Municipal Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Reconciliation Sharing Platform















The Diversity Institute undertakes research on diversity in the workplace to improve practices in organizations. We work with organizations to develop customized strategies, programming, and resources to promote new, interdisciplinary knowledge and practice about diversity with respect to gender, race/ethnicity, Indigenous Peoples, abilities, and sexual orientation. Using an ecological model of change, our action-oriented, evidence-based approach drives social innovation across sectors.





Kingston's vision of being a smart, livable, 21st century city is fast becoming a reality. History innovation thrive in our dynamic city located along the beautiful shores of Lake Ontario, an easy drive from Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal, in the heart of eastern Ontario. With a stable and diversified economy that includes global corporations, innovative startups and all levels of government, Kingston's high quality-of-life offers access to world-class education and research institutions, advanced health care facilities, affordable living and vibrant entertainment and tourism activities.





The Future Skills Centre (FSC) is a forward-thinking centre for research and collaboration dedicated to driving innovation in skills development so that everyone in Canada can be prepared for the future of work. We partner with policy makers, researchers, practitioners, employers and labour, and post-secondary institutions to solve pressing labour market challenges and ensure that everyone can benefit from relevant lifelong learning opportunities. We are founded by a consortium whose members are Toronto Metropolitan University, Blueprint, and The Conference Board of Canada, and are funded by the Government of Canada's Future Skills program.



Funder



The Future Skills Centre – Centre des Compétences futures is funded by the Government of Canada's Future Skills Program.

The opinions and interpretations in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Government of Canada.

Authors

Wendy Cukier, PhD

Founder and Academic Director Professor, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Toronto Metropolitan University

Betina Borova

Senior Research Associate, Diversity Institute

Katlynn Sverko

Director, Research - Special Projects, Diversity Institute

Mingxin (Shayla) Wang

Research Assistant, Diversity Institute

Contributors

Vanessa Mensah

Manager, Equity, Diversity & Inclusion, City of Kingston

Guang Ying Mo

Director of Research, Diversity Institute

Joey Chong

Program Manager, Diversity Institute

Lindsay Coppens

Research Associate, Diversity Institute

Publication Date

May 2025

Contents

| Executive Summary | i |
|--|----|
| Context | |
| Design of a Shared National Municipal EDIR Platform | |
| Prototype Design and Implementation | |
| Project Evaluation | |
| Conclusion and Next Steps | 23 |
| Appendix A: Structure of the Municipal EDIR Platform | |
| Appendix B: Questionnaire | 27 |
| References | 32 |

Executive Summary

Context

Municipal governments are significant employers and play a critical role in shaping and reflecting the communities they serve. As Canadian municipalities become more diverse, there is an increasing need to embed equity, diversity, inclusion, and reconciliation (EDIR) both within the organizations and in their policies and service delivery in order to access talent, meet community needs, and drive innovation and entrepreneurship. The context in which municipalities operate differ considerably in terms of the populations, political imperatives and strategic priorities, as well as infrastructure and access to resources.

For example, while the proportion of women is fairly consistent across communities, the proportion of Indigenous Peoples and racialized populations as well as the specific ethnic makeup of the communities vary dramatically. The proportion of persons with disabilities varies depending on the age distribution of the population. Self-identification and inclusion also shape the proportion of persons identifying as 2SLGBTQ+. While larger cities may have whole departments devoted to equity, diversity, inclusion, and reconciliation, smaller communities may not. Levels of knowledge and access to talent and resources also vary considerably with communities at different stages of their diversity journeys.

Recent research from the Diversity Institute also showed significant variations in the extent of representation of different equity deserving groups in leadership roles across sectors and larger cities in Canada. For example, while women are relatively well represented on municipal councils in most cities, Black, racialized, and Indigenous Peoples remain significantly underrepresented in most leadership roles. The degree of representation varies widely across regions, with few instances where the composition of leadership reflects the demographic realities of the communities they serve.

Variability in resources, institutional capacity, and local priorities results in wide-ranging strategies and levels of engagement in EDIR. While some municipalities have established and comprehensive EDIR frameworks, dedicated staff, and measurable objectives, others may just be starting to engage in foundational activities such as conducting assessments to identify equity gaps and focusing on building awareness across departments. Some jurisdictions may be reluctant to adopt new strategies due to perceived financial costs, staffing limitations, or uncertain political environments.

While currently many municipalities have well developed and innovative approaches to addressing EDIR, the information is fragmented and sharing is limited. The municipal EDI community of practice was developed to promote more sharing across municipalities and currently includes 165 municipalities. This project, led by the City of Kingston, in collaboration

with the Diversity Institute and support of the Future Skills Centre, aimed to address these challenges by providing a shared national platform to promote sharing of information, best practices, and experience across municipalities, informed by research. The goals of the initiative were as follows:

- 1. To understand the unique EDIR needs and challenges within different municipalities across the country.
- 2. To enhance accountability and transparency in EDIR implementation while cultivating a shared sense of ownership among municipalities.
- 3. To develop a searchable platform of EDIR resources that addresses internal practices, service delivery and community and business partnerships, that can be adaptable for municipalities with diverse EDIR maturity levels.

Prototype Design and Implementation

To help address this gap, the City of Kingston, with support from the Diversity Institute and funding from the Future Skills Centre, led a project to assess municipalities' needs, develop a curated, and accessible platform that would support municipalities of varying sizes and levels of readiness in advancing their EDIR efforts by providing access to shared, continuously updated resources. The process included:

- 1) **Needs Assessment:** Including the purposes of the platform, its structure and contents and the types of tools and information needed through extensive consultation with the municipal EDI Community of Practice led by the City of Kingston, as well as review of existing resources (for e.g., the Federation of Canadian Municipalities resource library) by the Diversity Institute. This included surveys, focus groups and consultations with key informants (August-September 2024). Consultations confirmed the need for a centralized, practical, and contextually relevant platform that includes curated policy frameworks, case studies, and implementation tools.
- 2) **Prototype Development:** Based on the needs assessment, the structure and functionality of the platform was developed and populated with examples of leading practices as well as curated resources. The content and structure of the platform were guided by the Diversity Institute's Diversity Assessment Tool (DAT), which informed the categorization of over 260 best practices into four core areas: aligning strategy with organizational goals, internal processes, policies and programs, and community engagement. These four categories were further broken down into 14 sub-categories and 77 topics. Resources were gathered through a national literature scan, contributions from community partners, and peer-reviewed municipal submissions. The platform is designed to allow regular updates and includes an FAQ section to support usability. The site's navigation system is built for ease of use, with expandable menus

- and filters by topic, resource type, population size, and municipality type. Bilingual accessibility is also supported, prioritizing original French-language resources when available.
- 3) **Prototype validation:** To validate and refine this structure, the City of Kingston organized seven workshops between August and September 2024, engaging 139 attendees from 62 municipalities. Feedback on the prototype was then collected through surveys, focus groups, and consultations, with modifications made on an ongoing basis until December 30, 2024. A preliminary evaluation was undertaken.
- 4) **Prototype integration:** Based on the feedback, the tool was revised and more feedback was solicited including opportunities to add to the platform. Feedback from a demo event (December 2024) and a follow-up survey (March-April 2025) informed further refinements. The survey, using a combination of Likert scale and open-ended question, was completed by 40 participants representing 32 unique municipalities. The results indicate high levels of satisfaction, with the platform receiving a recommendation score of 8.58 out of 10. A large majority of respondents (92.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that the platform is valuable and comprehensive, and 87.5% found it to be a unique and centralized source of information. Slightly fewer (77.5%) agreed that the resources directly addressed the specific needs of their municipality. Respondents found the language to be clear (4.23), the layout to be navigable (4.08), and the design to be visually appealing (4.18) and 60% of respondents said the platform offered new knowledge. Respondents from smaller municipalities shared that the wide range of best practices offered practical guidance for embedding EDIR into governance structures, especially in communities with fewer internal resources. In turn, larger municipalities noted the value of seeing how smaller municipalities are addressing EDIR despite their limited resources. In terms of implementation potential, nearly half of respondents (47.5%) reported that their municipality is already actively implementing EDIR strategies and policies, while 37.5% are currently developing them. Notably, none of the respondents indicated they would not use the platform, with 87.5% planning to use it either actively (45%) or occasionally (42.5%). Anticipated challenges in using the platform included limited capacity and budgets, especially in smaller municipalities, as well as difficulties securing buy-in from leadership.
- 5) The final tool was launched at an event organized by the City of Kingston at Toronto Metropolitan University on May 15, 2025.

Project Evaluation

The final evaluation report prepared by City of Kingston and the Diversity Institute, documents the process and the feedback received from the 144 individuals representing 66 unique municipalities who were engaged through workshops, surveys, and knowledge-sharing

sessions. It addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the platform, additional features desired, as well as the strategy to update and maintain it. It also suggests other areas where a platform for sharing resources and knowledge could benefit municipalities for example with respect to green transition programs and skills development.

The project is structured around a set of defined outcomes, each with associated key performance indicators (KPIs) to guide implementation and assess progress.

| Outcome | KPI | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Outcome 1: Comprehensive EDIR | Active engagement by more than 10 municipalities in the development of the toolkit. | | | | |
| Platform Developed | Outreach to at least 50 municipalities to get input | | | | |
| Outcome 2: Enhanced Municipal EDIR Capacity | Training provided to at least 50 municipalities on how to use the new online platform. | | | | |
| | At least 50 municipalities access the platform. | | | | |
| | At least 70% of municipalities accessing the platform indicate that they found tools that were useful or very useful. | | | | |
| Outcome 3: Establishment of a National EDIR Community of Practice | At least 20-30 municipal leaders and staff join the community of practice in the first six months. | | | | |
| Outcome 4: Sustainable EDIR Initiatives | FCM or a comparable organization agrees to host the initiative | | | | |
| EDIK HIRIGUVCS | 6 months after the project, 50% of municipalities engaged with the toolkit report changes to practices. | | | | |

To date, our progress exceeds established targets. A few key highlights include outreach to 177 municipalities for input and active engagement from 66 unique municipalities in the development of the toolkit; training materials shared with 144 municipal representatives; 62 attendees at our training events; 771 active users since January 2025; and 165 municipalities engaged through the Community of Practice.

Conclusion and Next Steps

While barriers for implementation remain, the workshop feedback and survey findings suggest that the platform is a valuable resource to support municipalities' EDIR efforts across strategy,

internal processes, policy and programming, and community engagement. Ongoing dissemination and engagement are key to the tool's continued success. Although participation to date has been strong, it has been concentrated in Ontario. Increasing uptake across other provinces and territories will help ensure the platform reflects Canada's regional diversity.

Context

Municipal governments are major employers and play a critical role in reflecting and shaping the communities they serve. Yet there has been limited research on their approaches to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Reconciliation (EDIR), internally or externally, and even less on the levers they use to shape practices in their communities. Rural and remote municipalities face distinct issues shaped by geography, population size, and resources.

There is considerable evidence to suggest that the contexts in which EDIR initiatives operate vary dramatically depending on the region and size of the community as well as its socio-economic and cultural context.^{2,3} For example, the challenges facing large centres like Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver are much different than the challenges in smaller cities like Markham, Niagara Falls, Halifax, or Kingston. In turn, rural and remote municipalities face distinct issues shaped by geography, population size, and resources. The challenges around EDIR also vary significantly based on the demographics of a community, such as the proportion of youth and seniors, racialized, immigrant and Black residents, Indigenous Peoples, persons with disabilities, and those identifying as 2SLGBTQI+.

The social and economic fabric of the community also varies dramatically, with some dominated by public sector employers or large corporations and others by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). For example, small and rural municipalities may face specific challenges such as young people leaving and taking talent with them,^{4,5} gaps in services and infrastructure,⁶ and new people moving in—either newcomers from other regions or from outside Canada—who are not yet connected to the social fabric of the community.⁷ In addition, small populations can mean little diversity, so community members are not used to interacting across differences, and it might mean that there are not a lot of services to support people who experience exclusion and discrimination. Funding for municipal projects may be stretched, and staff resources may be limited.⁸

Given these differences, it is important to consider the variation across municipalities and meet them where they are at. Further, it is not surprising that the tools and approaches employed by municipalities are wide-ranging. An EDIR lens is critical at the municipal level, since local governments are responsible for policies and programs that can profoundly affect the daily lives of residents. More inclusive municipalities stand to gain as a collective and may enjoy potential economic and social benefits, as well as improved trust, loyalty and respect. 10

However, systemic and persistent forms of discrimination still exist in communities, leading to inequities in resources, access, and power. Municipalities are responsible for the quality of life of their residents, including addressing social inequities to ensure the inclusion of all residents is cost-effective at a time of shrinking city budgets. 12

Municipalities face challenges in the work of enhancing EDIR. These include limited financial resources, competing demands on staff time, uncertainty over the best approach to EDIR work, disbelief that inequities exist, lack of political will and limited knowledge of the value of using an intersectional lens, which is crucial to help understand how different people experience policies and programs.¹³

Representation in Municipal Leadership

Several research studies have examined aspects of representation in municipal governments including elected officials. In 2016, the largest share of legislators in Canada worked in local, municipal or regional governments (46%),¹⁴ and women accounted for 31.7% of elected officials.¹⁵ Recent research has analyzed the representation of women, Black and racialized people, and Indigenous Peoples in 10 large regions in Canada, considering representation in municipal councils, municipal administration and agencies, boards, and commissions (ABCs). In 2021, across cities in Canada, women make up a relatively consistent proportion of the population, about 51%.¹⁶ However, the proportion of racialized and Indigenous Peoples vary considerably. Populations of racialized people, excluding Black people, range from 11.3% in Halifax to 52.2% in Vancouver.^{17,18} Populations of Black people range from 1.6% in Vancouver to 7.9% in Montreal.^{19,20} Similarly, populations of Indigenous Peoples range from 0.7% in Toronto to 12.5% in Winnipeg.²¹

Taking this into consideration, researchers should expect to see variations in levels of representation of racialized peoples and Indigenous Peoples on boards and senior management teams across the analyzed cities. While the level of representation of racialized peoples and Indigenous Peoples on boards of directors, senior management, and municipal councilors is often considerably lower than the city population in each of the cities, some exceptions have been found and are marked with an asterisk in the tables below.

Table 1. Representation on municipal councillors across 10 Canadian cities

| | Women | | | Racialized People (excluding Black People) | | | Black People | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------|-------|-----|--|------|-----|-----------------|-------|-----|-------|
| City | % of Population | % | No. | % of Population | % | No. | % of Population | % | No. | No. |
| Edmonton | 50.2 | 61.5* | 8 | 26.9 | 23.1 | 3 | 5.7 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Halifax | 51 | 47.1 | 8 | 11.3 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 | 11.8* | 2 | 17 |
| Hamilton | 51.2 | 43.8 | 7 | 18.9 | 12.5 | 2 | 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| London | 51.1 | 26.7 | 4 | 19.6 | 6.7 | 1 | 3.5 | 6.7* | 1 | 15 |
| Montreal | 51 | 34.3 | 37 | 18.7 | 1.9 | 2 | 7.9 | 2.8 | 3 | 108 |
| Ottawa | 51.1 | 33.3 | 8 | 21.5 | 8.3 | 2 | 7.6 | 4.2 | 1 | 24 |
| Vancouver | 51 | 45 | 49 | 52.2 | 10.1 | 11 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 1 | 109 |

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that representation for the group meets or exceeds that group's proportion of the municipality's overall population. **Source:** Internal calculations based on data from Diverse Representation in Leadership: A Review of 10 Canadian Cities (2024).

Role in governance

While municipalities are governed by elected officials, they make appointments to a range of agencies, boards, and commissions (ABCs) that oversee everything from policing to libraries. Again, there are significant variations in the levels of representation across regions.

Table 2. Representation on boards of directors of municipal ABCs

| | Women | | | Racialized People (excluding Black People) | | eople) | Black Peop | Total | | |
|----------|-----------------|-------|-----|---|------|--------|------------------------|-------|-----|-----|
| City | % of Population | % | No. | % of Population | % | No. | % of Populatio n | % | No. | No. |
| Calgary | 50 | 38.3 | 171 | 33.2 | 15.7 | 70 | 5.1 | 2.5 | 11 | 447 |
| Edmonton | 50.2 | 37.7 | 61 | 26.9 | 15.4 | 25 | 5.7 | 4.9 | 8 | 162 |
| Halifax | 51 | 34.6 | 100 | 11.3 | 2.8 | 8 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 9 | 289 |
| Hamilton | 51.2 | 40.5 | 68 | 18.9 | 8.9 | 15 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 5 | 168 |
| London | 51.1 | 38.1 | 32 | 19.6 | 4.8 | 4 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0 | 84 |
| Montreal | 51 | 53.2* | 66 | 18.7 | 4.8 | 6 | 7.9 | 11.3* | 14 | 124 |

| | Women | | Racialized People (excluding Black People) | | | Black People | | | Total | |
|-----------|-------|------|---|------|------|--------------|-----|------|-------|------|
| Ottawa | 51.1 | 22.4 | 11 | 21.5 | 2 | 1 | 7.6 | 2 | 1 | 49 |
| Toronto | 51.1 | 45.0 | 50 | 48.6 | 20.7 | 23 | 7.9 | 9.0* | 10 | 111 |
| Vancouver | 51.0 | 42.3 | 190 | 52.2 | 15.8 | 71 | 1.6 | 3.8 | 17 | 449 |
| Winnipeg | 50.6 | 39.0 | 60 | 26.0 | 7.1 | 11 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 4 | 154 |
| Total | - | 39.7 | 809 | - | 11.5 | 234 | - | 3.9 | 79 | 2037 |

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that representation for the group meets or exceeds that group's proportion of the municipality's overall population. **Source:** Internal calculations based on data from Diverse Representation in Leadership: A Review of 10 Canadian Cities (2024).

Role in private sector

Municipalities also play a significant role in their community's economic development, using a range of levers, including policy, regulation, procurement and culture building. Again, the data available focuses only on large corporations and shows significant variations across communities.

Table 3. Representation on corporate boards

| | Women | | Racialized People (excluding Black People) | | | Black People | | | Total | |
|-----------|-----------------|------|---|-----------------|------|--------------|-----------------|-----|-------|------|
| City | % of Population | % | No. | % of Population | % | No. | % of Population | % | No. | No. |
| Calgary | 50 | 31.5 | 131 | 33.2 | 4.8 | 20 | 5.1 | 3.4 | 14 | 416 |
| Edmonton | 50.2 | 40.2 | 33 | 26.9 | 4.9 | 4 | 5.7 | 1.2 | 1 | 82 |
| Montreal | 51 | 34.9 | 160 | 18.7 | 3.7 | 17 | 7.9 | 1.7 | 8 | 459 |
| Toronto | 51.1 | 33.1 | 259 | 48.6 | 11.8 | 92 | 7.9 | 4 | 31 | 782 |
| Vancouver | 51 | 39.7 | 104 | 52.2 | 8.4 | 22 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 4 | 262 |
| Winnipeg | 50.6 | 34.4 | 42 | 26 | 5.7 | 7 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 1 | 122 |
| Total | - | 34.3 | 729 | - | 7.6 | 162 | - | 2.8 | 59 | 2123 |

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that representation for the group meets or exceeds that group's proportion of the municipality's overall population. **Source:** Internal calculations based on data from Diverse Representation in Leadership: A Review of 10 Canadian Cities (2024).

Role in non-profits

Municipalities engage with non-profits in a variety of ways; they often co-fund or provide support through grants and other instruments.

Table 4. Representation among voluntary sectors

| | Women | Women | | Racialized People (excluding Black People) | | | Black People | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------|-------|-----|---|------|-----|-----------------|------|-----|-------|
| City | % of Population | % | No. | % of Population | % | No. | % of Population | % | No. | No. |
| Calgary | 50 | 44.3 | 94 | 33.2 | 12.7 | 27 | 5.1 | 0.9 | 2 | 212 |
| Edmonton | 50.2 | 46.7 | 115 | 26.9 | 8.9 | 22 | 5.7 | 2.8 | 7 | 246 |
| Halifax | 51 | 50.9 | 55 | 11.3 | 0.9 | 1 | 4.5 | 5.6* | 6 | 108 |
| Hamilton | 51.2 | 44.2 | 53 | 18.9 | 7.5 | 9 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 5 | 120 |
| London | 51.1 | 43.8 | 39 | 19.6 | 9 | 8 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3 | 89 |
| Montreal | 51 | 39.2 | 104 | 18.7 | 9.1 | 24 | 7.9 | 8.3* | 22 | 265 |
| Ottawa | 51.1 | 51 | 155 | 21.5 | 12.2 | 37 | 7.6 | 5.3 | 16 | 304 |
| Toronto | 51.1 | 42 | 102 | 48.6 | 14.4 | 35 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 19 | 243 |
| Vancouver | 51 | 46.6 | 109 | 52.2 | 22.2 | 52 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 1 | 234 |
| Winnipeg | 50.6 | 44.4 | 108 | 26.0 | 8.6 | 21 | 4.9 | 1.7 | 4 | 243 |
| Total | - | 45.3 | 934 | - | 11.4 | 236 | - | 4.1 | 85 | 2064 |

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that representation for the group meets or exceeds that group's proportion of the municipality's overall population. **Source:** Internal calculations based on data from Diverse Representation in Leadership: A Review of 10 Canadian Cities (2024).

The data shows significant variations in the demographics in each region, as well as the representation across various sectors. For example, there is a strong representation of women on municipal councils in Edmonton (Table 1). The representation of Black people on municipal councils also exceeds that of the city's population in several cities, including Halifax, London, and Winnipeg; however, racialized people are under-represented compared to the respective city's population across all selected cities and there are no Indigenous Peoples represented. Similarly, the data on the representation on municipal agencies, boards, and commissions

(ABCs) shows that the selected equity-deserving groups are overwhelmingly underrepresented, with the exception of Black people in Montreal and Vancouver, and Indigenous Peoples in Edmonton (Table 2).

Regarding the data on representation on corporate boards, all equity-deserving groups were under-represented in comparison to their representation in the Canadian population. For example, women accounted for 50.7% of the Canadian population, yet hold 34.3% of board of directors in the corporate sector.²² Representation on corporate boards in the voluntary sector is slightly improved, particularly for women and Black individuals. From 2020 to 2023, the percentage of women on voluntary boards increased by 2.2 percentage points (43.1% to 45.3%) and by 9 percentage points on corporate boards (25.3% to 34.3%).²³

Municipal Approaches to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Reconciliation

Drawing on decades of work with municipalities, the Diversity Institute has found that local governments are at different levels of maturity with respect to EDIR practices. Some are at the initial stages of developing strategies. Others have strategies that they are updating to address issues such as anti-Black racism, Truth and Reconciliation or trans inclusion. Others have implemented strategies that are producing results. Some municipalities are still focused on internal human resources practices while others are applying an EDIR lens to service delivery and to their engagement with the broader community.

Municipalities have access to various tools and supports to help advance EDIR but these are often fragmented, outdated, or not well suited to the specific and evolving needs of local governments. For instance, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities offers tools, information, and training to support municipalities in their EDIR efforts, but there is still room to expand on these foundations by developing more comprehensive and regularly updated resources that address the shifting priorities and challenges faced by local governments.²⁴ The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has an international coalition along with global examples of best practices.²⁵ While almost a decade old, Ottawa's guide to inclusion remains relevant.²⁶ There is considerable information on the strategies that individual municipalities have implemented which are quite divergent in their approaches and priorities, which the Diversity Institute has collected to inform part of the development of the Diversity Assessment Tool.²⁷

Given that the needs of municipalities vary widely based on factors such as demographic composition, geographic location, population size, and available resources, there is no one-size-fits all approach to advancing EDIR at the local level. In response, this project aims to develop a shared, adaptable platform that curates relevant tools, strategies, and best practices to support municipalities at different stages of their EDIR journeys. By consolidating resources and tailoring guidance to reflect the distinct contexts of different jurisdictions, the platform is intended to help municipalities access the supports most relevant to their goals and realities.

Design of a Shared National Municipal EDIR Platform

Project Overview

The City of Kingston, working with the Diversity Institute, with support from the Future Skills Centre, undertook a national initiative to develop a shared user-friendly, and curated platform aimed at assisting municipalities across different sizes and stages of EDIR engagement. The goals of the initiative were as follows:

- 1. To understand the unique EDIR needs and challenges within different municipalities across the country.
- 2. To enhance accountability and transparency in EDIR implementation while cultivating a shared sense of ownership among municipalities.
- 3. To develop a coherent and customizable platform that municipalities can utilize to effectively navigate EDIR challenges, fostering an ecosystem where EDIR principles thrive within local governance systems.

The project is structured around a set of clearly defined outcomes, each with associated key performance indicators (KPIs) to guide implementation and assess progress.

Table 5. Project outcomes and KPIs

| Outcome | КРІ | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Outcome 1: Comprehensive EDIR | Active engagement by more than 10 municipalities in the development of the toolkit. | | | | |
| Platform Developed | Outreach to at least 50 municipalities to get input | | | | |
| Outcome 2: Enhanced Municipal EDIR Capacity | Training provided to at least 50 municipalities on how to use the new online platform. | | | | |
| | At least 50 municipalities access the platform. | | | | |
| | At least 70% of municipalities accessing the platform indicate that they found tools that were useful or very useful. | | | | |
| Outcome 3: Establishment of a National EDIR | At least 20-30 municipal leaders and staff join the community of practice in the first six months. | | | | |

| Outcome | KPI |
|---|---|
| Community of Practice | |
| Outcome 4: Sustainable EDIR Initiatives | FCM or a comparable organization agrees to host the initiative |
| EDIK IIItiatives | 6 months after the project, 50% of municipalities engaged with the toolkit report changes to practices. |

Prototype Design and Implementation

The purpose of the platform is to provide municipalities with a standardized, customizable set of EDIR tools and strategies. While it addresses municipalities' immediate needs for EDIR integration, the platform also lays the groundwork for long-term, sustainable change by making municipalities more resilient and responsive to the needs of diverse communities. Figure 1 illustrates the design process of the platform across three phases. Each row represents a category of activity (e.g., desk review, iteration processes, and feedback and continuous improvement), as indicated by the grey boxes on the left. Within each row, specific activities or resources are placed under the phase(s) in which they occurred or influenced. For example, activities from the initial desk review are shown extending into the prototype development and validation phase, highlighting how they informed subsequent stages of the process.

Prototype Development Needs Assessment Prototype Integration and Validation The Diversity Assessment Tool (DAT) 260+ municipal best practices Desk Review DI Best Practices Playbook Introductory workshops (August 2024) Follow-up workshops (September 2024) 4 sub-categories, 77 distinct partners, academic institutions & community-based Iteration Navigation bar with expandable Processes menus & FAQ section Platform demo workshop (December 2024) Follow-up survey (March-April 2025) Feedback National knowledge-sharing symposium (May 2025) Continuous Improveme Strategic outreach and partnerships

Figure 1. EDIR platform development phases

Needs Assessment

Desk review

The desk review included two core resources: the Diversity Assessment Tool (DAT App) and the DI best practices playbook. The DAT App is a free, evidence-based self-assessment tool that

supports organizations in evaluating their EDI performance across six dimensions: governance and leadership, human resources, organizational culture, measurement and tracking, diversity across the value chain, and outreach.²⁸ Drawing from over two decades of research, it enables organizations to identify gaps, benchmark their performance, and access tailored recommendations to advance EDI. Complementing the DAT App, the DI Best Practices Playbook helps organizations move from assessment to implementation by offering step-by-step guidance, real-world examples, and adaptable tools.²⁹

To ensure that the platform was tailored to the realities and priorities of municipal governments, a review of publicly available materials from municipalities across Canada was conducted. This review was used to identify existing tools and gaps, and to help shape the preliminary structure and filtering mechanisms of the platform. Based on the review, four categories were chosen to reflect the core needs of municipalities, each embedding EDIR principles:

- Aligning Strategy with Organizational Goals: goal setting, implementing initiatives, measuring progress, and training.
- **Internal Processes:** governance and leadership, human resources, and organizational culture.
- Policies and Programs: program design and evaluation, inclusive procurement, and applying EDIR strategies across key functional areas.
- Community Engagement: designing and evaluating community engagement processes.

The desk review took into consideration the numerous roles municipalities fulfill within their communities. As employers, municipalities play a critical role in reflecting and shaping the communities they serve. In their capacity as policy makers and purchasers of goods and services, they shape policy, regulation, and procurement that directly impacts their communities and economic development. As service providers, municipalities deliver essential public services to their residents. Finally, municipalities act as partners in collaboration with other entities to achieve shared goals.

In addition to the comprehensive review of materials, the community of practice shared examples from select municipalities. However, many of these examples centred on tools developed for broader public sector program design and were less focused on tools that address the full range of functional areas within municipalities. This reinforced the findings of the desk review and highlighted the importance of developing a flexible suite of tools that can be adapted to a range of municipal contexts, including those with limited capacity or infrastructure. Rather than relying on a single, standardized approach, municipalities require customizable resources that reflect their diverse functions, priorities, and available resources.

Consultations to define municipal needs

The desk review informed the early design of the municipal EDIR shared platform and laid the groundwork for a collaborative feedback process through consultations with municipalities. Introductory workshops, launched in August 2024, were designed to foster buy-in and a sense of shared ownership over the platform. These sessions also provided a platform for municipalities to speak about their current EDIR initiatives, highlight areas where additional support was needed, and contribute input during the development phase. A range of engagement methods were used to gather feedback, including surveys, live polls, and open discussion sessions. Follow-up workshops in September 2024 enabled more targeted conversations around municipalities' specific needs, challenges, and goals related to EDIR implementation. The insights gathered played a critical role in refining the platform to ensure it responds to the diverse contexts, priorities, and capacities of municipalities across Canada.

Table 6. Workshop participation and feedback methods

| Month | Number of Webinars | Number of attendees | Feedback methods |
|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| August 2024 | 3 | 98 | Post-workshop survey (n=8) Q&A session |
| September 2024 | 4 | 41 | Pre-workshop survey (n=12) Post-workshop survey (n=7) Q&A session Polls (n=37) (# varies per question) |

A total of 62 municipalities engaged in consultations throughout the seven workshops hosted in August and September 2024. The majority (72.6, n=45) of municipalities are located in Ontario, followed by Quebec (9.7%, n=6) and Alberta (8.1%, n=5). Participation from British Columbia and Nova Scotia was lower (each at 3.2%, n=2). New Brunswick and Manitoba had the lowest representation, each making up 1.6% (n=1) of the municipalities consulted. Participating municipalities included major urban centres like Toronto, Vancouver, and Calgary, as well as smaller rural communities, such as the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville and Strathcona County.

Insights from initial consultations

This section summarizes the findings from the initial consultations, structured around four areas 1) needs expressed, 2) challenges faced, 3) motivations for participating, and 4) feedback on the proposed platform structure.

Need for Centralized, Practical, and Contextually Relevant Resources

Municipalities expressed interest in a centralized, shareable platform to consolidate EDIR resources within the municipal context. They emphasized the need for a comprehensive

repository that includes best practices, policy frameworks, reports, research papers, case studies, infographics, webinars, and practical tools such as templates, checklists, and training materials. However, municipalities noted that a high quantity of resources should not be the primary output, and stressed the importance of prioritizing resources that are accessible, contextually relevant, and applicable across various departments.

Given the dispersed nature of EDIR resources across multiple frameworks, municipalities expressed a need for more guidance to navigate the gaps between them. They noted insufficient integration of anti-oppression and anti-racism principles, alongside a lack of reconciliation-focused resources, particularly tools that offer guidance on language when referring to Indigenous communities and raised about the use of colonial terminology in particular, such as referring to them as "stakeholders." Municipalities also reported a need for more support in applying EDIR principles into their hiring and recruitment processes. They further emphasized the importance of long-term strategies to sustain EDIR efforts, including ongoing access to training and examples of effective initiatives being implemented by other municipalities.

EDIR Challenges Faced by Municipalities

Initial consultations with municipalities identified several ongoing challenges related to EDIR. A major concern is the lack of municipal and organizational data, which limits the ability to assess gaps and monitor progress. Limited resources and funding, inconsistent buy-in across departments, and lack of prioritization of EDIR efforts were also identified as key barriers to implementing and sustaining EDIR efforts. Municipalities also highlighted challenges in achieving diverse representation within their leadership and workforce. Findings from the preworkshop survey identified the following EDIR areas where municipalities require the most support: measurement and tracking of EDIR (66.7%); human resources (33.3%); garnering support for implementing EDIR strategies (33.3%); governance, leadership and strategy (25%); organizational values and cultures (25%); and outreach and engagement (25%).

Motivations for Participating in Workshops

Municipalities expressed interest in participating in workshops to exchange ideas, access curated EDIR materials, and evaluate their relevance and usability. All participating municipalities expressed interest in assessing the usability of the EDIR resources and sharing feedback to incorporate the diverse needs of users. Most also wanted to learn how to access the resources and contribute feedback (87.5%), while half (50%) expressed interest in sharing examples of EDIR resources currently used within their own municipalities.

Feedback on the Proposed Platform Structure

To ensure that workshop discussions were informed, focused, and constructive, participants were presented with the concept and proposed structure of the EDIR Best Practices Platform, developed based on insights from the desk review. Participants found the four main categories identified during the desk review (Aligning Strategy with Organizational Goals, Internal Processes, Policies and Programs, and Community Engagement) to be relevant and useful.

Municipalities emphasized the importance of keeping the platform up-to-date, and suggested incorporating features such as regular calls for submissions of resources, mechanisms for continuous feedback, and a designated individual or organization responsible for overseeing updates. They also recommended implementing bi-annual or quarterly updates and making it easy to upload resources. Municipalities also proposed adding a section for case studies that document both successful and unsuccessful EDIR practices to support learning and reflection. Municipalities unanimously supported the inclusion of a Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) section and emphasized the importance of ensuring it is clearly structured and easy to navigate.

Access management emerged as a key consideration. The majority (69%) of participants favoured a "members only" model, while 31% supported open access. A hybrid model was also discussed, where some sections of the platform would be restricted to members and others open to the public. Concerns were raised about accountability and the potential for misuse in a fully public system. As such, some participants suggested limiting initial access to municipalities, while others emphasized the benefits of extending access to non-governmental and community organizations to foster transparency and broader engagement.

Prototype Development and Validation

Based on the needs assessment, a website was developed as a centralized, curated repository to support municipalities in advancing their EDIR efforts. Designed as a one-stop resource hub, the site offers a range of materials, including tools, case studies, and policy documents, practical strategies for implementation. These strategies provide guidance on areas such as designing effective training programs, engaging internal and external stakeholders, and building sustained support from elected officials and community members.

The platform was developed to be intuitive and easy to navigate. A navigation bar allows users to quickly access best practices by dimension and relevant subsection, with expandable and collapsible menus to enhance usability. The site is updated regularly to ensure municipalities have access to current resources. An FAQ section is also included to address common questions and improve the user experience.

Platform content

Research and consultations identified a clear need for accessible, comprehensive resources to support EDIR adoption across municipalities with varying levels of readiness, capacity, and resources. In response, the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform was developed to provide municipalities with practical support for internal practices, service delivery, and community and business partnerships, ensuring that resources account for different EDIR maturity levels.

The structure of the platform was informed by the Diversity Assessment Tool, a proven diagnostic framework used to identify EDIR strengths and gaps. This tool guided the organization of the platform into dimensions aligned with core municipal functions. What

began as four primary dimensions (Aligning Strategy with Organizational Goals, Internal Processes, Policy and Programs, and Community Engagement) was refined and expanded to include 14 sub-categories and 77 distinct topics under 110 individual pages. Table 7 provides the four main municipal categories along with their 14 corresponding sub-categories. For a complete list of the 77 distinct topics covered within the platform, see the Appendix A.

Table 7. Organizing structure of Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform (Category and Sub-Category)

| Municipal Category | Sub-Category | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Aligning Strategy with Organizational Goals | Context and goal setting for EDIR strategies | | |
| | Implementation | | |
| | Measurement and KPIs | | |
| | Training materials | | |
| | Legislation | | |
| Internal Processes | Governance and Leadership | | |
| | Human Resource Practices | | |
| | Values and Culture | | |
| Policy & Programs | Design, implementation, evaluation | | |
| | Procurement | | |
| | Functional areas | | |
| | Specialized activities | | |
| Community Engagement | Examples of interested and affected parties | | |
| | Authentic Engagement Approaches | | |

More than 260 municipal best practices were compiled through a comprehensive literature review, direct submissions from municipalities participating in the community of practice, and an online scan of publicly available resources from municipalities across Canada. Contributions also came through municipal partners and third-party organizations that advise municipalities, including academic institutions and community-based organizations. In curating these practices, care was taken to ensure representation across various municipal types (e.g., single-tier, upper-tier/regional, lower-tier), population sizes, and provinces or territories.

The technical implementation of the EDIR platform was designed to ensure the integrity of existing content and efficient integration of new resources and best practices over time. A standardized spreadsheet is used for data entry, which is linked to a web application that automatically updates the platform as new entries are added. Each best practice submission must include key details such as author name and type, resource title and description, link, municipal category, sub-category, and topic, province or territory, municipal type and population size, and language (English and/or French). Once submitted, each entry undergoes a peer review process, during which a designated reviewer assesses its accuracy, relevance, and alignment with platform standards. Approved entries are then published to the live platform.

Over 100 questions from the Diversity Assessment Tool informed the selection and organization of best practices on the platform. Examples include:

- Does the municipality have a strategy, including skills and competencies, to identify and recruit a diverse senior management team, including women and/or non-binary people, Indigenous Peoples, persons with disabilities, racialized people, and those identifying as 2SLGBTQI+?
- Are there representational targets (e.g., gender, race, Indigenous Peoples, people with disabilities, 2SLGBTQI+) set to ensure senior leadership is reflective of the community?³⁰
- Are EDI objectives, including goals, key actions, key performance indicators (KPIs) and benchmarks, embedded in the municipality's strategic plan(s)?³¹
- Are EDI initiatives incorporated into budgeting and forecasting, as well as risk management and quality assurance processes?³²
- Does the municipality collect disaggregated data to inform program and policy design, implementation and evaluation?
- Does customer/client service, and related municipal positions, receive training to respond to diverse customer/client needs (e.g., persons with disabilities)?
- When implementing a policy, does the municipality ensure that feedback has been collected from diverse equity-deserving groups throughout the implementation stage of the policy?
- Do the municipality's communications materials express its commitment to diversity and inclusion to key stakeholders (e.g., suppliers, clients, partners, educational institutions)?

User interface

This section outlines the key design principles behind the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform, including its navigational structure, accessibility features, and bilingual functionality.

Design Principles

The user interface of the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform was designed with an emphasis on intuitiveness, user-friendliness, and accessibility. The website features clickable navigation that guides users seamlessly through the content, allowing them to explore resources without requiring prior knowledge of specific search terms or EDIR-related terminology. Accessibility standards were integrated throughout the design process to ensure compliance with web accessibility guidelines, including appropriate colour contrast, alt text, and accessible interface components.

Website Structure and Navigation

The website was organized in a way that allows for intuitive navigation. The landing page introduces the purpose of the platform, highlights the importance of EDIR in municipal contexts using supporting evidence, and provides a visual overview of the platform's structure. An easily accessible FAQ section is located at the bottom of the page. A navigation menu allows users to move between pages, with expandable toggles that make it easy to drill down from category to sub-category and topic levels. Each category page provides links to its associated sub-categories and topics. On sub-category and topic pages, best practices are listed with the author name and resource title. Clicking on an entry expands the listing to reveal a description that explains why the resource is considered a best practice, along with a "Learn More" link that opens the original resource in a new tab.

Bilingual Accessibility

On the French version of the site, best practices originally developed in French are prioritized and displayed above English-language resources where available. Efforts are ongoing to expand the number of best practices available in French. Rather than translating English materials, the focus is on curating documents that were developed in French to ensure cultural and contextual relevance.

Prototype Integration

This section outlines the iterative process used to refine the sharing platform, drawing on feedback from municipalities and other stakeholders during the demo and survey phases of the platform rollout. The feedback includes insights on content relevance, user experience, and implementation feasibility, highlighting areas where the platform is performing well and where there are opportunities for improvement.

Feedback from demo presentation

The Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform was showcased in December 2024 to 38 attendees, comprising 18 municipalities as well as representatives from universities and network organizations, for another round of feedback. The demo workshop provided valuable feedback from municipal participants regarding the usability, relevance, and future potential of the

platform. Participants overwhelmingly found the resource to be comprehensive, with many indicating plans to use it actively or occasionally, depending on need. There was recognition that the tool could support municipalities in both updating existing EDIR strategies and developing new ones. The platform was valued for making complex work more accessible and was seen as a helpful tool for municipalities to build on existing resources rather than creating new ones from scratch. Key suggestions for refining the platform further included:

- Training materials: Several attendees emphasized the need for more access to training materials. Suggestions included curating a list of EDIR-related courses from postsecondary institutions and other credible and trusted organizations. Participants' suggestions included curating a list of EDIR-related courses from post-secondary institutions and other credible and trusted organizations.
- Measuring and evaluating EDIR impact: Participants highlighted the need for resources
 that go beyond output tracking and focus on program impact. They expressed interest in
 filters or flags to identify resources that include metrics, KPIs, or other evaluation tools.
- Resource types: When asked what kinds of resources they'd like to see more of, participants strongly favoured tools such as templates, guidelines, and policy documents.

Survey results

The platform was further refined based on feedback from the demo. Between March and April 2025, a follow-up survey was distributed to 144 municipal representatives, yielding 40 responses from 32 unique municipalities. The survey was designed to assess the platform's content relevance; user experience, navigation, and functionality; and potential for implementation within municipal contexts. The survey used a combination of Likert scale questions (ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree") and open-ended responses to capture insights (see Appendix B for questionnaire).

Content

Survey results indicate that the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform had widespread appeal, with the likelihood of recommending the platform to others receiving a mean score of 8.58 out of 10. A clear majority (92.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that the platform is valuable and comprehensive. Similarly, 87.5% agreed or strongly agreed that the platform offers a unique, centralized source of information. While slightly lower, 77.5% agreed or strongly agreed that the resources are relevant to the specific needs and challenges of their municipality.

Respondents were asked to review each section of the platform and rate how relevant the resources were in supporting their municipality's EDIR efforts. All sections received favourable ratings, with mean scores ranging from 3.79 to 4.10, indicating general agreement on their relevance. A follow-up open-ended question was asked about whether the platform covers the functional areas important to respondents' municipalities. Most respondents indicated that the platform does address these core areas; however, some noted that greater diversity in

examples would enhance its usefulness, particularly from smaller or rural municipalities. Suggested additions for resources included climate and environmental planning, emergency services (e.g., fire and police), recreation, culture, and health.

Table 8. Perceived relevance by platform section (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree)

| Section | Mean Score |
|---|------------|
| Aligning Strategy with Organizational Goals | |
| Context and goal setting for EDIR strategies | 4.10 |
| Implementation | 3.98 |
| Measurement and KPIs | 3.90 |
| Training materials | 3.95 |
| Internal Processes | |
| Governance and leadership | 3.95 |
| Human Resource practices | 3.90 |
| Organizational values and culture | 3.98 |
| Policy and Programs | |
| Program design, implementation and evaluation | 4.05 |
| Procurement | 3.79 |
| Functional areas (e.g., planning, transportation, economic development, social programs, digital accessibility, etc. | 3.88 |
| Specialized activities (e.g., emergency management and resilience strategies, partnerships, programs and initiatives, and social and inclusive procurement practices) | 3.95 |
| Community Engagement | |
| Examples of interested and affected parties | 3.93 |

| Section | Mean Score |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| Authentic engagement approaches | 4.05 |

When asked whether the platform provided new insights or practices that were previously unknown, 60% of respondents (n=24) answered yes, while 37.5% (n=15) were unsure and only one respondent (2.5%) answered no. Among those who indicated that they had learned something new, several emphasized the value of the platform's broad and diverse content. Smaller municipalities indicated that the wide range of best practices and resources was helpful in guiding efforts to adopt and embed EDIR into their governance structures, while larger municipalities noted that learning from the approaches of smaller or rural communities offered valuable insight into how EDIR strategies are adapted to different demographic and geographic contexts. Specific areas of learning included authentic engagement approaches, language revitalization and cultural preservation, and the use of key performance indicators (KPIs) in tracking progress. A few respondents noted that while the platform offered a large volume of material, its comprehensiveness could be challenging to navigate.

User Experience, Navigation, and Functionality

Respondents were asked to rate their overall experience with the platform, including aspects related to usability, design, and navigation. As shown in Table 9, responses were consistently positive, with all mean scores falling between 4.08 and 4.23 on a 5-point scale.

Table 9. Means scores for user experience (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree)

| Statement | Mean Score |
|---|------------|
| The language used in the platform was easy to understand. | 4.23 |
| The layout of the platform is easy to navigate. | 4.08 |
| Navigating the website by clicking through the sections is intuitive and user-friendly. | 4.10 |
| The design of the website (e.g., colour scheme, font, font size) is visually appealing. | 4.18 |
| Overall, it is easy to find the resources I need on the platform. | 4.08 |

Implementation

Survey responses indicate a high level of engagement with EDIR initiatives across municipalities. Nearly half of respondents (47.5%, n=19) reported that their municipality is actively implementing EDIR strategies and policies. Another 37.5% (n=15) stated they are developing

EDIR strategies but have not yet fully implemented them. A smaller group (12.5%, n=5) is exploring EDIR but has not taken formal steps.

A combined 87.5% of respondents indicated they plan to use the platform, with 45% (n=18) planning to use it actively, and 42.5% (n=17) planning to use it occasionally, depending on the need. A small number (10%, n=4) were unsure or did not have a plan yet. Notably, no respondents indicated they do not intend to use the platform. Table 10 presents mean scores that reflect respondents' views on the platform's practicality and adaptability for municipal use. The results suggest that, overall, users see the platform as a useful tool, particularly in terms of saving time and improving productivity, which received the highest rating (4.21 out of 5).

Table 10. Mean scores for platform practicality and adaptability (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree)

| Statement | Mean Score |
|--|------------|
| The resources can be customized to fit the needs of my municipality. | 3.85 |
| The resources can be used to address complex issues. | 3.90 |
| The platform can save time and improve productivity. | 4.21 |
| Sufficient resources are available to support learning. | 3.95 |

Respondents identified several anticipated challenges in applying best practices from the platform. The most common barriers cited were budget limitations and capacity constraints, particularly among smaller and rural municipalities. Several participants expressed concern about securing buy-in from council, senior leadership, or staff, especially in municipalities facing resistance to EDIR or operating in anti-EDIR environments. Others highlighted the need to ensure regional relevance, including examples from Quebec, and to account for unique local contexts.

Project Evaluation

Outcomes & KPIs

This section briefly outlines our progress to date against four defined outcomes. Table 11 presents a summary of the outcomes, associated metrics, and current status of progress So far, all key outcomes and performance measures have been exceeded, apart from Outcome 4, which has yet to be assessed as it is not applicable at this stage.

Table 11. Status of defined outcomes and KPIs

| Outcome | КРІ | Status |
|--|---|---|
| Outcome 1: Comprehensive EDIR Platform | Active engagement by more than 10 municipalities in the development of the toolkit. | Exceeded. 66 unique municipalities. |
| Developed | Outreach to at least 50 municipalities to get input | Exceeded. 177 municipalities targeted for outreach. |
| Outcome 2: Enhanced Municipal EDIR Capacity | Training provided to at least 50 municipalities on how to use the new online platform. | Exceeded. Training material shared with 144 municipal representatives. December demo workshops and May national knowledge-sharing symposium: 62 attendees. |
| | At least 50 municipalities access the platform. | 771 active users since January 2025. 40 municipalities provided input to March 2025 survey. |
| | At least 70% of municipalities accessing the platform indicate that they found tools that were useful or very useful. | Exceeded. 92.5% agree that the platform is valuable and comprehensive. 87.5% agree that the platform offers a unique, centralized source of information not easily found in one place elsewhere. 77.5% agree/strongly agree that the resources on the platform are relevant to the specific needs and challenges of their municipality. |

| Outcome 3: Establishment of a National EDIR Community of Practice | At least 20-30 municipal leaders and staff join the community of practice in the first six months. | Exceeded. 165 municipalities engaged. |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Outcome 4: Sustainable EDIR | FCM or a comparable organization agrees to host the initiative | TBD |
| Initiatives | 6 months after the project, 50% of municipalities engaged with the toolkit report changes to practices. | TBD |

Conclusion and Next Steps

The development of the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform was informed by a comprehensive needs assessment, desk review, and direct engagement with municipalities to ensure relevance and practicality. In total, 144 individuals participated in the process, including representatives from 66 unique municipalities, as well as community organizations and universities that play a key role in advancing EDIR at the local level. Through an iterative approach that incorporated feedback at various stages, the platform was refined to include relevant content, a user-friendly interface, and features that support practical implementation, findings which were reinforced by the most recent survey results.

Many municipalities will continue to face implementation challenges, including financial constraints, capacity limitations, and inconsistent support across leadership and departments. Despite these barriers, the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform serves as an important resource to support municipalities in advancing EDIR through their strategies, internal processes, policies, programs, and community engagement by offering practical tools, concrete examples, and adaptable resources that municipalities can tailor to their specific needs and contexts.

A key next step in the success of the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform is widespread dissemination and sustained engagement. The development process already engaged municipalities through direct feedback and collaborative input. However, while engagement efforts were successful, participation was concentrated in Ontario. Future dissemination efforts should focus on increasing involvement from municipalities in other provinces and territories to ensure the platform reflects the full diversity of regional contexts and experiences across Canada. To continue building momentum, efforts have focused on strategic outreach and partnerships aimed at promoting the use of the platform and supporting its implementation.

On May 15, 2025, a national knowledge-sharing symposium was held in partnership with the City of Kingston, the Diversity Institute, and the Future Skills Centre, with 27 municipal representatives in attendance. The event showcased the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform and focused on equipping municipal representatives with actionable strategies to embed EDIR into their strategies and operations. Examples from across Canada were shared to demonstrate how municipalities are adapting EDIR practices to their unique contexts. Beyond the symposium, dissemination efforts are ongoing. The Diversity Institute is also working with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to feature the platform at their annual conference and expand awareness among municipal leaders and sector networks.

Appendix A: Structure of the Municipal EDIR Platform

| Municipal Category (4) | Sub-Category (14) | Topic (110) | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Advisory Committees and Working Groups | |
| | | Anti-Racism Strategies and Initiatives | |
| | | Community Grants | |
| | | Community-Centred EDI Strategies | |
| | Carla Landard | EDI Metrics, Monitoring, and Benchmarking | |
| | Context and goal setting for EDIR | EDI Strategies, Tools, and Frameworks | |
| | strategies | GBA+ Framework | |
| | strategies | Equity-Responsive Budgeting | |
| | | Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation | |
| | | Indigenous Relations | |
| | | Leadership and Workforce Diversity | |
| | | Youth Initiatives | |
| | | Advisory Committees and Working Groups | |
| Aligning Strategy with Organizational Goals | | Anti-Racism and Cultural Redress | |
| | Implementation | Community Outreach, Engagement, and Consultation | |
| | | Community Safety and Well-Being | |
| | | Community-Centred EDI Strategies | |
| | | EDI Metrics, Monitoring, and Benchmarking | |
| | | EDI Strategies, Tools, and Frameworks | |
| | | GBA+ Framework | |
| | | Employment Equity Policies | |
| | | Tools and Frameworks for Monitoring and Accountability | |
| | | Community Outreach, Engagement, and Consultation | |
| | Measurement and | Data Collection, Evaluation, and Transparency | |
| | KPIs | EDI Metrics, Monitoring, and Benchmarking | |
| | | Policy Development and EDI Tools | |
| | Training materials | Accessible Customer Service | |
| | Legislation | Legislation | |
| | | Advisory Committees and Working Groups | |
| | | Anti-Racism Strategies and Initiatives | |
| Internal Processes | Governance and | Community Outreach, Engagement, and Consultation | |
| internal FIOCESSES | Leadership | Community-Centred EDI Strategies | |
| | | EDI Strategies, Tools, and Frameworks | |
| | | Leadership and Workforce Diversity | |

| EDI Statements EDI Training and Capacity Building GBA+ Framework Employee Advancement and Retention Employee Engagement and Exit Surveys Financial Investment and Resource Allocation Internships and Mentorship Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | Municipal Category (4) | Sub-Category (14) | Topic (110) |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| EDI Training and Capacity Building GBA+ Framework Employee Advancement and Retention Employee Engagement and Exit Surveys Financial Investment and Resource Allocation Internships and Mentorship Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Tools and Frameworks for Monitoring and Accountability |
| Human Resource Practices Financial Investment and Resource Allocation Internships and Mentorship Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | EDI Statements |
| Human Resource Practices Human Resource Practices Financial Investment and Resource Allocation Internships and Mentorship Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | EDI Training and Capacity Building |
| Human Resource Practices Human Resource Practices Employee Engagement and Exit Surveys Financial Investment and Resource Allocation Internships and Mentorship Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | GBA+ Framework |
| Human Resource Practices Financial Investment and Resource Allocation Internships and Mentorship Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Employee Advancement and Retention |
| Human Resource Practices Internships and Mentorship Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Employee Engagement and Exit Surveys |
| Practices Internships and Mentorship Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | 5 | Financial Investment and Resource Allocation |
| Job Design Leadership and Professional Development Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Internships and Mentorship |
| Reasonable Accommodation Strategies Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | Practices | Job Design |
| Recruitment Strategies Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Leadership and Professional Development |
| Selection and Interview Processes Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Reasonable Accommodation Strategies |
| Standardized Employment and Pay Levels Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Recruitment Strategies |
| Accessibility Plans and Policies Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Selection and Interview Processes |
| Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Standardized Employment and Pay Levels |
| Community Grants Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Accessibility Plans and Policies |
| Cultural and Diversity Events Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Hate Resources |
| Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Community Grants |
| Values and Culture Accommodations EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Cultural and Diversity Events |
| Values and Culture EDI Policies Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Disability, Family Status, and Parental Leave |
| Values and Culture Employee Resource Groups Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Accommodations |
| Values and Culture Inclusive Spaces Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | EDI Policies |
| Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | | Employee Resource Groups |
| Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation Intercultural Relations | | Malica a and College | Inclusive Spaces |
| | | values and Culture | Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation |
| Mental Health and Well-Being Initiatives | | | Intercultural Relations |
| · | | | Mental Health and Well-Being Initiatives |
| Pride | | | Pride |
| Remote and Hybrid Work Policies | | | Remote and Hybrid Work Policies |
| Strategies for Fostering Inclusive Workplace Culture | | | Strategies for Fostering Inclusive Workplace Culture |
| Workplace Culture and Safety | | | Workplace Culture and Safety |
| Public Education and Cultural Awareness | | | Public Education and Cultural Awareness |
| EDI Metrics, Monitoring, and Benchmarking | | | EDI Metrics, Monitoring, and Benchmarking |
| Accessibility and Cultural Diversity Awards | | | Accessibility and Cultural Diversity Awards |
| Accessibility Plans and Policies | | | Accessibility Plans and Policies |
| Accessible Customer Service | | | Accessible Customer Service |
| Design, Addressing Environmental Racism | | • . | Addressing Environmental Racism |
| Policy & Programs Implementation, Anti-Discrimination Plans and Initiatives | , - | • | |
| Anti-Racism Strategies and Initiatives | | | Anti-Racism Strategies and Initiatives |
| Communications | | | |
| Digital Accessibility | | | |

| Municipal Category (4) | Sub-Category (14) | Topic (110) | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | | Community Engagement and Consultation | | |
| | | Community Outreach, Engagement, and Consultation | | |
| | | EDI Strategies, Tools, and Frameworks | | |
| | | Inclusive and Accessible Design | | |
| | | Indigenous Awareness and Reconciliation | | |
| | | Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation | | |
| | | Language Revitalization and Cultural Preservation | | |
| | | Policy Design and Development | | |
| | | Poverty and Community Development Initiatives | | |
| | | Procurement and Supplier Diversity Policies | | |
| | | Social Programs | | |
| | | Corporate Services | | |
| | | Sustainable Development | | |
| | Procurement | Procurement and Supplier Diversity Policies | | |
| | | Planning | | |
| | | Transportation | | |
| | Functional areas | Economic Development | | |
| | | Social Programs | | |
| | | Cultural Programs | | |
| | | Corporate Services | | |
| | | Communications | | |
| | | Digital Accessibility | | |
| | Specialized | Emergency Management and Resilience Strategies | | |
| | | Partnerships, Programs, and Initiatives | | |
| | activities | Social and Inclusive Procurement Practices | | |
| | Examples of | Arts and Cultural Inclusion | | |
| | interested and | Community Outreach, Engagement, and Consultation | | |
| | affected parties | Inclusive Language, Communication, and Marketing | | |
| | | Community Outreach and Engagement | | |
| | | EDI Strategies, Tools, and Frameworks | | |
| C | | Employment, Skills Development, and Workforce Inclusion | | |
| Community | | Housing and Community Development | | |
| Engagement | Authentic | Inclusive Volunteering and Organizational Practices | | |
| | Approaches | Indigenous Awareness, Engagement, and Reconciliation | | |
| | | Leadership, Research, and Training Partnerships | | |
| | | Community Grants | | |
| | | Partnerships, Programs, and Initiatives | | |
| | | Social and Inclusive Procurement Practices | | |

Appendix B: Questionnaire

- 1. Name:
- 2. Please enter your email address:
- 3. Municipality:

Content

4. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform? Please rate each statement on a scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | Not applicable |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------|-------------------|
| The platform is valuable and comprehensive. | | | | | | |
| The platform offers a unique, centralized source of information not easily found in one place elsewhere. | | | | | | |
| The resources in the platform are relevant to the specific needs and challenges of my municipality. | | | | | | |

5. The following questions assess the platform's relevance for municipalities. Please rate the relevance of each section on a scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

| Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Aligning Strategy with Organizational Goals | | | | | | | |

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|-------------------|-----|
| Context and goal setting for EDIR strategies | | | | | | |
| Implementation | | | | | | |
| Measurement and KPIs | | | | | | |
| Training materials | | | | | | |
| Internal Processes | | | | | | |
| Governance and leadership | | | | | | |
| Human Resource practices | | | | | | |
| Organizational values and culture | | | | | | |
| Policy and Programs | | | | | | |
| Program design, implementation and evaluation | | | | | | |
| Procurement | | | | | | |
| Functional areas (e.g., planning, transportation, economic development, social programs, digital accessibility, etc.) | | | | | | |
| Specialized activities (e.g., emergency management and resilience strategies, partnerships, programs and initiatives, and social and inclusive procurement practices) | | | | | | |
| Community Engagement | | | | | | |
| Examples of interested and affected parties | | | | | | |
| Authentic Engagement | | | | | | |

| | Strongly disagree | _ | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A |
|------------|-------------------|---|---------|-------|-------------------|-----|
| Approaches | | | | | | |

| 6. | Planning, Transportation, Economic Development, Social Programs, and Digital Accessibility)? If not, which areas should be added? |
|----|---|
| 7. | Would you suggest any additional questions for the FAQ section (bottom of page)? Please share your thoughts here |

| 8. | Did the platform | provide new insig | hts or practices that v | you were not previousl | v aware of? |
|----|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Ο. | Did the platform | provide new mag | into or practices that | you were not previous | y avvaic oi. |

- a. Yes. Please specify _____
- b. No
- c. Unsure

User Experience, Navigation, and Functionality

9. The following statements are about your experience with the platform. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | Not applicable |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------|-------------------|
| The language used in the platform was easy to understand | | | | | | |
| The layout of the platform is easy to navigate | | | | | | |
| Navigating the website by clicking through the sections is intuitive and user-friendly | | | | | | |
| The design of the website (e.g., colour scheme, font, font | | | | | | |

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | Not applicable |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------|-------------------|
| size) is visually appealing | | | | | | |
| Overall, it is easy to find the resources I need in the platform | | | | | | |

Implementation

10. The following statements aim to assess the usability and adaptability of the platform in supporting municipal needs. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | Not applicable |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------|-------------------|
| The resources can be customized to fit the needs of my municipality. | | | | | | |
| The resources can be used to address complex issues. | | | | | | |
| The platform can save time and improve productivity. | | | | | | |
| Sufficient resources are available to support learning. | | | | | | |

- 11. How would you describe your municipality's current level of engagement in Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Reconciliation (EDIR)?
 - a. Actively implementing EDIR initiatives and policies.
 - b. Developing EDIR strategies but not yet fully implementing them.
 - c. Exploring EDIR but have not taken formal steps.

| d. | Limited | engagen | nent wit | h EDIR at | t this tir | ne. | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----|
| e. | No enga | gement | with ED | IR initiati | ves. | | | | | | |
| 12. Do you a. b. c. d. e. f. | yes, I pla Yes, I pla Yes, I pla Unsure No, I do No, I do Prefer n | use the item to act an to use n't have not inte | resource lively use the reso a plan yo nd to uso swer | s in the pethe reso ources o et, but methe res | olatform ources i ccasion night in ources. | n the p ally, de the futi | latform pending ure. | for my w g on the r | vork need | the platform? | |
| Final Wo | ds | | | | | | | | | | |
| | kely are y organizat | | | | - | | | = | | to colleagues | or |
| 0 - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 - | |
| Extremely unlikely | | | | | | | | | | Extremely likely | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sharin | | n for fut | ure user | | _ | | • | • | | unicipal EDIR Please avoid | |

- 16. Would you like to stay in touch about the Municipal EDIR Sharing Platform?
 - a. Enter your preferred mode of communication (including email address, phone number, or other contact details as appropriate):
 - b. Prefer not to say

References

resources.canada.ca/sites/nrcan/files/GNBC/Chapter%203 Rural%20and%20Remote%20Communities Final EN.pdf

https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection 2016/canadacouncil/K34-5-2016-eng.pdf

FS%20Diverse%20Representation%20in%20Leadership%20%E2%80%93%20Aug2024-final.pdf

¹ Associations of Municipalities of Ontario. (n.d.). Municipal 101. https://www.amo.on.ca/about-us/municipal-101

² Williams, T., & Barr, V. (2022). Municipal equity policies: Takeaways for planners. *Plan Canada: Looking Back, Looking* Forward, 62(4). https://teaminteract.ca/ressources/PlanCanada Vol.62 No.4 Winter2022 WilliamsBarr.pdf

³ Tangirala, N. (2022). *Integrating equity, diversity and inclusion into municipal climate action*. ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability. https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/6022ab403a6b2126c03ebf95/6324c6886b6975ec85d3aace_pcpintegrating-equity-diversity-and-inclusion-into-municipal-climate-action.pdf

⁴ Vodden, K., & Cunsolo, A. (2021). Chapter 3: Rural and remote communities. In F.J. Warren and N. Lulham (Eds.), Canada in a Changing Climate: National Issues Report. Government of Canada. https://natural-

⁵ iCA Immigration. (n.d.). A Guide to the Rural Community Immigration Class (RCIC). https://www.ica-immigration.ca/aguide-to-the-rural-community-immigration-class-rcic

⁶ Federation of Canadian Municipalities. (2018). *Rural challenges, national opportunity: Shaping the future of rural Canada*. https://data.fcm.ca/documents/issues/FCM-Rural-Canada-2018-EN.pdf

⁷ Affonso, A., Ahmed, N., Beaucage, L., Fournier, V., Wasko, K., & Zhou, W. (2022). Settling the Unsettled: Closing the Urban-Rural Immigration Gap in Canada. Public Policy Forum. https://ppforum.ca/publications/settling-the-unsettled-closing-theurban-rural-immigration-gap-in-canada/

⁸ Canadian Commission for UNESCO. (n.d.) The coalition of inclusive municipalities: Small and rural municipalities. https://en.ccunesco.ca/-/media/Files/Unesco/Resources/2021/08/SmallAndRuralMunicipalities.pdf

⁹ Association of Municipalities of Ontario. (n.d.). *Municipalities 101*. https://www.amo.on.ca/about-us/municipal-101

¹⁰ Canadian Commission for UNESCO. (n.d.). *The coalition of inclusive municipalities: A guide for new and established* members. https://en.ccunesco.ca/-/media/Files/Unesco/Resources/2020/04/ToolkitCoalitionInclusiveMunicipalities.pdf

¹¹ Canadian Commission for UNESCO. (2016). *Creating inclusive and equitable cities.*

¹² City for All Women Initiative. (2015). *Advancing equity and inclusion: A guide for municipalities*. https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/documents/files/documents/adv equity en.pdf

¹³ City for All Women Initiative. (2015). Advancing equity and inclusion: A guide for municipalities. https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/documents/files/documents/adv equity en.pdf

¹⁴ Bonikowska, A. (2022, September 28). Who are Canada's legislators? Characteristics and gender gaps among members of legislative bodies. Statistics Canada. https://doi.org/10.25318/36280001202200900003-eng

¹⁵ Bonikowska, A. (2022, September 28). Who are Canada's legislators? Characteristics and gender gaps among members of legislative bodies. Statistics Canada. https://doi.org/10.25318/36280001202200900003-eng

¹⁶ Statistics Canada. (2022). Canada at a Glance, 2022: Women. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/12-581x/2022001/sec7-eng.htm

¹⁷ Statistics Canada. (2023). Census Profile, 2021 Census of Population: Profile table. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/ census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=Toronto& GENDERlist=1,2,3& STATISTIClist=1,4&DGUIDlist=2021S0503535&HEADERlist=30,1

¹⁸ Gagnon, S., Cukier, W., Oliver, A., & Mo, G. Y. (2024). DiversityLeads: Diverse representation in leadership: A review of 10 Canadian cities. Asper School of Business, Diversity Institute, and Future Skills Centre. https://www.torontomu.ca/content/dam/diversity/reports/diversityleads2024/DI-

¹⁹ Statistics Canada. (2023). Census Profile, 2021 Census of Population: Profile table https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/ census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=Toronto& GENDERlist=1,2,3& STATISTIClist=1,4&DGUIDlist=2021S0503535&HEADERlist=30,1

https://www.torontomu.ca/content/dam/diversity/reports/diversityleads2024/DI-FS Diverse Representation in Leadership – Aug2024-final.pdf

https://www.torontomu.ca/content/dam/diversity/reports/diversityleads2024/DI-FS Diverse Representation in Leadership – Aug2024-final.pdf

²³ Gagnon, S., Cukier, W., Oliver, A., & Mo, G. Y. (2024). *DiversityLeads: Diverse representation in leadership: A review of 10 Canadian cities*. Asper School of Business, Diversity Institute, and Future Skills Centre.

 $https://www.torontomu.ca/content/dam/diversity/reports/diversityleads 2024/DI-FS\ Diverse\ Representation\ in\ Leadership\ - Aug 2024-final.pdf$

²⁴ Federation of Canadian Municipalities. (n.d.). *Programs.*

 $\underline{https://fcm.ca/en/programs\#:^:text=Our\%20work\%20is\%20centred\%20around,training\%2C\%20support\%20and\%20sometimes\%20funding}$

- ²⁵ UNESCO. (n.d.). *UNESCO's Global Education Coalition*. https://www.unesco.org/en/global-education-coalition
- ²⁶ City for All Women Initiative. (2015). *Advancing equity and inclusion: A guide for municipalities.* https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/default/files/documents/adv_equity_en.pdf
- ²⁷ Diversity Institute. (n.d.). *Diversity Assessment Tool*. https://diversityassessment.ca/
- ²⁸ Diversity Institute. (n.d.). *Diversity Assessment Tool*. https://diversityassessment.ca/
- ²⁹ Diversity Institute. (n.d.). *Diversity & Inclusion Playbook*. https://diplaybook.ca/
- ³⁰ See City of Ottawa Advancing Equity and Inclusion: A Guide for Municipalities, Getting Our House in Order: The City of Vancouver's Equity Framework and City of Calgary Dismantling Systemic Racism, Transforming Lives
- ³¹ See A Playbook for Equitable Economic Development and Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada: Anti-Racism Strategy 2.0, Long Beach Equity Toolkit, Best Practice Guide for Gender Equity in Local Government
- ³² See City of Ottawa Equity & Inclusion Lens Handbook, Advancing Racial Equity: A Framework for Federal Agencies, and Long Beach Equity Toolkit for City Leaders and Staff

²⁰ Gagnon, S., Cukier, W., Oliver, A., & Mo, G. Y. (2024). DiversityLeads: Diverse representation in leadership: A review of 10 Canadian cities. Asper School of Business, Diversity Institute, and Future Skills Centre.

²¹ Statistics Canada. (n.d.). *Census Program Data Viewer*. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/dv-vd/cpdv-vdpr/index-eng.cfm

²² Gagnon, S., Cukier, W., Oliver, A., & Mo, G. Y. (2024). *DiversityLeads: Diverse representation in leadership: A review of 10 Canadian cities*. Asper School of Business, Diversity Institute, and Future Skills Centre.