This is a comprehensive report for the Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA) on the Canadian Association of University Teachers’ (CAUT) equity and diversity conference, which was held in Toronto 7-9 February 2014. This report does three things: first, it provides a synopsis of all conference presentation; second, it provides the working groups’ three-fold recommendations to advance diversity with equity: (i) what CAUT can do, (ii) what faculty associations can do and (iii) what individuals can do; and, third, in footnotes it provides hyperlinked references and resources referred to by the presenters.
Abstract

This is a comprehensive report for the Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA) on the Canadian Association of University Teachers’ (CAUT) equity and diversity conference, “Perpetual Crisis?: Diversity with Equity in the Academy,” which was held in Toronto 7-9 February 2014. The main audience for the conference was members of faculty associations – officers, executive members, chief negotiators, equity advocates, and others interested in diversity with equity. The purpose of the national conference was to provide attendees an opportunity to meet colleagues from other associations, engage in high level discussion, share best practices, and build a network of contacts and support so that faculty associations can more effectively fulfil their obligations in relation to promoting diversity with equity within their institutions and the larger society.

This report-back on the conference proceedings is for members of the University of Alberta academic community. It does three things: first, it provides a synopsis of all conference keynotes and plenary presentations; second, it provides the discussion groups’ three-fold recommendations to advance diversity with equity: (i) what CAUT can do, (ii) what faculty associations can do and (iii) what individuals can do; and, third, in the text and in footnotes it provides selected hyperlinked references and resources referred to by the conference keynote and plenary speakers. From these important recommendations it is anticipated that CAUT will develop and disseminate, in a timely manner, a plan of action for advancing diversity with equity.
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“Perpetual Crisis?: Diversity with Equity in the Academy”:
Report on the CAUT Equity Conference

By
Dr. Malinda S. Smith, Department of Political Science and
Equity Chair, Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA)

I. Overview

The conference, “Perpetual Crisis?: Diversity with Equity in the Academy,” was held at the Courtyard Marriott Downtown Toronto from the 7-9 February 2014. It was sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and opening remarks were delivered by its president, Dr. Wayne Peters, an associate professor in the Department of Engineering at the University of Prince Edward Island. This was the second equity conference in CAUT’s history. The previous Equity Forum, “Recasting Equity,” was held at the Delta Chelsea Hotel in Toronto, 6-8 February 2009. I attended the 2009 conference as an invited speaker. As Equity Chair I attended the 2014 conference on behalf of the AASUA. My report-back shares with the university community equity and diversity ideas, path-breaking research, frontline experiences, best practices and lessons learned.

The 2014 “Perpetual Crisis?” conference was attended by about 100 participants, mostly from faculty associations. It included 2 keynotes, 1 plenary panel, and 4 discussion group sessions. The keynotes and plenary were facilitated by CAUT’s two Equity & Diversity Council Co-Chairs: Dr. Doreen Fumia (Ryerson) and Dr. Audrey Kobayashi (Queen’s). The conference’s opening keynotes was Camille Nelson, Professor and Dean of Suffolk University Law School, who spoke on the topic, “Human Rights, Equity and the University.” The keynote on the second day was delivered by Philomena Essed, Professor of Critical Race, Gender and Leadership Studies at Antioch University, who spoke on the topic, “The Other side of Everyday Oppression: Cultural Cloning and Durable Inequities in Higher Education.”

The plenary session was entitled, “Visible absences and the neoliberal university.” It featured 4 speakers: Sirma Bilge, associate professor of Sociology at the Université de Montréal; Grace-Edward Galabuzi, associate professor of political science and public administration at Ryerson University; Sarita Srivastava, associate professor of Sociology and Women and Gender Studies at Queen’s University; and David Newhouse, an associate professor in Indigenous Studies and Business Administration at Trent University. The report concludes with the discussion groups’ three-fold recommendations on advancing diversity with equity in Canadian universities: (i) what CAUT can do; (ii) what faculty associations can do; and (iii) what individuals can do.

II. Summary Notes on Contributions by Speakers

A. KEYNOTE: PROFESSOR CAMILLE NELSON, “Human Rights, Equity and the University.”

Dean Nelson’s remarks were dialogical and punctuated by critical race/critical legal studies autobiographical interventions. Nelson completed her undergraduate degree at the University of Toronto, went to Columbia University, where there was the best collection of Critical Race Theorists in-house, including the opportunity to study with Prof. Patricia J. Williams. Nelson’s talk stressed the concept of intentionality, and how diversity is not going to happen by accident. It stressed diversity as a verb. Diversity is the right thing to do (social justice approach) but not always the most popular thing to do. This is especially so as efforts to advance diversity with equity unsettles those colleagues who don’t want change, who are comfortable with, or complacent about, the status quo. She cited Martin Luther King Jr’s April 1963 “Letter from the Birmingham Jail”4 and his challenge to those religious leaders who kept encouraging activists to “wait” for equality and freedom; King admonished those who were content to stand on the sidelines in the face of injustice. Waiting did not lead to change. Waiting was not going to achieve civil and human rights. According to Dean Nelson, speaking up and not standing idle on the sidelines takes courage, and may lead to unpopularity.

Leadership Matters: In the struggle for diversity with equity there are leadership and credibility concerns. Dean Nelson discussed leadership and the power and discretion of leaders. How many chairs, deans, provosts are women and/or people of colour? A difference can be made by leaders. However, there is much less diversity among university leaders. The power of leaders and how that power is managed and deployed is important. She argued that those who care about diversity need to go to the ‘dark side’ – need to become a chair, or a dean or a provost. Nelson argued that it is relatively easy to critique, to write about everything that is wrong. In Race and Races: Cases and Resources for a Diverse America,5 the authors make a number of relevant points: first, there is a need to make implicit biases more explicit. Privileged groups seldom give up or share their power. The research also suggests groups, acting in concert, tend to be more immoral than individuals. Tough questions need to be asked: Who is in charge of nominating candidates? Who is put on admissions committees? Who is put on hiring committees? These questions reflect discretionary power. They point to the need for intentionality in order to construct committees equitably and in order to ensure diversity with equity in outcomes. Leadership messaging needs to be intentional about nominating, appointing and supporting people of colour and diversity more generally. Faculty association leadership also needs to be intentional. Some leaders, including in faculty associations, can be
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dismissive, condescending and disrespectful – so faculty associations also need to look at their own structures, processes and practices.

**Context Matters:** Dean Nelson also discussed context and the ways it which it can inhibit change. She discussed how for some minorities and underrepresented groups they cannot look to leadership or even colleagues for support or solidarity. Often they are cheered on by unlikely allies: the non-academic staff, the security guards, the housekeeping and maintenance crews, and the cafeteria staff. These folks, often hyper-visible and, at the same time, invisibilized, are often the lifeline for underrepresented groups. Most often such individuals are the only other sources of diversity on many university campuses. There is a need to be very intentional about envisioning and respecting community. This commentary by Dean Nelson was also about class, and how privileged folks on campus tend to be snooty and obnoxious to security guards or cafeteria staff: University campuses are not just recruiting and populated by people from privileged classes.

**Justice Matters:** Dean Nelson also discussed why the pursuit of justice matters and what can be done to foster greater democratic inclusion. All universities have lofty missions and goals. Yet, few leaders anchor their decision-making in such mission statements despite the fact that they say, at least rhetorically, that they are committed to diversity, inclusion and access. Consider the nature of the harm if we look back every few years: People opt out of the system – the “leaky pipeline” phenomenon. For underrepresented and marginalized faculty, staff and students universities can be an incredibly isolating and debilitating experience. Being a sole woman or minority individual in an academic unit can be isolating. A problem is the absence of a critical mass of female and/or minority scholars. It can be deeply draining, sometimes painful, on every level to be in that solitary space.

Mission statements laud diversity but few leaders seem to make decisions with such diversity statements in mind. Admission offices tout a commitment to diversity and add images to their brochures but don’t cross-check the rhetoric and multicultural images with the lived reality. A commitment to change requires intentionality. Too many people do not think through implications and don’t think of consequences, including harm. Marketing brochures may go out and either underrepresent or over-represent diversity. Who checks to see if how the university is represented in such brochures include Aboriginal people or women or gender diversity or racial and ethnic minorities, or persons with diverse abilities? Someone has to be paying attention. Someone has to be accountable. Doing the right thing and in the right way takes time, intentionality, and commitment. As well, to get diverse nominations and/or hires we need to examine the evaluation criteria and hidden biases, and we need to be intentional and deliberate in connecting to diverse networks, such as drawing upon Native/Indigenous Law Clinics, Outlaw/QueerLaw Groups; fundraise for scholarships for diverse students; and cultivate and advance more non-traditional outsiders in to leadership positions. People in positions of privilege need to be mentors and, also, members of underrepresented groups need to be willing to be mentored. Finally, the absence of good data is a persistent issue. Institutions are reluctant to collect and maintain good data, despite the fact that it helps them to set benchmarks and monitor progress. Institutions also need to keep good salary data to ensure they are not reproducing or aggravating pay inequity. Who is collecting, analyzing, distributing and keeping institutional data, including intersectional data, in your institution? There is a need to develop equity and diversity report cards.

**Q&A:** A number of questions followed Dean Nelson’s keynote. Some useful resources were shared. One notable resource is a book on implicit biases – Virginia Valian’s *Why So Slow? The Advancement of
Women (1998) – and how such biases impede the advancement of women. (I believe we can extend this analysis to, for example, racialized minorities, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal people, and sexual and gender minorities). The Valian study analysed every psychological survey of gender at the time of publication and found that 66% of men have serious gender biases against women. More troubling, and contrary to the ‘natural allies’ assumption, some 66% of women also have serious gender biases against other women. Put differently, one-third of men are more women-friendly than two-thirds of women. Both men and women need to unlearn gender biases. One can extend this argument and indeed call for more robust studies on the ways in which biases against racialized minorities, Aboriginal people, persons with disabilities, and sexual and gender minorities impact efforts to achieve diversity with equity.

SATURDAY, 8 FEBRUARY 2014

B. Recap of Insights from Friday’s Discussion Groups

The Saturday events included a recap of the previous day by Equity & Diversity Co-Chair Doreen Fumia of the previous day’s insights. This was followed by a keynote and Q&A with keynote Professor Philomena Essed. The second major programming event of the day included a conference’s plenary panel and Q&A on “Visible absences and the neo-liberal university,” followed by discussion groups. The following is a synopsis of insights from Friday’s discussion groups:

- Equity and diversity are often perceived as lip-service. Universities need to go beyond lip-service and writing up documents to actually doing and achieving diversity with equity.
- There was a lot of discussion of the words and meanings of equity and diversity generally and in the Canadian context.
- There is a need for more explicit links to be made between what we understand as equity and human rights and the relationship to academic freedom.
- Participants identified as a challenge achieving diversity with equity hires in smaller and more remote sites.
- Equity needs to be sustained via incorporation in to admissions, recruitment and retention.
- Equity committees need buy-in; they need to build coalitions, and see what works and what does not work. Faculty association and university leadership to work together to achieve diversity with equity.
- Equity work needs to have sustainable processes in place that ensure it is monitored, evaluated and sustained – and not just a one-off set of activities.
- Participants stressed the need to create spaces for CAUT to engage in some self-education; diversity with equity work within CAUT is taking way too long.
- There is a need for data collection and regular equity audits to assess outcomes and inform decision-making.
- There is a need to generate compelling stories and narratives from the margins.
- Faculty associations should build collegial alliances and coalitions with students and student organizations.
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C. **KEYNOTE: PROFESSOR PHILOMENA ESSED.** “The Other side of Everyday Oppression: Cultural Cloning and Durable Inequalities in Higher Education.”

Professor Essed’s keynote and PowerPoint presentation built on her engaged scholarship that has informed critical race research, teaching and scholarship in Europe, the United States and Canada, as elsewhere. Professor Essed’s keynote covered three interrelated concepts in relation to the need to change underlying values that give rise to cultural cloning and durable inequalities:

(i) Everyday oppression
(ii) Cultural cloning
(iii) Durable inequalities

Scholarly engagements of the practices and experiences of everyday racism emerged in the 1980s and 1990s. Everyday racism is concerned with how the *practices of racism* play out in everyday life, including in emails and in daily conversations and interactions. The talk explored the practices of everyday oppression for diverse people, including women, working class people, racialized and ethnicized groups, and LGBTI (of all classes, genders, races, ethnicities, ages). While oppressions are not cumulative they often function to reinforce each other. The keynote also discussed the fear caused by aggressive denial and how those who engage in practices of racism often deny it. Essed referred to the “politically correct white excuse to declare innocence.” While racism may not be the intent, Essed suggested the absence of intent should never be the explanation or the excuse. Silencing was discussed as one of the most discouraging tendencies, which functions to actively eliminate dissent and protest – and to eliminate or expel protestors. Self-silencing in the face of injustices often eat at a person, causing shame and illness. It is part of the role of the scholar’s role as public intellectual to refuse to be silenced, to work to restore dignity – mindful there can be retaliation. There is often intimidation of oppositional voices and viewpoints. Privileged individuals engage in shunning, further reinforcing everyday racism. Too often t response by privileged individuals is angry: How dare you accuse me of racism? Such emotional responses often foreclose efforts to address the practices and experiences of racism.

Despite government and university policies there is a great wall. Naming racism is met with objections. Naming everyday racism too often is seen as worse than the acts themselves. Iris Marion Young in *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (1990) explores how these tendencies need not emanate from the tyrannical. Rather they are the results of everyday practices of often well-intended individuals, and such practices are embedded in norms and assumptions underlying institutional rules. Oppressions are vast and deep injustices, often unconscious, and often are evident in the media and in the structural features of bureaucratic hierarchy. In short, everyday racism and oppression are embedded in ‘normal’ processes of everyday life. Essed stressed that it is in the normal – not abnormal or exceptional – processes of everyday life where racism occurs and systematically reproduces the prevailing order. She fleshed out three dimensions further:
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1) Acts of oppression
2) Experience of oppression
3) Underlying values – serve to validate the workings of oppression as “normal” and, as a result, oppression integrates smoothly into everyday routine.

**Cultural Cloning in Higher Education:** Professor Essed discussed the phenomenon of privileging likeness, homogeneity, ableism, masculinity and how this phenomenon informs durable inequalities embedded in larger higher education frameworks. Essed surveyed various studies from Brazil to Europe. Jerry Dávila’s *Diploma of Whiteness: Race and social policy in Brazil, 1917-45* (2003), for example, sought to uncover the assumptions in Brazil’s school system and social policies around the concept of public whiteness and the constitution of Afro-Brazilians as “racially degenerate rather than virile and Aryan.” In Brazil there was a cloning of the hegemonic model of perfection and the racialized body of progress (public whitening). This interwar period in Brazil’s history was also shaped by the triumph of a particular conception of masculinity, of progress, and notions of physical and mental capacity. Public whitening was associated with social mobility. Similarly, in Europe during the 1980s and 1990s, higher knowledge and intelligence were seen to correspond to a list of names of great white men. In Europe awards for scholars reflected the normative profile, as did administrative rank of full professors – a traditional conception of masculine and European norms. Emulation gave rise to a number of things: schools, even buildings looked-alike. There was a tendency to homogenize as well as to standardize many aspects of education; an assault on authenticity; and hostility to originality and deviations from the norm. Pressures were exerted on those who were not normative to adapt, to conform, resulting in cloning and counter-cloning.

Today’s universities in North America are increasingly diverse. However, there continues to be a cloning of white, male, and European. Similarly, in Europe, there is a high cloning tendency, with the majority of the professoriate and the administration constituted by white males. In such environments the idea of the ‘best’ candidate translates into one-dimensional man. Women candidates and/or people of colour candidates are perceived as “lacking” and falling short. Discrimination against women and people of colour reflect durable inequalities.

**Durable Inequality:** Prof. Essed suggested that we need to place this cloning phenomenon in a larger context, such as the cloning of standardization and even issues of accountability. These cloning tendencies all work to reproduce certain standards of people, often those in positions of power and privilege. It is not a healthy or sustainable situation: students commit suicide; faculty members become teaching machines and experience chronic fatigue; and there is less and less time to think, to reflect and to be creative. It is dehumanizing. De-cloning starts with disobedience and non-conformity to this system.

**Change:** When is change possible? What are the mechanisms? Essed offered a number of suggestions for an alternative to the neoliberal model; for de-cloning, and for engendering change. She stressed that it is not about engendering a utopia. The aim is to advance a university that is a learning community that recognizes people as whole people. In a performativity culture there are chronic insecurities and constant pressures to live up to prevailing expectations, however unhealthy or unsustainable. There is a need to see full human beings with real feelings and aspirations. Such a space is neither teacher nor learner centred but, rather, learning centred. As well, a social justice
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mission reflects pressing societal and global needs. Social justice in the mission suggests such work is not marginal, rather central to the academy. This might mean a shift from publications as a measure of individual success. The importance of the knowledge and achievement would be for community and humanity, and not just for the individual. In such a change environment there would be less stress on competition, more on collaboration. From beginning to end students would learn to share their ideas (i.e. not operate from the competitive and fearful notion that sharing might mean someone would “steal my ideas”). Students would be less isolated, less lonely and the climate would allow for greater sharing and collaboration, and for less competition. Such a system would not be about reproducing homogeneity; rather about supporting and enabling heterogeneity. There would be less stress on peer review and more on peer learning. The system of ‘you scratch my back, I scratch your back’ breathes cloning, homogenization and competition. More is to be learned from an environment of diversity rather than homogeneity. Diversity is only a first step.

Q&A with Prof. Philomena Essed: A number of probing questions were posed and resources shared. One useful resource shared was Jeff Schmidt’s *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul-Battering System that Shapes Their Lives* (2001). Decloning begins with disobedience. Yet, disobedience is intolerable to the status quo and often efforts are made to silence such individuals. Often those in the system collude to silence the disobedient one. Despite the creation of a toxic environment by those colluding to silence or marginalize the disobedient one, paradoxically, the way power works is that it is the nonconforming one who is ‘taxed’ with toxicity. Often there is an effort made to expel, eliminate or shun the nonconforming person – even in environments of academic freedom and that promote critical and independent thinking. Ironically, through such experiences people learn to become specialists in what they are against.

D. PLENARY: VISIBLE ABSENCES AND THE NEOLIBERAL UNIVERSITY

Speakers:

- **DAVID NEWHOUSE** (Trent University)
- **SIRMA BILGE** (Université de Montréal)
- **GRACE-EDWARD GALABUZI** (Ryerson University)
- **SARITA SRIVASTAVA** (Queen’s University)

**DAVID NEWHOUSE** (Trent University, Peterborough)

Prof. David Newhouse offered a number of insights about respect for diversity and diversity in a neoliberal university. We are part of a web of diverse relationships. First, diversity is the order of the universe, and a set of values for living in heterogeneous communities. In a neoliberal environment that values efficiency, corporations are seen as the best form of human organization. Conformity is valued. In such an environment it takes a huge effort to maintain diversity. There is diversity in corporations but it is seen in a different fashion in the academy. Second, Prof. Newhouse observed
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that, like many Indigenous and diversity advocates in the academy, he was tired. Efforts to achieve diversity with equity are exhausting and require constant struggle. Achieving diversity with equity takes a lot of effort and there is no end in sight. The academy, for all of its social liberalism, is often resistant to efforts to achieve diversity and thus is slow to change. Third, Prof. Newhouse offered some autobiographical interventions. He has been Chair of Indigenous Studies at Trent University for some 20 years, on CAUT’s Aboriginal Caucus for a decade and for the last 5 years head of Trent’s faculty association. In 1972 there were some 160 Aboriginal faculty members who were tenured or tenure-track. There were about 35,000 to 40,000 Aboriginal students. Today CAUT’s Aboriginal Caucus alone has been 120-150 Aboriginal faculty members and has held 3 conferences for Aboriginal faculty. Some universities are making strong commitments. The University of British Columbia (UBC), for example, has a cadre of 500 graduate students. There is a growing number of Aboriginal undergraduate and graduate students on university campuses: Manitoba has 1,200, University of Alberta has 1,900, Saskatchewan has 2,000, and UBC has 2,500. Fourth, there are challenges of attending universities.

In order to enter, Aboriginal faculty and students are asked to leave bits and pieces of themselves at the door; are asked to leave traditional knowledge at the door and substitute non-Aboriginal forms of knowledge. Aboriginal scholars are also asked to leave social practices developed over millennia at the door. It is difficult to be expected to adopt the practices of those who are dominant within the university. In some senses the university is an extension of the Indian Residential School and the work of Duncan Campbell Scott. Often it is not an instrument that helps Aboriginal people improve their lives and livelihoods. Another issued discussed by Prof. Newhouse is the tendency to study Aboriginal people as “problems” and Aboriginal students through a “risk” lens. Prof. Newhouse examined the fragility of the environment within the academy, especially around issues of tenure and promotion. Aboriginal advancement can be stopped by one dean. As well, after a single intransigent dean or administrator it can take years to get back on track.

Diversity gains in the academy are often predicated on people of good will, and people willing to engage. The “red person’s burden,” according to Prof. Newhouse, is that Aboriginal scholars have to educate new colleagues, new deans, new vice presidents – all the time – about Aboriginal issues. He noted the undervaluing of engaged scholarship as well as the undervaluing of the invisible labour of educating the academy. So much time and energy are expended by so many Aboriginal faculty members to educate non-Aboriginal administrators who benefit, even as the institutions consistently fail to acknowledge this work: “we can’t put this education of administrators on our annual reports and CVs, can’t say, I educated 4 presidents, 12 deans… this education work does not count.”

SIRMA BILGE (Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec)

Prof. Sirma Bilge’s theoretical and autobiographical intervention grappled with the complexities of migration, bordercrossings, intersectionality, traditional Sociology, and place. A scholar originally from Turkey, Prof. Bilge has a doctorate from the Sorbonne in Paris, and teaches at the Université
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de Montréal, a predominantly francophone university in Québec. Her department includes other non-Québécois but Bilge is the only non-European. Prof. Bilge’s teaching and research engages knowledge from the margins. She researches and teaches intersectionality, ethnic studies, postcolonial studies, and decolonial studies. In conventional sociology, intersectionality is not seen as real sociology. At the same time, Prof. Bilge noted that she can be disciplined by contradictory claims: intersectionality is not sociology and sociology is doing this kind of work since Émile Durkheim.

In the neoliberal university we are experiencing wide-ranging changes: privatization, escalating inequalities, and obsolescence of notions of the public good. Prof. Bilge expressed some ambivalence about using the concept of neoliberalism, including the potential of sacrificing of internal complexities. Following Stuart Hall she sees neoliberalism as a provisional concept, a close approximation. Naming neoliberalism is critical, particularly the ways in which it naturalizes and legitimizes inequalities. Resistant and counterhegemonic knowledge can be put in the service of unsettling neoliberalism. However, we also need to go beyond neoliberalism and market logic, and to unpack its cultural rationale, form of governance, and the restructured economy, society and state.

The language of rights has become prominent under neoliberalism. Individualized and market-based notions of rights co-exist with and, in fact, are building blocks of neoliberalism. Similarly, equity and diversity practitioners coexist in the neoliberal academy. Rights are a double-edged sword as they can both resist and reinforce neoliberal hegemony.

Neoliberal knowledge production is displacing radical notions of social justice. Corporatism, new public managerialism, auditing, and accounting techniques all allow public service to be shaped by an audit culture. With these changes comes a bureaucratic and technologized approach to equality and human rights – government at a distance. Neoliberalism reinscribes techniques and the exercise of government at a distance. It has led to a new form of minority struggle (Paul Gilroy). There is also the privatization of rights and grievances. Angela Davis in her book, The Meaning of Freedom and Other Difficult Dialogues (2012), makes the point about neoliberalism’s ahistoricism. Neoliberalism suggests history doesn’t matter: The claim that history does not matter – reproduced in Frances Fukuyama’s The End of History and Dinesh D’Souza’s The End of Racism – suggests we can extricate ourselves from race and the ways in which it inhabits social and psychic worlds. There is a neoliberal belief that race and racism no longer matters.

Racial neoliberalism builds silently on structural conditions of racism while eradicating categories like race. Ethnic studies – like gender, women, feminist studies – were initially insurgent and then incorporated and neutralized in the corporate academy through techniques of racial management. There is a ‘double entanglement’ (Angelia McRobbie), the coexistence of neoconservative claims of postracial and colourblind alongside liberal notions of tolerance and diversity. Cultural racism’s ‘managed difference’ often functions in ways that make no difference; it is a simple recognition of difference without redistribution. Neoliberals often find it comforting to identify difference.

Neoliberal governance of diversity incorporates and neutralizes unruly differences. The deployment of diversity exonerates the liberal left while ignoring the corporatization of left, itself, and the ways in which neoliberalism also works to incorporate insurgent left. Global capital has taken a new

---

12 See Stuart Hall and Alan O’Shea’s “Common-sense Neoliberalism” in a special issue of Sounding on Values as commodities, Soundings, 55 (Winter 2013), [http://www.lwbooks.co.uk/journals/soundings/contents.html](http://www.lwbooks.co.uk/journals/soundings/contents.html)
interest in minority differences. Following Stuart Hall, Prof. Bilge suggested that the neoliberal order made difference a fact of life but also a form of capital. Capital has a new-found interest in particularity. Global capitalism learned to live and also to overcome and incorporate difference. Capital incorporates and neutralizes and sanitizes difference. Increasingly we are faced with a world in which things are different but differences do not matter.

GRACE-EDWARD GALABUZI (Ryerson University, Toronto)

Prof. Galabuzi presentation made a number of interventions on achieving diversity with equity and also on the resistance to achieving inclusion and equity in the academy. On the perpetual nature of the struggle he began by noting: “it is a political struggle, stupid!” In this struggle there is a need to centre colonization and racialization within an interlocking set of oppressions. Prof. Galabuzi examined the question of the legitimacy of the inclusion and diversity project as a social justice project. He discussed shifts in dominant theories of race and colonization – and the emergence of a so-called colourblind society. He asked: What is to be done in order to return to the struggle approach to equity and diversity? This question was posed mindful that there are elements of the academy that are indifferent, tuned out and even turned off.

In 1963 Martin Luther King Jr. went to the March on Washington by talking about the dire circumstances of black, poor and working class people in the United States. King did not talk about “having a nightmare.” He talked about having a dream. The struggle is about challenges but it is also about hope. King admonished well-meaning people who did nothing or who perpetually deferred struggle and wanted to wait. The question of struggle must remain on the table. Today many institutions mainstream equity and diversity support: the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (FHSS), and in Ontario the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA). Some might even say we are in a moment of the golden age of diversity. Yet, if we listen to the voices of the most affected, a different story is told. Instead, we hear of a failed mission and reports that the academy remains hostile to pursuing any meaningful commitment to diversity. There remains a lack of racialized faculty in many universities. Those equity seeking groups who are in the academy report experiences of disrespect and micro-aggression. They face hostile environments, systematic marginalization, racial oppression, chilly climates, and backlash when questions of diversity and equity are raised.

Double Consciousness: Prof. Galabuzi drew on W.E.B. Du Bois’ concept of the “double consciousness,”13 that critical consciousness of trying to reconcile “two-ness” – one’s own self-consciousness and the often distorted image of oneself through the eyes of others. There is a challenge, still, for Indigenous and racialized faculty to fully experience their humanity. In the academy, there is a challenge for them to fully realize academic freedom, to experience academic integrity, authority in the classroom, voice in institutional decision-making, as well as to be recruited, hired, mentored and promoted. There are institutional norms that validate European and whiteness.

An examination of the academy from the perspective of Indigenous and racialized faculty suggests we’ve lost significant ground. Rather than talk about an inclusion project we need to talk about an atrophied inclusion project. The neoliberal order commodifies diversity on the basis of inclusion
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informed by market logic. There’s been an institutional shift away from addressing racism, decolonization and non-hierarchy. This shift is an epistemic and an ontological shift towards an understanding of racism as an individual ‘problem’ or phenomenon as opposed to understanding racism as a systemic or institutional one. Universities can be understood as colonial racial institutions – the ‘racial university’ – along the lines of David Theo Goldberg’s notion of the ‘racial state’. Prof. Galabuzi suggested equity projects within universities were in need of a reboot.

**Illusions of Inclusion:** There’s been an appropriation of inclusion and diversity for capital and a reinsertion and privileging of whiteness, western European and middle class. At the same time, there is a false sense of neutrality, fairness, objectivity, and ‘public good’. Education is the basis for the advantage of some and to the detriment of others. There’s a need for the decolonization of thought and action. Race comes in to being as part of this broader context of colonization. Referring to W.E.B. DuBois again Prof. Galabuzi talked about the intractability of the problem of race in a so-called post-racial environment. Universities are racial institutions. They are marked by racial formations with racial power to organize life at the institutional level. This critical lens allows us to challenge the term of delimited progress, to reject the liberal concept of the university and to understand the racialized nature of social relations. The colorblind multicultural myth is a real challenge. Racialization is a structural problem, both on the right and on the left: individualist, essentialist, intentional, race-target rather than structural and institutional analysis. Today can’t get right or left to commit to equity and diversity.

**SARITA SRIVASTAVA (Queen’s University, Kingston)**

Prof. Srivastava’s talk built on her seminal research, “You’re calling me a racist? Emotional Encounters about Race”14 – which reflects on anti-racism in organizations. This research asks the following questions: Why is it that the concept of race often leads to (i) denial or (ii) to angry and hurtful exchanges? Why is it so difficult to create lasting and creative change beyond counting bodies? The talk examined the ways in which emotional narratives stall change and, also, the ways in which clear borders are placed around various social justice issues, whether antiracism, women’s issues, labour, and/or the environment. These borders are guarded in the name of purity. Second, there is an automatic assumption of egalitarian. Further, emotional responses shape approach to equity and diversity. These emotional responses are draining, exhausting. When this is pointed out the very naming is often met with emotional resistance: complaints, guilt, anger – typical emotional responses – tearful, angry, hurt – “what, you’re calling me a racist?” In almost every instance simply to raise the issue of racism leads to rage and emotional responses, which regulate and circumscribe the range of antiracism response. Often such moments become mired in emotions and become therapeutic or political rather than an opportunity for transformation.

**Let’s talk approach:** This approach calls for a sharing of styles, experiences, and consciousness-raising. This approach tends to be prescriptive and normative. This mode of discussion deflects and personalizes antiracism. Deeper investment in racial hierarchy is linked to imperial histories. The responses of anger, fears, and tears – all tied up in what it means to be a good person. Being non-
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racist is seen as central to being a good Canadian. Limits and forecloses discussions. In feminism’s discussions of gender the antiracist becomes resisted in deeply emotional ways. They don’t think of themselves as having power (either victim/survivor or perpetrator rather than potentially both). Fear, anger, despair – these tend to lead us to focus on the racist’s personal traits rather than power or relational dynamics. There is a focus on the individual – a therapeutic/moral response.

**Stalled:** Antiracist change has been stalled. Broadly linked: narratives of multicultural society; of racism as moral traits of individual not institutional; and emphasis on education as if we know more we’ll do better. There is an attachment to a singular, progressive person who it is presumed simply can’t be involved in racism. These emotional responses and assumption stall change. Emotional resistance and hostility tend to fuel a fearful and angry refrain: Fears of being excluded as whites or of being silenced as whites. Usually the speakers are vocal and angry. The aim is to establish one’s innocence and vulnerability. There are particularities of these dynamics that are particular to universities, including repeated instances of blackface and debates around racism and cultures of whiteness. There are quieter debates on curriculum.

Are there inspiring signs or alternatives? There is an intensifying push for data. Some of the anecdotal data is worrisome. For example, Prof. Srivastava revealed data on one university in Toronto that suggests that 98 percent of those denied tenure are people of colour/visible minorities. As well, tenure files approved at the departmental level are overturned by an individual dean who acts as the sole gatekeeper fuelling “leaky pipelines” through which minorities fall out of or are disappeared from the university system. What is the data on minority hiring, tenure, promotion, retention? Prof. Srivastava said she is simultaneously hopeful and pessimistic. Belief that greater or better knowledge will make a difference has shifted from retreat. Struggle is draining, and requires emotional energy.

**Panel Q&A:** Among the comments and question posed during the plenary included ones related to the Henry Report (2004) at Queen’s University,\(^\text{15}\) and the report of the Ryerson University Taskforce on Anti-Racism (2010). Rather than tackling the substantive issues within the reports, the responses tend to deflect and to zero in less on racism and oppression and more on methodology, and the politics of citation. Often the aim of such deflections is to try and discredit the reports’ findings and to deny that racism, oppression, and discrimination remain challenges in the modern universities, as they were in universities of the past. Discrediting has become a familiar motif; and “jokes” become a way of continuing the stigmatizing. There was a suggestion that we need to turn negativity, killjoy into creativity. There was also interest in the overwhelming sense of tiredness, the sense that people are fatigued, and worn out by the struggle for diversity with equity that has produced so few success stories. At the same time, among those in the struggle there is a constant anxiety of not doing enough even as the neoliberal university of conditions us to do more and more – engendering burnout and an increase in chronic fatigue syndrome.

III. Recommendations from the Working Groups

There were a number of working groups. Each group was asked to generate three-fold recommendations as follows: First, what can CAUT do? Second, what can faculty associations and unions do? Third, what can individuals do? The below is a composite of the recommendations.

A. What can CAUT do?

The discussion groups recommended that the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) needs to do the following:

- Hold its equity and diversity conferences on a regular 2-year cycle
- Examine the high cost of its equity and diversity conference as an equity and access issue and whether the costs prohibit more people attending
- Model diversity with equity and lead by example
- Hire dedicated equity staff with knowledge and experience of equity seeking groups
- Collect equity data nationally. CAUT should lead on provincial level collection of data on equity and share its template with faculty associations.
- Collect data on equity groups among contract academic staff
- Conduct an inventory/equity assessment of all faculty associations
- Develop a scorecard / report card on diversity with equity
- Develop an equity rolodex
- Develop bargaining advisory on employment equity including model clauses
- Develop model language and clauses on bargaining for equity and share via googledocs
- Equity model clauses should account for contract staff and how equity intersects with precarious labour
- Develop texts with model clauses, policy statements on equity, on collegial workplace, on equitable work, on how to deal with harassment (sexual, gender, racial, religious)
- Collect model university equity plans that can be an example for universities to follow
- Develop a certification/equity training including an online module
- Develop a faculty association handbook which provide different equity lens
- Compile a list of existing collective agreements with equity and diversity statements
- Conduct equity and human rights investigations in relation to academic freedom
- Identify best practices and procedures for collecting language and data on salary, promotion, retention
- Increase attention to age discrimination especially intersectional analysis that can engender double and triple jeopardy
- Equity Council needs to examine CAUT’s own practice of diversity with equity; need for internal self-examination
• Conduct an external audit of its own equity and diversity awareness and practices
• Conduct an equity audit of faculty associations Executives
• Ensure CAUT staff receives equity and anti-oppression training
• Develop materials and lead campaign to get faculty associations to promote equity
• Create regional caucuses to build solidarity and decrease isolation
• Establish a network of faculty associations equity and antiracism officers
• Encourage local faculty association equity officers to be on CAUT Executive
• Develop a ‘travelling townhall’ to promote equity and diversity in academe
• Develop an equity and diversity speakers’ list
• Ensure equal access to funding for committees at CAUT
• Use social media to educate on antiracism, equity and diversity
• Work to put equity on media and national agenda

B. What can faculty associations do?

The discussion groups recommended that faculty associations can do the following to advance diversity with equity:

• Articulate a vision and model an equitable organization
• Create mission statements that make equity foundational and link equity to excellence
• Go beyond legislative compliance in supporting equity and diversity
• Equity officers should be a member of the faculty association Executive
• Include dedicated seats on faculty association Executives or Councils for racialized and Aboriginal representation and/or francophone speakers
• Executive position for individuals representing contract academic staff
• Create an equity and diversity listserv to connect people
• Draw on internal academic staff equity expertise to educate faculty association members
• Use CAUT’s existing equity workshop to educate members
• Engage in intersectional analysis and practices and avoid fragmentation/hierarchy among equity seeking groups
• Collect data and conduct equity audit of the faculty association and its own staff, Executive and committees
• Draw on methodological expertise of members to collect data on contract academic staff and equity issues
• Conduct internal equity audits of faculty association and collective agreements with model language
• Work collegially with university Senates and encourage members to serve on university representative bodies
• Support Fair Employment Week with a focus on equity or an Employment Equity Week
• Work collegially with faculty associations with standing committees on equity and diversity
• Identify best practices among faculty associations with antiracism officers, equity officers, equity committees, including those who are compensated
• Encourage faculty associations to develop diversity caucuses or standing committees (e.g. some have women’s caucuses)
• Where there are multiple campuses faculty associations should ensure equity work occurs on all regional and satellite campuses
• Bargaining committees need to link their work to equity and diversity
• Bargain for control over anti-harassment and discrimination policies
• Bargain for equity in hiring and for observer status on search committees
• Ensure equity and diversity language is incorporated in to the recruitment section of collective agreements
• Ensure university investigates the complaints that people feel isolated and unsupported
• Ensure transparency in human rights complaints
• Ensure grievance officers are trained in equity and human rights
• Collect cases of human rights violations to forward to CAUT to develop a profile of what is happening nationally
• Engage in pro-active strategic alliance-building within university. Broaden equity work to reach out to students
• Regional conferences should prioritize and work to advance diversity with equity
• Add equity reports to faculty association web sites to raise awareness among members

C. What can individuals do?

The discussion groups recommended that individuals can do the following to achieve diversity with equity in the academy:

• Elect representatives that support equity work and are in a position to make change
• Faculty members with tenure and job security need to speak up for diversity with equity (reduce complacency)
• Have courage. Be brave. Speak up. Unlearn own biases and engage in own education/awareness work to ensure you are not participating in micro-aggressions and everyday oppression
• Encourage diverse tenured faculty to step-up to the plate and help advance equity
• Mentoring matters: Individuals in majoritarian groups need to mentor/serve as allies of marginalized colleagues
• Provide collegial support to tired individuals promoting equity work that benefits all
• Encourage engaged scholars, and connect with community organizations
• Educate students on antiracism, equity and diversity through curriculum, teaching and learning, research and community engagement
• Develop online course on equity and diversity
• Acknowledge and highlight administration successes on equity and diversity
• Encourage equity and diversity training for new hires
• Identify resources that signal how and why ‘Equity Matters’
• Avoid burnout
• Report to Executives and association governing bodies on results of equity conferences