

8-1-1994

# An Evaluation of the jobsOntario Training Program

Michael Schuster  
*Western University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/lgp-mrps>



Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Schuster, Michael, "An Evaluation of the jobsOntario Training Program" (1994). *MPA Major Research Papers*. 13.  
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/lgp-mrps/13>

This Major Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Local Government Program at Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in MPA Major Research Papers by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact [tadam@uwo.ca](mailto:tadam@uwo.ca), [wlsadmin@uwo.ca](mailto:wlsadmin@uwo.ca).

# **An Evaluation of the jobsOntario Training Program**

**MPA Research Report**

**Submitted to**

**The Local Government Program**

**Department of Political Science**

**The University of Western Ontario**

**August 1994**

**Michael J. Schuster**

## **INTRODUCTION**

A variety of approaches have been tried to assist employable social assistance (welfare)\_recipients (SARs) to obtain employment or to enter a training program which will lead to a job. Such programs have had the end goal to change the individual's reliance on public assistance to survive. In Canada, two current initiatives underway in this regard are New Brunswick Works and B.C.'s Self-Sufficiency Project. However, such programs have been criticized because they cannot create "real" jobs and that economic growth is needed to provide permanent employment opportunities for those without work.

In the spring of 1992, Ontario introduced a new program called jobsOntario Training (JOT). It is designed to work with employers, workers and communities to promote jobs and training for workers who had been unemployed for a prolonged period of time and to contribute to Ontario's economic renewal (after the prolonged recession in the Province). The program is to be available for three years and is delivered by local brokers including boards of education, community colleges, community agencies and municipalities.

This study will attempt to evaluate the impact/successes of JOT for the two year period ending in March, 1994. By the use of a broker questionnaire and interviews with the officials responsible for the development and implementation of the program, the evaluation will try to determine whether four components of the program are meeting the stated goals and more specifically in helping SARs obtain work. An attempt will also be made to evaluate the impact of using local brokers to deliver the program.

## **Section I Literature Review/JobsOntario Training Program Description**

### **1) Historical Perspective on Working/Training for Welfare**

The basis for the North American twentieth century approach to assisting the poor can be found in the changes that occurred in Europe in the early 1500's. Urban poor relief was handled mainly by almshouses, hospitals and poor tables under the supervision of town authorities. Except for the old, the ill or the disabled, the poor in receipt of relief were forced to work by learning a trade or by doing any manual labour they were capable of performing. Towns were creating work and withholding assistance from the able-bodied to force compliance. In some cities the children of the poor were sent to school to teach them discipline and to learn a skill or trade. H.C.M. Michielse claims that this sixteenth century manner of providing for the poor has been maintained well into the 1900's. Present day social welfare programs are simply "a matter of making the poor more useful and less politically dangerous with the help of techniques of social administration - guidance, help and education."<sup>1</sup>

There have been many studies conducted on various interventions tried in America to assist those in receipt of social assistance to become gainfully employed. Mildred Rein, in her book, Dilemma of Welfare Policy: Why Work Strategies Haven't Worked, outlines 3 basic ways that the U.S. has tried to intervene.

- "Work through Social Services"<sup>2</sup> (providing such supports as referrals to employment or training, day care, pre-employment training, counselling,

---

<sup>1</sup> H.C.M. Michielse, "Policing the Poor: J.L. Vives and the Sixteenth Century Origins of Modern Social Administration," Social Services Review, Vol. 64, No. 1 (March 1990), 18.

<sup>2</sup> Mildred Rein, Dilemma of Welfare Policy: Why Work Strategies Haven't Worked (New York: Praeger Publications, 1982) p. 15.

etc.). These have never been fully implemented as a strategy by the different states.

- "Work through Incentives"<sup>3</sup> (providing an earnings exemption). Work incentives are only effective when benefit rates are kept low.
- "Work through Requirements"<sup>4</sup> (making it mandatory for recipients to undertake training or work). This approach is relatively ineffective as most administrators do not enforce the requirements.

She concludes that government work programs should be directed only to that portion of the caseload that is relatively employable.

In her 1987 article, which summarizes the major findings of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation's study of eight states which implemented workfare programs, Judith Gueron, concludes that efforts to induce welfare recipients to work only have limited success.<sup>5</sup> In fact when one views the poor results obtained in West Virginia with its poor economy and lack of work, the impact of unemployment rates on the success of workfare programs becomes apparent.

In a later article, Gueron analyzes the impact of the Family Support Act (1988) which requires welfare recipients to look for and accept a job, or to participate in activities that prepare people for work.<sup>6</sup> In studying the programs introduced in various municipal settings across America, she says that "such programs can be successfully implemented and can impose obligations on

---

<sup>3</sup> Midred Rein, Dilemma of Welfare Policy: Why Work Strategies Haven't Worked (New York: Praeger Publications, 1982) p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 65

<sup>5</sup> Judith M. Gueron, "Reforming Welfare with Work," Public Welfare, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Spring 1992), 25.

<sup>6</sup> Judith M. Gueron, "Work and Welfare: Lessons in Employment Programs," Journal of Economic Perspectives, Volume 4, No. 1 (Winter 1990), 79.

some share of the caseload"<sup>7</sup> and that such programs can be shown to be cost-effective. However, the question of whether such initiatives can be made more effective by making the work requirements tougher or by spending more on expensive education and training services remains unanswered.<sup>8</sup>

Many of the American studies have focused on the success of the voluntary versus the mandatory nature of the intervention. The Ontario Municipal Social Services Association in trying to show that voluntary American programs were more successful cites the example of the \$2 savings for every dollar spent under that Massachusetts Employment and Training Choices Program.<sup>9</sup>

Lightman<sup>10</sup> has studied the impact of earnings disregards ("work through incentives") practices of Britain, Israel and Canada. He concludes that all three countries encourage the blending of work and welfare. However, such disregards may only play a minor role in an individual's decision to work. Employment related expenses and the availability of jobs and of day care may be just as important.

Hum and Simpson in their in-depth analysis of the only guaranteed annual income experiment conducted in Canada (Mincome) believe that "changes in the number of pre-school children in the family...has a significant effect on the

---

<sup>7</sup> Judith M. Gueron, "Work and Welfare: Lessons In Employment Programs," Journal of Economics Perspectives, Volume 4, No. 1 (Winter 1990), 94.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 95.

<sup>9</sup> Ontario Municipal Social Services Association, A Position Paper on Workfare (Toronto: The Association, October 1986), p.5.

<sup>10</sup> Ernie Lightman, "Earnings Disregards In Canada, Britain and Israel," Social Service Review, Vol. 64, No. 4 (December 1990).

labour supply, of husband and wives. Additional preschool children increase the labour supply of the husband and reduce the labour supply of the wife."<sup>11</sup>

In Canada under the Canada Assistance Plan, Provinces receive cost-sharing for such interventions as "counselling, assessment and referral, casework and day care. These services presumably help welfare recipients break the cycle of poverty - a result that yield dividends in the form of individual self-support, higher national output and lower assistance payment".<sup>12</sup> Thus, Provinces have been encouraged to develop services to assist welfare recipients re-enter the labour market. In Ontario, these are often delivered and partially funded by municipalities.

However this "same federal legislation in the form of the Canada Assistance plan precludes the possibility of receiving federal transfer payments in support of a mandatory work for welfare program".<sup>13</sup> Provinces do have the authority to cut off assistance to welfare recipients who do not take jobs offered to them. British Columbia has experimented with a number of these over the years including making employable recipients take jobs picking berries (in the 60's). In 1988 a program called "Employment Plus" was created "to provide a wage subsidy for employers who hired income assistance recipients."<sup>14</sup> In

---

<sup>11</sup> Derek P.J. Hum and Wayne Simpson, Income Maintenance Work Effort and the Canadian Mincome Experiment (Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada, 1991), p.83

<sup>12</sup> Derek P.J. Hum, Federalism and the Poor: A Review of the Canada Assistance Plan (Toronto: Ontario Economic Council, 1983), p. 72.

<sup>13</sup> Ontario Municipal Social Services Association, A Position Paper on Workfare (Toronto: The Association, October 1986), p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> Marilyn Callahan and others, "Workfare in British Columbia: Social Development Alternatives," Canadian Review of Social Policy, Issue #26 (1990), 18.

evaluating the results of the B.C. programs, Callagan and others conclude that "the rise and fall in numbers of persons in receipt of assistance appears much more related to the unemployment rate than the existence of workfare programs."<sup>15</sup>

An evaluation of the Ontario Employment Opportunities Program was conducted in 1988 by Burt Perron Associates for the Ministry of Community and Social Services. The various program components to assist SARs re-enter the labour market were assessed over a 3-year period. Some of the findings of this evaluation included the following:

- programs (such as the Social Service Employment Program) which provided direct employment placements through financial incentive to employers were most expensive but also most successful;
- using a pre-employment training coupled with child care and employment related expenses was successful for single parents;
- assessment and referral to training were more successful when operated in conjunction with direct placement programs;
- employment preparation and providing employment expenses for youth had a short-term effect in moving youth off social assistance;
- using flexible client approaches and ensuring support services such as day care and employment related expenses were most successful;

The consultants concluded "that people can be assisted in finding - and in keeping jobs...people can be assisted in becoming financially independent of social assistance payments."<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Marilyn Callagan and others, "Workfare in British Columbia: Social Development Alternatives," Canadian review of Social Policy, Issue #26 (1990), 17.

<sup>16</sup> Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services Towards Independence: Highlights of the Evaluation of the Employment Opportunities Program (Toronto: Queen's Printer, July 1988), p. 37.



## 2) Recent Government Programs to Assist Social Assistance Recipients

### Find Work/Training

In January 1992, the Province of Ontario consolidated its six different programs to help SARs enter or re-enter the job market, into one program. This was to make the program more effective for clients by making the program more flexible and accessible for clients. A key ingredient in the program continued to be its voluntary nature -- "services are offered to those who want to become employed, acknowledge the barriers they face and are willing to overcome these obstacles."<sup>17</sup> Municipalities which provide this program have to include the following functions: needs analysis (through counselling), employment preparation (personal adjustment skills, job search preparation and basic skills training), brokerage (matching, marketing and follow-up) and support (employment related and child care expenses).

The above reforms coupled with increased earnings exemptions which the Province had introduced in 1989 under the Supports to Employment Program (STEP) were supposed to remove the disincentives to employment that existed in the social assistance system. Under these two initiatives the Province also indicated that by providing specific social services through its municipal partners it wanted "to support and assist individuals to secure and maintain employment."<sup>18</sup> Essentially Ontario had opted for a combination of the work

---

<sup>17</sup> Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services Municipal First Nation Employment Programs: Guidelines (Toronto: Queen's Printer, November 1991), p. 7.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 7.

through social services and work through incentives approaches as categorized by Rein.

In May 1992, New Brunswick introduced a new comprehensive program which was to ensure that SARs who participated would "achieve a level of educational/skill proficiency and obtain relevant work experiences which would allow them the opportunity to achieve permanent labour force attachment."<sup>19</sup>

Specifically, the program was to achieve three goals:

- to develop the human resource and employment potential of social assistance recipients, to achieve the goal of a more educated, better trained work force;
- to begin to change the attitude that income assistance is an end in itself, to an attitude that people can increase their employability and
- to save social assistance costs through the moving of persons from the caseload to work.<sup>20</sup>

Scheduled to take in 1000 voluntary SARs each year for three years, the program offers each participant a sequential continuum of services to break the welfare cycle. These services can be provided up to four years and include case plan development/job placement (5 months), extra mural high school (24 months), skills training (9 months), job experience search (3 months) and subsidized private sector placements (8 months).<sup>21</sup> By combining funding from the federal and provincial governments participants were guaranteed that

---

<sup>19</sup> New Brunswick, Department of Advanced Education and Labour and Department of Income Assistance, N.B. Works (Fredericton, New Brunswick: The Department, May 1992), p.3.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p.10.

they would be "no worse off"<sup>22</sup> if they had remained on assistance. Therefore child care, transportation and other training expenses were provided. Local advisory Committees which were to include private sector employers are to identify the type of skill training that is in demand so recipients are given skills that they can market.

The Department of Income Assistance conducted a one year evaluation of the program. One conclusion reached is that SARs have many problems that prevent them from becoming gainfully employed. It is not enough just to provide more jobs and/or to train/educate people into the job market.<sup>23</sup> However, N.B. works has recently been criticized as being too expensive and having high drop-out rates ("half of the 2000 people who entered the three year program in May 1992 and May 1993 have dropped out"<sup>24</sup>).

New Brunswick has also co-operated in a joint venture with British Columbia called the "self-sufficiency project". Introduced in 1993 the program is designed to counter the impacts of added costs and low paying jobs that SARs face when they accept work. It is designed "to determine the effectiveness of an earnings supplement for single-parent Income Assistance recipients who take jobs and agree to leave Income Assistance".<sup>25</sup> Participants are given an income supplement of up to 50% of the difference between the individual's

---

<sup>22</sup> New Brunswick, Department of Income Assistance, N.B. Works: Annual Report (Draft) (Fredericton, New Brunswick: The Department, September 1993), p. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 13

<sup>24</sup> John Daly, "Cross-training," MacLean's, Vol. 107, No. 26 (June 27, 1994), 30.

<sup>25</sup> Social Research and Demonstration Corporation, Self-Sufficiency Project Overview (Vancouver, British Columbia: The Corporation, January 1993), p. 1.

annual earnings and a ceiling earnings level (set at \$37,000 in B.C. and \$30,000 in N.B.). Such supplements are provided for up to 3 years as long as the recipient keeps working. Participation in the program is voluntary. Up to 8000 individuals who agree to take part are randomly assigned to either a control group or the earnings supplementation group. Participants are being selected from specific areas of both provinces that have been identified for the project. An extensive evaluation and follow-up period is planned. To date no information on the project's progress has been released. Funding for the program is provided by the federal government.

The early 1990's recession affected Ontario residents more than the rest of the country. Because of this welfare caseloads more than doubled between 1989 and 1992, the province responded with the introduction of the JOT program. When interviewed, both Richard Allen (the minister responsible for the introduction of JOT) and senior jobsOntario staffers agreed that the skyrocketing costs for welfare, the increased numbers of persons on the caseloads and the desire to make some social welfare reforms that were different, spawned the program. Since federal job creation and training programs focused on those in receipt of U.I., the Province wanted to help those who were ineligible for such benefits. Ontario wanted to assist the long term unemployed (ie. those who had exhausted U.I. benefits or who were on social assistance) and help them obtain work. By timing the program's introduction as the economy was recovering (mid-1992), the government hoped to help employers create jobs.

In developing the program for the Ontario cabinet's consideration, a series of consultations were conducted with various groups by a specially selected team of civil servants. Employers said, that they hired when they needed to hire, but that training costs were often prohibitive. Labour groups expressed concerns with a wage subsidy program. Employers also said that their commitment to employees hired under wage subsidy programs ended when the subsidy ended.

Considering all of this, plus input from the Ministry of Community and Social Services on the results of previous and current employment programs and knowing what New Brunswick was contemplating, a training credit program for private sector employees was proposed. By hiring a long term unemployed resident of the province, an employer could have some of the training costs covered for the new employee and for existing employees. This then was to be the mainstay of JOT and the major incentive for the private sector to hire those on social assistance and/or to hire earlier and/or more staff.

### 3) JobsOntario Training Program Description

#### a) Program Objectives

Introduced in the spring of 1992, JOT Fund is to be a three year program to develop worker skills and create jobs. It is designed to work with employees, workers and communities to promote jobs and training for workers who had been unemployed for a prolonged period of time and to contribute to Ontario's economic renewal.<sup>26</sup> Specifically the program is to:

---

<sup>26</sup> Ontario, Ministry of Skills Development, JobsOntario Training Fund: Program Overview (Toronto: Queens Printer, June 1992), p. 1.

- help employers and trainers develop a skilled labour force that could compete for high wage, value-added jobs;
- help those most hurt by the recession - the long term unemployed ie. those in receipt of social assistance, those whose unemployment insurance benefits had expired or who were ineligible for unemployment insurance;
- help employers create higher grade jobs;
- remove barriers to employment such as lack of affordable child care and
- enhance the job-generating capacity of specific industry sectors and geographic regions.<sup>27</sup>

#### **b) Program Components/Financial Incentives**

##### **i) Training Credit**

Private sector employers willing to create a new permanent position (lasting one year) for an eligible participant can receive a training credit equal to 35% of that new employee's annual wages up to \$10,000. At least half of the money is to be used to train the new employee while the remainder can be used to upgrade the skills of the current workforce. In order to qualify, employers must have developed a broker-approved training plan in advance and must have been in operation for at least six months. Training can be delivered by local training institutions or "in-house". Participation of SARs in these programs is voluntary.

##### **ii) Economic Renewal**

Essentially, this is the same as the training credit, but intended for large numbers of new hires/trainees (over 25) for larger employers. Such credits are administrated centrally by the Province. Local brokers assist in the job

---

<sup>27</sup> Ontario, Ministry of Skills Development, JobsOntario Training Fund: Program Overview (Toronto: Queen's Printer, June 1992), p.2.

referral component. Employers eligible under this program can also receive a higher reimbursement for each training credit.

iii) Pre-employment Training

Such training is to provide participants with the skills required to ensure job readiness. Courses include computer and communications skills, upgrading, basic language skills, etc. The average cost per course is not to exceed \$3,200 for each participant. Local brokers have the responsibility for coordinating the purchase of such training through existing agencies. They are allocated one pre-employment training space for every eight training credits forecast under (a) above.

iv) Child Care and Other Employment Supports

The Province wants to provide funding for the creation of an additional 20,000 subsidized child care spaces. Instead of the usual 80:20 cost-sharing with municipalities for such spaces, 100% Provincial funding is provided until the program ends. The additional spaces are provided so that lack of child care does not prevent a potential participant from taking a job (training credit) or a pre-employment training course.

Limited allowances for employment-related costs such as buying work clothes, obtaining a special licence, getting a bus pass, etc. are also available for non-SARs. Both of these components of the program are to be provided or arranged by the local broker for participants.

v) Regional Development

Funding is available for business development which will result in job opportunities for program participants. Assisting in the development of new

self-employment initiatives and helping grass roots community groups develop co-ops and other community businesses are examples of this program component.

### **c) Program Delivery/Broker Responsibilities**

The JOT Fund is co-ordinated locally by Brokers. They are community organizations having extensive knowledge and expertise in working with employers and the long-term unemployed. Forty-six brokers were selected. Included are 18 municipal Social Services Departments, 11 Community Colleges, 3 Boards of Education, and 14 Community Agencies (e.g., Help Centres). Some of these brokers have agreements with local agencies to act as sub-brokers. The brokers are to:

- reach out to employers, labour and employer and industry associations;
- reach out to potential participants in the community;
- liaise with existing training, education and social service stakeholders to ensure high levels of co-operation;
- make job referrals;
- provide follow-up and support to employers and participants;
- create and enhance community networks to facilitate the administration of all program components.<sup>28</sup>

Local Brokers are responsible for the delivery of the following four program components: training credits, pre-employment training, child care and other employment supports.

---

<sup>28</sup> Ontario, Ministry of Skills Development, JobsOntario Training Fund: Program Overview (Toronto: Queens Printer, June 1992), p. 4.



After developing training credit and pre-employment training targets for their area, local brokers developed program budgets for the three-year period. Such budgets could not exceed the maximum amounts per trainee (ie. \$10,000 and \$3,200 respectively). Brokers also formulated administrative budgets, which were not to exceed 11% of the program budget.

Eleven aboriginal community brokers were selected to deliver the four program components to the native residents of the Province. Since some of the program criteria vary for these brokers and because they service a specific population, they are not included in this evaluation.

#### **d) Provincial Program Targets/Results**

##### **i) Targets**

The Province expected to create 90,000 new jobs (32,000 in the first year) under the training credits/economic renewal components of the program and provide pre-employment training for 10,000 workers under the 3 year program. Total program expenditures were estimated at \$1.1 billion.

In addition the government had committed \$324 million to fund 20,000 new subsidized day care spaces over the same period.

Pre-employment training for 1,000 clients was offered in seven large urban centres when the program was announced in early May, 1992. Brokers were to be ready to deliver the training credit and other program components by mid-August 1992.

##### **ii) Results**

Beyond the pre-employment training which started in May 1992, there was very little activity in the various components of the program until late fall of

1992. This was one of the reasons the last day for starting a training credit was changed from March 31, 1994 to September 30, 1994 and then to March 31, 1995. By the beginning of 1993, the program with its various components appeared to be well underway.

By March 31, 1994 jobsOntario training reported the following cumulative results on a Province-wide basis:<sup>29</sup>

- 43,411 jobs created; 32,892 filled;
- 4,000 additional persons placed but did not remain for the one year;
- about 15% turnover rate with only 2% for those working over 6 months;
- 11,000 employers involved; 35% of jobs in manufacturing;
- average wage for training credits is \$20,500 (\$24,400 for economic renewal jobs);
- about 45% of those placed are social assistance recipients;
- placements include the following: youth (20.5%), aboriginal people (3.6%), racial minorities (11.4%) and women (36.5%);
- training credit cost per participant is \$10,800 (includes training and administrative costs);
- 18,505 pre-employment training spaces purchased;
- 1,348 child care spaces utilized
- \$1.6 million expended on other employment related expenses;
- \$61.6 million in administrative costs and
- over half of pre-employment courses were for job-readiness and general academic upgrading.

---

<sup>29</sup> These statistics were provided by provincial jobsOntario staff to the researcher. Although requested, Province-wide data broken down in a similar manner as in the broker questionnaire was not available. The Provincial data is shown in Appendix VII.

## **Section II Description of Evaluation Study**

### **1) Relevance to Study of Public Administration**

The expenditures of significant (\$1.1 billion) public funds to assist the long-term unemployed re-enter the job market in a decentralized administered program makes it relevant to the study of public administration. An evaluation of the program's effectiveness in term of dollars expended compared to its expected outcomes (jobs created and social assistance recipients helped in finding work) is in order.

The Province estimates it will save \$600 million<sup>30</sup> during the 3 year program that would otherwise have been spent on social assistance. Since municipalities in Ontario contribute 20% towards general welfare assistance payments to their residents in need (they also pay 50% of administration costs), JOT can help reduce such expenditures by reducing client caseloads.

### **2) Research Questions to be Addressed**

The JOT Program has been operational since May 1, 1992. The four components (pre-employment training, training credit, child care and employment related expenses) are scheduled to sunset by March 31, 1996. The evaluation may help the program sponsors to analyze results to date, to determine the success of the various components in meeting the stated objectives, to make changes to the current program components, to have a basis for a further evaluation at the conclusion of the program, and to make

---

<sup>30</sup> Ontario, Ministry of Skills Development, JobsOntario Training Fund: Questions and Answers for Employers (Toronto: Queens Printer, September 1992), p. 11.

recommendations for successor programs (eg. JobLink, OTAB). Hopefully it will also provide insights on the delivery aspects (local brokers) of the program. As the program is still underway, this evaluation will focus on initial start-up and program results to the end of March 31, 1994. Specifically, the evaluation will try to answer the following questions:

- a) How effective are the two basic program components (pre-employment training and training credits) in assisting social assistance participants to obtain employment?
- b) How does the availability of child care and employment supports impact on the participation of trainees in the two training program components?
- c) How effective is the program in creating higher grade jobs?
- d) How can the program components be improved?
- e) Is there a relationship between the type of local broker delivering the program and program results? program costs? administrative costs?
- f) How can the delivery of the program be improved?

### 3) Initial Assumptions

- Financial incentives to employers can be used as inducements to create new jobs.
- Voluntary participation by social assistance recipients in training/employment programs acts as a channelling mechanism, in that only those most eager/willing to find work take part.
- A financial incentive makes an employer more willing to hire/train social assistance recipients.
- It is possible to categorize jobs into various grades (ie. higher and lower).
- The various program component targets as developed by the local broker (and approved by the Province) are realistic.
- Brokers will provide accurate information on the program in their communities.

#### 4) Research Design

As the four program components are still being delivered across the Province a formative evaluation<sup>31</sup> was conducted. The basic approach was goal-oriented<sup>32</sup> but hopefully the results will influence decisions on future job-training programs. Three different methods were used to conduct the research.

##### a) Provincial Document Review

A review of provincial documents which were used in the program development was attempted. The researcher was provided only one document<sup>33</sup> that is not generally available to the public. This document added some data on the rationale for the program's introduction.

##### b) Implementation Survey

By obtaining written responses to a questionnaire (see Appendix III) sent to all the JOT brokers, the researcher attempted to obtain answers to the research questions posed. Although program managers (brokers) often resist such evaluations, are uncooperative or fail to grasp the purposes of the studies<sup>34</sup>, they were selected as being the ones best able to provide feedback at this

---

<sup>31</sup> The role of the formative evaluator is described by Joan L. Herman and others in the Evaluator's Handbook (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications Inc., 1987) chapter 2.

<sup>32</sup> The "goal-oriented" and "decision-focused" approaches to evaluations is outlined by Brian M. Stecher and W. Alan Davis in How to Focus an Evaluation (Newbury Park California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1987), chapter 2.

<sup>33</sup> Provincial staff provided the background report, JobsOntario Training: Overview Report (Toronto: The Ministry, March 1992) and a two page statistical summary referred to under footnote 4. All other documents were considered cabinet documents that could not be released.

<sup>34</sup> Peter H. Rossi and Howard E. Freeman, Evaluation A Systematic Approach (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1989), p. 149.

stage of the program. In addition, there were cost and timing limitations in conducting the research<sup>35</sup>.

c) **In-person Interviews**

An in-person interview was conducted with Dr. Richard Allen, the Provincial Minister responsible for the implementation of JOT for the Ontario N.D.P. government. The questions asked are detailed in Appendix I.

Individual telephone interviews were planned with the managers of the five JOT districts. However because of concerns regarding confidentiality, senior staff in Toronto agreed to a focus group interview. The topics covered are outlined in Appendix II.

These interviews were to elaborate on the Provincial perspective on program development and results to date.

d) **Protocol**

i) **Research Survey**

In March/April, a pre-test of the survey was done by asking three project managers to complete the questionnaire and provide feedback on content, time to complete, etc. The survey was amended in response to the feedback provided by the two managers who completed the pre-test.

The Province sent out a memo to all brokers on April 27th from the ADM indicating Provincial co-operation with this research endeavour.

Then forty-six questionnaires with covering letters and releases were sent out on May 9th. These were addressed to the project manager (broker). Replies

---

<sup>35</sup> The Region of Hamilton-Wentworth funded the survey and provided resources for the analysis of the responses. Research data to complete this paper had to be received by mid-July 1994.

in stamped, self-addressed envelopes were requested by May 24th. Respondents were assured anonymity, as results were considered only on a province-wide and group basis [ie. municipal social services departments (MUN), community agencies (COMM) and educational institution (ED) brokers]. Results from the survey were promised to all participants in the form of an executive summary.

By June 3rd only ten replies had been received with an additional two brokers indicating that they could not respond. Follow-up telephone calls were made to all non-respondents. By June 21st, this generated an additional five completed questionnaires with three more indicating they would not reply. A fax requesting a reply was sent to the remaining 26 brokers on that date. This resulted in an additional 5 completed questionnaires by July fourth.

ii) Interviews

On May 6, 1994 a one hour in-person taped interview was conducted by the researcher with Dr. Richard Allen in the latter's constituency office. The interview was pre-arranged and the questions that were to be covered were previously sent to the office.

On May 16, 1994 a 1-1/2 hour in-person group interview was held with three senior jobsOntario staff in Toronto (one district manager was present; one additional senior staffer could not attend). This interview was also pre-arranged. The questions that were to be covered were sent to the office before the interview. The researcher's administrative assistant also attended the session to record responses on a laptop computer.

## 5) General Results

### Implementation Surveys/Interviews

Twenty out of forty-six local brokers completed surveys. Of these, ten were MUN brokers (out of a possible 19); five were COMM brokers (out of a possible 13) and five were ED brokers (out of a possible 14) (The higher response rates in the municipal sector may in part be because the researcher is fairly well known in the municipal Social Services sector). In all cases but one, the replies indicated that the project manager (director, supervisor) had completed the survey. A senior policy staffer of a MUN broker was the exception.

Five brokers did not complete the survey because of work-load and staff turnover. Several other brokers called to indicate that they had planned to complete the survey but could not meet the July 15th final deadline.

The interviews provided important details on the Provincial development of the programs and the government perspective on the results achieved to the end of March/94. Several technical aspects regarding the completion of the survey and the interviews are detailed in Appendix V.

### Section III Survey and Interview Results

This section provides a summary of the responses of the local brokers to the implementation survey to the various questions posed. These responses have been grouped into three major categories of broker types (ie. MUN, COMM and ED brokers). They provide the broker perspective on the various issues identified. Their combined responses give an overall broker point of view. The comments of the minister and the senior staffers in the interviews provide the provincial



perspective on the same issue. Reference is made to the appropriate survey or interview question.

### 1) Program Purposes

The responses of brokers to question 6 of the survey indicate the following purposes for the four JOT components:

- **pre-employment training** - provides jobs readiness training (14)
  - helps workers develop their skills (7)
  - helps workers obtain job search skills (6)  
(no broker saw this as a preparation for the training credit)
- **training credit** - helps employer provide training (16)
  - creates jobs(8)
  - helps a client obtain work (5)
  - is a wage reimbursement (3)
- **child care** - removes barriers to work/training (16)
  - helps single parents/families (6)
  - helps a person keep a job (2)
- **employment related expenses** - help a person to get a job (12)
  - remove barriers to work/training (11)
  - help a person to keep a job (2)

There was little variation among the three groups of brokers to this question.

The province believes that the training credit is the central component of the program and its major purpose is to act as an incentive for employers to create jobs. Pre-employment training is seen as necessary for the hard core recipient but only in support of job creation. Child care is viewed as a much needed support for single parents especially women who make up a significant portion of the caseload. It is also viewed as an opportune way of creating more subsidized child care spaces in the Province. Employment related expenses are seen as important for those coming off assistance to obtain necessary clothing and transportation. Both the minister and staff are adamant that it is

not a wage subsidy program. The employer pays the new worker and then receives reimbursement for providing training to this employee and other employees according to a pre-set training plan.<sup>36</sup>

## 2) Program Start-Up

### a) Broker Perspective

In order to determine how quickly the four components of the program were available in the communities, brokers were asked question 2. Their responses are summarized in Table I. There was substantial variation on the actual program component start-up dates. One thousand pre-employment training spaces were allocated by the Province when the program was announced in May/92. However, in some communities this component was not available until April 1993. Similarly in some areas, the day care supports were not available until March '93. There was less variation in the start-up of the training credit (ie. August 92 to November 92). Employment related expenses also ranged significantly in start-up, (ie. from August 1992 until July 1993). There appears to be little differences in the actual start-up dates for the various components by broker group. However it is surprising that some MUN brokers required until January '93 to have the subsidized child care support available, since municipal social services departments usually provide such services as part of their regular programming. Equally surprising is the late availability date for pre-employment training by the ED brokers, since many of them provide such training under various other federal and provincial programs. The reported difference between planned and actual start-up months must be

---

<sup>36</sup> Summary of replies by Dr. Allen and senior jobsOntario staff to interview questions 3 and 6.

**Table I: JobsOntario Training Program Start-up  
(Actual vs. Planned)**

<b>Brokers</b>	<b>Pre-employment Training</b>	<b>Training Credit</b>	<b>Day Care</b>	<b>Employment Related Expenses</b>
Municipalities (MUN) - 10	1.7 (Jun 92-Mar 93)	0.6 (Aug 92-Nov 92)	0.7 (May 92-Jan 93)	2 (Sep 92-Jul 93)
Community Agencies (COMM) - 5	1.6 (Aug 92-Feb 93)	0.4 (Aug 92-Oct 92)	3.2 (Aug 92-Mar 93)	1 (Aug 92-Nov 92)
Educational Brokers (ED) - 5	1.4 (Nov 92-Apr 93)	0.6 (Sep 92-Oct 92)	1.6 (Dec 92-Feb 93)	1 (Oct 92-Nov 92)
<b>Total - 20</b>	<b>1.6</b> (Jun 92-Apr 93)	<b>0.5</b> (Aug 92-Nov 92)	<b>1.8</b> (May 92-Mar 93)	<b>1</b> (Aug 92-Jul 93)

- The average difference in months between the planned and actual start-up of the program is shown for each broker group.
- Because brokers were asked to report actual start-up dates, the range of start-up dates of the various components is indicated in brackets.

viewed with some skepticism as over half of the brokers reported they started the program component in the month in which it was planned to start.

b) **Provincial View**<sup>37</sup>

Having the training credit component available by August 15th when it was only announced on May 7th, meant provincial staffers had to work very hard with potential brokers who had only one month to prepare a proposal and only one month from receiving the approval to being operational. At the same time the variety of brokers selected caused delays (ie. some such as municipalities and colleges had experience and support services available - others did not and in one community, brokers misused funds). In other communities there were pressures to use JOT funds to replace reductions in other federally funded training programs. Some agencies wanted to use the administration funding to provide core funding for community based training agencies. Finally Metro Toronto provided a special challenge with its various cross-cultural communities. Provincial staff also indicated that no central administration existed to support the program. Therefore as brokers were being recruited so were additional staff, who required training. All this caused delays in program implementation. Dr. Allen believes the delays would have occurred regardless of how the program was delivered. Program take-up, specifically the training credit was slower than forecast because some employers were trying to use it as a wage subsidy and because the provincial economy was not recovering as quickly as expected.

---

<sup>37</sup> Summary of replies by the minister and senior JobsOntario staff to interview question 5.

c) **Program Support Provided by Local Brokers**

Table II illustrates how brokers resourced the program. Although relying mainly on JOT Administration funding, brokers did provide significant internal resources. The use of such resources indicates that some brokers may have had excess capacities. Unanswered is why such resources were provided. Perhaps they were used to keep overall administration costs at or below the 11% maximum.

d) **Program Targets**

Program targets had to be negotiated by each broker with the JOT district manager. Responses to question 15(a) provides an indication of brokers' support of the negotiated targets. ED brokers were most in agreement with their communities targets (average 3.8 score on a five point scale in which 3 is neutral). As shown by Table III, both COMM and MUN brokers on average tended to not agree with the targets for their areas, (average scores of 2.6 and 2.8 respectively). This may also be indicative that these brokers are not meeting their targets.

3) **Use of Local Brokers**

a) **Provincial Rationale**<sup>38</sup>

The minister wanted to use a local broker model because there were already skilful brokers available in communities and because the government would not increase its own bureaucracy. Staff believed that the expertise existed in communities to implement the program and that the use of brokers would force

---

<sup>38</sup> Summary of replies by the minister to interview question 4 and by senior JobsOntario staff to question 4(a).

**Table II: JOT Program – Administration Costs Resourced by Brokers**

Brokers

	<b>JOT</b>	<b>External</b>	<b>Internal</b>
<b>MUN (8)</b>			
Transportation	7	0	0
Accommodation	7	1	4
Furniture	7	0	3
Office Equip./Computers	6	0	4
Staff	5	0	4
Supervisors	5	0	3
Administrative Supports	0	0	0
Board/Community Assist.	1	4	3
Others	0	0	1
<b>COMM (5)</b>			
Transportation	5	0	0
Accommodation	4	0	3
Furniture	4	1	4
Office Equip./Computers	4	0	3
Staff	4	0	4
Supervisors	4	0	4
Administrative Supports	0	0	0
Board/Community Assist.	0	3	0
Others	0	0	0
<b>ED (5)</b>			
Transportation	4	0	1
Accommodation	2	0	2
Furniture	4	0	3
Office Equip./Computers	4	0	2
Staff	2	0	3
Supervisors	3	0	3
Administrative Supports	0	0	0
Board/Community Assist.	1	1	4
Others	0	0	0

JOT = funded from jobsOntario Admin. budget

External = provided by outside resources

Internal = provided by the broker from internal resources

**Table III: Attitudes of Brokers to jobsOntario (Responses to Question 15 of Survey)**

<u>Brokers</u>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
MUN 1	1	2	4	5	3	3	3	1	1	4	1
3	4	3	3	4	4	2	4	2	2	4	2
4	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	5	5
5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	2	4	5	1
7	2	5	5	5	4	1	4	2	3	5	3
10	1	4	3	4	2	4	5	2	2	5	3
11	2	3	4	4	1	5	5	3	3	4	1
12	3	5	5	4	3	2	5	4	4	5	2
18	3	2	3	5	4	4	4	2	2	5	2
19	2	3	3	3	3	2	4	2	1	4	3
<b>AVG. RATING</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>2.3</b>
COMM 23	3	4	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	1	4
24	1	3	4	4	4	3	5	3	2	2	5
27	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	3
30	3	5	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	1
32	2	5	5	5	3	2	4	4	5	5	1
<b>AVG. RATING</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.8</b>
ED 38	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	1	4	5	2
40	4	4	4	5	2	2	3	4	4	5	1
42	3	4	5	4	4	1	3	1	2	3	1
43	5	5	5	5	3	1	2	4	4	5	1
44	3	2	2	4	4	5	5	4	2	4	3
<b>AVG. RATING</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>
<b>TOTAL AVG.</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>

communities to link social and economic development. They also said that setting up a new bureaucracy for a temporary program did not make sense and that there is no provincial government department that had a series of local offices.

b) **Broker Role**

i) **Broker Perspective**

Brokers view their role as representatives of JOT in their communities who make decisions on whether local companies are eligible for the program. To a lesser extent they see themselves as communicators for JOT central, who have limited decision-making power on policy and program changes and full decision-making power on how to allocate the four program components. Three brokers believed they do what JOT wants. As shown by Table IV, there are no significant variances among broker groups in this regard.

ii) **Provincial Perspective**<sup>39</sup>

Senior staff believe brokers make all the pieces of JOT work, by reaching out to employers, by promoting the program in the community, by coordinating the intake of participants, by matching clients to jobs, by deciding on what type of pre-employment training to fund, by drawing up training plans, by monitoring the plans and by disbursing money. Provincial staff had to ensure that the program was seen the same across the province, that there was 100% geographic coverage and that anyone who met the criteria could be registered for the program. Local brokers who

---

<sup>39</sup> Summary of replies to interview question 4(b) by senior jobsOntario staff.



**Table IV: Role of Broker (in jobsOntario Training Program)**

<u>Brokers</u>	Rep.	Do/Wants	Com.	Decide Elig.	Limit Decide	Full Decide
MUN 1		1				
3	1		1	1	1	
4	1					1
5						
7	1			1	1	1
10	1		1	1		
11	1		1		1	
12	1			1		1
18	1			1	1	
19	1			1	1	
SUB-TOTAL	8	1	3	6	5	3
COMM 23	1	1	1	1	1	1
24	1		1	1	1	
27	1	1		1	1	1
30	1		1	1		
32	1			1		1
SUB-TOTAL	5	2	3	5	3	3
ED 38	1		1	1		
40	1		1	1	1	
42	1		1	1		1
43	1		1	1		1
44	1		1	1		
SUB-TOTAL	5	0	5	5	1	2
TOTAL	18	3	11	16	9	8

Rep. = jobsOntario representative in the community

Do/Wants = we do what jobsOntario in Toronto wants

Com. = communicator for jobsOntario Central

Decide Elig. = makes decisions on local company eligibility in the program

Limit Decide = limited decision-making power on policy and program changes

Full Decide = full decision-making power on how to allocate 4 program components

had more discretion in the delivery of other programs (i.e., municipalities for Welfare and colleges for Ontario Skills Development) could not be allowed the same flexibility.

c) **Rationale for Becoming a Broker**

When asked why their agency became involved, the majority of project managers said it was a natural extension of their current services (17) and/or their previous experience in delivering such programs (15). Eleven said it was because they were selected by the community and five believed it was because they were nominated by a government representative. None believed they became involved to avoid lay-offs.<sup>40</sup>

Specifics on how two brokers became involved are provided in Appendix IV. From these examples it appears that the Province hoped that communities would select one broker from the various agencies invited to apply. These invitees were nominated by local provincial government administrators and politicians. Unfortunately, the researcher did not ask details about this process during the interviews (e.g., What happened when a community could not reach consensus? What factors were considered in deciding on the broker when an area had two applications? Who had the final say on local brokers?).

d) **Use of Sub-brokers**

Seven of the brokers use sub-brokers to assist them in delivering the program. They had to sign an agreement with the sub-broker based on a JOT prototype. Of these seven, five were municipalities and two were

---

<sup>40</sup> Summary of broker responses to question 7(a).

community agencies. The five MUN brokers had agreements with four community colleges, two boards of education, and seven community agencies. The two COMM brokers used three other community agencies as sub-brokers.

In replying to question 9 of the survey, the two COMM brokers said their sub-brokers were an effective way to achieve training credit targets. Only two out of the five MUN brokers agreed. The expertise of sub-brokers in certain geographic or rural areas and in local economic conditions were given as the rationale for their effectiveness. The three other MUN brokers believed that sub-brokers were in it for the money, were constantly complaining, and had different goals.

e) **Local Advisory Committees**

Eighteen out of the twenty brokers have local advisory committees. These range in size from 7 to 27 with an average membership of 15. They have an average of 2 internal staff (range from 1 to 3) and 13 external representatives (range from 4 to 25) on the committees.

Seventeen of the committees involve community agencies. Others well represented include welfare offices (16), boards of education (15), community colleges (13), Canada Employment Centres (13), and ministry of community and social services representatives (12). Also represented are consumers (10) and private trainers (7). A potpourri of other representatives are also present.

As shown by Table V, such advisory committees are seen mainly as providing general direction to the broker and for information sharing. A significant number (8) also decide on pre-employment training for their areas.

f) **Effectiveness of the Broker Model**

From the provincial perspective,<sup>41</sup> there is general satisfaction with the use of the local broker model in attaining training credits. Where there was local pressure to achieve targets, local brokers produced. For brokers who saw it as only one of many programs, such successes were not as readily apparent. A bureaucratic structure run by the province may have been better in achieving the targets. The use of sub-brokers allows for penetration into parts of the employer community that could not have been achieved by brokers or by a government office. This is especially true in Toronto.

In their response to survey question 16(a), project managers indicated support of the local broker delivery model (13 in favour versus 1 opposed). They also believe that there should be only one local broker with no sub-brokers (11 in support versus 3 opposed). They are in agreement that the Province should have provided clearer guidelines on the Program to brokers (13 to 4). Eighteen brokers provided comments on their responses to 16(a).

Suggested changes include:

- removing the political interference (2)
- clearer guidelines (5)
- more lead time to plan and organize program (3)
- having only one community broker (3)
- more flexible guidelines (4)
- less administrative control by jobsOntario central (2)

---

<sup>41</sup> Summary of reply to interview question 8 by senior jobsOntario staff.

**Table V: Role of Advisory Committee – Broker View**

<u>Brokers</u>	Decide on Training	Market Program	Decide on Pre-employment Training	Labour Market Advice	General Direction to Broker	Information Sharing
MUN 1					1	
3			1	1	1	1
5					1	
7				1	1	1
10		1	1		1	1
11			1		1	1
12		1			1	1
18				1	1	1
19	1		1	1	1	1
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>
COMM 24			1			1
27		1			1	
30		1			1	1
32					1	
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
ED 38		1	1		1	
40			1			
42				1	1	1
43					1	
44	1		1		1	1
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>11</b>

Brokers (see Table III) also believe JOT provided sufficient administrative funding for brokers to deliver the program as shown by their responses to question 15(e). However, Provincial JOT staff did not provide sufficient training to brokers as per replies to question 15(h). MUN brokers were most critical regarding this lack of training. COMM and ED brokers indicate that there was sufficient direction/communication provided by jobsOntario staff, so brokers could deliver the four components. On the other hand, MUN brokers disagree [responses to question 15(i)].

#### 4) Training Programs Outcomes and Effects

##### a) Pre-employment Training

##### i) Clients Helped/Dollars Expended

Tables VI and VII<sup>42</sup> provide details on the number of clients assisted with pre-employment training and the expenditures to do same. Overall 6463 individuals started pre-employment training by March 31, 1994. Of the twenty brokers only two municipalities had not started some pre-employment training in the first year. One broker not showing any achievements in the MUN group reported numbers on a calendar year basis while the other broker had an unusual situation.

By the end of the second year, most brokers had achieved their targets in pre-employment training spaces. However, there were still four brokers who had not achieved 50% of their cumulative two year targets. It appears that COMM and ED brokers were able to meet their first year targets better than

---

<sup>42</sup> Summary of broker replies to questions 3 and 4 of survey.

**Table VI: Pre-Employment Training Seats (as reported by broker)**

<u>Brokers</u>	3 T.	3 A.	% A.	4 T.	4 A.	% A.	T. T.	T. A.	% A.
MUN 1	104	4	3.8%	241	67	27.8%	345	71	20.6%
3	498	498	100.0%	767	767	100.0%	1265	1265	100.0%
4	0	0		300	60	20.0%	300	60	20.0%
5	12	1	8.3%	53	91	171.7%	65	92	141.5%
7	30	0	0.0%	165	259	157.0%	195	259	132.8%
10	12	38	316.7%	8	53	662.5%	20	91	455.0%
11	34	34	100.0%	25	25	100.0%	59	59	100.0%
12	32	21	65.6%	82	72	87.8%	114	93	81.6%
18	0	0		40	51	127.5%	40	51	127.5%
19	0	0		323	781	241.8%	323	781	241.8%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>82.5%</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2226</b>	<b>111.1%</b>	<b>2726</b>	<b>2822</b>	<b>103.5%</b>
COMM 23	45	74	164.4%	657	488	74.3%	702	562	80.1%
24	12	12	100.0%	200	200	100.0%	212	212	100.0%
27	10	17	170.0%	10	245	2450.0%	20	262	1310.0%
30	35	174	497.1%	290	766	264.1%	325	940	289.2%
32	27	1	3.7%	218	118	54.1%	245	119	48.6%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>215.5%</b>	<b>1375</b>	<b>1817</b>	<b>132.1%</b>	<b>1504</b>	<b>2095</b>	<b>139.3%</b>
ED 38	50	141	282.0%	150	205	136.7%	200	346	173.0%
40	68	33	48.5%	90	79	87.8%	158	112	70.9%
42	48	4	8.3%	217	78	35.9%	265	82	30.9%
43	11	11	100.0%	10	10	100.0%	21	21	100.0%
44	265	265	100.0%	720	720	100.0%	985	985	100.0%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>102.7%</b>	<b>1187</b>	<b>1092</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	<b>1629</b>	<b>1546</b>	<b>94.9%</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1293</b>	<b>1328</b>	<b>102.7%</b>	<b>4566</b>	<b>5135</b>	<b>112.5%</b>	<b>5859</b>	<b>6463</b>	<b>110.3%</b>

3T=92/93 Targets  
 3A=92/93 Actuals  
 %A=Percentage Achieved

4T=93/94 Targets  
 4A=93/94 Actuals  
 T.T.=Total Targets  
 T.A.=Total Achieved

Table VII: Pre-employment Training Expenditures (in dollars as reported by broker)

Brokers	3 B.	3 E.	% E.	4 B.	4 E.	% E.	T. B.	T. E.	% E.
MUN 1	332800	12880	3.9%	771120	214439	27.8%	1103920	227319	20.6%
3	596534	596534	100.0%	675200	675200	100.0%	1271734	1271734	100.0%
4	153000	7225	4.7%	105000	25225	24.0%	258000	32450	12.6%
5	2520	2520	100.0%	157955	157955	100.0%	160475	160475	100.0%
7	96000	0	0.0%	528000	714600	135.3%	624000	714600	114.5%
10	38400	29631	77.2%	25600	21336	83.3%	64000	50967	79.6%
11	41600	10688	25.7%	29280	51660	176.4%	70880	62348	88.0%
12	30000	21280	70.9%	180000	66827	37.1%	210000	88107	42.0%
18	0	0		114000	33102	29.0%	114000	33102	29.0%
19	0	3199		1032600	634791	61.5%	1032600	637990	61.8%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>	<b>1290854</b>	<b>683957</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>3618755</b>	<b>2595135</b>	<b>71.7%</b>	<b>4909609</b>	<b>3279092</b>	<b>66.8%</b>
COMM 23	113626	23633	20.8%	199650	199788	100.1%	313276	223421	71.3%
24	2181	2181	100.0%	90260	90260	100.0%	92441	92441	100.0%
27	22000	0	0.0%	22000	44800	203.6%	44000	44800	101.8%
30	52500	52500	100.0%	172550	93103	54.0%	225050	145603	64.7%
32	86400	240	0.3%	153600	154000	100.3%	240000	154240	64.3%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>	<b>276707</b>	<b>78554</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>638060</b>	<b>581951</b>	<b>91.2%</b>	<b>914767</b>	<b>660505</b>	<b>72.2%</b>
ED 38	50000	50033	100.1%	150000	139000	92.7%	200000	189033	94.5%
40	190400	86568	45.5%	260800	231967	88.9%	451200	318535	70.6%
42	76370	530	0.7%	346030	227865	65.9%	422400	228395	54.1%
43	275	275	100.0%	5700	5700	100.0%	5975	5975	100.0%
44	860793	363464	42.2%	374775	713174	190.3%	1235568	1076638	87.1%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>	<b>1177838</b>	<b>500870</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>1137305</b>	<b>1317706</b>	<b>115.9%</b>	<b>2315143</b>	<b>1818576</b>	<b>78.6%</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>2745399</b>	<b>1263381</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>5394120</b>	<b>4494792</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>8139519</b>	<b>5758173</b>	<b>70.7%</b>

3B=92/93 Budget  
 3E=92/93 Expenditure  
 %E=Percentage Expended

4B=93/94 Budget  
 4E=93/94 Expenditures  
 T.B.=Total Budget  
 T.E.=Total Expenditures



municipalities. Based on population size, brokers representing larger areas also had some difficulties.

Even though brokers generally achieved their two year training targets, they did not over-expend their budgets.

ii) Types of Pre-employment Training Provided

From the responses provided by brokers to question 11(a), 7786 pre-employment training spaces were provided to the end of March 1994. This is substantially more than the numbers reported in question 4 of the survey. The reason for this discrepancy may be that purchases have been made for programs starting after March 31/94. From the data received, it appears that sixty per cent of all pre-employment training can be categorized as job readiness. The next largest group at 21% is computer skills training. Communication skills (9%), and basic upgrading (5%) make up the remaining top four categories. (The 1265 spaces not categorized by one broker were excluded in arriving at these percentages). The responses to question 11(a) are shown in Table VIII. The province indicated that over half of the courses purchased were for job readiness and general academic up-grading.

iii) Utilization of Pre-employment Training by Social Assistance Recipients

Only seventeen of the twenty brokers responded to question 11(b) regarding the number of SARs who were placed in pre-employment training. Four only provided an overall percentage (the researcher assumed these to be estimates so excluded them from consideration). The remaining 13 brokers' figures indicate that 65% of their total pre-employment training spaces were occupied by SARs for the two year period ending March 31/94. With the

**Table VIII: Types of Pre-Employment Training Provided**

<u>Brokers</u>	Eng.	Upgrad.	Job Rd.	Comput.	Commun.	Other	Totals
MUN 1	0	0	380	161	0	1	542
3	0	0	0	0	0	1265*	1265
4	0	0	20	0	0	0	20
5	0	0	0	47	0	58	105
7	0	0	220	45	0	11	276
10	0	4	29	37	0	43	113
11	0	0	25	0	0	34	59
12	13	0	59	99	0	34	205
18	0	0	41	5	0	5	51
19	55	0	354	336	0	110	855
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1128</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1561</b>	<b>3491</b>
COMM 23	5	0	472	184	8	84	753
24	0	4	170	15	0	20	209
27	0	200	60	0	60	0	320
30	0	1	901	7	0	31	940
32	0	0	44	68	8	9	129
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>1647</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>2351</b>
ED 38	0	0	296	20	15	25	371
40	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
42	0	0	125	60	110	64	423
43	0	8	0	2	0	0	13
44	0	40	684	275	0	63	1127
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1105</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>1944</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>3880</b>	<b>1361</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>7786</b>

Eng. = English/French Literacy

Upgrad. = Basic Upgrading

Job Rd. = Job Readiness

Comput. = Computer Skills

Commun. = Communication Skills

Other = Includes brokers who did not specify types of training provided

\* Broker did not categorize types of pre-employment training

small sample sizes in the three groups it was not possible to determine differences (eg. were MUN brokers more apt to place recipients in such training compared to the other brokers?).

iv) Pre-employment Training Results

Question 11(c) of the survey attempted to determine what happened to trainees who started pre-employment training programs. One broker did not reply to this question. The remaining 19 brokers indicated that 4873 trainees completed the training programs which they started. Therefore 63% of trainees completed their pre-employment programs. However this figure is a conservative estimate as many of the programs started in 1993/94 had not finished by March 31/94. By looking only at the 1992/93 results this percentage improves to 75%.

Question 11 did not allow brokers to specify whether they followed-up on all participants or on only graduates. However all COMM brokers indicated they did at least attempt such follow-up.

By examining the responses of the 15 brokers who completed all of question 11(c), the impact of pre-employment training can be assessed. These results are shown in Table IX. There was no attempt made to verify these figures by the researcher. Of the 2367 pre-employment trainees for which brokers indicated follow-up data, it appears that 43% use the training credit to enter the labour market. Another 34% find a job without such "on the job" training. Some (13%) take additional training. Trainees sponsored by COMM brokers are more likely to use training credits to find a job (65%). Trainees involved with ED brokers are more likely to find a job (42%) or to start another training

**Table IX: Pre-employment Training Results**

(Shown as a cumulative percentage of total responses\*  
to the end of March 1994)

Brokers	Started Training Credit	Found a Job	Took Other Training	Unknown	Total
MUN (6)	17% (105)	39% (235)	12% (72)	32% (193)	100% (605)
COMM (5)	65% (772)	28% (340)	6% (69)	1% (15)	100% (1196)
ED (4)	27% (150)	42% (239)	30% (170)	1% (7)	100% (566)
Total (15)	43% (1027)	34% (814)	13% (311)	9% (215)	99%** (2367)

(Actual numbers are shown in brackets)

\*This represents the responses of the 15 brokers who completed question 11(c) and who followed up on 2367 trainees out of 5709 who started the training.

\*Does not equal 100% because of rounding.

course (30%). MUN broker trainees are more likely to find employment (39%).

v) *Effectiveness in helping Social Assistance Recipients Become Employed*

When asked whether pre-employment training was effective in helping SARs become employed [survey question 13(a)], eleven of the brokers rated this component as very effective or effective. Six said it was neutral and three rated such training ineffective. There was little difference in these ratings among the three groups of brokers.

Provincial staff advised that there were data problems on the pre-employment component of the program but said that brokers had become more selective recently in their purchases of such training. Initially brokers were being pressured by institutions to buy more of the same training.<sup>43</sup>

b) *Training Credits*

i) *Clients Assisted/Dollars Expended*

Brokers were requested to indicate the number of training credits achieved compared to their targets for the fiscal years ending on March 31, 1993 and March 31, 1994. They were also to indicate their program expenditures for the same periods. Tables X and XI summarize the responses to questions 3 and 4 regarding training credits. One MUN broker provided results on a calendar year basis so did not report any achievement for 1992/93. Another MUN broker had a unique situation and also did not report any results for the first year. Compared to their first year targets, COMM brokers performed the best (ie. a 68% achievement). ED and MUN brokers

---

<sup>43</sup> Summary of replies to interview question 7 by the minister and senior JobsOntario staff.

**Table X: jobsOntario Training Credit Targets/Achievements**

<u>Brokers</u>		3 T.	3 A.	% A.	4 T.	4 A.	% A.	T. T.	T. A.	% A.
MUN	1	1036	178	17.2%	1277	884	69.2%	2313	1062	45.9%
	3	264	385	145.8%	2002	1776	88.7%	2266	2161	95.4%
	4	60	45	75.0%	145	160	110.3%	205	205	100.0%
	5	154	154	100.0%	374	374	100.0%	528	528	100.0%
	7	112	41	36.6%	605	605	100.0%	717	646	90.1%
	10	45	24	53.3%	75	50	66.7%	120	74	61.7%
	11	88	32	36.4%	130	56	43.1%	218	88	40.4%
	12	250	80	32.0%	408	271	66.4%	658	351	53.3%
	18	0	0		394	308	78.2%	394	308	78.2%
	19	0	0		1874	879	46.9%	1874	879	46.9%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>		<b>2009</b>	<b>939</b>	<b>46.7%</b>	<b>7284</b>	<b>5363</b>	<b>73.6%</b>	<b>9293</b>	<b>6302</b>	<b>67.8%</b>
COMM	23	90	109	121.1%	638	406	63.6%	728	515	70.7%
	24	28	28	100.0%	110	110	100.0%	138	138	100.0%
	27	30	30	100.0%	60	200	333.3%	90	230	255.6%
	30	240	119	49.6%	511	295	57.7%	751	414	55.1%
	32	125	63	50.4%	225	227	100.9%	350	290	82.9%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>		<b>513</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>68.0%</b>	<b>1544</b>	<b>1238</b>	<b>80.2%</b>	<b>2057</b>	<b>1587</b>	<b>77.2%</b>
ED	38	60	64	106.7%	300	315	105.0%	360	379	105.3%
	40	375	134	35.7%	738	734	99.5%	1113	868	78.0%
	42	370	27	7.3%	701	584	83.3%	1071	611	57.0%
	43	15	18	120.0%	19	22	115.8%	34	40	117.6%
	44	533	533	100.0%	1456	1456	100.0%	1989	1989	100.0%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>		<b>1353</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>57.4%</b>	<b>3214</b>	<b>3111</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	<b>4567</b>	<b>3887</b>	<b>85.1%</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>3875</b>	<b>2064</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	<b>12042</b>	<b>9712</b>	<b>80.7%</b>	<b>15917</b>	<b>11776</b>	<b>74.0%</b>

3T.=1992/93 Target  
 3A.=1992/93 Achieved  
 %A=Percentage Achieved

4T.=1993/94 Target  
 4A.=1993/94 Achieved  
 T.T.=Total Target

T.A.=Total Achieved

**Table XI: jobsOntario Training Credit Expenditures (expressed in dollars)**

<u>Brokers</u>		<b>3 B.</b>	<b>3 E.</b>	<b>% E.</b>	<b>4 B.</b>	<b>4 E.</b>	<b>% E.</b>	<b>T. B.</b>	<b>T. E.</b>	<b>% E.</b>
MUN	1	6216000	938864	15.1%	7662000	6553765	85.5%	13878000	7492629	54.0%
	3	1834319	1834319	100.0%	15534799	15534799	100.0%	17369118	17369118	100.0%
	4	360000	337500	93.8%	870000	1200000	137.9%	1230000	1537500	125.0%
	5	273272	273272	100.0%	916864	916864	100.0%	1190136	1190136	100.0%
	7	784000	89090	11.4%	6510000	1833371	28.2%	7294000	1922461	26.4%
	10	270000	161700	59.9%	450000	414042	92.0%	720000	575742	80.0%
	11	528000	99821	18.9%	800000	294888	36.9%	1328000	394709	29.7%
	12	2896850	62065	2.1%	2698000	427070	15.8%	5594850	489135	8.7%
	18	0	0		2505544	1146765	45.8%	2505544	1146765	45.8%
	19	0	0		7794000	4099036	52.6%	7794000	4099036	52.6%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>		<b>13162441</b>	<b>3796631</b>	<b>28.8%</b>	<b>45741207</b>	<b>32420600</b>	<b>70.9%</b>	<b>58903648</b>	<b>36217231</b>	<b>61.5%</b>
COMM	23	540000	280667	52.0%	3464500	1408520	40.7%	4004500	1689187	42.2%
	24	217505	217505	100.0%	642893	642893	100.0%	860398	860398	100.0%
	27	180000	110000	61.1%	360000	600000	166.7%	540000	710000	131.5%
	30	1440000	171444	11.9%	2820000	1243493	44.1%	4260000	1414937	33.2%
	32	75000	292000	389.3%	1350000	1131000	83.8%	1425000	1423000	99.9%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>		<b>2452505</b>	<b>1071616</b>	<b>43.7%</b>	<b>8637393</b>	<b>5025906</b>	<b>58.2%</b>	<b>11089898</b>	<b>6097522</b>	<b>55.0%</b>
ED	38	35127	35127	100.0%	853000	853000	100.0%	888127	888127	100.0%
	40	2250000	842920	37.5%	4428000	2236435	50.5%	6678000	3079355	46.1%
	42	3098750	177214	5.7%	4907000	2353810	48.0%	8005750	2531024	31.6%
	43	94170	94170	100.0%	101000	101000	100.0%	195170	195170	100.0%
	44	2888316	2888316	100.0%	6530397	6530397	100.0%	9418713	9418713	100.0%
<b>SUB-TOTALS</b>		<b>8366363</b>	<b>4037747</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>16819397</b>	<b>12074642</b>	<b>71.8%</b>	<b>25185760</b>	<b>16112389</b>	<b>64.0%</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>23981309</b>	<b>8905994</b>	<b>37.1%</b>	<b>71197997</b>	<b>49521148</b>	<b>69.6%</b>	<b>95179306</b>	<b>58427142</b>	<b>61.4%</b>

3B.=1992/93 Budget  
 3E.=1992/93 Expenditures  
 %E.=Percentage Expended

4B.=1993/94 Budget  
 4E.=1993/94 Expenditures  
 T.B.=Total Budget

T.E.=Total Expenditures

lagged behind at 57% and 47% respectively. In the second year, ED brokers achieved the best results. On a cumulative 2 year basis, ED brokers achieved 85% of their targeted credits, while community agencies and municipalities lagged behind at 77% and 68% respectively. Of the 20 brokers, nine had achieved at least 90% of their targets by the end of the second year. Broker responses to these two questions do not match with replies to question 12 on types of training credits obtained (ie. total credits achieved is reported as 11,776 compared to 10,677). Therefore some caution regarding the validity of the data must be raised. The total costs for the 11,766 training credits was \$58,427,142; each credit costing about \$4,961 (exclusive of admin. costs).

ii) Types of Jobs Created

Broker responses to question 12(a) are summarized in Table XII. The majority of jobs were created in the manufacturing sector (34%). Retail and wholesale trade accounted for another 17% of new positions. The "other services" sector provided 8% of the jobs. The accommodation, food and beverages sector followed at 7% and the business services sector rounded out the top six at 6%.

This categorization of jobs was used, as the researcher was advised it coincided with what brokers were reporting to JOT, Toronto. However it does not indicate the types of occupations that trainees were being recruited for, in the various sectors. When asked their opinion, eleven brokers were satisfied that the classification according to industry was an adequate description of the types of jobs created. Five were not satisfied, citing the



Table XII: Types of jobs Ontario Training Credits (for the period ending March 31/94)

<u>Brokers</u>	AF/B	Agri.	Bus. Serv.	Comm.	Const.	Ed. Serv.	Fin.	H&SS	Log.	Manu.	Other Serv.	R/E	Ret. Trd.	Trans.	Whole. Trd.
MUN 1	80	24	86	42	182	32	36	30	43	224	481	26	190	26	16
3	139	18	101	20	109	16	46	48	7	1010	249	21	275	39	121
4	0	10	0	0	32	0	6	15	0	24	38	7	64	4	0
5	67	33	62	9	14	1	15	4	4	157	62	0	73	19	8
7	16	47	41	13	35	1	9	14	0	208	19	9	20	6	44
11	2	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	2	55	17	0	2	1	3
12	135	32	38	27	67	1	13	15	1	469	145	4	50	29	15
18	18	0	7	4	5	0	1	19	0	144	35	0	22	7	46
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>2291</b>	<b>1046</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>253</b>
COMM 24	16	13	7	0	9	0	0	0	0	189	2	0	8	3	0
30	36	8	7	1	22	0	5	12	6	243	60	2	71	16	29
32	75	4	12	5	57	0	2	4	1	66	68	13	50	2	16
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>45</b>
ED 38	33	0	52	0	95	0	34	0	0	70	26	0	113	0	0
40	97	14	49	4	91	5	22	12	1	89	90	16	209	33	37
42	19	8	40	8	52	1	7	22	1	249	99	4	58	23	20
43	9	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	13	4	2
44	46	4	154	28	65	14	19	29	0	386	235	31	148	49	167
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>226</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>788</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3583</b>	<b>1627</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>1306</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>524</b>

AF/B=accommodation, food & beverages services  
 Agri.=agriculture & related  
 Bus. Serv.=business services  
 Comm.=communication & other utility  
 Const.=construction

Ed. Serv.=education services (incl. child care)  
 Fin.=finance & insurance  
 H&SS=health & social services  
 Log.=logging & forestry  
 Manu.=manufacturing

Other Serv.=other services  
 R/E=real estate operator & insurance agent  
 Ret.Trd.=retail trade  
 Trans.=transportation & storage  
 Whole.Trd.=Wholesale Trade

reasons that manufacturing is too large a category and that the approach is not specific regarding type of job.<sup>44</sup>

iii) Utilization of Training Credits by Social Assistance Recipients

In their response to question 12(b), project managers indicated 37% (3466) of all training credits were filled by SARs. Five of the brokers did not report figures for this question. The results are summarized in Table XIII.

Surprisingly there are no significant differences when comparing the number of SARs placed among the three broker groups.

iv) Perceived Effectiveness

All but one broker rated the use of the training credit as either an effective or a very effective way to help social assistance recipients become employed.<sup>45</sup>

Provincial staff indicate that brokers report that only 35% of training credits are filled by SARs. However when compared with the Ministry of Community and Social Services records, about 45% of placements are SARs. From the provincial perspective the training credit is an effective way to help SARs obtain work.<sup>46</sup>

5) Program Supports

a) Day Care

Only thirteen brokers reported target and achievement figures for day care supports and only six broke the figures into the individual two year periods.

---

<sup>44</sup> Broker responses to survey question 12(c).

<sup>45</sup> Broker responses to survey question 13(a).

<sup>46</sup> Gleaned from interview replies by senior JobsOntario staff and the minister to questions 7 and 8 of their interviews.

**Table XIII - JobsOntario Training Credits Filled by Social Assistance Recipients (SARS)**

<b>Brokers</b>	<b>Credits Filled by SARS</b>	<b>Total Credits*</b>	<b>% Filled by SARS</b>
<b>MUN (7)</b>	<b>1663</b>	<b>4287</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>COMM (4)</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1449</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>ED (4)</b>	<b>1303</b>	<b>3508</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>Total (15)</b>	<b>3466</b>	<b>9244</b>	<b>37%</b>

\*Figures used from results reported in table X. Only the 15 brokers who reported actuals for Question 12(b) are included.

As a result only cumulative data is shown in Table XIV. The data on dollars expended on day care are not shown because of insufficient responses. Of the 6301 clients placed either in pre-employment training or in a training credit positions only 993 required subsidized day care support (9%). Interestingly, there are little differences among the three broker groups in regard to the achieving of their day care targets. However when one compares the number of day care spaces used to total credits/pre-employment spaces achieved a different result emerges. As Table XIV illustrates MUN brokers are more likely to use this employment support for participants. Overall the results reported indicate that about one in ten training participant requires subsidized day care.

b) Employment Supports

i) Expenditures

Brokers spent \$39,284 by March 31/93 in providing other employment supports to participants. In year two, \$244,707 were expended. MUN brokers spent most of such employment supports for the two years (\$153,985). This compares to \$75,182 spent by ED brokers and \$54,824 spent by COMM agencies. These results are not surprising, since municipalities have provided SARs such supports under other programs. However one MUN broker accounted for 39% of the total expenses and is probably the reason MUN brokers appear to be using this program component more than the other two broker groups.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Broker responses to survey questions 3 and 4.

**Table XIV: Utilization of Day Care Spaces by jobsOntario Participants  
(May 7, 1992 to March 31, 1994)**

<b>Brokers</b>	<b>Total Target</b>	<b>Total Achieved</b>	<b>% Achieved</b>	<b>Total Pre-Employment Training</b>	<b>Total Training Credits</b>	<b>Total Training</b>	<b>% Using Day Care</b>
MUN (5)	1174	727	61.9%	2165	3684	5849	12%
COMM (All)	264	180	68.2%	2095	1587	3682	5%
ED (3)	133	86	64.7%	449	1030	1479	6%
<b>Total (13)</b>	<b>1571</b>	<b>993</b>	<b>63.2%</b>	<b>4709</b>	<b>6301</b>	<b>11,010</b>	<b>9%</b>

ii) Types of Employment Related Expenses

The results of survey question 5 are summarized in Table XV. From this chart it appears that ED brokers use these supports the most for their clients. However only five of the MUN and 3 of the COMM brokers answered this question. By looking only at those brokers who answered both questions an average cost per trainee can be calculated. The lower cost per trainee for the ED group is probably caused by the large number of transportation supports provided (compared to the large number of renovations authorized by community brokers). Work clothes/boots and transportation costs are the supports most required by trainees.

c) Need for Employment Supports

i) Broker View

In their replies to question 14(a) brokers rate the availability of child care and other employment related expenses as either helpful or very helpful in allowing social assistance recipients to take part in the jobsOntario training programs. Out of 20 responses only three rated child care neutral and one rated it as not helpful. Only 2 rated other employment supports as neutral and one rated them as not helpful.

ii) Provincial View<sup>48</sup>

Provincial officials estimated that one subsidized child care space would be needed for every five participants. However the take-up is not at that level. It appears that participants are using the informal child care system as per anecdotal reports from brokers.

---

<sup>48</sup> Summary of responses by senior staff to interview question 9.

**Table XV: Number of JobsOntario Participants Assisted with Employment Related Expenses (May 1992 to March 1994)**

Brokers	Work Clothes & Boots	Transportation	Certificates or Licenses	Equip. & Renovations (for disabled)	Others	Total	Total* Expenditures	Average per Trainee
MUN (5)	154	115	4	0	28	301	\$26,067	\$87
COMM (3)	257	138	19	16	0	430	\$41,119	\$96
ED (5)	377	772	19	1	27	1196	\$75,182	\$63
Total (13)	788	1025	42	17	55	1927	\$142,368	\$74

\* excludes those brokers who did not answer question #5 of the survey

d) Administrative Supports/Costs

i) General

Four brokers did not respond to this part of questions 3 and 4. Another broker provided only budget figures. Only two brokers were slightly over-budget by March 31/94. All others had spent at least 73% of their budgets. Table XVI compares program and administrative expenditures to the end of March 1994. Day care program costs are excluded as most brokers did not report these. Costs for program delivery is averaging 21% of total program dollars expended. This is considerably over the target of 11% set-out in the guidelines for the program. Some of this average may be explained by initial start-up costs (most of which are one-time and expended at the start of the program). Another reason for the overage is that brokers only achieved 74% of their targets in training credits by the end of March 31st. Presumably if these had been achieved the expenditures would be higher by 26%. This would reduce the percentage from 21% to 17%. Finally brokers only spent 71% of their pre-employment training by March 31st. If these had been used, the expenditures would be higher by 29%. This would reduce the percentage from 17% to 16%.

ii) Broker/Provincial Attitude on Program Costs

When asked if this was an expensive way to create jobs, brokers tended to disagree or strongly disagree (see Table III). ED brokers were most likely to disagree with this. COMM workers were split on their opinions regarding costs and as a group were neutral about the statement. Only one MUN broker believed it was an expensive way to create jobs.



**Table XVI: jobsOntario Administrative Costs Compared to Program Expenditures\*  
(for the period May 1992 to March 1994)**

<b>Brokers</b>	<b>Pre-Employ. Expenditures</b>	<b>Train. Credit Expenditures</b>	<b>Employment Related Expenses</b>	<b>Total Program Expenditures</b>	<b>Admin. Costs</b>	<b>Admin.Costs % of Prog. Expenditures</b>
MUN (9)	\$3,118,617	\$35,027,095	\$144,268	\$38,289,980	\$7,434,227	19.4%
COMM (4)	\$615,705	\$5,387,522	\$41,824	\$6,045,051	\$1,532,732	25.4%
ED (2)	\$324,510	\$3,274,525	\$24,631	\$3,623,666	\$1,175,719	32.4%
Totals (15)	\$4,058,832	\$43,689,142	\$210,723	\$47,958,697	\$10,142,678	21.1%

\* excludes day care expenditures

Provincial staff believe it is a cheap way to create jobs.<sup>49</sup> It is cheaper than N.B. Works or SSEP (Ontario Program) and costs about the same as Futures (Ontario Program). Staff estimate that it costs about \$10,800 per trainee which includes all costs. This compares favourably with the \$10,400 it costs to keep the average person on welfare for one year. There is a one year pay back period.

6) **Perception of the Program**

a) **Local Community Perspective**

Brokers were requested to provide a perspective on how their communities viewed JOT by rating statements (b), (c) and (d) of question 15. Generally brokers believe that there has been positive local media coverage, that local politicians have been supportive and that program participants have provided positive feedback. (see Table III)

b) **Provincial Perspective**<sup>50</sup>

The use of "jobsOntario" to describe other programs, such as jobsOntario Homes and jobsOntario Capital is viewed in a positive light because it gets people thinking about linking the social and economic components of job creation and generally creates an air of confidence. According to Dr. Allen and Provincial staff the media on a provincial basis have targeted the program and tried to provide as much negative press as possible. An example of this, they

---

<sup>49</sup> Summary of responses by senior staff to Interview question 15.

<sup>50</sup> Summary of responses by the minister to Interview questions 8 and 10 and by senior staff to questions 10 and 12.

site numerous Toronto Star articles and a W5 television documentary aired in the Spring of 1994.

In hindsight, staff would have preferred to have more lead time in getting the program operational, while on the political level a better public relations effort could have portrayed the program in a more realistic light.

## 7) Program Improvements

### a) Program Structure and Components

#### i) Broker Perspective<sup>51</sup>

Brokers recommended a variety of changes to the pre-employment training component of the program. The following were suggested by two or more brokers:

- programs should focus on job search techniques, resume writing, interview skills, etc. (5)
- programs should focus on life skills, goal setting and building self-esteem (4)
- more dollars committed for such program (4)
- more time to consider types of training needed (2)
- better screening of referrals (3).

They also recommended the following changes to the training credit component of the program:

- require external (3rd party) training (4)
- allow for part-time positions to be eligible (2)

Suggestions to make the **child care** component more effective include:

- making more informal/private home day care available (5)
- more spaces (2)
- more accessible locations (2)

---

<sup>51</sup> Broker replies to questions 13(b), 14(b), 15(f) and (g), and 17 of the survey.

Comments made by brokers to move the **employment related expenses** component more effective include:

- make funds available to all JOT participants including SARs (6)
- more money for some cases (2)

Brokers also believe participants need more help for transportation/relocation (5); need more employment counselling assistance (3) and more support in job retention (2) (eg. mediator).

All groups of brokers believe that jobsOntario Training required too much paperwork of brokers. Overall they are neutral regarding paperwork requirements of employers.

When asked to provide comments about JOT, nine brokers provided some (question 17 of the survey). Five brokers are pleased with the broker model that allowed for local community involvement especially relating to local employers.

ii) Provincial Perspective<sup>52</sup>

Provincial staff suggested only two possible changes and these were of the tinkering variety (ie. to make the program more available to Family Benefit recipients and to allow some non-profit organizations to access the training credits). The minister did not have any comments in this regard.

---

<sup>52</sup> Summary of responses by minister to interview question 9 and by senior staff to interview question 11.

b) *Need for On-going Monitoring and Evaluation*

i) *Broker Suggestions*<sup>53</sup>

Five brokers suggested that the linkage/support/communication (training) provided by JOT, Toronto to local brokers should be evaluated in greater detail. Other brokers (3) suggested that an evaluation of the techniques used by brokers to penetrate the employer market would be useful.

ii) *Provincial Perspective*

The planning of a Program should entail an evaluation plan<sup>54</sup>. On the surface it appears the Province did not do this for JOT. To the evaluator's knowledge, the Province is only undertaking a limited evaluation of the program. In April 1994, a number of focus groups were conducted by JOT staff with the various JOT brokers. Groups were held for the project managers and for the senior administrators of broker and sub-broker agencies. Area managers also participated. The Assistant Deputy Minister chaired these sessions. The types of questions discussed at the 1 day session with broker project managers who had sub-brokers agreements are attached (Appendix VI). An agenda for the 1/2 day meeting with senior administrators is also included (Appendix VI). To date, no reports about these sessions have been released.

---

<sup>53</sup> Response of broker to survey question 18.

<sup>54</sup> Peter H. Rossi and Howard E. Freeman, *Evaluation A Systematic Approach* (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc. 1989), p. 145.

In addition, some brokers (eg. Halton, Brant) are undertaking an employer satisfaction survey on the JOT credit component of the program. Results are as yet not available.

When asked about comparing JOT to other provinces' program (eg. N.B. Works), provincial staff indicated that N.B. was very expensive (ie. costs about \$69,000 per person) but needed, because unlike Ontario, New Brunswick could not rely on the private sector to create jobs. They also indicated that B.C., Quebec, Manitoba and New York State had all expressed interest in learning more about JOT. The minister believed the N.B. program was very expensive.<sup>55</sup>

## 8) Program Future

### a) Broker Perspective<sup>56</sup>

Brokers overwhelmingly support an extension of JOT beyond its 3 year mandate. Only two brokers disagreed with the statement that it should be extended.

### b) Provincial Perspective<sup>57</sup>

Both the minister and staff believe JobLink is the natural successor to JOT, although JobLink will have to focus more on the long term unemployed. They believe that JobLink should be modelled after the successes of JOT. The

---

<sup>55</sup> Summary of responses by the minister to Interview question 12 and by senior staff to interview question 14.

<sup>56</sup> Responses of broker to survey question 15(j).

<sup>57</sup> Summary of responses by the minister to Interview question 11 and by senior staff to interview question 13.

minister even believes a local broker model should be used to deliver JobLink (a position that the government seems to have adopted<sup>58</sup>).

They believe brokers will be able to make a smooth transition to the delivery of a new program.

#### **Section IV Analysis and Discussion of Evaluation Data**

This section will attempt to analyze and discuss the evaluation data in relation to the six research questions posed. This data has several limitations in addressing these questions. Only 43% of the brokers responded to the survey. Employer and participant surveys should have been completed. As described earlier, some of the questionnaires were only partially completed, while others presented inconsistent data. Provincial data was not available in the same form as the broker survey.

1) **How effective are the two basic program components (pre-employment training and training credits) in assisting social assistance participants to obtain employment?**

a) **Pre-employment Training**

By March 31, 1994, the 20 brokers responding to the survey had placed 6463 individuals in a variety of pre-employment training courses. (They had purchased 7786 training spaces mainly in job readiness and computer skills.) Based on the sample of follow-up surveys conducted, up to 75% of these trainees completed the training. Pre-employment training participants are most likely to start a training credit (48.4%) or start another job (34.4%). Some take

---

<sup>58</sup> Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services. JobLink Ontario (Toronto: The Ministry, June 21, 1994).

other training courses (13.1%). In a best case scenario, 77.8% (5028) of all pre-employment participants (whether they graduated or not) either enter a training credit job or find another job. Sixty-five per cent of trainees are SARs. Assuming no differences in the success rate between SARs and non-SARs participants, leads one to the conclusion that 3268 recipients found work. The assumption is probably not too optimistic. JOT seems to confirm Perron's conclusion that having direct placement programs (such as the job credit) operating with training programs are more successful in helping SARs find work.<sup>59</sup>

The 20 brokers who responded covered various geographic areas of the province with a population totalling just under 4 million. Unfortunately, the survey did not also request the numbers of clients in receipt of social assistance (general welfare or family benefits), to determine what percentage of the total SARs population, the 3268 trainees who found work through this component represent.

Brokers had budgeted to spend about \$1,390 per trainee, but ended up spending only \$891. Using this cost and the Provincially estimated \$10,400 yearly cost paid to a SARs, this program provides a one month pay-back period. This inexpensive outlay is only for those SARs (34.4%) finding a non-training credit position. There is no indication that brokers follow-up on how long such jobs last or the types of job recipients took. The Province also does not have data on what happens to pre-employment participants. A better

---

<sup>59</sup> Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services Towards Independence: Highlights of the Evaluation of the Employment Opportunities Program (Toronto: Queen's Printer, July 1988).



tracking mechanism is needed. However brokers rate this component as being effective in helping SARs become employed. Gueron had concluded that having welfare recipients participate in activities that prepare people for jobs can be successful and cost-effective.<sup>60</sup>

b) Training Credits

Over the two year period, the twenty brokers placed 11,776 clients in training credit positions with employers. Since the brokers in the survey represent roughly one third of the Province's population, this figure is in line with the roughly 1/3 of the provincially reported result (32,892). Thirty-seven percent of the credits were filled by SARs (4357). The province indicates that this figure could be as high as 45%. The reported cost per credit (\$4,961 exclusive of admin. expenses) would indicate that administration costs appear excessive and/or that the province has over-estimated its reported \$10,800 cost per training credit and/or that the full training credit payment has not been made to the employer for most of the trainees.

By assuming that the 4357 SARs remain off the caseload for one year and using the Provinces \$10,400 yearly cost paid to a SARs, an estimated \$45 million was saved in social assistance costs by Ontario and its various municipalities. If the 45% provincial estimate is used this is increased to \$55 million. Municipal governments have a vested interest in supporting the program (and any successor) as it should reduce municipal welfare costs.

---

<sup>60</sup> Judith M. Gueron, "Work and Welfare: Lessons in Employment Programs," Journal of Economic Perspectives, Volume 4, No. 1 (Winter 1990).

Brokers overwhelmingly rate the training credit as effective in helping SARs become employed. Perron had indicated that programs which provide for direct employment placements through financial incentives to employers are most successful but also most expensive. This evaluation can not determine if a straight wage subsidy could have been as successful.

Overall both the pre-employment training and the training credit components of JOT are successful in helping SARs obtain employment. The costs to provide JOT seem reasonable in comparison to "N.B. Works". Whether the voluntary nature of the program (SARs are not forced to enroll) has made it successful, by encouraging only the most motivated to take part, cannot be ascertained from this evaluation. In addition more study is needed on the type of SARs assisted (ie. single parents, long-term recipients, disabled, younger clients, etc.). A longitudinal study of SARs graduates from pre-employment training and from the training credit (after 1 year) would indicate the long term impacts of the two interventions. (What are the chances such graduates have to return to social assistance?) However, it appears to answer the questions posed by Gueron - spending more money on education and training programs can be effective, (at least in the Canadian context). These two program components should be considered for any successor programs.

2) **How does the availability of child care and employment supports impact on the participation of trainees in the two training program components?**

One in ten training program participants needed subsidized day care support. This is about half of what was expected. According to provincial officials and brokers more use is made of the informal day care system.

Transportation allowances and funds to purchase work clothes and boots are also often needed by training participants. Brokers rate the availability of child care and other employment supports as helpful in allowing SARs to take part in the jobsOntario training programs. The use of these supports confirm the conclusion of both Perron and Lightman who indicated that the availability of child care and funds for employment related expenses are important in helping SARs obtain work.

3) **How effective is the program in creating higher grade jobs?**

Although brokers can report on the types of industries in which jobs were created through the training credit component (eg., 34% in manufacturing), they cannot indicate the types of occupations (clerk, manager, assembler, etc.) for these new jobs. The province claims that the average wages paid to workers on training credits is \$20,500 (annually). This would indicate that jobs are at least paying fairly well and most are being created in the goods producing sector of the economy (manufacturing, agriculture, and logging make up 36% of jobs created). But who is to say that jobs in the various service sectors are also not "higher grade" positions? Classifying jobs created both by industry and occupational category (using National Occupational

Codes) would have provided a better picture on whether jobs were "higher grade". Most brokers believed the classification by industry was adequate in describing the types of jobs created.

Brokers generally agree that JOT is not an expensive way to create jobs. The evaluation could not answer the question if JOT created any jobs that employers were not planning anyways. The Province believed that by providing the training credit employers will hire earlier, will hire more workers and/or will hire a social assistance recipient. An employer survey would shed some light on the employer's rationale for using JOT. An indication of whether a wage subsidy would have had the same enticement on employers to hire SARs could also be obtained.

Callahan and others, Lightman and Gueron all indicated that the availability of jobs (unemployment rates) have a major impact on the success of workfare programs for SARs. With JOT, the Province is trying to help industry create "real" jobs for SARs. In this way, more jobs are made available for SARs so they are motivated to cease their reliance on social assistance. However by hiring SARs, are they excluding other employment applicants who cannot find other work and then end up being on welfare? Are the caseloads really being reduced?

4) **How can the program components be improved?**

a) **Pre-employment training**

According to the brokers, the courses purchased should focus on job search techniques, resume writing, life skills, goal setting and building self-esteem. Referrals for training should be better screened. Brokers should take more

time in selecting the types of training to purchase and more funds should be committed for this component of JOT.

b) **Training credit**

Brokers believe that training credits should require an external (3rd party) training component and criteria should be changed to allow for training of part-time positions. Provincial staff suggest a change in criteria to allow for some non-profit agencies to take part. They also believe both components need to be made more available to Family Benefits recipients.

c) **Child care**

Brokers say more informal/private home day care is needed and that in some areas more spaces are needed. Child care needs to be in more accessible locations in some communities. These issues should be addressed by municipal governments in conjunction with the Ministry of Community and Social Services, in their planning for the child care needs of communities.

d) **Employment Related Expenses**

Such supports should be provided to all participants including SARs and should allow for exceptions to go beyond the maximum ceiling. Both child care and employment related expenses should be available for any successor programs to JOT, especially any program to help SARs enter the work force.

e) **Administration/Delivery**

Brokers suggested the program needed less paperwork for brokers with some saying this reduction was also needed for employers. Some brokers believe participants need more employment counselling assistance and help in job retention. More specific help for transportation and relocation is also required.

5) Is there a relationship between the type of local broker delivering the program and program results? program costs? administrative costs?

a) Program Results

Brokers were able to operationalize the delivery of the training credit portion of JOT fairly quickly. All were providing it by November 1992. There was no difference among the broker groups. Similarly, although pre-employment training was not available until April 1993, in some communities, there were little differences among the three categories of brokers. Municipal brokers were able to provide the day care component faster than the ED and COMM brokers, while the latter two were able to provide employment supports faster. COMM brokers do the best follow-up on their pre-employment trainees. Such trainees are also more likely to find a job using the credit; training involved with ED brokers are equally likely to find a job directly or to enter other training while MUN broker participants are more likely to find employment.

ED brokers appear to be better at achieving their targets in training credits over the 2 year period (85%). While COMM and MUN brokers only achieved 77% and 68% of their targets. However these latter two groups also believed that targets for their communities were unrealistic. There was little difference among the three groups regarding the percentage of SARs assisted by JOT (MUN brokers placed slightly more SARs).

MUN brokers are more apt to provide subsidized day care and other employment supports for their trainees.

**b) Program Costs**

COMM brokers spend less per pre-employment space (\$315) than do MUN (\$1165) and ED (\$1176) brokers. However they also purchase more upgrading and job-readiness training (78%) than do the other brokers (51% and 59% respectively).

COMM brokers also spend less per training credit (\$3842) compared to ED (\$4145) and MUN (\$5747) brokers. Such differences may be the result of the wages paid for trainees.

Expenditures for day care could not be analyzed. COMM brokers spend more per trainee (\$96) on employment supports than do their MUN (\$87) and ED (\$63) counterparts.

**c) Administrative Costs**

ED brokers require more administrative funding (32.4% of program expenditures) to deliver the program. MUN brokers at 19.4% (for admin. costs) require the least, while COMM brokers require 25.4%. The sample size (2) for the ED brokers used to obtain this comparison is very small and may not be indicative of the whole group (see Table XVI).

**6) How can the delivery of the program be improved?**

The province is generally pleased with the use of local brokers to deliver the program. Since there was no provincial government department with the necessary network of local offices and since the province did not want to create another bureaucracy, it decided on the use of local agencies with expertise to deliver the program. This method of delivery is in keeping with the modern trend, especially in the USA whereby the organization that can provide

the program for the least costs, is awarded the contract to do same. However in the selection of JOT brokers, there is no evidence to suggest that costs were the prime factor in arriving at a decision. The proposed broker had to submit a budget under the maximum 11% admin. guideline. Community consensus on the broker appeared to be the deciding factor. The province decided to use this approach in spite of the fact that Osborne and Gaebler indicate that "in services such as job training, brokers are rare. When they do exist in the form of public programs, they are seldom visible or easily accessible to the public".<sup>61</sup>

Roxana Ng determined that by requiring certain documents, governments can make community agencies deliver programs in the manner in which the state wants.<sup>62</sup> Thus local agencies that deliver central government programs become "arms" of the state. Brokers actually view themselves as the representatives (communicators) of JOT in their communities who make decisions on whether companies are eligible for the program. Most see JOT as a natural extension of their current services. Many brokers are convinced they were selected by their communities or by a government representative as the best agency to deliver the Program. The use of advisory committees indicates that most believe they have the full support of their communities as the JOT broker.

---

<sup>61</sup> David Osborne and Ted Gaebler. Reinventing Government (New York: Penguin Books, 1993), p. 291.

<sup>62</sup> Roxana Ng. The Politics of Community Services (Toronto: Garmond Press, 1988), p. 89.



Eighteen of the twenty brokers think that the program should be extended beyond its three year mandate. Five volunteered that the broker model, because it allows for local community involvement is the approach to continue. Small wonder that both brokers and provincial staff believe that the delivery of the program through local brokers is successful. In retrospect, brokers believe that JOT Toronto should have provided more training to brokers; should have provided clearer (more flexible) guidelines and more lead time to plan and organize the program. Most wanted to have only one community broker (no sub-brokers).

Provincial representatives believe that JobLink, the successor to jobsOntario Training for SARs should also be delivered by local brokers. Broker comments may be useful if this delivery method is chosen. However, the Province will have to provide clearer direction and more training to brokers. In addition, a better more consistent manner of broker selection is recommended. By making it more of a competition, perhaps some of the apparently excessive administrative costs (16%) can be reduced.

The use of the broker model certainly has positive impacts from a community development perspective. Many municipal social service departments have extensive experience in the delivery of employment/training programs (some as JOT brokers). Those who also have wide community links should be prepared to bid as brokers for any successor programs to JOT.

**APPENDIX #1**

May 6, 1994

**INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR DR. RICHARD ALLEN  
PROVINCIAL MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR  
JOBSONTARIO IMPLEMENTATION**

- 1) Why was the jobsOntario Training Program initiated by the Province?
- 2) How was it developed? (ie. input received from business, labour, consumers, trainers and staff; modelled on other programs; etc.)
- 3) In your opinion, what are the purposes of the four jobsOntario training program components? (pre-employment training, training credits, child care and employment supports)
- 4) Why was the local broker model used?
- 5) In your opinion, what were the major start-up issues/problems in the implementation of the program?
- 6) Some employers/media have said that jobsOntario is just another wage reimbursement program to employers for hiring the unemployed - what are your comments regarding this?
- 7) How effective are the two jobsOntario training program components (pre-employment training and training credits) in helping social assistance recipients become employed?
- 8) Have all the different aspects of jobsOntario (i.e., Training Fund, Capital Works, Community Development and Entrepreneurial) caused confusion with the general public? Has the packaging of programs produced any benefits for the Training Program?
- 9) What changes would you make to the four program components at this time? (ie. pre-employment training, training credits, child care, and employment supports).
- 10) In hindsight, from the Provincial perspective what if anything would you have changed in implementing the jobsOntario Training Fund?
- 11)a) The Province recently announced that the jobsOntario Training Programs intake has been extended to March 31, 1995, and that the only aspect of Social Assistance Reform that is to proceed is Joblink. Is Joblink the

successor to jobsOntario Training?

- b) If so, what impact will another "new" program, with new definitions, have on the ability of brokers to effectively administer the program?
- 12) How extensively is the Province monitoring the success of similar training/employment programs in other parts of Canada (i.e., New Brunswick, B.C.)?

## APPENDIX #II

May 16, 1994  
10:00 a.m.

### GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR JOBSONTARIO STAFF - TORONTO

- 1) Why was the jobsOntario Training Program initiated by the Province?
- 2) How was it developed? (ie. input received from business, labour, consumers, trainers and staff; modelled on other programs; etc.)
- 3) What are the purposes of the four jobsOntario training program components? (pre-employment training, training credits, child care and employment supports)
- 4)a) Why was the local broker model used?  
b) Describe the role of the broker from the Provincial perspective.
- 5) What were the major start-up issues/problems in the implementation of the program?
- 6) Some employers/media have said that jobsOntario is just another wage reimbursement program to employers for hiring the unemployed - what are your comments regarding this?
- 7) How effective are the two jobsOntario training program components (pre-employment training and training credits) in helping social assistance recipients become employed?
- 8)a) Do you believe that the use of brokers has been an effective method of achieving training credits? Why?  
b) How effective has the use of sub-brokers been in achieving training credit targets?
- 9) How helpful has the availability of additional child care spaces and employment supports been in enabling social assistance recipients take part in the jobsOntario training programs?
- 10) Have all the different aspects of jobsOntario (i.e., Training Fund, Capital Works, Community Development and Entrepreneurial) caused confusion with the general public? Has the packaging of programs produced any benefits for the Training Program?

- 11) What changes would you make to the four program components at this time? (ie. pre-employment training, training credits, child care, and employment supports).
- 12) In hindsight, from the Provincial perspective what if anything would you have changed in implementing the jobsOntario Training Fund?
- 13)a) The Province recently announced that the jobsOntario Training Programs intake has been extended to March 31, 1995, and that the only aspect of Social Assistance Reform that is to proceed is Joblink. Is Joblink the successor to jobsOntario Training?
  - b) If so, what impact will another "new" program, with new definitions, have on the ability of brokers to effectively administer the program?
- 14) How extensively is the Province monitoring the success of similar training/employment programs in other parts of Canada (i.e., New Brunswick, B.C.)?
- 15) Is this an expensive way to create jobs?

**APPENDIX #III**

1994 May 9

Ms. jobsOntario Broker  
Project Manager  
jobsOntario Project  
Anycity, ON  
LOX 1P2

Dear Ms. Broker:

**Re: Evaluation of the jobsOntario Training Program**

As part of the requirements for the Master of Public Administration Program at the University of Western Ontario, a major research paper is necessary. In order to meet this requirement, I am doing an evaluation of the jobsOntario Training Program.

The evaluation will focus on initial start-up and program results to the end of March 31, 1994. Issues that will be addressed include:

- the effects of the two basic components in assisting social assistance participants obtain work
- the use of local brokers in program delivery
- the availability of child care and employment supports on the participation of trainees
- the success of the program in the creation of training placements and jobs
- potential improvements that can be made to the program components

In order to conduct the evaluation, all jobsOntario brokers (Project Managers) are being asked to complete a questionnaire. In addition, all five area managers of the Program are being requested to complete the attached questionnaire. Joan Andrew, the Assistant Deputy Minister of jobsOntario Training, is supportive of this study. Questionnaire respondents will be assured complete confidentiality. All results will be summarized without identification of individual respondents.

Your assistance is being requested. Please complete the attached questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by May 24, 1994. It will probably require about 1/2 hour of your time. An executive summary of the final report will be sent to all area managers.

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,



M. J. Schuster  
Student (part-time), M.P.A. Program  
University of Western Ontario, and  
Commissioner, Social Services, Region of Hamilton-Wentworth

MJS:rf

Attach.

I.D. Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Confidentiality:**

Please be assured that any information obtained from you during the interview and any subsequent discussion will not be identified directly when findings are reported. Both your name and location will be coded as a number to ensure complete confidentiality. No organizational affiliation will be directly identified.

**Permission:**

I am seeking your permission to participate in this study.

Written permission is given:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please return this copy with the completed Questionnaire.**



I.D. Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Confidentiality:**

Please be assured that any information obtained from you during the interview and any subsequent discussion will not be identified directly when findings are reported. Both your name and location will be coded as a number to ensure complete confidentiality. No organizational affiliation will be directly identified.

**Permission:**

I am seeking your permission to participate in this study.

Written permission is given:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**For your records.**

I.D. Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR jobsONTARIO LOCAL BROKERS**

1. Name of Broker: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Name and position of person completing the survey: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**As jobsOntario data is compiled on a fiscal year basis, your responses should reflect same. However, if your agency uses the calendar year for statistical/budgetary purposes, complete questions 3, 4, 5, 11 and 12 using your calendar year data (i.e., for 1992 and 1993). Check here if your responses are based on a calendar year: \_\_\_\_\_.**

*The information on this page is to be used by the researcher for follow-up purposes only. Completed questionnaires will be assigned an identification number and included in the overall results. All results will be summarized without identification of individual respondents or the organizations they represent.*

**Section A: (General Results)**

1. Total Population for your brokerage area: \_\_\_\_\_
2. On what dates were the following jobsOntario Training Fund programs initiated through your office:

	Planned Start Date Month/Year	Actual Start Date Month/Year
Pre-employment training		
Training credit		
Additional day care spaces		
Employment supports		

3. Please provide your target numbers and budget figures for the various jobsOntario Training Fund programs for 1992/93 and 1993/94 (fiscal years):  
(i.e., for the periods ending March 31/93 and March 31/94)

	1992/93		1993/94	
	Target	Budget	Target	Budget
Pre-employment training seats				
Training credits started				
Additional day care spaces utilized				
Expenditures on employment supports	---		---	
Administrative costs	---		---	

4. Please provide your achievements/expenditures for the various jobsOntario Training Fund programs for 1992/93 and 1993/94 (fiscal years):

(a)

Achievements by Number of	1992/93	1993/94
Pre-employment training (individuals)		
Training credits achieved		
Additional day care spaces utilized		

b)

Expenditure by Amounts (\$)	1992/93	1993/94
Pre-employment training expenditures		
Training credits expenditures		
Additional day care spaces expenditures		
Expenditures on employment supports		
Administrative costs		

5. What types of employment supports were provided to participants in 1992/93 and 1993/94 (fiscal years)? (In each column, please list number of clients helped by providing this support.)

	1992/93	1993/94
Work clothes/boots		
Transportation		
Certification or licenses		
Equipment or renovations to allow for the hiring of a person with a disability		
Others (i.e., eye glasses). Please name		

6. In your opinion, what are the purposes of the four jobsOntario program components?

Pre-employment training \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Training credits \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Child care \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Employment supports \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Section B: (Start-Up/Broker Organization)**

7 a) Why did your agency become involved in the delivery of jobsOntario programs?  
(check as many as applicable)

Selected by community representatives \_\_\_\_\_

Previous experience in delivering such programs \_\_\_\_\_

Natural extension of current services \_\_\_\_\_

Nominated by government representative \_\_\_\_\_

Way to avoid lay-offs \_\_\_\_\_

Others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b) How did your agency provide the necessary resources for program administration?  
Please indicate if jobsOntario Administrative dollars (jobsAdmin.), external contribution or internal contribution.

	jobsAdmin.	External Contributions	Internal Contributions
Transportation			
Accommodation			
Furniture			
Office Equipment & Computers			
Staff			
Supervision			
Administrative Supports			
Board/Community Assistance			
Others (please specify)			

8. How do you describe the role of the broker? (check as many as applicable)

- jobsOntario representative in the community \_\_\_\_\_
- We do what jobsOntario in Toronto wants \_\_\_\_\_
- Communicator for jobsOntario central \_\_\_\_\_
- Makes decisions on local company eligibility \_\_\_\_\_
- in the program \_\_\_\_\_
- Limited decision-making power on policy \_\_\_\_\_
- and program changes \_\_\_\_\_
- Full decision-making power on how to allocate \_\_\_\_\_
- the 4 program components \_\_\_\_\_

Other (describe) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9 a) Were sub-brokers involved in your community's delivery of the training credit components of the program?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

(if no, go to question #10)

b) If yes, check type of agency and how many in each category.

\_\_\_\_\_ Community College \_\_\_\_\_ (# of sub-brokers)

\_\_\_\_\_ Board of Education \_\_\_\_\_ (# of sub-brokers)

\_\_\_\_\_ Community Agencies \_\_\_\_\_ (# of sub-brokers)  
(indicate type e.g.,  
Housing Help Centre)

c) From your experience, do you believe that the use of sub-brokers is an effective method of achieving training credit targets? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_.

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If no, what changes are you considering? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10 a) Does your agency have a jobsOntario Advisory Committee?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please answer the following:

b) Number of persons serving on the Committee:

External \_\_\_\_\_

Internal \_\_\_\_\_

c) What agencies/organizations are represented on this Committee?

Boards of Education	_____
Social Services/Welfare Department	_____
Local Community College	_____
Canada Employment Centre	_____
Ministry of Community & Social Services	_____
Consumers	_____
Community Agencies	_____
Private Trainers	_____
Others (please specify)	_____

d) What is the role of the Advisory Committee? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Section C: (Specific Results)**

11 a) What type of pre-employment training spaces have you purchased in each category?  
(fiscal years)

	1992/93 (# of individuals)	1993/94 (# of individuals)
English/French literacy		
Basic upgrading		
Job readiness		
Computer skills		
Communication skills		
Other (Please indicate)		

b) How many of the pre-employment training spaces (actual numbers) were utilized by social assistance recipients? (fiscal years)

1992/93 \_\_\_\_\_ (to March 31/93)

1993/94 \_\_\_\_\_ (April 1/93 to March 31/94)

c) Pre-employment training results:

Number of Participants	1992/93	1993/94
Who completed course		
Who on training credit		
Who found a non training credit job		
Who entered other training/education		
Unknown (please specify)		



12 a) Indicate the number of training credits (jobs) created in your community by type of industry in 1992 and 1993 (fiscal years).

(This information should be accessible through your jOT information systems incorporating the Report Writer software package.)

INDUSTRY TYPE	1992/93	1993/94
Accommodation, Food and Beverages Services		
Agriculture and Related (includes food processing)		
Business Services		
Communication & Other Utility		
Construction		
Education Services (including child care)		
Finance and Insurance		
Health and Social Services		
Logging and Forestry		
Manufacturing		
Other Services		
Real Estate Operator & Insurance Agent		
Retail Trade		
Transportation and Storage		
Wholesale Trade		

b) How many of these training credits (actual numbers) were achieved/obtained by social assistance recipients? (fiscal years)

1992/93 \_\_\_\_\_ (until March 31/93)

1993/94 \_\_\_\_\_ (April 1/93 to March 31/94)

c) Is this approach to the classification of industry (e.g., manufacturing) in your community an adequate description of the types of jobs that were created? (If no, please explain.)

---



---



---



---



---

**Section D: (Comments/Opinions)**

13 a) In your opinion, how effective are these two jobsOntario Training Fund programs delivered by you (and your sub-brokers) in helping social assistance recipients become employed?

	Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Not Effective
Pre-employment Training	_____	_____	_____	_____
Training Credits	_____	_____	_____	_____

b) How could the programs be made more effective?

(i) Pre-employment training \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---



---

(ii) Training credits \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---



---

14 a) In your opinion, has the availability of additional child care spaces and employment supports helped social assistance recipients to take part in the jobsOntario programs (pre-employment and training credits)?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Neutral	Not Helpful
Child Care	_____	_____	_____	_____
Employment Supports	_____	_____	_____	_____

b) What changes could be made to these program components to make them more effective?

(i) Child care \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(ii) Employment supports \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

iii) Other supports needed (please indicate) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

15. Please rate the following statements on a scale of one to five with:

- 1 = strong disagreement
- 2 = disagreement
- 3 = neutral
- 4 = agreement
- 5 = strong agreement

Please circle a rating for each of the following statements:

- a) The initial jobsOntario goals for this community were realistic.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- b) There has been positive media coverage of jobsOntario in this community.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- c) Local politicians have been supportive of jobsOntario in general.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- d) There has been positive feedback from program participants.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- e) There was sufficient administrative funding provided to brokers to deliver the program.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- f) The jobsOntario training credit program has too much paperwork for employers.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- g) The jobsOntario training program has too much paperwork for brokers.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- h) There was sufficient training provided to brokers by jobsOntario staff from Toronto.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- i) There was sufficient direction/communication provided by jobsOntario staff to brokers to enable them to deliver the four components of jobsOntario training.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- j) The jobsOntario training program should be extended past the three-year mandate.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- k) This is an expensive way to create jobs.  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5

**Note: Your responses to the following questions are important feedback about the management and planning of the program.**

**16 a) In hindsight, from your perspective as a broker, what if anything would you have changed in implementing the jobsOntario Training Fund?**

	Yes	No
No change	_____	_____
Would not have used local brokers (have the Province directly administer)	_____	_____
Would have had only one local broker (without any sub-brokers)	_____	_____
Provided clearer guidelines on Program to brokers	_____	_____
Other changes (specify)	_____	_____
	_____	_____

**b) Please elaborate on your responses to 16 a):**

---

---

---

---

---

**17. Please make any other comments you wish to make about the jobsOntario Training Fund programs delivered by local brokers.**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

18. If you were to administer your own survey, what questions would you include?  
Please respond to your questions.

a) Question: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Response: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

b) Question: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Response: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

c) Question: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Response: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

*Thank you for your assistance!*

## APPENDIX IV

### Broker Selection Process (2 examples)

The process for broker selection in each area of Ontario varied from community to community. In some areas of the Province, a broker representative was to cover the geographic boundaries of a Regional Municipality, in others neighbouring counties were to have one broker for both entities. In May of 1992, selected organizations in each designated geographic area of the province were sent letters outlining the jobsOntario Training program (including a description of the local broker model for delivery of the various program components). These agencies were nominated by local offices of the various Provincial ministries (eg. Ministry of Community and Social Services) as the potential jobsOntario brokers. Any of these invitees could prepare a submission to be designated the local broker for their geographic area. Corporate jobsOntario in Toronto selected the successful applicant. In theory each of the proposed brokers was to have the support of the community(ies) which they represented. In theory also, the process for broker selection was to be similar in each area.

In practice the manner in which brokers were finalized varied substantially in each part of the Province. The following two examples highlight some of these differences.

#### Case I: Regional Municipality (mainly urban area)

In this situation, the three area boards of education, the local community college, the Regional Municipalities' Social Services Department and three community employment agencies were all sent invitation letters. The Social Services Department co-ordinated a meeting for all invitees (plus reps from the area MCSS and the CEC offices). At the meeting the college representative explained that jobsOntario had advised that all invitees could be designated as a broker for the area. As a result all those present (except the Boards) agreed to prepare a proposal to jobsOntario for a local brokerage. The boards argued that another community agency should also be allowed to apply and that they would apply to deliver only the pre-employment program. The municipality wanted to only deliver the child care and employment supports components of jobsOntario Training. All those present agreed to support each others submissions.

- - \ The college invited jobsOntario (Toronto) staff to another meeting. At that meeting it was explained that there was to be only one local broker but that this broker could contract with various community agencies to deliver parts or all four of the program components.

Another meeting of the interested agencies was called. At that time a consensus was reached that the Regional Social Services Department should be the local broker. The other invitees except the Boards all wanted to be sub-brokers. The Social Services Department was thus given the task of preparing a proposal to jobsOntario which was to combine the various proposals of the now sub-brokers. It was also decided that the invitees along with reps from the local MCSS and CEC offices would form a local jobsOntario Advisory Committee.

As a result the targets for training credits and pre-employment training were a compilation of what the various agencies proposed. Further, since the Boards of Education and the College were mainly interested in delivery the pre-employment training component, the broker had very little leeway in the purchase of such training. Most of the pre-employment training "had" to be obtained from the college and the boards of education.

Just as the Department was negotiating its final targets/costs with Toronto, political influence was exerted and another community agency was accepted as a sub-broker.

Costs of admin. for program delivery were not considered an issue in the process as long as the broker did not exceed the 11% maximum program guideline. However, because of the unclear direction provided by jobsOntario corporate during the initial stages, the local broker was hampered in the selection of sub-brokers and of pre-employment training spaces.

**Case II: Two Counties (mainly rural areas)**

In this case, seven organizations were invited: 3 school boards, one college, two municipal social services departments and one community agency.

The senior managers of these agencies had two meetings after receiving their letters. They quickly reached a consensus that their communities (2 counties) would make only one submission to jobsOntario corporate.



- ~ The community agency was selected and given a free hand in developing the proposal. The other six agencies served in an advisory capacity only.

The apparent ease with which this area selected their broker was based on the years of joint planning these agencies had previously undertaken in developing responses to other community needs.

**Some Conclusions: (based on the above examples)**

- Brokerage selection was not based on any rational process -- except the rudiments of community consensus building. However, such consensus was derived from only the selected interested parties at the table.
- There was political involvement in the selection of sub-brokers (and possibly in the overall selection process).
- Consumers were conspicuously absent from the selection of brokers.
- The process (sending out letters to potential brokers) empowered agencies on the one hand and then limited eventual brokers in their dealings with such interested players (those who were not selected).

## APPENDIX V

### Technical Notes: Administration of Surveys and Conducting of Interviews

During the administration of the broker surveys and in conducting the interviews with the minister and the senior jobsOntario bureaucrats. Several items were noted by the researcher.

#### a) Administration of Surveys

- Only 2 of the 3 executive directors responded to the pre-test of the questionnaire. These respondents varied greatly in their estimation of the time required to complete the survey ie. 1 1/2 - 12 hrs.
- Having the ADM of jobsOntario send out a covering memo supporting the questionnaire was probably a good tactic (see attached). This approach was used when one of the pre-test brokers contacted jobsOntario corporate to obtain permission to complete the survey.
- Because of a programming error, the final version of the letter introducing the questionnaire indicated that it would take only "1/2" hour to complete the document, instead of the intended "1-2" hours. Over half of the respondents commented that the questionnaire took over 2 hours to complete.
- Because the list of executive directors (supplied by jobsOntario) of brokerage agencies was out-of-date, four of the agencies had to be sent a second copy of the questionnaire.
- Telephone follow-ups were conducted for all non-respondents after about 4 weeks. Often messages were left for executive directors who did not return calls.
- A fax message was sent to all non-respondents four weeks after the deadline for returned questionnaires. This elicited many return calls and an additional five completed questionnaires.
- the use of a "fax" reminder letter may be a useful way to obtain replies (before making telephone calls).
- Most respondents do not readily provide narrative comments ie, only nine out of 20 respondents provided "other comments" (question 17) and only four provided "other questions" (question 18).

b) **Conducting of Interviews**

- Using a "voice activated" tape recorder is not a good way to obtain the full flavour of the respondents' answers. The reply provided by the minister to question 1 was taped in this manner. The beginning of his sentences were sometimes not recorded. Fortunately the interviewer noticed this and corrected for same by having the tape run throughout the remainder of the interview.
- In conducting the group interview, an awkward rectangular seating arrangement did not allow for eye contact with all participants and thus two respondents provided most of the responses.
- Not having enough tapes (dictating machine tapes only carry about 12 minutes per side -- not the indicated 15) led to the use of a portable word processor for recording the responses to questions 12 and 13 in the group interview.
- Unfortunately the portable word processor battery also gave out and this resulted in the use of note taking for the last two questions (both of these indicate the importance of having a contingency plan).
- Sending out the questions to be asked during the interview was a good tactic in that both parties were more comfortable knowing the areas to be covered during the interview.
- Having extra copies of the questions to be asked available at the group interview allowed all those present to be part of the process throughout.

**jobsOntarioTrainingFund****boulotOntarioFormation**

**MEMORANDUM TO:** Project Managers  
All Brokers

**FROM:** Joan Andrew  
Assistant Deputy Minister  
Open Learning and Training  
*jobsOntario Training*

**DATE:** April 27, 1994

In the near future you will be receiving a letter from Mike Schuster asking you to complete a survey concerning your participation and results in *jobsOntario Training*. You may know that Mike is the Commissioner of Social Services for the Regional Municipality of Hamilton Wentworth, the broker in that area. The project he is undertaking is part of his requirements for his Master of Public Administration and is not part of the official program evaluation. It will include evaluating *jobsOntario Training* as an example of a program designed to assist social assistance recipients to returning to employment, using a community-based delivery model.

I wanted you to know that we are aware of this project and will also be providing information to assist him. It is certainly your choice on whether you wish to fill out the questionnaire but I would encourage you to do so in order that the findings be representative of experiences to-date. We will be interested in the results of his project.

Joan Andrew

## APPENDIX VI

**jobsOntario Training Fund****boulotOntario Formation**

March 23, 1994

via facsimile

Dear

**Re: jobsOntario Training Evaluation Meetings**

As a follow up to Issue #28 of the Broker Weekly Package, we have finalized the dates for the jobsOntario Training Evaluation meetings.

As was outlined, these meetings have two purposes. Firstly, it provides a forum for operational analysis of the second full year of delivery. Secondly, it allows us to receive input on the strengths and weaknesses of the delivery model as well as the various program components.

We would encourage you to read "Turning Point", which captures the direction of the Ontario government in the area of Social Assistance reform. We have enclosed a copy of the list of questions and issues which were included in the Broker Weekly Package Issue #29. We would encourage you to share and discuss these with your staff.

The meeting for the lead brokers is scheduled to be held on April 13, 1994, at jobsOntario Training head office, 595 Bay Street, 9th floor, Toronto, Ontario. It will be held in the Deputy Minister's boardroom starting at 9:00 a.m. sharp. Since space is limited, the maximum number of delegates per broker is two. Please confirm that you will be attending to at the number below.

. . . / 2

595 Bay Street, 9th Floor  
Box No. 153  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5G 2C2

595 rue Bay, 9<sup>e</sup> étage  
C.P. 153  
Toronto (Ontario)  
M5G 2C2

- 2 -

If you have any questions or require clarification, please  
do not hesitate to contact at (416) We  
look forward to seeing you on April 13, 1994.

Yours truly,

uu:

worth

## Evaluation: Broker Model

### Part 1: Questions about jobsOntario Training

#### Organization Type

- What past experience did you find most useful in assisting your organization to deliver JOT?
- What existing qualities or characteristics about your organization allowed for successful program delivery; what characteristics about your organization might have impeded delivery?

#### Broker Catchment Areas

- Are your boundaries workable for you? If, no, what are the problems?
- What were the advantages and disadvantages of program delivery in both large and small catchment areas, and with large and small populations?
- What are the most workable broker structures and sizes for both large and small catchment areas and for large and small populations (eg. sub-brokers, other sites etc)?
- Overlapping boundaries between community brokers, AMBs, CED brokers: What, about this worked and what did not work? How did you make broker arrangements work where there are overlapping boundaries?

#### Broker Structures and Operations

- Sub-brokers: What have you learned about what works and what doesn't work in lead broker/sub-broker relationships?
- What have you learned about the best way to set up an organization and operations to deliver a program such as JOT?

#### Resourcing Levels and Broker Financing

- What did you learn about appropriate resourcing levels and staff size in order to deliver a program such as JOT?
- What was learned about appropriate broker size to target?
- Should financing to brokers be "secure", or tied to performance goals?

### **Relationship of Brokers to Province**

- From your perspective, what were the positive and negative aspects of the provincial-broker relationship?
- What are the positive and negative implications of the community-based model for service delivery across the province?
- What did you learn about the best ways to do provincial/broker planning?

### **General**

- Please comment generally on what worked about the broker model, what didn't, and what you might have done differently in hindsight?

### **Part 2: Questions about the Future**

- A) If jobsOntario Training evolves into a more narrowly focussed, job-matching and employment and referral service:
  - What are the implications of this for your operation?
  - What are the characteristics of an operation and organization most suited to this role?
  - What are the characteristics of an organization which is most suited to working with employers?
  - What are the characteristics of an organization which has the ability to make a good job-match?
  - What principles should be applied to selecting catchment areas for program delivery?
  
- B) What are the implications if brokers are to take on a broader role? Specifically, what are the implications if, in addition to a job-matching and employment referral service, brokers are asked to:
  - prepare individual employment plans?
  - perform a liaison function back to a participant's caseworker?
  - book participants into training?



- monitor more closely than current practice the progress of participants in jobs?

c) What are the implications if brokers are asked to increase their current volume of participants?

**Jobs Ontario Training: Evaluation of Program Components**

**Components:**

**Client Group**

**Issues for Broker Consideration:**

- Is the current target group of SARs and UI exhaustees workable and appropriate?
- Should the target group be limited to SARs alone? What would the impact of this be?
- What would the impact be if UI recipients were eligible for the program?
- Should the program focus more on some groups within the SAR group (eg. sole-support parents), and if so, how?
- What would be the effect of possible changes in the target group on marketing the program to employers?

**Employers and Jobs**

**Issues for Broker Consideration:**

- Should the range of eligible employers be expanded to include the non-profit sector or elements of the non-profit sector? What would be the impact of this?
- Should other kinds of jobs be permitted; in particular, part-time and non-incremental? What would be the impact of this?
- Should criteria be put in place requiring that all or some proportion of jobs be at salary levels above minimum wage?
- Should criteria be put in place to require a minimum number of hires per contract?
- Should an employer/employee job-matching service (without training credit) be offered in addition to placements in training credit jobs? What would be the impact of this on your operation?

## **Training Credit**

### **Issues for Broker Consideration:**

- Are there any alterations which should be made to the training credit itself (eg. add or remove eligible training costs, ceilings for on-production costs, any changes to the 50% new employees-50% existing employees rule)?
- Are there any changes in the broker-employer disbursement practices currently required by the Operations Guidelines which should be made?

## **Pre-Employment Training**

### **Issues for Broker Consideration:**

- What course types do you think were most successful in leading to job placements, and are your views supported by your statistics?
- What course types do you think were successful, although perhaps not leading to jobs? If these courses didn't lead to jobs, why were they successful?
- Of the following commonly purchased course types, which do you think are the most useful: job readiness, life skills, communication/literacy, math/numeracy, computer literacy, word processing, Ontario Basic Skill 3 and 4, general academic upgrading, driver education special and general, English as a Second Language, French as a Second Language, WITT/INTO, Auto CAD, Quarkrxpress, ACCPAC General Ledger, Lotus 123.
- What have you learned about appropriate costs for courses which your operation commonly purchases?
- What have you learned about the most efficient purchase mechanisms for pre-employment training? For example, were block purchases or individual seat purchases more useful etc.?
- What are appropriate course lengths, both if JOT is to continue to serve those most job-ready, and if the program is to begin to target those who are less job-ready?
- What have you learned about what are appropriate allocations of pre-employment training funding versus job placement targets, and seat purchases (ie. people attending training) versus job targets?

## **Employment Support Allowance**

### **Issues for JOT Consideration:**

- What were the general patterns for the use of the employment support allowance? What was the employment support most frequently used for?
- Based on your experience, was the amount of the employment support sufficient to reduce barriers to training and employment?
- Should other uses of the employment support be allowed? If so, what?
- Were there significant issues with consistency between the JOT employment start-up allowance and the SAR employment start-up?
- What are the common practices in your administration of these funds: that is, do you provide the allowance as a flat rate to participants in need, or do you cost out and pay for specific components as they are identified, and over what length of time do you pay out the employment support?

## **Economic Renewal:**

### **Issues for JOT evaluation:**

- What have you learned from the current delivery model for JOT economic renewal. What could have been done differently?
- Should "big deals" continue, and if so, with what alterations?
- Should self-employment projects continue, and if so, with what alterations?

## **For the Consideration of AMB Brokers:**

### **Aboriginal Component**

#### **Issues for Consideration**

- How did each of the JOT program components (training credit, pre-employment training, child care, employment start-up) work within aboriginal communities and for aboriginal employers? Were there additional program modifications which would have been useful?

4 March 1994

**Agenda: JobsOntario Training Meeting**  
**Wednesday April 20, 1994**  
**2pm - 4pm**  
**Metro Hall, Room #306, 3rd Floor**  
**55 John Street (at King), Toronto**

**Chair:** \_\_\_\_\_, Assistant Deputy Minister  
**Open Learning and Training**  
**Ministry of Education and Training**

1. "Lessons Learned" : JOT Delivery Model
2. "Lessons Learned": JOT Program Components
3. Future Directions

## **Appendix VII**

### ***jobsOntario Training***

#### ***Provincial Results***

***(for 1992/93 and 1993/94)***

- note - data excludes results from Aboriginal brokers except for child care fee subsidies
- training credit expenditures represent payments to brokers (not employers)
  - child care fee subsidies excludes costs paid to SARs through the STEP program
  - targets for child care, pre-employment training and employment supports were based on a formula relating to training credits. As the latter changed, so did their targets
  - employment related expenses are given only to clients not on social assistance

**jobsOntario Training**  
**Two-year totals of Spaces and Expenditures**  
 (expenditures are in \$ millions)

TOTAL	1992/93		1993/94		TOTAL of ACTUALS
	TARGET	ACTUAL	TARGET	ACTUAL	
Pre-employment Training Spaces	4,000	3,055	6,325	15,450	18,505
Pre-employment Training Expenditures	11.2	13.9	15.9	17.8	29.8
Training Credits	32,000	7,511	25,300	24,427	31,938
Training Credit Expenditures	84.2	60.8	234.9	153.2	214.0
Child Care Spaces Utilized	8,800	401	1400	947	1,348
Child Care Expenditures	37.2	1.0	76.0	55.2	56.2
Employment Support Expenditures	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.5	1.6
Administrative Costs	14.8	14.9	44.0	46.7	61.6

(Pages 1-3 were received August 15/94)

**jobsOntario Training**  
**Percentage of Social Assistance Recipients**  
**in**  
**Training Credits or Pre-employment Training**

	1992/93 ACTUAL	1993/94 ACTUAL
Percentage of pre-employment spaces filled by social assistance recipients	61.7	60.1
Percentage of training credits filled by social assistance recipients*	45	45

The number of people who self-identify as social assistance recipients at registration make up approximately 35 per cent of the total. Through a process of data matching where MCSS matches *jobsOntario Training* information with that collected through CIMS-Main, it has been determined that participation by people on social assistance is actually about 45 per cent.



**jobsOntario Training**  
**Jobs Filled by Industry Type as a Percentage of the Total**

INDUSTRY TYPE	1992/93	1993/94
CONSTRUCTION	4.3	6.0
HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES (includes Education Services)	2.7	2.3
MANUFACTURING	45.8	36.8
RESOURCE	1.0	1.2
TRANSPORTATION/COMMUNICATION	14.0	15.6
WHOLESALE/FOOD SERVICE (includes Retail and Accommodation Services)	20.0	20.6
OTHER (includes Agriculture, Business Services, Finance & Insurance, Real Estate and Retail)	13.1	17.4
TOTAL *	100.9*	99.9*

\* Numbers may not total 100 due to rounding.

**A BRIEF UPDATE ON THE PROGRAM UP TO MARCH 31, 1994:  
(Received from jobsOntario May 16/94)**

- Total jobs created 43,411, over 32,892 filled.
- There has been an average fill rate of 500 per week since Christmas and 759 on average during March. As the economy continues to recover, good results are expected to continue.
- Average program turnover is 15 per cent, consistent with programs of this sort that generally have a minimum of 15-20 per cent. This means that *in addition* to the 32,892 positions filled, approximately 4000 individuals have been placed in positions that did not result in a full year of employment.

Almost half the turnover occurs in the first three months with minimal turnover beyond six months (two per cent or less). This validates program objectives of encouraging permanent employment.

- In total, more than 11,000 employers are participating in the program with 35% of placements in manufacturing.
- Average wages continue to be approximately \$20,500, well above minimum wage, and \$24,400 in "big deals".
- Just under fort-five per cent of those placed are social assistance recipients.
- Placement of youth (20.5%); aboriginal people (3.6%), and members of racial minorities (11.4%) continue to exceed program goals.
- Women represent 36.5 per cent of those placed in employment. This reflects the percentage of women of General Welfare and those who are in receipt of Unemployment Insurance Benefits.
- In most cases, a significant increase in training is being levered through the provision of the training credit. This is particularly noticeable with "Big Deals" where the employers are hiring 25 or more participants. approximately 25 per cent of employers are using some of the training credit dollars for existing staff as well as those hired through *jobsOntario Training*.
- Average cost per participant \$10,800 (includes training and all other costs).

## Bibliography

- Advisory-Group on New Social Assistance Legislation. Back on Track: Report on Short-term Reform. Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1991.
- Ball, Caroline. An Examination of the impact of Employment Training Programs on Social Assistance Recipients in Hamilton-Wentworth. Hamilton, Ontario: Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton and District, 1989.
- Banting, Keith G. The Welfare State and Canadian Federalism. Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 1987.
- Besharov, Douglas J. "Beware of Unintended Consequences," Public Welfare. Vol. 50, No. 2, Spring 1992.
- Bickman, Leonard and Peterson, Keith A. "Using Program Theory to Describe and Measure Program Quality," New Direction for Program Evaluation. No. 47, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Fall 1990.
- Bodo, Brian and Ball, Caroline. An evaluation of the Hamilton-Wentworth Employment Awareness Project. Hamilton, Ontario: Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton and District, May 1992.
- Callahan, Marilyn and others.  
"Workfare in British Columbia: Social Development Alternatives," Canadian Review of Social Policy. Issue #26, 1990.
- Canadian Council on Social Development. "Enhancing Employability of Welfare Recipients: Literature Review," Employability Resources Network. Winter, 1991.
- Canadian Council on Social Development. "Helping People Succeed . . . in a Changing Labour Market," Employability Resources Network. Winter, 1991.
- Cormier, Terri. "Transition to Self-Sufficiency by 2000," Perception. Vol. 17, No. 4, January 1994.
- Daly, John. "Cross-training," MacLean's. Vol. 107, No. 26, June 27, 1994.
- Evans, Patricia M. "From Workfare to the Social Contract: Implications for Canada of Recent U.S. Welfare Reforms," Canadian Public Policy. Vol. XIX, No. 1, 1993.

- Florio, James J. "New Jersey's Different Approach," Public Welfare. Vol. 50, No. 2, Spring 1992.
- Gilbert, Richard. "Fiscal Fitness and Government Restructuring," Presentation to Canadian Urban Institute Conference. Toronto, Ontario: August 23, 1993.
- Gill, Stephen Joel. "Using Evaluation to Build Commitment to Training," in Brinkershoff, Robert O. (ed.) Evaluating Training Programs in Business and Industry. San Francisco and Oxford: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1989.
- Greenstein, Robert. "Cutting Benefits vs. Changing Behavior," Public Welfare. Vol. 50, No. 2, Spring 1992.
- Gueron, Judith M. "Reforming Welfare with Work," Public Welfare. Vol. 45, Fall 1987.
- Gueron, Judith M. "Work and Welfare: Lessons on Employment Programs," Journal of Economic Perspectives, Volume 4, No. 1, Winter 1990.
- Herman, Joan L. et al. Evaluator's Handbook. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications Inc., 1987.
- Hum, Derek P.J. Federalism and the Poor: A Review of the Canada Assistance Plan. Toronto: Ontario Economic Council, 1983.
- Hum, Derek P.J. "Social Security Reform during the 1970's," in Jacqueline S. Ismael (ed.) Canadian Social Welfare Reform: Federal and Provincial Dimensions. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985.
- Hum, Derek P. J. "The Working Poor, the Canada Assistance Plan, and the Provincial Responses in Income Supplementation," in Jacqueline S. Ismael (ed.) Canadian Social Welfare Reform: Federal and Provincial Dimensions. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985.
- Hum, Derek P.J. and Simpson, Wayne. Income Maintenance, Work Effort and the Canadian Mincome Experiment. Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada, 1991.
- Kasten, Robert W. Jr. "Wisconsin's 'Learnfare' and Federal Waivers," Public Welfare. Vol. 50, No. 2, Spring 1992.
- Koenig, Ray. "An Insider's View of the San Diego Evaluation," Public Welfare. Vol. 48, No. 4, Fall 1990.

- Levy, Frank S. and Michel, Richard S. "Work for Welfare: How much good will it do?" American Economic Review. Vol. 76, May 1986.
- Lightman, Ernie S. "Earnings Disregards in Canada, Britain and Israel," Social Service Review. Vol. 64, No. 4, December 1990.
- Manga, Pran and Muckle, Wendy. The Role of Local Government in the Provision of Health and Social Services in Canada. Ottawa: The Canadian Council on Social Development, 1987.
- McGillivray, Don. "Will 'workfare' be a punishment for being poor and jobless?" The Spectator. Hamilton: May 16, 1994.
- Mead, Lawrence M. "How should Congress Respond?" Public Welfare. Vol. 50, No. 2, Spring 1992.
- Michielse, H.C.M. "Policing the Poor: J.L. Vives and the Sixteenth-Century Origins of Modern Social Administration," Social Services Review. Vol. 64, No. 1, March 1990.
- Mumma, Edward W. "Reform at the Local Level: Virginia Beach Empowers both Clients and Workers," Public Welfare. Vol. 47, No., 2, Spring 1989.
- National Anti-Poverty Organization. You Call it a Molehill, I'll Call it a Mountain: Job Training For People on Social Assistance. Ottawa: NAPO, 1989. ←
- National Council of Welfare. Incentives and Disincentives to Work. Ottawa, Canada: Minister of Supply and Services, Autumn 1993.
- National Council of Welfare. Welfare Reform. Ottawa, Canada: Minister of Supply and Services, Summer 1992.
- New Brunswick. Department of Advanced Education and Labour and Department of Income Assistance. N.B. Works. Fredrickton, New Brunswick: May 1992. ←
- New Brunswick. Department of Income Assistance. N.B. Works: Annual Report (Draft). Fredrickton, New Brunswick: September 1993. ←
- Ng, Roxana. The Politics of Community Services. Toronto: Garmond Press, 1988.
- Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services. Joblink Ontario. Press Release, Toronto: The Ministry, June 21, 1994.

- Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services. Municipal First Nation Employment Programs: Guidelines. Toronto: Queen's Printer, November 1991.
- Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services. Towards Independence: Highlights of the Evaluation of the Employment Opportunities Program. Toronto: Queen's Printer, July 1988.
- Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services. Turning Point: New Support Programs for People with Low Incomes. Toronto: Queen's Printer, July 1993.
- Ontario. Ministry of Skills Development. jobsOntario Training: Overview Report. Toronto: The Ministry, March 1992.
- Ontario. Ministry of Skills Development. jobsOntario Training Fund: Program Overview. Toronto: Queen's Printer, June 1992.
- Ontario. Ministry of Skills Development. jobsOntario Training Fund: Questions and Answers for Employers. Toronto: Queen's Printer, September 1992.
- Ontario Municipal Social Services Association. A Position Paper on Workfare. Toronto: The Association, October 1986.
- Ontario Municipal Social Services Association. Fundamental Principles for Operation of Employment Preparation Programs in Municipal Social Service Departments. Toronto: The Association, November 1986.
- Ontario Municipal Social Services Association. The Municipal Role in Employment Programs. Toronto: The Association, June 1988.
- Ontario Social Assistance Review Committee. Transitions: Report of the Social Assistance Review Committee. prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1988.
- Osborne, David and Gaebler, Ted. Reinventing Government. New York: Penguin Books, 1993.
- O'Sullivan, Elizabeth and Rassel, Gary R. Research Methods for Public Administrators. New York: Longman, 1989.
- Rein, Mildred. Dilemma of Welfare Policy: Why Work Strategies Haven't Worked. New York: Praeger Publications, 1982.

- Rein, Mildred. "Work in Welfare: Past failures and future strategies," Social Service Review. Vol. 56, June 1982.
- Rossi, Peter H. and Freeman, Howard E. Evaluation A Systematic Approach. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc. 1989.
- Sanders, Nicholas M. "Evaluation of Training by Trainers," in Brinkershoff, Robert O. (ed.) Evaluating Training Programs in Business and Industry. San Francisco and Oxford: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1989.
- Scheirer, Mary Ann. "Program Theory and Implementation Theory: Implications for Evaluators," New Directions for Program Evaluation. No. 33, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Spring 1987.
- Sherwood, Kay E. and Long, David A. "Jobs Implementation in an Uncertain Environment," Public Welfare. Vol. 49, No. 1, Winter 1991.
- Shifrin, Leonard. "Income Security: The Rise and Staff of the Federal Role," in Jacqueline S. Ismael (ed.) Canadian Social Welfare Policy: Federal and Provincial Dimensions. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985.
- Shragge, Eric. "The new welfare workhouse," Perception. Volume 15, No. 1, Winter 1991.
- Social Research and Demonstration Corporation. Self-Sufficiency Project Overview. Vancouver, British Columbia: The Corporation, January 1993.
- Stecher, Brian M. and Davis, W. Alan. How to Focus an Evaluation. Newbury Park California: Sage Publications, Inc. 1987.
- Swadron, Barry B. and others. Report of the Task Force on Employment Opportunities for Welfare Recipients. Toronto: Queen's Printer, February 1992.
- Wilson-Smith, Anthony and Allen, Glen. "Changing the Rules," MacLean's. Vol. 106, No. 31, August 2, 1993.