
October 26, 2021

FROM: Aftab Erfan
Chief Equity Officer

SUBJECT: 2021 Employee Benchmark Survey – Organizational Results Update #1

PURPOSE

This short report provides a first update on the results of the City of Vancouver's internal Employee Benchmark Survey (2021) and highlights some of the opportunities and challenges illuminated by the survey. The report is provided for the information of Council, staff and the community, in alignment with the City's commitment to shared accountability and transparency around internal equity initiatives, articulated in the [Equity Framework](#). As deeper and more intersectional analysis of the data is completed, further updates will be provided at the organizational and team levels.

A number of efforts are already underway or planned to address the issues illuminated by the survey. They are presented in this report under three headings:

- A. [Actions to address low participation rates among some staff groups](#)
- B. [Actions to address issues of under-representation of certain demographics](#)
- C. [Actions to address challenges in inclusion and belonging in the workplace](#)

BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

The Employee Benchmark Survey is a voluntary survey conducted in the spring of 2021 to create the first demographic snapshot of City employees and obtain feedback on the employees' workplace experiences. The survey was administered online from April 12 to May 14, 2021, to 6,796 employees hired before March 20, 2021, including those on leave for up to two years. All City departments participated, except for Vancouver Fire and Rescue Services, which is in the process of considering when and how to collect similar types of information. Vancouver Police and Vancouver Public Library are separate employers and, as such, have conducted separate employee surveys. Their results are not included in this report.

The survey was led jointly by the Human Resources department and the Equity Office. To ensure rigour and confidentiality, [BC Stats](#), an arms-length statistical research branch of the province, was contracted to conduct the survey and perform analysis on behalf of the City.

The survey design, which included 27 demographic and experience questions, was inspired by the BC Human Rights Commission [report on the collection of disaggregated data \(2021\)](#). As such, it involved staff voices through the City's Employee Resources Groups, helping determine what questions were meaningful to ask. Leadership across City departments and the unions were also consulted in creating the survey and championing it during the implementation stage.

The survey was available in English, Punjabi, Tagalog and Simplified Chinese. It included a short definition section and extensive [FAQs](#). Survey questions can be found in Appendix A.

Beyond a data collection exercise, the mandate of the survey is to identify gaps in representation and belonging at the City, so that leaders can focus efforts and investments to address these gaps and challenges. Going forward, the City intends to collect this information regularly (every three years at a minimum) to inform monitoring of our internal equity efforts and take a more rigorous, data-based approach to create a workplace that (a) represents the communities we serve, and (b) works better for everyone.

PARTICIPATION RATES AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

A total of 3,732 employees participated in the survey. This represents a response rate of 55%. Respondent characteristics can be seen in Table 1 in Appendix B.

The response rate is in line with previous voluntary surveys at the City comparable to rates from other organizations of a similar nature. Over half of City departments had very high participation rates (80% and above). Even in departments with low participation, the number of participants is large enough for most results to be reliable. However, a 55% response rate does indicate absence of nearly half of the City's workforce from the exercise. This absence limits the reliability of the results, the conclusions that can be drawn and the scope of the resulting action.

Early staff consultations through the Employee Resource Groups indicated that some staff, particularly those from systemically marginalized communities, were hesitant to participate in the survey due to their communities' past experiences with unethical research. Too often, marginalized people have gone through the frustrating experience of engaging with narrow, categorizing survey questions, only to have the data buried or shelved without any benefits to the community. In other instances, surveys have actively done harm to the community by providing the means for surveillance, discipline, or further stigmatization of respondents. The project team did its best to alleviate these concerns through the design and communication phase, by being clear and explicit about intentions, and setting up systems to ensure confidentiality and accountability. However, trust can only be built over time by the City demonstrating its commitments to responsible data collection, including acting on the results.

The rate of participation varied widely among employee groups. An exploration of respondent characteristics shows that respondents were most likely to be:

- Permanent full-time employees
- In managerial, professional, administrative or senior clerical roles
- Female
- Mid-career (between 41 and 60 years of age)

In contrast, there was a significant under-representation of operational and frontline staff who are likely to be in auxiliary and temporary positions, and also likely to experience fewer forms of social and economic privilege overall. Operational and frontline staff – representing over a third of City workers - generally do not have City computers, phones, or email addresses. For the purposes of this survey, they were reached via postcards, individually addressed to them and distributed by their supervisors. Only 18% responded, compared to nearly 60% of staff reached through direct email invites from BC Stats. Other factors compounded the dynamics. COVID-19 was a major pre-occupation and possible detractor for many staff. It also limited the ability of the project team to reach the operational and frontline staff through site visits and on-location activities. The project team has documented several lessons learned to improve future instances of all-staff surveys of this nature.

Actions to address low participation rates among some staff groups

Action A1. In 2022, the Equity Office will convene a working group comprised of Human Resources, Internal Communications, Technology Services, and relevant union leadership, to address internal barriers in communicating with operational and frontline staff. This project will explore human and technological solutions used by other jurisdictions, and recommend how the City should invest in mechanisms to better engage with operational and frontline staff.

Action A2. In units with low participation rates and/or where there is reason to believe the staff may face barriers, departmental leaders will arrange for additional and complementary data collection. Examples include staff focus groups facilitated by external consultants, comment boxes for anonymous reports, facilitated all-staff meetings where work culture is a topic of discussion, and on-site informal events where management builds relationships with staff and listens to what is going on in units.

DEMOGRAPHIC RESULTS

Before this survey, the only known information about the identity of City staff was their sex and age, which are recorded in the City's administrative records at the time of hiring. The survey questions invited participants to report on Indigenous identity, race and ethnic origins, gender identity, trans experience, sexual orientation, ability, practice of religion, immigration and place of birth, and caregiving responsibilities. Participants could opt out of any question (or part of a question) or choose multiple answers where appropriate. The calculations in this report exclude skipped questions and "prefer not to say" responses.

Table 2, Appendix B, breaks out the results for unionized staff, exempt staff (typically professionals, supervisors, managers, etc.) and senior exempt staff (typically senior managers, directors, general managers, etc.) to help illustrate representation at various levels of the organization. Table 3, Appendix B, provides comparators between representation among City staff, among the population of Vancouver, and the presentation in the labour force at the regional and provincial level (when available).

Indigeneity, race, ethnicity

The survey posed questions on race and ethnicity in a couple of different ways. An open-ended question on ethnic origins resulted in a very wide range of answers (not yet coded) reflecting the complexity of ethnic identity in Vancouver. The two sets of close-ended questions on race and ethnicity produced very similar results as described below.

One set of questions asked respondents to choose among broad racial categories that best represent them. Just over half (56%) of respondents who answered this question chose "White, European descent, Caucasian or similar term," 37% selected "Racialized, visible minority, non-white, Indigenous, Black, Person of Colour or similar term," and 7% considered themselves "Biracial, multiracial, mixed-race or similar term." In answer to a question on Indigeneity, 2% responded that they are Indigenous, defined as "those whose ancestors have lived on Turtle Island (also referred to as North America) since time immemorial."

The second set of questions asked respondents to select the Canadian Census category (or categories) that described their racial identity. Again, about 56% of those who responded to this question selected White. Nearly one-fifth selected Chinese (18%). Other sizeable groups selected included South Asian (8%), Filipino/a/x (4%). Indigenous, Black, Latin American, Southeast Asian, and West Asian groups are each represented at around 2% of total respondents, and Korean and Japanese communities are represented at around 1% each. The total percentage of "visible minorities" (the Canadian Census term for racialized) is 42%.

An early intersectional analysis of the survey data examined self-identified gender and racial identity together. Of those who responded to both questions, roughly 30% are white men, 25% are white women, 25% are IBPOC men, and 20% are IBPOC women. For this analysis, the acronym IBPOC stands for Indigenous, Black, People of Colour and includes all non-white categories, including multiracial identities. A further intersectional analysis is currently underway.

Gender and Sexual Orientation

Of those who responded to the question on gender identity, 55% reported themselves as men, 44% as women, and 1% as non-binary or gender fluid person. When asked whether they have trans experience, about 1% of those who responded selected "yes."

Among the employee invited to complete the survey, roughly 4,200 were identified as male (62%) and 2,580 as female (38%) in the City's administrative files. (A significant limitation of these files is that gender or sex outside the male/female binary is not adequately recorded.) BC Stats participation records show that females were more likely than males to have responded to the voluntary Employee Benchmark Survey. As a result, the percentage of those who identified as women in the survey (44%) is almost certainly an overcount.

In response to the question on sexual orientation, about 92% of those who responded selected "Straight, heterosexual or analogous term," while 8% identified as members of the LGBTQ/2S+ community. Within the LGBTQ/2S+ community, respondents selected gay (38% of 8%), bisexual (35% of 8%), queer (28% of 8%), lesbian (21% of 8%) and pansexual (13% of 8%), with many respondents making multiple selections for this question. Indigenous respondents were prompted to indicate if they are Two-Spirit, and a small number (under 5) selected "yes."

Ability

Ability and disability were broadly defined in the survey. According to the survey results, 9% of respondents have "a significant, persistent or recurring mobility, sensory, learning, physical and/or mental health impairment, condition or disability." The most common impairment, condition or disability was related to chronic pain, illness or medical condition (49% of 9%), followed by emotional or mental health (41% of 9%), learning, developmental or behavioural disorder (26% of 9%), mobility or dexterity limitation (24% of 9%), hearing or speech impediment (11% of 9%), and vision impairment (6% of 9%). Limited-term illness, injury or disability – which often requires temporary accommodation in the workplace - is unlikely to be captured by these numbers given the phrasing of the question.

Religious and Spiritual Practice

When asked what religion or spiritual tradition they regularly observed, 59% of respondents noted they do not observe a religion or spiritual tradition. Of the 40% or so who do observe a religion, the religion most often selected was Christianity (29% of total respondents), followed by Buddhism (5%) and Sikhism (4%). Islam and Hinduism are practiced by 2% of respondents, and Judaism and Indigenous spiritualities are practiced by 1%. Roughly 13% of City staff regularly practice a religion or spiritual tradition other than Christianity.

Caregiving and Age

When asked if they have significant caregiving responsibilities outside of work, 45% of those who responded selected "yes." The City has a sizeable staff population of age and stage of life typically associated with increased caregiving responsibility, including child care, elder care, and responsibility for another family or community member who requires significant support (or a combination of the above). The survey did not include a question on the age of respondents, but data on age is already contained in the City's administrative files and shows that employees aged 30 and under are 18% of City staff, 31-40 years of age are 25%, 41-50 years of age are 25%, 51-60 years of age are 23%, and over the age of 60 are about 9% of all City staff.

Immigration and Place of Birth

The survey included questions on migration to the lands known as Canada. Among those who responded to these questions, 36% were born outside of Canada, and a further 31% were born in Canada but have at least one parent born outside of Canada (typically considered second-generation Canadians). About 4% of respondents indicated they were newcomers to Canada who had been in the country for fewer than five years.

The question of equitable representation

The demographic snapshot summarized above provokes the question: how well does the City do on equitable representation of systemically marginalized communities – particularly Indigenous, Black and other racialized people, women, people with disabilities, immigrants, and sexual and gender minorities? Where and how large are the representational gaps?

This is a complex question. The size of the gap depends on how one looks at the issue of equitable representation and what comparisons one makes. There are multiple possibilities:

1) Comparison with City of Vancouver population.

Equitable representation could mean that the City's workforce demographics match the demographics of the communities it serves. In comparing the City's survey results with the Census data for residents of Vancouver, sizeable gaps are immediately evident for visible minorities (42% at the City, 52% in the community) and women (44% at the City, 51% in the community). Looking further at specific ethnic groups, it is notable that the Chinese community, in particular, is under-represented in the City's workforce (18% at the City, 27% in the community). These comparisons are presented in Table 2, Appendix B. They are based on the 2016 Census, which may be slightly outdated as the demographics of Vancouver have changed in the past five years. This analysis will be refreshed once the 2021 Census results are released in 2022.

2) Comparison with the availability in the labour market.

Equitable representation could be about ensuring that the City as an employer is accessible and attractive to all those eligible to work for the City. From this perspective, comparing the City employee demographics with the labour market demographics (as opposed to the general population) is more appropriate. The applicants to the City of Vancouver often come from the broader Metro Vancouver region and province, and the demographics of those geographies differs somewhat from Vancouver. Additionally, not all population groups can and do participate in the labour force at the same rate due to a host of societal barriers and personal factors. For example, while about one in five BC residents (21%) live with some form of disability, people with disabilities make up 11% of the available workforce in BC (compared with 9% of the City's workforce). The analysis of labour market availability is most useful when customized for each occupational category and type of work. For example, while one in two BC residents (50%) is a woman, and the global labour force availability rate for women in BC is 48%, only about 26% of those with a degree in engineering in BC are women.

Understanding the gaps between the City's demographics and labour force availability is important as it can help the City pinpoint and address specific areas where barriers (including potential bias) exist in the outreach and hiring processes. Table 2, Appendix B, shows general labour force availability for the region and province. However, a far more substantial analysis is needed to understand availability in each occupational category. This larger analysis is currently underway.

3) Comparison with proportion of the City's work with equity-denied communities.

Alternatively, equitable representation could mean that the City's workforce is representative of those segments of the community with whom the City is engaged in significant redress work. For example, the Black community may comprise only 2% of the city's population (at least in part due to the history of displacement in which City policies had a role), but the work of redress with the Black community comprises a large proportion of the work of certain City departments – in which case a larger representation of Black employees with lived experience is desirable. As another example, the urban Indigenous community in Vancouver may be quite small (due to colonization and history of genocide – also likely undercounted in the Canadian Census), but in certain neighbourhoods, this community makes up large proportions of the clientele of the City's

services – in which case a large presence of Indigenous employees with connection to the community is desirable. Disproportionate impact needs disproportionate investment and capacity to address. When these units of the City employ only one or two "representative" staff – Black or Indigenous - these staff members bear an inequitable burden of responsibility. The form of analysis to identify such gaps is highly site-specific, project-specific and difficult to perform quantitatively. It is nevertheless an important consideration in each unit's work.

4) Comparison across ranks.

Finally, equitable representation can be conceived of as representation across the City's lines of rank and power. Table 1, Appendix B compares the representation of identity groups for unionized, exempt and senior exempt employees. Of note here is the discrepancy between the percentage in the unionized and senior exempt roles for people with disabilities (11% unionized, 4% senior exempt) and visible minorities (44% unionized, 25% senior exempt). These comparisons indicate that the City as an organization is more diverse at the base than at the top. Many identity groups (e.g. Indigenous, non-binary, trans) are too small for meaningful analysis across ranks and BC Stats has suppressed numbers to protect privacy. Note that the gap at the base and top of the organization is relatively small for certain identity groups – women (43% unionized, 41% senior exempt) and LGBTQ/2S+ people (9% unionized, 7% senior exempt) in particular. This is a testament to the relative effectiveness of previous efforts to diversify City leadership which have benefited some groups. It does not mean that members of these communities do not face belonging challenges or more subtle forms of discrimination in the workplace. The work of effective inclusion is far from complete.

Actions to address issues of under-representation of certain demographics

B1. Analysis of labour force availability for each occupational group is underway, along with the breakdown of the demographics for each City department. Representational gaps identified in this analysis will be addressed within each department's recruitment efforts, and will influence the City's work under the umbrella of several identity-based strategies: Women's Equity Strategy, Accessibility Strategy, Anti-Racism Action Plan.

B2. The Human Resources Department currently has a set of initiatives targeting increased representation from each equity-denied community. HR staff are working with relevant Employee Resource Groups and community partners to identify and remove barriers to access. HR also plans to undertake a third-party audit of its equitable hiring practices in early 2022 to incorporate the findings of the labour force analysis and fine-tune its approach to equitable hiring.

B3. The Human Resources Department began to implement succession planning with departments across the organization in 2021. This work expands in 2022 and will include equity as a key consideration, with one of the objectives being to increase the representation of under-represented groups within leadership roles across the organization. In 2022, the Equity Office, in collaboration with Human Resources Department and select departments, will explore specific leadership development pathways for employees from equity-denied communities. Leadership roles within Employee Resource Groups currently provide some basic opportunities. Still, a more

comprehensive effort, including some form of mentoring and/or peer-support program for emerging leaders, may be needed.

B4. In 2022 the Equity Office, in partnership with Financial Services, Social Policy and interested staff, will be developing a set of metrics for evaluating progress toward equity within the organization over time. As part of this exercise, a small number of numeric indicators, enabled by the Employee Benchmark Survey will be decided upon and built into a public-facing dashboard. This process will also consider if and where setting representational targets would be meaningful and what those targets should be.

EMPLOYEE EXPERIENCE RESULTS

The 2021 Employee Benchmark Survey invited respondents to comment on eleven aspects of their workplace experience. Respondents were asked to specify their level of agreement to a statement along a Likert scale with five points: (1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Neither agree nor disagree; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly agree. The statements chosen included some common and standard statements typically used in employee engagement surveys, and some statements that pointed to potential concerns already raised by staff in the lead-up to the creation of the Equity Framework.

Table 4 in Appendix B summarizes both the average score and distribution of responses for the eleven survey questions about employee experiences at the City of Vancouver. BC Stats collapsed the distributions of responses into three categories. The "Disagree" category combines those who selected 1 or 2, the "Neutral" category represents those who selected 3, and the "Agree" category combines those who selected 4 or 5 on the Likert scale. Average scores were then derived by converting the five-point scale into a 100-point scale (1=0; 2=25; 3=50; 4=75; 5=100) and calculating the weighted average response based on the number of respondents.

The average score for each question provides a shorthand for understanding the collective response to each question which is useful for action planning. BC Stats indicates that the average score for similar questions in most public sector organizations is around 70. This suggests that where the City's score is over 70, the organization is doing well compared to the average among its peers. A different way to think about what is considered "doing well" is to consider that if 100% of respondents had agreed with any given statement, that would translate to an average score of 75. Assuming a normal distribution of respondents, some will always feel better, and some will always feel worse about any given statement. Still, an average of 75 may be considered a benchmark "good score" that the City's results should be compared to.

Highest scores: In four out of eleven areas, the City's average score is at or above 75. These include physical accessibility and flexibility of workplace and work arrangements, fairness of expectations placed by managers, and pride in working for the City. It should be noted that the scores in these areas vary by department and type of job, and that operational and frontline staff – who are more likely to have concerns in these areas - are under-represented in the respondents. Nevertheless, the high scores in these areas are a recognition of the ways that the City as an employer has exercised flexibility and care for staff, particularly at the time of the pandemic. Going forward, the City has continued on this path and has introduced a post-pandemic Flexible Work Program that is one of the most flexible amongst local peer organizations. As well, efforts are continuing to emphasize conversations about self and community care, prioritization and workload to help reduce pressure on

staff while serving multiple and growing needs of the community. These efforts need to continue and evolve in order to build on the City's strengths as an employer.

Middle scores: In four out of eleven areas, the City's average score is between 70 and 74. These include the full appreciation of diversity, access to culturally appropriate support, and the capacity of leaders to create inclusive environments, including being approachable when something wrong happens in the workplace. Again, scores vary on these questions across the organization from unit to unit. As well, early intersectional analysis shows some significant differences between identity groups. For example, the average score on the statement "I am confident that I can access support that is culturally appropriate for me through the City when I need it (e.g., counselling, mentorship)" varies between 67 for racialized women to 74 for white women. (The average score on that question is 72 for racialized men, and 73 for white men). Further analysis will illuminate these differences and may point to the most urgent and promising areas to prioritize for improvement.

Lowest scores: In three out of the eleven areas, the City's average score is under 70. They include responses to "My work unit is free from discrimination, bullying and harassment" (average score of 67) "I am confident that appropriate action will take place, when I report an incident of discrimination or harassment" (average score of 63), and "The City creates opportunities for me to thrive in my career" (average score of 60). They indicate that nearly one-quarter of respondents are unsatisfied with how the City is addressing inappropriate behaviour in the workplace. This is particularly concerning and requires expedient action. The question about thriving is somewhat more ambiguous and needs further exploration through intersectional analysis and qualitative research.

Actions to address challenges in inclusion and belonging in the workplace

C1. To better pinpoint areas of concern arising from the survey, further analysis of the experience questions are underway in two ways: 1) analysis by department, division and work units, working towards capturing results for each team (of 20 staff or more) and identifying priority intervention and appropriate actions at the team level, 2) intersectional analysis that examines responses to select experience questions for specific demographics. Team results will be shared with staff through managers with assistance from Human Resources to help identify interventions and actions, which may include things like climate assessments, investigations, training, coaching for leaders, etc. Results by demographics will be shared with Employee Resources Groups, summarized in a future public update by the Equity Office.

C2. Human Resources and the Equity Office, in partnership with the City's legal department, have undertaken a review and revision of the City's Respectful Workplace Policy and Human Rights and Harassment policy to create a new updated and consolidated Harassment and Bullying Policy that reflects the nuances of the current expectations of acceptable behaviour. The new policy is also accompanied by a revised guidance document for all parties involved, in which the processes for bringing a report or complaint forward are explained; roles, responsibilities, rights and limitations are spelled out; and formal investigation and informal resolution paths are better described. These changes will ensure that employees are clear on what they can expect from the process, and leaders have a better way of ensuring that reports of possible wrongdoings are appropriately investigated and/or addressed. The policy is undergoing consultations in late 2021 and is scheduled to be communicated to staff in early 2022.

C3. Human Resource and the Equity Office are revising many of the training offered by or through the City, and creating an Equity Curriculum that articulates learning paths for staff and managers. The survey results will influence the training that is prioritized for development, recommended to departments, or required of managers and staff to take.

C4. In early 2021 the City adopted a new set of leadership competencies. These include personal, interpersonal, and organizational competencies, including specific equity competencies that leaders must demonstrate. These leadership competencies will be socialized ahead of the 2021 performance review cycle and 2022 performance planning cycle. Along with the succession planning exercise (see B3), this process aims to improve the work conditions for staff by developing leaders who are more aware, open and resourceful in connection with issues that come up in the workplace, ultimately creating conditions for thriving.

C5. There are various initiatives in place to increase the availability of culturally appropriate support services for all staff. Of note is creating a new Elder in Residence program to support Indigenous staff, and the work with Homewood Health and independent contractors on expanding and improving their offerings to staff from systemically marginalized communities and others carrying heavy mental loads in the workplace.

Conclusion

The Employee Benchmark Survey is the City's first attempt to understand the composition of its workforce in connection with their experiences of the workplace. The Phase 1 analysis of this data already highlights several areas for improving the representation and belonging of diverse staff. These results influence internal departmental work plans, policy and procedure reviews, and are fed directly into an Equity Maturity Assessment exercise currently underway. As a single snapshot in time, the survey is truly an initial benchmark to measure the effectiveness of the City's efforts as we move in the direction of equity and improving employee experience.

APPENDIX A – SURVEY QUESTIONS

Demographic Questions (5 rate scale)

Indigeneity

1.0 Are you an Indigenous person?

For this survey's purpose, Indigenous people refer to those whose ancestors have lived on Turtle Island (also referred to as North America) since time immemorial.

☐ Yes

1.2 What is your home community or Nation affiliation, if applicable? ---

1.3 Are you Two-Spirit?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Prefer not to say

☐ No

☐ Prefer not to say

Ancestry

2.0 What is your ancestry, or the ethnic/cultural origins of your ancestors?

This question is asking about your ancestry, ethnic and cultural origins. Remember, this may be different from your birthplace, country of origin or primary language and may or may not refer to a specific geographical location. You may specify multiple ancestries. See examples here.

<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/ref/questionnaire/ancestry.cfm>

Race

3.0 Which of the following best describes your racial identity. Please check all that apply.

Race typically refers to groupings of people based on shared physical characteristics, such as skin colour.

☐ Racialized, visible minority, non-white, Indigenous, Black, Person Of Colour or similar term

☐ White, European descent, Caucasian or similar term

☐ Biracial, multiracial, mixed-race or similar term

☐ Prefer not to say

☐ If none of the above describes you, please specify ----

3.1 For purposes of comparing our employees' racial makeup to the Vancouver region, please also let us know which of the following broad Canadian Census categories describes you. You may check all that apply.

- ☐ Arab
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Filipino/a
- ☐ Indigenous
- ☐ Japanese
- ☐ Korean
- ☐ Latin American
- ☐ South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan)
- ☐ Southeast Asian (e.g. Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, Thai)
- ☐ West Asian (e.g. Iranian, Afghan)
- ☐ White
- ☐ If none of the above describes you, please specify ----

Gender Identity

4.0 What is your gender identity? Please select one.

- ☐ Woman
- ☐ Man
- ☐ Non-binary or gender fluid person
- ☐ Prefer not to say
- ☐ If none of the above describe you, please specify ---

4.1 Do you identify as someone with trans experience? For this survey's purpose, trans experience means that your gender identity does not align with your sex assigned at birth.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Prefer not to say

Sexual orientation

5.0 Which best describes your sexual orientation?

- ☐ Straight, heterosexual or similar term
- ☐ LGBTQ/2S+

Please check all that apply:

- ☐ Lesbian

- ☐ Gay
- ☐ Bisexual
- ☐ Asexual
- ☐ Pansexual
- ☐ Queer
- ☐ Prefer not to say
- ☐ Or please specify any other way(s) you identify your sexual orientation:-----
- ☐ Prefer not to say
- ☐ If none of the above, please specify your sexual orientation:-----

Ability

6.0 Do you have a significant, persistent or recurring mobility, sensory, learning, physical and/or mental health impairment, condition or disability?

- ☐ Yes

6.1 Please check all that apply.

- ☐ Mobility/dexterity limitation
- ☐ Chronic pain, illness or medical condition
- ☐ Hearing impairment
- ☐ Vision impairment (not corrected by prescription eye-glasses)
- ☐ Speech impairment
- ☐ Developmental disorder
- ☐ Emotional or mental health condition
- ☐ Learning or behavioural disorder
- ☐ Or please specify any other conditions:---
- ☐ No
- ☐ Prefer not to say

Religion

7.0 What religion or spiritual tradition do you regularly observe?

- ☐ Buddhism
- ☐ Christianity
- ☐ Hinduism
- ☐ Judaism
- ☐ Islam
- ☐ Sikhism
- ☐ Indigenous spirituality
- ☐ If you practice a religion not listed above, please specify
- ☐ No religion

☐ Prefer not to say

Migration

8.0 Were you born on the lands known as Canada?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Prefer not to say

8.1 Do you have at least one parent born outside of Canada?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Prefer not to say

8.2 Have you been in Canada for fewer than five years?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Prefer not to say

Caregiving

9.0 Do you have caregiving responsibilities (e.g. childcare, eldercare) outside of work?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

Engagement and Inclusivity Questions (5 rate scale)

Thinking of this point in time, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

1. The City creates opportunities for me to thrive in my career.
2. I am proud to work for the City of the Vancouver.
3. My work unit is free from discrimination, bullying and harassment.

4. If something inappropriate or uncomfortable happens in my workplace, I feel safe openly discussing it with my manager.
5. I am confident that appropriate action will take place, when I report an incident of discrimination or harassment.
6. Diversity in language, ability, accent, dress, lifestyle and physical appearance is fully appreciated in my work environment.
7. I feel that senior leadership in my department is serious about creating a fair and inclusive workplace.
8. My manager has fair and reasonable expectations of me.
9. My work arrangement is flexible and supports my needs.
10. I am confident that I can access support that is culturally appropriate for me through the City when I need it (e.g. counselling, mentorship).
11. My physical workspace is accessible and meets my needs.

APPENDIX B – TABLES and DETAILED RESULTS

Table 1: Respondent Characteristics^{1, 2, 3}

	EMPLOYEES	RESPONDENTS	RESPONSE RATE	RESPONSE PROPORTION
Organization				
City of Vancouver	6,796	3,732	55%	100%
Department				
Arts Culture Community Service	718	336	47%	9%
Parks & Recreation	1,926	681	35%	18%
Development Services, , Buildings & Licensing	349	259	74%	7%
Engineering Services	2,146	1,163	54%	31%
Finance, Risk & Supply Chain Management	306	253	83%	7%
Human Resources	97	87	90%	2%
IT, Digital Strategy & 311	362	316	87%	8%
Legal Services	54	45	83%	1%
Mayor & City Council	12	<10	S	S
Office of the City Manager	171	147	86%	4%
Planning, Urban Design & Sustainability	226	194	86%	5%
Real Estate & Facilities Management	420	237	56%	6%
Not included in the above ⁴	<10	<10	S	S

¹ The variables shown are from the administrative file and not self-reported variables from the survey

² "<10" indicates data suppressed because value is less than 10

³ "S" indicates value is suppressed to prevent residual disclosure

⁴ Includes administrative staff within Vancouver Fire and Rescue Services, and Office of Emergency Management

	EMPLOYEES	RESPONDENTS	RESPONSE RATE	RESPONSE PROPORTION
Age Group				
Under 31	1,240	462	37%	12%
31 to 40	1,729	1,056	61%	28%
41 to 50	1,689	1,075	64%	29%
51 to 60	1,540	862	56%	23%
61 and over	598	277	46%	7%
Service Years				
Less than 4 years	2,849	1,462	51%	39%
4 to 10 years	1,699	999	59%	27%
11 to 20 years	1,457	857	59%	23%
21 years and over	791	414	52%	11%
Employment Status				
Auxiliary/Casual	1,998	445	22%	12%
Reg. P/T Benefits	119	76	64%	2%
Regular Full Time	4,403	2,988	68%	80%
Temporary Full Time	276	223	81%	6%
Employee Group				
CUPE 1004 Non Parks	1,017	320	31%	9%
CUPE 1004 Parks	536	151	28%	4%
CUPE 15 Non Parks	2,580	1,734	67%	46%
CUPE 15 Parks	1,362	484	36%	13%
IBEW Tech & Inspectors	31	22	71%	1%
IBEW-Electrical Operations	81	32	40%	1%
IATSE	102	<10	S	S

	EMPLOYEES	RESPONDENTS	RESPONSE RATE	RESPONSE PROPORTION
TOTAL unionized	5,703	2,744	48%	74%
Exempt	867	788	91%	21%
Senior Exempt ⁶	214	194	91%	5%
Occupational Groups				
1. Senior Managers	64	60	94%	2%
2. Middle and Other Managers	295	270	92%	7%
3. Professionals	913	811	89%	22%
4. Semi-Professionals and Technicians	545	415	76%	11%
5. Supervisors	434	366	84%	10%
6. Supervisors: Crafts and Trades	215	95	44%	3%
7. Administrative and Senior Clerical	102	93	91%	2%
8. Skilled Sales and Service Personnel	157	126	80%	3%
9. Skilled Crafts and Trades Workers	466	222	48%	6%
10. Clerical Personnel	754	479	64%	13%
11. Intermediate Sales and Service Personnel	267	142	53%	4%
12. Semi-Skilled Manual Workers	460	124	27%	3%
13. Other Sales and Service Personnel	1,540	374	24%	10%
14. Other Manual Workers	584	155	27%	4%

⁶ Exempt staff pay band 10 and above (generally directors and above) have been included in the senior exempt category.

Table 2: Self Reported Staff Demographics

DEMOGRAPHIC	RESPONSES	CITY OF VANCOUVER	UNIONIZED	EXEMPT	SENIOR EXEMPT
Indigenous person (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	97%	98%	98%	96%
Indigenous person (self-selected)	Yes	2%	3%	<10	<10
Indigenous person (self-selected)	No	98%	97%	S	S
Racial identity (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	94%	93%	96%	94%
Racial identity (self-selected)	White, European descent, Caucasian or similar term	56%	54%	57%	73%
Racial identity (self-selected)	Racialized, visible minority, non-white, Indigenous, Black, Person of Colour or similar term	37%	39%	38%	23%
Racial identity (self-selected)	Biracial, multiracial, mixed-race or similar term	7%	7%	6%	4%
Population group (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	93%	92%	95%	94%
Population group (self-selected)	Arab	0%	0%	<10	<10
Population group (self-selected)	Black	2%	2%	2%	<10
Population group (self-selected)	Chinese	18%	18%	19%	12%
Population group (self-selected)	Filipino/a/x	4%	5%	3%	<10
Population group (self-selected)	Japanese	1%	1%	<10	<10
Population group (self-selected)	Korean	1%	1%	<10	<10
Population group (self-selected)	Latin American	2%	2%	3%	<10
Population group (self-selected)	South Asian	8%	8%	9%	7%
Population group (self-selected)	Southeast Asian	2%	2%	<10	<10
Population group (self-selected)	West Asian	2%	2%	3%	<10
Population group (self-selected)	Visible minority, n.i.e.	0%	0%	<10	<10

DEMOGRAPHIC	RESPONSES	CITY OF VANCOUVER	UNIONIZED	EXEMPT	SENIOR EXEMPT
Population group (self-selected)	Multiple visible minorities	2%	2%	2%	<10
Population group (self-selected)	Not a visible minority	57%	56%	56%	74%
Visible Minority (derived)	% of Respondents who Answered	93%	92%	95%	94%
Visible Minority (derived)	Yes	42%	44%	43%	25%
Visible Minority (derived)	No	58%	56%	57%	75%
Gender (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	97%	97%	97%	96%
Gender (self-selected)	Woman	44%	43%	50%	41%
Gender (self-selected)	Man	55%	55%	50%	59%
Gender (self-selected)	Non-binary or gender fluid person	1%	1%	<10	<10
Trans experience (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	96%	96%	97%	96%
Trans experience (self-selected)	Yes	1%	1%	<10	<10
Trans experience (self-selected)	No	99%	99%	S	S
LGBTQ/2S+ (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	94%	93%	95%	94%
LGBTQ/2S+ (self-selected) **	Yes	8%	9%	7%	7%
LGBTQ/2S+ (self-selected)	No	92%	91%	93%	93%
Persons with disabilities (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	96%	96%	98%	97%
Persons with disabilities (self-selected) ***	Yes	9%	11%	6%	4%
Persons with disabilities (self-selected)	No	91%	89%	94%	96%
Generation status (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	98%	98%	98%	97%

DEMOGRAPHIC	RESPONSES	CITY OF VANCOUVER	UNIONIZED	EXEMPT	SENIOR EXEMPT
Generation status (self-selected)	Born outside of Canada (first generation only)	36%	35%	41%	35%
Generation status (self-selected)	Parent born outside of Canada (second generation only)	31%	33%	25%	27%
Generation status (self-selected)	Born in Canada (second generation or more)	64%	65%	59%	65%
In Canada < 5 years (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	98%	98%	98%	97%
In Canada < 5 years (self-selected)	Yes	4%	4%	6%	<10
In Canada < 5 years (self-selected)	No	96%	96%	94%	S
Caregiver (self-selected)	% of Respondents who Answered	97%	97%	98%	97%
Caregiver (self-selected)	Yes	45%	43%	45%	66%
Caregiver (self-selected)	No	55%	57%	55%	34%

Note: Data for groups that do not meet the group size threshold for reporting have been suppressed. Respondents in these categories have been combined with those who selected "Prefer not to answer" and included in the rate of respondents who chose not to answer.

- "<10" indicates data is suppressed because the value is less than 10.
- "S" indicates data is suppressed to prevent residual disclosure.

** See Table 4 for further breakdown

*** See Table 5 for further breakdown

Table 3: Comparisons with community and labour force for equity-seeking groups

DEMOGRAPHIC	COV STAFF	VANCOUVER PROPER	LABOUR FORCE (REGION)	LABOUR FORCE (PROVINCE)
Women	44%	51%	48.5%	48.4%
Indigenous person	2%	2%	2.3%	5.2%
Visible Minority	42%	52%	45.9%	29.2%
Persons with disabilities	9%	Not Available	Not Available	11.0%

Data sources for comparisons : 2016 Census, 2017 Canadian Survey on Disability

Table 4: Sexual Orientation of respondents identifying as LGBTQ/2S+

SEXUAL ORIENTATION OF RESPONDENTS IDENTIFYING AS LGBTQ/2S+ (8%)	%
Gay	38%
Bisexual	35%
Queer	28%
Lesbian	21%
Pansexual	13%

96% of respondents answered this question

Table 5: Respondents by Impairment, Conditions or Disabilities

RESPONDENTS BY IMPAIRMENT, CONDITION OR DISABILITIES (AMONG THOSE WITH DISABILITY – 9%)	%
Chronic pain, illness or medical condition	49%
Emotional or mental health condition	41%
Learning, developmental or behavioural disorder	26%
Mobility/dexterity limitation	24%
Hearing or speech impairment	11%
Vision impairment	6%

94% of respondents answered this question

*Percentages will not sum to 100% as multiple responses were allowed from each respondent. Results for “Other” and “Prefer not to answer” responses are included in totals, but not shown.

*Vision impairment is one that is not corrected by prescription eye-glasses.

Table 6: RESPONDENTS RELIGION OR SPIRITUAL TRADITION REGULARLY OBSERVED

RELIGION OR SPIRITUAL TRADITION	%
No religion	59%
Christianity	29%
Buddhism	5%
Sikhism	4%
Islam	2%
Hinduism	2%
Indigenous Spirituality	1%
Judaism	1%

92% of respondents answered this question

*Percentages will not sum to 100% as multiple response were allowed from each respondent.

*Results for “Other” and “Prefer not to answer” responses are included in totals, but not shown.

Table 7: Experience Questions - City-wide Results

SURVEY QUESTIONS	% DISAGREE	% NEUTRAL	% AGREE	AVERAGE SCORE /100 POINTS
My physical workspace is accessible and meets my needs.	8%	13%	79%	79
My manager has fair and reasonable expectations of me.	10%	12%	78%	78
I am proud to work for the City of Vancouver.	9%	17%	74%	76
My work arrangement is flexible and supports my needs.	11%	14%	75%	75
Diversity in language, ability, accent, dress, lifestyle and physical appearance is fully appreciated in my workplace.	11%	17%	72%	74
If something inappropriate or uncomfortable happens in my workplace, I feel safe openly discussing it with my manager.	18%	13%	70%	72
I am confident that I can access support that is culturally appropriate for me through the City when I need it (e.g., counselling, mentorship).	13%	19%	68%	71
I feel that senior leadership in my department is serious about creating a fair and inclusive workplace.	18%	16%	67%	70
My work unit is free from discrimination, bullying and harassment.	22%	17%	62%	67
I am confident that appropriate action will take place, when I report an incident of discrimination or harassment.	23%	19%	58%	63
The City creates opportunities for me to thrive in my career.	22%	26%	52%	60