Less Consultation

Low risk

Risk is inconsequential or low, and is judged as acceptable as effective measures are in place to manage the risk.

Medium risk

Risks exist and mitigating strategies have been proposed but the sub-delegated manager chooses not to implement some or all of them.

The consequences could subject the type of staffing action to significant review or change ways of conducting this type of staffing action.

High risk

Risk is unavoidable, and is judged as unacceptable. Some but not all or no mitigating strategies were taken.

- The scope and impact is widespread and poses major risks to the integrity of the staffing system.
- The consequences could hinder the organization's ability to function and/or achieve its objectives.

Business

Nature of position Tenure, Highly-specialized Number of positions, Urgency, Unexpected departure Continuity of service Operational requirements Geographic location ..

Workplace

Impact on work environment Career aspirations Talent management, Impacted employees Workforce stability Linguistic duality Renewal.

Efficiency

Existing pools and processes Collective staffing Cost-effectiveness Volume management Timeliness Training investment...

Workforce planning Talent gaps Workforce availability EE and OL representation Communication Turnover rate Succession planning ..

Planning

equirements and PSEA preambule Legislativ

Transparency Accessibility Fairness Merit Information Requirements

Major Risk

Broader Consultation

Increased Oversight

Expected results(https://www.canada.ca/en/public-service-commission/services/appointment-framework/appointment-policy.html)

- A non-partisan and representative workforce of individuals drawn from across the country, benefitting from the diversity, linguistic duality and range of backgrounds and skills of Canadians;
- Appointment processes designed so as not to discriminate or create systemic barriers;
- Appointment processes conducted in a fair and transparent manner and in good faith;
- Appointments of highly competent persons who meet the needs of the organization; and
- Timely correction of errors and omissions.

Compliance and values-based risks may be mitigated by the continued strategic advice and guidance exercised by HR Consultants who support managers in understanding their accountabilities in exercising sub-delegated authorities.

Notes Annex A

Consultation

Low risk actions only require sub-delegated management involvement; medium/ high risk actions require a broader management consultation. Prior to escalating a given staffing action, the HR Consultant (HRC) must first discuss concerns with the sub-delegated manager responsible for the appointment process, and propose mitigation strategies. Refer to Annex B for details on the escalation process.

Oversight

HR Consultants will document advice and guidance and related decisions appropriately, this information will be used for monitoring and reporting purposes.

High-Risk Staffing actions that required escalation to the final management level will be closely monitored and results will be reported to the Deputy Minister as part of ongoing reporting mechanisms.

Risk Levels:

HRC's have the ability to raise or reduce the risk level based on situation specific factors that apply.

Staffing actions that contravene existing legislative and policy must be addressed immediately. (I.e. Merit is not met, Political Influence, Discrimination or systemic barriers, Priorities persons were not given due consideration and improper conduct / Fraud, Appointment based on personal favoritism)

Non-compliance is not a risk, but rather an issue that must be addressed immediately.

Aggravating or mitigating factors

The table provides examples of considerations when determining the risk level for a staffing action- it is not exhaustive. It is a sample of aggravating and mitigation factors that could be discussed. Managers and HRC's are also supported by several frameworks to make staffing decisions that best enable the achievement of desired business and workforce outcomes.