



Report to:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Per: Dean Ellie Hisama
Faculty of Music
University of Toronto

May 4, 2022

**RE: Faculty of Music Climate and Culture Review
Executive Summary**

Prepared by:
Elizabeth Bingham
RUBIN THOMLINSON LLP
20 Adelaide Street East, Suite 1104
Toronto, Ontario M5C 2T6
Telephone: 416.847.1809
Email: ebingham@rubinthomlinson.com
www.rubinthomlinson.com

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction and Mandate	1
2.	Conduct of the Climate and Culture Review	1
	a) Process Launch.....	1
	b) The Surveys	2
	c) The Interviews.....	2
3.	Information Gathered.....	4
	a) Contextual Information.....	5
	b) Racism and a Lack of Diversity	5
	i. Individual Experiences with Racial Discrimination	5
	ii. Issues in the Jazz Area, AREDI, and ARAO	6
	iii. Systemic Issues Contributing to Racism	6
	c) Sexism, Sexual Harassment, and Sexual Violence	7
	i. Individual Experiences with Sexism, Sexual Harassment, and Sexual Violence	7
	ii. Systemic Issues Contributing to Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence	8
	d) Harassment and Barriers to Respect	10
	i. Individual Experiences with Harassment	10
	ii. Systemic Issues with Respect	11
	e) Lack of Confidence in Existing Supports	12
	f) Other Barriers to Reporting	13
	g) Lack of Resources.....	14
	h) Positive Change	15
4.	Recommendations	16
	a) The Results of the Climate and Culture Review	17
	i. Share the Results with the Community.....	17
	ii. Processing the Report.....	18
	iii. Restoring the Work Environment	18

b) Fostering Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion	19
i. EDI Director and Task Force on Equity and Belonging	19
ii. ARAO	19
iii. Diversify Faculty and Leadership.....	20
iv. Diversify Curriculum	20
c) Addressing and Preventing Sexual Misconduct	21
i. Code of Conduct.....	21
ii. Physical Space.....	21
d) Increasing Respect	22
i. Improve Channels of Communication	22
ii. Sessional Instructors	22
e) Training and Awareness.....	22

1. Introduction and Mandate

On August 12, 2021, the University of Toronto (“the University”) retained Rubin Thomlinson LLP (“RT”) to conduct a Climate and Culture Review of the Faculty of Music (“the Faculty”). Our mandate was to assess the experiences of faculty, sessional and adjunct instructors, staff, students, and alums in the Faculty’s working/learning environment, including any issues they had with harassment, sexual harassment, and racial and code-based discrimination. We were to collect information via a dedicated email address, an online survey, one-on-one interviews, and group interviews with key stakeholders.

2. Conduct of the Climate and Culture Review

a) Process Launch

On September 15, 2021, the Faculty’s Dean Ellie Hisama announced the Climate and Culture Review in a letter to the Faculty community. As part of the process launch, we conducted “meet and greet” sessions with key stakeholders to explain the Climate and Culture Review process and answer any questions. Specifically, we met with representatives from the Faculty’s Anti-Racism and Anti-Oppression Committee (“ARAO”), the Faculty of Music Undergraduate Association (“FMUA”), the Music Graduate Students Association (“MGSA”), the Faculty of Music Anti-Racist Alliance (“FoMARA”), the Faculty’s Senior Leadership Group (“SLG”), and representatives from CUPE 3902, USW 1998, Professional and Managerial group, and UTFA (the unions and association that represent sessional instructors, staff, and faculty, respectively). We conducted 13 “meet and greets” between October 1 and 13, 2021.¹ We also attended a Faculty Council meeting on October 26.

¹ In some cases, we conducted more than one meeting for a group in order to accommodate representatives’ schedules.

b) The Surveys

We created two surveys – one for faculty, staff, librarians, adjunct and sessional instructors and one for students and alums – on the online survey platform Survey Monkey.

On October 4, 2021, we distributed links to the relevant survey via email to 2,082 faculty, staff, librarians, adjunct and sessional instructors, students, and alums from the classes of 2017-2021. We also provided the dedicated email address via this email, and advised potential participants that they were welcome to provide us with information or request a one-on-one interview using this email address.

Following feedback from stakeholders, we decided to include retired and emeritus professors and staff as well as accompanists in the survey population. We emailed these groups (a total of 65 people) links to the faculty, staff, and sessional instructor survey on October 19, 2021. The survey closed on October 28, 2021. We received a total of 470 responses: 319 responses from students and alums, and 151 responses from faculty, staff, librarians, adjunct and sessional instructors.

c) The Interviews

At the end of both surveys, participants could choose to identify themselves and provide their contact information for the purposes of participating in a one-on-one interview. We received 163 requests to participate in one-on-one interviews. Some participants did not provide their contact information, so we were unable to reach out to them. We reached out to all those who requested interviews and who provided us with their contact information, which was a total of 134 participants.

We began conducting interviews with those who requested them via the dedicated email account on October 25, 2021. Ultimately, we conducted 87 one-on-one interviews between October 25, 2021, and January 18, 2022. During the interviews, participants were encouraged to share anything they had not included in their surveys, anything they wanted to expand on, or anything that they wanted to highlight for the purposes of this Review process. All participants were asked if they had any suggestions or recommendations they would make to the Faculty.

On January 17, 2022, we contacted the stakeholder groups by email to request that they schedule interviews. We conducted interviews with the ARAO, the FMUA, the MGSA, FoMARA, the SLG, CUPE 3902, USW 1998, Professional and Managerial group, and UTFA between January 24 and March 4, 2022.

In addition to the survey and interviews, we received and reviewed documentation from participants, including reports from FoMARA and #thisisartschool (discussed in further detail under section b) ii) below) and an open letter from the FMUA.

In both the surveys and the interviews, participants were advised that they could participate anonymously and that the information they provided to RT as part of the Review process would not be attributed to them in the report. They were further advised that the only exception to the anonymity of the process would be if there was a disclosure of potential risk of physical harm to individuals (either self or others), threats or risk of violence, and/or the disclosure of a potential criminal act.

3. Information Gathered

In this section, we have included a summary of the information provided in the surveys and interviews. It is important to note that the information included in this section represents the subjective experiences of those who participated. We did not test the information, for example, by sharing information as allegations or by seeking responses, and we have not made factual findings related to the concerns.

Over the course of this process, we heard from hundreds of people about their experiences with the Faculty, their perception of the issues it faces, and their recommendations for change. In this section, we have summarized the issues that were raised most frequently and that appeared to most significantly impact the Faculty's working and learning environment. To assist in understanding the frequency with which issues or concerns were identified to us, we use the following ranges to denote frequency of response: "one" (1 person), "some" (2-5 people), "several" (6-10), "many" (over 10 people).

Below, we set out some general comments about the context of the survey and its participants. We have then organized the information we received into seven sections: Racism and a Lack of Diversity; Sexism, Sexual Harassment, and Sexual Violence; Harassment and Barriers to Respect; Lack of Confidence in Existing Supports; Other Barriers to Reporting; Lack of Resources; and Positive Change. We note that, as expected in a review of this magnitude, participants' opinions on each of the issues outlined below varied. In most cases, there were at least some participants who expressed views contrary to those of the majority of participants.

a) Contextual Information

Although participants described longstanding and serious issues in the Faculty, which will be detailed in the sections below, it should be noted that many participants described a learning, teaching, and working environment that is, at its best, supportive, collegial, and aimed at making great art and developing great artists. It was clear that many participants cared deeply about the Faculty and were dedicated to improving its environment.

It should also be noted that, although the issues below are described separately for the purposes of this report, they are interrelated. One theme in particular came up as a contributing factor to many of the issues we were told about: the Faculty’s “conservatory culture.” This was described to us as a culture that prioritizes the performance of Western, classical music and emphasizes one-on-one instruction. Participants told us that the “conservatory culture” or “conservatory model” of education fosters racism, sexism, and harassment and creates a barrier to reporting issues. This culture and its impact will be discussed in further detail in sections b), c) and d) below.

b) Racism and a Lack of Diversity

i. Individual Experiences with Racial Discrimination

Many participants described experiencing or witnessing racial discrimination in the Faculty. Most of the experiences described were instances of microaggressions and racist comments, which participants told us were made by professors, colleagues, and fellow students. Many of the examples were anti-Indigenous, anti-Black or anti-Asian in nature. The racist comments were made both in public settings, such as during classes, and in private conversations.

Racialized participants also described being overlooked or passed over for opportunities and feeling as if they did not belong in the Faculty. Many participants asked that faculty, adjunct and sessional instructors receive training on anti-racism and anti-oppression.

ii. Issues in the Jazz Area, AREDI, and ARAO

Many participants expressed concern about the work of the Anti-Racism, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion working group (“AREDI”) and, later, ARAO in the 2020-2021 academic year. We understand that the Faculty set up these bodies in response to calls to action to address racism within the Faculty from an online movement known as #thisisartschool, as well as from other alums, students, faculty, and staff. AREDI was a precursor to ARAO.

Several participants told us that ARAO was comprised mainly of white members and that it did not adequately consider the position or contributions of its racialized members. We also heard that ARAO lacked a clear mandate and a code of conduct. It was apparent that at least several participants were deeply hurt by their experiences with ARAO and had lost confidence in the ability of the Faculty to address racism.

We note that many participants told us that the functioning of ARAO had improved over the 2021-2022 academic year and that it now has a clear mandate and a code of conduct.

iii. Systemic Issues Contributing to Racism

Many participants pointed out to us that individual experiences with racism in the Faculty must be understood in the context of the institutional character of the Faculty.

Specifically, several participants told us that the Faculty’s conservatory model contributes to racism. Participants explained to us that the Faculty’s focus on classical music, primarily composed by white men, creates the conditions for racial discrimination.

Many participants told us that the Faculty lacks diversity in its curriculum, and expressed dissatisfaction with the focus on Western classical music in the Faculty’s courses, in repertoire selections, and in programming for performances.

Many participants also pointed out that the Faculty lacks diversity in its instructors, leadership, and students, and asked that the Faculty take steps to address this. Several participants specifically highlighted the lack of diversity in the Faculty’s Jazz Area. We were told that while jazz is a historically Black American art form, the Faculty’s Jazz Area is primarily white, and its courses do not address the cultural context of jazz.

c) Sexism, Sexual Harassment, and Sexual Violence
i. Individual Experiences with Sexism, Sexual Harassment, and Sexual Violence

Many participants described experiencing sexism, sexual harassment, and/or sexual violence in the Faculty. Many participants also described hearing about such experiences from students or colleagues. The incidents described were primarily, though not exclusively, perpetrated by men and directed at women. The most common type of behaviour described by participants were sexualized comments, boundary-violations between instructors and students, and unwanted sexual or romantic advances.

With respect to comments, participants described hearing or being the subject of comments about their appearance or bodies, sexually explicit comments, and comments that denigrated their musical ability based on their female gender. Several participants said that they had heard or been the subject of comments that were homophobic or transphobic. Some participants also described being the subject of comments that fetishized their racial identity. Participants most commonly described these comments being made by instructors or students, though they also provided examples of comments made by staff and guest artists who were visiting the Faculty.

With respect to boundary-violations and unwanted sexual or romantic advances, many student participants described experiencing or hearing about instructors or teaching assistants repeatedly contacting students on social media or by text, making sexual or romantic overtures towards students, and touching students without their consent during instruction.

ii. Systemic Issues Contributing to Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence

Many participants told us about risk factors for sexual harassment and sexual violence that are specific to the nature of the Faculty.

Specifically, many participants pointed out that the conservatory model of education leads to relationships between students and instructors that create a risk of sexual misconduct. We were told that under this model, students receive extensive one-on-one training. Many participants said that the amount of time that students spend alone with instructors and the power imbalance between teachers and students places students in a vulnerable position and can contribute to sexual misconduct. Many participants also pointed out that the significance of the instructor-student

relationship makes it difficult to for students to speak up when there are issues.

Several participants noted the risk created by the occasional need for music instructors to touch students for pedagogical reasons, such as breathing exercises. While we heard that many instructors ask students for consent before touching them, participants told us that this practice was not universal and that, given the power dynamics at play, students might feel unable to speak up if this made them uncomfortable.

We also heard from several participants that one-on-one student lessons often take place behind closed doors and in windowless, sometimes isolated, rooms. Participants told us that this contributes to the already vulnerable position students are in during lessons, and that it leads some students to feel unsafe.

Many participants pointed out that the Faculty does not have a code of conduct regarding instructor-student relationships and recommended that the Faculty implement one.

Some participants also described an “old boys’ club” culture in the Faculty’s leadership, which trickled down throughout the Faculty. Some specifically pointed out that, prior to the arrival of Dean Hisama, the Faculty’s Senior Leadership Group was entirely male. Other participants told us about male domination among faculty members, particularly within the Jazz Area.

Many female participants described the impact of this “old boys’ club” culture on them. Female instructors, in particular, told us about feeling othered and left out in the Faculty and described being interrupted or not

taken seriously when they voiced their opinions in meetings. Others described feeling that their work was undervalued or unappreciated by their male colleagues. Some female instructors noted that women do the bulk of the “emotional labour” within the Faculty, including addressing sexual harassment and violence and supporting students who have experienced the same. Some female instructors also said that they were denigrated or not taken seriously by male students, while some female students described receiving the same treatment from male instructors.

d) Harassment and Barriers to Respect

i. Individual Experiences with Harassment

Many participants reported experiencing or witnessing harassment within the Faculty. The main types of behaviour that student and alum participants told us about were harsh comments or critiques by instructors towards students during class or in lessons. These participants described intentional humiliation of students by teachers in class and the use of demeaning and negative language, rather than constructive criticism, when commenting on students’ performance.

Faculty, staff, librarians, adjunct and sessional instructor participants told us about two main types of harassing behaviour that they had either experienced themselves or witnessed. First, many participants reported incidents of faculty-faculty bullying, including cruel comments and spreading of rumours, as well as rude and aggressive behaviour during meetings. Second, several of these participants described bullying by faculty towards staff members. This behaviour included yelling, harsh comments, and fist pounding.

ii. Systemic Issues with Respect

Participants described the lack of communication within the Faculty and competition, favouritism, and the conservatory culture as issues that appeared to contribute to disrespectful behaviour or inhibit the development of a respectful environment in the Faculty.

Many participants said that communication within the Faculty is poor. Specifically, we heard that the various programs within the Faculty operate in silos and that the Faculty lacks a centralized means of communicating about things like meetings and scheduling rooms. Participants told us that they felt out of the loop regarding what was going on in other areas of the Faculty and that they had to rely on word of mouth to figure out how to solve problems or to get questions answered. Several participants noted a particular lack of communication between the Faculty's administration and sessional instructors.

Many participants expressed a desire for more Faculty-wide events so that they could get to know people in other areas of the Faculty, learn from their peers, and share information.

Many participants also said that the Faculty's conservatory culture, including intense competition for opportunities and resources, contributes to a lack of respect within the Faculty. Many student and alum participants told us that they felt pitted against each other, rather than encouraged to collaborate. Faculty, librarians, adjunct and sessional instructors, and staff participants similarly described the tensions that arise from competition over resources among colleagues.

Many participants also told us that they felt as if certain programs, including Performance, Voice and, Classical, were favoured over others in the Faculty and that this hierarchy caused tension. Participants who said that they belonged to less favoured parts of the Faculty told us that they felt unimportant or overlooked.

e) Lack of Confidence in Existing Supports

Participants in this process expressed a profound lack of confidence in the Faculty and the University's ability to respond to Faculty members' concerns, particularly to concerns about or allegations of sexual harassment and sexual violence. Their anger and frustration regarding this issue was palpable in their survey responses and interviews.

Specifically, many participants told us that they did not trust the University's Sexual Violence Prevention & Support Centre ("SVPSC") and/or that they did not trust the University's investigation process for reported incidents of sexual violence.

Participants described three specific issues with the SVPSC and investigations. First, the most frequently raised issue was the length of investigations conducted under the University's Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment ("the Policy"). Second, participants told us that complainants to the SVPSC were sometimes required to provide their version of events to the SVPSC multiple times, which was difficult and traumatizing. Third, we heard that complainants were sometimes reluctant to initiate investigations under the Policy because they wished to remain anonymous to the respondent. However, some participants told us that the SVPSC did not monitor disclosures under the Policy, so there was no way to know if multiple disclosures had been made about the same person.

Many participants also told us that they felt the Faculty and/or the University were sweeping problems under the rug. They told us that there was a lack of transparency and accountability in how the Faculty and University respond to complaints.

Specifically, participants told us that they thought that the Faculty and/or the University had a history of dismissing complainants and protecting those who were alleged to have engaged in sexual harassment or sexual violence. Many participants said that they felt that the Faculty and the University were only interested in protecting themselves from legal action or bad press and were not truly interested in creating a safe environment for all. In the absence of transparency and accountability, participants appeared to assume the worst: that the Faculty and the University were not doing anything to address issues in the Faculty and were, in fact, covering up for perpetrators.

Several participants also expressed a lack of confidence in this Climate and Culture Review. They told us that they expected that the University would remove unfavourable portions of this report before it was released to the Faculty community and that no action would be taken in response to this report.

f) Other Barriers to Reporting

In addition to the lack of confidence in the SVPSC and the perception that the Faculty and the University would sweep issues under the rug, participants also told us about two further barriers to reporting issues.

First, many participants told us that they were concerned about the effect that reporting an issue would have on their career. We heard that the field of music is small and insular. Participants said that they did not wish to ruin their reputation or the network they had built within the Faculty by complaining about someone else. Some participants pointed out that the concern about fallout from reporting is particularly significant for those who are already in vulnerable positions in the Faculty, such as racialized Faculty members and sessional instructors.

Second, many participants told us that they did not know where to go to report issues, what steps would be involved, or how to access supports. We heard that this information is not disseminated within the Faculty, nor is it easy to find online.

g) Lack of Resources

Many participants expressed concern regarding the lack of adequate physical and personnel resources within the Faculty, as well as frustration regarding a perceived lack of financial support from the central University.

Many participants said that the Faculty's buildings, the Edward Johnson Building and the Faculty of Music South, were in a state of disrepair. Participants noted a lack of resources required for teaching and learning, such as desks, chairs, music stands, and piano benches. Many participants also reported that the Faculty lacks adequate office, classroom, rehearsal, and practice space for its students, faculty, sessional instructors, and staff. Several expressed feeling that they had to fight or compete for space and several explicitly linked the stress and conflict that arises from trying to access scarce resources to the cultural problems in the Faculty.

Many participants raised concerns regarding the demands placed on the Faculty's staff members. Participants said that the Faculty is chronically understaffed and that staff members are overburdened, with each doing the job of more than one person. Some participants noted that they had observed bullying behaviour, such as rudeness and yelling, towards the already overburdened staff members.

Several faculty participants also described feeling overburdened and noted the Faculty's lack of full-time faculty members, relative to the number of students. Many participants commented on the Faculty's consequent reliance on sessional instructors and the issues that this creates for the Faculty. Specifically, many sessional instructor participants told us that they felt undervalued by the Faculty. Many also said that they felt left out of discussions and decision-making in the Faculty. Several participants commented on the precarious nature of sessional instructors' employment, which makes it difficult for them to speak out about problems in the Faculty.

In addition, several faculty participants described an inequitable division of labour within the Faculty, with female faculty members and faculty members of colour taking on the bulk of the service work in the Faculty. Some participants highlighted the fact that these contributions to the Faculty go unrecognized and take away time that these faculty members could otherwise devote to research, thereby impeding their career progression.

h) Positive Change

Many participants expressed strong support for Dean Hisama, who began her role in July 2021, and for the steps she has taken so far to improve the

culture in the Faculty (some of which are detailed further in the “Recommendations” section below).

Several participants told us that, although they had great confidence in Dean Hisama, she would not be able to change the Faculty on her own and would require support from the University.

4. Recommendations

For ease of reference, we have categorized our recommendations into five sections: The Results of the Climate and Culture Review; Fostering Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion; Addressing and Preventing Sexual Misconduct; Increasing Respect; and Training and Awareness. Our recommendations in each of these categories are detailed below.

Before detailing our recommendations, we wish to acknowledge limitations that many participants in this process pointed to when asked what they thought should change in the Faculty: the Faculty’s resources are limited and it relies on the University for Human Resources and the SVPSC.

Our recommendations below are aimed at the Faculty specifically. We are mindful that the Faculty may not have the resources to implement all of these recommendations or to implement all of them immediately. We suggest that, in the spirit of transparency, the Faculty be open about this with the community. We are also aware that large structural changes that were suggested by many participants and that could address some of the issues outlined above, such as increasing the number of faculty members, hiring more staff, and renovating or expanding the Faculty’s buildings, are likely outside of the Faculty’s means and/or control. Again, we suggest that the Faculty be transparent about these limitations.

We acknowledge that the University's Human Resources and the SVPSC are not within the control of the Faculty. However, we suggest that the Faculty advocate or continue to advocate to the University regarding two issues, given their impact on the culture of the Faculty.

First, we believe the Faculty would be well-served by a dedicated human resources representative, given its longstanding, intersecting issues with respect, communication, and training and the already enormous workload of current staff. We suggest that the Faculty advocate to the University regarding this issue.

Second, we suggest that the Faculty share the concerns that participants in this process expressed regarding the SVPSC with the SVPSC. Given the deep lack of trust in the SVPSC that was expressed to us by participants in this process, we do not believe that the Faculty can address its issues with sexual harassment and sexual violence on its own.

a) The Results of the Climate and Culture Review

i. Share the Results with the Community

Given the significant lack of trust in both the Faculty and the University that participants expressed to us, including concern that the Faculty and/or the University would selectively edit our report or not act on its recommendations, we recommend that the results of this process be shared with the Faculty community in as fulsome a manner as possible.

We acknowledge that care must be taken when sharing the report since it refers to confidential allegations against particular individuals which we understand have already been addressed through Faculty and University

processes. However, we believe that unless steps are taken to demonstrate to the Faculty community that the Faculty and the University are committed to transparency and accountability, the community will continue to write off Faculty and University administrative processes and serious issues will go unaddressed.

ii. Processing the Report

It was clear from our surveys and interviews that the events of the past few years, as well as longstanding unresolved issues, have greatly impacted many members of the Faculty community. We believe that the community needs space to process what has happened, to discuss our report and to share learnings and ideas for improvement. We recommend that Faculty leadership put in place opportunities for its community members to have these discussions, such as town hall meetings, listening sessions, and/or dedicated office hours. Given the sensitive nature of these discussions, we suggest that Faculty leadership seek guidance on facilitation from the University's Division of People Strategy, Equity & Culture.

iii. Restoring the Work Environment

In addition to the impact of the events of the past few years on the Faculty community as a whole, it was apparent from our surveys and interviews that relationships among faculty, staff, and sessional instructors have suffered from both longstanding issues with respect and communication, as well as the more recent attention given to racism and sexism in the Faculty.

As a result, we recommend that the Faculty consider engaging in a workplace restoration for faculty, staff, and sessional instructors, through which participants would be able to process their experiences with the assistance of a skilled facilitator. We believe that such a process would assist

the Faculty in re-setting relationships in order to move forward productively. Moreover, we believe that improved cohesiveness and communication among those who work in the Faculty would also improve the student experience.

b) Fostering Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

i. EDI Director and Task Force on Equity and Belonging

We understand that the Faculty is in the process of hiring an Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (“EDI”) Director. We support this step and recommend that the Faculty consult with the Director when carrying out the recommendations set out below, as well as for the equity, diversity and inclusion training recommended in section e).

We further understand that the Faculty has created a Task Force on Equity and Belonging, whose current role is hiring the EDI Director, developing guidelines on faculty and student interaction, and bringing new art to the Faculty’s buildings. We support the creation and role of this Task Force and suggest that the Task Force work with the EDI Director to consider how it can best contribute to the Faculty going forward and how its work can complement that of ARAO. We make specific recommendations regarding the guidelines on faculty and student interaction in section c) below.

ii. ARAO

We understand that ARAO has taken steps to learn from the difficulties it faced in the 2020-2021 academic year and that it now has a code of conduct and a mandate to create a Statement of Values for the Faculty. We support the progress that ARAO has made and suggest that once ARAO has completed the Statement of Values, it work with the EDI Director to consider how it can continue to contribute to anti-racism and anti-

oppression within the Faculty, in conjunction with the Task Force on Equity and Belonging.

iii. Diversify Faculty and Leadership

Many participants recommended that the Faculty take steps to diversify its faculty and leadership. We endorse this recommendation and suggest that the Faculty consider how it can increase diversity among its faculty members and within the SLG. We acknowledge that this is not something that can happen “overnight,” given the nature of academic positions and hiring processes. However, we suggest that the Faculty take every opportunity in the coming years to recruit and promote diverse candidates for open roles.

However, we caution that diversifying faculty and leadership alone is not sufficient. Without broader cultural change, the Faculty risks harming, alienating, or “tokenizing” racialized faculty members and leaders.

iv. Diversify Curriculum

We understand that the Faculty has revived its Teaching and Learning Committee and that one of the eventual aims of this Committee will be to consider how the Faculty’s curriculum can be more inclusive. We support this step and suggest that the Committee review how the Faculty’s course offerings, as well as the content of existing courses, can be diversified to include musical traditions, composers, and history outside of European classical music.

We also understand that the Faculty has made some efforts to diversify the programming for its performances, with the guest artists it brings in and for students’ repertoire selections. We recommend that the Faculty continue this work and consider how it can incorporate the works of more racialized,

female, and/or LGBTQ+ composers in its performances, repertoires, and library holdings, as well as continue to invite diverse guest artists to the Faculty.

c) Addressing and Preventing Sexual Misconduct

i. Code of Conduct

We understand that the Task Force on Equity and Belonging is working to create a set of guidelines on faculty and student interaction, and we support this endeavour. We suggest that the guidelines be applicable to all instructors, including teaching assistants and sessional instructors. We further suggest that the guidelines should include:

- An acknowledgment of the inherent power imbalance between students and instructors
- Appropriate conduct outside of class or lessons, including online, at social events, and at performances
- A requirement to request consent prior to touching a student for pedagogical purposes

We also suggest that the Faculty create specific guidelines for guest artists that they are required to review and acknowledge before they teach at the Faculty.

ii. Physical Space

We recommend that the Faculty take steps to lessen the isolation of students in one-on-one lessons in order to increase students' sense of safety, such as installing windows on practice room doors or encouraging instructors to video record their lessons with students.

d) Increasing Respect

i. Improve Channels of Communication

We recommend that the Faculty review current practices around intra-Faculty communication and the technology and channels available for communication, including scheduling and booking meeting and practice spaces, to determine areas for improvement.

We further recommend that intra-Faculty communication be increased with, for example, a newsletter, regular town hall meetings with leadership, and/or a list serv for instructors.

We also heard that participants would like to see more events that bring the Faculty together as a whole, such as lunch time performances or talks. We support this suggestion and believe that it would contribute to improved communication and an enhanced sense of respect and belonging in the Faculty.

ii. Sessional Instructors

We recommend that that Faculty make it a priority to include sessional instructors in all communications, as well as in meetings and decision-making as appropriate.

e) Training and Awareness

We recommend that the Faculty work with the EDI Director and leverage existing University training resources to develop Faculty-specific training on EDI, harassment, sexual harassment, and sexual violence.



We suggest that this training be mandatory or incentivized for instructors and leadership and that it be tailored to reflect the particular issues that arise in a music or arts environment.

We further suggest that the Faculty review how information about reporting issues of discrimination, harassment, sexual harassment, and violence is currently disseminated and consider increasing the visibility of reporting options through its website, social media, postering, brochures, and syllabi.

Date: May 4, 2022

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'EBingham', is written over a horizontal line.

Per: Elizabeth Bingham

RUBIN THOMLINSON LLP