



2025 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey

Produced by Data Services and Analysis Directorate, Oversight and Investigations
Sector in collaboration with the Policy and Communications Sector

Source of data: conducted by Advanis

March 9, 2026

CDO approved



Aussi disponible en français sous le titre : *Sondage sur la dotation et l'impartialité politique de 2025*.

Information contained in this publication or product may be reproduced, in part or in whole, and by any means, for personal or public non-commercial purposes without charge or further permission, unless otherwise specified. Commercial reproduction and distribution are prohibited except with written permission from the Public Service Commission of Canada.

For more information, contact
Public Service Commission of Canada
22 Eddy Street
Gatineau (Quebec) K1A 0M7

Email: cfp.infocom.psc@cfp-psc.gc.ca

Website of publisher: <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-service-commission.html>

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the President of the Public Service Commission of Canada, 2026

Cat No SC1-11E-PDF (PDF English)
ISSN 2816-3982

No de cat SC1-11F-PDF (PDF French)
ISSN 2816-3974

Table of contents

Executive summary	5
Key findings and commentary	5
Introduction	7
Political activities and non-partisanship.....	8
Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency.....	11
Merit.....	11
Employment equity and equity-seeking groups' perceptions on merit.....	12
Fairness.....	14
Employment equity and equity-seeking groups' perceptions on fairness	15
Transparency.....	17
Employment equity and equity-seeking groups' perceptions on transparency	18
Participation in staffing processes.....	20
Use of artificial intelligence while participating in a staffing process.....	20
Participation in staffing processes for a promotion	21
Assessment accommodation measures in staffing processes.....	23
Experience of biases and barriers in staffing processes.....	26
Employment equity and equity-seeking groups' experiences of biases and barriers	27
Perceptions of managers and staffing advisors on the staffing system	32
Use of non-advertised appointments.....	32
Use of alternative recruitment platforms	33
Use of artificial intelligence technologies	35
Pressure when selecting a candidate.....	35
Perceptions of staffing practices and staffing advice.....	36
Priority entitlements.....	40
Innovative staffing practices or initiatives	43
Moving forward.....	44
Promoting awareness of political activities and non-partisanship	44
Advancing equity and inclusion.....	45
Responsible use of AI and alternative recruitment platforms	45
Supporting persons with priority entitlements.....	46



Sustaining collaboration and innovation	46
Annex A: Methodology	47
Annex B: Respondent profile	49

Executive summary

The Public Service Commission of Canada (PSC)'s 2025 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey marks the fourth iteration of this cyclical oversight activity. Covering the period from April 1, 2024 to March 31, 2025, the survey offers insights into public servants' perceptions of the integrity of the staffing system.

Key findings and commentary

Political activities and non-partisanship

- **Increased awareness of non-partisanship responsibilities:** Public servants demonstrated greater awareness of their responsibilities related to political impartiality and non-partisanship, as compared to 2023 levels.
- Awareness was reinforced by the PSC's targeted communications and training during elections, as well as the Clerk of the Privy Council's renewed conversation on values and ethics in the federal public service.

Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency

- **Stable perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency:** Views on merit, fairness and transparency in staffing processes remained consistent with 2023 levels.
- **Non-advertised appointments are perceived as fair** (new question): Perceptions of fairness were only slightly lower for non-advertised appointments compared to advertised ones. New data collected on the reason for non-advertised appointments may improve employee perceptions of transparency.

Use of artificial intelligence

- **Emerging use of artificial intelligence (AI):** The use of AI by employees and managers in staffing processes remains limited, (fewer than 1 in 10 employees who participated in an advertised staffing process). It presents opportunities to improve efficiency but also poses risks to merit and integrity of staffing, which the PSC will continue to monitor and address through updated guidance.

Biases and barriers

- **Perceptions of the mitigation of biases and barriers are less positive than in 2023:** Less than half of employees indicated that staffing processes in their department or agency are conducted in a way that reduces or eliminates biases and barriers.
- **Experience of biases and barriers decreased:** Fewer employees reported experiencing biases and barriers in an advertised staffing process compared with 2023 levels; however, members of equity-seeking groups often report higher occurrences of biases and barriers.

Perceptions of managers of the staffing system

- **Improved perceptions of priority entitlement candidates:** Significant positive shift, as compared to 2023 levels, in managers' recognition of persons with a priority entitlement as a valuable source of qualified candidates who meet performance expectations. Ongoing outreach by the PSC remains important to promote priority hiring as an efficient solution during workforce reductions.
- **Managers are less comfortable communicating staffing decisions:** A lower proportion of hiring managers than in 2023 reported feeling comfortable to effectively communicate staffing decisions to employees.

Introduction

The Public Service Commission of Canada (PSC) safeguards the core values of merit and non-partisanship to maintain the trust of Canadians in the integrity of the public service and to uphold its accountability to Parliament.

To support this mandate, the PSC has conducted the Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey every two years since 2018, except for 2021, when the survey was delayed due to the pandemic. This survey serves as one of the PSC's oversight tools for gauging the integrity of the staffing system.

More specifically, it targets public service employees, managers and staffing advisors to gather their views on a wide range of staffing-related topics, including:

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

The 2025 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey was administered on behalf of the PSC by Advanis, a Canadian market and social research firm. The survey was sent to all employees in 80 federal departments and agencies subject to the *Public Service Employment Act*. A total of 82 987 responses were received, for a response rate of 30.9%. The methodological approach is described in [Annex A](#).

The intended audience for this report includes parliamentarians, deputy heads, heads of human resources and public servants across all participating departments and agencies. The findings are also shared with the broader Canadian public to foster transparency and reinforce trust in the federal public service.

Alongside survey findings, this report offers insights to help understand gaps and address areas of concern for the PSC. The "[Moving forward](#)" section identifies a number of concrete measures the PSC is taking and highlights some key areas of focus for departments and agencies to consider.

The PSC has also developed interactive [data visualization tools](#) that allow 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.

Political activities and non-partisanship

Non-partisanship is a core element of the [Public Service Employment Act](#). It is also a key principle in the Government of Canada's [Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector](#), which states that in relation to the Respect for Democracy, public servants are expected to respect "the rule of law and carry[...] out their duties in accordance with legislation, policies and directives in a non-partisan and impartial manner."¹

This responsibility is essential to maintaining a professional and politically impartial public service that serves all Canadians.

The PSC plays a central role in safeguarding the political impartiality of the public service by:

- providing guidance to public servants on their rights and responsibilities related to political activities
- granting public servants permission and leave to seek nomination as, and to be, a candidate in federal, provincial, territorial and municipal elections
- investigating allegations of improper political activities and taking corrective action when warranted

Overall, the 2025 survey results related to political activities and non-partisanship have improved across all measures compared to 2023, reflecting public servants' greater awareness and understanding of their responsibilities in this area.

¹ Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector (2011), section 1.1

What's changed

Within the survey period (April 1, 2024, to March 31, 2025), several elections were held at the municipal, provincial/territorial and federal levels. To support public servants through that time, the PSC provided deputy heads with communications material to remind employees of their rights and responsibilities related to political activities and non-partisanship. The PSC also delivered a series of information sessions on political activities throughout the year. During the same period, significant emphasis was put on non-partisanship as part of the Clerk of the Privy Council's renewed conversation on values and ethics, reinforcing the importance of maintaining public trust in the federal public service.

Delivering clear and consistent messaging across these various initiatives aimed to help employees understand their rights and responsibilities, so they could make informed decisions on their political engagement and uphold public sector values, such as respect for democracy.

This increased attention on political activities and non-partisanship likely contributed to the improvement in survey results in this area.

Results indicate that employees continue to demonstrate an understanding of their responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties as public servants (94% versus 90% in 2023). Results also show that employees believe that colleagues in their work unit carried out their duties as public servants in a politically impartial manner (93% versus 91% in 2023). Similarly, 94% of employees (up from 91% in 2023) acknowledged 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.

Table 1: Share of employees who agreed with statements about their awareness of rights and responsibilities related to non-partisanship, in 2023 and 2025

Statement about non-partisanship	2023	2025
I understand my responsibility to be politically impartial in carrying out my duties as a public servant	90%	94%
In my work unit, employees carry out duties as public servants in a politically impartial manner	91%	93%
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%	94%

In 2025, 90% of employees (versus 94% in 2023) said they did not engage in political activities beyond voting. As well, 85% (versus 77% in 2023) were aware of their legal rights and responsibilities for engaging in political activities, and 73% (versus 65% in 2023) were aware of their responsibilities as public servants if they wanted to seek nomination or become a candidate.

Table 2: Share of employees who agreed with statements about their awareness of rights and responsibilities related to political engagement, in 2023 and 2025

Statement about rights and responsibilities related to political engagement	2023	2025
I am aware of my legal rights and responsibilities for engaging in political activities.	77%	85%
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%	73%

In addition, 78% of employees (up from 69% in 2023) indicated that they know enough, or where to find information, about engagement in political activities, and 81% (versus 67% in 2023) agreed that their organization kept them informed of their responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties.

Table 3: Share of employees who agreed with statements about management communication related to non-partisanship and political engagement, in 2023 and 2025

Statement about management communication	2023	2025
I know enough or I know where to find information regarding engagement in political activities	69%	78%
My organization keeps me informed of my responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out my duties	67%	81%

Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency

This section summarizes responses to questions on the themes of merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing process. For each theme, the results presented in the tables are for all employees.

Merit

Overall, employees' perceptions of merit in the staffing process remain consistent with 2023 results. More than 4 out of 5 (83%) employees agreed that people hired in their organization can do the job, compared with 84% in 2023, while 83% (same as in 2023) agreed that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled.

Table 4: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process, in 2023 and 2025

Statements related to merit	2023	2025
We hire people who can do the job	84%	83%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	83%	83%

Employment equity and equity-seeking groups² perceptions on merit

In this report, the term “comparator group” refers to employees who are not members of the specified employment equity group. (The four designated employment equity groups are: women, Indigenous Peoples³, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities.)

- Women and men had similar views on merit in the staffing process, while employees identifying with another gender were less likely to agree that their organization hires people who can do the job or that advertised job requirements reflect the position to be filled
- Perceptions of merit in the staffing process were less positive for members of visible minorities, Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities compared with their comparator groups
- Employees identifying as asexual were less likely to agree that advertised job requirements reflect the position to be filled (78%) than all other sexual orientations
- Employees identifying as two-spirit and intersex employees reported notably less positive perceptions of both statements related to merit compared to all other identities

² 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.

³ 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.

Table 5: Share of employees agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process, by employment equity group and equity-seeking groups

Respondent category	We hire people who can do the job	Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled
All employees	83%	83%
Women	85%	85%
Men	83%	83%
Another gender	74%	69%
Members of visible minorities	82%	81%
Not members of visible minorities	84%	84%
Indigenous Peoples	77%	77%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	85%	84%
Persons with disabilities	80%	79%
Persons without disabilities	85%	86%
Members of religious communities	84%	84%
Employees who are not members of religious communities	85%	84%
Married	84%	84%
Living common-law	85%	84%
Separated, but still legally married	83%	83%
Divorced	81%	81%
Single, never married	85%	84%
Widowed	80%	83%
Employees with dependants	84%	84%
Employees without dependants	84%	84%
Lesbian	81%	82%
Gay	83%	84%
Bisexual	84%	84%
Asexual	85%	78%
Pansexual	83%	81%

Respondent category	We hire people who can do the job	Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled
Heterosexual	85%	85%
Cisgender	85%	85%
Two-spirit	75%	73%
Transgender	82%	81%
Queer	84%	82%
Questioning	79%	79%
Intersex	73%	67%
Gender non-binary	81%	76%

Fairness

In 2025, more than three quarters (76%) of employees agreed that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly, consistent with 2023 (77%).

Employees who perceived the selection process as unfair were asked to describe how. The main reasons cited were a perception that appointments in their work unit are not transparent, that they are based on “who you know” and that some appointees have benefitted from nepotism or favoritism.

Expanding on the perceptions of fairness in staffing processes, a new question on non-advertised appointments was introduced in 2025. Overall, 71% of employees agreed that non-advertised appointments are done fairly. The main reasons cited by respondents who perceived non-advertised appointments as unfair were that non-advertised appointments depend on who you know (74%) and that they are not transparent (70%).

Table 6: Share of employees agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process, in 2023 and 2025

Statements related to fairness	2023	2025
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	77%	76%
Non-advertised appointments are done fairly	n/a	71%

Table 7: Share of employees who did not agree or agreed to a minimal extent that within their work unit, non-advertised appointments are done fairly, by reason

Reasons	2025
Non-advertised appointments depend on who you know	74%
Non-advertised appointments are not transparent	70%
Non-advertised appointments are not based on merit	48%
Non-advertised appointments are never fair	30%
Non-advertised appointments are not inclusive	28%
Other	12%

Employment equity and equity-seeking groups' perceptions on fairness

With the exception of women, all employment equity groups expressed less positive perceptions than their respective comparator groups.

- Employees identifying as another gender had the least positive perceptions of fairness in the staffing process of all groups
- Members of visible minorities, Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities had less positive perceptions of fairness in the staffing process than their respective comparator groups
- Members of religious communities had less positive perceptions of fairness in the staffing process compared with employees who are not members of religious communities

- Employees who are separated, divorced or widowed had less positive perceptions of fairness in the staffing process compared with employees who are married, living common-law or single
- Employees identifying as asexual and pansexual had less positive perceptions of fairness compared with all other sexual orientations
- Employees identifying as two-spirit and intersex had less positive perceptions of both statements related to fairness compared to all other identities

Table 8: Share of employees agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process, by employment equity group and equity-seeking group

Respondent category	Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	Non-advertised appointments are done fairly
All employees	76%	71%
Women	78%	72%
Men	77%	72%
Another gender	65%	54%
Members of visible minorities	74%	66%
Not members of visible minorities	78%	73%
Indigenous Peoples	68%	63%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	78%	72%
Persons with disabilities	71%	65%
Persons without disabilities	80%	74%
Members of religious communities	77%	71%
Employees who are not members of religious communities	79%	74%
Married	78%	72%
Living common-law	79%	74%
Separated, but still legally married	73%	66%
Divorced	72%	66%
Single, never married	78%	73%
Widowed	73%	68%
Employees with dependants	77%	71%

Respondent category	Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	Non-advertised appointments are done fairly
Employees without dependants	78%	73%
Lesbian	75%	71%
Gay	78%	72%
Bisexual	78%	73%
Asexual	74%	67%
Pansexual	74%	69%
Heterosexual	78%	73%
Cisgender	79%	74%
Two-spirit	68%	60%
Transgender	79%	68%
Queer	77%	71%
Questioning	73%	67%
Intersex	67%	60%
Gender non-binary	74%	63%

Transparency

Perceptions related to transparency in the staffing process have remained stable since 2023, with 70% of employees agreeing that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way. As well, 72% of employees agreed that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit, consistent with 2023.

Did you know?

Recent changes to notices about staffing decisions, available to all employees on the GC Jobs website, to identify the rationale for internal non-advertised processes may contribute positively to perceptions of transparency in non-advertised processes.

Table 9: Share of employees agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process, in 2023 and 2025

Statements related to transparency	2023	2025
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	70%	70%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving my work unit	72%	72%

Employment equity and equity-seeking groups' perceptions on transparency

- Women and men had similar perceptions of transparency in the staffing process
- Employees identifying as another gender reported the least positive perceptions of transparency in the staffing process of all groups
- Members of visible minorities, Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities had less positive perceptions of transparency in the staffing process than their comparator groups
- Employees who are separated, divorced or widowed had less positive perceptions of transparency in the staffing process compared with employees who are married, living common-law or single
- Employees identifying as lesbian, bisexual, pansexual or asexual had less positive perceptions of transparency in the staffing process when compared with all other sexual orientations
- Employees identifying as cisgender had the most positive perceptions of transparency in the staffing process compared to all other identity groups

Table 10: Share of employees agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process, by employment equity group and equity-seeking group

Respondent category	Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving my work unit
All employees	70%	72%
Women	71%	72%
Men	72%	73%
Another gender	57%	61%
Members of visible minorities	68%	69%
Not members of visible minorities	72%	73%
Indigenous Peoples	65%	66%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	72%	73%
Persons with disabilities	65%	67%
Persons without disabilities	74%	75%
Members of religious communities	72%	72%
Employees who are not members of religious communities	71%	74%
Married	72%	73%
Living common-law	72%	74%
Separated, but still legally married	68%	68%
Divorced	68%	69%
Single, never married	72%	72%
Widowed	72%	68%
Employees with dependants	72%	73%
Employees without dependants	71%	73%
Lesbian	66%	71%
Gay	71%	73%
Bisexual	68%	71%
Asexual	67%	68%
Pansexual	65%	71%



Respondent category	Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving my work unit
Heterosexual	72%	73%
Cisgender	72%	74%
Two-spirit	63%	63%
Transgender	67%	70%
Queer	65%	72%
Questioning	63%	66%
Intersex	60%	72%
Gender non-binary	64%	70%

Participation in staffing processes

The 2025 survey gathers perceptions from employees participating in staffing processes and reflects the staffing environment for the fiscal year spanning April 1, 2024, to March 31, 2025, where staffing activities consisted of 4 187 job advertisements and 71 052 appointments to term, indeterminate and acting positions. For more data on hiring activities, please consult the [Public Service Commission's Staffing Dashboard](#).

Use of artificial intelligence while participating in a staffing process

The 2025 survey introduced new questions to explore how artificial intelligence (AI) technologies are being used in staffing processes.

Overall, 35% of federal public service employees participated in an advertised staffing process in the past 12 months (compared with 40% in 2023). Among those who participated in an advertised staffing process, 9% mentioned that they used AI technologies such as ChatGPT, Gemini by Google or Microsoft Copilot at some point during the staffing process.

Of those who used AI technologies, the most common parts of the staffing process where these tools were leveraged were preparing a résumé or curriculum vitae (49%) and answering screening questions (49%).



Table 11: Share of employees who used AI technologies, by part of the staffing process

Part of the staffing process	2025
Answering screening questions	49%
Preparing a résumé or curriculum vitae	49%
Writing a cover letter	39%
Preparing for an interview	38%
Writing an exam	8%
Preparing for a second language evaluation	6%
Other	12%

Participation in staffing processes for a promotion

Of all federal public service employees, 27% reported that they participated in an advertised staffing process for a promotion in the 2024 to 2025 fiscal year, down from 31% in 2023.

Among those who did not seek a promotion through an advertised staffing process:

- 53% (versus 43% in 2023) indicated that no promotion opportunities were available
- 32% (versus 33% in 2023) indicated being satisfied with their current group and level

A smaller proportion of employees reported that they did not pursue a promotion because the application process is burdensome (17% versus 21% in 2023), staffing processes take too long to complete (15% versus 17% in 2023) or that they are concerned that a promotion might affect their work-life balance (13% versus 14% in 2023).

Employees who selected other reasons for not applying to a staffing process for a promotion were asked to specify. Some of these respondents reported it was because they participated in a non-advertised process or because they were promoted as part of a development program. Others expressed a concern about lack of transparency, indicating they were not aware of processes that took place until after appointments had been made.

Table 12: Share of employees who did not participate in an advertised staffing process for a promotion in 2023 and 2025, by reason

Reasons for not participating in an advertised staffing process for promotion	2023	2025
No promotion opportunities were available	43%	53%
I am satisfied with my current group and level	33%	32%
Application process is burdensome	21%	17%
Staffing processes take too long to complete	17%	15%
I was concerned that this move would affect my work-life balance	14%	13%
I did not meet the language requirements for the positions	11%	12%
I have no interest in moving to a management or executive position	11%	11%
Advertised positions were meant for specific persons	11%	11%
I was concerned that my pay would be affected by issues with the Phoenix pay system	11%	8%
I do not believe that staffing processes are fair	9%	8%
I have not been at my current group and level for a long time	10%	7%
I did not meet the essential qualifications for the positions	7%	6%
I was concerned that I may not be successful	7%	6%
I am not geographically mobile	6%	6%
I was concerned that my current accommodation measures may not be accepted in a new position	5%	5%
I am retiring shortly	4%	4%
Operational requirements of the position did not suit my personal circumstances (for example: willingness and ability to work overtime on a short notice, willingness to travel)	n/a	2%
Concerns related to accessibility	n/a	1%

Reasons for not participating in an advertised staffing process for promotion	2023	2025
I don't want to self-declare as part of a staffing process if it's required	n/a	1%
Other reasons	14%	13%

Employees who said they did not participate in a staffing process for a promotion due to concerns related to accessibility were asked to specify the nature of their concerns. Some respondents indicated that they were concerned about their ability to maintain their existing remote work arrangements. Others indicated that they were concerned about managing additional responsibilities or having to disclose their health conditions.

Among employees who participated in a staffing process, 8% reported they withdrew because the process took too long.

Assessment accommodation measures in staffing processes

This section presents the perspectives of persons with disabilities on assessment accommodation measures.

An assessment accommodation is a change made to an assessment procedure, format or content. It is designed to remove barriers to a fair assessment and allow candidates to fully demonstrate their competency.

Assessment accommodation measures can be classified into five broad categories:

- testing environment
- test format
- response format
- scheduling/timing
- other

Most employees who request assessment accommodation do it on the basis of a disability. However, accommodation can be requested for any legitimate need relating to one of the 13 prohibited grounds for discrimination set out in the [Canadian Human Rights Act](#). (For more information, consult the Government of Canada's [basics of assessment accommodation](#).)

In 2025, the survey continued to explore whether respondents requested accommodation as part of a staffing process or a second language evaluation. Respondents who requested accommodation measures were then asked if they received them, and if so, to what extent they were satisfied with the accommodation provided. They were also asked to identify the types of accommodation they received.

To better understand situations where accommodation measures were needed but not requested, two new questions were introduced in 2025. Respondents were asked whether they chose not to request the accommodation measures they required, and if so, why they decided not to make the request.

The survey results show that employees with disabilities were nine times more likely to request assessment accommodation than those without disabilities (9% versus 1% for employees without disabilities). Among those who made a request, 72% of employees with disabilities received accommodation, compared to 45% of employees without disabilities. The level of satisfaction with the assessment accommodation received was identical for persons with and without disabilities (87%).

Table 13: Employees' experiences with assessment accommodations as part of a staffing process or second language evaluation; persons with disabilities compared with employees without disabilities

Category of employees	Employees with disabilities	Employees without disabilities
Employees who requested assessment accommodation	9%	1%
Employees who received assessment accommodation they requested	72%	45%
Employees who were satisfied with the assessment accommodation they received	87%	87%
Employees who needed assessment accommodation measures and did not request them	10%	1%

Employees who received accommodation measures were asked to identify the specific types of accommodation provided. Among employees granted assessment accommodation, extra time was the most commonly reported measure (74% for employees with disabilities versus 53% for those without disabilities).



Table 14: Share of employees who were provided with an assessment accommodation measure as part of a staffing process or second language evaluation, by type of accommodation measure; persons with disabilities compared with employees without disabilities

Type of accommodation measure	Employees with disabilities	Employees without disabilities
Extra time to complete an assessment	74%	53%
Break(s) during an assessment	29%	17%
Assessment done at home	17%	13%
Use of a private room	14%	4%
Materials/questions provided ahead of time	10%	2%
Accommodation measures for persons with difficulty hearing	8%	3%
Assessment shortened or divided into parts/sessions	6%	3%
Visual enhancement technology	2%	0%
Visual replacement technology such as a screen reader	2%	1%
Speech recognition software	2%	1%
Other	24%	33%

Among employees with disabilities who needed accommodation measures, 10% chose not to make a request, compared with 1% for employees without disabilities. Among employees with disabilities, the primary reason cited was concern about their chances of succeeding in the appointment process (70% versus 35% for persons without disabilities).



Table 15: Share of employees who needed but did not request assessment accommodations, by reason; persons with disabilities compared with employees without disabilities

Reason	Employees with disabilities	Employees without disabilities
I was concerned that making an accommodation request would reduce my chances of succeeding in the appointment process	70%	35%
I did not believe that I would receive the accommodation I needed	36%	46%
Requesting assessment accommodations is too difficult or complicated	36%	31%
The process of obtaining an accommodation takes too much time	29%	23%
Other reason(s)	28%	34%

Why it matters

These results suggest that concerns about stigma and being disadvantaged discourage some employees from requesting assessment accommodation measures, while the perception of complicated or time-consuming processes could further contribute to their reluctance. Although satisfaction is high when accommodation measures are provided, these perceptions and potential barriers may prevent some employees from accessing the support they need.

Experience of biases and barriers in staffing processes

As part of its mandate, the PSC gathers information on biases and barriers to support departments and agencies in reducing these barriers and promoting more inclusive recruitment.

Overall, 45% (versus 55% in 2023) of employees indicated that within their department or agency, staffing processes are conducted in a way that reduces or eliminates biases and barriers in staffing process assessment methods that disadvantage persons belonging to an equity-seeking group.

Among employees who participated in an advertised staffing process between April 1, 2024, and March 31, 2025, 15% (versus 18% in 2023) indicated that they had experienced biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them.

Employment equity and equity-seeking groups' experiences of biases and barriers

This section presents key highlights for the four designated employment equity groups and for equity-seeking groups regarding the experience of biases and barriers in staffing processes. Comprehensive findings and additional insights can be accessed through the PSC's [data visualization tool](#).

- Women (12%) were less likely than men (16%) and people who identified as another gender (28%) to report experiencing biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them
- Members of visible minorities (18%), Indigenous Peoples (20%) and persons with disabilities (22%) were more likely than their comparator groups to report experiencing biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them (13%, 14% and 11% respectively)
- Among equity-seeking groups, employees who identified as lesbian (19%) or gay (17%) were more likely to report biases and barriers than employees who identified as heterosexual (13%)
- Employees who identified as transgender (24%), two-spirit (32%) or gender non-binary (24%) reported higher experiences of biases and barriers relative to all employees (15%)

Table 16: Share of employees reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process, by employment equity group and equity-seeking group

Respondent category	Yes	No	Don't know
All employees	15%	60%	26%
Women	12%	63%	25%
Men	16%	59%	25%
Another gender	28%	46%	26%
Members of visible minorities	18%	48%	33%
Not members of visible minorities	13%	65%	22%
Indigenous Peoples	20%	53%	27%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	14%	61%	25%
Persons with disabilities	22%	50%	28%
Persons without disabilities	11%	66%	23%
Members of religious communities	16%	58%	26%
Employees who are not members of religious communities	12%	66%	22%
Married	14%	60%	26%
Living common-law	13%	66%	22%
Separated, but still legally married	17%	55%	28%
Divorced	19%	53%	27%
Single, never married	13%	62%	25%
Widowed	18%	59%	22%
Employees with dependants	15%	59%	25%
Employees without dependants	13%	63%	24%
Lesbian	19%	58%	24%
Gay	17%	58%	24%
Bisexual	16%	59%	25%
Asexual	18%	57%	26%
Pansexual	19%	53%	28%
Heterosexual	13%	63%	24%
Cisgender	13%	63%	24%
Two-spirit	32%	40%	27%
Transgender	24%	48%	28%
Queer	17%	54%	30%
Questioning	24%	46%	31%
Intersex	n/a	n/a	n/a
Gender non-binary	24%	51%	25%



Perceived basis of disadvantage experienced in the staffing process

Among those who reported experiencing biases and barriers that disadvantaged them in the staffing process, race (31%) was the most frequently reported, followed by national or ethnic origin (23%), sex (23%) and disability (22%). The following explores the intersection of employment equity status and equity-seeking groups.

- Among employment equity groups, women were less likely than men to report being disadvantaged based on race (21% versus 41%), national or ethnic origin (18% versus 27%) and colour (11% versus 25%), but more likely to report being disadvantaged due to disability (27% versus 17%) and family status (15% versus 8%)
- Members of visible minorities were most likely to report being disadvantaged based on race (49%), national or ethnic origin (37%) and colour (31%)
- Indigenous Peoples tended to report being disadvantaged based on race (34%) and sex (27%)
- Employees who identified as another gender were most likely to mention being disadvantaged due to disability (42%), race (35%), sex (33%) and gender identity or expression (30%)

Table 17: Share of employees who perceived biases and barriers for each prohibited ground of discrimination, by employment equity group

Respondent category	Race	National or ethnic origin	Colour	Religion	Age	Sex	Sexual orientation
All employees	31%	23%	19%	6%	20%	23%	6%
Women	21%	18%	11%	4%	22%	18%	2%
Men	41%	27%	25%	6%	19%	27%	9%
Another gender	35%	22%	17%	11%	16%	33%	20%
Members of visible minorities	49%	37%	31%	12%	22%	19%	4%
Not members of visible minorities	21%	15%	12%	2%	19%	25%	7%
Indigenous Peoples	34%	23%	14%	4%	22%	27%	8%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	30%	22%	18%	6%	20%	21%	5%
Persons with disabilities	21%	15%	12%	3%	20%	19%	4%
Persons without disabilities	40%	29%	23%	7%	21%	25%	7%

Table 17 (continued): Share of employees who perceived biases and barriers for each prohibited ground of discrimination, by employment equity group

Respondent category	Gender identity or expression	Marital status	Family status	Genetic characteristics	Disability	Conviction for an offence ⁴	Don't know
All employees	5%	4%	11%	3%	22%	0%	24%
Women	2%	5%	15%	2%	27%	0%	25%
Men	6%	3%	8%	4%	17%	0%	23%
Another gender	30%	7%	10%	6%	42%	3%	14%
Members of visible minorities	4%	5%	11%	3%	15%	0%	23%
Not members of visible minorities	5%	4%	12%	3%	27%	0%	24%
Indigenous Peoples	5%	4%	12%	4%	22%	1%	24%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	4%	4%	11%	3%	23%	0%	24%
Persons with disabilities	4%	5%	13%	4%	46%	0%	18%
Persons without disabilities	5%	4%	10%	1%	2%	0%	29%

Breakdown for each stage of hiring process

Biases and barriers were mostly reported to be experienced during the organizational screening (38%), interview (35%) and job application (33%) stages, while they were less frequently reported at the reference check (7%) and security clearance (2%) stages.

- At the job application stage, respondents identifying as another gender were the most likely to report biases and barriers (57%)
- During organizational screening, Indigenous Peoples (41%) and members of visible minorities (40%) were more likely to perceive the presence of biases and barriers compared to their comparator groups (37% in both cases)
- At the interview stage, respondents identifying as another gender were also much more likely to report biases and barriers (46%)

⁴ The full statement is "Conviction for an offence for which a pardon has been granted or in respect of which a record suspension has been ordered."

- Members of visible minorities (41%) and persons with disabilities (37%) were also more likely to report barriers compared with their comparator groups (respectively 31% and 33%).

Table 18: Share of respondents who perceived biases and barriers at different stages of advertised hiring processes, by employment equity group

Respondent category	Job application	Automated screening	Organizational screening	Written exam	Interviews
All employees	33%	27%	38%	15%	35%
Women	29%	22%	33%	17%	34%
Men	35%	31%	42%	13%	34%
Another gender	57%	39%	38%	19%	46%
Members of visible minorities	33%	27%	40%	15%	41%
Not members of visible minorities	33%	27%	37%	15%	31%
Indigenous Peoples	32%	27%	41%	14%	36%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	32%	26%	37%	15%	35%
Persons with disabilities	34%	29%	37%	19%	37%
Persons without disabilities	31%	25%	38%	12%	33%

Table 18 (continued): Share of respondents who perceived biases and barriers at different stages of advertised hiring processes, by employment equity group

Respondent category	Reference checks	Appointments	Second language evaluation	Security clearance
All employees	7%	30%	15%	2%
Women	7%	28%	15%	1%
Men	7%	31%	15%	2%
Another gender	10%	32%	20%	4%
Members of visible minorities	9%	33%	17%	4%
Not members of visible minorities	7%	28%	14%	1%
Indigenous Peoples	8%	28%	16%	2%
Non-Indigenous Peoples	7%	30%	15%	2%
Persons with disabilities	9%	30%	17%	2%
Persons without disabilities	6%	29%	13%	2%

Perceptions of managers and staffing advisors on the staffing system

Use of non-advertised appointments

New questions in 2025 examined hiring managers' use of non-advertised appointment processes. Among all hiring managers who staffed or attempted to staff one or more positions between April 1, 2024, and March 31, 2025, 41% reported using both advertised and non-advertised appointment processes, 36% used only non-advertised appointment processes, while 23% used only advertised appointment processes. The primary reasons reported for using non-advertised appointment processes were the ability to hire the best candidate for the position (47%) followed by the complexity and length of advertised processes (35%).

Hiring managers who indicated other reasons for using non-advertised appointments were asked to specify. The most common answers were that they had an urgent need for specialized skills due to operational requirements and that there was a lack of qualified candidates in existing pools. Others mentioned that they were bridging students.

Table 19: Share of hiring managers who used non-advertised appointment processes, by reason

Reasons	2025
Non-advertised appointment processes allow me to hire the best candidate for the position	47%
Advertised appointment processes are too complicated or take too long	35%
Non-advertised appointments improve employee retention	33%
I had a particular candidate in mind	32%
Non-advertised appointments allow my organization to promote more inclusive hiring	29%
Other	36%

Did you know?

The PSC is now asking departments and agencies to provide the rationale for internal and external non-advertised processes, to better understand their use and allow for greater transparency in its reporting. Early indications show non-advertised appointments are primarily used for highly specialized skills, shortage areas and pressing operational needs. Other reasons included shifts in employment type (for example, casual to term), hiring of former students (bridging) and appointments in support of employment equity objectives.

This data complements survey findings, providing insight into the use of non-advertised processes.

Use of alternative recruitment platforms

The 2025 survey also introduced new questions on the use of alternative recruitment platforms. These platforms are systems or tools used by federal departments and agencies to manage recruitment activities outside of GC Jobs (also known as the Public Service Resourcing System), the official Government of Canada recruitment portal. They can include:

- professional networking sites (for example, LinkedIn, GCconnex)
- external job boards (such as Indeed)
- social media channels (for example, Facebook, Twitter)
- tools procured from the private sector (such as VidCruiter)
- a system created by another federal department for functional community recruitment and management (for example, the Office of the Chief Information Officer of Canada's Digital Talent Platform)
- informal methods (such as employee referral programs)

Nearly half of hiring managers (47%) reported using alternative recruitment platforms when conducting a staffing process between April 1, 2024, and March 31, 2025. Facebook (16%), employee referral programs (15%) and GCconnex (13%) were cited as the most frequently used platforms.

Managers who reported using "other" alternative recruitment platforms were asked to specify which one(s) they were using. Responses included internal talent pools and employee referrals other than through official employee referral programs.

Table 20: Share of hiring managers who used alternative recruitment platforms, by platform

Alternative recruitment platform	2025
Facebook	16%
Employee referral programs	15%
GCconnex	13%
VidCruiter	8%
LinkedIn	7%
Indeed	1%
Twitter	1%
Other	16%
None of the above	53%

Among the hiring managers who used alternative recruitment platforms, 64% reported using them during the job posting stage of the staffing process. Additionally, 48% used these platforms during the applicant screening stage, and 41% used them during the interview stage.

Table 21: Share of hiring managers who used alternative recruitment platforms by stage of the staffing process

Stage of the staffing process	2025
Job poster	64%
Applicant screening	48%
Interviews	41%
Reference checks	31%
Appointments (for example: to provide letter of offer, make a formal job offer, notification of placement in a pool)	22%
Updating applicants on progress	18%
Written exam	16%
Other	8%

Use of artificial intelligence technologies

New questions on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) by hiring managers in staffing processes were introduced in 2025. Overall, 6% of hiring managers reported using AI technologies (for example, ChatGPT, Gemini, Microsoft Copilot) during a staffing process between April 1, 2024, and March 31, 2025. These technologies were primarily used to prepare assessment tools (52%) and develop merit criteria (46%).

Table 22: Share of hiring managers who used AI technologies, by stage of the staffing process

Stage of the staffing process	2025
Preparing assessment tools	52%
Preparing the merit criteria	46%
Preparing job posters	30%
Reviewing assessments (for example: written tests)	12%
Conducting interviews	11%
Updating applicants on progress	10%
Reviewing applications	10%
Appointments	6%
Reference checks	5%
Ranking candidates	2%
Other	14%

Pressure when selecting a candidate

Overall, 24% of managers (same as in 2023) reported feeling pressure to select a particular candidate. Among those who reported experiencing pressure, the most common source was individuals with authority over them (67%), followed by co-workers (15%).

Table 23: Share of hiring managers who felt pressure when selecting a candidate, in 2023 and 2025, by source of pressure

Source of pressure when selecting a candidate	2023	2025
Individuals with authority over me	68%	67%
Co-workers	16%	15%
Individuals reporting to me	12%	10%
Selection board members	10%	8%
Individuals from other departments or agencies	5%	6%
Elected officials or political staffers	n/a	2%
Individuals from outside the government	1%	1%
Other people	15%	16%

To watch

Of the 24% of managers who reported feeling pressure to select a particular candidate, the majority (67%) indicated that this pressure came from individuals with authority over them. While those with authority over hiring managers may have a role to play in the hiring process, it is important to ensure that accountability for staffing decisions remains with the individual to whom the authority has been subdelegated.

As well, 2% of managers reported experiencing pressure from elected officials or political staffers. Maintaining a clear separation between staffing decisions and political influence is essential to protecting a non-partisan public service. Upholding this distance helps protect the integrity and impartiality of the staffing process, ensuring that appointments are made based on merit rather than external or inappropriate pressures.

Perceptions of staffing practices and staffing advice

This section focuses on managers' perceptions of staffing support and advice they receive from staffing advisors, while also including staffing advisors' own perspectives. It also examines the role of managers and staffing advisors in mitigating biases and barriers in staffing processes.

In 2025, new questions were introduced to better understand managers' awareness of their organizational staffing plan and their perception of being equipped to identify and mitigate biases and barriers in assessment methods. Overall, 59% of managers reported

being aware of their organization's human resources or people management plan, and 82% indicated that they feel equipped to identify and mitigate biases and barriers in assessment methods that may disadvantage individuals belonging to an equity-seeking group.

Staffing advisors play a critical role in providing guidance, tools and support to help managers review assessment methods. In total, 97% of staffing advisors reported knowing where to find PSC tools and guidance to help their client managers remove or mitigate biases and barriers in assessment methods that disadvantage persons belonging to an equity-seeking group, and 91% indicated they received sufficient guidance from their organization to help managers review their assessment methods before using them to remove or mitigate any biases and barriers that disadvantage persons belonging to an equity-seeking group.

When asked about staffing options, 40% of managers believed that available staffing options allowed them to meet their needs quickly (versus 33% in 2023), while 50% agreed that staffing options provide the flexibility to appoint individuals who meet the needs of their work unit (versus 52% in 2023). As well, 79% of all managers felt comfortable explaining staffing decisions to their employees. When only looking at hiring managers, 88% reported feeling comfortable, compared with 94% in 2023.



Table 24: Share of managers who agreed with statements about the staffing process, in 2023 and 2025

Statement about staffing process	2023	2025
I am aware of my organization's Human Resources plan or People Management plan	n/a	59%
I feel equipped in identifying and mitigating biases and barriers in assessment methods that disadvantage persons belonging to an equity-seeking group	n/a	82%
Staffing options available within my organization allow me to address my staffing needs as quickly as required	33%	40%
Staffing options available within my organization provide me with the flexibility to appoint persons to meet the needs of my work unit	52%	50%
I felt comfortable explaining staffing decisions to my employees ⁵	94%	79% (88% for hiring managers)

Regarding staffing services and advice, 76% of hiring managers (versus 75% in 2023) expressed overall satisfaction with the staffing services received from their organization. Two thirds (66%) of hiring managers agreed that they receive adequate support from staffing advisors to reduce the time it takes to staff a vacant position (this question was introduced in 2025).

⁵ In 2023, this question was asked of hiring managers only.

Table 25: Share of hiring managers who agreed with statements about staffing practices and staffing advice, in 2023 and 2025

Statement about staffing practices and advice	2023	2025
Overall, I am satisfied with the staffing services I have received from my organization	75%	76%
I receive adequate support from staffing advisors to reduce the time it takes to staff a vacant position	n/a	66%

Among hiring managers who were not satisfied with the staffing services they received from their organization, 60% indicated that they would like to receive support and advice in finding new approaches to staffing. Half of respondents (50%) mentioned a need for advice, tools and guidance to support staffing decisions. As well, 42% said they would like greater advice and guidance on the use of existing pools of candidates within their organization. A similar proportion (42%) showed interest for advice and guidance in aligning their staffing needs with the priorities of their organization's human resources or people management plan.

Table 26: Share of hiring managers who agreed with statements about receiving more advice and guidance, in 2023 and 2025

Statement about staffing process	2023	2025
Finding new approaches to staffing	68%	60%
Advice, tools and guidance to support staffing decisions	53%	50%
Existing pools of candidates within your organization	46%	42%
Aligning your staffing needs with the priorities of your organization's human resources plan or people management plan	35%	42%
Establishing the merit criteria	33%	33%
Identifying and mitigating risks in staffing processes (2025) / Risk identification and risk mitigation (2023)	18%	28%
Establishing the area of selection	20%	21%
Employment equity considerations	14%	13%

Statement about staffing process	2023	2025
Legislative and policy interpretations	14%	13%
Federal Student Work Experience Program	n/a	12%
Consideration of persons with a priority entitlement	11%	12%
Accessibility, diversity and/or inclusion	13%	11%
Assessment accommodation measures	11%	11%
Indigenous Career Pathways	n/a	10%
Post-Secondary Co-operative Education and Internship Program	n/a	9%
Virtual Door to Talent with Disabilities	n/a	6%
Recruitment of Policy Leaders Program	n/a	4%
Mobility and preference provisions under the <i>Veterans Hiring Act</i>	n/a	4%
Research Affiliate Program	n/a	3%
Other areas	25%	28%

Priority entitlements

Priority entitlements provide certain qualified individuals with an entitlement to be appointed ahead of all other candidates to a position within the public service. More details are available on the PSC's [priority entitlements web page](#).

New results from the 2025 survey show that 75% of managers are aware of their responsibilities related to considering persons with a priority entitlement when making appointments. Among staffing advisors, 83% (compared to 80% in 2023) believe that managers are open to considering such candidates when they are referred to them for staffing positions. New questions were introduced in 2025 and found that overall, 38% of hiring managers reported having considered hiring a person with a priority entitlement, 26% assessed one as part of a hiring process and 9% hired one.

Table 27: Share of hiring managers who considered, assessed or hired a person with a priority entitlement

Activity	Hiring managers
Considered (confirmed interest, reviewed eligibility) hiring a person with a priority entitlement	38%
Assessed (screening, testing, interviewing) a person with a priority entitlement as part of a staffing process	26%
Hired (appointing or deploying) a person with a priority entitlement to a position	9%
None of the above	53%

Among hiring managers who did not consider, assess or hire a person with a priority entitlement, the most common reason was that no candidates were referred to them (65%). Other reasons included having limited hiring authority due to being in a temporary or acting position at the time, or that the decisions were being made by a more senior manager.

As well, 96% of staffing advisors mentioned feeling equipped to support hiring managers in hiring persons with priority entitlements.



Table 28: Share of hiring managers who did not consider hiring, assessed or hired a person with a priority entitlement, by reason

Reasons	Hiring managers
No candidates were referred to me	65%
I did not conduct any appointment processes	12%
The priority talent pool does not match my staffing needs	17%
The priority consideration process does not let me select the best candidate for the position	8%
The priority consideration process is unclear to me	6%
Considering persons with a priority entitlement is not a staffing option recommended by my human resources advisor	4%
The priority consideration process is too time consuming	1%
The priority consideration process is complicated	1%
Other	12%

Overall, 60% of managers agreed that persons with priority entitlements are a valuable source of qualified candidates (up from 38% in 2023). This perception was more prevalent among managers who have hired a person with a priority entitlement (77%) than those who have not (59%). Also, 41% of managers agreed that persons with a priority entitlement that are hired meet performance expectations (versus 30% in 2023). This proportion is also higher among managers who have hired a person with a priority entitlement (73%) compared to those who have not (39%).



Table 29: Share of managers who agreed with statements about persons with priority entitlements, in 2023 and 2025

Statement about persons with priority entitlements	2023	2025
Persons with a priority entitlement are a valuable source of qualified candidates	38%	60%
Persons with a priority entitlement that are hired meet performance expectations	30%	41%

What it means

Hiring managers' perceptions of persons with priority entitlements have improved significantly between 2023 and 2025, with increased outreach by the PSC raising awareness and potentially contributing to these views.

The value of persons with priority entitlements is more pronounced for managers who have hired a person with a priority entitlement. The less positive perceptions of managers who have not hired persons with priority entitlements demonstrates the need to continue promoting this experienced source of talent and addressing any stigma associated with it

Managers who did not agree that persons with a priority entitlement are a valuable source of qualified candidates were asked to provide reasons for their views. The most common perceptions among those managers were that persons with a priority entitlement do not possess the essential qualifications (58%) and that persons with a priority entitlement require additional training to get up to speed (54%).

Innovative staffing practices or initiatives

Overall, 10% of employees (versus 13% in 2023) indicated that their organization had undertaken innovative staffing practices or initiatives between April 1, 2024, and March 31, 2025. A follow-up open-ended question asked for details on these practices and initiatives. This additional information helped identify two themes:

1. **Diversity and inclusion:** A significant proportion of the comments received were related to equity, diversity and inclusion. Respondents mentioned recruitment initiatives for employment equity groups, including targeted processes for these groups, particularly Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities. Some

respondents mentioned adjustments and accommodation measures to ensure accessibility. Though many comments were positive, some respondents expressed concerns that these initiatives are detrimental to merit-based hiring and that they might impact the overall quality of work.

2. **Staffing mechanisms and tools:** Another important part of the feedback was related to various staffing mechanisms including greater use of talent pools, inventories and internal talent management systems. Some managers mentioned using social media to connect with potential employees and leveraging internal mobility programs to fill vacancies. However, some respondents highlighted the challenges of effectively using these resources, including issues with outdated processes, lack of manager engagement and difficulties in bridging the gap between talent identification and actual placement.

Moving forward

The 2025 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey offers valuable insights to help departments and agencies identify biases and barriers in staffing processes, understand gaps in employees' perceptions of staffing system integrity and design targeted measures to address these issues.

While this report presents overall trends for the public service as a whole, departments and agencies must review their results and take tailored action. The PSC will proactively engage with them to provide support where needed.

Promoting awareness of political activities and non-partisanship

Departments and agencies should maintain ongoing engagement with employees, with the PSC's support, to promote awareness of rights and responsibilities related to political activities. This may include onboarding sessions, information campaigns, regular reminders during election periods and town halls.

Engagement with newly appointed deputy heads will also continue to reinforce obligations and build awareness of their role in raising organizational considerations related to political activity requests.

There were more than 100 cases across the public service where managers reported experiencing pressure from elected officials or political staffers. Departments and agencies should monitor trends within their organizations and take action to ensure that staffing decisions remain free from political influence and are based on merit.

Advancing equity and inclusion

Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency remain generally positive; however, employment equity and equity-seeking groups report less positive experiences. Departments and agencies should continue to involve employment equity and equity-seeking groups in developing staffing practices and policies, and they should use employment systems reviews to identify biases and barriers, as well as opportunities for improvement.

Departments and agencies should foster an organizational culture that prioritizes accessibility and ensures employees feel comfortable requesting assessment accommodation when applying for job opportunities. Proactive measures are needed to offer accommodation, reduce stigma associated with such requests and advance inclusive-by-design approaches for all assessments. To support these efforts, the PSC is updating its [Guide for Assessing Persons with Disabilities](#), while working to enhance the accessibility of its language testing platform. The PSC will also continue offering workshops and consultations on accessible assessment practices.

Responsible use of AI and alternative recruitment platforms

As AI becomes more common in hiring, it presents opportunities for efficiency as well as risks to merit and integrity. The PSC will monitor the use of AI in staffing and continue to promote best practices and explore tools to prevent, detect and address cheating. It will also update guidance as new approaches and evidence emerge. At the same time, the PSC will pilot recruitment and candidate assessment platforms to explore functionalities and compliance with policy requirements, and look to certify these new tools for use across the public service.

Supporting persons with priority entitlements

As departments and agencies implement workforce reductions, the PSC will continue outreach to promote the hiring of persons with priority entitlements as a value-added, quick and effective staffing solution so that managers fully understand and meet their obligations. Managers are encouraged to contact their corporate service teams and attend PSC outreach sessions to learn more about considering persons with priority entitlements.

Sustaining collaboration and innovation

Strengthening staffing practices across the public service will require sustained collaboration and innovation. By working together to uphold merit, fairness and transparency, while adopting new technologies responsibly, we can build a staffing system rooted in inclusivity and integrity. The PSC remains committed to supporting departments and agencies as they evolve their staffing approaches to meet organizational needs and effectively serve Canadians.

Information about the 2025 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey results can be explored using the PSC's [data visualization tools](#). Comprehensive datasets are also available on the [Open Government Portal](#).

Annex A: Methodology

The overall 2025 survey response rate is 30.9%, reflecting strong employee engagement during a demanding period influenced by multiple factors. The collection took place over the summer months, as the survey launch was postponed to respect the federal election blackout period.

Responses are weight-adjusted within gender and age groups to account for non-response and ensure representativeness. The results are therefore considered representative of the 268 584 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 *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* who have public service employee direct reports employed under the *Public Service Employment Act*

The sample for this analysis consists of 82 987 public service employees, including:

- 57 367 non-manager/supervisor employees (69% of respondents)
- 24 846 managers/supervisors (30% of respondents)
 - 2 116 executives (3% of respondents)
- 774 staffing advisors (1% of respondents)

Data collection took place over a period of 10 weeks, between June 5, 2025, and August 14, 2025. For questions about their past experience, respondents were asked to refer to the previous fiscal year, from April 1, 2024, to March 31, 2025.

As in the previous cycle of the survey, the 2025 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 two categories to highlight the share of respondents responding most affirmatively to a “moderate” or “great extent.”

For the question on pressure when selecting a candidate, the proportion of managers experiencing pressure is calculated differently than in previous cycles. Previously, only managers who indicated pressure “to a moderate extent” or “to a great extent” were included. In 2025, managers who indicated pressure “to a minimal extent” were also included in the total of respondents experiencing pressure.



Annex B: Respondent profile

Note: Results are rounded to the nearest integer. For groups that account for less than 0.5% of respondents, the proportion is rounded to 0%.

Table 30: Respondent profile by employment equity group, weighted and unweighted

Employment equity groups	Proportion (unweighted)	Count (unweighted)	Proportion (weighted)	Count (weighted)
Women	64%	49 935	56%	143 514
Visible minorities	25%	19 849	25%	65 430
Persons with disabilities	30%	23 367	30%	74 595
Indigenous peoples	6%	4 494	6%	14 928

Table 31: Respondent profile by gender, weighted and unweighted

Gender	Proportion (unweighted)	Count (unweighted)	Proportion (weighted)	Count (weighted)
Women	64%	49 935	56%	143 514
Men	36%	28 207	43%	108 949
Another gender	1%	495	1%	1 799

Table 32: Respondent profile, by sexual orientation

Sexual orientation	Proportion
Heterosexual	73%
Bisexual	4%
Gay	2%
Lesbian	1%
Asexual	1%
Pansexual	1%
Another sexual orientation	1%
Prefer not to specify	17%

Table 33: Respondent profile, by identity

Identity	Proportion
Cisgender	72%
Queer	3%
Questioning	1%
Non-binary	1%
Two-spirit	0%
Intersex	0%
Transgender	0%
Another identity	3%
Prefer not to say	19%



Table 34: Respondent profile, by religion

Religion	Proportion
No religion	45%
Christianity	42%
Islam	4%
Hinduism	1%
Buddhism	1%
Sikhism	1%
Judaism	1%
Traditional (North American Indigenous) Spirituality	1%
Other religion and spiritual traditions	4%

Table 35: Respondent profile, by marital status

Marital status	Proportion
Married	51%
Single, never married	21%
Living common-law	20%
Divorced	5%
Separated, but still legally married	3%
Widowed	1%



Table 36: Respondent profile, by number of dependants in the household

Number of dependants per household	Proportion
0 dependant	50%
1 dependant	17%
2 dependants	23%
3 dependants	7%
4 or more dependants	3%

Table 37: Respondent profile, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Proportion
Non-Indigenous	94%
Indigenous	6%
First Nations	2%
Métis	2%
Inuit	0%
Yes, but prefer not to specify	1%



Table 38: Respondent profile, by type of disability

Category of employees	Proportion
Does not have a disability	70%
Has at least one disability	30%
Mental health	12%
Chronic health	6%
Sensory of environmental	5%
Pain-related	4%
Hearing	3%
Cognitive	3%
Learning	3%
Seeing	2%
Mobility	2%
Flexibility	2%
Dexterity	1%
Memory	1%
Developmental	1%
Speech or communication	0%
Other	2%
Yes, but prefer not to specify	3%
Prefer not to say	6%



Table 39: Respondent profile, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Proportion
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	75%
Members of visible minorities	25%
South Asian	5%
Black	5%
Chinese	4%
Arab	2%
Latin American	2%
Filipino	1%
Southeast Asian	1%
West Asian	1%
Korean	1%
Japanese	0%
Other groups	7%

