**Be Counted: 2016 Census Update** 

Release Date: March 2017

#### Be Counted Census: Response Rates and Internal Representation

On Nov. 21, 2016, Dalhousie launched the second annual *Be Counted* census campaign for all faculty, staff and students. A total of 1700 out of 7744 eligible employees responded to the Census between the launch on Nov. 21<sup>th</sup> and the end of December 2016. This represents an overall Census response rate of 22%. The response rate of full-time and regular part-time employees was higher at 36.4%.

Combining 2016 Census responses with previously collected self-identification information provides an overall employee response rate of 44%, and an 87.7% response rate among full-time and regular part-time employees. This response rate is significant as it exceeds the 80% response rate threshold required by the Federal Contractors Program and ensures that the data we analyze and report is reflective of the diversity of the university community.

The 2016 Census saw significant increases in response rates for faculty (DFA 78.3% to 89.7%, Non Union faculty >=50% 63.6% to 89.7% and Medicine Continuing >= 50% 47.3% to 68.8% in 2015 and 2016 respectively) and employees in NSGEU Local 99 (58.5% in 2015 to 83.7% in 2016).

# Response Rates by Employee Group/Bargaining Unit Total Dalhousie Faculty and Staff

Employee Group/Bargaining Unit	Return Rate
Senior Management Academic	93.8%
Senior Management Staff	97.2%
DFA	89.7%
CUPE	15.4%
Non Union Faculty >= 50%	79.5%
Non Union Part-time Faculty	13.3%
Post-doctoral Fellows	25.0%
DPMG	96.9%
NSGEU Local 77	89.8%
CCS	100.0%
NSGEU Local 99	83.7%
NSGEU Local 99 temps	53.3%
Other full-time staff, n.e.c.	27.0%
Temps	56.6%
Contracts	40.0%
Grant Paid/Associated Employees	48.8%
Casuals	10.0%
Total	43.8%

Chart 2 provides the equity composition of Dalhousie's full-time and permanent part-time employees, the percentage of female in each group, and the proportion of employees who identify in multiple designated groups, as an indicator of intersectionality.

Chart 2

### Dalhousie Representation by Designated Group, 2016 Full-time and Permanent Part-time Employees<sup>1</sup>

Designated Group	% of Total	% Female by Designated Group	% Employees who Identify in Another Designated Group
Aboriginal	1.9%	73.3%	28.3%
Mi'kmaq	1.0%	78.1%	
Racially Visible	11.0%	46.7%	8.5%
Historically/indigenous Black Nova Scotian	1.7%	72.7%	
Black (African) descent	3.6%	58.8%	
East Asian	2.5%	48.8%	
South Asian	1.8%	40.4%	
South East Asian	0.6%	57.9%	
West Asian	1.3%	38.1%	
Latin/South/Central American	0.6%	52.6%	
Persons with a Disability	5.6%	62.4%	19.7%
Women	56.7%		19.7%
LGBTQ	3.6%	64.4%	26.9%
Transgender	0.3%		
LGBQ	3.6%	64.0%	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Includes employees in Senior Administration, DFA, Non-Unionized faculty>= 50%, DPMG, NSGEU Local 77 and 99, CCS, and other full-time staff not elsewhere classified.

Chart 3 illustrates the diversity representation by employee group/bargaining unit. The percentage of racially visible employees increased from 8.3% in 2015 to 11% in 2016, with the largest gains occurring in faculty (both DFA and Non Union faculty >=50%) and NSGEU Local 99 employees. The proportion of aboriginal persons, persons with disabilities, and employees who identify as LGBTQ experienced moderate increases from the previous year.

Chart 3

## Diversity Representation by Employee Group/Bargaining Unit 2016 Full-time and Permanent Part-time Employees<sup>1</sup>

Employee Group/Bargaining Unit	Female	Male	Racially Visible	Aboriginal	Persons with a Disability	LGBTQ <sup>2</sup>
Senior Management						
Academic	56.3%	43.8%	4.7%	1.6%	10.9%	9.4%
Senior Management Staff	44.4%	55.6%	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%	5.6%
DFA	44.1%	55.9%	15.8%	1.3%	5.8%	3.7%
Non Union Faculty >= 50%	37.7%	62.3%	15.8%	0.7%	2.7%	1.4%
DPMG	72.3%	27.7%	6.9%	1.6%	6.4%	5.4%
NSGEU Local 77	71.4%	28.6%	8.7%	2.3%	5.9%	2.8%
CCS	92.3%	7.7%	7.7%	15.4%	7.7%	0.0%
NSGEU Local 99	32.4%	67.6%	12.2%	2.5%	3.6%	1.9%
Other FT staff, n.e.c.	60.9%	39.1%	9.4%	3.1%	3.1%	1.6%
Total	56.7%	43.3%	11.0%	1.9%	5.6%	3.6%

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Includes employees in Senior Administration, DFA, Non-Unionized faculty>= 50%, DPMG, NSGEU Local 77 and 99, CCS, and other full-time staff not elsewhere classified.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In order to protect the confidentiality of individuals, responses to the questions on sexual orientation and gender identity have been combined.

#### **External Labour Market Comparison and Gap Analysis**

Self-identification data forms the basis of the analysis of Dalhousie's workforce. Improvements in response rates, as described above, directly contribute to better quality data. The workforce analysis compares Dalhousie's internal representation of employees in the four designated groups to benchmarks of labour market availability<sup>1</sup> by occupation and area of recruitment. This analysis is critical to informing employment equity planning with faculties and administrative units, and is key to identifying and removing barriers to full and active participation in the workplace and promoting inclusion on campus.

Chart 4 presents a comparison of the gaps in representation by designated group and occupational group in 2015 and 2016.

Overall, women continue to reflect labour market availability. Between 2015 and 2016, the gap for women among Middle Managers improved significantly from a gap of -4.2 to full representation, while the gap for female University Professors increased slightly from -8.5 in 2015 and -11.4 in 2016

Significant progress was made in reducing the underrepresentation for racially visible persons from -100.7 in 2015 to -54 in 2016 due in part to improved faculty response rates to the Census as well as increased recruitment activity. Most notable is the improvement in representation of racially visible persons in the Professionals group, of which University Professors comprises close to 75%, and Middle Managers.

Representation of aboriginal persons also experienced substantial gains, as the overall gap declined from -25.8 in 2015 to -11.0 in 2016, due largely to increased recruitment and improved response rates. The Professionals (University Professors), Semi-Professionals and Technicians, and Other Sales and Service groups experienced the largest gap reductions.

In general, the number of employees at Dalhousie who report having a disability are reflective of the labour market, however gaps continue to exist in clerical positions, sales and service occupations and trades.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Internal representation of women, racially visible persons, and aboriginal person in compared to labour market data from the 0211 National Household Survey and representation of person with a disability is compared to the 2012 Canadian Survey on Disability.

Chart 4

Comparison of Gaps by Designated Group and Occupational Group, 2016 and 2015

Occupational Groups	Women		Racially Visible <sup>1</sup>		Aboriginal <sup>1</sup>		Persons w/a Disability	
	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015
Senior Managers	-4.2	-4.4	-1.9	-2.5	-1.1	-0.9	0.8	1.0
Middle & Other Managers	0.6	-4.2	-12.4	-20.3	-1.6	0.4	1.8	4.5
Professionals	41.1	40.6	-88.1	-103.2	-3.8	-13.9	33.3	11.3
University Professors	-11.4	-8.5	-34.0	-53.6	-2.9	-9.6	17.4	3.3
Semi-Professionals & Technicians	-9.8	-10.1	11.9	8.7	-2.7	-3.8	-1.9	-2.2
Supervisors	7.4	6.0	3.6	2.6	-0.2	-1.0	0.0	1.0
Supervisors: Crafts and Trades	-1.5	-1.6	0.8	-0.2	1.2	0.3	2.2	0.2
Administrative & Senior Clerical	7.5	7.4	3.2	1.6	1.5	0.8	28.0	23.0
Skilled Sales & Service	0.4	0.4	-0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Skilled Crafts & Trades	1.2	1.1	0.7	-1.4	-0.2	-1.2	-6.6	-6.8
Clerical Personnel	29.6	30.3	11.6	10.2	0.5	0.3	-20.9	-16.6
Intermediate Sales & Service	5.5	4.8	-2.5	-2.4	-0.3	-0.2	-5.2	-4.2
Semi-Skilled Manual	-1.8	-1.9	0.6	0.6	-0.6	-0.7	-1.6	-1.7
Other Sales & Service	39.5	39.2	16.7	4.9	-3.6	-5.8	-7.1	-10.1
Other Manual Workers	-0.3	1.7	1.8	0.8	-0.2	-0.2	-0.7	-0.8
Total	115.2	109.3	-54.0	-100.7	-11.0	-25.8	22.2	-0.3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Gaps for Professionals and University Professors in 2015 and 2016 have been adjusted by the inclusion of academic recruitment self-identification data, as a result 2015 gaps for these occupational groups will differ from those previously published.