



2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey:

Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities



Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Background	3
Merit, fairness and transparency-based nature of the staffing process.....	6
Participation of persons with disabilities in a staffing process for a promotion and potential barriers	17
Assessment accommodation measures.....	23
Hiring managers' perceptions of staffing practices.....	28
Conclusion	31
Annex.....	31

Introduction

About the survey

The Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey was first introduced in 2018 as a biennial survey addressed to all employees in the federal public service subject to the [Public Service Employment Act](#). The survey targeted employees, hiring 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 2021, questions were added on “staffing during the COVID-19 pandemic”. A copy of the [survey questionnaire](#) is available on Statistics Canada’s website.

In total, 75 federal departments and agencies participated in the survey, with 75,440 employee responses received, for an overall response rate of 34.2%.

The information gathered in the survey was used to:

- identify current and emerging trends at government-wide and organizational levels
- inform potential improvements to staffing policies and practices
- better target efforts to safeguard non-partisanship within the federal public service

Background

Public Service Commission of Canada’s mandate

The *Public Service Employment Act* states that Canada will continue to benefit from a public service that is representative of Canada’s diversity. Under the [Employment Equity Act](#), the Public Service Commission of Canada must:

- identify and eliminate employment barriers in the appointment system for the designated employment equity groups, including persons with disabilities
- develop positive policies and practices
- provide reasonable accommodations to create a representative public service

The Public Service Commission's mandate is to promote and safeguard a representative public service with merit-based appointments and, in collaboration with other stakeholders, to protect the non-partisan nature of the public service.

Disability screening questionnaire versus self-identification form

The 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey changed how it identified persons with disabilities, using Statistics Canada's disability screening questionnaire instead of the [employee self-identification form](#) used in 2018. The new method resulted in more respondents being identified as persons with disabilities. With the new method, 39% of respondents reported experiencing daily activity limitations and were identified as persons with disabilities. In 2018, using the self-identification form, the survey resulted in 7% of respondents identifying themselves as having a disability.

Even though both methods use the term "persons with disabilities," levels of representation obtained are not comparable. The self-identification form used in 2018 was designed to collect information on the public service workforce to comply with employment equity legislation and to help plan and implement employment equity activities. The 2018 survey asked respondents to self-identify as a person with a disability using a yes/no question: "Are you a person with a disability?"

The 2021 version of the survey used the disability screening questionnaire, which looks at types and severity of disabilities through 37 questions to identify respondents' functional limitations to infer disability status. The screening questionnaire allowed for more detailed analyses of the perceptions of persons with disabilities on staffing according to severity and impact of disabilities.

The Public Service Commission of Canada's decision to adopt the screening questionnaire for the 2021 survey was made in consultation with Statistics Canada and the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat. These agencies, as well as Employment and Social Development Canada, were also consulted to determine how best to analyze, interpret and compare this data.

While the Public Service Commission decided to use the screening questionnaire to support its research objectives, the *Employment Equity in the Public Service of Canada* annual reports remain the only official source of information on the rate of representation of persons with disabilities in the public service

Persons identified as having a disability, by method, in different public service reports and surveys

Report or survey	Method used	Persons identified as having disabilities
2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey	Disability screening questionnaire	39%*
Canadian Survey on Disability	Disability screening questionnaire	20%
2020 Public Service Employee Survey	Self-identification questionnaire	9%
2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey	Self-identification questionnaire	7%
Employment Equity in the Public Service of Canada for Fiscal Year 2020 to 2021	Self-identification questionnaire	5.6%

* Unweighted figure

Report objectives

Using findings from the 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey, this report explores the following themes:

- perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency of the staffing system
 - by disability status
 - by severity status
 - by disability status and intersections with other employment equity groups
- perceptions of assessment accommodation measures by disability status/severity
- perceptions of hiring managers with disabilities and their counterparts
- persons with disabilities' participation in staffing processes and potential barriers for seeking a promotion

5 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities



Merit, fairness and transparency-based nature of the staffing process

This section presents a summary of responses to questions on the themes of merit, fairness and transparency. Results are presented according to disability status and severity of disability. Unless otherwise indicated, all differences are statistically significant.

To establish the severity of disability, the 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey used the approach developed by Statistics Canada for the Canadian Survey on Disability. The approach relies on a global severity score drawing on the disability survey questionnaire. The severity score takes into account the number of disability types a person may report, the level of difficulty associated with the disability to carry out activities, as well as the frequency of activity limitations.

To ensure a sufficient number of observations by degree of severity, the questionnaire has 4 classes of severity: mild, moderate, severe and very severe. In this report, in order to accommodate our sample size, mild and moderate classes were further collapsed into a “less severe” category, whereas the severe and very severe categories were collapsed into a “more severe” category. For more information on the disability severity indicators, please consult the [Canadian Survey on Disability, 2017: Concepts and Methods Guide, Appendix C – Disability severity indicators](#).

Merit

Generally, perceptions of merit were less positive¹ among federal public servants with disabilities compared to their counterparts. In addition, federal public servants with more severe disabilities had less positive views than those with less severe disabilities.

Employees with disabilities were less likely than their counterparts to believe that their work unit hired people who could do the job (80.9% versus 86.0%), that newly appointed employees were a good fit (84.8% versus 89.0%), and that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled (80.8% versus 86.5%).

Moreover, employees with more severe disabilities were less likely than those with less severe disabilities to agree that newly appointed employees were a good fit within their

¹ See the [Methodology Section](#) in the Annex, for further details about what positive perceptions refer to.
6 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities



work unit (77.8% versus 85.7%), that their work unit hired people who could do the job (73.4% versus 81.9%), and that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled (71.4% versus 82.1%).

Employees' perceptions of merit, by disability status and severity

Questions related to merit	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
Newly appointed employees are a good fit within my work unit	89.0%	84.8%	85.7%	77.8%
We hire people who can do the job	86.0%	80.9%	81.9%	73.4%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	86.5%	80.8%	82.1%	71.4%

Overall, among persons with disabilities who also reported being a member of at least one other employment equity group (women, Indigenous and visible minorities) (Tables 3 to 5), women had the most positive perceptions of merit in the hiring process. However, women with disabilities were less likely than women without disabilities to believe that people hired in their work unit could do the job (83.2% versus 88.1%), that newly appointed employees are a good fit in their work unit (86.2% versus 90.1%), and that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled (83.6% versus 88.5%). In general, women with disabilities had more positive perceptions than men with disabilities on all questions related to merit.

Members of visible minorities with disabilities had less positive perceptions of merit than members of visible minorities without disabilities for all questions related to merit.

Members of visible minorities with disabilities were less likely than visible minorities without disabilities to agree that persons hired in their work unit could do the job (79.3% versus 84.8%), that newly appointed employees were a good fit within their work unit (83.6% versus 87.8%), and that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled (78.0% versus 84.4%).

Indigenous employees with disabilities had lower perceptions of merit compared to Indigenous employees without disabilities. In addition, among all employees with disabilities and all employment equity groups, Indigenous employees with disabilities had the lowest perceptions of merit (see Tables 3 to 5):

- 73.6% agreed that people hired in their work unit could do the job
- 78.6% agreed that newly appointed employees were a good fit in their work unit
- 76.0% believed that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled

Employees agreeing that people hired could do the job: Intersection of persons with disabilities and other employment equity groups

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Women	88.1%	83.2%
Men	84.2%	78.1%
Indigenous peoples*	79.3%	73.6%
Did not identify as Indigenous	86.4%	81.5%
Members of visible minorities	84.8%	79.3%
Did not identify as a member of visible minorities	86.6%	81.3%



* Differences between Indigenous employees with and without disabilities are not statistically significant.

Employees who agreed that newly appointed employees were a good fit within their work unit: Intersection of persons with disabilities and other employment equity groups

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Women	90.1%	86.2%
Men	88.2%	83.1%
Indigenous peoples*	83.6%	78.6%
Did not identify as Indigenous	89.3%	85.2%
Members of visible minorities	87.8%	83.6%
Did not identify as a member of visible minorities	89.5%	85.1%

* Differences between Indigenous employees with and without disabilities are not statistically significant.

Employees who agreed that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled: Intersection of persons with disabilities with other employment equity groups

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Women	88.5%	83.6%
Men	84.8%	77.3%
Indigenous peoples*	79.9%	76.0%
Did not identify as Indigenous	86.9%	81.2%
Members of visible minorities	84.4%	78.0%
Did not identify as a member of visible minorities	87.2%	81.4%

*Differences between Indigenous employees with and without disabilities are not statistically significant.

Fairness

Employees with disabilities were less likely than their counterparts to believe that appointments were done fairly (72.1% versus 80.6%). Also, less than half of employees (46.9%) with disabilities believed that appointments did not depend on who you know, compared to 56.0% of employees without disabilities.

Negative perceptions were even more pronounced for employees who had more severe disabilities. About 60% of employees with more severe disabilities agreed that appointments were done fairly (versus 73.6% of those with less severe disabilities). Slightly more than 37% of employees with more severe disabilities believed that appointments did not depend on who you know, compared to 48.3% of those with less severe disabilities.



Employees' perceptions of fairness, by disability status and severity

Questions related to fairness	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	80.6%	72.1%	73.6%	60.3%
Appointments do not depend on who you know	56.0%	46.9%	48.3%	37.2%

Members of visible minorities with disabilities were less likely than members of visible minorities without disabilities to agree that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly (69.2% versus 75.6%). The same goes for Indigenous employees with disabilities, who are less likely to agree with this statement than Indigenous employees without disabilities (64.8% versus 72.6%).

Among persons with disabilities who also reported being a member of at least one other employment equity group (women, Indigenous and visible minorities) (see Tables 7 and 8), Indigenous employees were the least likely to believe that appointments are done fairly (64.8%) followed by members of visible minorities (69.2%). Women with disabilities were the most likely to agree with this statement (73.5%).

As well, members of visible minorities with disabilities were the least likely to agree that appointments did not depend on who you know (39.8%), followed by Indigenous employees with disabilities (43.8%). Women with disabilities were the most likely to agree with this statement (47.6%).

Employees who agreed that the process of selecting a person for a position was done fairly: Intersection of persons with disabilities and other employment equity groups

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Women	82.0%	73.5%
Men	79.6%	70.5%
Indigenous peoples	72.6%	64.8%
Did not identify as Indigenous	81.0%	72.6%
Members of visible minorities	75.6%	69.2%
Did not identify as visible minorities	81.9%	72.7%

**Employees who agreed that appointments did not depend on who you know*:
Intersection of persons with disabilities and other employment equity groups**

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Women	55.7%	47.6%
Men	56.5%	46.5%
Indigenous peoples**	50.6%	43.8%
Did not identify as Indigenous	56.3%	47.2%
Members of visible minorities	45.7%	39.8%



Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Did not identify as visible minorities	58.3%	48.1%

* This question was reverse coded so that more positive responses are allotted a higher score

** Differences between Indigenous employees with and without disabilities are not statistically significant.

Transparency

Generally, persons with disabilities had less positive perceptions of transparency in the staffing process than persons without disabilities, as shown in Table 9. Employees with more severe disabilities had less positive views compared to those with less severe disabilities.

Less than 2 thirds of employees with disabilities (64.4%) perceived that job opportunities were well communicated during the COVID-19 pandemic, compared to nearly 3 quarters of employees without disabilities (74.0%). A similar gap was observed between employees with disabilities (65.8%) and employees without disabilities (75.5%) regarding perceptions that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way. Finally, about 2 thirds of employees with disabilities (66.5%) said that their managers kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit compared to 74.3% of employees without disabilities.

Persons with more severe disabilities were less likely than those with less severe disabilities to agree that:

- job opportunities were well communicated during the COVID-19 pandemic (53.1% versus 65.9%)
- staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way (54.7% versus 67.2%)
- managers kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (55.2% versus 68.0%)

Employees' perceptions of transparency, by disability status and severity

Questions related to transparency	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	74.3%	66.5%	68.0%	55.2%
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	75.5%	65.8%	67.2%	54.7%
Job opportunities were well communicated in my organization during the COVID-19 pandemic	74.0%	64.4%	65.9%	53.1%

As seen in Tables 10 to 12, women with disabilities had the most favorable perception of transparency in the staffing process among all employment equity groups with disabilities. This is also true among federal public servants without disabilities. However, women with disabilities were less likely than women without disabilities to agree that job opportunities were well communicated during the COVID-19 pandemic (66.0% versus 74.9%), that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (67.1% versus 76.3%), and that their managers kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (67.8% versus 75.7%). Similar to results on merit and fairness, women with disabilities also had more positive views than men with disabilities on perceptions of transparency in the staffing process.

Indigenous employees with disabilities had the least positive perceptions of transparency:

- 60.1% agreed that their managers kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit
- 61.7% believed that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way
- 58.4% believed that job opportunities were well communicated during the COVID-19 pandemic

Members of visible minorities with disabilities had less positive perceptions than visible minorities without disabilities for all questions related to transparency. Visible minorities with disabilities were less likely than visible minorities without disabilities to agree that job opportunities were well communicated during the COVID-19 pandemic (62.5% versus 72.5%), that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way (63.9% versus 72.2%) and that their managers kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit (67.1% versus 71.9%). However, gaps were narrower when comparing members of visible minorities with disabilities to non-members of visible minorities with disabilities on all questions related to transparency in staffing.

Employees who agreed that job opportunities were well communicated in their organization during the COVID-19 pandemic: Intersection of persons with disabilities and other employment equity groups

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Women	74.9%	66.0%
Men	73.5%	62.6%
Indigenous peoples	66.5%	58.4%
Did not identify as Indigenous	74.4%	64.9%
Members of visible minorities	72.5%	62.5%
Did not identify as a member of visible minorities	74.7%	64.9%

15 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities



*Differences between Indigenous employees with and without disabilities are not statistically significant.

Employees who agreed that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way: Intersection of persons with disabilities and other employment equity groups

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Women	76.3%	67.1%
Men	75.0%	64.5%
Indigenous peoples	69.4%	61.7%
Did not identify as Indigenous	75.8%	66.1%
Members of visible minorities	72.2%	63.9%
Did not identify as a member of visible minorities	76.5%	66.3%

*Differences between Indigenous employees with and without disabilities are not statistically significant.

Employees who agreed that their manager kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit: Intersection of persons with disabilities and other employment equity groups

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Women	75.7%	67.8%
Men	73.3%	65.0%

Category of employees	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities
Indigenous peoples*	65.9%	60.1%
Did not identify as Indigenous	74.7%	67.0%
Members of visible minorities	71.9%	67.1%
Did not identify as a member of visible minorities	75.1%	66.5%

*Differences between Indigenous employees with and without disabilities are not statistically significant.

Participation of persons with disabilities in a staffing process for a promotion and potential barriers

Participation in a staffing process for a promotion

As seen in Table 13, 28.1% of persons with disabilities reported having participated in an advertised staffing process for a promotion in the twelve months prior to responding to the survey, which is similar to the proportion of persons without disabilities (28.6%). Moreover, the degree of disability severity did not have a major impact on participation in promotion opportunities, as employees with less severe disabilities and employees with more severe disabilities showed a similar participation rate (28.3% vs 26.6%).

Employee participation rate in a staffing process for a promotion between March 16, 2020 and March 15, 2021, by disability status and severity*

Employees without disabilities*	Employees with disabilities*	Employees with less severe disabilities*	Employees with more severe disabilities*
28.6%	28.1%	28.3%	26.6%

*Differences between persons with and without disabilities, and between persons with less and more severe disabilities, are not statistically significant.

Reasons for not participating in a staffing process for a promotion

Persons with more severe disabilities were more likely than persons with less severe disabilities to report the following reasons for not participating in a promotion process (see Table 14):

- no promotion opportunities are available (45.6% versus 39.9%)
- application process is burdensome (28.1% versus 22.8%)
- concerns about potential pay issues with the Phoenix pay system (25.7% versus 18.8%)
- staffing processes are not fair (24.0% versus 15.6%)

Gaps were wider between persons with more severe disabilities and those without disabilities. Persons with more severe disabilities were more likely to mention the following as reasons for not participating in a staffing process for a promotion:

- application process is burdensome (28.1% versus 15.9%)
- concerns about potential pay issues with the Phoenix pay system (25.7% versus 12.2%)
- staffing processes take too long to complete (22.7% versus 12.3%)
- staffing processes are not fair (24.0% versus 9.0%)
- advertised positions are meant for specific persons (17.6% versus 9.1%)
- circumstances related to COVID-19 (12.6% versus 6.6%)

- concerns with not being successful in the selection process for a promotion (13.0% versus 4.6%)


Reasons provided by employees for not participating in a staffing process for a promotion

Reasons	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
No promotion opportunities were available*	38.3%	40.6%	39.9%	45.6%
I am satisfied with my current group and level	43.9%	38.1%	39.0%	31.4%
I want to maintain my work-life balance	32.2%	34.7%	35.0%	32.5%
Application process is burdensome	15.9%	23.4%	22.8%	28.1%
I have no interest in moving to a management or executive position	18.3%	21.0%	20.9%	22.6%
I have not been at my current group and level for a long time	22.0%	19.9%	20.4%	15.9%



Reasons	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
I was concerned that my pay would be affected by issues with the Phoenix pay system	12.2%	19.7%	18.8%	25.7%
Staffing processes take too long to complete	12.3%	18.6%	18.0%	22.7%
I do not believe that staffing processes are fair	9.9%	16.6%	15.6%	24.0%
I did not meet the language requirements for the positions	11.9%	14.6%	14.4%	16.0%
Advertised positions were meant for specific persons	9.1%	13.3%	12.7%	17.6%
Circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic	6.6%	10.3%	10.0%	12.6%
I did not meet the essential qualifications for the positions	7.0%	9.2%	9.0%	10.4%

20 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities



Reasons	Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
I was concerned that I may not be successful	4.6%	8.4%	7.7%	13.0%
I am not geographically mobile	6.5%	8.0%	7.8%	9.5%
I am retiring shortly	7.2%	7.8%	7.6%	9.3%
I was concerned that my current accommodation measures may not be accepted in another position	2.1%	6.8%	5.6%	15.8%
Other reasons	12.5%	15.2%	14.7%	18.7%

Differences between persons with and without disabilities are not statistically significant.

According to the [2017 Accessibility Findings from the Canadian Survey on Disability](#), among employees with disabilities aged 25 to 64 years, 18.2% believed their condition made it difficult to change jobs due to difficulties in obtaining required support or accommodations. Those with more severe disabilities were more likely to report difficulty in obtaining the necessary support than those with less severe disabilities (24.1% versus 13.9%).

Survey data from the 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey show similar results as persons with more severe disabilities were also more likely to express the concern that their accommodation measures may not be accepted in another position (15.8% versus 5.6% of those with less severe disabilities).

As shown in Table 14, 6.8% of persons with disabilities expressed concerns regarding whether their current accommodation measures would be accepted in another position. As can be garnered in Table 15, this concern was more pronounced with persons reporting developmental disabilities (17.3%).

Employees with disabilities who did not participate in a staffing process due to concerns about the acceptance of their accommodation measures, by disability type

Type of disability specified by employee*	Employees with specified disability who did not participate in a staffing process due to concerns about acceptance of accommodation measures
Developmental	17.3%
Memory	13.8%
Mobility	12.4%
Dexterity	11.7%
Flexibility	11.5%
Learning	10.6%
Mental health-related	8.2%
Visual	8.1%
Pain-related	7.9%
Hearing	6.5%

*These categories are not mutually exclusive, as respondents were able to report multiple types of disabilities.

Virtual interviews versus in-person interviews

In Table 16 below, we can see that respondents without disabilities were more likely than those with disabilities to report that virtual interviews had allowed them to demonstrate their qualifications (83.6% versus 79.1%). Of the respondents who reported having disabilities, persons with less severe disabilities had more positive responses than persons with more severe ones (79.9% versus 72.5%).

Employees who agreed that virtual interviews allowed them to demonstrate their qualifications, by disability status and severity

Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
83.6%	79.1%	79.9%	72.5%

As seen in Table 17, when respondents were asked if they were satisfied with virtual interviews in comparison to in-person interviews, persons without disabilities were more satisfied with virtual interviews (85.2%) than persons with disabilities (79.9%).

Employees who were satisfied with their experience with virtual interviews in comparison to in-person interviews, by disability status and severity*

Employees without disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities*	Employees with more severe disabilities*
85.2%	79.9%	80.4%	75.8%

*The difference between persons with less and more severe disabilities is not statistically significant.

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 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
- 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.

Assessment accommodation requests

The following section presents the views of persons with disabilities on assessment accommodation measures. In the 2021 survey results, 3.1% of persons with disabilities reported having requested assessment accommodations as part of a staffing process or a second language evaluation². As can be observed in Table 18 when compared to persons with less severe disabilities, a larger proportion of persons with more severe disabilities reported having requested assessment accommodations (7.2% versus 2.5%).

Employees with disabilities who requested assessment accommodations as part of a staffing process or second language evaluation

Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
2.5%	7.2%

Respondents with developmental disabilities were more likely (10.0%) to have requested assessment accommodations than persons with any other types of disability (see Table 19).

² The nature of the assessment accommodation type was not captured in the 2021 SNPS.

Employees with disabilities who requested assessment accommodations, by disability type

Type of disability specified by employee**	Employees with specified disability who requested accommodations
Developmental	10.0%
Memory	7.4%
Learning	6.5%
Dexterity	5.7%
Mobility	5.4%
Flexibility	5.0%
Hearing	4.8%
Seeing	4.2%
Pain-related	3.3%
Mental health-related	3.0%

*Survey results do not indicate whether requests for accommodations were necessarily related to type of disability.

**These categories are not mutually exclusive, as respondents could report multiple types of disabilities.

As seen in Table 20, 66.8% of persons with disabilities felt they were provided with the assessment accommodations requested. However, persons with more severe disabilities

were less likely to report having been provided the assessment accommodations (57.4%) they requested.

Employees with disabilities who were provided with their requested accommodations, by severity of disability

Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
66.8%	70.6%	57.4%

As well, persons with visual disabilities were more likely to report not being provided with requested assessment accommodations (46.8%), as seen in Table 21.

Employees with disabilities who did not receive the requested accommodations, by disability type

Type of disability specified by employee**	Respondents with specified disability who did not receive requested accommodations
Visual	46.8%
Dexterity	39.4%
Memory	37.4%
Mobility	37.3%
Flexibility	36.9%
Pain-related	36.2%
Mental health-related	36.0%

Type of disability specified by employee**	Respondents with specified disability who did not receive requested accommodations
Hearing	35.7%
Learning	33.8%
Developmental	33.2%

The results do not specify the circumstances in which accommodation measures were not provided (because of a disability type).

**These categories are not mutually exclusive, as respondents were able to report multiple types of disabilities.

Overall, of the employees with disabilities who received assessment accommodations, 83.4% were satisfied with the accommodations received (see Table 22).

Employees with disabilities who reported being satisfied with the assessment accommodations provided, by severity

Employees with disabilities	Employees with less severe disabilities	Employees with more severe disabilities
83.4%	84.8%	78.7%

Note: The differences between persons with less and more severe disabilities are not statistically significant.

Persons with hearing disabilities (91.7%) were most satisfied with the assessment accommodations provided. Persons with flexibility disabilities were least satisfied with their assessment accommodations (70.0%).

Employees with disabilities who reported being satisfied with the assessment accommodations provided, by disability type*

Type of disability specified by employee**	Respondents with specified disability who were satisfied with assessment accommodations
Hearing	91.7%
Pain-related	81.8%
Learning	81.0%
Mental health-related	78.9%
Mobility	78.7%
Developmental	78.6%
Dexterity	76.0%
Visual	71.1%
Memory	70.9%
Flexibility	70.0%

*Results do not specify whether respondents had all their assessment accommodations needs met or partially met, which can also impact the satisfaction rate.

**These categories are not mutually exclusive, as respondents could report multiple types of disabilities.

Hiring managers' perceptions of staffing practices

The following section reports on the perspectives on staffing practices of hiring managers with and without disabilities.

28 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities



While a majority of hiring managers with disabilities have positive views of staffing practices, those views were somewhat less positive overall when compared with hiring managers without disabilities. For example, hiring managers with disabilities were less likely than those without disabilities to agree that virtual interviews allowed them to assess candidates efficiently when conducting staffing processes (87.2% versus 92.3%), that appointees met the performance expectations of the position (93.7% versus 96.4%), that they felt comfortable explaining staffing decisions to their employees (92.3% versus 95.7%), and that they did not feel pressured to select a particular candidate (85.1% versus 90.6%).

Hiring managers with disabilities (and those without disabilities alike) had less positive responses in questions related to the pandemic, particularly their ability to recruit the staff needed to carry out daily operations during the COVID-19 pandemic (74.8% versus 81.5% for hiring managers without disabilities) and to address the COVID-19 response (63.6% versus 72.5% for hiring managers without disabilities).

Similarly, hiring managers with more severe disabilities tended to have less positive perceptions when compared to hiring managers with less severe disabilities across all themes covered in the survey.

Hiring managers' perceptions of staffing during the COVID-19 pandemic, by disability status and severity

Statement	Hiring managers without disabilities	Hiring managers with disabilities	Hiring managers with less severe disabilities	Hiring managers with more severe disabilities
The appointees meet the performance expectations of the positions	96.4%	93.7%	94.3%	88.8%
I felt comfortable explaining staffing	95.7%	92.3%	92.9%	86.5%

Statement	Hiring managers without disabilities	Hiring managers with disabilities	Hiring managers with less severe disabilities	Hiring managers with more severe disabilities
decisions to my employees				
The use of virtual interviews allowed me to evaluate candidates efficiently when conducting staffing processes	92.3%	87.2%	87.9%	80.7%
I didn't feel pressure to select a particular candidate*	90.6%	85.1%	85.7%	79.6%
I was able to recruit the staff I needed to carry out day-to-day operations during the COVID-19 pandemic	81.5%	74.8%	75.4%	67.9%
I was able to recruit the staff I needed to address the COVID-19 response**	72.5%	63.6%	64.4%	57.2%

This question was reverse coded so that more positive responses are allotted a higher score.

**The difference between persons with less and more severe disabilities is not statistically significant.

Conclusion

This report provides a summary of the 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey's key results for persons with disabilities. The use of a disability screening questionnaire to identify persons with disabilities allowed for the breakdown of results according to type and severity of disability.

The findings show that federal public servants with disabilities have less positive perceptions of staffing than their counterparts. This perception is even less positive for persons with more severe disabilities.

This report constitutes a first step toward identifying potential barriers faced by federal public servants with disabilities in the federal public service staffing system. Issues raised by respondents in this survey, such as their general satisfaction with assessment accommodations, as well as reported concerns and barriers preventing employees with disabilities from participating in staffing opportunities, should be further explored. Moreover, the severity of disabilities should also be explored in more detail, as the results indicate that barriers may be experienced differently depending on the severity of disabilities.

The survey findings should be used to guide departments and agencies in their efforts to help persons with disabilities access employment opportunities.

Annex

Methodology

For this report, results from the 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey for persons with disabilities were compared against results for their counterparts (employees that did not identify as persons with disabilities). Survey results were further split by gender, Indigenous status, visible minority status, disability severity and disability type. As a result, this report provides an intersectional analysis by disability status and other employment equity groups.

The 2021 survey response rate is 34.2% and the results are weighted to account for non-response and are therefore considered representative of the 234 757 federal public

31 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities



servants that fall under the *Public Service Employment Act*. Data collection took place over 9 weeks, between March 16, 2021, and May 14, 2021. For questions about their past experience (for example, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic), respondents were asked to refer to the previous 12 months, from March 16, 2020, to March 15, 2021.

As in the previous cycle of the survey, the 2021 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"

For simplicity, this report groups the affirmative and negative responses into 2 categories based on the 4-point scale. Respondents who agreed "to a moderate extent" or "to a great extent" with a statement were considered to have given a positive response. In the rare exception where a question is posed negatively, positive responses were made up of those responses where respondents agreed "to a minimal extent" or "not at all" with a given statement.

Disability screening questionnaire

The use of a disability screening questionnaire allows for the identification of distinct types of disability as well as the measurement of the severity of disability. For each type of disability identified by the screening questions, follow-up questions are asked about the associated level of difficulty ("No difficulty", "Some difficulty", "A lot of difficulty", or "Cannot do") as well as the frequency of the limitation of daily activities ("Never", "Rarely", "Sometimes", "Often", or "Always"). Depending on the type of disability and the answers to subsequent questions, respondents are assigned a disability severity score. A global severity score is derived based on the scores calculated for all disability types. A person's global severity score is calculated by taking the average of the scores for the 10 disability types.

This method differs substantially from the self-identification method used in the 2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey, which simply asked respondents to declare whether they had a disability. The self-identification method only includes persons who view themselves as having a disability that they believe would disadvantage them in employment.

32 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities



Disability types

The disability screening questionnaire identifies the 10 following disability types:

1. Developmental
2. Memory
3. Learning
4. Dexterity
5. Mobility
6. Flexibility
7. Hearing
8. Seeing
9. Pain related
10. Mental health related