |  | ** | 0.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Resignations | 5 |  | ** | 60.0 | 5 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 20.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 20.0 |
| USW |  | 29 | 82.1 | 26 | 89.7 | 20 | 0.4 | ** | 0.0 | 20.9 | ** | 15.0 | 5.1 | ** | 10.0 | 4.3 | ** | 10.0 |
|  | Early Retirements | ** |  | ** | 100.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 100.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Expiry of Appointment | ** |  | ** | 100.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Resignations | 23 |  | 20 | 87.0 | 16 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 18.8 |  | ** | 6.3 |  | ** | 12.5 |
|  | Layoff | ** |  |  | 100.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |
|  | Terminations for Cause | ** |  | ** | 100.0 | ** |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |  | ** | 0.0 |

[^14]NEW HIRES BY STAFF CATEGORY (FULL-TIME) BY DESIGNATED GROUP

| STAFF CATEGORY | All Employees |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Women |  | \# of New <br> Hires with Completed Surveys | Aboriginal Peoples |  |  |  | Visible Minorities |  |  |  | Persons with Disabilities |  |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% of Workforce | \% of New Hires |  | \% of Workforce | \% of <br> New Hires | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ |  | \% of Workforce | \% of New Hires | \# Men | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ \text { Women } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% of Workforce | \% of New Hires | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \# } \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | Women | \% of Workforce | \% of New Hires | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \# } \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \# \\ \text { Women } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Faculty | 176 | 34.8 | 49.4 | 133 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0 | 1 | 14.0 | 13.5 | 7 | 11 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2 | 1 | 4.7 | 9.0 | 4 | 8 |
| Tenure Stream | 99 | 32.2 | 52.5 | 78 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0 | 1 | 13.3 | 10.3 | 2 | 6 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 5.1 | 11.5 | 2 | 7 |
| Non-TS CLTA/Other ${ }^{2}$ | 45 | 40.6 | 37.8 | 31 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 11.3 | 9.7 | 3 | 0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 1 | 1 |
| Other Academics ${ }^{5}$ | 32 | 54.2 | 56.3 | 24 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 18.7 | 29.2 | 2 | 5 | 3.2 | 12.5 | 2 | 1 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 1 | 0 |
| Professional Librarians | 7 | 68.0 | 85.7 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 11.4 | 25.0 | 0 | 1 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Research Associates | 56 | 33.5 | 33.9 | 40 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 36.6 | 35.0 | 6 | 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 2.3 | 5.0 | 2 | 0 |
| Administrative, Non-unionized ${ }^{4}$ | 64 | 60.9 | 56.3 | 56 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 1 | 0 | 21.7 | 23.2 | 4 | 9 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 1 | 1 | 6.9 | 12.5 | 5 | 2 |
| Continuing | 47 |  | 59.6 | 41 |  | 2.4 | 1 | 0 |  | 26.8 | 3 | 8 |  | 4.9 | 1 | 1 |  | 14.6 | 4 | 2 |
| Term ${ }^{3}$ | 17 |  | 47.1 | 15 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  | 13.3 | 1 | 1 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6.7 | 1 | 0 |
| USWA | 303 | 68.6 | 67.7 | 248 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | 33.9 | 39.1 | 35 | 62 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3 | 4 | 4.5 | 11.7 | 16 | 13 |
| Administrative, Unionized | 68 | 40.1 | 38.2 | 54 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 29.5 | 24.1 | 8 | 5 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 3.2 | 5.6 | 2 | 1 |
| ALL STAFF | 674 |  | 56.2 | 536 |  | 0.7 | 2 | 2 |  | 29.1 | 60 | 96 |  | 2.2 | 6 | 6 |  | 9.9 | 29 | 24 |

[^15]
## Table 12(A)

## September 30, 2007 Data

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

| STAFF CATEGORY | All Employees |  |  | Survey Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { \# of } \\ \text { New } \\ \text { Nires } \end{array}$ | Women |  | \# of New Hires with Completed Surveys | Aboriginal Peoples |  |  |  | Visible Minorities |  |  |  | Persons with Disabilities |  |  |  | Sexual Minority |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Workforce } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { New Hires } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Workforce } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% of } \\ \text { New Hires } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \# \\ \text { Women } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Workforce } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% of } \\ \text { New Hires } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ \text { Women } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Workforce } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { New Hires } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | Women | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Workforce } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { New Hires } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \# \\ \text { Women } \end{array}$ |
| Faculty | 38 | 44.7 | 60.5 | 22 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 12.7 | 27.3 | 3 | 3 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 2.3 | 9.1 | 1 | 1 |
| Tenure Stream | 1 | 32.0 | 100.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-TS CLTA/Other ${ }^{2}$ | 15 | 49.0 | 53.3 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 30.0 | 2 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 2.2 | 10.0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other Academics ${ }^{4}$ | 22 | 63.1 | 63.6 | 11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 11.9 | 27.3 | 1 | 2 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 | 9.1 | 1 | 0 |
| Research Associates | 6 | 46.4 | 66.7 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 20.0 | 33.3 | 1 | 0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| USWA | 30 | 82.1 | 76.7 | 25 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 20.9 | 16.0 | 1 | 3 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 1 | 0 |
| Administrative, Unionized | 7 | 56.9 | 57.1 | 4 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| ALL STAFF | 81 |  | 66.7 | 54 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  | 20.4 | 5 | 6 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  | 5.6 | 2 | 1 |

[^16]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ University of Toronto Statement on Equity, Diversity, and Excellence, 2006; http://www.hrandequity.utoronto.ca/Assets/equity/statement.pdf
    ${ }^{2}$ For more information on the offices please see http://www.equity.utoronto.ca/
    ${ }^{3}$ The Top 100 Employers list is compiled annually by MediaCorp Canada and was featured in Maclean's Magazine, October 9, 2007.

[^1]:    ${ }^{4}$ Federal 2006 census data by Employment Equity Occupational Groups is not yet available.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ A questionnaire is counted as completed if any one question is answered.

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ Information on PhDs awarded is provided by Statistics Canada.

[^4]:    ${ }^{7}$ The Taleo online application system was set up for administrative positions in 2006 with a highly successful employment equity-styled survey created by the University. The overall return rate for the applicant survey was $89 \%$ from July 2006January 2007.

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ Lecturers include tutors and instructors for the purposes of this report only.
    ${ }^{9}$ Ibid.
    ${ }^{10}$ There is a slight difference in the representation levels of "all women faculty" in Figure 7 at $34.8 \%$ and Figure 9 at $34.1 \%$ when shown by SGS division. This difference represents 'uncategorized' academics who are not directly linked to an SGS division (Transitional Year Program for instance) and/or do not teach at the graduate level.

[^6]:    ${ }^{11}$ For the purposes of this report, "promotions" among Administrative non-unionized staff includes movement to a higher salary grade.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Total Population is based on the number of employees as of September 30, 2007.
    Total Population is based on the number of employees as of September 30,2007 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Faculty are defined as all faculty (tenure-stream and non-tenure stream) except for clinical faculty
    "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; they are not in the tenure stream.
    ${ }^{4}$ Includes Electricians (IEBW, Local 353), Plumbers (UA 46), Sheet Metal Workers (SMWIA, Local 30), Carpenters (CAW, Local 27),
    Machinists/Locksmiths (IAMAW, Local 235), and Painters (District Council 46, Local 557).

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Academic administrators are included in the tenure stream group according to their rank
    Based on number of surveys completed.
    ${ }^{4}$ Includes Teaching Stream staff.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Academic administrators are included in the tenure stream group according to their rank.
    ${ }^{3}$ Based on number of surveys completed.

[^10]:    Academic administrators are included in the tenure stream group according to their division.
    ${ }^{2}$ Of 624 Full-Time Faculty represented in Table 2(A), seven are uncategorized in terms of SGS Divisions.
    ${ }^{3}$ Based on number of surveys completed
    ${ }^{4}$ Both "Assistant Professors" and "Assistant Professors (Conditional)" are included.

[^11]:    'Based on a number of surveys completed

[^12]:    'Promotions are defined by: (a) Academics: only promotions to Full Professor in Tenure Stream are shown (all are from Associate Professor,
    (d) Unionized staff: a salary increase.
    ${ }^{2}$ Promotions are determined by comparing September 2006 to September 2007 data only. Of the 530 promotions shown, 518 are full-time.
    " Wkfrc" shows \% of relevant full-time workforce, to be used as a comparator. For Academic, the comparat
    ${ }^{4}$ Based on a number of surveys completed

[^13]:    1 "Reason for Leaving" is based on coding on Action Forms by departments, which may not be consistently applied in all cases.
    Admin, Non-Union includes one resignation and one deceased for ESL.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ "Reason for Leaving" is based on coding on Action Forms by departments, which may not be consistently applied in all cases. < "\% of Workforce" represents percentage of relevant part-time workforce only.

[^15]:    New Hires for Tenure Stream Faculty are new appointments from October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2007, including those from other staff categories.
    All other new hires are defined as employees hired externally, i.e. from outside University of Toronto, for Oct. 1, 2006 to Sept. 30,2007 inclusive.
    2 "CLTA/Other" faculty positions include Contractually Limited Term Appointments, Sessionals, Lecturers, and Associates in Dentistry.
    3 "Term" is defined as a staff appointment having an established date on which the appointment will terminate.
    ${ }^{4}$ "Administrative, Non-Unionized" totals include PVP.
    ${ }^{5}$ Includes Teaching Stream staff.

[^16]:    New hires are defined as employees hired externally, i.e. from outside University of Toronto, for Oct. 1, 2006 to Sept. 30, 2007 inclusive ${ }^{2}$ "CLTA/Other" faculty positions include Contractually Limited Term Appointments, Sessionals, Lecturers, and Associates in Dentistry.

