Public Service Commission of Canada

Commission de la fonction publique du Canada

2023 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Report on the Results for the Federal Public Service

Candidate for Open Government

GCdocs #: 16369929

Canada

Table of contents

Introduction

About the survey

The Public Service Commission of Canada (PSC) is responsible for promoting and safeguarding a merit-based, representative and non-partisan public service that serves all Canadians.

As part of the PSC's mandate and responsibilities to oversee the integrity of the federal public service staffing system and ensure non-partisanship, the Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey was introduced in 2018 as a biennial public service-wide survey. The survey targets employees, managers and staffing advisors to gather their views on a wide range of staffing-related topics, including:

- perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency
- organizational staffing policies and practices
- awareness of rights and responsibilities related to political activities and non-partisanship

In 2023, as a result of the changes to the *Public Service Employment Act*, new questions were added to identify biases and barriers experienced in staffing processes, and to evaluate the perceptions of respondents who identify as members of certain equity-seeking groups.

> According to the *Employment Equity Act*, employment equity aims to achieve equality in the workplace and to correct conditions of disadvantage in employment for the 4 designated employment equity groups: women, Indigenous Peoples[1], persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities.
>
> In 2023, the *Public Service Employment Act* was amended to strengthen diversity and inclusion and address biases and barriers faced by equity-seeking groups.

---

[1] The term "Indigenous Peoples" aligns with international usage and in this report replaces the legislative term "Aboriginal peoples" that appears in the *Employment Equity Act* and the *Employment Equity Regulations*. The definition has not changed.

> Equity-seeking groups refer to groups of persons who are disadvantaged on the basis of one or more prohibited grounds of discrimination within the meaning of the *Canadian Human Rights Act*. The 13 prohibited grounds of discrimination are: race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, marital status, family status, genetic characteristics, disability, and conviction for an offence for which a pardon has been granted, or for which a record suspension has been ordered.

This report provides a summary of the survey's key results for:

- employees of departments and agencies that fall under the *Public Service Employment Act*
- members of the Canadian Armed Forces who have civilian (that is, public servant) direct reports employed under the *Public Service Employment Act*
- regular members, civilian members and special constables of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police hired under the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act* with public service direct reports employed under the *Public Service Employment Act*

A separate report will present detailed results on the perceptions of employment equity groups and certain equity-seeking groups, based on the new demographics added to the survey (marital status, number of dependents, religion and sexual orientation).

The PSC has also developed interactive data visualization tools that allows users to explore the survey data and generate customized data tables.

If you have any questions about this report, please email us at: cfp.sdip-snps.psc@cfp-psc.gc.ca.

Overview of the survey

The 2023 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey is an online survey of federal public servants, administered on behalf of the Public Service Commission of Canada by Advanis, a Canadian market and social research firm. The survey was sent to all employees in 77 federal departments and agencies. A total of 84 741 responses were received, for a response rate of 31.7%. The methodological approach is described in Appendix A.

Merit, fairness and transparency in staffing

This section presents a summary of responses to questions on the themes of merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing process. Within each theme, the results presented in the tables include all in-scope respondents.

Merit

Overall, employees' perceptions of merit in the staffing process are very similar to 2021. As seen in Table 1, 84% of respondents agreed that people hired in their organization can do the job (exactly the same proportion as in 2021). As well, 83% (versus 84% in 2021) agreed that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled.

Table 1: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process, in 2021 and 2023

Statements related to merit	2021	2023
We hire people who can do the job	84%	84%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	84%	83%

Fairness

The perception of fairness in the staffing process is identical to 2021, with 77% of respondents agreeing that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly (see Table 2).

Table 2: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process, in 2021 and 2023

Statements related to fairness	2021	2023
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	77%	77%

Transparency

As shown in Table 3, perceptions related to transparency in the staffing process are similar to 2021. The survey found that 7 out of 10 employees (70%) agreed that staffing

activities are carried out in a transparent way (versus 72% in 2021). As well, nearly 3 quarters (72%) of respondents agreed that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (versus 71% in 2021).

Table 3: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process, in 2021 and 2023

Statements related to transparency	2021	2023
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	72%	70%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving my work unit	71%	72%

Biases and barriers in staffing processes

In June 2021, the *Public Service Employment Act* was amended to address systemic barriers for equity-seeking groups in public service staffing processes.

As part of its mandate, the PSC is gathering information on biases and barriers to help departments and agencies implement the changes to the act, so they can establish programs and policies to reduce barriers and encourage more inclusive recruitment practices.

For the purpose of this report, an overview of results with respect to perceived biases and barriers for the 4 designated employment equity groups is included. A detailed analysis for equity-seeking groups will be included in the thematic report that will be available in the coming months.

Overall findings

Overall, 55% of employees indicated that within their department or agency, staffing processes are conducted in a way that reduces or eliminates biases and barriers that disadvantage people belonging to any equity-seeking group, in assessment methods used in staffing processes. A third of respondents (33%) indicated that they did not know, and the remaining 12% answered in the negative.

Among employees who participated in an advertised staffing process between September 16, 2022, and September 15, 2023, 18% indicated that they had experienced biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them (see Table 4).

Results for the 4 employment equity groups

In this report, the term "comparator group" for a given employment equity group refers to employees who are not members of that employment equity group.

Members of visible minorities (24% versus 16% for employees who are not members of visible minorities), Indigenous Peoples (22% versus 18% for non-Indigenous Peoples), and persons with disabilities (26% versus 15% for persons without disabilities) were more likely than their respective comparator groups to say that they had experienced biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them.

On the other hand, women (16%) were slightly less likely than men (19%) to say that they had experienced biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them. People who identified as another gender were the most likely to report facing biases and barriers that put them at a disadvantage in staffing processes (36%).

Table 4: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process, by employment equity group and comparator group

Respondent category	Yes	No	Don't know
All respondents	18%	59%	23%
Women	16%	61%	23%
Men	19%	59%	21%
Another gender	36%	35%	30%
Members of visible minorities	24%	47%	29%
Not members of visible minorities	16%	64%	20%
Indigenous Peoples	22%	57%	21%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	18%	59%	23%
Persons with disabilities	26%	49%	25%
Persons without disabilities	15%	64%	21%

Breakdown for each stage of hiring process

As seen in Table 5, biases and barriers were mostly reported at the organizational screening stage of the hiring process (37%), followed by interviews (30%), job application (29%) and automatic screening stages (29%). (At the automated screening stage, applications are screened using the Public Service Resourcing System, based on a candidate's responses to a set of questions or criteria established by the hiring

manager.) A smaller proportion of respondents reported experiencing biases and barriers at the reference check stage (7%).

Women

A smaller proportion of women than men said that they had experienced biases and barriers:

- at the job application stage (26% versus 31% for men)
- at the automated screening stage (27% versus 30% for men)
- at the organizational screening stage (33% versus 41% for men)

Members of visible minorities

Members of visible minorities were more likely than employees who are not members of visible minorities to report experiencing biases and barriers in all stages of the hiring process. The widest gaps were seen at the appointment (30% versus 21% for employees who are not members of visible minorities) and at the interview stages (36% versus 28% for employees who are not members of visible minorities).

Indigenous Peoples

Indigenous Peoples were slightly less likely than non-Indigenous Peoples to report experiencing biases and barriers:

- at the job application stage (27% versus 29% for non-Indigenous Peoples)
- at the automated screening stage (26% versus 29% for non-Indigenous Peoples)
- at the organizational screening stage (35% versus 37% for non-Indigenous Peoples)

However, they were more likely to report that they had experienced biases and barriers at the interview stage (34% versus 30% for non-Indigenous Peoples).

Persons with disabilities

Persons with disabilities were more likely than those without disabilities to report experiencing biases and barriers at most stages of the hiring process, with the largest gaps reported at the written exam (22% versus 14% for persons without disabilities) and at the interview stages (34% versus 28% for persons without disabilities).

People who identified as another gender

The other group of respondents who identified facing biases and barriers at the written exam stage are those who identified as another gender (26%). They were also the most likely to report facing biases and barriers at the job application stage (39%).

Table 5: Share of respondents who perceived biases and barriers at different stages of advertised hiring processes, by employment equity group

Respondent category	Job application stage	Automated screening stage	Organizational screening stage	Written exam stage	Interviews stage	Reference checks stage	Appointments stage
All respondents	29%	29%	37%	17%	30%	7%	24%
Women	26%	27%	33%	17%	30%	7%	24%
Men	31%	30%	41%	17%	30%	7%	24%
Another gender	39%	29%	31%	26%	37%	8%	17%
Members of visible minorities	30%	31%	40%	19%	36%	9%	30%
Not members of visible minorities	28%	28%	35%	16%	28%	6%	21%
Indigenous Peoples	27%	26%	35%	19%	34%	9%	25%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	29%	29%	37%	17%	30%	7%	24%
Persons with disabilities	32%	31%	39%	22%	34%	9%	23%
Persons without disabilities	27%	27%	35%	14%	28%	7%	25%

Notes for Table 5:
- Note 1: Respondents were allowed to select multiple answers.
- Note 2: Automated screening is the stage where applications are screened using the Public Service Resourcing System, based on a candidate's responses to a set of questions or criteria established by the hiring manager.

Participation in a staffing process for a promotion

About a third (31%) of all federal public service employees surveyed participated in an advertised staffing process for a promotion in the past 12 months, an increase compared to 2021 (28%).

Among the remaining 69% of employees (versus 72% in 2021) who did not seek a promotion through an advertised staffing process:

- 43% (versus 39% in 2021) indicated there were no opportunities for a promotion
- 33% (versus 42% in 2021) said that it was because they were satisfied with their current group and level

Fewer employees were concerned that a promotion would affect their work-life balance (14% in 2023 versus 33% of employees wanting to maintain their work-life balance in 2021). One fifth of employees (21% versus 19% in 2021) indicated that the application process is burdensome, while others said that staffing processes take too long to complete (17% versus 15% in 2021). Only 1% (versus 8% in 2021) indicated that they did not participate in a staffing process for a promotion due to circumstances directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic (see Table 6).

Table 6: Share of respondents who did not participate in an advertised staffing process for a promotion in 2021 and 2023, by reason

Reasons for not participating in advertised staffing process for promotion	2021	2023
No promotion opportunities were available	39%	43%
I am satisfied with my current group and level	42%	33%
Application process is burdensome	19%	21%
Staffing processes take too long to complete	15%	17%
I was concerned that this move would affect my work-life balance / I want to maintain my work-life balance (2021)	33%	14%
I have no interest in moving to a management or executive position	19%	11%
I was concerned that my pay would be affected by issues with the Phoenix pay system	15%	11%
I did not meet the language requirements for the positions	13%	11%
Advertised positions were meant for specific persons	11%	11%
I have not been at my current group and level for a long time	21%	10%
I do not believe that staffing processes are fair	13%	9%
I did not meet the essential qualifications for the positions	8%	7%
I was concerned that I may not be successful	6%	7%
I am not geographically mobile	7%	6%
I was concerned that my current accommodation measures may not be accepted in a new position	4%	5%
I am retiring shortly	7%	4%
Circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic	8%	1%
Other reasons	14%	14%

Note for Table 6: Respondents were allowed to select multiple answers.

Virtual interviews versus in-person interviews

Among employees who participated in a staffing activity that had used virtual assessments, 70% reported that virtual assessments had allowed them to demonstrate their qualifications (versus 82% for virtual interviews in 2021). As well, 75% were satisfied

with virtual interviews in comparison to in-person interviews, a decrease compared to 2021 (81%).

Managers' perceptions of staffing advice and support

Overall, as seen in Table 7, the same share of managers indicated that they understand their organization's policies with respect to staffing (84% in both 2021 and 2023). However, fewer managers reported that staffing has improved within their organization (45% versus 47% in 2021) and that staffing within their organization has been simplified (29% versus 35% in 2021).

Compared to 2021, a greater proportion of managers believed that the process to staff a position is burdensome (86% versus 82% in 2021) while a smaller share believes that staffing options available within their organization allow them to address their staffing needs as quickly as required (33% versus 38% in 2021).

As well, 52% of managers agreed that staffing options available within their organization provide them with the flexibility to appoint people to meet the needs of their work unit (not asked in 2021).

Table 7: Share of managers who agreed with statements about the understandability, flexibility, efficiency and administrative ease of the staffing process, in 2021 and 2023

Statement about staffing process	2021	2023
Understandable: I understand my organization's policies with respect to staffing	84%	84%
Improved: Staffing has improved within my organization (2023) / Staffing has improved within my organization over the past 2 years (2021)	47%	45%
Simplified: Staffing within my organization has been simplified (2023) / Staffing has been simplified within my organization over the past 2 years (2021)	35%	29%
Administrative ease: The process to staff a position is burdensome	82%	86%
Efficiency: Staffing options available within my organization allow me to address my staffing needs as quickly as required	38%	33%
Flexibility: Staffing options available within my organization provide me with the flexibility to appoint persons to meet the needs of my work unit	n/a	52%

Adequate staffing advice (50%) and sufficient staffing support (43%) were the main reasons provided by managers to explain why staffing has been simplified within their organization (not asked in 2021), as shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Share of managers who agreed with reasons for why staffing has been simplified within their organization

Reason for simplified staffing within organization	2023
Adequate staffing advice	50%
Sufficient staffing support	43%
Less people involved	27%
Adequate screening tools	27%
Less paperwork	26%
Less approval stages	24%
Fewer candidates to assess	17%
Second language evaluation (SLE) takes less time	16%
The priority clearance process takes less time	15%
Security clearance takes less time	13%
Developing assessment tools takes less time	12%
Other reasons	11%

Note for Table 8: Respondents were allowed to select multiple answers.

As shown in Table 9, the main reasons provided by managers as to why staffing within their organization is burdensome were:

- too much paperwork (64%)
- too many approval stages (59%)
- the security clearance process takes too much time (57%)

Table 9: Share of managers who agreed with reasons for why the staffing process is burdensome within their organization

Reason why staffing system is burdensome	2023
Too much paperwork	64%
Too many approval stages	59%
Security clearance process takes too much time	57%
Time to staff requirements	49%
Too many people involved	44%
Not enough staffing support	41%
Developing assessment tools takes too much time	34%
Second language evaluation takes too much time	32%
Inadequate staffing advice	29%
Inadequate screening tools	20%
Too many candidates to assess	11%
Other reasons	16%

Notes for Table 9:
- Note 1: Respondents were allowed to select multiple answers.
- Note 2: Data for 2021 was not included due to answer options being modified.

Consideration of priority entitlements

Priority entitlement provides certain qualified people, who meet specific conditions, with an entitlement to be appointed ahead of all other candidates to a position within the public service. Additional information can be found on the information on the priority entitlements page.

Results from the 2023 survey reveal that 80% of staffing advisors believe that managers are open to considering persons with a priority entitlement referred to them when staffing positions. In 2023, 38% of managers were of the view that persons with priority entitlements are a valuable source of qualified candidates, an increase compared to 2021 (34%). However, 29% of managers said that they did not agree that persons with a priority entitlement are a valuable source or qualified candidates, while 33% of managers said they did not know.

Managers who did not agree that persons with a priority entitlement are a valuable source of qualified candidates were asked to give reasons why. The most common perceptions among those managers were that persons with a priority entitlement do not possess the essential qualifications and that persons with a priority entitlement require additional training to get up to speed.

Table 10: Share of managers who agreed with statements about persons with priority entitlements, in 2021 and 2023

Statement about persons with priority entitlements	2021	2023
Persons with a priority entitlement are a valuable source of qualified candidates	34%	38%
Persons with a priority entitlement that are hired meet performance expectations	n/a	30%

Hiring managers' perceptions of staffing practices and staffing advice

Overall, 75% (versus 78% in 2021) of hiring managers were satisfied with the staffing services they have received from their organization (see Table 11).

Most hiring managers (95% versus 96% in 2021) indicated that appointees meet the performance expectations of the positions for which they were hired. A similar proportion (94% versus 95% in 2021) felt comfortable explaining staffing decisions to their employees. In addition, 13% (versus 11% in 2021) felt pressure to select a particular candidate.

Furthermore, 80% of hiring managers agreed that the use of virtual assessments allowed them to evaluate candidates efficiently when conducting staffing processes, which is lower than the level of agreement observed in 2021 (91%) in relation to the use of virtual interviews.

Table 11: Share of hiring managers who agreed with statements about staffing practices and staffing advice, in 2021 and 2023

Statement about staffing practices and advice	2021	2023
The use of virtual assessments allows to evaluate candidates efficiently when conducting staffing processes / The use of virtual interviews allows to evaluate candidates efficiently when conducting staffing processes (2021)	91%	80%
The appointees meet the performance expectations of the positions for which they were hired	96%	95%
I felt comfortable explaining staffing decisions to my employees	95%	94%
I felt pressure to select a particular candidate	11%	13%
Overall, I am satisfied with the staffing services I have received from my organization	78%	75%

More than 2 thirds (68%) of hiring managers who were not satisfied or satisfied to a minimal extent with the staffing services they received from their organization would like to receive support and advice in finding new approaches to staffing. In addition, 53% of hiring managers would like to receive advice, tools and guidance to support staffing decisions, and 46% would like greater advice and guidance with existing pools of candidates within their organization (see Table 12).

Table 12: Share of managers who agreed with statements about receiving more advice and guidance

Statement about receiving more advice and guidance	2023
Finding new approaches to staffing	68%
Advice, tools and guidance to support staffing decisions	53%
Existing pools of candidates within your organization	46%
Aligning your staffing needs with the priorities of your organization's Human Resources plan or People Management plan	35%
Establishing the merit criteria	33%
Public Service Commission of Canada (PSC) recruitment programs	23%
Establishing the area of selection	20%
Risk identification and risk mitigation	18%
Employment equity considerations	14%
Legislative and policy interpretations	14%
Accessibility, diversity and/or inclusion	13%
Consideration of persons with a priority entitlement	11%
Assessment accommodation measures	11%
Other areas	25%

Innovative staffing practices or initiatives

The 2023 survey included new questions on innovative staffing practices and initiatives. Overall, 13% of employees indicated that their organization has undertaken innovative staffing practices or initiatives. A follow-up open-ended question asked for details on these practices and initiatives. This additional information helped identify 4 themes:

1. **Diversity and inclusion:** A significant proportion of the comments received were related to equity, diversity and inclusion. Respondents mainly mentioned recruitment initiatives for employment equity groups, including targeted processes for these groups. They also commented on the use of specific tools to reduce biases and barriers, such as anonymized recruitment and blind assessments, telephone interviews, interview transcripts (to eliminate potential biases related to accent and appearance), bias checklists, support of an external HR consultant, use of a diverse assessment board, and manager training on unconscious biases.

2. **Innovative staffing mechanisms and tools:** Another important part of the feedback received was related to various staffing mechanisms including greater use of non-advertised processes, pools (including sharing between departments), regional recruitment initiatives and acting opportunities. Respondents also referred to several third-party tools and methods used in the hiring process. These included virtual, pre-recorded, telephone and group interviews as well as character interviews for senior management positions. In addition, respondents pointed out specific innovations related to assessment flexibility, such as offering more time for exams, being able to complete them at home, or using an online platform to hold these exams.

3. **Career development:** Career development was another area where a number of innovations were identified. Respondents' examples included development programs such as the [Talent Bank project](#), which is an internal staffing tool to identify talent within an organization and create internal opportunities. It was initially launched by Statistics Canada, however similar initiatives from other departments were also reported. Mentoring (for example, [Mentorship Plus](#)), talent management programs for certain professional groups or employment equity groups, sponsorship and micro-missions were also perceived as innovative.

4. **Student hiring:** Some respondents also identified a number of student recruitment initiatives as innovative and helpful, such as: university partnerships to recruit students in specific fields, simplified processes for hiring Federal Student Work Experience Program students, school job fairs, virtual fairs, hackathons and student bridging into indeterminate positions.

Diversity and inclusion initiatives

Nearly 3 quarters (72%) of employees agreed that diversity and inclusion initiatives related to staffing within their organization are adequate to support building a diverse and representative workforce (see Table 13).

Members of all employment equity groups were less likely to agree with this statement compared to their respective comparator groups:

- 72% of women agreed, compared to 74% of men
- 63% of members of visible minorities agreed, compared to 75% of people who were not members of visible minorities
- 63% of Indigenous Peoples agreed, compared to 72% of non-Indigenous Peoples
- 65% of persons with disabilities agreed, compared to 74% of persons without disabilities

People identifying as another gender were the least likely to agree with this statement (46%).

Table 13: Share of employees who agreed that their organization's diversity and inclusion staffing initiatives are adequate to support building a diverse and representative workforce, by employment equity group and their comparator groups, in 2023

Respondent category	2023
All respondents	72%
Women	72%
Men	74%
Another gender	46%
Members of visible minorities	63%
Not members of visible minorities	75%
Indigenous Peoples	63%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	72%
Persons with disabilities	65%
Persons without disabilities	74%

Political activities and non-partisanship

The PSC provides guidance to employees about their legal rights and responsibilities related to political activities, and it renders decisions on political candidacy, respecting employees' rights to participate in political activities, while protecting the non-partisan nature of the public service.

Results from the 2023 survey show that employees understand their responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties as public servants (90% versus 91% in 2021). Results also show that employees in their work unit carried out their duties as public servants in a politically impartial manner (91% versus 93% in 2021). As well, 91% (same proportion as in 2021) of employees reported being aware that expressing their political views on social media could impact their ability to remain politically impartial or to be perceived as impartial when carrying out their public service duties (see Table 14).

Table 14: Share of employees who agreed with statements about their awareness of rights and responsibilities related to non-partisanship, in 2021 and 2023

Statement about non-partisanship	2021	2023
I understand my responsibility to be politically impartial in carrying out my duties as a public servant	91%	90%
In my work unit, employees carry out duties as public servants in a politically impartial manner	93%	91%
I am aware that expressing political views on social media may impact my ability to remain politically impartial or to be perceived as impartial	91%	91%

In 2023, 94% of employees (versus 97% in 2021) did not engage in political activities beyond voting. As shown in Table 15 below, more than 3 quarters (77% versus 76% in 2021) were aware of their legal rights and responsibilities for engaging in political activities, and 65% (same proportion as in 2021) were aware of their responsibilities as public servants if they wanted to seek nomination or become a candidate.

Table 15: Share of employees who agreed with statements about their awareness of rights and responsibilities related to political engagement, in 2021 and 2023

Statement about rights and responsibilities related to political engagement	2021	2023
I am aware of my legal rights and responsibilities for engaging in political activities.	76%	77%
If I wanted to seek nomination or become a candidate in a federal, provincial, territorial or municipal election, I am aware of my responsibilities as a public servant.	65%	65%

As well, about 7 in 10 (69%) employees indicated that they know enough or they know where to find information regarding engagement in political activities (not asked in 2021) and 67% (versus 69% in 2021) agreed that their organization keeps them informed of their responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties (see Table 16 below).

Table 16: Share of employees who agreed with statements about management communication related to non-partisanship and political engagement, in 2021 and 2023

Statement about management communication	2021	2023
I know enough or I know where to find information regarding engagement in political activities	n/a	69%
My organization keeps me informed of my responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out my duties	69%	67%

Conclusion

The 2023 survey shed light on public servants' perceptions of the staffing system, including their experience of biases and barriers.

The survey results show that:

- perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency are largely similar to levels observed in the 2021 survey, which took place during the COVID-19 pandemic
- public servants who identified as another gender were the most likely to report that they faced biases and barriers that disadvantaged them in staffing processes
- members of visible minorities, Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities were more likely than their respective comparator groups to report experiencing biases and barriers
- participation in staffing processes for a promotion is higher than in 2021, but satisfaction with virtual interviews in comparison to in-person interviews is lower in the post-pandemic environment
- perceptions of departmental diversity and inclusion initiatives related to staffing were less positive among members of visible minorities, Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities when compared to their respective comparator groups
- as in 2021, only a small proportion of managers view persons with a priority entitlement as a valuable source of qualified candidates
- in 2023, a greater proportion of managers believed that the process to staff a position is burdensome
- in 2023, managers were less likely to say that staffing options available within their organization allow them to address their staffing needs as quickly as required
- employees' awareness of political impartiality responsibilities remains high
- less than 2 thirds of public servants are aware of their responsibilities when seeking a nomination as, or becoming, a candidate in an election

The survey findings should be used to guide departments and agencies in:

- identifying barriers that disadvantage participants in staffing processes
- identifying gaps in employees' perceptions of the integrity of the public service staffing system
- developing measures to address these gaps and barriers

The PSC will proactively engage with departments and agencies on their survey results, and offer support as needed to address any gaps. The PSC will continue to support departments and agencies by providing advice and guidance to identify and mitigate biases and barriers in assessments. Results from the survey will also be used to inform future outreach strategies to increase awareness around priority entitlements as well as political activities and non-partisanship.

Future work will look at perceptions of members of employment equity groups and certain equity-seeking groups.

For more information, the 2023 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey results can be explored using the tools on our data visualization hub, which allow for the visualization of key results from the survey. Comprehensive datasets can be found on the Open Government portal.

Appendix A: Methodology

The overall 2023 survey response rate is 31.7%, and the results are considered representative of the 273 186 federal public servants subject to the *Public Service Employment Act*.

Survey results are based on:
- all full-time indeterminate and term employees of federal departments and agencies that fall under the Public Service Employment Act
- members of the Canadian Armed Forces who have civilian (public servant) direct reports employed under the act
- regular members, civilian members and special constables of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police hired under the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act* who have public service employee direct reports employed under the *Public Service Employment Act*

Part-time and seasonal employees, casuals, students, contractors, Governor-in-Council appointees and ministers' exempt staff are excluded from this analysis.

The sample for this analysis consists of 84 741 public service employees, including:

- 57 317 non-manager/supervisor employees (68% of respondents)
- 27 274 managers/supervisors (32% of respondents)
- 932 staffing advisors (1% of respondents)

Data collection took place over a period of 9 weeks, between September 20, 2023, and November 17, 2023. For questions about their past experience, respondents were asked to refer to the previous 12 months, from September 16, 2022, to September 15, 2023.

As in the previous cycle of the survey, the 2023 survey frequently uses response categories that ask respondents the extent to which they agree with the question based on a 4-point scale:

- "Not at all"
- "To a minimal extent"
- "To a moderate extent"
- "To a great extent"

In the rare exception where a question is posed negatively, the most positive response would be for those who say "not at all" or "to a minimal extent," and this is the result included. For simplicity, this report groups these results into 2 categories to highlight

the share of respondents responding most affirmatively to a "moderate" or "great extent."

Appendix B: Comparator groups for employment equity groups

Results for members of visible minorities, Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities were compared to results of their respective comparator groups (employees who are not members of those respective employment equity groups). Results for women were compared to results for men and results for people who identified as another gender.

Methodology to identify persons with disabilities

The methodology used to identify persons with disabilities was changed in 2023. For the 2021 cycle, the PSC used Statistics Canada's disability screening questionnaire. Please refer to [2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey - Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities](#) for details.

In 2023, respondents were asked which employment equity group they identified with. To collect these data, questions aligned with the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat's [self-identification form](#) were [included in the questionnaire](#).

Appendix C: Respondent profile

Table 17: Respondent profile by employment equity group, weighted and unweighted

Employment equity groups	Proportion (unweighted)	Count (unweighted)	Proportion (weighted)	Count (weighted)
Women	63%	51 153	57%	143 704
Visible minorities	24%	20 106	24%	62 468
Indigenous Peoples	5%	4 294	5%	13 714
Persons with disabilities	24%	19 543	24%	60 707

Table 18: Respondent profile by gender, weighted and unweighted

Gender	Proportion (unweighted)	Count (unweighted)	Proportion (weighted)	Count (weighted)
Women	63%	51 153	57%	143 704
Men	36%	29 621	42%	107 265
Another gender	1%	567	1%	2 064