



Commission de la fonction publique
du Canada

Public Service Commission
of Canada



Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Courts Administration Service

Canada

Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey

Introduction

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

The Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey was introduced in 2018 as a biennial public service-wide survey.¹ Data collection took place over a period of 8 weeks — between February 22 and April 20, 2018. The survey targeted employees, hiring managers and staffing advisors to gather their views on a wide range of staffing-related topics, including the New Direction in Staffing, organizational staffing policies and practices, as well as political activities and non-partisanship.

Invitations to complete the survey were sent to 214 275 public servants across 74 departments and agencies subject to the Public Service Employment Act. A total of 101 892 employees completed the survey, representing an overall response rate of 47.6%. A complete list of participating departments and agencies with their respective response rates is found in Appendix A.

This report provides a summary of key survey results for your organization, and compares them with results for departments and agencies of similar size², as well as for the federal public service as a whole.

In-scope survey respondents

The results in this report are based on all full-time indeterminate and term employees. Part-time and seasonal employees, casuals, students, contractors, Governor-in-Council appointees and ministers' exempt staff are excluded from this analysis. Results also include members of the regular Canadian Armed Forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who conduct staffing activities under the Public Service Employment Act.

Results

The data presented in this report has been weighted to adjust for non-response and for respondents who did not want to share their data with the Public Service Commission. Therefore, the results can be generalized to the federal public service population in departments and agencies that are subject to the Public Service Employment Act.

Results are shown as percentages for 3 categories of responses:

1. "yes" or "no";
2. "strongly agree"; "somewhat agree"; "neither agree nor disagree"; "somewhat disagree"; or "strongly disagree";
3. "not at all"; "to a minimal extent"; "to a moderate extent"; or "to a great extent".

1. The Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey was conducted by Statistics Canada on behalf of the Public Service Commission.

2. Size of department or agency: Very small (less than 100 employees); small (100-499 employees); medium (500-1 999 employees); large (2 000 or more employees).

For all of the above, the "don't know", "not applicable" and "unable to assess" responses are excluded. Due to rounding, figures may not always add up to 100%.

To protect the confidentiality of respondents, results are only provided for questions with at least 10 respondents. For ease of reference, the survey question numbers are reported in the tables. A copy of the survey questionnaire is available on Statistics Canada's website.

Results are reported in table format. Most questions in the survey are phrased in a positive manner. However, please note that some questions are negatively phrased in which case positive responses refer to negative outcomes. For example, a positive response to the statement "Within my organization, the administrative process involved in order to staff a position is burdensome," would represent a negative outcome.

In addition to this report, we developed an interactive web-based visualization tool allowing departments and agencies to explore the survey data and generate customized data tables. A series of thematic reports will also be made available.

Courts Administration Service Medium-sized department or agency	2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey responses
Number of employees ³	619
Number of respondents ⁴	258
- Number of staffing advisors ⁵	3
- Number of managers or supervisors	60
- Number of managers who hired or attempted to hire an indeterminate or term employee between January 1 and December 31, 2017	34

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@canada.ca

3. For a given department or agency - total number of employees who were sent the survey.

4. Total number of respondents who agreed to share their results with the Public Service Commission.

5. While survey respondents from a variety of occupational groups indicated they were a staffing advisor, results to staffing advisor questions in this report are restricted to those from the PE group, as the intent of these questions was to solicit views of the HR community.

Courts Administration Service

Employees' number of years of experience

Table 1: Number of years employed in the federal public service (ALL_Q55)

	Less than a year	1 year to less than 3 years	3 years to less than 10 years	10 years to less than 20 years	20 years to less than 30 years	30 years or more
Courts Administration Service	8.2%	11.1%	24.4%	31.3%	20.1%	5.0%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	3.1%	8.6%	24.2%	43.9%	15.8%	4.3%
Federal public service	3.2%	8.5%	23.4%	39.9%	17.5%	7.5%

Table 2: Number of years employed in current department or agency (ALL_Q50)

	Less than a year	1 year to less than 3 years	3 years to less than 5 years	5 years to less than 10 years	10 years or more
Courts Administration Service	12.4%	22.8%	9.0%	17.7%	38.0%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	8.9%	21.3%	12.2%	22.2%	35.4%
Federal public service	6.1%	14.7%	9.1%	21.7%	48.4%

Table 3: Number of years employed in current work unit (ALL_Q45)

	Less than 6 month	6 months to less than 1 year	1 year to less than 3 years	3 years to less than 5 years	5 or more years
Courts Administration Service	7.0%	14.2%	23.8%	7.5%	47.4%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	6.5%	12.2%	28.6%	13.4%	39.2%
Federal public service	6.1%	11.0%	24.0%	12.2%	46.7%

Table 4: Years of experience as a **manager/supervisor** in the federal public service (MAN_Q05)

	Less than a year	1 to less than 5 years	5 to less than 10 years	10 years or more
Courts Administration Service	21.0%	27.0%	16.3%	35.7%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	13.5%	27.3%	24.3%	34.9%
Federal public service	15.8%	27.7%	21.8%	34.7%

Table 5: Years of experience as a **staffing advisor** in the federal public service (ADV_Q05)

	Less than a year	1 to less than 5 years	5 to less than 10 years	10 years or more
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	8.8%	30.0%	22.9%	38.4%
Federal public service	11.4%	29.7%	21.0%	37.8%

Perception of merit, fairness and transparency

Table 6: Extent **employees** agreed that people hired in their work units can do the job (ALL_Q05B)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	26.4%	35.4%	13.3%	14.6%	10.3%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	26.3%	41.3%	13.2%	12.8%	6.4%
Federal public service	16.4%	37.4%	15.3%	19.8%	10.9%

Table 7: Extent **managers** agreed that appointees meet the performance expectations of the positions for which they were hired (MAN_Q60A)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	72.0%	23.0%	2.6%	0.0%	2.4%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	69.2%	25.2%	1.3%	2.5%	1.7%
Federal public service	63.7%	28.2%	3.3%	2.5%	2.3%

Table 8: Extent **managers** agreed that the persons they appointed are a good fit within their assigned teams or work units (MAN_Q60B)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	75.5%	19.7%	0.0%	2.5%	2.3%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	72.6%	21.4%	2.4%	2.2%	1.4%
Federal public service	67.0%	25.4%	3.1%	2.3%	2.2%

Table 9: Extent **managers** agreed that they felt external pressure to select a particular employee (MAN_Q85A)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	88.4%	7.8%	0.0%	3.8%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	82.0%	9.4%	4.6%	4.1%
Federal public service	75.6%	11.6%	7.3%	5.4%

Table 10: Extent **managers** agreed that they felt a sense of personal indebtedness to one or more employees (MAN_Q85B)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	78.9%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	85.2%	10.2%	3.5%	1.1%
Federal public service	81.2%	12.5%	4.9%	1.5%

Table 11: Extent **employees** agreed that the process used for selecting persons for positions in their work units is done fairly (ALL_Q05D)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	24.6%	33.2%	19.9%	13.7%	8.5%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	21.5%	37.6%	18.8%	14.1%	8.0%
Federal public service	14.0%	32.4%	21.6%	18.2%	13.8%

Table 12: Extent **employees** agreed that appointments for positions in their work units depend on who you know (ALL_Q05C)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	14.0%	28.6%	20.5%	16.8%	20.1%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	15.7%	31.1%	22.6%	16.2%	14.4%
Federal public service	19.5%	34.5%	22.5%	12.5%	11.0%

Table 13: Extent **employees** agreed that staffing activities in their work units are carried out in a transparent way (ALL_Q05A)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	23.4%	31.3%	18.9%	14.1%	12.3%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	20.0%	34.6%	14.9%	18.2%	12.3%
Federal public service	13.8%	30.5%	17.5%	20.0%	18.2%

Consideration of priority entitlements

Table 14: Extent **managers** indicated that they understand the provisions that help veterans gain employment in the federal public service (MAN_Q80I)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	15.1%	28.3%	25.7%	30.9%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	11.4%	20.9%	35.2%	32.5%
Federal public service	13.5%	20.7%	35.9%	29.9%

Table 15: Extent **managers** agreed that priority entitlements limit their ability to appoint persons who are a good fit within their work unit (MAN_Q80H)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	22.4%	24.7%	34.6%	18.3%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	27.9%	33.9%	27.4%	10.9%
Federal public service	18.5%	31.6%	30.4%	19.5%

Table 16: Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that they are sufficiently informed about changes to priority entitlements included in the Veterans Hiring Act so as to provide sound advice to managers within their organizations (ADV_Q10D)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	1.3%	7.4%	32.9%	58.4%
Federal public service	1.0%	6.0%	31.6%	61.4%

Table 17: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that their strategic input was sought by managers regarding the consideration of persons with priority entitlements (ADV_Q15A)

	Yes	No
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	85.5%	14.5%
Federal public service	88.6%	11.4%

Table 18: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that their strategic input regarding the consideration of persons with priority entitlements influenced hiring managers' staffing actions (ADV_Q20A)

	Yes	No
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	79.0%	21.0%
Federal public service	83.4%	16.6%

Perception of the New Direction in Staffing

Table 19: Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that they are sufficiently informed about how their organization has chosen to implement the New Direction in Staffing (NDS) (ADV_Q10A)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	1.3%	1.5%	19.7%	77.6%
Federal public service	1.4%	5.3%	20.4%	72.9%

Table 20: Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that they can explain to managers how their organization's implementation of the NDS relates to their staffing needs (ADV_Q10B)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	1.3%	1.5%	19.6%	77.6%
Federal public service	1.6%	5.3%	21.8%	71.3%

Table 21: Extent **managers** indicated that they understand the NDS (MAN_Q80A)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	8.6%	21.3%	43.4%	26.7%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	9.3%	17.2%	43.4%	30.0%
Federal public service	15.1%	23.4%	42.3%	19.1%

Table 22: Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that the NDS provides managers with the ability to customize their staffing activities based on organizational needs (ADV_Q10C)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	1.3%	3.1%	29.8%	65.8%
Federal public service	1.1%	5.7%	26.9%	66.3%

Table 23: Extent **managers** indicated that the NDS has improved the way they hire and appoint persons to and within their organization (MAN_Q80B)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	0.0%	26.0%	46.4%	27.6%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	10.4%	20.2%	43.5%	25.9%
Federal public service	18.5%	25.4%	38.9%	17.2%

Table 24: Extent **managers** indicated that the NDS has resulted in staffing being made simpler in their organization (MAN_Q80C)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	7.1%	34.0%	38.9%	20.0%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	15.3%	24.0%	37.7%	23.0%
Federal public service	26.2%	27.6%	32.4%	13.9%

Table 25: Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that the implementation of the Attestation Form has served to reinforce sub-delegated managers' key accountabilities (ADV_Q10E)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	6.0%	14.5%	50.1%	29.4%
Federal public service	6.3%	20.5%	41.7%	31.6%

Table 26: **Managers** who indicated that they have sub-delegated authority to make appointments to and within their organizations by their deputy heads (MAN_Q10A)

	Yes	No
Courts Administration Service	37.8%	62.2%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	28.3%	71.7%
Federal public service	23.6%	76.4%

Table 27: **Managers** who indicated that they have signed an **Attestation Form** (MAN_Q10B)

	Yes	No
Courts Administration Service	100.0%	0.0%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	96.0%	4.0%
Federal public service	93.5%	6.5%

Perception of organizational staffing policies and practices

Table 28: Extent **managers** indicated that they understand their organizations' policies with respect to staffing (MAN_Q80D)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	0.0%	14.8%	40.4%	44.7%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	3.2%	14.6%	43.0%	39.2%
Federal public service	6.1%	20.7%	45.2%	27.9%

Table 29: Extent **managers** indicated that the staffing options available to them within their organizations allow them to address their staffing needs as quickly as required (MAN_Q80F)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	7.4%	39.3%	36.7%	16.6%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	11.9%	33.5%	39.9%	14.7%
Federal public service	24.9%	37.5%	29.9%	7.7%

Table 30: Extent **managers** indicated that staffing options available to them within their organizations provide them with the flexibility to appoint persons who are a good fit within their work units (MAN_Q80G)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	7.4%	21.0%	34.1%	37.6%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	6.0%	20.3%	41.9%	31.9%
Federal public service	13.2%	26.8%	41.1%	18.9%

Table 31: Extent **managers** indicated that the administrative process to staff positions within their organizations is burdensome (MAN_Q80E)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	8.6%	23.3%	38.0%	30.1%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	1.9%	14.1%	41.3%	42.7%
Federal public service	1.9%	10.1%	32.4%	55.5%

Perception of staffing advice and support

Table 32: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that their strategic input was sought by managers in each of the following areas (ADV_Q15B-Q15I)

	Courts Administration Service	Medium-sized departments and agencies	Federal public service
Testing accomodations for candidates	N/A	68.5%	66.1%
Employment equity considerations	N/A	59.9%	56.2%
Identifying the area of selection	N/A	82.1%	89.3%
Establishing the merit criteria	N/A	92.3%	95.7%
The assessment tools or methods to be used	N/A	94.4%	96.1%
The proposed length of time to advertise	N/A	85.5%	88.3%
Choice of method used to staff their positions	N/A	93.9%	95.3%
Aligning the manager's staffing needs with the priorities of your organization's HR plan	N/A	55.0%	59.4%

Table 33: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that the input they provided to managers influenced managers' staffing actions in each of the following areas (ADV_Q20B-Q20I)

	Courts Administration Service	Medium-sized departments and agencies	Federal public service
Testing accomodations for candidates	N/A	84.9%	80.8%
Employment equity considerations	N/A	67.6%	76.8%
Identifying the area of selection	N/A	93.7%	94.8%
Establishing the merit criteria	N/A	92.8%	95.5%
The assessment tools or methods to be used	N/A	89.8%	94.5%
The proposed length of time to advertise	N/A	90.9%	90.7%
Choice of method used to staff their positions	N/A	91.6%	95.5%
Aligning the manager's staffing needs with the priorities of your organization's HR plan	N/A	83.4%	86.8%

Table 34: Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that they are confident in their ability to provide managers with useful advice on staffing (ADV_Q10F)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medium-sized departments and agencies	1.3%	1.5%	14.0%	83.3%
Federal public service	0.4%	1.3%	16.0%	82.3%

Table 35: Extent **managers** agreed that staffing advisors in their organizations provide them with useful staffing advice (MAN_Q65B)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	58.0%	17.4%	8.9%	15.6%	0.0%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	41.5%	36.2%	8.5%	10.5%	3.3%
Federal public service	36.2%	36.5%	10.7%	10.2%	6.5%

Table 36: Percentage of **managers** who indicated that the information provided to them by staffing advisors assigned to their appointment processes was **not useful** (MAN_Q70 01-09)

	Courts Administration Service	Medium-sized departments and agencies	Federal public service
Consideration of persons with priority entitlements	N/A	14.5%	24.2%
Testing accommodations for candidates	N/A	12.2%	15.4%
Employment equity considerations	N/A	9.6%	11.8%
Identifying the area of selection	N/A	20.4%	25.9%
Establishing the merit criteria	N/A	56.9%	50.2%
The assessment tools or methods to be used	N/A	63.1%	54.6%
The proposed length of time to advertise	N/A	21.1%	24.9%
Choice of method used to staff your positions	N/A	61.7%	55.4%
Aligning your staffing needs with the priorities of your organization's HR plan	N/A	43.0%	43.1%
Other	N/A	26.2%	33.4%

Table 37: Extent **managers** agreed that staffing advisors in their organizations provide them with consistent staffing advice (MAN_Q65A)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	52.5%	19.7%	15.5%	10.0%	2.3%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	39.7%	34.8%	9.9%	11.0%	4.5%
Federal public service	33.1%	35.7%	10.3%	12.9%	8.0%

Table 38: Extent **managers** agreed that staffing advisors in their organizations acted proactively to help them fill positions with the appointees they need (MAN_Q75A)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	34.7%	27.6%	15.9%	15.3%	6.5%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	26.0%	29.5%	17.0%	17.4%	10.0%
Federal public service	22.8%	28.9%	16.9%	18.3%	13.2%

Table 39: Extent **managers** agreed that%, overall%, they were satisfied with the staffing services they received within their organizations (MAN_Q75B)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Courts Administration Service	46.9%	22.9%	14.8%	8.9%	6.5%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	33.1%	34.5%	13.2%	13.1%	6.1%
Federal public service	28.2%	31.2%	13.7%	15.1%	11.8%

Awareness and understanding of political activities and non-partisanship

Table 40: Percentage of **employees** who indicated that they engaged in political activities – other than voting or seeking political candidacy - between January 1 and December 31, 2017 (ALL_Q25)

	Yes	No
Courts Administration Service	4.9%	95.1%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	2.3%	97.7%
Federal public service	2.4%	97.6%

Table 41: Extent **employees** indicated that they are aware of their rights and obligations for engaging in political activities (ALL_Q15A)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	3.5%	13.8%	40.5%	42.2%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	2.1%	12.0%	40.2%	45.7%
Federal public service	3.4%	16.6%	44.5%	35.6%

Table 42: Extent **employees** indicated that their organizations keep them informed of their right to engage in political activities (ALL_Q15C)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	9.8%	23.3%	34.6%	32.3%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	7.7%	20.0%	35.9%	36.3%
Federal public service	11.2%	25.2%	35.9%	27.7%

Table 43: Extent **employees** indicated that they are able to make informed decisions about engaging in political activities (ALL_Q20D)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	2.2%	6.0%	30.4%	61.5%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	1.5%	6.1%	28.1%	64.3%
Federal public service	2.1%	9.3%	32.8%	55.7%

Table 44: Extent **managers** indicated that they could provide guidance and answers to their employees regarding engagement in political activities (ALL_Q15E)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	1.8%	17.7%	24.8%	55.6%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	3.0%	13.7%	38.6%	44.7%
Federal public service	5.7%	17.7%	41.7%	34.9%

Table 45: Extent **employees** indicated that they understand their responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties as public servants (ALL_Q15B)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	0.3%	4.2%	22.9%	72.5%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	0.8%	3.6%	19.4%	76.1%
Federal public service	1.3%	6.3%	25.8%	66.5%

Table 46: Extent **employees** indicated that their organizations kept them informed of their responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties (ALL_Q15D)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	8.2%	21.6%	29.4%	40.8%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	5.6%	17.2%	34.5%	42.7%
Federal public service	8.0%	21.3%	36.7%	33.9%

Table 47: Extent **employees** indicated that they understand the importance to be perceived as being politically impartial in carrying out their duties (ALL_Q20A)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	0.3%	2.9%	17.8%	79.0%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	0.5%	2.3%	13.1%	84.1%
Federal public service	1.0%	4.7%	19.3%	74.9%

Table 48: Extent **employees** indicated that they are able to carry out their duties as public servants in a politically impartial manner (ALL_Q20B)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	0.0%	2.0%	15.1%	82.9%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	0.6%	1.6%	11.8%	86.0%
Federal public service	0.7%	2.9%	15.9%	80.5%

Table 49: Extent **employees** indicated that, within their work units, employees carried out their duties as public servants in a politically impartial manner (ALL_Q20C)

	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Courts Administration Service	1.4%	4.1%	18.4%	76.0%
Medium-sized departments and agencies	0.7%	2.0%	14.8%	82.4%
Federal public service	1.1%	4.0%	21.8%	73.0%

Appendix A: Participating departments and agencies

Table 50: Participating departments and agencies, and final response rates

Department or agency	Final response rate
Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada	51.7%
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	44.3%
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	55.7%
Canada Border Services Agency	44.2%
Canada Economic Development for Québec Regions	51.7%
Canada School of Public Service	46.5%
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	56.4%
Canadian Grain Commission	66.0%
Canadian Heritage	48.7%
Canadian Human Rights Commission	50.5%
Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat	52.2%
Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency	54.8%
Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC)	52.4%
Canadian Space Agency	49.6%
Canadian Transportation Agency	56.0%
Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP	54.7%
Copyright Board of Canada	70.6%
Correctional Service Canada	33.2%
Courts Administration Service	45.2%
Department of Finance Canada	47.2%
Department of Justice Canada	49.4%
Department of National Defence (non-civilian managers)	39.8%
Department of National Defence - public servants	49.1%
Employment and Social Development Canada	52.2%
Environment and Climate Change Canada	48.2%
Farm Products Council of Canada	68.8%
Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario	54.6%
Financial Consumer Agency of Canada	63.6%
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	36.5%
Global Affairs Canada	49.0%
Health Canada	47.6%
Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada	41.4%
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada	50.5%
Indian Oil and Gas Canada	69.0%
Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada	43.5%

Department or agency	Final response rate
Infrastructure Canada	47.5%
Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada	52.5%
International Joint Commission	50.0%
Library and Archives Canada	62.6%
Military Grievances External Review Committee	66.7%
Military Police Complaints Commission of Canada	55.6%
National Energy Board	56.6%
Natural Resources Canada	45.6%
Office of the Chief Electoral Officer	52.2%
Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs Canada	46.9%
Office of the Commissioner of Canada Elections	72.0%
Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying of Canada	75.0%
Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages	51.4%
Office of the Correctional Investigator	60.0%
Office of the Information Commissioner of Canada	25.6%
Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada	46.8%
Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada	65.2%
Office of the Secretary to the Governor General	44.8%
Office of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy of Canada	54.4%
Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada	45.0%
Parole Board of Canada	48.9%
Patented Medicine Prices Review Board	43.3%
Privy Council Office	35.1%
Public Health Agency of Canada	46.4%
Public Prosecution Service of Canada	53.5%
Public Safety Canada	48.1%
Public Service Commission of Canada	51.6%
Public Services and Procurement Canada	52.4%
RCMP External Review Committee	66.7%
Royal Canadian Mounted Police (non-civilian managers)	46.6%
Royal Canadian Mounted Police - public servants	50.8%
Shared Services Canada	52.5%
Statistics Canada	60.9%
Status of Women Canada	38.7%
Supreme Court of Canada	38.8%
Transport Canada	51.7%
Transportation Safety Board of Canada	51.4%
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	49.1%

Veterans Affairs Canada	55.1%
Veterans Review and Appeal Board	52.7%
Western Economic Diversification Canada	58.1%
Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey	47.6%

6. Note: When the survey frame was created in October 2017, Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs and the Department of Indigenous Services Canada did not exist. However, these departments did exist for selection purposes as departments when the data was collected. For the purpose of this report, the results of these 2 departments were combined with those of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada.