Public Service Commission of Canada

Commission de la fonction publique du Canada

2023 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Thematic Report on the Results for Employment Equity Groups and Equity-Seeking Groups

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 federal public service that serves all Canadians.

As part of the PSC's mandate and responsibilities for safeguarding a merit-based, representative and non-partisan public service that serves all Canadians, the Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey (SNPS) 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, and 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* (PSEA), new questions were added on biases and barriers that disadvantage persons belonging to equity-seeking groups in staffing processes as well as demographic questions to evaluate the perceptions of equity-seeking groups.

According to the *Employment Equity Act* (EEA), employment equity aims to achieve equality in the workplace and to correct conditions of disadvantage in employment for the 4 designated groups (or employment equity groups): women, Indigenous peoples[1], persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities.

On June 29th, 2021, the Budget Implementation Act 2021 proposed amendments to the PSEA to affirm the importance of a diverse and inclusive workforce and avoid biases and barriers in hiring received royal assent. The provisions of the law came into force in stages and on July 1st, 2023, the 2 remaining amendments to the PSEA to strengthen diversity and inclusion and address biases and barriers disadvantaging persons belonging to any equity-seeking groups came into force. 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

---

[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.

the Canadian Human Rights Act (CHRA). 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 in respect of which a record suspension has been ordered.

This report provides a summary of the survey's key results for the designated employment equity groups as well as for equity-seeking groups across federal public service departments and agencies that rely on the Commission's authority to make appointments as set out in the *Public Service Employment Act*. This includes members of the Canadian Armed Forces who have civilian (i.e. public servant) direct reports employed under the act and regular members, civilian members and special constables of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police hired under the RCMP Act who have public service employee direct reports that are employed under the PSEA. Results for the subgroups of employment equity groups and equity-seeking groups are also summarized where a sufficient number of responses was obtained.

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 related to the content of this report, don't hesitate to contact us by email at: cfp.sdip-snps.psc@cfp-psc.gc.ca.

An overview of the 2023 Staffing and Non-Partisanship 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.

Employment Equity Groups

This section presents a summary of responses to questions on the themes of merit, fairness, and transparency in the staffing process for the designated employment equity groups (women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible

minorities). For a breakdown of the respondent profile by employment equity group, please refer to [Table 36 in Appendix C](#).

Women

Merit

In general, women had more positive perceptions on questions related to merit when compared with men and with employees who identify as another gender. Among women, 86% agreed that people hired in their organization can do the job compared with 83% of men and 76% of employees who identify as another gender. Further, 85% of women agreed that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled compared with 82% of men and 69% of employees who identify as another gender.

Table 1: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process, by gender

Statements related to merit	Women	Men	Another gender
We hire people who can do the job	86%	83%	76%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	85%	82%	69%

Fairness

Women and men were similar in agreeing that the process for selecting a person for a position is done fairly (78% for women versus 77% for men). However, 64% of employees identifying as another gender agreed with this statement.

Table 2: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process, by gender

Statements related to fairness	Women	Men	Another gender
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	78%	77%	64%

Transparency

Women and men had identical views on transparency in the staffing process with 71% agreeing that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way and 73% saying that their managers kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit. However, 62% of employees identifying as another gender agreed that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent manner while 64% said that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit.

Table 3: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process, by gender

Statements related to transparency	Women	Men	Another gender
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	71%	71%	62%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	73%	73%	64%

Indigenous peoples

Merit

Indigenous employees had less positive perceptions compared to non-Indigenous employees on questions related to merit in the staffing process. Among Indigenous employees, 80% agreed that people hired in their organization can do the job (versus 84% for non-Indigenous employees). Meanwhile, 77% of Indigenous employees agreed

that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled (versus 83% for non-Indigenous employees).

Table 4: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process; Indigenous employees compared with non-Indigenous employees

Statements related to merit	Indigenous employees	Non-Indigenous employees
We hire people who can do the job	80%	84%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	77%	83%

Perceptions of merit for Indigenous subgroups were similar to each other. Métis and First Nations employees were the most likely to believe that we hire people who can do the job (both 80%) (see Appendix D, Table 51). Inuit employees were the least likely to believe that we hire people who can do the job (77%) (see Appendix D, Table 51). First Nations employees were the most likely to believe that the advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled (78%) (see Appendix D, Table 3)

Fairness

Indigenous employees were less likely than non-Indigenous employees to say that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly. Slightly more than 2 thirds (69%) of Indigenous employees agreed with the statement compared with 77% of non-Indigenous employees.

Table 5: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process; Indigenous employees compared with non-Indigenous employees

Statements related to fairness	Indigenous employees	Non-Indigenous employees
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	69%	77%

Perceptions of fairness in the staffing system were similar across Indigenous subgroups (within 1% of each other) (see Appendix D, Table 55)

Transparency

Similar to results on merit and fairness, employees who identified as Indigenous had less positive views than non-Indigenous employees on questions related to transparency in the staffing process. Less than 2 thirds (64%) of Indigenous employees agreed that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (versus 71% of non-Indigenous employees). Meanwhile, 2 thirds (66%) of Indigenous employees said that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit compared with 73% of non-Indigenous employees.

Table 6: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process; Indigenous employees compared with non-Indigenous employees

Statements related to transparency	Indigenous employees	Non-Indigenous employees
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	64%	71%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	66%	73%

Perceptions of transparency in the staffing system were similar among Indigenous subgroups for all questions regarding transparency (within 2% for all questions). Employees who identified as Inuit were the least likely to agree that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (63%) (see Appendix D, Table 57).

Persons with disabilities

Merit

Employees with disabilities had slightly less positive perceptions than employees without disabilities on questions related to merit. Among employees with disabilities, 81% agreed that people hired in their work unit could do the job (versus 85% of employees without disabilities). Nearly 4 out of 5 (79%) employees with disabilities said that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled compared with

85% of employees without disabilities. Among employees with disabilities, results varied by type of disability. For example: employees with flexibility or dexterity disabilities, and employees with intellectual disabilities had the least positive perceptions of merit in the staffing process (see Table 65 in Appendix D).

Table 7: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process; employees with disabilities compared with employees without disabilities

Statements related to merit	Employees with disabilities	Employees without disabilities
We hire people who can do the job	81%	85%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	79%	85%

Fairness

Employees with disabilities were less likely than employees without disabilities to agree that the process for selecting a person for a position is done fairly (71% versus 79% for employees without disabilities). Among employees with disabilities, employees with intellectual disabilities were the least likely to agree that the process for selecting a person for a position is done fairly (see Table 65 in Appendix D).

Table 8: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process; employees with disabilities compared with employees without disabilities

Statements related to fairness	Employees with disabilities	Employees without disabilities
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	71%	79%

Transparency

Similar to results on merit and fairness, employees with disabilities had less positive views than employees without disabilities on questions related to transparency in the staffing process. Less than 2 thirds (64%) of employees with disabilities agreed that

staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (versus 73% of employees without disabilities). Furthermore, 68% of employees with disabilities said that their manager kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit compared with 74% of employees without disabilities. Among employees with disabilities, results varied by type of disability. As with questions related to merit, employees with flexibility or dexterity disabilities, and employees with intellectual disabilities had the least positive perceptions of transparency in the staffing process (see Table 65 in Appendix D).

Table 9: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process; employees with disabilities compared with employees without disabilities

Statements related to transparency	Employees with disabilities	Employees without disabilities
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	64%	73%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	68%	74%

Assessment accommodation requests

The following section presents the views of persons with disabilities on assessment accommodation measures[2].

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 how they meet the qualifications required for the position. Assessment accommodation can be classified into 5 broad categories:

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

---

[2] The basics of assessment accommodation- Canada.ca

- other

It is important to note that although most assessment accommodations are made on the basis of disability, accommodations may be requested for any need relating to one of the 13 prohibited grounds for discrimination set out in the *Canadian Human Rights Act*. For more information, please consult the Government of Canada's [basics of assessment accommodation](#) web page.

The 2023 survey asked respondents if they required accommodations as part of a staffing process or second language evaluation. Those who indicated they required accommodations were asked if they requested them. Those who requested accommodations were asked if they received the accommodations. Those who received accommodations were then asked to what extent they were satisfied with the accommodation they received. Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the types of accommodations they received.

The survey results show that 9% of persons with disabilities indicated they required assessment accommodations compared with 3% of employees without disabilities. Among persons with disabilities who required assessment accommodations, 56% actually requested the accommodations they required compared with 22% of employees without disabilities. Among persons with disabilities who requested accommodations, 78% received the accommodations requested compared with 60% of employees without disabilities. Among persons with disabilities who were provided with the accommodations they requested, 82% were satisfied with the accommodations compared with 90% of employees without disabilities who were provided accommodations.

Table 10: 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 required assessment accommodations	9%	3%
Employees who required assessment accommodations that requested assessment accommodations	56%	22%
Employees who requested assessment accommodations that received assessment accommodations	78%	60%
Employees who received assessment accommodations that were satisfied with the assessment accommodations	82%	90%

Respondents who were provided with accommodation measures were asked to specify the types of accommodation measures they received. Among employees who were provided with assessment accommodation measures, 68% of employees with disabilities mentioned that they were given extra time to complete an assessment as the measure they received (compared with 39% of employees without disabilities). This is the most common type of accommodation provided. For additional results on the types of accommodation measures provided, see Table 11.

Table 11: Share of respondents 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.

Types of accommodation measure	Employees with disabilities	Employees without disabilities
Extra time to complete an assessment	68%	39%
Breaks during an assessment	30%	13%
Assessment done at home	18%	28%
Use of a private room	12%	9%
Accommodation measures for persons with difficulty hearing	10%	2%
Materials/questions provided ahead of time	9%	2%
Assessment shortened or divided into parts/sessions	7%	4%
Visual enhancement technology	2%	3%
Visual replacement technology such as a screen reader	2%	1%
Speech recognition software	2%	2%
Wheelchair access	1%	0%
Other	26%	31%

Members of visible minorities

Merit

Employees who identified as members of visible minorities had less positive perceptions than employees who did not identify as members of visible minorities on questions related to merit in the staffing process. Among members of visible minorities, 82% agreed that people hired in their work unit can do the job (versus 85% of employees who are not members of visible minorities). Approximately 4 out of 5 members of visible minorities said that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled (81% versus 84% employees who are not members of visible minorities).

Table 12: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process; members of visible minorities compared with employees who are not members of visible minorities

Statements related to merit	Members of visible minorities	Employees who are not members of visible minorities
We hire people who can do the job	82%	85%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	81%	84%

Perceptions of merit varied among visible minority subgroups. Employees who identified as Latin American and employees who identified as Black were the most likely to believe that people hired within their work unit could do the job (85% and 87% respectively) (see Appendix D, Table 50). Employees who identified as Black and employees who identified as Chinese were the most likely to believe that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled (83% for both) (see Appendix D, Table 52). Employees who identified as Japanese had the least positive perceptions regarding merit in the staffing process.

Fairness

Members of visible minorities were less likely than employees who are not members of visible minorities to have positive perceptions of fairness in the staffing process. Less

than 3 quarters (73%) of members of visible minorities agreed that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly compared with 78% of employees who are not members of visible minorities.

Table 13: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process; members of visible minorities compared with employees who are not members of visible minorities

Statements related to fairness	Members of visible minorities	Employees who are not members of visible minorities
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	73%	78%

The perceptions of fairness varied among the visible minority subgroups. Employees who identified as Filipino and employees who identified as Chinese were the most likely to believe that the process of selecting someone for a position was done fairly (both 79%) (see Appendix D, Table 54). Employees who identified as West Asian had the least positive perceptions of fairness in the staffing process.

Transparency

Similar to results on merit and fairness, employees who identified as members of visible minorities had less positive views than employees who are not members of visible minorities on questions related to transparency in the staffing process. Approximately 2 thirds (67%) of members of visible minorities agreed that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way compared with 71% of employees who are not members of visible minorities. In addition, 70% of members of visible minorities said that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (versus 73% of employees who are not members of visible minorities).

Table 14: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process; members of visible minorities compared with employees who are not members of visible minorities

Statements related to transparency	Members of visible minorities	Employees who are not members of visible minorities
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	67%	71%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	70%	73%

Perceptions of transparency in the staffing system differed between visible minority subgroups. Employees who identified as Latin American and employees who identified as Filipino were the most likely to believe that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (72% and 71% respectively) (see Appendix D, Table 56). Employees who identified as Japanese were the least likely to believe that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (57%) (see Appendix D, Table 56). Meanwhile, employees who identified as Chinese and employees who identified as Filipino were the most likely to believe that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (74% and 73% respectively) (see Appendix D, Table 58). Employees who identified as West Asian and employees who identified as Japanese were the least likely to believe that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (63% and 64% respectively) (see Appendix D, Table 58).

Equity-Seeking Groups

The previous section explored the perceptions of the 4 designated employment equity groups and sub-groups. While these groups and sub-groups may also be considered equity-seeking groups within the meaning of the PSEA, the following section will present results for the equity-seeking groups for which data is now available for the first time.

This section presents a summary of the responses as well as results on the themes of merit, fairness, transparency, and biases and barriers that disadvantage members of equity-seeking groups in the staffing process. For results on biases and barriers that disadvantage designated employment equity groups, please refer to the 2023 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Report on the Results for the Federal Public Service. For a breakdown of the respondent profile by equity-seeking group, please refer to Tables 38-41 in Appendix C.

Employees who identify as 2SLGBTQIA+

The 2023 SNPS asked respondents if they identify as 2SLGTQIA+. More specifically, respondents were able to identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, Two-Spirit, Intersex, Asexual, or another identity, or they could choose not to specify. The 2023 SNPS found that approximately 10% of federal public servants identify as 2SLGBTQIA+. For a breakdown of the respondent profile by 2SLGBTQIA+ identity, please refer to Table 38 in Appendix C.

Merit

In general, employees who identified as 2SLGBTQIA+ had similar perceptions to employees who did not identify as 2SLGBTQIA+ on questions related to merit.

Among employees who identified as 2SLGBTQIA+, 84% agreed that their work unit hired people who can do the job (identical to employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+). Meanwhile, 81% of 2SLGBTQIA+ employees said that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled (versus 84% for employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+).

Table 15: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process; 2SLGBTQIA+ employees compared with employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+

Statements related to merit	Employees who identify as 2SLGBTQIA+	Employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+
We hire people who can do the job	84%	84%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	81%	84%

Fairness

Employees who identified as 2SLGBTQIA+ had identical perceptions to employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+on fairness in the staffing process, with 77% agreeing that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly.

Table 16: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process; 2SLGBTQIA+ employees compared with employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+

Statements related to fairness	Employees who identify as 2SLGBTQIA+	Employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	77%	77%

Transparency

Employees who identify as 2SLGBTQIA+ were less likely than employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+to say that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (67% versus 71% for employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+). However, they were almost as likely to say that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (72% vs 73% for employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+).

Table 17: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process; 2SLGBTQIA+ employees compared with employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+

Statements related to transparency	Employees who identify as 2SLGBTQIA+	Employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	67%	71%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	72%	73%

Biases and barriers in staffing processes

Table 18 below shows that 51% of employees who identify as 2SLGBTQIA+ agreed that, within their organization, assessment methods used in staffing processes reduce or eliminate biases and barriers that disadvantage persons belonging to equity-seeking groups (compared with 56% for employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+).

Table 18: Share of respondents agreeing that methods used in staffing processes in their organization reduce or eliminate biases and barriers; 2SLGBTQIA+ employees compared with employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
2SLGBTQIA+ employees	51%	17%	32%
Employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+	56%	11%	33%

Among employees who participated in an advertised staffing process between September 16, 2022 and September 15, 2023[3], 22% of 2SLGBTQIA+ employees

---

[3] Subsection 36(2) of the PSEA, which provides that "before using an assessment method, the Commission shall conduct an evaluation to identify whether the assessment method and the manner in which it will be applied includes or creates biases or barriers

indicated that they had experienced biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them, a higher proportion than employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+ (17%).

Table 19: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process; 2SLGBTQIA+ employees compared with employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
2SLGBTQIA+ employees	22%	55%	23%
Employees who are not 2SLGBTQIA+	17%	61%	22%

Religious communities

The 2023 SNPS asked respondents if they identify with a religion. The different religious communities in the survey are Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Sikhism, Traditional (North American Indigenous) spirituality, and other religions and spiritual traditions. Among public servants, 55% identify as members of a religious community. For a breakdown of the respondent profile by religion, please refer to Table 39 in Appendix C. For additional results on questions related to merit, fairness, and transparency by religion, please refer to Tables 60 through 64 in Appendix D.

Merit

In general, employees who identified as members of religious communities had similar perceptions as employees who are not members of religious communities on questions related to merit.

Among employees who identified as members of religious communities, 84% agreed that people hired within their work unit can do the job (versus 85% of employees who

that disadvantage persons belonging to any equity-seeking group and, if one is identified, make reasonable efforts to remove it or to mitigate its impact on those persons", came into force on July 1, 2023 and applies to staffing processes that were initiated as of that date.

are not members of religious communities). Further, 84% agreed that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled (identical to employees who are not members of religious communities)

Table 20: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process; members of religious communities compared with employees who are not members of religious communities.

Statements related to merit	Members of religious communities	Employees who are not members of religious communities
We hire people who can do the job	84%	85%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	84%	84%

Fairness

Employees who identified as members of a religious community had slightly less positive perceptions than employees who are not members of religious communities on fairness in the staffing process. Over 3 quarters of members of religious communities agreed that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly (77% versus 79% for employees who are not members of religious communities).

Table 21: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process; members of religious communities compared with employees who are not members of religious communities

Statements related to fairness	Members of religious communities	Employees who are not members of religious communities
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	77%	79%

Transparency

Members of a religious community were equally likely as employees who are not members of religious communities to believe that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (71%). However, they were slightly less likely than employees who are not members of religious communities to say that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (72% versus 74% for employees who are not members of religious communities).

Table 22: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process; members of religious communities compared with employees who are not members of religious communities

Statements related to transparency	Members of religious communities	Employees who are not members of religious communities
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	71%	71%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	72%	74%

Biases and barriers in staffing processes

Among members of religious communities, 57% agreed that, within their organization, assessment methods used in staffing processes reduce or eliminate biases and barriers that disadvantage persons belonging to equity-seeking groups. This perception is slightly higher compared to employees who are not members of religious communities (54%).

Table 23: Share of respondents agreeing that methods used in staffing processes in their organization reduce or eliminate biases and barriers; members of religious communities compared with employees who are not members of religious communities

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
Members of religious communities	57%	12%	31%
Employees who are not members of religious communities	54%	11%	35%

Among employees who participated in an advertised staffing process between September 16, 2022 and September 15, 2023, 19% of employees who are members of a religious community indicated that they had experienced biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them compared with 15% employees who are not members of religious communities.

Table 24: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process; members of religious communities compared employees who are not members of religious communities

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
Members of religious communities	19%	58%	23%
Employees who are not members of religious communities	15%	65%	20%

Employees who identified with Hinduism, Sikhism, and Traditional (North American Indigenous Spirituality) were the most likely to report experiencing biases and barriers in a staffing process. For additional results by religion, please refer to Table 25.

Table 25: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process, by religion

Religion	Yes	No	Don't know
Hinduism	29%	42%	29%
Sikhism	28%	46%	26%
Traditional (North American Indigenous) spirituality	28%	48%	24%
Islam	26%	46%	28%
Buddhism	22%	51%	28%
Judaism	21%	60%	19%
Christianity	17%	60%	23%
Other religions and spiritual traditions	20%	55%	25%
No religion	15%	65%	20%

Marital status

The 2023 SNPS asked respondents to declare their marital status. Respondents could indicate that they were married, living common-law, separated but still legally married, divorced, widowed, or single, never married. For a breakdown of the respondent profile by marital status, please refer to Table 40 in Appendix C.

Merit

Respondents who were married, living common-law or single had the most positive perceptions on questions related to merit in the staffing process. As shown in Table 26, 86% of single employees and those living common-law, and 84% of married employees agreed that their work unit hired people who can do the job (versus 80% of divorced and separated employees and 81% of widowed employees). Furthermore, 84% of single, married, and employees living common-law agreed that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled (versus 80% of separated employees and 81% of divorced and widowed employees).

Table 26: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process, by marital status

Statements related to merit	Married	Living common-law	Separated, but still legally married	Divorced	Single, never married	Widowed
We hire people who can do the job	84%	86%	80%	80%	86%	81%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	84%	84%	80%	81%	84%	81%

Fairness

Perceptions of fairness in the staffing process are most positive for employees who are living common-law, married or single. Among employees living common-law, 79% agreed that the process for selecting a person for a position is done fairly while 78% of single or married employees agreed with the statement. Employees who were widowed (73%), separated (71%) or divorced (71%) had the least positive perceptions on this question.

Table 27: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process, by marital status

Statements related to fairness	Married	Living common-law	Separated, but still legally married	Divorced	Single, never married	Widowed
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	78%	79%	71%	71%	78%	73%

Transparency

As with questions on merit and fairness, respondents who were married, living common-law or single had the most positive perceptions on questions related to transparency. Widowed employees had slightly less positive perceptions while divorced and separated employees had the least positive perceptions on the questions related to transparency.

As shown in Table 28 below, 72% of employees living common-law and 71% of married or single employees believed that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (versus 65%, 67% and 70% of separated, divorced and widowed employees respectively). Furthermore, 74% of single and living common-law employees, and 73% of married employees agreed that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (versus 68% of separated and divorced employees and 72% of widowed employees).

Table 28: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process, by marital status

Statements related to transparency	Married	Living common-law	Separated, but still legally married	Divorced	Single, never married	Widowed
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	71%	72%	65%	67%	71%	70%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	73%	74%	68%	68%	74%	72%

Biases and barriers in staffing processes

Table 29 below shows that 58% of employees living common-law agreed that, within their organization, assessment methods used in staffing processes reduce or eliminate biases and barriers that disadvantage persons belonging to equity-seeking groups. This proportion is slightly lower for married or single employees (55% for both) and the lowest for divorced (53%), separated or widowed employees (52% for both).

Table 29: Share of respondents agreeing that methods used in staffing processes in their organization reduce or eliminate biases and barriers, by marital status

Marital status	Yes	No	Don't know
Living common-law	58%	10%	32%
Married	55%	12%	33%
Single, never married	55%	11%	33%
Divorced	53%	14%	33%
Separated, but still legally married	52%	13%	35%
Widowed	52%	13%	35%

Among employees who participated in an advertised staffing process between September 16, 2022 and September 15, 2023, 20% of divorced employees and 19% of married or separated employees indicated that they had experienced biases and barriers in the staffing process that disadvantaged them (see Table 30). This number is slightly lower for single employees (16%) and the lowest for employees living common-law or widowed employees (15% for both).

Table 30: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process, by marital status

Marital status	Yes	No	Don't know
Divorced	20%	55%	25%
Married	19%	59%	22%
Separated, but still legally married	19%	54%	27%
Single, never married	16%	61%	23%
Living common-law	15%	65%	20%
Widowed	15%	59%	27%

Family status

A new question related to family status was introduced in the 2023 SNPS. Respondents were asked if they had dependants residing in their household and to enter the number of dependants in the affirmative. For a breakdown of the respondent profile by family status, please refer to Table 41 in Appendix C.

Merit

Overall, perceptions of merit in the staffing process for employees with dependants are similar to those of employees without dependants. As seen in Table 31 below, 85% of employees, with or without dependants, agreed that people hired in their organization can do the job. Furthermore, 84% of employees with dependants agreed that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled (versus 83% of employees without dependants).

Table 31: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process; employees with dependants compared will employees without dependants

Statements related to merit	Employees with dependants	Employees without dependants
We hire people who can do the job	85%	85%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	84%	83%

Fairness

The perception of fairness in the staffing process is similar for employees with dependants compared with that of employees without dependants. Over 3 quarters (77%) of employees with dependants agreed that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly (versus 78% of employees without dependants).

Table 32: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process; employees with dependants compared employees without dependants

Statements related to fairness	Employees with dependants	Employees without dependants
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	77%	78%

Transparency

As shown in Table 33, perceptions of transparency in the staffing process are identical for employees with dependants and for employees without dependants.

Table 33: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process; employees with dependants compared will employees without dependants

Statements related to transparency	Employees with dependants	Employees without dependants
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	71%	71%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	73%	73%

Biases and barriers in staffing processes

Table 34 below shows that 56% of employees with dependants agreed that assessment methods used in staffing processes in their organization reduce or eliminate biases and barriers that disadvantage persons belonging to equity-seeking groups. This proportion is similar for employees without dependants (55%).

Table 34: Share of respondents agreeing that methods used in staffing processes in their organization reduce or eliminate biases and barriers; employees with dependants compared will employees without dependants

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
Employees with dependants	56%	12%	32%
Employees without dependants	55%	11%	34%

Results by number of dependants are also similar to each other (see Appendix D, Table 48).

Among employees who participated in an advertised staffing process between September 16, 2022 and September 15, 2023, 19% of employees with dependants reported having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process. This perception is slightly higher compared to employees without dependants (16%).

Table 35: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process; employees with dependants compared will employees without dependants

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
Employees with dependants	19%	59%	22%
employees without dependants	16%	62%	22%

Results by number of dependants show that the proportion of employees reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process increases as the number of dependants increases, reaching 26% for employees with 4 or more dependants (see Appendix D, Table 49).

Conclusion

The 2023 SNPS shed light on the perceptions of the staffing system for members of employment equity groups and certain equity-seeking groups.

The survey results show that:

- Members of visible minorities, Indigenous peoples, and persons with disabilities had less positive perceptions on merit, fairness, and transparency in the staffing process.
- Employees who identified as another gender had the least positive perceptions of any demographic group on merit, fairness, and transparency in the staffing process.
- Among members of visible minorities:
    - Employees who identified as Black had the most positive perceptions of merit in the staffing process while employees who identified as West Asian and employees who identified as Japanese had the least positive perceptions.
    - Employees who identified as Chinese and employees who identified as Filipino had the most positive perceptions of fairness in the staffing process while employees who identified as South Asian and employees who identified as West Asian had the least positive perceptions.

- o Employees who identified as Latin American were the most likely to agree that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way while employees who identified as Chinese and employees who identified as Filipino were the most likely to say that their manager keeps them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit.
  - o Employees who identified as Japanese and employees who identified as West Asian employees had the least positive perceptions of transparency in the staffing process.
- Employees with disabilities were 3 times more likely than employees without disabilities to require assessment accommodations and were less satisfied with the accommodations they received.
- Employees with dependants were more likely than employees without dependants to say that they faced biases and barriers in a staffing process.
- 2SLGBTQIA+ employees were more likely than employees who did not identify as 2SLGBTQIA+ to say that they faced biases and barriers in a staffing process.
- Among members of religious communities, employees who identified with Hinduism, Sikhism, and Traditional (North American Indigenous Spirituality) were the most likely to report facing biases and barriers in a staffing process.

The survey findings should be used to guide departments and agencies in identifying barriers and gaps and in developing measures to address them.

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

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.

Survey results are based on all full-time indeterminate and term employees of federal departments and agencies that rely on the Commission's authority to make appointments as set out in the *Public Service Employment Act* as well as members of the Canadian Armed Forces who have civilian (i.e. public servant) direct reports employed under the act and regular members, civilian members and special constables of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police hired under the RCMP Act who have public service employee direct reports that are employed under the PSEA. 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)

The 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: 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 (DSQ). Please refer to 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey - Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities for details.

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

Appendix C: Respondent profile

Table 36: 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
Persons with disabilities	24%	19 543	24%	60 707
Indigenous peoples	5%	4 294	5%	13 714

Table 37: 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

Table 38: Respondent profile, by 2SLGBTQIA+ identity

2SLGBTQIA+ identity	Proportion
Bisexual	3%
Gay	2%
Lesbian	1%
Queer	1%
Asexual	1%
Transgender	0%
Questioning	0%
Two-spirit	0%
Intersex	0%
Another identity	1%
Yes, but prefer not to specify	1%
Identifies as 2SLBGTQIA+	10%
Does not Identify as 2SLBGTQIA+	90%

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

Table 39: Respondent profile, by religion

Religion	Proportion
No religion	45%
Christianity	42%
Islam	3%
Hinduism	1%
Buddhism	1%
Sikhism	1%
Judaism	1%
Traditional (North American Indigenous Spirituality)	1%
Other religion and spiritual traditions	5%

Table 40: Respondent profile, by Marital Status

Marital Status	Proportion
Married	50%
Single, never married	21%
Living common-law	20%
Divorced	5%
Separated, but still legally married	3%
Widowed	1%

Table 41: Respondent profile, by number of dependants in the household

Number of dependants per household	Proportion
0 dependant	52%
1 dependant	16%
2 dependants	22%
3 dependants	7%
4 or more dependants	3%

Note: some respondents indicated having dependants but did not provide the number. These respondents are excluded from this table (about 1%).

Table 42: Respondent profile, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Proportion
Non-Indigenous	95%
Indigenous	5%
First Nations	2%
Métis	3%
Inuit	0%

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

Table 43: Respondent profile, by type of disability

Category of employees	Proportion
Does not have a disability	76%
Has at least one disability	24%
Seeing	1%
Hearing	3%
Speech	0%
Mobility	2%

Category of employees	Proportion
Flexibility or dexterity	2%
Mental health	9%
Sensory or environment	3%
Chronic health condition or pain	6%
Cognitive	5%
Intellectual	1%
Other	1%
Yes, but prefer not to specify	2%
Prefer not to say	3%

Table 44: Respondent profile, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Proportion
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	76%
Members of visible minorities	24%
South Asian	4%
Chinese	4%
Black	5%
Filipino	1%
Arab	2%
Latin American	2%
Southeast Asian	1%
West Asian	1%
Korean	0%
Japanese	0%
Other groups	6%

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

Appendix D: Results by subgroup

Table 45: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit in the staffing process, by number of dependants

Statements related to merit	Employees with 0 dependant	Employees with 1 dependant	Employees with 2 dependants	Employees with 3 dependants	Employees with 4 or more dependants
We hire people who can do the job	85%	85%	85%	84%	83%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	83%	84%	84%	85%	82%

Table 46: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about fairness in the staffing process, by number of dependants

Statements related to fairness	Employees with 0 dependant	Employees with 1 dependant	Employees with 2 dependants	Employees with 3 dependants	Employees with 4 or more dependants
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	78%	78%	78%	77%	74%

Table 47: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about transparency in the staffing process, by number of dependants

Statements related to transparency	Employees with 0 dependant	Employees with 1 dependant	Employees with 2 dependants	Employees with 3 dependants	Employees with 4 or more dependants
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	71%	72%	72%	71%	68%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	73%	73%	75%	73%	70%

Table 48: Share of respondents agreeing that assessment methods used in staffing processes in their organization reduce or eliminate biases and barriers, by number of dependants

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
Employees with 0 dependant	55%	11%	34%
Employees with 1 dependant	56%	11%	32%
Employees with 2 dependants	57%	11%	32%
Employees with 3 dependants	57%	12%	31%
Employees with 4 or more dependants	55%	15%	30%

Table 49: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process, by number of dependants

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
Employees with 0 dependant	16%	62%	22%
Employees with 1 dependant	17%	60%	23%
Employees with 2 dependants	18%	61%	22%
Employees with 3 dependants	22%	56%	22%
Employees with 4 or more dependants	26%	52%	22%

Table 50: Share of respondents agreeing that people hired could do the job, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
Black	87%
Latin American	85%
Arab	83%
Filipino	83%
Chinese	83%
Southeast Asian	81%
Korean	80%
South Asian	79%
West Asian	75%
Japanese	75%
Other groups	77%
Members of visible minorities	82%
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	85%

Table 51: Share of respondents agreeing that people hired could do the job, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
Métis	80%
First Nations	80%
Inuit	77%
Indigenous peoples	80%
Non-Indigenous employees	84%

Table 52: Share of respondents agreeing that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
Chinese	83%
Black	83%
Southeast Asian	82%
Latin American	82%
Filipino	82%
Arab	81%
South Asian	78%
Korean	78%
West Asian	75%
Japanese	73%
Other groups	75%
Members of visible minorities	81%
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	84%

Table 53: Share of respondents agreeing that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
First Nations	78%
Métis	76%
Inuit	74%
Indigenous peoples	77%
Non-Indigenous employees	83%

Table 54: Share of respondents agreeing that the process of selecting someone for a position is done fairly, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
Filipino	79%
Chinese	79%
Latin American	77%
Southeast Asian	74%
Arab	74%
Black	73%
Japanese	72%
Korean	71%
South Asian	70%
West Asian	65%
Other groups	68%
Members of visible minorities	73%
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	78%

Table 55: Share of respondents agreeing that the process of selecting someone for a position is done fairly, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
First Nations	70%
Inuit	70%
Métis	69%
Indigenous peoples	69%
Non-Indigenous employees	77%

Table 56: Share of respondents agreeing that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
Latin American	72%
Filipino	71%
Chinese	70%
Southeast Asian	69%
Arab	69%
Black	68%
South Asian	64%
Korean	62%
West Asian	60%
Japanese	57%
Other groups	62%
Members of visible minorities	67%
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	71%

Table 57: Share of respondents agreeing that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
First Nations	65%
Métis	64%
Inuit	63%
Indigenous peoples	64%
Non-Indigenous employees	71%

Table 58: Share of respondents agreeing that managers keep them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
Chinese	74%
Filipino	73%
Southeast Asian	72%
Arab	72%
Latin American	69%
Black	68%
South Asian	68%
Korean	65%
Japanese	64%
West Asian	63%
Other groups	65%
Members of visible minorities	70%
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	73%

Table 59: Share of respondents agreeing that managers keep them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Share of respondents agreeing
Métis	66%
First Nations	66%
Inuit	66%
Indigenous peoples	66%
Non-Indigenous employees	73%

Table 60: Share of respondents agreeing that people hired could do the job, by religion

Religion	Share of respondents agreeing
Judaism	86%
Christianity	85%
Islam	83%
Hinduism	81%
Buddhism	80%
Traditional (North American Indigenous Spirituality)	78%
Sikhism	73%
Other religion and spiritual traditions	81%
Members of religious groups	84%
No religion	85%

Table 61: Share of respondents agreeing that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled, by religion

Religion	Share of respondents agreeing
Christianity	85%
Judaism	84%
Buddhism	82%
Islam	81%
Hinduism	80%
Traditional (North American Indigenous Spirituality)	79%
Sikhism	78%
Other religion and spiritual traditions	79%
Members of religious groups	84%
No religion	84%

Table 62: Share of respondents agreeing that the process of selecting someone for a position is done fairly, by religion

Religion	Share of respondents agreeing
Judaism	82%
Christianity	78%
Buddhism	77%
Islam	73%
Hinduism	70%
Traditional (North American Indigenous Spirituality)	68%
Sikhism	66%
Other religion and spiritual traditions	72%
Members of religious groups	77%
No religion	79%

Table 63: Share of respondents agreeing that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way, by religion

Religion	Share of respondents agreeing
Christianity	72%
Judaism	71%
Buddhism	70%
Islam	68%
Hinduism	67%
Traditional (North American Indigenous Spirituality)	64%
Sikhism	64%
Other religion and spiritual traditions	67%
Members of religious groups	71%
No religion	71%

Table 64: Share of respondents agreeing that managers keep them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit, by religion

Religion	Share of respondents agreeing
Judaism	76%
Buddhism	74%
Christianity	73%
Islam	69%
Hinduism	68%
Traditional (North American Indigenous Spirituality)	65%
Sikhism	64%
Other religion and spiritual traditions	69%
Members of religious groups	72%
No religion	74%

Table 65: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit, fairness, and transparency, by type of disability

Type of disability	Share of respondents agreeing that we hire people who can do the job	Shares of respondents agreeing that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	Share of respondents agreeing that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	Share of respondents agreeing that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	Share of respondents agreeing that managers keep them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit
Seeing	79%	76%	68%	61%	66%
Hearing	80%	79%	71%	65%	66%
Speech	84%	78%	71%	64%	63%
Mobility	78%	76%	67%	61%	65%
Flexibility or dexterity	74%	73%	63%	57%	60%
Mental health	81%	79%	71%	63%	67%
Sensory or environment	80%	75%	67%	60%	64%

Type of disability	Share of respondents agreeing that we hire people who can do the job	Shares of respondents agreeing that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	Share of respondents agreeing that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	Share of respondents agreeing that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	Share of respondents agreeing that managers keep them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit
Chronic health condition or pain	80%	78%	70%	63%	66%
Cognitive	84%	79%	73%	65%	69%
Intellectual	75%	67%	60%	58%	60%
Other	76%	74%	63%	60%	60%
Prefer not to say	76%	74%	64%	58%	63%
Employees with disabilities	81%	79%	71%	64%	68%

Type of disability	Share of respondents agreeing that we hire people who can do the job	Shares of respondents agreeing that advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	Share of respondents agreeing that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	Share of respondents agreeing that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	Share of respondents agreeing that managers keep them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit
Employees without disabilities	85%	85%	79%	73%	74%

Table 66: Share of respondents agreeing with statements about merit, fairness, and transparency; employees who are members of an employment equity group compared with all employees

Statements on merit, fairness and transparency	Women	Members of visible minorities	Indigenous Peoples	Persons with Disabilities	All employees
We hire people who can do the job	86%	82%	80%	81%	84%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	85%	81%	77%	79%	83%
The process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	78%	73%	69%	71%	77%
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	71%	67%	64%	64%	70%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving my work unit	73%	70%	66%	68%	72%

Table 67: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
West Asian	34%	36%	30%
South Asian	26%	44%	30%
Arab	24%	50%	26%
Latin American	22%	53%	25%
Black	22%	45%	33%
Southeast Asian	21%	51%	28%
Filipino	19%	56%	25%
Japanese	18%	56%	26%
Chinese	17%	55%	29%
Korean	16%	45%	39%
Other groups	31%	42%	27%
Members of visible minorities	24%	47%	29%
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	16%	64%	20%

Table 68: Share of respondents agreeing that assessment methods used in staffing processes in their organization reduce or eliminate biases and barriers, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
Latin American	59%	14%	28%
Filipino	58%	13%	30%
Arab	55%	14%	31%
Southeast Asian	55%	16%	30%
Chinese	53%	12%	35%
Black	50%	18%	31%
Korean	50%	19%	31%
South Asian	47%	19%	34%
Japanese	47%	20%	32%
West Asian	44%	22%	34%
Other groups	46%	20%	35%
Members of visible minorities	51%	16%	32%
Employees who are not members of visible minorities	56%	10%	34%

Table 69: Share of respondents reporting having faced biases or barriers in the staffing process, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
Inuit	27%	57%	16%
First Nations	23%	56%	21%
Métis	21%	58%	21%
Indigenous peoples	22%	57%	21%
Non-Indigenous employees	18%	59%	23%

Table 70: Share of respondents agreeing that assessment methods used in staffing processes in their organization reduce or eliminate biases and barriers, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Yes	No	Don't know
First Nations	52%	18%	30%
Métis	51%	19%	30%
Inuit	46%	17%	37%
Indigenous peoples	51%	18%	30%
Non-Indigenous employees	55%	11%	34%