Canadian Political Science Association, Diversity Task Force

Report and Analysis of the Questionnaire for Chairs of Departments of Political Science

Prepared by the Diversity Task Force (Yasmeen Abu-Laban, Joanna Everitt, Richard Johnston and David Rayside)

May 2010

Background

The Canadian Political Science Association has periodically examined issues relating to the state of the profession with the use of data gleaned from departments and/or members. Since the early 1970s, there have been three relevant CPSA-sponsored studies, which have given special priority to the status of women. The 1973 "Preliminary Report" of the "Committee on the Profile of the Profession" (chaired by Pauline Jewett) used a mail-out survey of political science teachers to create a "profile" of the profession.[1] This report focused primarily on the place of women in the profession, but also sought to gather information on issues relating to "race" and "social class," and notably saw this work to be ongoing. In 1982 Janine Brodie chaired a CPSA committee that produced the "Report on the Status of Women in the Discipline," which presented its findings as a follow-up to the 1973 review, and also part of an on-going study.[2] This report drew information from a number of sources, most notably including a survey directed to departments—with 44 departments reporting. Third, between 1997 and 2000 Diane Lamoureux and Linda Trimble conducted a survey of female members of the CPSA, as well as a survey directed at departments—after an initial response rate of 18 departments, a follow-up call stemming from the February 1999 annual chairs meeting resulted in a total of 36 departments reporting back.[3] Chairs were asked to detail the number and rank of male and female staff as well as courses dealing with gender and politics.

In 2006, the Board of the Canadian Political Science Association struck a Diversity Task Force, with a mandate to examine issues relating to "diversity" in the profession. In recognition of these earlier studies, the Diversity Task Force retained a focus on issues relating to "the status of women," but also broadened out to consider all groups explicitly designated under Canada's *Employment Equity Act* (women, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal people, and members of visible minorities), and where possible minorities along sexual and religious and other lines. Since Canadian universities typically participate in the Federal Contractors Program under the *Employment Equity Act*, they are required to monitor the representation of at least the four equity groups in their workforce. Beyond those groups, we acknowledge that "representational" issues are complex, and concrete information more challenging to acquire.

As part of this examination, the Diversity Task Force developed a survey to be given to Chairs or their designates in Departments of Political Science aimed at illuminating the

---

[1] Committee on the Profile of the Profession, "Preliminary Report" August 1973.
[2] M. Janine Brodie, Caroline Andrew and David Rayside, "Report on the Status of Women in the Discipline" June 1982.
[3] Diane Lamoureux, Linda Trimble and Miriam Koene "Status of Women in the Discipline" May 1997; Diane Lamoureux and Linda Trimble, "Recommendations to the Board of the Canadian Political Science Association" 30 May 1997; Linda Trimble, "Report on the Results of the Status of Women Survey, Part Two: Questionnaire for Political Science Chairs," *CPSA Bulletin* XXIX: 1 (May 2000): 19-25.

degree of representation of designated equity groups in the professoriate and graduate and undergraduate student populations within Canadian Departments of Political Science, as well as the nature of research and teaching in the areas of gender, race, ethnicity, indigeneity, sexuality and disability. Addtionally, the Diversity Task Force was attuned to the plethora of contemporary scholarly as well as popular discussions that could take place around the idea of "diversity," so where possible attention was also paid to issues relating to sexual and religious diversity.

In November 2008, Chairs of Canadian Departments of Political Science were sent this survey. The full survey is listed as "Appendix A" in this report. Once the survey was sent out, it became clear that some Chairs were experiencing difficulty getting basic demographic information about their units from University equity or related offices. In response, the Diversity Task Force developed a "quick survey" which was sent by way of email to all Chairs as an addendum to the survey. This quick survey was designed for faculty members of departments to quickly self-identify, so that Chairs would have that information if it was not forthcoming from their own institution or other departmental information, and this information could be put into the full survey. The quick survey is presented as "Appendix B" in this report.

Data input and initial analysis of the full survey results were provided by Richard Johnston. The Diversity Task Force (Chair: Yasmeen Abu-Laban, University of Alberta; Joanna Everitt, University of New Brunswick, St. John; Richard Johnston, University of British Columbia; and David Rayside, University of Toronto) compiled the survey and full report.

A draft of this report was shared with Chairs of Canadian Departments of Political Science at the Feburary 2010 Annual Chairs Meeting for purposes of discussion and feedback.

The Board and other CPSA members are encouraged to examine the Final Report of the Chair Survey along with the results of an online CPSA Member Survey developed by the Diversity Task Force. The Member Survey is currently running, and results should be available in late 2010 or 2011.

Return Rate and Reporting

Returns for the departmental survey were very disappointing. Despite reminder notes, and discussion at the 2009 Annual Chairs Meeting, by the end of Winter 2009 only 15 departments replied (that is about ¼ of Canadian Political Science Departments). When CPSA Board Members learned of this return rate at the Canadian Political Science Association Annual Meetings in May 2009, some Board Members alerted members of the CPSA to seek to ensure their own Chairs had completed the survey (this was done by word of mouth, as well as through email communications of the Women's Caucus). Because of this additional effort, the Diversity Task Force indicated that they would be willing to accept completed surveys through to the end of June 2009. However, no other completed surveys were forthcoming.

Following the February 2010 Chairs Meeting, and the interest expressed by Chairs, the Diversity Task Force once again extended the survey in hopes of achieving a higher response rate. Taking heed of criticisms that the survey was time-consuming and/or posed a constraint for departments lacking resources, Chairs were given the option this time of filling out the full survey, or simply completing the first four questions of the survey. Notably the first four questions relate to representation of designated equity groups amongst faculty. By the deadline of April, 2010 only one more department returned a response, for a total response rate of 16 departments.

Of fifteen usable surveys that were submitted, we note that in some cases answers were not always complete, and that little was offered by way of open-ended comments. These features, along with the overall return rate, mean that the results we report have to be treated cautiously. For example, we do not know if there are distinct characteristics about the Departments that did respond, in comparison to those that did not. Nonetheless, the results may be seen as offering insights into the experiences of many political science students and faculty in Canada because the responses include departments of diverse sizes; of the 15 departments we report on, over half of them (8) were large PhD-granting departments. These results, as promised on the survey, are not reported by specific Department.

Demographic Profile of Faculty and Instructors

Basic personnel data appear in Tables 1 and 2. These tables cover groups specifically designated in Canada's Employment Equity Act: women, Aboriginal peoples, visible minorities and people with disabilities. According to the 2006 Canadian census, Aboriginal peoples comprise 3.8 per cent of Canada's population, and what the Canadian government terms "visible minorities" comprise 16.2% of Canadian population. Both are quickly growing segments of the Canadian population. The category of people with disabilities is also subject to change in the context of an aging population. Indeed, disability activists sometimes speak of the "temporarily able-bodied" for this reason.

TABLE 1: EQUITY GROUPS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	All	Lecturer	Tenure Track	Tenured
Women	28.0	26.8	41.8	25.5
Aboriginal	1.8	2.6	5.1	0.4
Visible Minorities	12.8	8.5	25.3	11.6
Disability	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.8
N	*491*	*161*	*79*	*251*

TABLE 2: EQUITY GROUPS BY RANK, TENURED & TENURE-TRACK

	Assistant	Associate	Full	*N*
Women	34.0	33.0	33.0	*97*
Aboriginal	80.0	20.0	0.0	*5*
Visible Mins.	40.8	26. 5	32.6	*49*
Disability	0.0	50.0	50.0	*2*

All told the personnel in the 15 departments numbered 491 persons, tenured and tenure-track ranks and lecturers not on a track. Of all reported instructional personnel, women constitute 28% and visible minorities, almost 13%. By equity group:

- The percentage of women in the non-tenure-track group is about the same as in the overall pool. Roughly the same proportion holds for women in permanent positions. Women are disproportionately in junior ranks, constituting over 40% of the tenure-track group, as opposed to 25.5% of those who have cleared the tenure bar.
- Aboriginal peoples, who constitute less than two percent of the total, are overrepresented among temporary staff. They make up 5 percent of tenure-track positions, though their minuscule numbers among the tenured suggests that it will be some time before senior faculty ranks demonstrate noticeable diversity on this front.
- Visible minorities are underrepresented among temporary staff, though they have made important inroads in tenure-track positions. Their representation among the tenured is close to their percentage in the overall pool, but—as with women—about half are ranked as Associates.
- The number of persons with a disability is very small. None have been hired as lecturers, and we see no important signs of diversification on this dimension.

We do not have the data to compare the distribution of equity groups by rank with the distribution for all faculty; however the questionnaire results generally show that members of the designated equity groups are not in senior positions.

Availability of Equity Data

The picture for availability of equity data is mixed, but striking. It is relevant, in light of the fact that universities are part of the Federal Contractors Program and obligated to collect information, that of 15 reporting universities, only one claims that data are "readily available." Three (one in five) say it is difficult to find, and another three do not know about the data availability. This leaves slightly over half the reports saying that data are available on demand, a murky category.

Special Recruitment Efforts and Mentoring

A series of questions in the Chair Survey considered whether departments made special efforts to recruit members of the designated groups under employment equity (women, Aboriginal peoples, visible minorities, or people with a disability) as well as sexual minorities. The survey also sought to discover the extent to which mentoring was offered to faculty, and whether any of that mentoring was targeted (for example, mentoring with the potentially unique needs/issues of specific groups— like racialized minorities—in mind).

Table 3 combines a focus on special recruitment efforts along with mentoring.

TABLE 3: SPECIAL RECRUITMENT EFFORT

Equity Group	% Special effort	%Targeted mentoring
Women	93	23
Aboriginal	47	10
Visible Minorities	67	3
Disability	27	3
Sexual orientation	27	3

Table 3 makes clear that of the designated groups, most of the focus has been on women and to a lesser extent visible minorities and Aboriginal peoples. Despite the inclusion of disability in employment equity legislation, only one in four departments reports special efforts in that direction, and the issue elicited no open-ended commentaries from chairs.

One in four pointed to at least some effort to include sexual minorities. One chair commented that this dimension had just been added to equity policy by the university. Another noted this:

While our hiring and recruitment efforts have reflected the Federal Contractors program, and thus on removing barriers to employment for designated groups, we have perceived employment equity to include attention to sexual diversity. As a result, "sexual minorities" (for lack of a better term) are reasonably well represented in the Department.

It is also interesting to note that a special or targeted effort in recruitment is not matched by ***mentoring*** of persons on staff. Although 80% of the reporting departments claim that mentoring takes place at some level in the institution and most say that mentoring takes place at more than one level, few report mentoring "explicitly geared" to an equity group.

About one in four claims that mentoring is offered in ways that may be geared for women specifically, and about one in ten, in ways that are specifically geared for Aboriginal peoples. However, visible minority status, disability, and sexual orientation receive scant mention.

As well, it is notable that the presence of mentoring—including targeted mentoring—seems unrelated to the number or proportion in an equity group. In light of the fact that like women, both Aboriginal and visible minority staff are disproportionately untenured and at the junior levels, targeted rather than simply generic mentoring may be important to ensuring retention and healthy movement through the ranks in the coming years (though this clearly has to be attuned to the wishes of the faculty members concerned).

Representation of Faculty in Relation to Students and Recruitment Efforts

Several questions in the Chair Survey were designed to allow Chairs to comment on the degree to which the faculty complement seemed to represent the undergraduate as well as graduate student populations in each of the four designated equity groups.

In general, departments are acutely aware that faculty demography departs from that of the student body, especially when compared with undergraduates. For all four of the designated equity groups, the modal perception is that the department has "somewhat fewer" members of the group than the undergraduate body. Most of the rest of the responses are "far fewer." The widest gap is for representation of Aboriginal peoples and the narrowest is for people with disabilities.

For comparison with graduate students the gaps are much smaller, as a reflection of the fact that the graduate student body itself is less diverse than the undergraduate one. A partial exception is gender, where the male/female mix is similar to that for undergraduates and, thus, the demographic gap (more women students than women faculty) is more acutely felt.

There is, however, *no* relationship between departmental self-perception and special effort in recruiting, at least not at the level of the individual department. Virtually every department makes a special effort to recruit women and visible minorities. Effort is less normal for the other categories. But even for categories where special effort is relatively rare, effort for recruitment seems unrelated to perception of underrepresentation relative to the student body.

The same is broadly true for the link between effort and underrepresentation in full-time faculty ranks. The only relationship in the area is a *positive* one with the Aboriginal proportion. This points to a problem with assessing the relationship. For some departments report of special effort may indeed be a response to underrepresentation. But for others special effort (past as well as current) may have lessened the problem. The general point, in any case, is that recruitment effort is largely unrelated to actual or perceived representation deficits.

The presence of certain equity groups among full-time faculty seems pretty clearly related to the volume of *graduate teaching* on gender and race/ethnicity. No links appear for Aboriginal, disability, or religious issues. For gender and race/ethnicity, the critical element seems to be the sheer *number* of full-time faculty rather than the proportion. When there are larger numbers of female and visible minority staff, the number of graduate course offerings covering themes of gender, race and ethnicity go up dramatically. Representation of equity groups amongst faculty does not seem critical for *undergraduate* teaching: there seems to be no relationship between the number of faculty in equity groups and the number of undergraduate courses on such themes. Perhaps such courses are in demand anyway.

In *research*, representation of equity groups amongst faculty does not drive much in the way of *PhD* thesis writing (for the 8 PhD-granting institutions in the pool). Similarly, there seems to be little relationship between the number of faculty in key equity groups and the reporting of financial support for research. Where the impact of gender and ethnicity in faculty composition is relevant for thesis-writing is at the MA level; here the relationship between sheer number of women and visible-minority faculty, on one hand, and thesis-writing on equity issues, on the other, is robust. In our data, each additional female faculty member "yielded" slightly over 0.5 M.A. theses on gender issues. Each additional visible-minority faculty member "yielded" 1.2 theses on race and ethnicity.

Faculty Research

A series of questions sought to discover the extent to which faculty were engaged on research relating to gender, race/ethnicity, indigeneity, disability studies, sexual diversity, and religion. The pattern is summarized in Table 4. Clearly a lot of research is being conducted in these areas, but less than half of it is funded. The largest concentration of work is on gender relations, 52 projects of which 24 are funded. Only one institution reported that *no* research on gender issues was under way. Next most frequent was research on race and ethnicity, 43 projects with 25 receiving funding. This was a more concentrated field, so to speak, than gender relations, in that more institutions reported no research in the area but more institutions reported multiple projects and more of the projects were funded. Aboriginal studies and religious studies were roughly equivalent in frequency: about two dozen in each area, about half of these funded. Sexual diversity was the subject of nine projects, only two of them funded. Disability studies attracted one, unfunded project.

TABLE 4 RESEARCH EFFORT AND SUPPORT, BY EQUITY GROUP

	Gender	Aboriginal	Race /Ethnicity	Religion	Sexuality	Disability	All Equity Groups	
% Funded	46 *(52)*	45 *(24)*	58 *(43)*	57 *(23)*	22 *(9)*	0 *(1)*	49 *(152)*	
% of all funded projects	17	8	18	9	1	0	52	Total funded = 143

Cumulatively, the funding picture seems quite positive. Departments were asked to report the total number of funded research projects, all areas. The reported total was 143, just under 10 per department, with, unsurprisingly, a strong, positive relationship between size of department and number of grants. Of these 143 funded grants, over half (75) were for projects that dealt with diversity along lines of gender, indigeneity, race/ethnicity, religion, and sexuality.

Inclusion and Social Life

The social life of a Department may be viewed as relevant to the overall workplace and educational climate. The questionnaire sought to discover the extent to which informal social events reflected attention to diverse participants. Overall, Chairs reported that department social events fell somewhere in between being sensitive to diversity (1), and not at all sensitive to diversity (10). The average of 3.8 suggests considerable room for thinking about the nature of events when they are held. The question on social events elicited the most comments, and the Diversity Task Force was struck by this, as well as the number of times Chairs noted that there were not many social events:

All invitations are open and non gender-specific. We do sometimes have events where alcohol is served but try to downplay that aspect, and also try not to refer to specific religious holidays when organizing events (like having holiday parties instead of Christmas parties)

We have very few social events, but those held would present no or few barriers or discomfort.

We are not a very social department. We support and attend student events.

While we have very few events, those we do have are inclusive events without physical barriers, contentious settings or religious contents and we attempt to provide child care and other assistance. Faculty are encouraged to provide input on the structure and nature of each event. Having said that, there is a history of low attendance at events in this department that predates my arrival. Attendance is rising but there are still notable holdouts.

Issues for Ongoing Discussion

As noted earlier, the Diversity Task Force has adopted a two-pronged approach in gathering information: the Chair Survey, and a Member Survey that is currently being conducted. Once the results of the Member Survey are available, a much fuller picture of the political science discipline in Canada is likely to emerge.

At this juncture, a few points can be raised based on the information given by reporting departments (and bearing in mind that this survey only represents information from 1/4 of departments). The first has to do with the fact that at the junior ranks there appears to be

better representation of women, Aboriginal people and visible minorities than at senior ranks. This skewed concentration means that issues relating to retention and the facilitation of movement through the ranks are especially pertinent for members of these designated equity groups. At the same time, neither universities nor departments make use of targeted mentoring for all of these groups. The lack of targeted mentoring, coupled with the concentration of members of equity groups at the junior ranks, is a feature that may warrant closer attention and consideration in the short-term. As the Member Survey is likely to yield more information about the experiences of people in the profession, the salience of this observation may be sharpened.

Second, there were practical limits on the range of questions the survey could pose in relation to sexual diversity. However, it is notable that only about one-quarter of responding departments made special efforts to ensure such diversity in their recruitment, in contrast to the much higher proportion making at least some efforts in regard to Aboriginal status, race/ethnicity, and gender. The discrepancies between departments on this are worthy of a broader disciplinary conversation.

Third, there are signs here of important changes in political science faculty demographics and research conducted by both faculty and graduate students. However, the progress made has still not seemed to bring faculty composition into alignment with undergraduate student populations especially in relation to gender and race/ethnicity. The extent to which it "matters" whether the professoriate reflects those they teach has been an ongoing one in the field of education as a whole. Within political science specifically the 1997 "Status of Women in the Discipline" survey by Lamoureux, Trimble and Koene found that the lack of female professors negatively impacted the experience and research support for female students.[4]

Fourth, judging from the reported responses, there appears to be a near invisibility of people with disabilities in faculty composition and research. There are likely real challenges that universities as a whole face in engaging issues of ability. This comes out at times in relation to how to foster more inclusionary educational opportunities, or how to support professors who may develop a progressive disability (e.g., degenerative hearing loss). In the context of Canadian legislation governing a "duty to accommodate," (often used in relation to physical or mental disability), as well as an aging population, the research and workplace relevance of this issue may grow. This may warrant more attention within political science specifically.

Finally, and not least, what can be called "the elephant on the table" also needs to be acknowledged: the low response rate of Chairs/Departments to this survey. It should be noted that this low response rate persisted despite ample opportunities over the course of 1 ½ years to fill out the survey, as well as efforts to streamline the survey to a bare minimum of just four questions in light of possible competing time and resource demands on Chairs (particularly in times of budgetary crisis). However, returning to where we

---

[4] See Diane Lamoureux, Linda Trimble and Miriam Koene "Status of Women in the Discipline" May 1997.

started, with the fact that CPSA committees have made use of surveys of departments to garner information about the discipline, what can be observed is that in fact there has been an evident decline in responding to these surveys since the 1980s. The question of why this is the case deserves consideration, and this may be more or less pressingly felt once the online survey tells us more about the actual experiences of diverse CPSA members.

Canadian Political Science Association
Questionnaire for the Chairs of Departments of Political Science

University Name   _____

1. What is the total number of faculty members employed in your department in 2008-09?

non-tenure track   _____   tenure-track   _____   tenured _____

2. Most universities are required to keep records about the number of individuals it employs from the designated equity groups.   What are your department's numbers for members of these groups? (Note that the Canadian Government's definition of these groups is specified in the attached cover letter).

	Women	Aboriginal	Visible or non-White Minority	Person with a Disability
Lecturers / non-tenured track	_____	_____	_____	_____
assistant professors	_____	_____	_____	_____
associate professors	_____	_____	_____	_____
full professors	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. As Chair, how available is the information that your institution gathers on members of various diversity groups?

   a) readily available _____   b) available upon request _____   c) difficult to find _____
   d) not available at all _____   e) don't know _____

4. Has your department made any special effort to recruit new faculty from the employment equity designated groups?

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, please indicate which group or groups have been the focus:

_____ Women

_____ Aboriginal Peoples

_____ Visible Minorities

_____ Persons with a Disability

5. Has your department included sexual diversity in its attempts to recruit from underrepresented groups?

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, can you elaborate:
_____

6. In comparison to the general *undergraduate* student body do you perceive there to be far fewer, slightly fewer, pretty much the same, slightly more, or far more members of the following equity groups among the faculty in your department?

	Far Fewer Faculty	Somewhat Fewer Faculty	Pretty Much The Same Faculty	Somewhat More Faculty	Far More Faculty
Women	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aboriginal Peoples	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Visible or non-White Minority	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
People with a Disability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. In comparison to the general *graduate* student body do you perceie there to be far fewer, slightly fewer, pretty much the same, slightly more, or far more members of the following equity groups among the faculty in your department?

	Far Fewer Faculty	Somewhat Fewer Faculty	Pretty Much the Same Faculty	Somewhat Fewer Faculty	Far Fewer Faculty
Women	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aboriginal Peoples	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Visible or non-White Minority	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
People with a Disability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

5. Please provide the approximate total number of courses offered in a typical year at the undergraduate and graduate level (specifying whether you are referring to full-year or semester courses as your standard)

Undergraduate:

Graduate:

Could you then estimate the number of courses offered in most years by your department that are primarily focused on or have a major component on (25%+) the following areas:

Undergraduate Courses:
Women/Gender Studies as focus?
     Women/Gender as a significant component (25%+)
Aboriginal Studies as focus?
     Aboriginal Studies as a significant component
Race and Ethnicity as focus?
     Race and Ethnicity as a significant component. (25%+)
Sexual Diversity as focus?
     Sexual Diversity as a significant component (25%+)
Disability Studies as focus?
     Disability Studies as a significant component (25%+)
Religion or Religious Diversity as focus?
     Religion as a significant component (25%+)

Graduate Courses:
Women/Gender Studies as focus?
     Women/Gender as a significant component (25%+)
Aboriginal Studies as focus?
     Aboriginal Studies as a significant component
Race and Ethnicity as focus?

Race and Ethnicity as a significant component. (25%+) .
Sexual Diversity as focus?
Sexual Diversity as a significant component (25%+)
Disability Studies as focus?
Disability Studies as a significant component (25%+)
Religion or Religious Diversity as focus?
Religion as a significant component (25%+)

11. Does your graduate program(s) allow an option for students to specialize in a field of study that focuses on questions of diversity such as women's/gender studies, Aboriginal politics, race and ethnicity, sexual diversity or disability studies?

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, could you describe the field or sub-field?
_____

12. Please provide, *as best you can*, the following information about graduate research being conducted in your department.

Ph. D. level

Does your Program contain a PhD program?

If yes, how many active Ph.D. students are there in your program?:

* How many Ph.D. theses are currently being written on topics of *women or gender*?
_____

* How many Ph.D. theses are currently being written on topics of *Aboriginal politics*?
_____

* How many Ph.D. theses are currently being written on topics of *race or ethnicity*?
_____

* How many Ph.D. theses are currently being written on topics of *sexual diversity*?
_____

* How many Ph.D. theses are currently being written on topics of *disability studies*?
_____

* How many Ph.D. theses are currently being written on topics on *religion or religious*

diversity?

_____

* How many faculty members are currently involved in supervising theses on these topics?_____

* How many Ph.D. theses in total are currently being written in your department?

_____

M.A. level

Does your M.A. program include a major research paper or thesis? If no, skip to Q. 13

If yes, how many active M.A. students are in your program and opting for a research paper or thesis?

* How many M.A. theses/MRPs are currently being written on topics of *women or gender*?   _____

* How many M.A. theses/MRPs are currently being written on topics of *Aboriginal politics*?   _____

* How many M.A. theses/MRPs are currently being written on topics of *race or ethnicity*?   _____

* How many M.A. theses/MRPs are currently being written on topics of *sexual diversity*?

_____

* How many M.A. theses/MRPs are currently being written on topics of *disability studies*?   _____

* How many M.A. theses are currently being written on topics on *religion or religious diversity*?

_____

* How many faculty members are currently involved in supervising these theses/MRPs?

_____

* How many M.A. theses/MRPs in total are currently being written in your department?

_____

13. We are interested in the faculty research being conducted in your department. How many of your tenure-track faculty members would you estimate engage in research on:

Women/Gender_____   Aboriginal politics   _____

Race or ethnicity_____   Sexual Diversity   _____

Disability issues _____   Religion or religious diversity?   _____

14. Could you please indicate how many faculty research projects supported by major funding relate to:

women/gender   _____

Aboriginal politics   _____

race or ethnicity   _____

sexual diversity   _____

disability issues   _____

religion or religious diversity   _____

* How many faculty research projects in total are funded in your department?
        _____

19. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is not at all sensitive and 10 is very sensitive how sensitive do you feel your department in general is to the following issues of diversity in its organization of departmental social events?

          Not at all   Sensitive   Very Sensitive

          1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

Please elaborate:

_____

20. Are any formal efforts made to mentor new faculty by your department, faculty or university as a whole?

          Department   Yes   No
          Faculty   Yes   No
          University   Yes   No

If yes, are any of these mentoring efforts explicitly geared to any of the following:

_____ Women

_____ Aboriginal People

_____ Visible Minorities

_____ Persons with a Disability

_____ Sexual Minorities

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. This will assist the Canadian Political Science Association in providing accurate information to all Chairs, departments and members. Please forward your survey by January 9, 2009 to:

> Michelle Hopkins, Administrator
> Canadian Political Science Association
> #204 - 260 Dalhousie Street
> Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7E4
>
> Email: cpsa@csse.ca

APPENDIX B: Quick Survey
In order to provide information about the discipline as a whole, it would be helpful to have all departments fill out Question 2, pertaining to the representation of designated groups (women, Aboriginal peoples, visible minorities, and persons with a disability) amongst teaching and permanent academic staff. It may be the case that in some universities, the numbers associated with particular designated groups-- especially when broken down by faculty or department-- may be so small that the data is suppressed in order to protect individuals. If this is the case for your department in any or all categories, we would ask that as Chair you consider developing your own confidential quick survey asking staff members to self-identify to you for the purposes of the CPSA survey, and conveying the overall numbers in the CPSA survey. As noted, this information will not be reported by department, but rather for all political science departments in Canada. A sample quick survey follows.

SAMPLE QUICK SURVEY for CHAIRS

The Canadian Political Science Association is seeking to gather information on the representation of women, Aboriginal people, visible minorities, and disabled people in the political science discipline in Canada. This survey will not report results by department, and information you convey to me will be treated as confidential. In order for me to fill out this survey, could you please take a moment to answer the following question.

Do you identify yourself as a member of any of the following designated groups* (designated by Canadian employment equity legislation)?

If not, reply with "no".

If yes, please specify the group (or groups) with which you self-identify:

    Women

·   Aboriginal peoples (defined by the Federal Contractor's Program (FCP) as "persons in Canada who identify themselves to be Status Indian, Non-Status Indian, Inuit or Metis").

·   Persons with disabilities (defined by the FCP as "those individuals whose prospects of securing and advancing in employment may be substantially reduced as a result of recognized physical or mental impairment").

·   Visible minorities (defined by the FCP as "persons who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour").