

Women in Public Sector Science

From Analysis to Action

March 2018



The Professional Institute
of the Public Service
of Canada

www.pipsc.ca

Women in Public Sector Science: From Analysis to Action

March 2018, Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada

This report is a product of the Women in Science Initiative of the PIPSC Science Advisory Committee 2017-2019 Strategic Plan. It was prepared by a committee of active science members supported by PIPSC research staff.

O'Donnell, S., Oppen, K., & Wright, C. (2018). *Women in Public Sector Science: From Analysis to Action*. Ottawa: Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, March, 20 pages.

Editorial team:

Susan O'Donnell, PIPSC NRC RO/RCO group, Senior Research Officer, National Research Council of Canada

Katie Oppen, PIPSC CFIA-S&A Group, Policy Analyst, Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Catherine Cheung, PIPSC NRC-RO/RCO Group, Research Officer, National Research Council of Canada

Shannan Little, PIPSC SP Group, Model Developer, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Deborah Danoff, PIPSC SH Group, Medical Officer, Health Canada

Catherine Wright, Research Officer, Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada

The authors would like to thank the many PIPSC members and staff – women and allies – who contributed their ideas and thoughts to the report in progress during numerous PIPSC meetings and teleconferences, including: Robin Anderson, Louise Beauchamp, Jean Bérubé, Alia Bigio, Andrew Billyard, Niasha Blake, Sylvia Boucher, Jennifer Carr, Roxanne Côté-Bigras, Craig Bihun, Veronica Carpani, Tara Chisholm, Aruna Dixit, Sushil Dixit, Norma Domey, Michael Forbes, Stéphanie Fréchette, Shirley Friesen, Stephan Grosse, Karen Hall, Maegan Harrison, Samah Henein, Claire Hurtig, Lina Johannson, Catherine Keir, Rashid Khalid, Waheed Khan, Kevser Korhan Taymaz, Lucy Li, Helen MacDonald-Piquard, Matthew MacLeod, Glenn Maxwell, Robert Macdonald, Anne McLay, Shelley Melanson, Michael Mihaylov, Beverley Miranda, Chantal Morin, Leslie Nasmith, Van-Anh Nguyen, Sherry Oake, Anna Onufer, Jill Piebiak, Amanda Prysizney, Elizabeth Ptasznik, Ann Therriault, Adrienne Turnbull, Sima Vyas, Cynthia Whaley, and Fiona Wong.

CONTACT FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Catherine Wright, Research Officer (cwright@pipsc.ca)

Laureen Allan, Communications Officer (lallan@pipsc.ca)

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction: Focus on women in public sector science 1**
- 2. Current PIPSC science membership gender breakdown 2**
- 3. Gender-related findings of the 2017 PIPSC Science Survey 3**
 - 3.1 Gender Bias..... 4**
 - 3.2 Dependent Care Responsibilities and Work-Life Balance 5**
 - 3.3 Mentorship and Leadership 5**
- 4. Hiring in Focus..... 6**
- 5. Employment equity in review 7**
- 6. Moving forward: including the perspectives of PIPSC members..... 8**
- 7. Conclusions..... 9**
- Annex A 10**
- Annex B 11**
- Bibliography..... 14**

1. Introduction: Focus on women in public sector science

Canadians are currently engaged in many conversations about women in society. One important discussion is the role of women in science. In 2017, federal Minister of Science Kirsty Duncan spoke out about the need for more women to work in traditionally male-dominated science fields. The Minister launched the “Choose Science” campaign to encourage young women to pursue careers in science. Also in 2017, Canada hosted the annual international Gender Summit, where PIPSC representatives and 675 advocates of science and gender equity discussed how to increase the participation of women in science.¹ Indeed, improving the role of women in science is now a major focus for many stakeholders in Canada and around the world, because diverse perspectives enhance research excellence and innovation.

The Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada (PIPSC) is an important voice in this conversation. PIPSC represents the single largest science workforce in Canada: More than 16,000 federal government scientists ensure the safety of the food we eat, the drugs and other health products we use, the air we breathe, the water we drink, the toys our children play with, the health of other species, and the general state of the natural environment and scientific innovation on which Canadians and the economy depend.

Diversity adds value to public science. Diverse perspectives contribute new ways to look at challenges, and generate innovative solutions. Increasing opportunities for women scientists will bring diverse perspectives to decision-making, policy-setting and publicly funded research to improve public services for Canadians.

PIPSC is committed to finding ways to improve the roles of women in federal science. The Science Advisory Committee’s 2017-2019 Strategic and Operational Plan for Public Sector Science identified Women in Science as an area needing research on challenges facing women in this field. For this report, PIPSC gathered evidence by:

- Conducting a survey of over 16,000 public sector scientists;
- Analysing the PIPSC member database for data and trends for gender and science roles; and
- Analysing data on government science hiring competitions.

¹ Gender Summit North America: Quality Research and Innovation through Equality. 2017. Conference held in Montréal, QC. <https://gender-summit.com/gs11-about>

2. Current PIPSC science membership gender breakdown

PIPSC currently represents six federal science bargaining groups. Annex A lists the groups and shows the breakdown by gender and classification level. This sort of analysis is new territory for PIPSC, as we do not yet collect self-identification data on members by employment equity group and human rights protected grounds.² Stronger self-identification data is required to complete more robust analyses. While this report is focused on women, the PIPSC Science Advisory Committee remains committed to intersectional activism.³ Enhancing our intersectional approach in future research with stronger self-identification data will ensure we do not lose sight of identities which may be of primary importance to marginalized groups.

In general, women are under-represented across core science groups. The Research (RE) Group and National Research Council-Research Officers/Research Council Officers (NRC-RO/RCO) Group have the most significant gaps between the number of women in the current membership and the labour market availability⁴ for women. The number of women in these groups is much lower than we would expect compared to the number of qualified women in the workforce.

In many cases, there is a diminishing proportion of women to men occupying higher-level positions. Although this is unsatisfactory, it is in line with the well-documented problem of the “leaky pipeline,” the decreasing participation of women in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) from early education to university, science careers and leadership.⁵ The disproportionality of PIPSC science membership by gender and classification level demonstrates the need to reduce both horizontal segregation of women in historically male-dominated occupations and sectors, and vertical segregation of women in hierarchical levels.⁶

Interestingly, the very highest classification level of some science groups (SP, CFIA-S&A) showed greater equality between men and women. A limited number of positions often exist at the top, with larger pools from which to draw candidates. From this breakdown, a question arises: Why are women and men almost equally represented in the highest ranks of some science groups, while positions mid-level and below still show major gaps?

² A motion to collect voluntary employment equity self-identification data was put forward by the PIPSC RE Group to the PIPSC AGM in 2017, and was referred to the Board of Directors.

³ Definition of intersectionality: “the interconnected nature of social categorizations such as race, class, and gender as they apply to a given individual or group, regarded as creating overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage” (*Oxford Dictionaries*). Originally coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw.

⁴ A note on the Labour Market Availability (LMA) estimates: The labour market availability for various occupational groups is crafted uniquely for each department or agency using the latest Census population estimates. For example, the Scientific and Professional LMA category for a given department is uniquely made up of National Occupational Codes (NOC) which reflects the responsibilities of science positions specific to that department.

⁵ Jacob Clark Blickenstaff. 2005. “Women and science careers: Leaky pipeline or gender filter?” *Gender and Education*. 17(4) pp. 369-386.

⁶ Directorate-General Justice, Unit D2 Gender Equality. “The current situation of gender equality in Norway – Country profile.” European Commission.

3. Gender-related findings of the 2017 PIPSC Science Survey

In spring 2017, PIPSC hired Environics Research to administer a survey of members who work in science fields, covering such topics as scientists' right to speak, departmental funding cuts, and gender issues. This survey was a follow-up to an initial survey in 2013 which provided evidence for two influential reports.⁷ A comparative report has since been released on the results of the 2017 survey.⁸ The 2017 survey was emailed between May 29 and June 27 to 16,377 PIPSC science and engineering members, and 3,025 responses were received (a response rate of 18.5%). This report focuses on three key issues facing women in science: gender biases; dependent-care responsibilities and work-life balance; and mentorship and leadership.

In the 2017 survey, PIPSC members were asked to self-identify by employment equity group. By gender, 38% of respondents identified as women, 58% as men, 3% preferred not to identify and 0.3% (8 respondents) were gender non-binary. Overall, 1% identified as First Nations/Indigenous, 17% identified as a visible minority, 3% identified as having a disability, and 80% identified as none of the above. Other social identity categories such as sexual orientation could be included in the future to conduct a more robust intersectional analysis that could reveal further areas of inequality. By age, 4% of respondents were under 30, 21% were 30 to 39, 32% were 40 to 49, 32% were 50 to 59, and 11% were 60 and above.

Differences existed between women's and men's perceptions of gender biases in the workplace. Though many believed that women and men are treated equally in the workplace, women perceived more strongly that men receive favourable treatment in the workplace, and men perceived more strongly that women receive favourable treatment in the workplace. This contrast in perspective is consistent with recent research⁹ demonstrating that a dominant group tends to perceive the advancement of a subordinate group as a threat to their dominance.¹⁰ This perception is not unfounded: men have historically benefitted from gender inequality, and efforts to reconstruct social systems so that women and men are more equal will deconstruct male privilege as a result.¹¹ This zero-sum myth – that whatever is gained by one side is lost by the other – feeds resistance to gender equality.¹² It also suggests a need to improve understanding of unconscious biases as well as present-day impacts of the historical exclusion of women from science workplaces.

⁷ PIPSC (2013). [The Big Chill: Silencing Public Interest Science](#) and [Vanishing Science: The Disappearance of Canadian Public Interest Science](#)

⁸ PIPSC (2018). Defrosting Public Science: A Survey Report on Federal Government Efforts to Reverse the Effects of "The Big Chill." <http://www.pipsc.ca/news-issues/scientific-integrity>

⁹ Kim Parker (2017). "Women are more concerned than men about gender discrimination in tech industry." Pew Research Center.

¹⁰ A. Kehn & J. C. Ruthig (2013). Perceptions of Gender Discrimination across Six Decades: The Moderating Roles of Gender and Age. *Sex Roles*. doi:10.1007/s11199-013-0303-2

¹¹ Michael Flood & Bob Pease (2005). Undoing Men's Privilege and Advancing Gender Equality in Public Sector Institutions, *Policy and Society*, 24:4, pp. 119-138.

¹² A. Kehn & J. C. Ruthig (2013).

There were differences in perception by age: older members perceived less gender discrimination in the workplace than those who were younger. For example, members under 30 were twice as likely as older members to believe that men are favoured and get better treatment in recruitment and selection processes. In fact, older respondents were more likely to be men – only 37% of respondents over 30 were women, while 59% of respondents under 30 were women.

The difference in perception by age is consistent with recent research.¹³ Older generations may perceive less gender bias today compared with their past experiences, and younger generations can be comparably more sensitive to gender bias. Previous research also suggests that women and men perceive gender discrimination to have declined more rapidly than objective data suggests.¹⁴ This belief can cause diminishing concern for women's rights and fewer resources allocated to alleviating gender inequality.

3.1 Gender Bias

Perceptions of gender bias were surveyed across areas such as recruitment and selection processes, performance appraisal, and opportunities for leadership roles. Overall, 42% of women said that gender bias is a barrier to their career progression, and one in four women (27%) believed that men are favoured in opportunities for leadership roles. Bias in federal government workplaces has recently been well-examined by the Joint Union/Management Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion in the Public Service. The survey administered by the Task Force in 2017 identified bias as a top barrier to diversity and inclusion in the workplace (73%). The report notes:

There is strong perception and evidence that recruitment and people management policies and practices inhibit diversity and inclusion. For instance, nearly a quarter of all public servants (23%) believe selection processes in their unit are not fair, according the latest Public Service Employee Survey.¹⁵

To mitigate bias, we need to critically reflect on the notion of 'fit,' and become cognisant of our desire for sameness.¹⁶ To truly embrace diversity and cultivate an inclusive workplace, all employees should be encouraged to bring their whole selves to the science and research environment, including their gendered and cultural experiences.

¹³ Kim Parker (2017).

¹⁴ C. DeNavas-Walt, B.D. Proctor & J.C. Smith (2011). Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2011. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. pp. 60–226.

¹⁵ *Public Service Employee Survey* (2014). Question 27. 13% of respondents "somewhat" disagree and 10% "strongly disagree" with the statement, "In my work unit, the process for selecting a person for a position is done fairly."

¹⁶ Frances Henry et al. (2017). *The equity myth: Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian universities*. UBC Press.

3.2 Dependent Care Responsibilities and Work-Life Balance

The PIPSC survey included questions about dependent care responsibilities, and our analysis found significant differences based on gender. While women and men were equally likely to report that they have primary responsibility for dependents (e.g. children), women were significantly more likely than their male counterparts to identify dependent care responsibilities as a barrier to their career progression. Moreover, significantly fewer women than men believe they are able to satisfy both their job and family or personal responsibilities. Approximately 10% more men than women said dependent care responsibilities were not a barrier at all to their career progression (58% vs. 49%). Globally, recognition is growing that men need to assume greater responsibility for dependent care responsibilities,¹⁷ as care work has long been treated as women's responsibility. Our findings demonstrate that women continue to disproportionately bear the burden of dependent care, and that more could be done to evoke a cultural change not only inside the workplace but in the wider community.

3.3 Mentorship and Leadership

Analysis of our science survey found that one in four women respondents (23%) said lack of access to mentors was a major barrier to their career progression. Eight percent more women than men identified this as a barrier. The importance of mentorship and role models for increasing women's participation in science was well documented by the Standing Committee on the Status of Women in their recent report on women in skilled trades and STEM.¹⁸ While female mentorship and role models are vital for encouraging young women to pursue STEM careers, men's participation in mentorship programs for women is also critically important.

In summary, key results from the science survey are as follows:

- More women than men believe dependent care responsibilities are a barrier to their career progression.
- 42% of women believe that gender biases are a barrier to their career progression.
- 27% of women believe that men are favoured in opportunities for leadership roles.
- One in four women respondents said that lack of access to mentors was a major barrier to their career progression.

¹⁷ United Nations (2011). "Men in families and family policy in a changing world." Economic & Social Affairs.

¹⁸ Hélène LeBlanc (2015). "Women in skilled trades and science, technology, engineering and mathematics occupations: Report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women." *House of Commons, Canada*. 41st Parliament, second session.

4. Hiring in Focus

To further explore the issues of hiring and promotion of federal public scientists, PIPSC submitted a series of Access to Information and Privacy (ATIP) requests to science-based departments and agencies.¹⁹ The data in Annex B on the advertised hiring processes of scientists in the SP and RE occupational groups (the two largest PIPSC science groups) for the past five years was retrieved through ATIP requests to two major federal government departments: Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC). These sample datasets returned valuable findings which complement the comparison of our membership to the estimates of labour market availability of women scientists. A limitation of this dataset is that identifying by gender for employment equity purposes is optional.

Our analysis of these datasets found that, where the gender of all applicants was known (NRCan), fewer women than men were successful at higher classification levels (Table 3). While this is often attributed to the lesser availability of women candidates in the labour market, reasons for our finding are worth exploring. Too often, women candidates do not meet qualification requirements due to a break in employment for family and dependent care responsibilities. They also have less or no access to mentoring and sponsorship. Research has shown hiring bias for male potential over a female track record.²⁰ That is, men are hired based on their perceived future contributions, while women must prove themselves qualified based on their past achievements. Studies would also explain this finding as a result of the confidence gap between women and men. The confidence gap is the term used to describe how women can be held back by higher levels of self-doubt than their male counterparts.²¹ However, other sources contend that the notion of a confidence gap applies a “dangerous logic of choice” to structural systems of marginalization.²²

Interestingly, a comparison of the ratios of total applicants to qualified applicants between women and men in the AAFC dataset showed that women were more likely to be qualified applicants than men (Table 2). This finding is also consistent with the notion of a confidence gap, and recent research showing that women are more likely than men to perceive qualification requirements and hiring processes as inflexible. It has also been suggested that women are more susceptible to social pressure to follow rules, and as a result may tend to apply for positions *only* if they meet the most stringent requirements, where men are less constrained.²³

¹⁹ Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) and Natural Resources Canada (NRCan). (2017). *Gender Breakdown of Externally Advertised Hiring Processes, 2012-16*. Spreadsheet and analysis prepared by C. Wright, ATIP requests A- 2016-00193 and DC7040-16-614. Unpublished internal document, The Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada.

²⁰ F. Tresh, A. Player, & Randsley de Moura (2014). “The Role of Gender in Hiring Situations: The Preference for Potential.” Poster presented at the BPS Social Psychology Section, Canterbury Christchurch University. As cited in *Science* 2.0.

²¹ N.F. Clark (2014). “Act now to shrink the confidence gap.” *Forbes*.

²² Kim Tran (2014). “Racism, sexism and the myth of the ‘confidence gap.’” *The Feminist Wire*.

²³ T.S. Mohr (2014). “Why women don’t apply for jobs unless they’re 100% qualified.” *Harvard Business Report*.

5. Employment equity in review

Ensuring equitable representation of the four employment equity designated groups – women, Indigenous peoples, people with disabilities, and visible minorities – continues to be a challenge for federal public sector employers. As noted by the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC), the constant demographic evolution of employment equity designated groups in the labour market impacts an employer’s attempts to eliminate representation gaps.²⁴

Canada was lauded in 1986 for enacting progressive employment equity legislation, promising “equality of results” rather than mere formal legal equality.²⁵ Covering federally regulated employers in its first version, the *Employment Equity Act* was later expanded to include the federal public service. While the implementation of the Act has brought improved representation rates across the four designated groups, much more work is needed to attain substantive equality in employment opportunities and improved workplace culture. The Act requires employers to prove they are working to match employee representation by designated group with labour market availability estimates for each group.

The data and findings from our own survey show that we are not substantively achieving equality in hiring women into public sector science occupations. The stated goals of the public sector – to hire women scientists in sufficient numbers to meet an arbitrary standard of between 20 to 40% of the women scientists available in the labour market – is a nebulous equity goal, and not ambitious enough to achieve real equality. Moreover, labour market availability data is not detailed enough to identify the levels at which women in science are employed and if they are employed at lower classifications than their male counterparts. More detailed and focussed data should be collected to enable researchers and policy analysts to fully understand whether and how employment equity objectives are being met.

A number of other weaknesses exist with the current Act. Notably, workplace culture is not assessed through the employment equity compliance process. As articulated by Carol Agócs, “The current legislation does not adequately address informal workplace practices. There needs to be more investigation of the implications of informal workplace practices for employment equity policy.”²⁶

The research raises the question of why candidates do not identify their gender when applying for government science positions, and whether employment equity is viewed by applicants and hiring panels as a way to circumvent a more neutral, merit-based process. A pervasive misunderstanding of the purpose and application of employment equity exists: In departmental employment equity audits, the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) describes misconceptions surrounding employment equity as a significant challenge affecting departments’ abilities to meet equity goals. This includes the perception, even among senior levels, that “employment equity compromises the merit principle,” leading to “the reluctance to self-identify, including at the EX level, due to the perception of negative impact on career development.”²⁷ Focusing on diversity and inclusion does not disadvantage “non-

²⁴ Reports produced by the Canadian Human Rights Commission (2017, August), retrieved through ATIP request A-2017-00019/VD1.

²⁵ Carol Agócs (2014). *Employment equity in Canada: The legacy of the Abella Report*. University of Toronto Press.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (2010). *Employment Equity Report 2010*. Canadian Human Rights Commission.

diverse” people,²⁸ and this reveals an opportunity for PIPSC to offer and encourage education on employment equity.

The numerical approach to employment equity is also out of step with more intersectional approaches to achieving a diverse and inclusive workforce. “Perhaps most serious of all is the risk that a “counting” framework will imply that if employee numbers match the surrounding population, the equity challenge has been satisfactorily addressed.”²⁹ While the simplest indicator of progress may be the representation rate,³⁰ it is not the most progressive. Achieving target numbers alone will not invoke a culture change, and in fact, may entrench the idea of employment equity as circumventing a fair hiring process.

The government is required to review the Act every five years; however, it has not conducted a review since 2002.³¹ The next review should address the challenges identified here.

6. Moving forward: including the perspectives of PIPSC members

As we conducted our analysis for this report, it became clear that the issue of women in science touches all our members – women, men, and gender non-conforming – in the PIPSC science groups as well as members in other groups who are allies. As union members, many of us have considerable experience of being a woman in science or working with women in science, and we have ideas about what needs to be done to improve the situation in our workplaces and in society more broadly. PIPSC members want to be part of positive change moving forward. For this reason, we have been engaging PIPSC members to be part of the Women in Science (WiS) initiative and have been gathering the perspectives of PIPSC members to be included in this report.

The WiS initiative held an introductory meeting at the 2016 PIPSC AGM that drew an overflow crowd of members keen to share their experiences and ideas about what should be included in the initiative. From there, the WiS core group created a dedicated group of more than 70 members who were invited to participate in a series of teleconference meetings to discuss the findings of our on-going analysis and shape the structure of this report. In mid-2017 two ad-hoc groups were formed: an editorial team to work on report drafts and a separate team to plan WiS activities at the 2017 PIPSC AGM.

The WiS initiative hosted two events at the 2017 PIPSC AGM. The breakfast workshop – for women, non-binary and trans-identified science members – engaged 20 participants in facilitated small-group discussions about the key issues and ways forward. The women-led lunch workshop for allies of all genders engaged 50 members who learned about the challenges identified at the breakfast meeting and participated in small-group discussions to identify targeted actions and build collective responsibility for the initiative. Following the 2017 AGM, a survey was sent to participants of the breakfast meeting to gather stories and experiences that could be shared anonymously as a companion to this report.

²⁸ Joint Union/Management Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion in the Public Service (2017). “Building a diverse and inclusive public service.” Final Report.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ *Employment Equity Act: Annual Report 2014*.

³¹ Judi Longfield (2002). “Promoting equality in the federal jurisdiction: Review of the *Employment Equity Act*.” Ottawa: Parliament of Canada, Standing Committee on Human Resource Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

The input of PIPSC members has been crucial to shaping this report and crafting recommendations for action that we believe can be realized. Moving forward, the WiS initiative will continue to keep the dialogue open with PIPSC members. The WiS group remains open to new members and looks forward to an ongoing dialogue and process for the development of policies and recommendations on these issues.

7. Conclusions

It is clear from the research that overcoming gender inequality and cultivating diverse workplaces involves the mainstreaming of gender. Attention to the goal of gender equality should be an important theme across an organization's activities, and not a standalone component.³² While more women than ever are pursuing careers in science, much work is left to be done to mitigate gender bias and break down the barriers women face in advancing their careers. Our analysis of the PIPSC science member survey found that:

- More women than men believe dependent care responsibilities are a barrier to their career progression.
- 42% of women believe that gender biases are a barrier to their career progression.
- 27% of women believe that men are favoured in opportunities for leadership roles.
- One in four women respondents said that lack of access to mentors was a major barrier to their career progression.
- Women were more likely to be qualified applicants than men; this is consistent with recent research indicating women have been more socialized to follow rules, and view qualification requirements as more stringent than men do.

PIPSC is looking to influence change for women in science in four ways: 1) conducting advocacy and activism campaigns aimed at new or better workplace legislation; 2) collective bargaining for new and better workplace rights; 3) supporting consultation presidents at union-management consultation for new and improved human resources policies; and 4) developing and conducting awareness and education campaigns for PIPSC members. An action plan has been put forward within PIPSC to carry out this work. Key items include bargaining for flexible work hours and telework options, strategies to mitigate bias in hiring processes, and calling for a review of the *Employment Equity Act*.

As a labour union, PIPSC is well positioned to lead the charge on improving participation of women in federal public sector science, and is working with Women in Science members on gender issues as this initiative moves forward. The value of diversity in science extends beyond the benefits to diverse groups themselves; indeed "removing gender bias can open science and engineering to new perspectives, new questions, and new missions."³³ Diversity is a fact and inclusion is a choice, and PIPSC is prepared to work with the federal government to make the right choice.

³² United Nations (2001). "Gender Mainstreaming: Strategy for promoting gender equality." Office of the Special Advisor on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, United Nations.

³³ Londa Schiebinger (2007). "Getting more women into science: Knowledge issues." *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*. Vol. 30, pp. 365-378.

Annex A

PIPSC science membership, % women				
	Total # Members	# Women	# Men	% Women
RE	2,378	724	1654	30.4%
SP	7,350	3820	3530	52.0%
CFIA-S&A	1,131	674	457	59.6%
CFIA-VM	546	246	300	45.1%
NRC-RO/RCO	1,456	338	1118	23.2%
NUREG	691	312	379	45.2%
Total science members	13,552	6114	7438	45.1%

PIPSC science membership by classification level, % women						
Classification Level	RE	SP	CFIA S&A	CFIA VM	NRC RO/RCO	NUREG
1	33.3%	54.5%	42.9%	37.1%	9.1%	75.0%
2	37.4%	54.2%	63.1%	43.0%	35.6%	80.0%
3	33.5%	52.6%	57.0%	55.0%	34.0%	85.9%
4	27.9%	52.9%	60.3%	63.5%	20.6%	44.8%
5	18.7%	52.0%	54.4%	33.3%	0.0%	53.1%
6	22.9%	32.3%	60.6%			40.9%
7	0.0%	37.9%	66.7%			28.0%
8		61.5%				0.0%

Some member classification data was not available, causing some variance between the totals in the first table with the classification level breakdowns in the second table.

Annex B

Table 1: Applicants by Classification and Level RE and SP group advertised hiring processes, 2012-16 <i>Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada</i>							
Group	Classification	Level	# of Self-Declared Female Applicants	# of Self-Declared Male Applicants	# Apps who did not self-identify	% Apps female-identified	
SP	BI	1	11	29	26	16.7%	
		2	57	83	103	23.5%	
		3	31	14	35	38.8%	
		5	4	1	4	44.4%	
	CH	2	7	9	2	38.9%	
		3	38	49	60	25.9%	
		4	0	0	85	0.0%	
	PC	1	5	7	24	13.9%	
		2	7	14	10	22.6%	
		3	0	0	3	0.0%	
			5	16	17	58	21.3%
	RE	SE-REM	2	7	5	22	20.6%
		SE-RES	1	60	34	184	21.6%
2			96	215	304	15.6%	
3			86	85	145	27.2%	
4			3	12	11	11.5%	
		5	6	6	5	35.3%	

Table 2: Qualified & Successful Applicants by Gender

RE and SP group advertised hiring processes, 2012-16

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Total applicants, 2012 - 2016	Classification	% of Male Applicants Qualified	% of Female Applicants Qualified	% of Unknown Applicants Qualified	% Successful Applicants, Male	% Successful Applicants, Female	% Successful Applicants, Unknown gender
SP	(average)	9.4%	14.6%	10.6%	28.8%	21.4%	49.7%
SP	AC	7.0%	9.1%	6.1%	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%
SP	BI	9.2%	14.8%	17.7%	22.5%	32.5%	45.0%
SP	CH	0.0%	6.7%	6.1%	0.0%	22.2%	77.8%
SP	PC	21.6%	27.9%	12.5%	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%
RE	(average)	11.0%	17.9%	18.4%	18.3%	23.7%	58.0%
RE	SE-REM	15.4%	21.4%	26.8%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%
RE	SE-RES	6.6%	14.4%	9.9%	16.7%	27.4%	56.0%

Table 3: Successful Applicants by Gender

RE and SP group advertised hiring processes, 2012-16

Natural Resources Canada

Group	Classification	Level	Male	Female	% Identified Female	Total
SP	BI	1	39	63	61.8%	102
		2	30	9	23.1%	39
		3	1	0	0.0%	1
		5	2	0	0.0%	2
	CH	1	0	2	100.0%	2
		2	1	1	50.0%	2
		3	1	0	0.0%	1
		4	2	0	0.0%	2
	FO	1	11	15	57.7%	26
		2	8	1	11.1%	9
		3	11	1	8.3%	12
		4	1	0	0.0%	1
	PC	1	109	74	40.4%	183
		2	92	83	47.4%	175
		3	13	10	43.5%	23
		4	6	10	62.5%	16
		5	6	1	14.3%	7
	SG	3	2	1	33.3%	3
		4	4	2	33.3%	6
		5	1	0	0.0%	1
7		1	0	0.0%	1	
RE	SE-REM	1	2	0	0.0%	2
		2	19	6	24.0%	25
	SE-RES	1	71	31	30.4%	102
		2	34	3	8.1%	37
		3	12	2	14.3%	14
		4	12	0	0.0%	12
		5	9	0	0.0%	9

Bibliography

- Agócs, Carol (2014). *Employment equity in Canada: The legacy of the Abella Report*. University of Toronto Press.
- Blickenstaff, Jacob Clark. 2005. "Women and science careers: Leaky pipeline or gender filter?" *Gender and Education*. 17(4) pp. 369-386.
- Canada, Agriculture and Agri-Food. Employment Equity Report 2010. Canadian Human Rights Commission.
- Canada, Employment and Social Development. *Employment Equity Act: Annual Report 2014*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/services/labour-standards/reports/employment-equity-2014.html>
- Canada. Treasury Board (2014). Public Service Employee Survey. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pse-saff/2014/results-resultats/bd-pm/00/org-eng.aspx>
- Clark, N.F. (2014). "Act now to shrink the confidence gap." *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/womensmedia/2014/04/28/act-now-to-shrink-the-confidence-gap/#60d15b0e5c41>
- DeNavas-Walt, C, Proctor, B.D. & J.C. Smith (2011). Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2011. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. pp. 60–226.
- European Commission. "The current situation of gender equality in Norway – Country profile." Directorate-General Justice, Unit D2 Gender Equality.
- Flood, Michael & Bob Pease (2005). Undoing Men's Privilege and Advancing Gender Equality in Public Sector Institutions, *Policy and Society*, 24:4, pp. 119-138. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1449-4035\(05\)70123-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1449-4035(05)70123-5)
- Henry, Frances et al. (2017). *The Equity Myth: Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian universities*. UBC Press.
- Joint Union/Management Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion in the Public Service (2017). "Building a diverse and inclusive public service." Final Report. <https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/corporate/reports/building-diverse-inclusive-public-service-final-report-joint-union-management-task-force-diversity-inclusion.html>
- Kehn, A. & J. C. Ruthig (2013). Perceptions of Gender Discrimination across Six Decades: The Moderating Roles of Gender and Age. *Sex Roles*. doi:10.1007/s11199-013-0303-2 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11199-013-0303-2>

Women in Public Sector Science: From Analysis to Action

LeBlanc, H  l  ne (2015). "Women in skilled trades and science, technology, engineering and mathematics occupations: Report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women." House of Commons, Canada. 41st Parliament, second session.

Longfield, Judi (2002). "Promoting equality in the federal jurisdiction: Review of the Employment Equity Act." Ottawa: Parliament of Canada, Standing Committee on Human Resource Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

Mohr, T.S. (2014). "Why women don't apply for jobs unless they're 100% qualified." *Harvard Business Report*. <https://hbr.org/2014/08/why-women-dont-apply-for-jobs-unless-theyre-100-qualified>

Reports produced by the Canadian Human Rights Commission (2017, August), retrieved through ATIP request A-2017-00019/VD1.

Parker, Kim (2017). "Women are more concerned than men about gender discrimination in tech industry." Pew Research Center. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/10/10/women-are-more-concerned-than-men-about-gender-discrimination-in-tech-industry/?amp=1>

PIPSC (2013). Vanishing Science: The Disappearance of Canadian Public Interest Science. <https://www.pipsc.ca/portal/page/portal/website/issues/science/vanishingscience>

PIPSC (2013). The Big Chill: Silencing Public Interest Science. <https://www.pipsc.ca/portal/page/portal/website/issues/science/bigchill>

PIPSC (2018). Defrosting Public Science: A Survey Report on Federal Government Efforts to Reverse the Effects of "The Big Chill" <http://www.pipsc.ca/news-issues/scientific-integrity/defrosting-public-science>

Schiebinger, Londa (2007). "Getting more women into science: Knowledge issues." *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*. Vol. 30, pp. 365-378.

Tran, Kim (2014). "Racism, sexism and the myth of the 'confidence gap.'" *The Feminist Wire*. <http://www.thefeministwire.com/2014/04/confidence-gap/>

Tresh, F., Player, A. & Randsley de Moura (2014). "The Role of Gender in Hiring Situations: The Preference for Potential." Poster presented at the BPS Social Psychology Section, Canterbury Christchurch University. As cited in Science 2.0. http://www.science20.com/news_articles/in_hiring_simulation_male_potential_is_preferred_over_a_female_track_record-155376

United Nations (2001). "Gender Mainstreaming: Strategy for promoting gender equality." Office of the Special Advisor on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, United Nations.

United Nations (2011). "Men in families and family policy in a changing world." Economic and Social Affairs.