



2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey

Perceptions of Federal Public Servants Who Are Members of an Employment Equity Group



Table of Contents

Highlights.....	3
Introduction	4
Merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing process	6
Hiring Managers.....	19
Conclusion	24
Appendix 1: Definitions of Employment Equity Groups for the SNPS.....	25
Appendix 2: Methodology	26
Appendix 3: Subgroups for Visible Minorities and Indigenous peoples	27

Highlights

This report is based on results from the second cycle of the Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey (SNPS), which was conducted over 9 weeks from March 16 to May 14, 2021. It follows the [2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Highlights Report](#) published in March 2022 and a thematic report on the Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities published in November 2022. For information on the previous iteration's results, please consult the following reports:

- [2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Report on the Results for the Federal Public Service – Canada.ca](#)
- [2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants Who Self-Identified as a Member of an Employment Equity Group - Canada.ca](#)

The 2021 SNPS used Statistics Canada's Disability Screening Questionnaire (DSQ), which introduced complexities in the interpretation of the results, but allowed for a more detailed analysis of the perceptions of persons with disabilities on staffing. As such, a separate [thematic report on the perceptions of persons with disabilities](#) was published in November 2022.

This report focuses on the perceptions of women, members of visible minorities and Indigenous peoples. For each of the employment equity groups, results are compared with their counterparts (See Annex for definitions of counterparts).

Views across all demographic groups on merit, fairness and transparency have improved since 2018. However, it is important to note that in 2018, a 5-point scale was used for response categories for some questions as opposed to the 4-point scale used in 2021. Despite these methodological changes, results were positive overall; however, some gaps remain for Indigenous peoples and members of visible minorities.

- Overall, women had more positive perceptions for merit, fairness and transparency.
 - Women who are members of another employment equity group had less positive perceptions than women who are not a member of another employment equity group.

- Members of visible minorities and Indigenous peoples had less positive perceptions than their counterparts on merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing system.
 - Members of visible minorities had the highest share of respondents who believed that appointments depend on who you know. Indigenous peoples had less positive perceptions than their counterparts on merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing system.
- Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing process varied among the subgroups of visible minorities with certain subgroups expressing more positive perceptions while others expressed more negative perceptions.
 - Latin American employees generally had the most positive perceptions, often reporting more positive perceptions than employees who are not members of visible minorities.
 - Employees belonging to “Other Groups” generally reported the least positive perceptions, consistently reporting less positive perceptions than employees who are not members of visible minorities.
 - Black employees had the least positive perceptions on questions related to fairness among all visible minority subgroups. However, their perceptions of merit, and transparency in the staffing process were similar or slightly lower than other visible minority subgroups.
- Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing process were similar across the subgroups of Indigenous employees when compared with each other.
- Despite staffing constraints during the pandemic, hiring managers, regardless of employment equity status, expressed high confidence in their organizations’ ability to recruit needed staff.

Introduction

About the survey

The Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey was first introduced in 2018 as a survey conducted biennially and 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 regarding 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, representing 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

Thematic Report on Persons with Disabilities

The 2021 SNPS used Statistics Canada's Disability Screening Questionnaire (DSQ), which looks at types and severity of disabilities through a series of questions to identify the functional limitations of respondents as a means to determine if they have a disability or not. Inclusion of the DSQ in the 2021 SNPS allowed the Public Service Commission (PSC) to conduct more detailed analysis of the perceptions of persons with disabilities on staffing according to severity and impact of limitations.

Therefore, a separate thematic report has been created for federal public servants with disabilities to provide a more thorough analysis. A copy of the [thematic report](#) is available on the [Open Government Portal](#).

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. The Public Service Commission promotes and safeguards a representative public service with merit-based appointments and, in collaboration with other stakeholders, protects the non-partisan nature of the public service.

Under the [Employment Equity Act](#), the Public Service Commission of Canada has, as part of its mandate, obligations to:

5 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey - Perceptions of Federal Public Servants Who Are Members of an Employment Equity Group



- identify and eliminate employment barriers in the appointment system for the designated employment equity groups
- develop positive policies and practices and make reasonable accommodations to ensure that employment equity groups achieve representation

Objectives of this report

Using findings from the 2021 SNPS, this analysis seeks to:

- examine how federal public service employees who belong to one or more of the designated employment equity groups (except persons with disabilities), perceive merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing system
- determine whether employees who are members of an employment equity group (except persons with disabilities) have different perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing system than their counterparts, and whether these perceptions differ by gender
- explore the perceptions of managers who belong to one or more of the designated employment equity groups (except persons with disabilities) compared to the perceptions of their counterparts

Merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing process

This section presents a summary of responses to questions on the themes of merit, fairness, and transparency in the staffing process. Within each theme, results are presented for each employment equity group. Results for members of an employment equity group are compared to those of their respective counterparts. This section also provides an intersectional analysis by employment equity group and gender. Results have also been collected on the subgroups for members of visible minorities and Indigenous employees (see [Appendix 3](#), Tables 18 to 33). When making comparisons throughout the report, differences are statistically significant, unless noted otherwise.

Merit

Respondents' perceptions of merit in staffing processes are assessed mainly through the following questions:

- We hire people who can do the job

- Newly appointed employees are a good fit within the work unit
- Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled

Women were more likely than men to believe that their work unit hired people who could do the job (86.0% versus 82.2%) (see [Table 1](#)). Women were also more likely than men to believe that newly appointed employees were a good fit (88.4% versus 86.5%), and that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled (86.4% versus 82.4%).

Members of visible minorities had slightly less positive perceptions of merit in the staffing process compared with their counterparts. Among members of visible minorities, 83.2% agreed that their work unit hired people who could do the job versus 84.5% for their counterparts. Meanwhile, 86.6% of visible minorities agreed that newly appointed employees were a good fit compared with 87.7% of their counterparts. Finally, 82.6% of visible minorities agreed that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled compared with 84.9% for their counterparts.

Results for Indigenous employees followed a similar pattern with 76.5% believing that their work unit hired people who could do the job (versus 84.5% for their counterparts), while 81.2% agreed that newly appointed employees were a good fit (versus 87.8%), and 78.0% said that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled (versus 84.8%).

Table 1 Employees' perceptions of merit in the staffing process, by employment group

Questions related to merit	Women	Men	Members of visible minorities	Counterparts of visible minorities	Indigenous peoples	Counterparts of Indigenous peoples
We hire people who can do the job	86.0%	82.2%	83.2%	84.5%	76.5%	84.5%
Newly appointed employees are a good fit within my work unit	88.4%	86.5%	86.6%	87.7%	81.2%	87.8%
Advertised job requirements reflect those of the position to be filled	86.4%	82.4%	82.6%	84.9%	78.0%	84.8%

Indigenous women were more likely than Indigenous men to believe that their work unit hired people who could do the job (80.2% versus 71.6%) (see [Table 2](#)). Indigenous women were also more likely to believe that newly appointed employees were a good fit within their work unit compared to Indigenous men (83.3% versus 78.5%; gap is not statistically significant); however, they were less likely to believe this compared to women who did not identify as Indigenous (83.3% versus 88.7%) (see [Table 3](#)). Women who identified as members of visible minorities had a similar gap in perceptions when compared with women who did not identify as members of visible minorities on this statement (86.4% versus 88.8%).

Indigenous women also had more positive views than Indigenous men that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled (82.2% versus 72.8%); however, their views were less positive when compared to women who did not identify as Indigenous (82.2% versus 86.7%) (see [Table 4](#)). This gap is also observed for women who are visible minorities compared with women who did not identify as members of visible minorities (83.2% versus 87.1%) for this statement.

Table 2 Employees who agreed that people hired could do the job: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Employees	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	80.2%	71.6%	76.5%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	86.3%	82.7%	84.5%
Members of visible minorities	83.7%	83.0%	83.2%
Counterparts of visible minorities	86.5%	82.2%	84.5%
All employees	86.0%	82.2%	84.1%


Table 3 Employees who agreed that newly appointed employees were a good fit within their work unit: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Employees	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	83.3%	78.5%	81.2%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	88.7%	87.0%	87.8%
Members of visible minorities	86.4%	86.9%	86.6%
Counterparts of visible minorities	88.8%	86.6%	87.7%
All employees	88.4%	86.5%	87.4%

Table 4 Employees who agreed that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Employees	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	82.2%	72.8%	78.0%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	86.7%	82.9%	84.8%
Members of visible minorities	83.2%	82.2%	82.6%
Counterparts of visible minorities	87.1%	82.6%	84.9%
All employees	86.4%	82.4%	84.4%

10 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey - Perceptions of Federal Public Servants Who Are Members of an Employment Equity Group



Perceptions of merit varied among visible minority subgroups. Latin American and Korean employees were the most likely to believe that people hired within their work unit could do the job (87.9% and 86.4% respectively) (See [Appendix 3, Table 18](#)) and that newly appointed employees were a good fit within their work unit (88.5% for both) (see [Appendix 3, Table 20](#)). Latin American and Korean employees consistently expressed more positive perceptions of merit in the staffing system than employees who are not members of visible minorities. Visible minority employees who identified as members of other visible minority sub-groups (employees who did not select one of the options provided), Japanese and South Asian employees had the lowest perceptions regarding merit in the staffing process (see [Appendix 3, Tables 18, 20 and 22](#)). Perceptions of merit for Indigenous subgroups were similar to each other, and not substantially different from the overall Indigenous group (see [Appendix 3, Tables 19, 21 and 23](#)).

Fairness

Respondents' perceptions of fairness in staffing processes are assessed mainly through the following questions:

- Appointments depend on who you know
- The process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly

Women were slightly more likely than men to believe that appointments were done fairly (78.4% versus 76.6%). However, 47.8% of women compared to 46.7% of men believed that appointments depend on who you know.

Employees who identified as members of visible minorities were less likely than their counterparts to believe that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly (73.8% versus 78.3%), and they were more likely to believe that appointments depend on who you know (56.1% versus 45.8%).

Results for Indigenous employees followed a similar pattern with 68.8% agreeing that the process for selecting a person for a position is done fairly (versus 77.9% for their counterparts), and 52.8% believed that appointments depend on who you know (versus 47.2% for their counterparts) (see [Table 5](#)).

Table 5 Employees' perceptions of fairness in the staffing process, by employment equity group

Questions related to fairness	Women	Men	Members of visible minorities	Counterparts of visible minorities	Indigenous peoples	Counterparts of Indigenous peoples
Appointments do not depend on who you know (see note 1)	52.2%	53.3%	43.9%	54.2%	47.2%	52.8%
Process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly	78.4%	76.6%	73.8%	78.3%	68.8%	77.9%

Note 1: This question was reverse coded.

Perceptions that appointments depend on who you know were more prevalent for women who are Indigenous and women who are visible minorities compared with women who did not identify as Indigenous or as members of visible minorities, respectively (see [Table 6](#)).

Among Indigenous women, 71.3% of employees believed that the process for selecting a person for a position was done fairly, whereas 65.9% of Indigenous men agreed with this statement (see [Table 7](#)). However, the difference between Indigenous women and Indigenous men is not statistically significant. Indigenous women were less likely to agree with this statement than non-Indigenous women (71.3% versus 78.8%). A similar gap is observed on this statement for women who are members of visible minorities compared with women who are not members of visible minorities (74.2% versus 79.3%).

In addition, 74.2% of women who are visible minorities reported that the process for selecting a person was done fairly.

Table 6 Employees who agreed that appointments do not depend on who you know: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Employees	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	47.6%	47.1%	47.2%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	52.4%	53.6%	52.8%
Members of visible minorities	43.5%	44.5%	43.9%
Counterparts of visible minorities	53.8%	55.0%	54.2%
All employees	52.2%	53.3%	52.6%

Table 7 Employees who agreed that the process of selecting a person for a position was done fairly: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Employees	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	71.3%	65.9%	68.8%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	78.8%	77.2%	77.9%
Members of visible minorities	74.2%	73.6%	73.8%
Counterparts of visible minorities	79.3%	77.4%	78.3%
All employees	78.4%	76.6%	77.4%

Perceptions varied among the visible minority subgroups regarding the fairness of the staffing process. Black public servants (65.1%) were the least likely to believe that the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly among the visible minority subgroups (see [Appendix 3, Table 24](#)). In comparison, Chinese, Latin American and Filipino employees (approximately 80% each) were most likely to agree with this statement. When asked whether appointments depend on who you know, 51.1% of Latin American employees agreed with this statement, meanwhile approximately 60% of Black and Southeast Asian employees agreed (see [Appendix 3, Table 26](#)). Among Indigenous subgroups, Inuit employees were more likely to believe this statement compared with First Nations employees (59.6% versus 50.6%) (see [Appendix 3, Table 27](#)).

Transparency

Respondents' perceptions of transparency in staffing processes are assessed mainly through the following questions:

- Job opportunities were well communicated in the organization during the COVID-19 pandemic
- Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way

- Manager keeps employee informed of staffing decisions involving work unit

Both members of visible minorities and women had similar views to their counterparts regarding how job opportunities were communicated during the COVID-19 pandemic (see [Table 8](#)). Indigenous employees, on the other hand, were less likely than their counterparts to agree with this statement (62.6% versus 70.8%).

Members of visible minorities (70.5%) and women (72.3%) had similar results to their respective counterparts (71.7% and 70.5% respectively) on the extent they believed that their managers kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit. Indigenous employees, however, were less likely than their counterparts to believe this statement (63.1% versus 71.8%).


Members of visible minorities and Indigenous peoples had slightly less positive perceptions compared with their respective counterparts regarding the transparency of staffing activities. Among visible minorities, 69.8% said that staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way (versus 72.4%) while 65.6% of Indigenous peoples agreed (versus 72.2%). Meanwhile, 72.4% of women agreed that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way (versus 71.6%).

Table 8 Employees' perceptions of transparency in the staffing process, by employment equity group

Questions related to transparency	Women	Men	Members of visible minorities	Counterparts of visible minorities	Indigenous peoples	Counterparts of Indigenous peoples
Job opportunities were well communicated in my organization during the COVID-19 pandemic	71.1%	69.9%	69.6%	70.8%	62.6%	70.8%
Staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way	72.4%	71.6%	69.8%	72.4%	65.6%	72.2%
Manager keeps me informed of staffing decisions involving work unit	72.3%	70.5%	70.5%	71.7%	63.1%	71.8%

Indigenous women were more likely than Indigenous men to agree that job opportunities were well communicated in their organization (65.8% versus 58.0%) (see [Table 9](#)). However, they were less likely to agree to this statement when compared with

16 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey - Perceptions of Federal Public Servants Who Are Members of an Employment Equity Group



women who did not identify as Indigenous (65.8% versus 71.4%). A smaller gap exists between women who are members of visible minorities and women who did not identify as members of visible minorities (68.9% versus 71.6%).

Indigenous women were less likely than non-Indigenous women to report that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way (68.2% versus 72.6%) (see [Table 10](#)). For Indigenous men, 62.4% of employees agreed with the same statement, though the difference with Indigenous women is not statistically significant. Meanwhile, women who are members of visible minorities also had less positive perceptions regarding the transparency of staffing activities compared with women who did not identify as members of visible minorities (68.5% versus 73.3%).

Indigenous women were less likely to report that their manager kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit when compared with women who did not identify as Indigenous (63.7% versus 72.8%) (see [Table 11](#)). Meanwhile, women who are members of visible minorities had slightly less positive perceptions on this question than women who did not identify as members of visible minorities (70.3% versus 72.7%).

Table 9 Employees who agreed that job opportunities were well communicated in their organization during the COVID-19 pandemic: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Employees	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	65.8%	58.0%	62.6%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	71.4%	70.5%	70.8%
Members of visible minorities	68.9%	70.6%	69.6%
Counterparts of visible minorities	71.6%	70.0%	70.8%
All employees	71.1%	69.9%	70.4%

Table 10 Employees who agreed that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Employees	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	68.2%	62.4%	65.6%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	72.6%	72.1%	72.2%
Members of visible minorities	68.5%	71.6%	69.8%
Counterparts of visible minorities	73.3%	71.7%	72.4%
All employees	72.4%	71.6%	71.8%

Table 11 Employees who agreed that their manager kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Employees	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	63.7%	62.5%	63.1%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	72.8%	70.9%	71.8%
Members of visible minorities	70.3%	70.9%	70.5%
Counterparts of visible minorities	72.7%	70.6%	71.7%
All employees	72.3%	70.5%	71.3%

Perceptions of transparency varied among visible minority subgroups. Filipino and Latin American employees were most likely to agree that job opportunities were well communicated in their organization during the COVID-19 pandemic (74.9% and 72.3% respectively) and that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way (74.5% and 75.9% respectively). Employees who identified as South Asian, Black, or members of other groups were the least likely to agree with these statements (see [Appendix 3](#), Tables [28](#) and [30](#)). Perceptions of transparency in the staffing system were similar across Indigenous subgroups (within 3% for all questions) (see [Appendix 3](#), Tables [29](#), [31](#) and [33](#)).

Hiring Managers

In general, hiring managers expressed confidence in their organization's ability to recruit the staff needed to carry out day-to-day operations during the COVID-19 pandemic. Some slight differences exist between the views of managers who belong to an employment equity group and those who do not, though most differences are not statistically significant. Data on hiring managers by visible minority sub-group leads to small numbers, which are not conducive to statistically significant results. Results for hiring managers are therefore only provided at the aggregate level.

19 – 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey - Perceptions of Federal Public Servants Who Are Members of an Employment Equity Group



About two thirds (66.9%) of Indigenous women managers agreed that they could hire the staff needed to address the COVID-19 response, while 78.6% agreed that they could hire the staff needed for day-to-day operations. For women managers who are members of visible minorities, the results were 70.1% versus 78.1%, respectively. The views of hiring managers who identified as women and members of visible minorities regarding their ability to recruit staff to address the COVID-19 response were similar to those of men who are members of visible minorities (70.1% versus 69.9%). Finally, despite the gap between the views of Indigenous women and Indigenous men (66.9% versus 59.3%), the difference was not statistically significant.

Hiring managers across all demographic groups expressed confidence regarding the use of virtual interviews to evaluate candidates efficiently when conducting staffing processes (positive results were over 90% for most demographic groups) (see [Table 14](#)). However, there was a pronounced gap between hiring managers who identified as Indigenous women and to those who identified as Indigenous men (91.0% versus 77.6%). Hiring managers across all demographic groups agreed that the performance of newly hired candidates met the expectations of the position for which they were hired (over 90% for all demographic groups) (see [Table 15](#)). Hiring managers, regardless of their employment equity status, expressed feeling comfortable explaining staffing decisions to their employees (over 90% for all demographic groups) (see [Table 16](#)).

A large majority of hiring managers indicated that they did not feel pressured to select a particular candidate (more than 80% for all demographic groups) (see [Table 17](#)). However, Indigenous women managers were the least likely to say that they did not feel pressure to select a particular candidate (82.4% versus 88.7% for women hiring managers who did not identify as Indigenous).

Table 12 Hiring managers who agreed that they were able to recruit the staff needed to carry out day-to-day operations during the COVID-19 pandemic: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Managers	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	78.6%	74.6%	76.4%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	80.0%	79.0%	79.5%
Members of visible minorities	78.1%	79.7%	78.9%
Counterparts of visible minorities	80.2%	78.7%	79.4%
All hiring managers	80.0%	78.8%	79.2%

Table 13 Hiring managers who agreed that they were able to recruit the staff needed to address the COVID-19 response: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of managers	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	66.9%	59.3%	62.5%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	71.0%	69.1%	70.0%
Members of visible minorities	70.1%	69.9%	69.9%
Counterparts of visible minorities	70.7%	68.5%	69.5%
All hiring managers	70.7%	68.6%	69.4%

Table 14 Hiring managers agreeing that the use of virtual interviews allowed them to evaluate candidates efficiently when conducting staffing processes: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Managers	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	91.0%	77.6%	85.2%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	93.5%	88.5%	90.9%
Members of visible minorities	93.4%	88.9%	91.2%
Counterparts of visible minorities	93.4%	88.0%	90.7%
All hiring managers	93.4%	88.1%	90.6%

Table 15 Hiring managers who agreed that the appointees met the performance expectations of the positions for which they were hired: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Managers	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	92.7%	92.2%	92.2%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	95.9%	95.8%	95.8%
Members of visible minorities	94.0%	93.4%	93.7%
Counterparts of visible minorities	96.0%	95.8%	95.9%
All hiring managers	95.7%	95.6%	95.5%

Table 16 Hiring managers indicating they felt comfortable explaining staffing decisions to their employees: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups

Category of Managers	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	94.3%	90.8%	92.6%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	95.1%	94.4%	94.7%
Members of visible minorities	94.8%	93.3%	94.1%
Counterparts of visible minorities	95.1%	94.5%	94.7%
All hiring managers	95.0%	94.3%	94.6%

Table 17 Hiring managers who agreed that they did not feel pressure to select a particular candidate: Intersection of gender and other employment equity groups (see note 1)

Category of Managers	Women	Men	Total
Indigenous peoples	82.4%	85.1%	83.3%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	88.7%	89.7%	89.1%
Members of visible minorities	85.8%	87.9%	86.7%
Counterparts of visible minorities	88.8%	89.9%	89.3%
All hiring managers	88.4%	89.5%	88.8%

Note 1: This question was reverse coded.

Conclusion

This report provides a summary of the 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey's key results for women, members of visible minorities and Indigenous peoples (please consult the [2021 Staffing and Non Partisanship Survey: Perceptions of Federal Public Servants with Disabilities Report](#) for results on persons with disabilities).

Overall, the results are positive. However, some gaps remain. In particular, Indigenous peoples and members of visible minorities expressed less positive perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency in the staffing process than employees who are not members of these respective employment equity groups. Perceptions varied between the subgroups of visible minorities. Latin American and Korean employees often expressed more positive perceptions than counterparts of visible minorities. Black employees had the least positive perceptions on questions related to fairness among all visible minority subgroups. However, their perceptions of merit, and transparency in the staffing process were similar or slightly lower than other visible minority subgroups. For Indigenous employees, results were similar across subgroups.

The survey also found that hiring managers, regardless of their employment equity status, expressed confidence in their organizations' ability to recruit needed staff during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Public Service Commission of Canada encourages federal public service organizations to use these results to influence their employment systems, policies and practices to address the gaps identified in this report as they may be indicative of biases or barriers to persons who are members of employment equity groups.

For more information, the 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey results can be explored using the [2021 SNPS Data Visualization Tool](#) or by using the newly designed [SNPS Pivot Table](#) which allows organizations to explore their own 2021 SNPS results for specific socio-demographic categories. In addition, the [2021 SNPS Dashboard](#) provides 2021 SNPS results on merit, fairness, transparency and other staffing-related topics in the Federal Public Service. Finally, comprehensive datasets can be found on the [Open Government portal](#).

Appendix 1: Definitions of Employment Equity Groups for the SNPS

Women

Respondents for the 2021 SNPS were asked about their gender, in which they could select “Male”, “Female”, “Other” and “Not Stated”. As such, women in the following report are all respondents who selected “Female” in the survey.

Visible minorities

Persons, other than Indigenous peoples, who do not identify as white. The 2021 SNPS asked respondents to self-identify with a detailed list of options to ensure all sub-groups in the Federal Public Service are also represented.

Indigenous peoples

Persons who identified as First Nations, Inuit or Métis.

Counterparts

Counterparts to an employment equity group are all other employees who do not belong to that respective group. Members of visible minorities were compared to employees who did not identify as members of visible minorities, and Indigenous peoples were compared to employees who did not identify as Indigenous. Women were compared to men.

“Other gender” category

The “other gender” category is made up of respondents who selected “other” as their gender. For the purposes of this report, gender analysis was restricted to respondents who indicated their gender as male or female. Perceptions of respondents who are part of the other gender category are reflected in overall results (totals), but an analysis of “other gender” as a group was not undertaken because of its heterogenous nature. A broken down analysis of “other gender” by its sub-categories was also not made available in this report as there are too few data points to ensure confidentiality and to allow for statistically significant results.

“Other groups” as part of the visible minority subgroups

Respondents who were classified as “Other groups” are members of visible minorities who did not identify as members of any of the subgroups listed.

Appendix 2: Methodology

For this report, results from the 2021 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey for persons who are members of an employment equity group have been compared by employment equity status and gender. Results for members of visible minorities and Indigenous peoples were compared to results of their counterparts (employees who are not members of those respective employment equity groups). Results for women were compared to results for men. Furthermore, this report provides an intersectional analysis by combining gender with Indigenous and visible minority status respectively.

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 servants who 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, respondents were asked to refer to the previous 12 months, from March 16, 2020, to March 15, 2021.

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”

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 asked negatively, respondents who agreed “to a minimal extent” or “not at all” for a given statement made up the positive responses.

For statistical comparison purposes, the bootstrap estimates provided by Statistics Canada were used to obtain valid variance estimates to develop confidence intervals and/or hypotheses tests. Bootstrap is generally useful for estimating the distribution of a statistic such as variance estimation of a mean. This allows the researcher to make

statistical comparisons between two or more population parameters. Many of Statistics Canada's surveys provide bootstrap weights, which can be used by researchers to generate consistent estimates of population parameters, and sampling variances that account for sample design.

Appendix 3: Subgroups for Visible Minorities and Indigenous peoples

Table 18 Employees who agreed that people hired could do the job, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Latin American	87.9%
Korean	86.4%
Southeast Asian	85.2%
Arab	85.1%
Filipino	84.6%
Chinese	84.1%
West Asian	83.4%
Black	82.7%
Japanese	80.1%
South Asian	79.0%

Table 18 Employees who agreed that people hired could do the job, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Other groups	75.8%
Members of visible minorities	83.2%
Counterparts of visible minorities	84.5%

Table 19 Employees who agreed that people hired could do the job, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the Indigenous subgroup
Métis	76.7%
First Nations	76.3%
Inuit	76.0%
Indigenous peoples	76.5%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	84.5%

Table 20 Employees who agreed that newly appointed employees were a good fit within their work unit, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Latin American	88.5%
Korean	88.5%
Arab	87.2%
Black	86.8%
Filipino	86.8%
Southeast Asian	86.8%
Chinese	86.5%
West Asian	85.1%
South Asian	84.7%
Japanese	84.0%
Other groups	82.0%
Members of visible minorities	86.6%
Counterparts of visible minorities	87.7%

Table 21 Employees who agreed that newly appointed employees were a good fit within their work unit, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the Indigenous subgroup
First Nations	81.5%
Métis	80.8%
Inuit	79.0%
Indigenous peoples	81.2%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	87.8%

Table 22 Employees who agreed that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Latin American	86.0%
Filipino	85.7%
Korean	85.2%
Chinese	85.2%
Arab	84.6%
West Asian	83.4%
Southeast Asian	81.8%
Black	79.7%
South Asian	78.9%
Japanese	78.4%
Other groups	77.3%
Members of visible minorities	82.6%
Counterparts of visible minorities	84.9%

Table 23 Employees who agreed that advertised job requirements reflected those of the position to be filled, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the Indigenous subgroup
Inuit	78.4%
First Nations	77.8%
Métis	77.8%
Indigenous peoples	78.0%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	84.8%

Table 24 Employees who agreed that the process of selecting a person for a position was done fairly, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Filipino	79.9%
Chinese	79.5%
Latin American	79.4%
Southeast Asian	78.2%
Korean	76.8%
Arab	75.7%
Japanese	72.9%
West Asian	71.8%
South Asian	71.5%
Other groups	69.1%
Black	65.1%
Members of visible minorities	73.8%
Counterparts of visible minorities	78.3%

Table 25 Employees' perceptions on the extent the process of selecting a person for a position is done fairly, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the Indigenous subgroup
Inuit	73.8%
First Nations	68.8%
Métis	68.4%
Indigenous peoples	68.8%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	77.9%

Table 26 Employees who agreed that appointments do not depend on who you know, by visible minority subgroups (see note 1)

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Latin American	48.9%
Arab	47.4%
Other groups	46.1%
Chinese	45.4%
South Asian	44.9%
Filipino	44.8%
Korean	43.4%
West Asian	43.4%
Japanese	40.8%
Southeast Asian	39.8%
Black	39.7%
Members of visible minorities	43.9%
Counterparts of visible minorities	54.2%

Note 1: this question was reverse coded.

Table 27 Employees who agreed that appointments do not depend on who you know, by Indigenous subgroups (see note 1)

Category of employees	Members of the Indigenous subgroup
First Nations	49.4%
Métis	46.0%
Inuit	40.4%
Indigenous peoples	47.2%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	52.8%

Note 1: this question was reverse coded.

Table 28 Employees who agreed that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Latin American	75.9%
Filipino	74.5%
Arab	73.1%
Southeast Asian	72.9%
Chinese	72.7%
West Asian	69.0%
Korean	66.9%
Japanese	65.5%
South Asian	65.5%
Black	64.8%
Other groups	62.7%
Members of visible minorities	69.8%
Counterparts of visible minorities	72.4%

Table 29 Employees who agreed that staffing activities were carried out in a transparent way, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the Indigenous subgroup
Inuit	67.3%
Métis	66.3%
First Nations	64.8%
Indigenous peoples	65.6%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	72.2%

Table 30 Employees who agreed that job opportunities were well communicated in their organization during the COVID-19 pandemic, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Filipino	74.9%
Latin American	72.3%
Chinese	71.9%
Arab	71.6%
West Asian	70.4%
Korean	69.9%
Southeast Asian	68.7%
Black	67.8%
Japanese	65.3%
South Asian	64.8%
Other groups	61.4%
Members of visible minorities	69.6%
Counterparts of visible minorities	70.8%

Table 31 Employees who agreed that job opportunities were well communicated in their organization during the COVID-19 pandemic, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the Indigenous subgroup
First Nations	63.5%
Métis	62.2%
Inuit	60.8%
Indigenous peoples	62.6%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	70.8%

Table 32 Employees who agreed that their manager kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit, by visible minority subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the visible minority subgroup
Chinese	74.1%
Southeast Asian	73.8%
Filipino	73.2%
Arab	72.3%
Korean	70.4%
Latin American	69.5%
West Asian	69.3%
South Asian	69.0%
Black	66.1%
Japanese	65.7%
Other groups	65.1%
Members of visible minorities	70.5%
Counterparts of visible minorities	71.7%

Table 33 Employees who agreed that their manager kept them informed of staffing decisions involving their work unit, by Indigenous subgroups

Category of employees	Members of the Indigenous subgroup
Inuit	64.6%
Métis	63.4%
First Nations	62.5%
Indigenous peoples	63.1%
Counterparts of Indigenous peoples	71.8%