- One staff member said that, "UPEI is the most miserable, soul sucking place of work I have ever experienced. Managers talk about other employees behind their backs to other staff members, harassment and bullying is acceptable. **Human Resources policies are not there to help those who are being bullied, but to smooth and shush over situations to have everyone go back to work.**" (p. 22).

- **Several participants, both females and males, said that the recent appointment processes for the roles of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were examples of sexism at UPEI. These participants were not critical of the individuals who were appointed but described the appointment processes as "secretive" and "non-transparent" and said that more experienced women were excluded from consideration and/or "skipped over" in favour of men who were close friends and/or colleagues of the decision-makers. One participant described the appointment processes as "shocking" and another remarked that, "a generation of potential female leaders has been put-off by what transpired at great cost to the institution. We also heard that the process demonstrated that, "the University's stated commitment to diversity and equity were empty words"; further, that it sent "a message to the community that if you want to get ahead at UPEI, you need to be friends with people in leadership"** (p. 34-35)

- **"I believed that universities should uphold the highest standards of society. Instead UPEI has turned a blind eye to bullying, harassment and unethical behaviour** [REDACTED]. **UPEI and the Board of Governors of UPEI are primarily interested in protecting UPEI's/their reputations and not the safety and wellbeing of community members"** (p. 42)

- **"Most employees know about the 'firing at will' and it has created a culture of fear, silence, and mistrust"** (p. 45).

- We are concerned that the multipleroles the SVPRO manager is expected to undertake is too much for one person. Some survey participants also echoed this sentiment. As one participant put it, **"[…]Sexual harassment and violence have been deeplyembedded in the UPEI working culture forquite some time and it was an uphill battle for the one-person SV-PRO to address this adequately and for any significant change to occur."** We understand that, in part to help address the lack of support for the SVPRO in their role, the SVPRO now reports into the EDI Officer (who in turn reports to both the VPAR and the VPAF) (p. 59).

- One participant noted that:

  After hearing about UPEI using non-disclosure agreements to silence sexual harassment victims, I really don't think UPEI has created a safe, respectful, or positive environment. **They created a safe haven for sexual predators and bullies. It's terrible to think of people keeping their jobs after harassing another person in that way, and they could possible do it again. Or do something worse** (p. 69-70).

- To enhance accountability, and to ensure that it is making sufficient progress on the issues identified in this review, we recommend that the University engage in audits to assess its execution of its action plan, and its progress (or lack of it) annually for the next five years. We further recommend that the results of these audits be made public. We make this recommendation for two reasons: First, there is a disconnect between the views of many at the University about the current environment (as evidenced in the themes identified in this report) and the apparent confidence that the Board of Governors has regarding the current state of affairs. We note that as part of this process, we interviewed various members of the Executive Committee of the Board and asked them to "rate" the University's performance vis-à-vis creating a fair environment that is free from discrimination and harassment. **Their own assessments were consistently 7 or 8 out of 10. This is clearly at odds with what we heard from many participants in this process**. (p. 75).

- We further recommend that the form of agreements used by the University be reviewed, and any "fact of" language be removed. Given the views of signatories and participants contained in this report, we recommend that the University revisit whether it has used NDAs to informally resolve or mediate complaints about wrongdoing. **Based on what we heard during this process, we are concerned that these agreements may have been used to sweep problematic issues "under the rug" without proper probing and investigation**. We recommend that if they are not already doing so, the Board of Governors monitor all terminations and resignations for the foreseeable future, to satisfy themselves that NDAs are not being used in this way (p. 82).