Organizational Review of the Office of Human Rights,

Equity and Inclusion

at the University of Waterloo

Submitted July 19, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Review Mandate and Process

The purpose of this Review was, broadly expressed, to consider equity and inclusion at the University of Waterloo ("Waterloo" or "the University"). Specifically, the purpose of the Review was expressed as follows:

> "To review and evaluate the HREI portfolio at the University of Waterloo, with an emphasis on organizational structure and leadership, partnerships, internal collaborations, and the delivery of services and programs. To advise on strengths, challenges, and opportunities the University should consider to ensure the human rights, equity and inclusion needs of the Waterloo community are met in an efficient, effective, and progressive manner."

The Terms of Reference provided to the Review Team outlined six specific areas for consideration including mission and mandate, structure and organization, alignment, compliance, effectiveness, and enhancement. The full text of the Terms of Reference is attached in Appendix A. The core objective of the Review was to provide information and advice to the Senior Leadership about HREI, as the University embarked upon its 2020-2025 Strategic Plan.

Dr. James Rush, Vice-President Academic and Provost ("the Provost"), requested that the Review Team conduct this Review. He believed that it was important to hold this Review to help the University achieve greater alignment and contributions in this area. He noted that HREI was a relatively young area of the University, as the product of the amalgamation of five previously distinct areas. Dr. Rush articulated the importance of alignment to provide stronger outcomes and accountability.

As the process unfolded during a pandemic with far-reaching restrictions, we conducted all of the interviews by MicroSoft Teams in the period from December 11, 2020 through May 5, 2021. As this was a complicated time to navigate, we were grateful for the candour, specificity and thoughtfulness of diverse community members who engaged with us in these interviews. They were generally supportive of the Review and were pleased to contribute to the process, the future of HREI, and to equity, diversity and inclusion more broadly.

Specifically, we are thankful to Ms. Michelle Hollis for the extraordinarily generous time she spent with us on logistics to ensure the effectiveness of the project. It is not an easy task to

make all these arrangements across multiple calendars, and she did so quickly and with professionalism and kindness.

General Observations about the University

In addition to specific observations and recommendations regarding the HREI portfolio and equity and inclusion more broadly, the Panel makes five general observations regarding Waterloo. These general observations provide context for both the more specific observations that follow and for our recommendations.

I.   The University has been a member of the U15 group of universities since its inception and is recognized as a leading Canadian university in research and innovation. Its strength is generally, although not exclusively, recognized in the STEM disciplines. At the same time, we note that Waterloo is not seen as a leader in Canada in terms of advancing inclusivity for equity-deserving groups.

II. In almost every conversation that was part of this Review process, Waterloo was described as highly decentralized, with diffuse decision-making. People described the importance of collaborations and partnerships, particularly for administrative units, to succeed in this environment.

III. Like many universities, Waterloo has adopted a strong Provost and Decanal model. Interviewees shared the observation that this means that the senior academic leadership had the primary voice in setting priorities, and allocation of the associated resources.

IV. The Senior Leadership of the University is mostly white. The community shared that there is diversity within the student body, with heavy representation from East Asia.

V.   The University is experiencing a Presidential transition this summer. The arrival of a new President will be a significant change for the community (as it should be). In the context of this Review, it creates an exciting opportunity for re-setting the strategic focus on equity, inclusion, Indigenous reconciliation and anti-racism.

It is clear that Waterloo enjoys success on many fronts, and particularly in its core purposes of teaching and learning, and research and innovation. The vast majority of the community members we spoke with were dedicated to its continuing success, while desiring that the University take greater strides and bolder actions with respect to inclusion.

We brought a strengths-based lens to this Review, and ultimately the observations and recommendations are intended, working from a base of some strength, to continue to advance the University's success, albeit with a lens of equity and inclusion.

Observations about the Context for the Review

During the course of the Review it became evident to the Team that this Review was being conducted during a time when a number of other changes within, or connected to, the Waterloo equity space were occurring, including:

- the President's Anti-Racism Task Force (PART), initiated in the summer of 2020,
- an ongoing review of Policy 33 (Policy on Ethical Behaviour), with final recommendations imminent,
- some much needed resources added to HREI, including the creation of a new position, Manager Anti-Racism Response,
- the announcement in May 2021 of two sets of cluster hires - 10 tenure track positions restricted to Indigenous faculty, and 10 tenure track positions restricted to Black faculty, and
- the departure of two well-respected and important leaders of the equity-deserving community at Waterloo: Lori Campbell, Director of the Waterloo Indigenous Student Centre; and Kofi Campbell, Vice President and Dean at Renison University College.

The Review Team notes that all of these changes, positive with the exception of the departures, are occurring without the benefit of a confirmed leader and a well thought out strategic framework and plan for equity and inclusion. Ms. Jean Becker should be commended for her willingness to step into the role of Acting Associate Vice-President, HREI. In our view, she has held things together, and endeavoured to address critical matters, in the absence of a coherent framework and plan for HREI. Many of our recommendations below flow from this observation.

Approach and Methodology

The Review Team's mandate required that we engage in broad, campus-wide consultations. Members of identified stakeholder groups, as well as many other individuals and groups whose work or interests intersected with our mandate, were invited to meet with us. In addition to the communications from the Provost, the Review Team sent two communications inviting interested members of the community to meet with us, or to provide written submissions. With support from Ms. Hollis, we also reached out to a significant number of groups and individuals to engage with us. We held 57 group or individual interviews in which we listened carefully, and asked questions as appropriate, to ensure each person was able to share their thoughts and information with us as clearly as possible. We received 35 written submissions. The Review Team committed that all

communications would remain confidential so that participants would feel safe in sharing their perspectives.

We were provided with materials including the University's Strategic Plan, and detailed information about HREI. In addition, we considered publicly available information at 10 identified comparator universities. Those universities were identified by Waterloo, as well as by Review Team members who considered those universities (mainly research-intensive) in Canada that were addressing equity and inclusion more progressively, including:

- University of British Columbia
- Dalhousie University
- Queen's University
- University of Saskatchewan
- Western University

- University of Calgary
- McMaster University
- Ryerson University
- University of Toronto
- York University

We also relied upon our collective knowledge of and experience in Canadian universities, given our current and former leadership roles in equity and inclusion, and in human resources.

It was important for the Review Team to begin our consultations with the current HREI staff. As external professionals, we had a limited understanding of equity and inclusion work at Waterloo. Starting with HREI staff enabled us to grow our understanding, and address gaps and questions in interviews with the broader community. The community-based interviews were held with individuals and groups, with the exception of two separate roundtables for staff and faculty.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is clear to us that in support of Waterloo's strengths, there is significant room for growth in further establishing equity and inclusion as an institutional priority and commitment. There are a number of matters upon which we will comment, and we make 16 recommendations to ensure HREI is organized and functions more effectively, and to support the University in its journey to a more equitable and inclusive environment.

We will begin with an introduction to key concepts and principles, then provide several high-level observations about equity and inclusion and, lastly, follow with observations and recommendations related to specific areas.

Key Concepts and Principles

Our mandate included making recommendations on the organizational structure and leadership of the HREI portfolio, as well as to advise on strengths, challenges and opportunities the University should consider in order to meet its human rights, equity and inclusion needs moving forward. In conducting our assessment and in formulating our recommendations we are guided by key concepts and principles underlying effective organizational design and cultural change.

Organizational Design

First, it is a generally accepted strong practice to put the best interests and core purposes of the organization first in designing optimal organizational structure. The University of Waterloo's stated mission is to "advance learning and knowledge through teaching, research and scholarship, nationally and internationally, in an environment of free expression and inquiry".

Within that overarching statement, the next step is to articulate the purposes of the department or unit under consideration. How does it support the core purpose, values and strategic objectives of the institution? How broad is its mandate? What level of leadership is required to enable achievement of the stated purpose? What is the University's level of commitment to the unit? What are the critical partnerships and collaborations? Then, a structure should be created or revised. In that way, the structure will support those interests and purposes. In our view, it is critical to take a building approach to the long-term interests of the University.

Following the design of the structure, the next step is to map the current people to it and make thoughtful and intentional choices about having people work to their strengths and address any outstanding gaps. As both a practical matter and a matter of principle, when people work to their strengths, they will do their best work in the interests of the institution.

Cultural Change

Building a culture of equity and inclusion requires a process of cultural change - change throughout the University. In developing our recommendations, we were informed by many of the key concepts that enable successful cultural and organizational change. These include:

- Clearly articulated values and strategic goals, expressed in ways that inspire while at the same time are concrete and measurable.

- Visible executive leadership and championing. There should be no doubt that equity and inclusion are strategic priorities for the Senior Leadership, and that these values and priorities are embedded in executive decision-making at the University.

- Clear and transparent communication of goals, decisions, actions, challenges, progress and setbacks.

- Progress is measured and evaluated, and there are systems of accountability at all levels.

- Those leading the work have the required expertise, knowledge, credibility and lived experience.

- Collaboration and reciprocity across hierarchy. Universities have multiple hierarchies which both enrich and complicate the process of change. Collaboration across both hierarchies and disciplines is key to building lasting change.

- Build trusting and trusted relationships across a highly decentralized structure is critical to ensuring effective collaboration. The work of equity and inclusion is not the responsibility of one department. It needs to be shared and infused across the University.

- Respect for the lived experience and knowledge of equity-deserving groups and individuals is fundamental to building trust and collaboration.

- Roles, policies and processes need to be clearly articulated and understood.

High-level Observations about Equity & Inclusion

During the course of our interviews, the Review Team made a number of observations that informed our specific findings and recommendations. These observations provide useful context for our recommendations and may also be of assistance to decision-makers and community members. The most relevant of those observations are listed below, in no particular order.

- The University has a relatively new Strategic Plan (2020-2025). Global impact, diversity and creation of an inclusive community are relevant key priorities, highlighted in the "themes for impact". This has the potential to set a strong foundation for the work of equity and inclusion, if supported by a bold, clearly articulated vision and objectives that become core to the University's view of its own success.

- There was a belief among many interviewees that the University's executive leadership was not fully committed to Equity and Inclusion, and to the changes and investments required to make significant progress in this area. Some initiatives were seen by a

noticeable number of interviewees as performative, rather than actioning real change. This is discussed further below.

- The President's Anti-Racism Task Force (PART) has been an important mechanism for initiating consultation and collaboration around anti-racism and the development of an action plan. We heard, however, that there was confusion regarding roles and responsibilities related to equity initiatives. As the leadership of and mandate for HREI is strengthened, it would be important to transition the work of PART to HREI, while continuing and enhancing collaboration with leaders, experts and those with lived experience across the University.

- HREI is a relatively young unit, having only come together as a portfolio within the last four years. Units came into the portfolio incrementally, as circumstances unfolded, rather than as part of a clearly formed strategy. It is perhaps not surprising that HREI as a whole has not yet developed a clear vision and purpose, and an understanding of the ways in which "the whole is greater than the sum of its parts".

- The team within HREI are skilled professionals who are dedicated to, and care deeply about, their work and the University community. They shared their distress at the sometimes negative perceptions of HREI. They all reported feeling over-extended and frustrated by the challenges of constantly having to "fight fires'' with little or no time for the proactive work needed. They are hopeful that this Review will result in positive changes for the University, for HREI and for their ability to do their work and make a difference in the culture at Waterloo.

- The Review Team observed, and were told by the majority of interviewees, that HREI is significantly under-resourced in relation to the demands placed on this unit. This remains the case despite the fact that new resources were added while this Review was under way.

- We heard that there is confusion regarding roles and processes within HREI. Community members often do not know which HREI office to contact for any given issue, or what process to expect. This lack of clarity with respect to roles, process and accountabilities is felt internally within HREI, as well as by the individuals and departments that access HREI's services.

- We heard about significant past tensions in many of the relationships between HREI and its clients, and between HREI and some of the units with which it collaborates. While in some cases these were now being addressed, there is much healing needed to ensure positive and constructive collaborations.

- We encourage Waterloo leadership and HREI to develop the mindset of supporting equity and inclusion where it happens, and where it needs to happen. An ecosystem is needed to allow the values of human rights, equity, inclusion, Indigenization and anti-racism to thrive on the ground. HREI can lead and partner, but many other areas need to be engaged in equity work. A strategic HREI function can take a systems approach to

supporting cultural change - building relationships, providing financial support for grassroots initiatives (if they are granted the resources), and partnering with individuals and Faculties to do this work.

- Within Waterloo's highly decentralized structure, the Review Team observed a tendency to work vertically, in silos, in order to navigate the decentralization and hierarchy. This can tend to reinforce territorial and rigid thinking, making it difficult to foster the type of ecosystem described immediately above. Rigid hierarchical structures can also inhibit the identification and amelioration of systemic racism that such a structure tends to support. The ability to work horizontally, for example through dotted line reporting relationships, is especially important for equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) work.

- The Review Team heard that a primary focus for HREI during its first years was championing and supporting Waterloo's participation in the UN HeForShe campaign. While this is important equity work, HREI needs to champion all areas of equity and inclusion, prioritizing through active, ongoing consultation with the community.

- During the course of this Review we learned that the University's Policy on Ethical Behaviour (Policy 33) was under review. While the review of Policy 33 is outside of the scope of the HREI review, we understand that the recommended changes to the Policy will result in significant changes to the role of the Conflict Management and Human Rights Office (CMHRO) within HREI. We observed through the interviews that there were polarized views of CMHRO, which were quite difficult to reconcile. Removing the responsibility for investigation of Policy 33 complaints (which are broader than HREI's mandate) from HREI appears to be a positive direction. We offer a few more comments on this further in our Report.

Specific Areas

The University's Commitment to Equity and Inclusion

A significant majority of interviewees did not believe there was a deep understanding of, and commitment to, Equity and Inclusion amongst the University's Senior Leadership. When asked why, people pointed to that group's lack of visibility at events and educational opportunities, reactive statements in response to events or reputational issues, and lack of transparent strategic objectives related to increasing representation of equity-deserving groups. The group was not seen as conversant in the principles of equity and inclusion, nor as champions for why it mattered, and how it was integral to the University's broader success.

While acknowledging the strengths of individual staff members in HREI, the under-resourcing for its mandate, and the "growing pains'' stemming from the amalgamation of separate units under one umbrella starting a few years ago, people stated that they had not

seen meaningful, sustained progress; rather, they observed an approach that "ticked the boxes". There is a sense from many interviewees that the work of building a culture of equity and inclusion has been "assigned" to HREI and that HREI has neither the resources nor the authority to do this work on its own. Equity work should be included in the responsibilities of the Senior Leadership, and community members more broadly.

In our view, there is a need for the University to articulate clearly what it wants to accomplish in inclusion, and how crucial success in this area is to its excellence and broader achievements. As stated earlier, this requires a bold and ambitious statement, measurable goals, and clear action including the investment required to achieve these goals. We heard that the status quo, consisting of a compliance-based approach, and incremental change, are unacceptable. Waterloo is justifiably proud of its innovation capability. The statement and action can be grounded in similar values and actions taken to achieve that capability.

For many community members, the Senior Leadership's commitment will be measured in:

- Visible support for and attendance at community events and learning opportunities, and agreement to create and/or strengthen written requirements for their role responsibilities, and assessment of progress as part of their annual evaluation process;

- Endorsing and supporting a systems approach to embedding equity and inclusion in policies, structures and processes. This is a much more sustainable approach than applying an equity lens towards the end of a decision-making process;

- Allocating the resources necessary, in a multi-year approach, to undertake this work in a more progressive, and less reactive, manner;

- Setting specific and measurable objectives to address under-representation, particularly for faculty, staff, and those in formal leadership roles. We note the commitment to the faculty cluster hires described earlier;

- Drawing upon the expertise of faculty and professional staff, in addition to HREI, to be included in goal setting and actions taken to improve equity and inclusion; and

- Committing to a follow-up review in five years.

Recommendation #1: The Senior Leadership should articulate clearly its bold and ambitious vision for equity and inclusion, together with goals and actions, and how progress will be measured. This needs to have strong linkages to Waterloo's broader success as an academic institution and may be grounded in comparable values and actions which supported the University's reputation for innovation.

Recommendation #2: The Senior Leadership should commit to a series of measures to increase transparency and community belief that they are fully committed to a progressive approach to equity and inclusion at the University.

HREI – Purpose and Clarity of Mandate

It will be critical for the University to be explicit about the mandate of HREI, and in particular, answer the questions: What does it do? How does it do it? Who does it serve? We expected that the answer to this latter question would have been clear, i.e. students, faculty and staff. During the interviews, there was some confusion, even amongst HREI staff. It would be helpful to be explicit about the community served by HREI.

Once the mandate or purpose has been crystallized, this would be an opportunity to re-name HREI to better reflect that purpose, to signal priorities, and to put some of the past criticisms behind them.

In our view, the answer to the first two questions (what and how) should include the following:

- Develops, leads and directs Waterloo's equity and inclusion strategy.

- Engages with Senior Leadership to advance equity and inclusion practices in all areas of Waterloo.

- Builds institutional capacity for equity and inclusion.

- Advocates through the lens of culture change. It wants the University to do and be better. This requires advocacy, and it means that HREI is not neutral. Acknowledges the tension of being part of the institution and being critical of the institution.

- Provides leadership to improve the inclusive campus climate for students, faculty and staff.

- Trusted advocate, advisor and space for all constituencies.

- Expert advisor and coach to leaders in formal senior and executive leadership roles.

- Provides intake advice and facilitates informal resolution of issues/conflicts that are Human Rights Code-based, where appropriate to do so.

- Advises and collaborates with the new office responsible for investigations on matters that are Human Rights Code-based.

- Leads the collection and reporting of cogent and relevant EDI data.

- Provides guidance and expert advice on inclusive curriculum and pedagogy.

- Provides guidance and facilitation in educational offerings; harnesses relationships with other departments.

- Leads from a place of expertise, credibility, authenticity, visibility, warmth, openness, and welcome.

- Orients to more transformational work, less transactional work (e.g. reviewing departmental communications for equity language).

- Helps build and sustain other structures such as equity roles, liaisons, champions and ambassadors in Faculties, Departments and student organizations. This is commonly referred to as a hub and spoke model.

- Responsible for supporting and amplifying voices of all equity-deserving groups. This may include establishing priorities for periods of time. The focus for next 2 years should be anti-Black and Indigenous racism.

- Sponsors, promotes and endorses grassroots and local community initiatives. This support should include people and financial resources (depending upon the need), but not gatekeeping.

Recommendation #3: Review and re-establish the mandate or purpose of HREI to ensure clarity for the University, HREI staff and the Waterloo community. Rename HREI to appropriately reflect the new purpose and mandate.

Recommendation#4: Provide explicitly that HREI serves students, faculty and staff.

Reporting Relationship & Leadership Roles

A core consideration for the Review Team was to whom the HREI senior leader should report. When interviewees were asked, there were a range of responses. Some indicated that reporting to the Provost was important, because structurally one would be able to get things done, and acquire the appropriate resources along with access to senior academic leaders who report to the Provost. Others expressed that reporting to the President and being a member of the Executive was more advantageous, because this was the table where strategic direction was determined, and decisions for the institution were made. Furthermore, if HREI was to be an institutional priority, a seat at the Executive table was vital.

Below is a table of Senior Equity positions and the posts they report to in their respective universities. Of the 10 comparators named, five report only to the Provost, four report to the President, and one reports to four Vice Presidents, including the Provost. Reporting

lines within a university have just as much to do with who is willing to take on the responsibility to champion the role, as they do with the organizational structure. Whether it be the Provost or President, this senior equity position will require a champion, support and resources.

University	Senior Equity Position	Reports To
UBC	Associate Vice President, Equity & Inclusion	4 Vice Presidents
Calgary	Vice Provost, Equity, Diversity & Inclusion	Provost
Dalhousie	Vice Provost Equity & Inclusion	Provost
McMaster	Assoc. Vice President Equity & Inclusion	Provost
Queens	Associate Vice Principal HREI	Provost
Ryerson	Vice President, Equity & Community Inclusion	President
Saskatchewan	Vice Provost Indigenous Engagement	Provost
	Director, Discrimination & Harassment Prevention Services	Assoc. VP People & Resources Assoc. VP Students
Toronto	Vice President Human Resources & Equity	President
Western	Associate Vice President, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (search process underway)	President
York	Vice President, Equity, People and Culture	President

After much deliberation, we believe that the leaders (plural is described in the next paragraph) should continue to report to the Provost, with a dotted line reporting relationship to the President. We recognize this is not ideal given the sheer number of direct reports to the Provost and the breadth of his responsibilities, but the function is situated with Students, Human Resources and academic leadership such as the Deans, all of which reside within the Provost's portfolio.

With that context, we recommend that there be at minimum two senior positions created: **Associate Vice President ("AVP"), Indigenous Initiatives**, and **Associate Vice President ("AVP") Anti-Racism, Equity and Inclusion, each reporting to the Provost.** The University may also wish to consider dividing the latter position into two: AVP Anti-Racism, and AVP Equity and Inclusion. In this case the former position would have a focus on anti-Black racism, and the latter a focus on equity, diversity and inclusion. While it may be possible to find one leader with the requisite expertise in all of these areas, it is unlikely, and it takes dedication to address each in a fulsome, comprehensive way to bring about culture change, disruption and integration.

We offer the above options for consideration, however, for ease of understanding and clarity the remainder of this report will refer to two positions: AVP Indigenous Initiatives and AVP Anti-Racism, Equity and Inclusion.

At a minimum, both (or all three) positions require access to the Executive team and senior level tables to influence academic planning, strategic planning and decision-making. Given the institution-wide importance of the roles, these leaders should also be members of the Deans' Council, Executive Council and the Executive team. The President, the Vice-Presidents and the Deans must make their commitment to the portfolio and the equity issues on the campus widely known, and a key lens that they bring to institutional governance, planning and assessment.

Elevating these positions to the rank of Vice-President was also considered, and some shared that being at the AVP level was inadequate and did not afford the position enough power and authority to do what is needed. We think this should be an institutional goal to consider in a 3-5 year timeframe. At this time, the University will be better served by a combination of strategy and "doing" by AVPs. The first order of business will be to engage in strategic planning for Indigenous Initiatives, Anti-Racism, Equity and Inclusion with the Senior Leadership, their teams and the community.

Structural change is required to set up both positions for success to move throughout the organizational structure, be impactful on both academic and administrative "sides", making needed connections and sitting at tables where decision-makers are setting direction and forming strategy. The success of these positions is dependent upon the willingness of other leaders to integrate these priorities into the core of the University; otherwise, the expectation that this office will deliver is unrealistic.

Recommendation #5: Consider two, if not three, Associate Vice-President roles: AVP Indigenous Initiatives, and AVP Anti-Racism, Equity and Inclusion, or consider disaggregating the second role into AVP Anti-Racism, and AVP Equity and Inclusion. Recommend considering Vice-President roles in a 3-5 year time frame.

Recommendation #6: Ensure Associate Vice-Presidents are members of decision-making tables such as Deans' Council, Executive Council and the Executive team.

HREI – Leadership Qualifications & Style

The topic of HREI leadership was the focus of many discussions we had with community members. Throughout these discussions elements of qualifications and expected responsibilities, style of leadership, and reporting lines, the latter of which is discussed above, were articulated.

Qualifications:

The senior leader for HREI should have racialized, lived experience and deep, extensive subject matter expertise in areas, such as equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI), anti-racism (anti-Black racism), decolonization, etc. along with an advanced degree.

Experience leading, navigating and effecting change in a highly decentralized and siloed academic environment (change management) is essential to the role's success; along with needing strong, proven administrative skills to navigate structures and processes, including distributive leadership.

Expertise and understanding of the political, social and structural landscape of universities with respect to equity, diversity, inclusion, anti-racism, decolonization, etc., competing priorities and external pressures.

Ability to build a cohesive, diverse (racially) team, with faculty experience and advocate for needed resources to deliver on the office's mission.

Ability to listen to students, faculty, staff and community members; experience working with different equity groups; build strong relationships with student, faculty and staff campus groups, departments and organizations and foster respect, empathy and collegiality.

Develop and champion an institutional vision and strategic direction at leadership and decision-making tables and the campus community, more broadly. Communicate the role and mission of the office at different tables. Coordination of efforts to proactively push EDI efforts forward (ie. coordination across faculties) versus reactive.

While faculty experience is not required, it is preferred, given that understanding of the tenure process, expectations, responsibilities and challenges faculty encounter, along with the career life cycle, is vital to this role being effective in working with academic leaders.

Demonstrated ability to work with and support students; and understand the student experience and their respective issues at both undergraduate and graduate levels, with an intersectional approach.

Style of Leadership:

Leadership style overlaps somewhat with qualifications, however, in an effort not to be redundant, this section focuses on how a particular style or approach is considered important to achieve success at Waterloo.

Operating from the vantage point of building connections across campus can lead to success and establishing credibility. Gaining respect by way of developing relationships Faculty by Faculty, listening with empathy and respect to students, faculty, staff and community members, and being able to persuade versus a top-down approach.

A commitment to engage and access different perspectives to shape the culture change strategy, in addition to informing the learning and training that senior management needs is an important place to start.

Using the power of the position is not enough to bring about change; the person in this role must leverage soft skills of influence, building authentic partnerships, supporting the community, use persuasion and expertise, and relationships, etc. to move roadblocks and forge high-level strategic collaborations with counterparts across campus, including Deans and other senior leaders, both academic and administrative.

It has been noted that Waterloo relies heavily on individuals, and not roles. Embedding accountability that aligns with leadership style expectations can facilitate specific outcomes, such as working with students to improve life on campus for them.

Reconciliation and Indigenization

The University's commitments in this area are relatively nascent. The first dedicated leadership role was created in 2019 to lead Indigenous Initiatives, and the Senior Director, Ms. Jean Becker, commenced her role in January 2020. Because of events that transpired in the late summer and fall of 2020, she accepted the additional responsibility as Acting Associate Vice-President in September 2020. This has been an extraordinarily demanding

period for her. Consequently, she has not been able to allocate the full scope of her talents to Indigenous Initiatives. That said, she has been able to have important conversations, and has recruited an experienced staff member for the Coordinator role.

More broadly, reconciliation and Indigenization (inclusive of decolonization) is one of the newer areas that universities are figuring out, especially following the many substantive findings and recommendations contained in the reports of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. A number of universities are struggling to get it right – to reflect their own history and aspirations, and that of their province, in having relationships with Indigenous peoples. Universities in British Columbia and Saskatchewan are often considered to be leading the way in this area.

A number of interviewees accepted the importance of centralizing leadership and support for Indigenous Initiatives in a standalone office, such that it can get traction, and influence and provide appropriate stewardship. Responsibilities for reconciliation and Indigenization are not generally diffused within the structure of universities, other than in areas of academic programming. There were also some people who believed it should remain in HREI, given its comparable focus on increasing inclusion for traditionally marginalized communities.

Given the enormous importance, historical structures, and complexity of the issues surrounding Indigenization, there is a need for institutional leadership, with appropriate resources, that is credible both within Indigenous communities, and the academic community. While there are similarities with other equity-deserving groups, there are fundamental differences in Indigenous engagement that can only be addressed through a separate office with senior leadership. This is the developing direction of travel for Canadian universities, and is in place in a number of the identified comparators as shown in the chart below.

We think that, as in the case of many comparators, there should be an AVP position for Indigenous Initiatives, and it should be part of the Vice-President Academic and Provost portfolio. A related and important question will be whether the new senior leader should be a faculty member, or a staff member, and whether the mandate of this portfolio should be broadened to include academic programming. Lastly, consideration should be given to whether Indigenous Initiatives is the right name for the Office moving forward. Perhaps a term could be chosen that is more sustainable than "initiatives".

Comparator Review:

University	Senior Indigenous Focus Position
UBC	Senior Advisor to the President on Indigenous Affairs
Calgary	Vice-Provost Indigenous Engagement
Dalhousie	part of Vice-Provost Equity & Inclusion portfolio
McMaster	Indigenous Services & Community office reporting to Associate Vice-President & Dean of Students
Queens	Associate Vice-Principal (Indigenous Initiatives and Reconciliation)
Ryerson	Director Aboriginal Initiatives reports through the Vice-President Equity and Community Inclusion (VPECI). Elder and Senior Advisor - Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation; reports to the Provost with a dotted line to the VPECI; is a member of Senate, Academic Planning Group and is Honorary Board Elder on the Board of Governors
Saskatchewan	Vice-Provost, Indigenous Engagement
Toronto	Shared responsibility between the Provost and Vice-President Human Resources and Equity portfolios
Western	Vice-Provost & Associate Vice-President Indigenous Initiatives
York	President's Advisor on Indigenous Initiatives; and An academic director position (reporting to the Vice Provost Academic) focusing on Indigenous curriculum and the academy

Finally, but very importantly, the Review Team believes strongly in the importance and effectiveness of the work of the Waterloo Indigenous Student Centre (WISC). We also think it is important to acknowledge and respect the expertise and enormous community-building work being undertaken by or through the leadership of a federated institution, St. Paul's University College. In the spirit of collaboration and sharing the enormity of the work that needs to be done in this area, it should be the responsibility of the AVP Indigenous Initiatives to continue to support and enhance the current WISC. There is no need to replicate or absorb it into Waterloo.

Recommendation #7: Establish Indigenous Initiatives as a separate Department from HREI. At the same time, consider whether "Initiatives" conveys the sustainability needed for long-term indigenous engagement.

Recommendation #8: Preserve the Waterloo Indigenous Student Centre (WISC) as part of St. Paul's University College. Waterloo should continue to support and enhance WISC.

HREI – Structure

The future structure of HREI was a consistent theme in the interviews, whether raised by the Review Team or interviewees. There was not consensus amongst the latter, but there was a majority view that was ultimately shared by the Review Team. The recommendations for "HREI" in the remainder of this report do not include the portfolio of Indigenous Initiatives, on the assumption that Indigenous Initiatives will become a separate department/unit under its own AVP.

Consistent with the general observations and purpose sections offered earlier in this report, it is important in our view to seek a congruence amongst units, and practically speaking, achieve some sort of critical mass.

The new structure should be recognized as a Department that is inclusive of the streams of work currently undertaken by the Equity Office and the Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office (SVPRO), along with the new or changed responsibilities recommended above. It will be important to move away from the term "Office", and for the staff in these streams of work to see themselves as part of a larger entity, rather than separate ones under an umbrella. This separateness has, in HREI's brief history, interfered in the understanding of HREI's services, as well as perceptions of HREI, and conflation with the Equity Office.

Given the predominance (but not exclusivity) of students as part of the mandate of the SVPRO, it would be useful to explore an explicit reporting relationship for this office with the Associate Provost, Students in addition to the reporting relationship to the AVP Anti-Racism, Equity and Inclusion. This will reflect more clearly the duality of its mandate for students and employees. This could be a strong functional relationship ("dotted line"), or a formal dual reporting relationship ("solid line"). This could work to strengthen accountabilities for the mandate of the SVPRO in respect of students, and strengthen the ability of the SVPRO to work collaboratively with other units within the Student portfolio.

Concurrently, there should be an Equity stream of work/core responsibility in the new iteration of HREI. The current Director of Equity should lead that work. Within a broad mandate to develop inclusion, this stream of work will need to have a focus upon: all equity-deserving groups including people with disabilities and the LGBTQ++ community (to rectify concerns that HREI has not provided leadership for their needs and aspirations) and the intersectionalities amongst these groups; systems, structures and processes; education and awareness; and, developing data capacity (addressed later in this report).

Given the significance of the priority to end racism, and particularly anti-Black racism, in our view there should be a separate stream of work in the Department, with a senior position reporting to the AVP Anti-Racism, Equity and Inclusion (note also the option mentioned earlier in this report for the establishment of a separate AVP position for this role), who will have the responsibility to tackle this priority. This should be a senior role that works in close collaboration with the Director of Equity to fulfill their mandate. The current organization chart shared with the Review Team shows a vacant new position of Senior Manager, Anti-Racism Response. This role could be developed into the more senior, separate role.

In addressing the need for congruence in the portfolio, it was clear to the Review Team and a number of interviewees that CMRHO, in its current form, does not fit in HREI as noted earlier. The Policy 33 – Ethical Behaviour review process (including Procedures) will have a significant effect upon complaints management. If the proposed changes are accepted, investigations and complaint management for all Policy 33 complaints (e.g. Human Rights Code-based, non-Code-based workplace harassment, conflict of interest, and other areas) would no longer be part of CMHRO, but rather part of an Investigations Office reporting elsewhere. We support this change, while noting the importance of strong collaboration between a new Investigations/Complaints Management Office and the leaders within Anti-Racism, Equity and Inclusion.

As part of its core responsibilities, HREI should continue to have a role in intake, advising and in facilitating informal resolution of issues/conflicts that are Human Rights Code-based, as appropriate. This could be done within the Equity stream as well as by the Anti-Racism focused position. This role also requires a robust and trauma-informed intake and triage function.

What would remain is support for conflict management and informal resolution for non-Code-based complaints; that function could be shared by Human Resources and Students.

It was clear during the interviews that a core mandate of HREI is education and awareness, both in terms of developing programming, and supporting and lending its expertise to the work of others. Initially, there had been one Education and Learning Specialist, who became part of HREI as a member of CMHRO, with expertise in developing workshops and learning materials on conflict management. More recently the role of this position was broadened to support all of the HREI offices. This was not an effective way forward given the deep knowledge, experience and expertise required for Equity, SVPRO and Indigenous Initiatives. During the course of the Review, we understood that additional educator roles had been approved for each of SVPRO and Equity, and incumbents recruited. We believe that it is important to have Educators embedded within the streams, and who work

collaboratively for the Department, and who contribute to the broader community of learning practitioners at the University such as OHD, CTE and ALP.

Finally, Administration and Communications and Engagement staff provide discipline-based expert support of all streams in the Department. Unlike with learning specialists, we support this model, rather than each unit having their own communications and engagement professionals. Equity, Anti-Racism and SVPRO need to focus on engaging their finite resources upon their core responsibilities.

Recommendation #9: Establish a University Department with the work streams of Equity, SVPRO and Anti-Racism. CMHRO in its current form should not be part of the Department. The current models for Education and Awareness, Administration and Communications and Engagement within this Department should not change.

Recommendation #10: Consider amending the reporting relationship of SVPRO to be more formally connected with the Associate Provost, Students portfolio, in addition to its reporting relationship within HREI.

Recommendation #11: Develop a strong front door for HREI that includes a robust intake and triage function, as well as advice and facilitation of informal resolution of Human Rights Code–based issues/conflicts, as appropriate.

HREI Staff

It is important to reiterate at this juncture that the Review Team heard many times about the valuable contributions of individual staff members, particularly in the Equity Office and the SVPRO. Staff members in these areas are highly regarded, and it is important to share the respect and appreciation that was expressed for the Director of Equity, Ms. Gina Hickman. Our specific observation is that her role and title may not be correctly classified, given the enormity and breadth of her responsibilities, particularly at an institutional level. Our observation more generally is that HREI is staffed with skilled professionals with a commitment to a trauma-informed approach. This is a tremendous base upon which to build.

Moving forward, hiring should be focused on more racialized staff. It is important that staff in HREI be more visibly representative of the community it serves and wishes to serve in the future.

As noted earlier, we also think it is important to expand upon its professional staff expertise and build greater connections with faculty. Recognizing that HREI is an administrative unit, consideration should be given to appointments or secondments of

academic experts. Dr. Christopher Taylor's appointment in 2020 as the Confronting Anti-Black Racism Advisor to the Equity Office was a good start. We observed a tremendous opportunity to strengthen HREI, and its credibility, with faculty members.

Given the precarious nature of work in the equity space, it is fundamentally important that staff and faculty working in HREI are able to do so while occupying continuing roles. Recognizing there will be a need for project-based roles, it is vital that the core contingent have the safety of "permanent" roles. In the case of faculty members, this, in our view, means tenured positions.

Recommendation #12: Build upon existing professional staff strength, including a focus on hiring more racialized staff.

Recommendation #13: Build greater connections with faculty, through appointments or secondments of academic experts.

Data

Many universities across Canada are tackling the issue of collecting and reporting on institutional equity data for the purpose of evidence-based decision-making, and to inform strategy, set goals and measure progress. This approach also directly addresses statements that challenge or imply there are no factual bases to notions of racism, colonialism, inequities and the like as problems on campus.

At the University, the lack of data is a clear issue as it impedes efforts to develop fully appropriate employment equity, anti-racism, anti-Black racism and Indigenous strategies. Knowing who Waterloo has in terms of diversity and representation of equity groups among its faculty, staff and students is essential to drive accountability. Access to this campus data is also challenging.

While there are offices and/or committees on campus that are looking at data collection processes and reporting, there are expressions of support for greater collaboration, cooperation and consistency on this front, and the need to bring together key areas that can support an equity data collection program.

Relationship building, according to community members, with faculty, staff and student groups, in addition to offices that collect data and faculty with data collection expertise is essential to make progress on this file.

Data that is disaggregated, race-based, representational, intersectional and qualitative are forms of data being sought on campus. The HeForShe initiative emphasized numbers with

respect to women in leadership and progress was made. However, an intersectional approach was not used, a consistent criticism of the program.

Efforts to increase, retain and promote Black and Indigenous faculty into leadership ranks can benefit from Indigenous and race, disaggregated data across faculties, administration and senior leadership.

To move forward, HREI needs skilled expertise in the area of analysis, planning and assessment to drive a data collection program that meets the needs of the campus and liaises with the appropriate offices to set goals, develop data collection strategies and support the dissemination of data.

Recommendation #14: Move to expeditiously develop expertise in HREI to drive a data collection program that enables the University to accelerate evidence-based decision-making about its strategies, goals and progress.

Resources and Space

As part of its mandate, the Review Team was asked to comment upon the adequacy of resourcing of HREI. We note that a few additional positions were approved during the Review process. This was an outcome of the extended process of the Review and pressing needs that were identified. While we understood the need to move forward, we were concerned that decisions were being made in the absence of a comprehensive strategy or plan for HREI, and with interim leadership.

We reviewed the number of positions in equivalent units at identified comparators. While somewhat useful, it was apparent that each unit was at a different place in its evolution and mandate, resulting in an "apples and oranges" comparison that was not helpful. It was clear to the Review Team that this work is generally and significantly under-resourced in universities. This was confirmed in the 2019 Universities Canada report[1], *Equity, diversity and inclusion at Canadian universities: Report on the 2019 survey.* It was also confirmed by members of the community who have worked with HREI, recognizing that more resources are needed to bring about substantive and enduring change.

Waterloo and its community have an enormous amount of work to do in addressing Anti-Racism, Indigenous Initiatives, Equity and Inclusion across the University and its constituencies. The existing core budget of approximately $2 million per year only sustains current strained HREI operations. The enormity of the challenges ahead will require a

---

[1] Universities Canada (October 2019) Equity, diversity and inclusion at Canadian universities: Report on the 2019 national survey. https://www.univcan.ca/media-room/publications/equity-diversity-and-inclusion-at-canadian-universities-report-on-the-2019-survey/

significant investment of resources to create the energy and focus needed across a diffuse decision-making structure. This will be needed to support the success of the two or three AVP portfolios described in this report, and to build out the hub and spoke model. Providing financial support to Faculties and Departments to grow local initiatives, whether as seed or recurring funding, is critical to securing their engagement. In our view, the University needs to take bold action to develop supports and processes, and build outcomes that reflect its Anti-Racism, Indigenous, Equity and Inclusion priorities and goals. Demonstrating progress that results in profound culture change will require a multi-year timeframe. Waterloo should commit to adding $1million in recurring (base) funding each year over a 5-year period, for a total of $5-million in recurring funding. This funding should be protected from budget reductions and should be reviewed after 5 years. The AVPs should be required to report to the Waterloo community annually upon their allocation of funds, together with their progress towards priorities and goals.

Space is of both symbolic and operational importance on university campuses and as such it is one of the prized commodities in a university community. How the HREI units should be spatially organized was one of the key issues that preoccupied the Review Team over the course of its deliberations. The committee is unanimous in its view that no part of HREI should be located in the same building as the campus police. It is our understanding, in any case, that the university has made a commitment to ensuring that Indigenous Initiatives will be granted a space apart from the other units in HREI, in keeping with the view that Indigenous Initiatives should no longer be a part of HREI.

The university should work to keep the other HREI units together but again it is our view that the placement of the current office in the same building as the police is less than desirable, given the mandate of these offices to serve the needs of equity deserving groups, who have had a complicated and fraught relationship with law enforcement officials over the course of their respective histories.

Recommendation #15: Consistent with bold action and innovation, the University should commit $1million in recurring (base) funding each year over a 5-year period, for a total of $5-million in recurring funding at the end of the 5 years. This funding should be protected from budget reductions and should be reviewed after 5 years. The AVPs should be required to report to the Waterloo community annually about both the allocation of funds and progress towards priorities and goals.

Recommendation #16: HREI should have space appropriate for its mandate in a location separate from campus police, recognizing the need for traditionally marginalized communities to feel safe talking about their experiences.

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS

The Review Team wishes to offer brief observations on two related matters, but notes they were outside the scope of the Terms of Reference.

First, during the course of its deliberations, we sought to understand the current and proposed Policy 33 - Ethical Behaviour and related Procedures. Our interest stemmed from how often the subject arose in our meetings, and from seeking to ensure that our Review did not undermine the multi-year policy review process that appeared to be coming to a conclusion. The Review Team is supportive of the direction of the Policy 33 review process, especially with the stated goals to increase clarity and understanding, and to develop an independent investigations office. We think this will be fundamental to building trust in the processes. At the same time, the University will need to address the capacity of this new office to deal with matters covered by the Policy both proactively and reactively. This requires ensuring the office has the appropriate expertise and credibility to address equity concerns, human rights disclosures, complaints and issues. In our view, this trust and credibility requires both a trauma-informed approach and lived experience.

Second, we were surprised at how often members of the community, across faculty, staff and students, expressed a desire to have an Ombudsperson Office. This came from multiple constituencies. We were told that such an office used to exist and reported to the Secretariat* but was phased out some years ago. We wanted to share, as part of our report, the serious interest expressed to us about such an office with a focus on strengthening the fairness of processes, from the principles underpinning them, to the design, and the subsequent implementation.

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The University of Waterloo is a highly successful institution by many measures. Given the content of this Report, it is important for the Review Team to reiterate that this Review was predicated upon contributing further to that success through developing, improving and sustaining the University's commitments to equity and inclusion. We were struck by the need to preserve what is successful and make recommendations to enhance it. We were consistently impressed with the community's desire to make intentional progress on achieving belonging. Clearly, one of Waterloo's greatest strengths is its thoughtful, warm, and committed people. They have a genuine desire to contribute to the University's success, and be part of a strong, equitable, inclusive and vibrant community.

---

* *Correction: The office did not report to the Secretariat it reported to a business office that no longer exists.*

Summary of Recommendations:

Recommendation #1: The Senior Leadership should articulate clearly its bold and ambitious vision for equity and inclusion, together with goals and actions, and how progress will be measured. This needs to have strong linkages to Waterloo's broader success as an academic institution and may be grounded in comparable values and actions which supported the University's reputation for innovation.

Recommendation #2: The Senior Leadership should commit to a series of measures to increase transparency and community belief that they are fully committed to a progressive approach to equity and inclusion at the University.

Recommendation #3: Review and re-establish the mandate or purpose of HREI to ensure clarity for the University, HREI staff and the Waterloo community. Rename HREI to appropriately reflect the new purpose and mandate.

Recommendation#4: Provide explicitly that HREI serves students, faculty and staff.

Recommendation #5: Consider two, if not three, Associate Vice-President roles: AVP Indigenous Initiatives, and AVP Anti-Racism, Equity and Inclusion, or consider disaggregating the second role into AVP Anti-Racism, and AVP Equity and Inclusion. Recommend considering Vice-President roles in a 3-5 year time frame.

Recommendation #6: Ensure Associate Vice-Presidents are members of decision-making tables such as Deans' Council, Executive Council and the Executive team.

Recommendation #7: Establish Indigenous Initiatives as a separate Department from HREI. At the same time, consider whether "Initiatives" conveys the sustainability needed for long-term indigenous engagement.

Recommendation #8: Preserve the Waterloo Indigenous Student Centre (WISC) as part of St. Paul's University College. Waterloo should continue to support and enhance WISC.

Recommendation #9: Establish a University Department with the work streams of Equity, SVPRO and Anti-Racism. CMHRO in its current form should not be part of the Department. The current models for Education and Awareness, Administration and Communications and Engagement within this Department should not change.

Recommendation #10: Consider amending the reporting relationship of SVPRO to be more formally connected with the Associate Provost, Students portfolio, in addition to its reporting relationship within HREI.

Recommendation #11: Develop a strong front door for HREI that includes a robust intake and triage function, as well as advice and facilitation of informal resolution of Human Rights Code–based issues/conflicts, as appropriate.

Recommendation #12: Build upon existing professional staff strength, including a focus on hiring more racialized staff.

Recommendation #13: Build greater connections with faculty, through appointments or secondments of academic experts.

Recommendation #14: Move to expeditiously develop expertise in HREI to drive a data collection program that enables the University to accelerate evidence-based decision-making about its strategies, goals and progress.

Recommendation #15: Consistent with bold action and innovation, the University should commit $1million in recurring (base) funding each year over a 5-year period, for a total of $5-million in recurring funding at the end of the 5 years. This funding should be protected from budget reductions and should be reviewed after 5 years. The AVPs should be required to report to the Waterloo community annually about both the allocation of funds and progress towards priorities and goals.

Recommendation #16: HREI should have space appropriate for its mandate in a location separate from campus police, recognizing the need for traditionally marginalized communities to feel safe talking about their experiences.

All of which is respectfully submitted:

Lisa Castle   *Denise O'Neil Green*

_____   _____

Christina Sass-Kortsak   *Barrington Walker*

_____   _____

<u>University of Waterloo Human Rights Equity and Inclusion Departmental Review</u>
<u>Terms of Reference</u>
Fall, 2020

Preamble:

Founded in 1957, the University of Waterloo is Canada's top innovation university with over 36,000 students, six faculties, and three satellite campuses. The university is home to the world's largest co-operative education system of its kind. Our unmatched entrepreneurial culture, combined with an intensive focus on research, powers one of the top innovation hubs in the world.

The [mission statement](#) of the University of Waterloo is to advance learning and knowledge through teaching, research, and scholarship, nationally and internationally, in an environment of free expression and inquiry.

Human Rights, Equity & Inclusion (HREI) works to bring members of the campus community together to facilitate understanding and address systemic barriers to equity, inclusion, and decolonization. Five intersecting portfolios support the work:

- <u>Indigenous Initiatives</u>
- <u>Equity Office</u>
- <u>Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office</u>
- <u>Conflict Management and Human Rights Office</u>
- <u>Education and Awareness</u>

As the University of Waterloo embarks on its next Strategic Plan (2020-2025), the results of the external review will inform and advise Senior Leadership on any recommendations that will inform the future structure and resourcing of the work done by various portfolios, as well as the leadership profile required for the area.

Role of the Review Team:

The Review Team will consist of external professionals experienced in administration of similar departments in an academic environment and who have expertise in consulting with the BIPOC community. They will engage in broad campus-wide consultations with the following stakeholder groups:

- Current HREI team
- Students
- BIPOC and Indigenous Groups
- Faculty
- Staff/Union
- Executive Council members
- External/Community Partners

- Relevant University Committees
- Other groups or individuals that may emerge during the course of the review

These consultations may be in the form of roundtables, individual meetings or through other means available to the Review Team.

Scope: The HREI review will include the activities of the five intersecting portfolios. Included in the review are the functions and related administration, policies and systems, service standards, internal and external stakeholder relations, departmental culture and community engagement. These functions will be considered from *many* user perspectives.

Purpose: To review and evaluate the HREI portfolio at the University of Waterloo, with an emphasis on organizational structure and leadership, partnerships, internal collaborations, and the delivery of services and programs. To advise on strengths, challenges, and opportunities the University should consider to ensure the human rights, equity and inclusion needs of the Waterloo community are met in an efficient, effective, and progressive manner.

Terms of Reference: The Review Team will

1. **Review the mission and mandate of the HREI portfolio.** Do the current HREI mission and mandate support the current institutional priorities of the University? Does the department achieve its mandate effectively? Are there opportunities to consider the current institutional priorities, the efficiency of current allocations, and the adequacy of resourcing against the priorities and/or expectations?

2. **Review the structure and organization of the HREI portfolio.** Is the organizational reporting and leadership structure and profile consistent with and support of the departmental mandate? How are HREI initiatives coordinated at Waterloo? Does the current structure and operation meet the needs of the Waterloo community? How should the HREI portfolio be organized to meet the future and evolving needs of the university community?

3. **Review the alignment of the HREI portfolio across the campus.** Are there functions that could or should be governed in another manner? Is there an opportunity to better align and leverage the skills and expertise of the HREI professionals across campus? Is there clear communication of service delivery responsibilities? Are partnerships encouraged and fostered? Is the structure and process for collaboration, appropriate and effective?

4. **To understand the legislative and compliance landscape for the HREI portfolio.** Is Waterloo appropriately resourced in the context of current regulatory and legislative requirements? Are there adequate internal and external resources to support the campus requirements? Have appropriate contracts been established with external support i.e. investigation services?

5. **Review and evaluate the effectiveness of the services, supports and programs offered by HREI.** What is the quality of HREI service delivery to the Waterloo community? Is there

any duplication of service provision, opportunities for synergies in service provision? What service gaps exist? Are the leadership capabilities of the University supported and improved by HREI? What improvements (including process improvements) can be implemented?

6.   **Suggest opportunities for future development and enhancement.** What should be prioritized moving forward? What are the best opportunities for enhancement?

The anticipated timeline for this review is 3-4 months, with the expectation that the report will be completed and shared with the University of Waterloo community by end of May, 2021.

The Vice-President Academic and Provost along with the Associate Provost, Human Resources will determine the terms of reference and scope of the review, the selection of reviewers and provide review team support for the gathering of information. The Vice-President Academic and Provost and the Associate Provost, HR is responsible for receiving and evaluating the review team's recommendations.

University of Waterloo 2020