

## **Guidance for the application of CA s. 32.3 c)**

CA 32.3 lists procedures and requirements for setting up ARPT Committees, which must include various provisions including, in s. 32.3c)

**Ensuring that committees are structured so as to be as inclusive as possible, in particular ensuring representation of qualified members from designated equity-seeking groups.**

The principles underlying this provision include:

- Ensuring a fair assessment of an application by including diverse perspectives on the committee;
- Supporting the committee's understanding of non-traditional academic approaches which may have been taken by a candidate from an equity-seeking group;
- Supporting the committee's understanding of systemic barriers or bias that may have affected the progress of the candidate's academic record.

Committees are encouraged to structure their committee to include a diversity of perspectives, often accomplished through one or both of the following mechanisms:

- 1) Establish the committee with parameters to ensure that the makeup of the committee generally reflects the makeup of the Unit in terms of gender, race or ethnicity.
- 2) Establish the committee to allow for the addition of diverse perspectives which are supportive of the principles above, based on the particular candidate(s) being considered.

This may necessitate requesting that a member of a designated equity-seeking group from another department be asked to join the committee. Qualified members of equity-seeking groups who are added to committees should be voting members, or their presence on these committees will be perceived as tokenistic. Participation by members of equity-seeking groups serving on ARPT committees beyond their departments should be counted as Service and where their Service commitments exceed the normal 20%, other mechanisms should be employed to ensure they are not overburdened (e.g. AWL, provision for TA support, etc.)

Legally defined equity-seeking groups include women, Indigenous peoples, Black and people of colour, LGBTQI2S+ people and people with a disability. Where possible, it would be best practice to have representation on the committee reflecting the experience of the candidate – for example, if you are considering a woman, seek to have at least one woman on the committee (this is a long-standing practice throughout most of campus); an Indigenous member in the case of an Indigenous candidate, and a racialized member in the case of a racialized candidate. However, in the latter case it is not generally necessary to seek out a candidate of a closely related racial background. It may be the case that a Member requests an adjustment to the composition of the committee to provide for a person who is knowledgeable of the candidate's methods or field of research or the candidate's teaching methods under CA s. 32.10. This can be interpreted to include knowledge of methodologies, approaches and barriers endemic to the academic work of a Member within an equity-seeking group and may support the augmentation of the committee under s. 32.14. In such cases, the expressed needs of the candidate should be met, insofar as possible. Where this is not possible, efforts should be made to include a perspective that best meets the principles above.

CA section 32.2 f) already requires that every effort be made to ensure that you have a member with expertise in community-engaged research if the candidate works in that area, and there could be some synergy between these requirements.

As an additional consideration, please be respectful of not relying on the same people time and again for this equity work. Equity-seeking faculty are often sought for committee work and also have extensive responsibility supporting equity-seeking students. It is important not to impair their academic progress by imposing more than a normal share of Service work. If they are sought out more than their peers for such committee work, then other mechanisms should be employed to ensure they are not overburdened (as described above).