

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE
STUDENT INVESTMENT AND
OPPORTUNITY CORPORATION
VOLUME II – APPENDICES
(FINAL)**

Prepared by Hollett and Sons Inc.

December 4, 2008

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Case Studies | 1 |
| SWASP -Paid Participant | 1 |
| SWASP - Paid Participant | 2 |
| GEP Private Sector Employer | 4 |
| GEP Participant on Income Support | 5 |
| 2. HRLE Strategic Plan 2006 - 2008..... | 6 |
| 3. SIOC Evaluation Goals..... | 8 |
| 4. List of Programs Evaluated..... | 12 |
| 5. Best Practices Report | 14 |
| Annotated Bibliography..... | 20 |
| 6. Stakeholder Interview List..... | 27 |
| 7. Survey Results | 31 |
| Employer Survey Results..... | 31 |
| GEP | 31 |
| SWASP Post Secondary | 51 |
| SWASP High School | 74 |
| Participant Survey Results | 92 |
| GEP | 92 |
| SWASP Post Secondary | 116 |
| SWASP High School | 136 |
| 8. Focus Group Reports | 155 |
| GEP Participant..... | 155 |
| GEP Employer Excerpts | 160 |
| SWASP Employer Excerpts..... | 164 |
| 9. Employer Telephone Interview Reports | 180 |
| GEP Employer | 180 |
| SWASP Employers | 187 |
| Final Observations | 193 |
| Primary Research Protocols..... | 197 |
| Protocols for Employer Focus Group | 197 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Protocol for Employer Telephone Interviews | 199 |
| Protocol for Participants Focus Group..... | 201 |
| Protocol for Non-Participants Telephone Interviews..... | 204 |
| Participant Telephone Survey | 206 |
| Employer Telephone Survey..... | 232 |
| Protocol for Stakeholder Interviews | 241 |
| Protocol for Interviews from other Jurisdictions | 241 |
| 10. Document Source List..... | 243 |

1. Case Studies

SWASP -Paid Participant

Sarah (not her real name), 31, single parent of a four and a half year old:

I am a student at MUN and I graduated this semester with a Psychology degree. I have a little boy who is four and a half years old. I'm living on my own, I'm 31 – I went back to school when I was 26 after I moved to Toronto and worked there for a while. For my placement I worked on campus at MUN. For me, I had to be proactive to define my own position, I found my employer and told her what I was interested in, told her the skills I wanted to develop. My employer went on vacation and I had to fill in and be her secretary. I had to tell everyone there that I was not their research assistant, I was not there to get coffee, I didn't mind helping and being accommodating but I am being paid from grant money to help me find my skills related to what I am doing in school and doing up this power point for you is not what I am interested in and I am really sorry about that. I had to say that about once a day and I felt really awful saying it.

A major problem seems to be that employers don't understand the mandate of the program, don't realize that they are supposed to encourage us and constantly sit down with us and get feedback from us. I had to sit down and have impromptu discussions with my supervisor and say I would like to work on this now – don't just find busy work.

I have \$35,000 debt because I have been going to school. The debt and the financial worry are huge and the SWASP is an opportunity to gain employment while I'm studying and get paid for it but the money is disgusting. I found it insulting. I was living in poverty for the summer. At the end of each week I brought home \$50. It almost made more sense to get a student loan.

One day during my placement my son was sick and that threw my whole schedule off -- I had to work two hours extra every day for two weeks to make up the time I had missed.

SWASP - Paid Participant

Jane (not her real name), in first year of college, had SWASP between high school and college:

I worked at a corner store and I didn't know it was a SWASP job or anything. I just applied because my friend worked there and then my employer asked if I was a student and I filled out the forms and that was all that [sic] was to it. If more people knew about it you would see a lot more students applying for jobs. The only way that I find any information about jobs is through the Service Canada website. Even if they came to the high schools and told students about it that would help.

I was paid a regular salary and then also got a tuition voucher. The tuition voucher was great. I got minimum wage and a \$400 voucher so it did pay for half my tuition. Minimum wage is good because right now I am not trying to support myself so a tuition voucher is handy. More on the tuition side would be better. The job was a good length of time for me but the job got harder because people got their tuition vouchers in the mail early and then they would quit their job before their time was up so I was trying to fill in for them until the employer could replace them which they couldn't afford to do very quickly. My job was across town so every day to get to work I would have to walk for an hour so I couldn't work during the winter. If there was more transportation available I could have kept my job there.

I think this program would help people on Income Support but I don't know if it would work. People on IS don't have a lot of money and sometimes the tuition voucher doesn't quite cover it so you still have to cover those other expenses and they're not really in a position to have a loan. Should be based on family income – people with less money should get a higher voucher so they can pay for their education and not have to drop out.

Severe debt has had a big impact on my decisions. You're trying to figure out what you want to do and it is so much money and you don't want to make the wrong decision. We need more information on programs like this that can help offset the cost of university or college. We do have a guidance counselor at my school and she could help you but it seemed like everything was aimed at either getting a student loan or your parents were going to pay for it. There was no information about programs like this. I definitely didn't learn about this from school.

If programs were more connected that would definitely be helpful because right now I don't know of any other jobs that I can apply to with the SWASP right now. If there was a program in place where you could go right from one placement to another and you could benefit more from it that would be better. I like that idea a lot.

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Paying back the debt is going to be a big issue when I graduate. At that point you're going to have to pay rent, you're going to want a car, you're 25 years old or more and then student loans starts looking for \$500 a month and you think where is that coming from, I just got my first job, starting off at a low wage. I told my mom, I can't go to university because I don't want to have a debt the size of your mortgage so that is why I had to choose college and I don't like the idea that I had to pick and choose where I go because I couldn't afford one of them.

If you want to keep people in the province you have to have cheaper tuition. People can't make enough in Newfoundland to ever pay off their student debt. Sometimes what you have to pay to go to college or university is not worth it for the job. I find a lot of the jobs that you get especially after you get out of college they're not really that high above minimum wage. It's almost better just to go down to a call centre or something and not bother going to school. There's not a lot of encouragement there.

GEP Private Sector Employer

I am a hard-nosed, hard-working entrepreneur. My father started the company and he would say to people he hired – come to work on Monday and don't bring lunch. If you are no good you will be gone by lunch and if you are good enough to keep I'll buy you lunch... so that is where I come from.

The labour market now is in a horrible place. There are very few people who are actually interested in doing work. Young people's attitudes are the pits. Most of them feel they are entitled to everything and have no loyalty to their employer, or [have any] concept that you have to start at the bottom and work your way up, no matter how good you are (or think you are).

I would rather take a person from [a low-income neighbourhood] than from [a high-income neighbourhood] – at least the person from the low income area might want to work! But no one gets in my company if they don't work. I have no time for special accommodations. Everyone has their burdens to bear, but to earn their pay, they must do their work. Now the people who work with the crowd on income support do good work, but there are some that will never go to work. *[Note: At the end of the focus group, he donated his \$50 for attending the FG to the organization represented in the room who worked with IS clients.]*

It is a real crap shoot out there now, with regards to getting employees – it doesn't matter if it is in the office or on the site. Maybe 1 in 20 applicants are going to work out. So I use the GEP as a way to do a really extended interview of someone. If I think they may work out, I'll get a GEP for them and then I have a year with a subsidy to see if they have what it takes. Sometimes I have been able to use a SWASP for them the summer before and then the GEP – that way I know even a bit more about them.

The GEP has worked for me – I have had 4 in our company and one is now the Vice President, one is the director of Finance and two others are moving up in the administration side, so I consider it a very good program. The money could be more for sure and the program could be longer, but I find a good use for it and will (hopefully) use it again.

GEP Participant on Income Support

The GEP took me off the Income Support system for the first time in 18 years. I am a single parent and got through the College admin program. Getting through to student loans and welfare was horrible – lots of times I wanted to quit. As soon as I would get my student loan, I had to take it to HRLE and give it to them in order to stay on Income support. But then I still had to pay it back as a loan when I graduate! It was crazy! But I was determined I would make this work.

When I first went to work on my GEP, the salary was too low – it was lower than what I would get on IS and plus I had to pay back my loans and support my children. So I went to the employer and reviewed this. They agreed to increase my wages to be higher than IS. It was fabulous and I loved the work. I stayed for 2.5 years, but funding ran out for my project and I was let go. I was devastated as I loved that work. But I now have started my own business doing accounting work for people from my home and love it. It may not be what I do for the rest of my life but I earn a reasonable living at it. And my student loans? My father was very sick and asked me if there was anything he could do for me before he died. All I wanted was the money to pay off my loans and he was able to do that.

2. HRLE Strategic Plan 2006 - 2008

Vision

Newfoundland and Labrador will have a diverse, self-reliant population with minimal dependency on Income Support and a labour market supply that meets the economic development requirements of the province.

Mission

By 2011 the Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment will have enhanced supports and services to better assist people, particularly youth, to enter the labour market and reduce dependency on Income Support.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: By 2008 HRLE will have decreased the number of youth on Income Support.

Objective 1: By 2007 HRLE will have increased the participation of youth in employment programs and services who are receiving, or are at risk of receiving, Income Support.

Objective 2: By 2008 HRLE will have reduced the number of youth on Income Support.

Goal 2: By 2008 individuals will have increased access to labour market information and supports.

Objective 1: By 2007 HRLE will have established an infrastructure to gather and disseminate labour market information.

Objective 2: By 2008 HRLE will have developed a process to monitor and forecast current and emerging employment demands and skills gaps.

Goal 3: By 2008 HRLE will have implemented a new service delivery model that allows the department to deliver its programs and services effectively and efficiently.

Objective 1: By 2007 HRLE will have implemented the service delivery model in all HRLE regions.

Objective 2: By 2008 HRLE will have evaluated and refined the service delivery model, as required.

Strategic Issues

- Employment supports for youth who are receiving, or are at risk of receiving, Income Support;
- Support for labour market development; and

3. SIOC Evaluation Goals

The following were the goals of the SIOC Evaluation

Goal 1: To identify the benefits of SIOC programming and determine if the outcomes of the programs are consistent with government priorities and the stated goals of the SIOC and the individual programs.

- 1.1. Determine outcomes of the programs pertaining to government priorities, SIOC and program goals, including
 - increasing employability skills (i.e. skill development, self-esteem, motivation),
 - enhancing career development,
 - supporting access to and continuance of education (if applicable),
 - easing the transition from school to work,
 - enabling access to work experience,
 - longer term labour market attachment, and
 - reducing reliance on Income Support.

Particular attention should be focused on assessing the participation of rural youth, youth leadership development, post-secondary student debt reduction, and increasing the numbers of recent post-secondary graduates working in the province.

- 1.2. Identify factors that impact on the success of a program and outcomes for client and user groups.
- 1.3. Construct a profile of participants in programs when relevant and meaningful—including, where possible: gender, age, disabled status, marital status, number of children, educational level, program retention and retention in post-secondary education; salary levels, geographic location (i.e. urban/rural and regions), family characteristics, including income levels, number of parents present in home and number of dependents.
- 1.4. Review a sample of participants with an Income Support background to construct a listing of the most frequent characteristics of these participants to compare to the larger group.

Goal 2: To identify possible program enhancements to improve the efficiency and effectiveness in light of current and evolving youth needs, recent labour market trends and other government programs.

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Issues to be addressed for all programs:

- 2.1 Determine if SIOC programs are relevant in meeting the needs of youth. Is there some program or program enhancement or other vehicle that would be better at dealing with a youth issue that should be explored?
- 2.2 Make recommendations for enhancements or changes to programs to improve their effectiveness in meeting the clients', SIOC and program goals along with government priorities. When doing this, take the findings of the evaluation into consideration, including best practices in other jurisdictions.
- 2.3 Determine changes that could be made to improve graduate retention and long term attachment to opportunities and occupations in the province (i.e. early awareness and interventions, duration of employment, wage rates, etc.).

Employer Related

- 2.4 Determine if SIOC programs have helped with meeting employers' work needs.
- 2.5 Determine to what extent clients' employability skills impact their ability for successful placement/long term employment, what types of on-the-job supports are required, what supports are required prior to job placement and who should promote these supports and how.
- 2.6 Determine if there are other types of supports employers require (e.g. on-the-job training supports).
- 2.7 Determine the extent to which employers would offer paid work terms without a subsidy.
- 2.8 Determine how important SIOC programs are in enabling employers to hire a client.
- 2.9 Make recommendations on changes in the design of SIOC programs (i.e. wage rates, duration of subsidy, administration, etc.) that would improve programs from the client and employer perspectives.
- 2.10 Determine how HRLE could best structure the provision of services to assist employers and clients in being successful on the job.
- 2.11 Determine if there are elements of our current programs that act as disincentives for employers to participate in programs or to hire clients of HRLE. What could be changed to make it better?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

2.12 Determine what would be needed to help the client maintain employment and, when relevant, progress to higher paying positions within the company.

2.13 Determine what perception employers have of HRLE clients.

2.14 Determine if SIOC programs are supporting employers to develop employment opportunities in the province through business growth.

In addition to addressing the issues outlined in Goal 1 and Goal 2, assess the following issues as they relate to community grants to youth-serving organizations:

2.15 Determine if the current template for funding proposals, the method used to assess and make recommendations related to funding proposals, the current contract template, and the organizations required performance reports are in line with the purpose of the SIOC.

2.16 Determine if the required youth information to be used for performance measurement, monitoring, and evaluation is submitted to the department and if the information provided meets the needs outlined in the Accountability Framework.

2.17 Determine if the current client assessment tools used by contracted community groups are in line with the purpose of the SIOC and, when relevant and meaningful, HRLE's Accountability Framework

2.18 Determine if there are appropriate protocols for sharing information between community agencies and HRLE, as are outline in the Accountability Framework.

Goal 3: To identify barriers for participation in SIOC programs for youth at risk of receiving income support, youth receiving income support and youth in families receiving income support, and strategies for enhancing participation of these client groups.

3.1 Determine the extent of participation of these client groups in current programs.

3.2 Determine reasons for participation versus non-participation (including lack of program awareness, personal and/or employability barriers, other opportunities, etc.).

3.3 Identify best practices that have increased participation.

3.4 Recommend program and service elements that should be continued and/or new program elements that should be provided to improve the current programs. In particular,

how programs can improve the participation rates of *Youth at Risk* and improve outcomes for these clients.

3.5 Make recommendations for strategies to respond to the barriers identified by youth. For example, transportation and motivation may be identified as barriers to participation in programs. What strategies would address transportation barriers and what would work best in different areas for different youth? What would help motivate youth to participate in programs?

4. List of Programs Evaluated

This evaluation extensively evaluated the Student Work and Service Programs and the Graduate Employment Programs.

A partial evaluation was done on the following programs – based upon data from reports and stakeholders (but not participants):

1. Tutoring Work Experience (TWEP)
2. Faculty of Education – Professional Practice Seminar and School Placement
3. Youth Opportunities Marine Co-op
4. IT – Tutoring for Tuition
5. Rural Practice Medical
6. Conservation Corps
7. Youth Exploring Trades – CNA Placentia Campus
8. Marine Camp
9. Exploits Valley Economic Dev. Corp. – FAM Tour
10. Baccalieu Trail Tourism Ambassador Program
11. Irish Loop Tourism Assoc. – Enhanced Youth Employment
12. Youth at Promise – Choices for Youth
13. St. Francis Foundation – Youth Are Working
14. FINALLY

The following programs were not evaluated as there was no contact information, and little secondary data was available:

15. Leadership Programs
 - Youth Ventures
16. Awareness Programs
 - Skills Canada
 - Career Fairs
 - Youth Career Fair – Marystown-Burin
 - MUN Career Fair
 - CNA College Day
 - Marine Institute Career Fair
 - Youth Career Fair – Argentia
 - Community Development Corporation (Youth Career Fair Grand Falls-Windsor)
 - Gander and Area Chamber of Commerce (Youth Info Fair)
17. Early Intervention Programs
 - Community Centre Alliance (Value of Money - Value of Work Program)
 - Western School District (Social Worker in Schools Project)

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

- Homework Havens
- Community Centre Alliance - St. John's/Avalon
- Dunfield Park - Corner Brook
- Branch (Southern Avalon)
- Smallwood Crescent Youth Centre (Marystown)

5. Best Practices Report

There is an existing body of research related to the effectiveness of various programs and policy approaches for assisting young people in the transition from school to work. While it is important to note that wider social and economic conditions have a significant influence on the effectiveness of any given approach there are some key features of effective programs that can be used to guide ongoing program delivery and development.

Dual-system approach

Situations where school-based and work-place based training are provided together are referred to as ‘dual systems’. Within these systems apprenticeships are part of formal education. According to Quintini et al. this type of system has been proven successful in easing the transition of young people into the labour market.¹ Taylor points out that, in comparison to Canada:

...other countries do more to provide recognized labour market skills to students at the beginning of upper secondary education either through workplace based apprenticeship...or through school-based vocational systems...As a result, the proportion of young people who have not successfully completed high school and are not pursuing further education credentials in these countries is smaller.²

The primarily academic Canadian system arguably prepares students more for post-secondary education than employment. de Broucker suggests that dual systems could, not only improve youth employment prospects but also decrease the number of high school drop outs:

Some education systems are effective at providing skills recognised by employers as part of the secondary school curriculum. This improves both employment rates and access to desirable skilled occupations. The lack of demonstrated benefits from completing high school, for those who have no intention of continuing in further education, is certainly one reason why some young people decide to drop out before getting a high school diploma.³

¹ Quintini, Glenda and Martin, Sebastien. (2006) *Starting Well or Losing their Way? The Position of Youth in the Labour Market in OECD Countries*. OECD, Paris.

² Taylor, Alison. (2007) *Pathways for Youth to the Labour Market: An Overview of High School Initiatives*. Pathways to the Labour Market Series – No. 3. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

³ de Broucker, P. (2005) *Without a Paddle: What to do About Canada’s Youth Drop-outs*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

Strong links to local labour market

These dual-systems, like all youth employment programs, require the support of employers, business associations and unions (where applicable). In order for them to be truly effective there needs to be sufficient incentives to encourage employers to participate.⁴ Programs that provide “real world”, on the job training have been found to have more successful outcomes for participants than those that rely solely on classroom based training.⁵ In 1999, the OECD noted that “a major weakness in the Canadian approach to the transition process is the traditionally limited role played by the employers. Ways must be found for greater involvement of employers and unions...The involvement of small employers is of particular concern.”⁶

Skills in demand

The success of training and apprenticeship programs is further determined by their ability to meet the needs of the labour market. Programs have been found to be more effective when they provide participants with skills that are in demand.⁷ McCrea recommends that government “proactively monitor economic trends and provide funding and economic forecasts to allow institutions to adjust their offerings accordingly”.⁸

Multiple pathways

One common theme in the research in this area is the heterogeneity of the target population. As a result there is an identified need for multiple, diverse, interconnected, strategic pathways through education into employment. There is a need to understand the different needs of various subgroups within the targeted youth population. For example, these would include examining client needs by gender, ethnicity, age, geography, and income groups. Thiessen points out “it is clear that the concentration on academic success in high schools is not serving the needs of all students”.⁹ The OECD Thematic Review recommends that:

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Marquardt, Richard. (1999) *Labour market policies and programmes affecting youth in Canada*. OECD, Paris.

⁶ *Thematic Review of the Transition for Initial Education to Working Life: Canada Country Note*. (1999) OECD, Paris.

⁷ Marquardt, Richard. (1999)

⁸ McCrea, Silva, M., and Phillops, S.M. (2007) *Trading Up – High School and Beyond: Five Illustrative Canadian Case Studies*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

⁹ Thiessen, Victor. (2001) *Policy Research Issues for Canadian Youth: School-Work Transitions*. Applied Research Branch Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada, Quebec.

One approach is to broaden the curriculum and the range of teaching methods to cater to a variety of learning needs. These efforts call for different mixes of academic and experiential learning. The latter can take place both in schools and at the work place. The key point is motivating students to continue to learn and this motivation may require paying greater attention to the type of curriculum and teaching methods that best suits individual learning needs and aptitudes.¹⁰

A 1997 evaluation of the effectiveness of youth employment programs in Canada determined that the most effective strategy for youth who are not in education is one that links training with employment and offers skill development along with meaningful work experience.¹¹

Broad range of supports and flexibility of service provision

For a number of years there has been widespread movement towards greater integration and coordination of social services. In the case of facilitating the school to work transition of youth, this is particularly important. As Crocker points out, there is a need for integrated and coordinated services for youth at risk, the development of broadly conceived individual service plans, and increased flexibility in service provision that meets the needs of individual clients.¹² This is supported by Quitini and Martin who note that “programmes that integrate and combine services and offer a comprehensive “package” seem to be more successful”.¹³

The 1998 evaluation of the Graduate Employment / Self-Employment Program found that Social Assistance recipients did not participate in the program to the extent that was expected. The report concluded that this was “primarily a result of difficulties in linking the service delivery network for the Social Assistance recipients to the program”.¹⁴

In addition to a host of social services, information and programs, young people may also require access to additional supports and subsidies. For example, subsidies for child care and

¹⁰ *Thematic Review...* (1999)

¹¹ *The Effectiveness of Employment-Related Programs for Youth: Lessons Learned from Past Experience.* (1997) Evaluation and Data Development, Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada.

¹² Crocker, Robert. (2001) “Children and Youth at Risk: A Synthesis”. Children and Youth at Risk Symposium Report, Pan Canadian Education Research Agenda 2000. (2001)_Canadian Education Statistics Council, Toronto, Ontario.

¹³ Quitini, Glenda and Martin, Sebastien. (2006)

¹⁴ *Summative Evaluation of the Graduate Employment/Self-Employment Program — Newfoundland.* (1998) Evaluation and Data Development Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada, Department of Human Resources and Employment, Department of Education.

transportation may be essential for many young people before they are capable of participating in education and employment programs.¹⁵

Finally, Quitini and Martin point out that early intervention programs are key to improving the success rate of young people in school; these include Head Start programs in early childhood.¹⁶

Targeted population

Due to the different needs of the youth population it is important that programs be properly targeted and designed accordingly. The 1998 evaluation of the Graduate Employment Program reported that the program had more benefit for Social Assistance recipients than it did for other participants. The authors suggested that:

*The return on investment could be improved by focusing the subsidies on the most at risk graduates (for instance Social Assistance recipients, and those without much work experience who are having difficulties in finding related work), and through additional program support to these graduates.*¹⁷

A future challenge for the program was described as the choice between targeting the graduate population in general or providing more tailored support to those most at-risk. An evaluation of the SWASP had similar findings;

*... tuition vouchers that were given in return for participation in work experience projects had a significant effect on increasing the number of social assistance recipients who decided to go on to post-secondary education after taking part in the program. On the other hand, vouchers had little impact on the decisions of non-social assistance recipient participants (the vast majority who pursued post-secondary studies would have done so without the voucher).*¹⁸

The specific target population needs to be considered in the development, implementation and delivery of programs in order to ensure that anticipated outcomes are met.

Supply-side and demand-side measures

The program choices discussed above, including skills development, the provision of childcare subsidies, and access to a broad range of social services and supports are all aimed at the supply-

¹⁵ *Reconnecting Social Assistance Recipients to the Labour Market Lessons Learned.* (2000) Evaluation and Data Development, Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada, Quebec.

¹⁶ Quitini, Glenda and Martin, Sebastien. (2006)

¹⁷ *Summative Evaluation...* (1998)

¹⁸ *The Effectiveness of Employment-Related Programs for Youth...* (1997)

side of the labour equation; ensuring young people are well positioned to take advantage of opportunities in the labour market. Research has shown that, on their own, supply-side measures are not enough. They must be paired with demand-side measures that provide incentives for employers to participate in programs and facilitate the availability of employment opportunities. One example of a demand-side measure is wage subsidies.

*...wage subsidies are widely used as an incentive to employers involved in particular programmes for youth. Evaluations of federal training and work experience programmes suggest that wage subsidies can play a useful role in getting employers involved, and employer involvement in turn is a key factor in the success of such programmes.*¹⁹

The 1998 evaluation of the Graduate Employment Program found wage subsidies did provide an incentive for employers to hire graduates and helped to offset their investment in training them once hired.²⁰ However, Marquardt also points out that wage subsidies do not increase the total number of jobs available and may simply displace other workers. This needs to be taken into consideration in program development and implementation.

Career Development and Awareness

Research has shown that access to career development services such as counselling and information services are also an important component of the school to work transition. This type of service helps youth and their parents make informed choices about post-secondary programs and career options.²¹ Career development helps individuals understand labour markets, understand their own interests, and make the most of networks and contacts.²² McCrea and Bell both recommend early provision of these types of services.

Quality Matters

Helping young people to gain labour market experience is viewed as one of the key goals of many school-to-work transition programs. However, Thiessen points out there is a body of evidence to suggest “the *quality* of youth’s work experience is ultimately of far greater significance than the mere opportunity to work”.²³ Program development and implementation in this area must ensure work placements provide quality experiences for young people if these programs are to have the desired effect.

¹⁹ Marquardt, Richard. (1999)

²⁰ *Summative Evaluation...*(1998)

²¹ McCrea, Silva (2007)

²² Bell, Donnalee and Bezanson, Lynne. (2006) *Career Development Services for Canadian Youth: Access, Adequacy and Accountability*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

²³ Thiessen, Victor. (2001)

Characteristics of Successful Programs

Based on the literature reviewed above there are key characteristics successful programs could be expected to have. These are:

- Strong links between education and employers
 - Successful programs would be expected to combine classroom learning with on the job training
- Focus on skills in demand
 - In order to ensure success, supply-side investments should be aimed at addressing skills shortages identified through up to date labour market information
- Multiple pathways through education into employment
 - Successful school to work transitions require multiple methods to accommodate the broad range of needs of individuals; these would include opportunities for experiential learning where classroom based education is unsuccessful and second chance programs to allow individuals to upgrade their education
- Integrated packages of services developed to meet the needs of individuals across the life course
 - Greater coordination of services across government departments and agencies should allow individuals to access all of the varied services and supports they may need to successfully make the transition from school to work
- Target programs to those most at risk
 - Programs have been shown to have the greatest impact on those most at risk making a targeted approach the most cost-effective
- Incentives for employers
 - These should help to offset the cost of on the job training, time spent mentoring new employees, and lower productivity during the training period
- High quality work experience
 - In order to promote successful school to work transitions the emphasis should be placed on providing opportunities for quality, career-related work experience

Annotated Bibliography

For Best practices report

Annotated Bibliography

Bell, Donnalee and Bezanson, Lynne. (2006) *Career Development Services for Canadian Youth: Access, Adequacy and Accountability*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

This report reviews the existing career development services for youth in Canada and summarizes existing evidence on the effectiveness of various approaches. The authors find that there is little consistency in the services available across the country. Recommendations for strengthening career development services for youth include: requiring career development courses as part of teacher education; beginning career development courses for youth earlier; providing intensive career development courses for all students; and developing a cohesive national approach.

Bowlby, Jeffrey W., and McMullen, Kathryn. (2002) *At a Crossroads: First Results for the 18 to 20-Year-old Cohort of the Youth in Transition Survey*. HRDC and Statistics Canada, Quebec.

This report provides an overview of the first results from the 2000 Youth in Transition Survey (YITS) for 18-20-year-olds in Canada. Key findings include the fact that just under half of 18-20-year-olds reported facing barriers to going as far in school as they would like. About two-thirds of those reporting barriers cited financial barriers. Additional barriers reported by high school continuers and dropouts were: not being able to get into the post-secondary education program they wanted or marks that were too low; not enough interest or motivation; and in the case of high school dropouts, wanting to work and needing to care for their own children.

Crocker, Robert. (2001) "Children and Youth at Risk: A Synthesis". Children and Youth at Risk Symposium Report, Pan Canadian Education Research Agenda 2000. (2001) Canadian Education Statistics Council, Toronto, Ontario. Website: www.cmec.ca

This report documents the proceedings of the 1999 Pan Canadian Education Research Agenda symposium. This particular paper provides analysis of the key issues and themes discussed during the symposium. These issues include the need for integrated and coordinated services for youth at risk, the development of broadly conceived individual service plans, and increased flexibility in service provision to meet the needs of individual clients. It is noted that many programs in Canada for those at risk of dropping out of school, those who wish to return to finish their education and those who require assistance with the school to work transition lack coherence across the country. They are largely dependent on the success of local groups in securing funding through various federal and provincial programs. Developing an overall strategy to improve the likelihood of older youth making successful transitions from school to work is identified as an area for future policy development.

de Broucker, P. (2005) *Without a Paddle: What to do About Canada's Youth Drop-outs*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

This report examines the school to work transition experiences of youth drop-outs in Canada and other countries to identify lessons for Canadian employers, educators and government. Recommendations include: raising the age of mandatory school attendance; diversifying high school curriculum to include vocational training; providing access to career and education counselling; policy that addresses the different needs of young men and women; and ensuring youth from lower socio-economic backgrounds receive ample attention in early childhood, counselling and career-oriented high school training options.

de Broucker, P. (2006) *Post-secondary Education in Canada: A Vision from Canadian Youth*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

This report provides a summary of the discussions around post-secondary education held with a group of youth and decision-makers in November 2005. Three main challenges were identified. These were: access to education; ensuring the quality of education is the same for all Canadians; and developing education programs that prepare youth to be better citizens as well as being prepared for employment.

Goss Gilroy Inc. (1995) *Evaluation of the Student Work and Service Program (SWASP) Newfoundland: Final Report*. Human Resources Development Canada, Newfoundland

This report provides the findings of a formative evaluation conducted after the first year of operation of the SWASP. Some of the key findings are that the program design was consistent with the stated objectives, was successful in reaching the appropriate clientele and created partnerships among government, the private sector and community organizations. However, the evaluation also found that adequate attention was not given to the quality of work assignments or school to work transitions. It was found that employers did not understand their role related to providing opportunities for career exploration. It is recommended that communication between government and employers be improved and procedures be developed to ensure employers and students are appropriately matched so both benefit. The evaluation found that adequate supports were provided to Social Assistance Recipients (SARs) to allow them to participate in the Community Service component of the program. Additional supports that could be added to increase the likelihood of SARs being successful in post-secondary education included the provision of career counselling, enhancing the ability of the sponsoring organization to provide appropriate supports, improved communication about supports available to SARs while at school, improved communication about SWASP and the provision of supports to address other mandatory education costs. Overall, the evaluation found SWASP to be successful but cited the limitation of not adequately addressing the need for high quality work experiences that would assist youth making the transition from school to work.

Hango, Darcy and de Broucker, Patrice. (2007) *Education-to-Labour Market Pathways of Canadian Youth: Findings from the Youth in Transition Survey*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

This report uses the data from the *Youth in Transition Survey* to explore the different paths that Canadian youth take from high school through to the labour market. The authors describe and analyze the various background (for example, gender or Aboriginal status) and intervening (for example, academic performance or family responsibilities) factors that lead youth to various pathways and the employment outcomes associated with each.

Marquardt, Richard. (1999) *Labour market policies and programmes affecting youth in Canada*. OECD, Paris.

This paper examines trends in labour market policies and programmes as they affect youth in Canada. Evaluations of labour market training programs have shown positive impacts. Key factors for the success of these programs include strong links to the local labour market, emphasis on training on the job and a focus on skills in demand. Training programs are most effective when combined with other services including counseling, job finding support and wage subsidies. Evaluations of wage subsidy programs have shown these can play a key role in developing partnerships with employers. However, they do not appear to increase the number of jobs available; rather, they redistribute opportunities to the targeted group. The paper notes evaluations of new and existing programs are still needed to fill information gaps related to the overall impact of these programs.

McCrea, Silva, M., and Phillops, S.M. (2007) *Trading Up – High School and Beyond: Five Illustrative Canadian Case Studies*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

This report uses the examples of five Canadian secondary schools to explore various pathways from school to work. Each school provides a different program that offers trades training to secondary school students. The case studies illustrate commonalities across the programs leading the authors to develop a list of characteristics contributing to the programs' effectiveness. These are: vision and support; active partnerships; flexible delivery options; program design, and scheduling of instruction; marketing, recruitment and selection processes; and early career awareness and development programs. The report includes recommendations for creating successful trades programs for secondary students.

Myers, K. and de Broucker, P. (2006) *Too Many Left Behind: Canada's Adult Education and Training System*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

This report reviews the adult learning opportunities available in five Canadian provinces. The review identifies a number of significant gaps. These are: lack of coordination; lack of information; limited financial aid; minimal employer support; insufficient government investments; and a lack of research data. The authors conclude that the current systems are

complicated, difficult to navigate and pose barriers for those wishing to improve their skills. Recommendations are made to address these gaps and barriers.

Noel, Alan. (2004) *A Focus on Income Support: Implementing Quebec's Law Against Poverty and Social Exclusion*. Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc., Ottawa. Website: www.cprn.org

In 2004 the Quebec government released an action plan against poverty and social exclusion. This paper presents a preliminary assessment of the plan as an approach to reducing poverty and social exclusion. The government's plan itself included eliminating penalties imposed on social assistance recipients who refuse to participate in training or employment measures, an improved supplement for those who do participate, and new income support measures for the working poor, with or without children. The paper presents the argument made by European sociologist Gøsta Esping-Andersen that governments must pursue a double strategy; they must improve labour market rules and income support measures so as to make work available and rewarding; and they must develop public services on a universal basis, to neutralize as much as possible inherited social disadvantages. The paper concludes the Quebec government plan is inclusive of these strategies and is progressive in its move away from penalties towards policies that are more effective in supporting the transition from social assistance to the labour market.

Quitini, Glenda and Martin, Sebastien. (2006) *Starting Well or Losing their Way? The Position of Youth in the Labour Market in OECD Countries*. OECD, Paris. Website: <http://www.oecd.org.els>

This paper identifies the trends in youth labour market participation and discusses the nature of school to work transitions. Several policy approaches are presented that have been generally agreed upon to have a positive impact on the labour market situation of youth. The first is early intervention to improve the success rate of young people in school; these include Head Start programs in early childhood. Second, systems that use apprenticeship and high quality classroom based vocational training have proven successful in providing young people with labour market opportunities. Finally, strategies that aim to increase the employment prospects of unemployed youth have been successful in finding participants a job. These include job-search assistance, mentoring, work experience and education.

Quintini, Glenda, Martin, John P. and Martin, Sebastien. (2007) *The Changing Nature of the School-to-Work Transition Process in OECD Countries*. Institute for the Study of Labour, Germany.

This paper generally discusses the process of school to work transitions in selected OECD countries. It is noted when young people enter the labour market they are likely to be in temporary and low paid positions. The lack of training opportunities and precariousness associated with these positions may pose a problem for young people hoping to move on to more

stable, well paying jobs. Evaluations of several programs have indicated it is vital for at-risk youth to be identified early in their unemployment experience and provided with focused and personalized help. There is also evidence that residential programs for these youth may be more effective. These supply-side programs also need to be complemented with policies aimed at increasing job creation and removing obstacles to hiring young people.

Reconnecting Social Assistance Recipients to the Labour Market Lessons Learned. (2000)
Evaluation and Data Development, Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development
Canada, Quebec.

This paper examines the changes that governments have made to both the focus of their social assistance programs and their method of delivery. The experiences of Canada, the United States and selected OECD countries are drawn upon. There are key lessons learned from these case studies. Work experience programs are found to be most effective when they are temporary, focus on developing marketable skills and assist clients in addressing personal issues. Access to child care and other subsidies are also an important part of supporting individuals in low wage employment to continue their attachment to the labour market.

Summative Evaluation of the Graduate Employment/Self-Employment Program —
Newfoundland. (1998) Evaluation and Data Development Strategic Policy, Human Resources
Development Canada, Department of Human Resources and Employment, Department of
Education.

This report provides the findings of an evaluation of the Graduate Employment / Self-Employment Program. The evaluation found that Social Assistance recipients did not participate to the extent intended. This was found to be a result of the difficulty connecting the Social Assistance delivery system with the program. The program included only a minimal amount of follow-up and monitoring, relying heavily on the employer to provide a suitable work environment and mentoring. Participants were generally not satisfied with the wages paid in placement, and the wages paid did appear to be somewhat below the average earnings of other recent graduates. The evaluation concluded the Graduate Employment Program could be improved by focusing the subsidies on the most at risk graduates and through additional program support to these graduates. Employers felt the wage subsidy did give them the opportunity to hire graduates they would not have hired otherwise and were satisfied with the contribution of the graduates to their businesses. Employers also thought they had made a contribution to developing the graduate.

Taylor, Alison. (2007) *Pathways for Youth to the Labour Market: An Overview of High School Initiatives.* Pathways to the Labour Market Series – No. 3. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

This report uses the situation in four Canadian provinces to examine the structures that affect the ability of high school students to successfully make the transition through education to

employment. The author suggests that stronger links need to be made among vocational education in high schools, apprenticeship programs and other educational opportunities. Features of effective transition systems in OECD countries are identified. In particular, elements of the Australian approach are noted as relevant to the Canadian situation. These include: a greater emphasis on credentialing and vocational knowledge for youth; formalized apprenticeships in a wide variety of sectors and occupations; and specific equity initiatives.

The Effectiveness of Employment-Related Programs for Youth: Lessons Learned from Past Experience. (1997) Evaluation and Data Development, Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada.

This paper summarizes “lessons learned” based on the evaluation studies of former and current programs of Human Resources and Development Canada. This review determines the most effective strategy for disadvantaged out-of-school youth is one that combines a training component with strong links to the employer community, more formal training linked to on-the-job training and work experience, and, for the most disadvantaged, job search assistance and transitional wage subsidies. Strategies are also required on the demand side to encourage the private sector to provide job opportunities for youth. The quality of job experiences provided is found to significantly affect the success of graduates. Wage subsidies can increase the probability of disadvantaged people being hired to fill available jobs but they are unlikely to increase the number of jobs available. Tuition vouchers are also found to be effective in increasing the number of Social Assistance recipients who go on to post-secondary education. These were found to have little impact on the choices of those individuals not in receipt of Social Assistance.

Thematic Review of the Transition for Initial Education to Working Life: Canada Country Note. (1999) OECD, Paris.

This report examines the education and labour market institutions and policies as they affect young people before the end of compulsory education to the age where the majority of a cohort is in the labour market. The review team emphasizes the importance of developing a long term strategy for multiple pathways through education and into employment. This should include strengthening the roles of apprenticeship and cooperative education. It is recommended that reducing the incidence of school leaving be given higher priority. A weakness identified in the Canadian approach to the school to work transition process is the limited role played by employers. Guidance counselling services for young people should also be expanded.

Thiessen, Victor. (2001) *Policy Research Issues for Canadian Youth: School-Work Transitions.* Applied Research Branch Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada, Quebec.

This paper summarizes the post-1995 school-work transitions literature on Canadian youth to provide information on emerging and ongoing policy issues. It is clear alternate pathways need

to be devised, which permit some students to combine work experience with education. More needs to be done to develop links between various technical and vocational programs, community college and university. The government should also provide youth with occupation skill development training since those with little education, low tenure, and part-time employees are unlikely to obtain employer-sponsored training. Another theme identified is that the quality of work experience provided to young people is more significant than just the opportunity to work.

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

6. Stakeholder Interview List

| Program | Contact | Contact info | Status |
|---|-----------------|--|--|
| 1. Graduate Employment Program 2. SWASP Paid Work 3. High School Level I, II, III | Eileen Connors | Manager, Employment Programs Department of HRLE Tel: 729-3101; Fax: 729-0767 eileenconnors@gov.nl.ca | Completed |
| SWASP CSC | Pam Corrigan | Community Services Council Tel: 753-9860 pamcorrigan@csc.nf.net | Completed |
| SWASP CYN | David Brazil | Manager, CYNs Department of HRLE Tel: 729-6890 or 727-1068 davidbrazil@gov.nl.ca | Left message tcb & emailed. Thursday March 13, 2:00pm Emailed to re-schedule March 18 Left message to re-schedule March 20) |
| | Arlene Michelin | Coordinator Labrador CYN Happy Valley-Goose Bay, NL AOP 1C0 Tel: 897-2152; Fax: 896-4900 Arlene.michelin@lghealth.ca | Focus groups on Thursday march 13. (Joanne) Plus online survey (Susan) |
| | Lisa Davis | Coordinator Labrador Straits CYN Tel: 927-5151; Fax: 927-5150 grcyn@nf.aibn.net | |
| | Mary Gaultois | Coordinator Southwestern CYN Tel: 643-2666; Fax: 643-6045 mgaultois.cyn@nfld.net | |
| | Marie Bungay | Coordinator Harbour Breton CYN Tel: 885-3040; Fax: 885-3069 hbcyn@nf.aibn.com | |
| | Wayne Clarke | Coordinator Springdale CYN Tel: 673-3755; Fax: 673-3722 icecap@nf.aibn.com | |
| | | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Program | Contact | Contact info | Status |
|---|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | Mr. Darrell Rice | Coordinator Botwood CYN Tel: 257-3191; Fax: 257-4293 drice@nf.aibn.com | |
| | Danita Power | Coordinator Tel: 596-2400; Fax: 596-2478 danitapower@thesplashcentre.com | |
| | Harold Burton | Coordinator Grand Bank CYN Tel: 832-2692; Fax: 832-1636 mainstyouthcentre@nf.aibn.com | |
| | Angela Crockwell | Coordinator St. John's CYN Tel: 754-0536; Fax: 754-0842 acrockwell@cyn-stjohns.nf.ca | |
| 1. SWASP MUN 2. SWASP – (PACEE)-MUN 3. SECPAP – MUN 4. | Jennifer Browne | Director Career Development and Experiential Learning Memorial University of Newfoundland Tel: 737-3448 jbrowne@mun.ca | Completed |
| 1. SWASP CONA 2. SWASP – Above and Beyond (PACEE)-CONA 3. SECPAP – CONA | Shirley Woodward | Manager Student Recruitment and Enrollment Services College of the North Atlantic Stephenville, NL A2N 2Z6; Tel: 643-7817 Shirley.woodward@cna.nl.ca | Completed |
| Tutoring Work Experience (TWEP) | Ron Smith | Program Specialist Eastern School District Tel: 758-2348 ronsmith@esdnl.ca | Online Survey sent March 13, 2008 |
| | Krista Freake | Student Affairs/Educational Programs Central School District Gander, NL Tel: 256-2547 ext. 277 kristafreake@ncsd.ca | |
| | Dan Murphy | International Education/Outdoor Ed. Western School District | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Program | Contact | Contact info | Status |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Robert Swyer | Program Specialist Labrador School District Happy Valley-Goose Bay, NL A0P 1E0 Tel: 896-2431 ext 238 rswyer@lsb.ca | |
| | Bob Hipditch | Coordinator or Jim Paul, Guidance Counselor Centre for Distance Learning and Innovation (CDLI) Gander, NL Tel: 651-8127 rhipditch@stemnet.nf.ca jpaul@cdli.ca | |
| | Ellen Chalker | Program Coordinator Department of HRLE St. John's, NL Tel: 729-0725 echalker@gov.nl.ca | |
| Faculty of Education – Professional Practice Seminar and School Placement | Bernadette Power | Manager Finance and Administration Faculty of Education Memorial University of Newfoundland St. John's, NL A1B 3X5 Tel: 737-4507 berpower@mun.ca | Completed |
| Youth Opportunities Co-op | Bernie Brockerville | Placement Office Marine Institute Tel: 778-0308 Bernie.Brockerville@mi.mun.ca | Joanne (email March 16) – left message March 25, received message March 27 |
| | Or Fred Christian-Quinton | Manager St. John's, NL A1C 5R3 Tel: 778-0391 fquinton@mi.mun.ca | |
| IT – Tutoring for Tuition | Bob Hipditch | Coordinator or Jim Paul, Guidance Counselor Centre for Distance Learning and Innovation (CDLI) Tel: 651-8127 rhipditch@stemnet.nf.ca jpaul@cdli.ca | Completed |
| Rural Practice | Scarlet Hann | Provincial Physician Recruitment | Completed |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Program | Contact | Contact info | Status |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Medical | | Coord. NL Health Boards Association c/o Student Affairs Faculty of Medicine, Health Science Centre Tel: 777-6031 shann@mun.ca | |
| Conservation Corps | Terry McNeil | Executive Director Conservation Corps NL Tel: 729-7267 tmcneil@conservationcorps.nf.ca | Completed |
| | or Darren Feltham | Director of Programs Conservation Corps NL Tel: 729-7266 dfeltham@conservationcorps.nf.ca | |
| Youth Exploring Trades – CNA Placentia Campus | Karen Coombs | Business Development Officer College of the North Atlantic Engineering Technology Centre 153 Ridge Road Tel: 758-7554 karen.mulrooney@cna.nl.ca | Joanne – email bounce – call to schedule – different contact name at that # - left message March 25 |
| | or Florence Power | Tel: 227-6287 | |
| Marine Camp | Gerald Anderson | Manager Marketing and Business Development Marine Institute Tel: 778-0646 gerald.anderson@mi.mun.ca | Completed |
| Exploits Valley Economic Dev. Corp. – FAM Tour | Amy Byrne | Regional Archaeology Coordinator Exploits Valley Economic Development Corp. Tel: 489-8700; Fax: 489-8711 heritage@exploitsvalley.nf.ca | Completed |
| Baccalieu Trail Tourism Ambassador Program | Claudine Garland | Executive Director Baccalieu Trail Tourism Association Carbonear, NL A1Y 1A7 Tel: 596-3474; Fax: 596-3424 cgarland@baccalieutourism.com | Completed |
| Irish Loop Tourism Assoc. – Enhanced Youth Employment | Pat Curran | Executive Director Irish Loop Development Board Tel: 438-2898; Fax: 438-2892 executivedirector@irishloop.nf.ca | Joanne (email March 16) – out of office 17 – 20, out of office March 25 |
| | or | Manager of Operations | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Program | Contact | Contact info | Status |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | Kate Pennell | Irish Loop Development Board Tel: 438-2898; Fax: 438-2892 coordinator@irishloop.nf.ca | |
| Youth at Promise – Choices for Youth | Paul Donovan | St. John's Community Youth Network St. John's, NL A1C 6L2 Tel: 754-0536 paul@cyn-stjohns.nf.ca | Joanne (emailed March 18) – emailed Sheldon March 25 |
| | or Sheldon Pollett | Executive Director Choices for Youth St. John's, NL, A1C 6N5 Tel: 754-3047; Fax 754-6102 sheldon@choicesforyouth.ca | |
| St. Francis Foundation – Youth Are Working | Hugo McCarthy | Program Manager Youth Are Working St. Francis Foundation Tel: 738-3392; Fax: 738-8755 youthareworking@nf.aibn.com | Completed |
| FINALY | Jennifer Deon, Executive Director | (Acting) FINALY! St. John's, NL Tel: 738-6272; Fax: 738-6271 jennifer@finaly.ca | Completed |
| | or Chan Wiseman | Chair Paradise, NL A1L 1B1 Tel: 549-2244; Cell: 689-6225 chanwiseman@nlfa.ca | |

7. Survey Results

Employer Survey Results

GEP

1. Which program(s) has your organization participated in? (Check only one - if they did more than one,

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| they must pick one (most recent) and are invited to complete another survey for the other program.) | | |
| a. SWASP Post Secondary | 0 | 0% |
| b. SWASP High School | 0 | 0% |
| c. GEP | 78 | 100% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 2. How did you find out about the Program? | | |
| HRLE mailed me an application | 10 | 12% |
| a. I was in it before | 16 | 19% |
| b. I heard from other business colleagues | 8 | 9.4% |
| c. I went looking for the info online | 10 | 12% |
| d. I called HRLE looking for info on employment programs | 7 | 8.2% |
| e. Other (specify) | 34 | 40% |
| • I don't know. | | |
| • I'm an informed person. | | |
| • I heard about it from a student looking for a placement. | | |
| • I heard about it from other organizations. | | |
| • I heard it from a personal contact/word of mouth | | |
| • I heard it through a government department. | | |
| • It was in the Newspaper. | | |
| • I worked previously as an Employment Counselor . | | |
| • I heard of it through advertisements. | | |
| • I heard of it from the school my student graduated from. | | |
| • I heard it from the MHA. | | |
| • I found out through the Archives Association of the province. | | |
| • I have known about it for years. | | |
| • I was in the program when I was a student. | | |
| Total Responses | 85 | |
| 3. How can the program be better promoted? | | |
| a. Website devoted to all Youth Employment programs | 10 | 9% |
| b. Brochure delivered to all businesses with a mail-out (such as WHSCC assessment) | 27 | 24% |
| c. Through Industry, trade or employer associations (Board of Trade, etc.) newsletters | 7 | 6.5% |
| d. Advertising in the Newspaper | 12 | 11% |
| e. Government should have meetings that discuss the various programs available | 2 | 1.9% |
| f. It should be co-ordinated with the federal government summer employment program promotion | 3 | 2.8% |
| g. Other (specify) | 47 | 44% |
| • I don't know | | |
| • Ensure that all potential graduates are made aware of the program | | |
| • Promote it through the schools | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No improvements needed | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They could promote the program by letting people who participate in it choose other than income support or social assistance. When they have been on this program long enough, they don't want to work. I tried three times to hire them. The government would be better to go to the employer to have them subsidized to encourage them to work. The program people need to visit to present the programs in smaller areas | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertise on Television | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertise on the Internet | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertise in Business Magazines | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send directly to employers via e-mail | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Word of Mouth | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote it in every way possible. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the schools distribute the application to graduates. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertise it using different medias | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertise/contact all Community Organizations | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More personal contact with individual Clients | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertise on Radio | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They need better administration of the program. Sometimes, you have to wait for too long to find out anything | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The counselors pre-approve I find when people do hire them we are taking a risk, we aren't getting revenue initially, but at the same time, we wouldn't be taking an extra person unless you had the room, so the delays were too long. | | |
| Total Responses | 108 | |
| 4. With whom did you work when you were applying for and implementing the program | | |
| a. HRLE Staff | 49 | 65% |
| b. Community Agency | 6 | 8% |
| c. MUN | 3 | 4% |
| d. CNA | 0 | 0% |
| e. Other (Please list) | 17 | 28% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I did it myself because nobody was willing to help me. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I did it myself. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBDC | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joan Pope [name given, but no indication which organization/agency] | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refused to give any personal information. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corduroy Brook Enhancement Association | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Someone from Government [did not specify which part of government] | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control Pro Distributors | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't know. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I worked with staff. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Atlantic Orthodoxics | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Royal Canadian Legion | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brooking House | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was the person who was directly involved with the program. | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| • C-Core | | |
| • Quidi Vidi Rennie Development Foundation. | | |
| • Someone from the Provincial Government | | |
| • It was a Client Services Officer | | |
| • Glenda Hayes (Corner Brook office) | | |
| Total Responses | 75 | |
| D1. What was the gender of the student/graduate? | | |
| a. Male | 33 | 42% |
| b. Female | 45 | 58% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| D2. What was the age of the student/graduate? | | |
| a. Under 18 | 8 | 10% |
| b. 18-20 | 11 | 14% |
| c. 21-24 | 36 | 46% |
| d. 25-34 | 16 | 21% |
| e. 35-44 | 4 | 5% |
| f. 45-54 | 3 | 4% |
| g. 55-64 | 0 | 0% |
| h. 65 or older | 0 | 0% |
| i. REFUSED | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 5. How would you rate the following aspects of the application and approval process to participate in the program? (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient, 6 =No Answer/Not applicable) | | |
| 5ai. Information about the program was timely. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 38 | 49% |
| b. 2 | 23 | 29% |
| c. 3 | 14 | 18% |
| d. 4 | 1 | 1% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 1 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Too slow | 0 | 0% |
| b. Too long to get an answer | 1 | 33% |
| c. Other (specify) C | 2 | 67% |
| • When I had an applicant in mind, they made me wait to see if there were income support persons who could do it first. | | |
| • I thought it was more than satisfactory. | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total Responses | 3 |
| How could this be improved? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They could allow other programs for the income support people. People who are qualified and want to work should not be penalized about getting to work. • Get better staff for this organization. | |
| Total Responses | 2 |
| 5a. Information about the program was accurate. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 57 73% |
| b. 2 | 12 15% |
| c. 3 | 5 6% |
| d. 4 | 3 4% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 1 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 |
| Why did you give it that rating? | |
| a. Not correct | 0 0% |
| b. Not relevant to my region/community | 0 0% |
| c. Not relevant to my organization | 0 0% |
| d. Other (specify) | 4 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deadline date was changed by a month. • It says it is eight to sixteen weeks, but no matter what you apply for, you only get eight weeks, and we get no reason why. When we are approved, we don't get any reasoning and we only get one student when we applied for more. • They should allow other programs for income support people. People who are qualified and want to work should not be penalized about getting to work. I don't recall it being on the application. • The payments for wage subsidy were not handled in a timely manner | |
| Total Responses | 4 |
| How could this be improved? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have all our addresses, and there is no reason why they can't notify us at the end of the year if there's going to be changes. • If I wanted twelve weeks, I should be able to get it, or if I want more students, I should be able to get two, if there are more available in the community. • They could look at another funding pot for income support. They want the same as what they get on income support and benefits. • I don't know. | |
| Total Responses | 4 |
| 5a.iii. Information about the program was easily available. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----------|------|
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 46 | 59% |
| b. 2 | 16 | 21% |
| c. 3 | 10 | 13% |
| d. 4 | 5 | 6% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 1 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Couldn't find it online | 0 | 0% |
| b. It was only online | 0 | 0% |
| c. Couldn't get a paper copy | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other (specify) | 6 | 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If I was not involved in the previous years, we would not know anything about it. • You have to look for the information. • It was hard to get the information. I had to get it through the school, and then, there was a problem with the office location. • It took me a bit of time to get a response • I didn't know about the program. If someone hadn't told me, I wouldn't have known about it. | | |
| Total Responses | 6 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should make sure everybody gets something in the mail • Businesses could be notified of the program. • I think that if employers were aware of it directly, it would make it easier, even if there was contact information on a website. • The timeliness of the response could be improved. • There could be better communication about the programs, and they could target potential employers. • Do more promotion and advertising | | |
| Total Responses | 6 | |
| 5bi. Ability of the application form to be understood. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 55 | 71% |
| b. 2 | 17 | 22% |
| c. 3 | 4 | 5% |
| d. 4 | 1 | 1% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 1 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Too hard to read | 0 | 0% |
| b. Too small to pick out | 0 | 0% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| c. Other (specify) | 2 | 100% |
| • Because there was too much information to read. | | |
| • The form was complicated. | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| • It could be improved by condensing it to accommodate other businesses. | | |
| • Maybe we could have a bit of time to speak to all the employers at the round table to get some input | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| 5bii. Length of application form. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 52 | 67% |
| b. 2 | 18 | 23% |
| c. 3 | 6 | 8% |
| d. 4 | 0 | 0% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 0 | 0% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 2 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Too long | 0 | 0% |
| b. Looking for too much information | 0 | 0% |
| c. Other (specify) | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 0 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| Total Responses | 0 | |
| 5ci. Questions about the program were addressed Promptly. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 55 | 71% |
| b. 2 | 15 | 19% |
| c. 3 | 6 | 8% |
| d. 4 | 0 | 0% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 2 | 3% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. I couldn't get hold of a real person | 1 | 50% |
| b. I couldn't email questions | 0 | 0% |
| c. I could only get voice mail | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other (specify) | | |
| • They never responded to my calls | 1 | 50% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could be improved by having someone available during normal business hours. They had one or two people that dealt with this program, and they would often be gone at the same time. • They need better staff. | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| 5cii. Questions about the program were addressed Accurately. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 59 | 76% |
| b. 2 | 12 | 15% |
| c. 3 | 6 | 8% |
| d. 4 | 0 | 0% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 0 | 0% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. They couldn't answer my questions | 0 | 0% |
| b. The answer they gave me was wrong | 0 | 0% |
| c. Other (specify) | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 0 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| Total Responses | 0 | |
| 5d. What was the length of time it took for you to receive approval notice? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 11 | 14% |
| 5e. Were you satisfied with the length of time it took to receive approval notice? | | |
| a. Yes | 47 | 60% |
| b. No | 29 | 37% |
| c. No answer | 2 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 5ei. If no, how long should the approval process be? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Total Responses | 0 | |
| 6. When you reflect upon the length of the program, would you say it was: | | |
| a. Too short | 24 | 31% |
| b. Just right | 48 | 62% |
| c. Too long | 1 | 1% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| d. No answer | 5 | 6% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 7. What, in your opinion, would be the ideal length of time for the GEP program? ENTER NUMBER OF MONTHS | | |
| Don't know | 2 | 8% |
| 8. How long on average did it take you to have your claim processed for payment? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 26 | 33% |
| 9. Were you satisfied with the length of time it took to process your wage subsidy claim for payment? | | |
| a. Yes | 58 | 74% |
| b. No | 16 | 21% |
| c. No answer | 4 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 9a. What is a reasonable amount of time to have your claim processed? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| No Responses | | |
| 10. Would you have hired someone Full-time if the program had not been in place? | | |
| a. Yes | 15 | 19% |
| b. No | 58 | 74% |
| c. No answer | 5 | 6% |
| 10b. Would you have hired a recent graduate if the program had not been in place? | | |
| a. Yes | 23 | 29% |
| b. No | 46 | 59% |
| c. Not sure | 9 | 12% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 11. How did you recruit the person you hired? (Select one) | | |
| a. The student/graduate presented themselves | 32 | 39% |
| b. Referred by HRLE | 5 | 6.1% |
| c. Referred by MUN | 2 | 2.4% |
| d. Referred by College of the North Atlantic | 4 | 4.9% |
| e. Referred by Private College | 2 | 2.4% |
| f. Other (please specify) | 37 | 45% |
| • Referred by a co-worker/word of mouth | | |
| • I put an ad in the newspaper. | | |
| • We posted ads at Memorial University and we also used | | |
| • We used e-mail list with other organizations. | | |
| • We advertise with Service Canada | | |
| • We have specific needs, and there is only one college that meets those needs, so we | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-------|
| recruit from there. | | |
| • I contacted the schools | | |
| • Posted applications at the student employment centre | | |
| • Hired a student who had worked for us before. | | |
| • We advertised.[not specified how] | | |
| • We advertised on the Internet | | |
| • Through another employer. | | |
| • We went looking. | | |
| • We put ads in local stores/post office in the community | | |
| • The applicant was placed with us for work-terms during her course. We then hired her for the program. | | |
| • We put up notices [not specified where] | | |
| • We know students going to university. | | |
| Total Responses | 82 | |
| 12. How would you rate the person's employability skills when they started with your organization? (1 = excellent and 5 = poor, 6 =No Answer/Not applicable) | | |
| a. 1- Excellent | 16 | 21% |
| b. 2 | 28 | 36% |
| c. 3 | 23 | 29% |
| d. 4 | 7 | 9% |
| e. 5 - Poor | 4 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 12a. Could these have been improved before employment started? | | |
| a. Yes | 5 | 45% |
| b. No | 6 | 55% |
| c. Not sure | 0 | 0% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 11 | |
| 12ai. In what skill areas do you think the person would have benefited from training?) | | |
| a. Work Ethic | 2 | 22.2% |
| b. Punctuality | 1 | 11.1% |
| c. Workplace Behaviour | 0 | 0% |
| d. Interpersonal Skills | 1 | 11.1% |
| e. Communication skills | 0 | 0% |
| f. Team work skills | 0 | 0% |
| g. Computer Skills | 1 | 11.1% |
| h. Dress & Attitude | 1 | 11.1% |
| i. Self-esteem | 0 | 0% |
| j. Motivation | 0 | 0% |
| k. Other (List) | 3 | 33.3% |
| • The resumes that I have been seeing are poorly done. Some training in this might make me actually call some of the people back. | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be life skills | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be in all areas of skill. | | |
| Total Responses | 9 | |
| 12b. Were their employability skills adequate at the end of the Program? | | |
| a. Yes | 68 | 87% |
| b. No | 5 | 6% |
| c. Not sure | 2 | 3% |
| d. No answer | 3 | 4% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 12b.i. If no, how can the program be improved to assist in this area? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. HRLE should provide training | 0 | 0% |
| b. HRLE should evaluate the graduate midway through | 0 | 0% |
| c. There should be a requirement for mentoring in the program | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other, please explain | 5 | 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More research needs to be done into the into the students skills before they come to us. • I'm not sure the program could help with this. The boy came one day and was done. • I don't think it is relative to the program. I think it was relative to the employee. • The program should be longer. • The program should not be limited to a finite period of time. | | |
| 13. Did the person stay with your organization for the full length of the GEP? | | |
| a. Yes | 62 | 79% |
| b. No | 14 | 18% |
| c. No answer | 2 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 13a. If yes, did the participant continue to work with your organization after the program was completed? | | |
| a. Yes | 47 | 73% |
| b. No | 14 | 22% |
| c. No answer | 3 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 13ai1. If yes, is that person(s) working at the same position? | | |
| a. Yes | 37 | 73% |
| b. No | 13 | 25% |
| c. No answer | 1 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 51 | |
| 13ai2. Has that person(s) worked at different jobs within your organization? | | |
| a. Yes | 18 | 35% |
| b. No | 32 | 63% |
| c. No answer | 1 | 2% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| Total Responses | 51 | |
| 13ai3. Has that person(s) received a higher salary? | | |
| a. Yes | 41 | 80% |
| b. No | 10 | 20% |
| c. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 51 | |
| 13ai3a. If no, are there career development supports HRLE could provide to enable them to be promoted to higher paying positions? | | |
| a. Yes | 4 | 40% |
| b. No | 5 | 50% |
| c. No answer | 1 | 10% |
| Total Responses | 10 | |
| 13ai4. How long after the subsidy ended did the person remain with your organization? ENTER NUMBER OF MONTHS | | |
| a. Don't know | 14 | 28% |
| 13aii1. If not, (the person did complete the GEP, but did not remain with the organization) Why not? | | |
| a. Couldn't continue to pay the person the same wage without the subsidy | 4 | 27% |
| b. Couldn't pay the salary requested by the person | 0 | 0% |
| c. Unsuitable candidate | 0 | 0% |
| d. Position no longer required | 1 | 6.7% |
| e. Graduate left for other opportunities | 6 | 40% |
| f. Other (Specify) | 4 | 27% |
| • I already had another student hired for the summer. | | |
| • The program is not completed yet. | | |
| • They returned to school/university | | |
| • They returned to school/university | | |
| Total Responses | 15 | |
| 13aii2. Are there supports that could have been provided that would have continued the employment? | | |
| a. Yes | 3 | 21% |
| b. No | 10 | 71% |
| c. No answer | 1 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 14 | |
| 13aii2a. What would these be? | | |
| a. Higher subsidy is needed for the program | 2 | 67% |
| b. Longer program length | 1 | 33% |
| c. More training/support covered by the program | 0 | 0% |
| d. Completion bonus for the Graduate | 0 | 0% |
| e. Other (Specify) | 0 | 0% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| Total Responses | 3 | |
| a. You indicated providing More financial resources with the program would have continued the employment. Please specify the amount. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$20,000 • \$230 | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| b. You indicated providing a Longer program length would have continued the employment. How long should the program be in total? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be three years in total | | |
| Total Responses | 1 | |
| 13bi. If no (the person did not complete the GEP) Why not? | | |
| a. Lack of financial resources to pay a competitive wage | 1 | 6.7% |
| b. Unsuitable candidate | 5 | 33% |
| c. Position no longer required | 0 | 0% |
| d. Graduate left for other opportunities | 6 | 40% |
| e. Other (Specify) | 3 | 20% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had to let that person go because we had a lay off. • They left the province. • They left for personal reasons. | | |
| Total Responses | 15 | |
| b. Why were they an unsuitable candidate? | | |
| a. Lack of workplace skills | 5 | 100% |
| b. Lack of employability skills | 0 | 0% |
| c. Other (Specify) | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 5 | |
| 13bii. Are there any supports that could have been provided that would have kept the person there to the end of the GEP | | |
| a. Yes | 2 | 14% |
| b. No | 12 | 86% |
| c. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 14 | |
| 13bii1. If yes, what would these be? | | |
| a. More financial subsidy with the program | 1 | 50% |
| b. More training/support covered by the program | 0 | 0% |
| c. Completion bonus for the Graduate | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other (Specify) | 1 | 50% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a break so we could lay the person off and rehire them again. | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| a. You indicated providing More financial subsidy with the program would have continued the | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| employment. Please specify the amount. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other programs will do sixty percent funding and adjust to what's paid as opposed to the original salary | | |
| Total Responses | | 1 |
| 14. Did the program benefit you as an employer? | | |
| a. Yes | 75 | 96% |
| b. No | 1 | 1% |
| c. Somewhat | 1 | 1% |
| d. No answer | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | | 78 |
| 14a. How was this program of benefit? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Subsidized the cost of worker(s) | 30 | 28% |
| b. It provided an opportunity to determine suitability of an individual for future possible full or part-time employment | 7 | 6.7% |
| c. It provided an opportunity to train an individual | 16 | 15% |
| d. Assistance with a specific project at work | 12 | 11% |
| e. Obtained new staff: to fill existing vacancies | 15 | 14% |
| f. Obtained new staff: because of Business Growth | 4 | 3.8% |
| g. It brought new skills into an organization | 7 | 6.7% |
| h. Opportunity to positively influence a young person's life | 4 | 3.8% |
| i. Other (please list) | 11 | 10% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was to get more funding because we are a non-profit company, and it lets you take a new risk on the graduate. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's hard in this industry for people who are qualified and are looking for work. They are either working for themselves or hired. You are almost forced in the industry to have to look at people who are unemployed, so it is a risk. I wouldn't hire an unemployed person if I have someone who has better qualifications. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It kept me in business | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It reduced the cost of training and I just saved money altogether. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are a charity. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was a great benefit to us. It allowed us to open and offer programs for the youth in the community. We were also able to have fundraising events. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It allowed me to better equip the center and maintain the staff I had. It allowed me to not have to increase the fees to parents. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't know. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would not have been able to open our museum without the program. However, it should be longer because we only get about seven weeks, and we have to close early because of it, and it is right in the tourism's peak season. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would not have our recreation program if it were not for this subsidy program. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It provided us with the ability to offer new programs that we otherwise could not afford to offer. | | |
| Total Responses | | 106 |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| 15. Do you have any specific suggestions on how the program could be improved? | | |
| a. Increase program length | 14 | 13% |
| b. Decrease program length | 0 | 0% |
| c. Provide a greater subsidy | 9 | 8.4% |
| d. Provide a training allowance for the student/graduate | 3 | 2.8% |
| e. Provide a completion bonus for the student (if GEP) | 3 | 2.8% |
| f. Improve the administration of the program | 9 | 8.4% |
| g. Other (please list) | 69 | 64% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No • I liked to see more grants go to business and not non-profit organizations. • They should let the employer decide how many weeks they should get. • I would like to have some leeway with the hours the students are allowed to work. If it happens to get busy, and we get them to stay for three to four hours extra one week, I don't think we should be disqualified for this. I think the turnaround time should be a maximum of three weeks for approval of the spot. • They need to get the subsidy money out to the employer faster. • The education limitations and also experience limitations could be a little broader. • Be more open to the employee candidate as opposed to seeking other candidates. • Treat employers as partners instead of charity cases, and by charity cases, I mean charitable organizations. • Get more students in the program. We tried to get another student, and we even went to other areas, but we couldn't get one. • Make people more aware of the existence of the program – both students & employers. • Speed up the application/approval process. • There should be a greater salary or a gradual raise during the program to increase competition • There should be better efficiency. • It would be really valuable to allow students who are not allowed to access the program. If they work full time for us over the summer, we are not allowed to hire them under the GEP. They have to work less than twenty hours. They should have some flexibility with this. We sometimes bring them on for a short contract, and then, we have to lay them off and try to hire under the program. The students get frustrated, and we may lose them to another employer. • Even late applicants should be recognized for employment. • Provide a once a month employment counseling service that the students must go through. • I don't know. • The graduate should start sooner. • Having the information more streamlined in terms of access to it. • We had to get things set up with our own finance office as well as with the Human Resources people. I just think it could be a little better organized. • Make sure the candidates are suitable for the position. Small businesses can't afford to compete with the oil industry. These students are being told they should be making forty to fifty thousand a year, but they have no on the job training, and we can't afford to give them all the training. • Halfway through the GEP, the employee in question required half time hours instead of full | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| time hours because of doctors orders. It would have been nice to transfer the GEP to someone else or something so I could have used the full subsidy instead of just part of it. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be more contact during the process and a little more notice. • Provide an officer to meet with the employer. • Make the period of time for the program more flexible and not limit it. • Make the program more accessible. • Make the deductions lower. • Make sure it goes to all schools/colleges/universities | | |
| Total Responses | 107 | |
| 16. If it were a requirement of the GEP for employers to pay minimum wage before a subsidy were added to make it a competitive wage instead of the current subsidy approach, would this make the program more attractive, less attractive, or no difference to you? | | |
| a. More attractive | 17 | 22% |
| b. Less attractive | 26 | 33% |
| c. No difference | 35 | 45% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 17. Would it be of benefit to stagger the subsidy to provide higher wages to the graduates as they get more experienced over time? | | |
| a. Yes | 51 | 65% |
| b. No | 20 | 26% |
| c. Not Sure | 7 | 9% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 18. Would it be of benefit to offer a completion bonus to graduates to encourage them to finish the full GEP? | | |
| a. Yes | 60 | 77% |
| b. No | 13 | 17% |
| c. Not Sure | 4 | 5% |
| d. No answer | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 18a. What value should it be for completion? ENTER DOLLAR AMOUNT | | |
| a. Don't know | 14 | 23% |
| 20. Are there other funding structures that would to allow you to offer competitive wage rates to graduates? (List responses) | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No • Yes – not specified • Yes – education supplements provided by the government. • Yes – federal programs • I don't know • Yes - Shell Internship Program | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| • Yes – EI programs | | |
| • Yes – GTEP from MUN | | |
| • Yes - AECELN | | |
| • That would be to increase the subsidy payment that parents get for childcare. | | |
| • I think you should have to pay the prevailing wage rate anyway, but if the subsidy is half the wage, they should pay half of the prevailing wage. Right now, the subsidy is up to \$5 which would make most employers pay \$10, but if the prevailing rate is \$13, they should pay half of that. | | |
| • I can't think of anything. The only thing I have found is that they don't always account for incremental increases. You may say, "I will give a raise in three months", and the program isn't that I know of. | | |
| • I think that extending it by six months and increasing the wage should be looked at because minimum wage is going up and the funding is not. | | |
| • I would say a targeted wage subsidy and federal government subsidies | | |
| 21a. Do you think the program Enables young people to stay and work in Newfoundland and Labrador? | | |
| a. Yes | 63 | 81% |
| b. No | 8 | 10% |
| c. Partially | 7 | 9% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 21b. Are there ways it can be improved to enable young people to stay in the province? | | |
| a. Yes | 55 | 71% |
| b. No | 14 | 18% |
| c. Partially | 3 | 4% |
| d. No answer | 6 | 8% |
| 21bi. How could it be improved to enable young people to stay in the province? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Must offer higher subsidies to enable employers to pay higher wages | 29 | 38% |
| b. Must have a student debt pay down portion to it | 3 | 3.9% |
| c. Must be longer in duration | 9 | 12% |
| d. Must be a tax credit for working in the province | 0 | 0% |
| e. Other (Specify) | 35 | 46% |
| • The employers should give them more responsibility. | | |
| • Have more advertising to make people more aware of the program. | | |
| • I do not think that they should limit a business to one position per year | | |
| • It would if they could do a sixty/forty split with the employer. | | |
| • Give some kind of incentive to keep the graduates. | | |
| • Make the application more available to the employers. | | |
| • Make sure money's in the pot to ensure the program can operate. | | |
| • Mentoring could be set up. | | |
| • Make the program more available to the student so they understand the needs of the employers and what can be offered to them in terms of employment and training. | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| • They should offer more programs and offer them more frequently. | | |
| • There should be a completion bonus. | | |
| • I think that education needs to be evaluated. | | |
| • I think they should extend the program to students who are employed or under-employed at an organization rather than capping them at twenty hours a week. We could move them to a better position if we had a subsidy and if they have a reasonable scope of time from the time they have graduated. | | |
| • There could be interest relief for students on student loans programs. | | |
| • The workshops for finding work in Newfoundland are really good. A lot of young people that leave do so because they don't know how to find a job here, and they may not have all the employment skills they need. They may need someone to show them. They may have the educational skills but not the employment skills. | | |
| • I don't know. | | |
| • They should also have more encouragement from elected officials. | | |
| • They should show some appreciation to the students for working here. | | |
| • I would like to see subsidies for additional training that larger corporations can supply. For example, if I wanted to send them back for a diploma or degree part time, there would be funding for this. | | |
| • There should be a bonus 6-months in. | | |
| • A training program that would fit in well with office environment with the degree or diploma they have. | | |
| • The program could be tied in with the place where they are located. | | |
| • Make our provincial wages standard to the national wages. | | |
| Total Responses | 76 | |
| 21c. Do you think the program Encourages young people to return to Newfoundland and Labrador? | | |
| a. Yes | 25 | 32% |
| b. No | 39 | 50% |
| c. Partially | 6 | 8% |
| d. No answer | 8 | 10% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 21d. Are there ways it can be improved to encourage Young people to return to the province? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Must offer higher subsidies to enable employers to pay higher wages | 31 | 34% |
| b. Must have a student debt pay down portion to it | 2 | 2.2% |
| c. Must be longer | 9 | 9.9% |
| d. Must be a tax credit for working in the province | 0 | 0% |
| e. Other (Specify) | 49 | 54% |
| • It needs to be better advertised. | | |
| • Wages have to be competitive with other parts of the country. | | |
| • It's not applicable to me. | | |
| • There should be more jobs. | | |
| • The employer should show leadership and encouragement to the student. | | |
| • The people who are eligible would have to know about it. | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| • They could change the format to the sixty/forty split with us paying the forty percent. | | |
| • No | | |
| • Offer greater out rates. | | |
| • I don't know. | | |
| • By allowing employers to hire more than one student through the program | | |
| • The program could be offered to people that were working away to bring them back. | | |
| • It would if people were available for it besides recent graduates, for example, if people were able to be accepted even two years after graduation. | | |
| • Offer signing bonuses and some kind of security. | | |
| • Match other graduates from other parts of the country with the program from this province | | |
| • It should be well organized. | | |
| • It could be improved by promoting in other provinces through their university websites. | | |
| • A sliding scale so we could offer more competitive salaries and relocation subsidies | | |
| • Offer a completion bonus. | | |
| • No change necessary. | | |
| • I don't think it would have any effect on them. They are high school students. | | |
| Total Responses | 91 | |
| 22. Have you ever hired a person on income support or whose family is on income support for the program? | | |
| a. Yes | 12 | 15% |
| b. No | 59 | 76% |
| c. Not Sure | 6 | 8% |
| d. No answer | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 22a. If yes, was the experience satisfactory? | | |
| a. Yes | 12 | 100% |
| b. No | 0 | 0% |
| c. Not Sure | 0 | 0% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 12 | |
| 22ai. If no, why was it unsatisfactory? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Candidate had poor employability skills (low work ethic, not punctual, etc.) | 0 | 0% |
| b. Candidate had poor workplace skills | 0 | 0% |
| c. Couldn't pay enough to compete with Income Support system | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other (Specify) | 0 | 0% |
| 22aii. Was there anything HRLE could have done to improve your satisfaction? Please explain. | | |
| • No responses | | |
| 23. Would you hire another student/graduate through the program? | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| a. Yes | 78 | 100% |
| b. No | 0 | 0% |
| c. Not Sure | 0 | 0% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 24. Would you recommend this program to a colleague? | | |
| a. Yes | 76 | 97% |
| b. No | 1 | 1% |
| c. No answer | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 25. Rate your overall level of satisfaction with the program: (Very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat unsatisfied, very unsatisfied, unsure) | | |
| a. Very satisfied | 50 | 64% |
| b. Somewhat satisfied | 26 | 33% |
| c. Somewhat unsatisfied | 1 | 1% |
| d. Very unsatisfied | 0 | 0% |
| e. Unsure | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| Information about your Organization... | | |
| 1. What is your postal code? (ENTER FORMAT: A9A9A9) | | |
| 2. What is your Average Number of Employees throughout the year? | | |
| a. 1-3 | 14 | 18% |
| b. 4-10 | 36 | 46% |
| c. 11-25 | 17 | 22% |
| d. 26-50 | 6 | 8% |
| e. 51-100 | 1 | 1% |
| f. 100+ | 3 | 4% |
| g. No Answer | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 78 | |
| 3. What sector is your company? | | |
| a. Retail | 7 | 8.9% |
| b. Service (Food service, Hospitality, professional services, etc.) | 34 | 43% |
| c. Manufacturing & Processing | 6 | 7.6% |
| d. Resources (Fishing, mining, agriculture, etc.) | 2 | 2.5% |
| e. No Answer | 0 | 0% |
| f. Other (Specify) | 30 | 38% |
| • Private Sector | | |
| • Day Care | | |
| • Non-Profit | | |
| • Construction Training | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|--|-----------|
| • Town Tax Collection | |
| • Community Improvement Group | |
| • Research Organization | |
| • Non-Profit Environmental | |
| • Environmental | |
| • Charity | |
| • Construction | |
| • Municipality | |
| • Consulting Engineering Company | |
| • Ad Specialty & Corporate Apparel | |
| • Marketing Services | |
| • Design & Construction | |
| • Educational Institution | |
| • Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland & Labrador | |
| Total Responses | 79 |
| 4. What was the approximate gross revenue of the company last year? | |
| a. \$50,000 - \$250,000 | 16 21% |
| b. \$250,001- \$500,000 | 10 13% |
| c. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | 11 14% |
| d. \$1,000,001-\$5,000,000 | 10 13% |
| e. \$5,000,001+ | 3 4% |
| f. Don't know | 12 15% |
| g. Not applicable / no answer | 16 21% |
| Total Responses | 78 |

SWASP Post Secondary

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| 1. Which program(s) has your organization participated in? (Check only one - if they did more than one, they must pick one (most recent) and are invited to complete another survey for the other program.) | | |
| SWASP Post Secondary | 300 | 100% |
| SWASP High School | 0 | 0% |
| GEP | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 2. How did you find out about the Program? | | |
| a. HRLE mailed me an application | 63 | 18% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| b. I was in it before | 117 | 34% |
| c. I heard from other business colleagues | 39 | 11% |
| d. I went looking for the info online | 18 | 5% |
| e. I called HRLE looking for info on employment programs | 11 | 3% |
| f. Other (specify) | 100 | 29% |
| • Through HRLE [not specified how] | | |
| • Community Service mailed me an application | | |
| • Envision sent it in the mail | | |
| • An information bulletin was mailed to me | | |
| • Previous experience with similar programs | | |
| • I learned about the program as a student | | |
| • My children have participated in the program | | |
| • Through my previous experience in a government job | | |
| • Through personal contacts / word of mouth | | |
| • The student/applicant informed me | | |
| • Through the government | | |
| • Through a MHA | | |
| • Through a MP | | |
| • Through the municipality | | |
| • Through Community Services Council [not specified how] | | |
| • Through the local Business Development Association | | |
| • Through CBDC | | |
| • Through the school | | |
| • Through Memorial University [not specified how] | | |
| • Another organization [not specified] informed me | | |
| • Meetings were held in my community | | |
| • Through the newspaper | | |
| • Through advertisements [not specified where] | | |
| • Through an e-mail mailing list (newsletter) about this & other programs | | |
| • Through the media [not specified] | | |
| • I was looking for grants | | |
| • I made phone calls [not specified to whom] | | |
| • I contacted Memorial University | | |
| • I have known about the program for years | | |
| • Not sure | | |
| • Don't know | | |
| Total Responses | 348 | |
| 3. How can the program be better promoted? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| a. Website devoted to all Youth Employment programs | 22 | 6% |
| b. Brochure delivered to all businesses with a mail-out (such as WHSCC assessment) | 54 | 14% |
| c. Through Industry, trade or employer associations (Board of Trade, etc.) newsletters | 5 | 1% |
| d. Advertising in the Newspaper | 51 | 13% |
| e. Gov't should have meetings that discuss the various programs available | 2 | 0.5% |
| f. It should be co-ordinated with the federal government summer employment program promotion | 2 | 0.5% |
| g. Other (specify) | 261 | 66% |
| • Better Internet/web promotion | | |
| • Mailing list via e-mail /blanket e-mail letters to all potential employers | | |
| • Direct, personal contact (phone or visit) with potential employers | | |
| • Make more literature available to businesses | | |
| • Better promotion to those interested in / qualified for the program [not specified] | | |
| • Better promotion to former employers | | |
| • Better promotion to new potential employers | | |
| • Better promotion to small businesses | | |
| • Mail applications directly to potential employers | | |
| • Better promotion via fax | | |
| • Better promotion via HRLE [not specified how] | | |
| • Better promotion via Student Employment Centre | | |
| • Better radio promotion | | |
| • Better television promotion | | |
| • Better promotion on community channels | | |
| • Better media promotion [not specified] | | |
| • Posters/signage in business locations, etc. | | |
| • Better promotion via word-of-mouth | | |
| • More public service announcements | | |
| • Better promotion via news media | | |
| • Better promotion in rural areas | | |
| • Better promotion in communities | | |
| • Send newsletters to constituency members | | |
| • Better promotion to schools/students/graduates | | |
| • Promote at the university (i.e. website) | | |
| • Rely on students to promote to businesses via asking for sponsorships | | |
| • Promote financial benefits to students | | |
| • More information given to school counselors | | |
| • Mentoring programs for students | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|--|---------|
| • Do presentations on career day at the schools | |
| • No improvement needed | |
| • Don't know / not sure | |
| • Promote the programs earlier in the year | |
| • Better marketing/advertising [not specified] | |
| • Too much promotion – not enough qualified students for interested employers | |
| • More promotion in general (i.e. there is too little) | |
| • Devote more funds to promotion | |
| • It depends on who they are trying to reach | |
| • “Having more of them” | |
| • Better management of deadlines (less changes, later deadlines, earlier notification, etc.) | |
| • Increase funding / number of placements/workers for the program | |
| • Better information/notification as to whether or not a grant was likely to be given | |
| • Better compensation for students (grant allowances, salaries, etc.) | |
| • Allow employers to advertise for qualified applicants, rather than sponsoring | |
| • Better management of grants (i.e. pay employers on time) | |
| • Offer more than one placement to interested employers | |
| Total Responses | 397 |
| 4. With whom did you work when you were applying for and implementing the program (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | |
| a. HRLE Staff | 166 53% |
| b. Community Agency | 24 8% |
| c. MUN | 10 3% |
| d. CNA | 0 0% |
| e. Other (Please list) | 112 36% |
| • Business organizations | |
| • Government organizations | |
| • Names [organization not given] | |
| • Associations [not sure if these are community associations or not] | |
| • Educational organizations | |
| • I did it myself | |
| • Don't know | |
| • No comment | |
| • Student did all the work | |
| • Nobody helped me [implication is that help was not available] | |
| Total Responses | 312 |
| D1. What was the gender or the student/graduate? | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| a. Male | 107 | 36% |
| b. Female | 193 | 64% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| | | |
| D2. What was the age of the student/graduate? | | |
| a. Under 18 | 18 | 6% |
| b. 18-20 | 185 | 62% |
| c. 21-24 | 89 | 30% |
| d. 25-34 | 8 | 3% |
| e. 35-44 | 0 | 0% |
| f. 45-54 | 0 | 0% |
| g. 55-64 | 0 | 0% |
| h. 65 or older | 0 | 0% |
| i. REFUSED | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| | | |
| 5. How would you rate the following aspects of the application and approval process to participate in the program? (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient, 6 =No Answer/Not applicable) | | |
| | | |
| 5ai. Information about the program was timely. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 161 | 54% |
| b. 2 | 75 | 25% |
| c. 3 | 44 | 15% |
| d. 4 | 12 | 4% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 6 | 2% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 2 | 1% |
| g. Total Responses | 300 | |
| | | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| Too slow | 6 | 32% |
| Too long to get an answer | 6 | 32% |
| Other (specify) | 7 | 37% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I had to look for the information myself / No information was given to me • The guidelines/rules changed suddenly & without warning • The application was not flexible enough for my situation, hurting my chances for approval • There is not enough information given for new employers • I was contacted by the community council | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|--|---------|
| Total Responses | 19 |
| How could this be improved? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process applications more efficiently so that approvals can be sent earlier • Get applications to potential employers earlier in the year • Send information about the program before the application process starts • Make information about the program more easily accessible • Mail applications directly to previous employers • Mail/E-mail a reminder about the approaching deadline • Call back right away • Make instructions on the application clearer & more concise • Require the student to provide more details • Have more direct contact with potential employers • Better inform students about the SWASP programs available | |
| Total Responses | 22 |
| 5a. Information about the program was accurate. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 227 76% |
| b. 2 | 59 20% |
| c. 3 | 11 4% |
| d. 4 | 1 0% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 0 0% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 2 1% |
| g. Total Responses | 300 |
| Why did you give it that rating? | |
| a. Not correct | 0 0% |
| b. Not relevant to my region/community | 0 0% |
| c. Not relevant to my organization | 0 0% |
| d. Other (specify) | 1 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I could not give answers that pertained to me because the questions were not flexible enough to fit my situation | |
| Total Responses | 1 |
| How could this be improved? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions need to be better suited to specific geographical regions | |
| Total Responses | 1 |
| 5a. Information about the program was easily available. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 180 | 60% |
| b. 2 | 74 | 25% |
| c. 3 | 35 | 12% |
| d. 4 | 8 | 3% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 2 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 1 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Couldn't find it online | 1 | 8% |
| b. It was only online | 1 | 8% |
| c. Couldn't get a paper copy | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other (specify) | 10 | 83% |
| • Information was difficult to find | | |
| • We had to seek the information ourselves | | |
| • The application came late | | |
| • Difficult to get people to contact us | | |
| Total Responses | 12 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| • Send information out | | |
| • Make information available on the Internet | | |
| • Better advertising | | |
| • Government should give more information to students | | |
| • Increase staff to answer phone calls | | |
| • Get the information out earlier | | |
| • More contact with the departments | | |
| • Application is easier after going through the process once | | |
| Total Responses | 11 | |
| 5bi. Ability of the application form to be understood. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 181 | 60% |
| b. 2 | 89 | 30% |
| c. 3 | 25 | 8% |
| d. 4 | 1 | 0% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 2 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| a. Too hard to read | 0 | 0% |
| b. Too small to pick out | 0 | 0% |
| c. Other (specify) | 3 | 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No opportunity to explain answers given (e.g. why question is irrelevant) • Repetitive questions | | |
| Total Responses | 3 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate some questions • More room to explain answers when applying online • Eliminate time limit for applying online • Make a paper copy available for those applying online • Allow questions to be marked “n/a” without penalization | | |
| Total Responses | 5 | |
| 5bii. Length of application form. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 182 | 61% |
| b. 2 | 79 | 26% |
| c. 3 | 28 | 9% |
| d. 4 | 2 | 1% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 4 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 5 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Too long | 5 | 83% |
| b. Looking for too much information | 1 | 17% |
| c. Other (specify) | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 6 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the application shorter • Remove the time limits when applying online • Allow moving back to the previous screen when applying online • Send a form to previous employers inquiring if they would like another student • Simplify the application | | |
| Total Responses | 7 | |
| 5ci. Questions about the program were addressed Promptly. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 188 | 63% |
| b. 2 | 71 | 24% |
| c. 3 | 18 | 6% |
| d. 4 | 5 | 2% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 3 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 15 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. I couldn't get hold of a real person | 3 | 38% |
| b. I couldn't email questions | 0 | 0% |
| c. I could only get voice mail | 1 | 13% |
| d. Other (specify) | 4 | 50% |
| • My questions weren't answered | | |
| • It took too long to answer my questions | | |
| • Community Services Council had to answer my questions | | |
| Total Responses | 8 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| • Quicker turnaround time for applications so that approval notices are sent out sooner | | |
| • Increase staff | | |
| • Ensure staff is qualified to answer questions | | |
| • Allow employers more placements if they really need them | | |
| • Ensure staff is available to answer phones | | |
| • Provide higher tuition vouchers & higher pay for students | | |
| • Prevent potential employers from applying for more grants than they really need | | |
| Total Responses | 8 | |
| 5cii. Questions about the program were addressed Accurately. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 212 | 71% |
| b. 2 | 58 | 19% |
| c. 3 | 13 | 4% |
| d. 4 | 0 | 0% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 2 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 15 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 8 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. They couldn't answer my questions | 1 | 50% |
| b. The answer they gave me was wrong | 1 | 50% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| c. Other (specify) | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 3 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| • Have qualified people available to answer questions | | |
| • Speed up the application process so that approval notices can be sent out earlier | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| 5d. What was the length of time it took for you to receive approval notice? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 61 | 20% |
| 5e. Were you satisfied with the length of time it took to receive approval notice? | | |
| a. Yes | 185 | 62% |
| b. No | 108 | 36% |
| c. No answer | 7 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 5ei. If no, how long should the approval process be? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 5 | 5% |
| 5f. When do you need the approval notification? | | |
| a. April | 152 | 51% |
| b. May | 118 | 39% |
| c. June | 30 | 10% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 6. When you reflect upon the length of the program, would you say it was: | | |
| a. Too short | 141 | 47% |
| b. Just right | 152 | 51% |
| c. Too long | 0 | 0% |
| d. No answer | 7 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 7. What, in your opinion, would be the ideal length of time for the SWASP program? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 0 | 0% |
| 8. How long on average did it take you to have your claim processed for payment? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 75 | 25% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| 9. Were you satisfied with the length of time it took to process your wage subsidy claim for payment? | | |
| a. Yes | 234 | 78% |
| b. No | 51 | 17% |
| c. No answer | 15 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 9a. What is a reasonable amount of time to have your claim processed? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 1 | 2% |
| 10. Would you have hired someone for the summer if the program had not been in place? | | |
| a. Yes | 103 | 34% |
| b. No | 184 | 61% |
| c. No answer | 13 | 4% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 10a. Would you have hired a student if the program had not been in place? | | |
| a. Yes | 98 | 33% |
| b. No | 182 | 61% |
| c. No answer | 20 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 11. How did you recruit the person you hired? (Select one) | | |
| a. The student/graduate presented themselves | 114 | 36% |
| b. Referred by HRLE | 35 | 11% |
| c. Referred by MUN | 3 | 0.9% |
| d. Referred by College of the North Atlantic | 4 | 1.2% |
| e. Referred by Private College | 3 | 0.9% |
| f. Other (please specify) | 162 | 50% |
| • Referred by a personal contact | | |
| • Referred by an employee or other business contact | | |
| • Referred by his/her high school | | |
| • Referred by Chamber of Commerce | | |
| • Referred by a government agency [not specified] | | |
| • We advertised the position | | |
| • Word-of-mouth | | |
| • We chose from applications/resumes we had on file | | |
| • We did interviews | | |
| • I knew the person beforehand | | |
| • The person had worked with us previously [possibly not through the program] | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-------|
| • We hired the same person through this or a similar program in previous years | | |
| • We utilized student job banks | | |
| • We went through the Student Employment Centre | | |
| • We searched within the community / contacted the municipality | | |
| • We selected people at random | | |
| • We went through the application process | | |
| Total Responses | 321 | |
| 12. How would you rate the person's employability skills when they started with your organization? (1 = excellent and 5 = poor, 6 =No Answer/Not applicable) | | |
| a. 1- Excellent | 87 | 29% |
| b. 2 | 98 | 33% |
| c. 3 | 87 | 29% |
| d. 4 | 23 | 8% |
| e. 5 - Poor | 5 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 12a. Could these have been improved before employment started? | | |
| a. Yes | 11 | 39% |
| b. No | 16 | 57% |
| c. Not sure | 1 | 4% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 28 | |
| 12ai. In what skill areas do you think the person would have benefited from training? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Work Ethic | 1 | 4.5% |
| b. Punctuality | 2 | 9% |
| c. Workplace Behaviour | 3 | 13.6% |
| d. Interpersonal Skills | 3 | 13.6% |
| e. Communication skills | 4 | 18.1% |
| f. Team work skills | 0 | 0% |
| g. Computer Skills | 0 | 0% |
| h. Dress & Attitude | 0 | 0% |
| i. Self-esteem | 1 | 4.5% |
| j. Motivation | 0 | 0% |
| k. Other (List) | 8 | 36.4% |
| • Mechanical/labour | | |
| • Hospitality | | |
| • Multi-tasking | | |
| • Life skills [e.g. household chores] | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| • Retail | | |
| • Flexibility | | |
| • Responsibility | | |
| • Call the manager if sick | | |
| Total Responses | 22 | |
| 12b. Were their employability skills adequate at the end of the Program? | | |
| a. Yes | 289 | 96% |
| b. No | 5 | 2% |
| c. Not sure | 6 | 2% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 12bi. If no, how can the program be improved to assist in this area? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. HRLE should provide training | 0 | 0% |
| b. HRLE should evaluate the graduate midway through | 0 | 0% |
| c. There should be a requirement for mentoring in the program | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other, please explain | 5 | 100% |
| • The program cannot do anything in this area | | |
| • Don't know | | |
| Total Responses | 5 | |
| 14. Did the program benefit you as an employer? | | |
| a. Yes | 293 | 98% |
| b. No | 1 | 0% |
| c. Somewhat | 5 | 2% |
| d. No answer | 1 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 14a. How was this program of benefit? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Subsidized the cost of worker(s) | 14 | 4% |
| b. It provided an opportunity to determine suitability of an individual for future possible full or part-time employment | 24 | 6% |
| c. It provided an opportunity to train an individual | 33 | 8.7% |
| d. Assistance with a specific project at work | 85 | 23% |
| e. Obtained new staff: to fill existing vacancies | 58 | 15% |
| f. Obtained new staff: because of Business Growth | 14 | 4% |
| g. It brought new skills into an organization | 25 | 7% |
| h. Opportunity to positively influence a young person's life | 35 | 9.3% |
| i. Other (please list) | 89 | 24% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|--|---------|
| • Provided an incentive for people to work for the employer | |
| • Provided money to get a better product | |
| • Provided extra service for customers | |
| • Allowed us to complete projects more quickly | |
| • Obtained new staff: to fill in for employees that needed time off (e.g. vacations) | |
| • More manpower to handle the current work load | |
| • Provided extra support [not specified how] | |
| • Obtained new staff: to give us more time for other projects / concerns | |
| • Obtained new staff: only for the time of the year we needed extra staff | |
| • Brought fresh people into the organization, creating a positive effect | |
| • Provided workers that were otherwise hard to find | |
| • Creates employment for students | |
| • Creates employment and/or opportunities for the community | |
| • Promoted the employment opportunities we have | |
| • Gave us a better image in the eyes of the community | |
| • Student's family gave us more business | |
| • I was not subsidized because I missed the deadline for payment | |
| • I also want to make a comment about the Grand Falls-Windsor staff. They have been great to work with. They are always helping us out, answering questions, and trying to get us more funding. I would like them to be recognized by a simple phone call. | |
| • It was having resources there in case we have any questions about the general employment. | |
| Total Responses | 377 |
| 15. Do you have any specific suggestions on how the program could be improved? | |
| a. Increase program length | 71 18% |
| b. Decrease program length | 0 0% |
| c. Provide a greater subsidy | 30 8% |
| d. Provide a training allowance for the student/graduate | 12 3% |
| e. Provide a completion bonus for the student (if GEP) | 4 1% |
| f. Improve the administration of the program | 8 2% |
| g. Other (please list) | 268 68% |
| • Have option to spread hours available over a longer period of time | |
| • Provide additional resources [not specified] | |
| • Increase the stipend | |
| • Provide funding for extra needs (e.g. putting students on company's insurance if driving) | |
| • Increase funding for employers' administration fees (e.g. EI deduction) | |
| • Increase the student's tuition supplement | |
| • Provide earlier notice of approvals (quicker application turnaround) | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| |
|---|
| • Make it easier for employers to get more than one placement |
| • Send payment / funding more quickly |
| • Provide information & applications earlier |
| • Make the application & application process shorter/more simple |
| • Give more information to employers & students & in a timely and/or intimate manner |
| • Increase number of students in the program |
| • Move back deadlines |
| • Allow previous employers to skip the application form |
| • Allow employers to complete the application online |
| • Allow employers to qualify for placements more easily |
| • Help employers determine which students are still available for SWASP when approval is granted (i.e. have not taken another job/position) |
| • Do the survey just after applications have been submitted |
| • Promote program in the schools around April/May |
| • Better time frames [not specified] |
| • Do not put employer's payment on the onus of students to call |
| • Increase placements eligible for volunteer groups |
| • Allow university students to start earlier than high-school students |
| • Remind people of deadlines |
| • Quicker notification if program can be extended |
| • Move up deadlines |
| • Send an information booklet out to potential employers |
| • Allow employers to better argue their fitness for the program on the application |
| • Guarantee each employer a subsidy |
| • Shorten surveys such as this |
| • Provide a window of opportunity to replace applicants without losing placement |
| • The line system doesn't make sense |
| • No I don't |
| • Better/earlier promotion |
| • Provide students with more training & employment skills (such as people skills) prior to getting the placement |
| • I don't know |
| • Provide incentives for students to pay attention to job performance |
| • Allow employers greater choice over who they hire / avoid unqualified people |
| • More focus on actual pay for students / greater pay |
| • Allow high school students (i.e. Grade 11 and/or 12) to enter the program |
| • Better promotion to students, especially in rural areas |
| • Allow placements to occur at other times besides the summer |
| • Provide a more permanent program |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| • Provide “mentor packages” for employers when applicable | | |
| • Allow part-time placements | | |
| • Promote to students the benefits of training via a SWASP program | | |
| • Provide a local person to talk to for help & advice | | |
| • Contact employers through e-mail | | |
| • Better matching of employers’ needs with skill of applicants | | |
| • Reinstate the workplace health and safety aspect of the program | | |
| • Create placements that allow students to utilize pertinent & worthwhile job skills | | |
| • Approve number of hours for each placement | | |
| • Better promotion to potential new employers | | |
| • Allow employers to upgrade current part-time students to full time via the program | | |
| Total Responses | | 393 |
| 19. Would it be of benefit to stagger the subsidy to enable employers to provide higher wages to the students as they progress in their education - i.e. if they return in subsequent summers? | | |
| a. Yes | 233 | 78% |
| b. No | 38 | 13% |
| c. Not Sure | 23 | 8% |
| d. No answer | 6 | 2% |
| Total Responses | | 300 |
| 20. Are there other funding structures that would to allow you to offer competitive wage rates to graduates? (List responses) | | |
| • No | | |
| • Yes – federal funding [not specific] | | |
| • I don’t know | | |
| • That would be a scale subsidy to ease them through the business. | | |
| • I don’t think it applies to me. | | |
| • I like the provincial funding a lot. | | |
| • Yes – graduate employment program | | |
| • I have applied with HR and ACONA for a graduate employment initiative It is for fifty-two weeks at a sixty percent subsidy. | | |
| • Yes – Service Canada | | |
| • It would have to be better than what everyone else is paying. | | |
| • Yes – but I’m not eligible | | |
| • The employer should be encouraged to pay more than minimum wage. | | |
| • Yes – GEP Program | | |
| • Service Canada, Eco Jobs, Band of Newfoundland Indians, SWASP, and Newfoundland Works target wage subsidies. | | |
| • Yes – [not specific] | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – provincial program |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They could provide a higher rate of subsidy. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – federal student summer grants |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial one strictly for high school. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that other subsidies would be good. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – the summer job creation |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There's the target wage subsidy, where employers match fifty percent of the funding for the first year. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be a few, but I don't use them. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's hard to offer more in this business because minimum wage is so high now. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, I have a girl working with the leakage program. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it's possible to get any subsidies, it would make it easier to hire students. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be better if they offered the funds up front, and then, you could. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would if the government subsidized the cost of employment, for example, Canada Pension. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you increased the allowance, it would be easier for me, and I wouldn't have to top the allowance myself. Also, if the tuition voucher was bigger, it would be better because it's hard to get an education with \$1400. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We raise money. We are just a heritage committee and having students is very valuable to us. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'm not sure that most students would want to work with me. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like a mentoring program, and I would like it to be funded. I would like an internship program available. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this was offered as a winter program I would certainly apply for it. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be the subsidy from the city of St John's and grants from the provincial government and one partially funded from Service Canada. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provincial and federal government both have longer programs for graduates. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – Canada Summer Jobs |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need maybe extra funds from the federal government. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – Federal SEP |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, I am aware that skilled trades offer a subsidy for students. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I guess it would be having some sort of tiered funding. The first year, you get a percentage, and the second year, you get more. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They could offer some tax break incentives. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are other opportunities we have such as bonuses. That is still done on an individual basis, though. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GTPE |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would if the subsidies were higher. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A program like this would help. One of the big issues is the cost of training a new person. If a program like this were offered, more businesses that aren't so big would |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| be more willing to do something like this. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer Career Placement Program | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That would depend on the position they would take. It's hard to hire somebody, for example, an administrative position, for only six weeks. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should encourage it to be more than minimum wage and the tuition voucher should be more. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We get donations from the community and from the town. We get a lot of equipment, and we have a good relation with the municipality. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have level one, two, and three for twenty hours a week for three weeks that could be improved and made longer. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That would be if there were less employment taxes, like EI. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should have a focus session, and gather a lot of employers to find out what would be of benefit. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In an industry point of view, we are above average. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I guess the students like coming earlier, so they can get prepared for their courses in the fall. They should start the program earlier | | |
| Total Responses | 298 | |
| | | |
| 21a. Do you think the program Enables young people to stay and work in Newfoundland and Labrador? | | |
| a. Yes | 201 | 67% |
| b. No | 59 | 20% |
| c. Partially | 31 | 10% |
| d. No answer | 9 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| | | |
| 21b. Are there ways it can be improved to enable young people to stay in the province? | | |
| a. Yes | 189 | 63% |
| b. No | 52 | 17% |
| c. Partially | 21 | 7% |
| d. No answer | 38 | 13% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| | | |
| 21bi. How could it be improved to enable young people to stay in the province? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Must offer higher subsidies to enable employers to pay higher Wages | 117 | 43% |
| b. Must have a student debt pay down portion to it | 2 | 0.7% |
| c. Must be longer in duration | 37 | 14% |
| d. Must be a tax credit for working in the province | 3 | 1.1% |
| e. Other (Specify) | 112 | 41% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| |
|---|
| • Offer more funding [not specified] |
| • Offer a sliding scale for wages & tuition subsidies based on students' year of study |
| • Offer larger tuition vouchers |
| • Offer the program at other times, not just the summer |
| • Extend program to include replacements by same student in subsequent years (e.g. 3) |
| • Increase number of hours per week |
| • Expand the program |
| • Offer the program earlier in the year |
| • Offer financial incentives to students (e.g. training allowances) |
| • Increase the number of placements & programs |
| • No comment / Don't know |
| • Create more competitive job opportunities |
| • Offer more competitive wages |
| • Provide placements that offer training/experience relevant to students' fields of study |
| • Provide earlier notice about approval and/or funding |
| • Offer more placements per employer |
| • Train students for jobs that are demanded within the province |
| • Provide placements that offer enjoyable & interesting work to students |
| • Create an internship/work-term program |
| • Have more jobs available to new graduates |
| • Provide better advertising to the schools/universities |
| • Help employers find people for summer employment |
| • There is nothing / I can't think of anything |
| • Offer benefits for students to stay [not specified] |
| • Offer apprenticeship programs |
| • Offer more employer incentives [not specified] |
| • Garner more support from the community for small businesses |
| • Allow post-graduates to have placements |
| • Government should give free books to university & college students |
| • Provide specialized training to students |
| • Give employers a chance to evaluate students as potential employees |
| • Minimum wage should be increased |
| • Program should recruit students by phone |
| • Make SWASP positions available to students with skilled trades |
| • Increase manufacturing base |
| • Students need to take it more seriously |
| • Make the job a "renewable resource space" |
| • Better/more promotion [not specified] |
| • Increase the number of approvals |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't penalize people on other systems (e.g. welfare) if they wish to enroll in the program | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide paid supervisors | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps in students' training | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows students to observe what work is in the province | | |
| Total Responses | 271 | |
| 21c. Do you think the program Encourages young people to return to Newfoundland and Labrador? | | |
| a. Yes | 91 | 30% |
| b. No | 66 | 55% |
| c. Partially | 22 | 7% |
| d. No answer | 21 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 21d. Are there ways it can be improved to encourage Young people to return to the province? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Must offer higher subsidies to enable employers to pay higher wages | 108 | 32% |
| b. Must have a student debt pay down portion to it | 7 | 2.1% |
| c. Must be longer | 30 | 9% |
| d. Must be a tax credit for working in the province | 3 | 0.9% |
| e. Other (Specify) | 191 | 56% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a signing bonus for hiring new graduates / post-graduates out of school for 6 months. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't know. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have to offer more full time jobs with competitive wages in their field of study after graduation. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the tuition vouchers so they can continue their studies. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students that are currently taking the program, make the tuition voucher for a local college or university | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the students we hire are from town. We just hire local students. We don't get applicants for out of province. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They need to be here to be hired for the program. They need to be aware of it in order to be hired. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate the jobs available to the all the students living away example: by advertising at all national universities | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program was better promoted and better communicated with the community and employers. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They could be given more training/education that is related to the industries within | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| |
|--|
| the province. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we knew about the funding earlier, we would let people outside of Newfoundland know what is available. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We must have enough time to train the students. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people would return if they had a graduate program that would take them into their field of study in the first couple of years. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a contract where education is sponsored by the province, and the graduate must work in the province for a specified number of years. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a separate program for the students returning to the province. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer government assistance in helping smaller businesses to offer their employees health care benefits. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student will learn about the heritage of Newfoundland and Labrador and would want to stay around. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again, there needs to be a longer amount of time with the student continuing to go to school, and come back to the same employer. If a student wanted to enter a certain profession, like insurance, they could gain experience rather just work for the summer to get some money. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They can improve with earlier notice of the job positions so they are aware there are jobs available. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it available to post-graduates. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are similar programs that are available in other provinces. They're provincial and federal projects, and I don't feel it keeps them here. I feel that it's more for the employer to hire students during the busier summer months. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide financial assistance [not specific] |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help them with student fares to get home. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer a program for skilled trades. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start educating earlier enough in school, like grade seven, that there are jobs in Newfoundland. It seems like career counselors are lacking. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give them a good work term making decent money at a good job so they can see that there is a good life to be had here in Newfoundland. If they work away in a back room all summer for \$8 an hour, they aren't going to want to return here. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer work skills. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More students should be informed that the program is available. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They just have to go back to school. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should offer more grants and funding. They should also consider how many people an organization wants to hire. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subsidy should match what the employer is paying. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could be improved by hiring students that are interested in the related employment. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have more promotion in High School. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis could be put on getting students in connection with career possibility based jobs. |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There could be another sum paid each week to help pay living expenses. | | |
| Total Responses | 339 | |
| 22. Have you ever hired a person on income support or whose family is on income support for the program? | | |
| a. Yes | 31 | 10% |
| b. No | 224 | 75% |
| c. Not Sure | 43 | 14% |
| d. No answer | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 22a. If yes, was the experience satisfactory? | | |
| a. Yes | 27 | 87% |
| b. No | 2 | 6% |
| c. Not Sure | 2 | 6% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 31 | |
| 22ai. If no, why was it unsatisfactory? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Candidate had poor employability skills (low work ethic, not punctual, etc.) | 2 | 67% |
| b. Candidate had poor workplace skills | 1 | 33% |
| c. Couldn't pay enough to compete with Income Support system | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other (Specify) | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 3 | |
| 22aii. Was there anything HRLE could have done to improve your satisfaction? Please explain. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| 23. Would you hire another student/graduate through the program? | | |
| Yes | 294 | 98% |
| No | 1 | 0% |
| Not Sure | 5 | 2% |
| No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 24. Would you recommend this program to a colleague? | | |
| a. Yes | 297 | 99% |
| b. No | 1 | 0% |
| c. No answer | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| 25. Rate your overall level of satisfaction with the program: (Very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat unsatisfied, very unsatisfied, unsure) | | |
| a. Very satisfied | 187 | 62% |
| b. Somewhat satisfied | 109 | 36% |
| c. Somewhat unsatisfied | 3 | 1% |
| d. Very unsatisfied | 0 | 0% |
| e. Unsure | 1 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| Information about your Organization... | | |
| 1. What is your postal code? | | |
| 2. What is your Average Number of Employees throughout the year? | | |
| a. 1-3 | 82 | 27% |
| b. 4-10 | 124 | 41% |
| c. 11-25 | 51 | 17% |
| d. 26-50 | 23 | 8% |
| e. 51-100 | 8 | 3% |
| f. 100+ | 8 | 3% |
| g. No Answer | 4 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 300 | |
| 3. What sector is your company? | | |
| a. Retail | 110 | 36% |
| b. Service (Food service, Hospitality, professional services, etc.) | 101 | 33% |
| c. Manufacturing & Processing | 14 | 5% |
| d. Resources (Fishing, mining, agriculture, etc.) | 8 | 2.6% |
| e. No Answer | 2 | 0.7% |
| f. Other (Specify) | 71 | 23% |
| • Not-for-profit /Volunteer/Charitable Organizations | | |
| • Environmental | | |
| • Tourism and Heritage | | |
| • Wholesale | | |
| • Municipality | | |
| • Communications | | |
| • Child Care Services | | |
| • Municipal Government | | |
| • Arts & Cultural Sector | | |
| • Government Agency [not specific] | | |
| • Private [not specific] | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| • Summer Camp | | |
| • Social [not specific] | | |
| • Construction | | |
| Total Responses | | 306 |
| 4. What was the approximate gross revenue of the company last year? | | |
| a. \$50,000 - \$250,000 | 59 | 20% |
| b. \$250,001- \$500,000 | 34 | 11% |
| c. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | 32 | 11% |
| d. \$1,000,001-\$5,000,000 | 36 | 12% |
| e. \$5,000,001+ | 11 | 4% |
| f. Don't know | 57 | 19% |
| g. Not applicable / no answer | 71 | 24% |
| Total Responses | | 300 |

SWASP High School

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| 1. Which program(s) has your organization participated in? (Check only one - if they did more than one, they must pick one (most recent) and are invited to complete another survey for the other program.) | | |
| a. SWASP Post Secondary | 0 | 0% |
| b. SWASP High School | 73 | 100% |
| c. GEP | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | | 73 |
| 2. How did you find out about the Program? | | |
| a. HRLE mailed me an application | 18 | 22% |
| b. I was in it before | 27 | 33% |
| c. I heard from other business colleagues | 3 | 3.7% |
| d. I went looking for the info online | 3 | 3.7% |
| e. I called HRLE looking for info on employment programs | 4 | 4.9% |
| f. Other (specify) | 26 | 32% |
| • From the Local MHA | | |
| • In the mail (not sure who mailed it). | | |
| • I've known about it for years. | | |
| • I don't know. | | |
| • Years ago, growing up, we had them in our community. | | |
| • From ANLA | | |
| • By Word of Mouth | | |
| • Through the Local Employment Office | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| • I contacted someone in the premier's office. | | |
| • Through the High School | | |
| • From Other municipalities | | |
| • It was at the company when I went to work there. | | |
| • General Advertising | | |
| • Through a church organization | | |
| • In the newspaper | | |
| • Through the media. | | |
| Total Responses | 81 | |
| 3. How can the program be better promoted? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Website devoted to all Youth Employment programs | 4 | 4% |
| b. Brochure delivered to all businesses with a mail-out (such as WHSCC assessment) | 13 | 13% |
| c. Through Industry, trade or employer associations Board of Trade, etc.) newsletters | 2 | 2% |
| d. Advertising in the Newspaper | 13 | 13% |
| e. Gov't should have meetings that discuss the various programs available | 1 | 1% |
| f. It should be co-ordinated with the federal government | | |
| g. summer employment program promotion | 1 | 1% |
| h. Other (specify) | 65 | 66% |
| • It should be promoted earlier in the year | | |
| • I don't know. | | |
| • It doesn't need to be improved. | | |
| • Different municipalities should be sent an e-mail with all of the information needed. | | |
| • Greater promotion in the high schools & colleges. | | |
| • Put the applications in the mail. | | |
| • E-mail information to businesses | | |
| • Advertise through the radio | | |
| • Advertise it on television. | | |
| • The program should be 35-40 hours per week. | | |
| • Have more students in the program, at least two for each business. | | |
| • Have some local advertising for individuals and groups prior to the deadline instead of sending out application packages. | | |
| • Charitable organizations find it hard to meet government requirements. Rural communities don't have the students that match the requirements or criteria. | | |
| • I think the program needs to be stricter for the students and more discipline. They need to know that it is not a joke. Follow the same guideline as if it were a real job. | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|--------|
| • Have someone personally visit the businesses to discuss the program. | | |
| • E-mail information to the public. | | |
| • Better promotion in general [not specified how] | | |
| • It has to be a more efficient application process so approvals notices can be sent out earlier. | | |
| • Better promotion of financial benefits for students working for non-profit organizations. | | |
| • If the program was up and running in March, it would give more time for pre-screening the applicants. | | |
| • They should be provided more money for materials and other expenses | | |
| Total Responses | | 99 |
| 4. With whom did you work when you were applying for and implementing the program (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. HRLE Staff | 39 | 51% |
| b. Community Agency | 14 | 18% |
| c. MUN | 2 | 2.6% |
| d. CNA | 0 | 0% |
| e. Other (Please list) | 22 | 29% |
| • I do not know. | | |
| • Church Organizations | | |
| • I did not work with anyone –I did it myself. | | |
| • Municipality/Local Service District | | |
| • It was Images in Slate. | | |
| • Government Employee [did not state provincial or federal] | | |
| • It was my MHA. | | |
| • They were paid for labour from the government at \$7.50 an hour at thirty hours a week for four weeks. The money came from the donations from people. We paid for the materials | | |
| Total Responses | | 77 |
| D1. What was the gender or the student/graduate? | | |
| a. Male | | 38 52% |
| b. Female | | 35 48% |
| Total Responses | | 73 |
| D2. What was the age of the student/graduate? | | |
| a. Under 18 | | 44 60% |
| b. 18-20 | | 22 30% |
| c. 21-24 | | 3 4% |
| d. 25-34 | | 1 1% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| e. 35-44 | 0 | 0% |
| f. 45-54 | 0 | 0% |
| g. 55-64 | 0 | 0% |
| h. 65 or older | 0 | 0% |
| i. REFUSED | 3 | 4% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 5. How would you rate the following aspects of the application and approval process to participate in the program? (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient, 6 =No Answer/Not applicable) | | |
| 5ai. Information about the program was timely. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 36 | 49% |
| b. 2 | 18 | 25% |
| c. 3 | 13 | 18% |
| d. 4 | 2 | 3% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 3 | 4% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Too slow | 2 | 40% |
| b. Too long to get an answer | 1 | 20% |
| c. Other (specify) | 2 | 40% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I did not get any information from them on the program. I had to get the information from my MHA. • There was a funding issue last year and that delayed information being passed on. | | |
| Total Responses | 5 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waiting time should be reduced • There should be more time for approval. • They need to give the same opportunity to all the municipalities • Everyone gets the information at the same time. • Ensure contact lists are updated. • You should establish funding earlier | | |
| Total Responses | 7 | |
| 5aai. Information about the program was accurate. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 49 | 67% |
| b. 2 | 18 | 25% |
| c. 3 | 3 | 4% |
| d. 4 | 0 | 0% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 2 | 3% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Not correct | 0 | 0% |
| b. Not relevant to my region/community | 0 | 0% |
| c. Not relevant to my organization | 1 | 50% |
| d. Other (specify) | 1 | 50% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last year, the criteria changed from the previous year, and this wasn't made clear to participants. It was noted that there would be changes, but not specified what they would be | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need this help to service and improve our younger generation. We had trouble getting a student last time, and we really need this in our community. • When notification was sent out, it could have been better explained. The program was better the previous year than it was last year | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| 5aiii. Information about the program was easily available. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 35 | 48% |
| b. 2 | 22 | 30% |
| c. 3 | 11 | 15% |
| d. 4 | 2 | 3% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 1 | 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 2 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Couldn't find it online | 0 | 0% |
| b. It was only online | 0 | 0% |
| c. Couldn't get a paper copy | 1 | 33% |
| d. Other (specify) | 2 | 67% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a lot of bugging around to do to sometimes just get the basic information. | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|--|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We were not informed properly about the program. | |
| Total Responses | 3 |
| How could this be improved? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think they should have a rep for each area. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be more information with it, such as, are the certain ages that have to pay, like at one point, Worker's Comp had to be involved. We had to pay Worker's Comp for these guys, but that was cut out last year. There should be a more comprehensive all encompassing government department that could be contacted about things we would like to find out about. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You need to update the mailing list. | |
| Total Responses | 3 |
| 5bi. Ability of the application form to be understood. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 41 56% |
| b. 2 | 21 29% |
| c. 3 | 9 12% |
| d. 4 | 1 1% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 1 1% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 73 |
| Why did you give it that rating? | |
| a. Too hard to read | 0 0% |
| b. Too small to pick out | 0 0% |
| c. Other (specify) | 2 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was hard to interpret and understand. | |
| Total Responses | 2 |
| How could this be improved? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the questions easier to understand. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They want so much information that we just didn't have at the time. We don't know everything when the application time is going on. We don't even know what we are going to have available. | |
| Total Responses | 2 |
| 5bii. Length of application form. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 39 53% |
| b. 2 | 22 30% |
| c. 3 | 9 12% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| d. 4 | 2 | 3% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 0 | 0% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. Too long | 0 | 0% |
| b. Looking for too much information | 0 | 0% |
| c. Other (specify) | 2 | 100% |
| • It was well carried out. | | |
| • We've been trying for projects, and this is the first one we've got. | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| • You don't need all the information that they ask for on the application. | | |
| • They could let us know when the project is out. | | |
| 5ci. Questions about the program were addressed Promptly (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 44 | 60% |
| b. 2 | 21 | 29% |
| c. 3 | 5 | 7% |
| d. 4 | 2 | 3% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 0 | 0% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. I couldn't get hold of a real person | 2 | 100% |
| b. I couldn't email questions | 0 | 0% |
| c. I could only get voice mail | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other (specify) | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| • I just don't like answering machines. | | |
| • There could be more staff. | | |
| Total Responses | 2 | |
| 5cii. Questions about the program were addressed Accurately. (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient) | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| a. 1 - Well done and efficient | 49 | 67% |
| b. 2 | 18 | 25% |
| c. 3 | 4 | 5% |
| d. 4 | 0 | 0% |
| e. 5 - Poorly carried out and inefficient | 0 | 0% |
| f. No Answer/Not applicable | 2 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| Why did you give it that rating? | | |
| a. They couldn't answer my questions | 0 | 0% |
| b. The answer they gave me was wrong | 0 | 0% |
| c. Other (specify) | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 0 | |
| How could this be improved? | | |
| Total Responses | 0 | |
| 5d. What was the length of time it took for you to receive approval notice? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 20 | 27% |
| 5e. Were you satisfied with the length of time it took to receive approval notice? | | |
| a. Yes | 48 | 66% |
| b. No | 22 | 30% |
| c. No answer | 3 | 4% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 5ei. If no, how long should the approval process be? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 0 | 0% |
| 5f. When do you need the approval notification? | | |
| a. April | 25 | 34% |
| b. May | 32 | 44% |
| c. June | 16 | 22% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 6. When you reflect upon the length of the program, would you say it was: | | |
| a. Too short | 26 | 36% |
| b. Just right | 47 | 64% |
| c. Too long | 0 | 0% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| 8. How long on average did it take you to have your claim processed for payment? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 25 | 34% |
| 9. Were you satisfied with the length of time it took to process your wage subsidy claim for payment? | | |
| a. Yes | 54 | 74% |
| b. No | 15 | 21% |
| c. No answer | 4 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 9a. What is a reasonable amount of time to have your claim processed? ENTER NUMBER OF WEEKS | | |
| Don't know | 0 | 0% |
| 10. Would you have hired someone for the summer if the program had not been in place? | | |
| a. Yes | 13 | 18% |
| b. No | 59 | 81% |
| c. No answer | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 10a. Would you have hired a student if the program had not been in place? | | |
| a. Yes | 20 | 27% |
| b. No | 53 | 73% |
| c. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 11. How did you recruit the person you hired? (Select one) | | |
| a. The student/graduate presented themselves | 29 | 36 % |
| b. Referred by HRLE | 7 | 9% |
| c. Referred by MUN | 1 | 1% |
| d. Referred by College of the North Atlantic | 0 | 0% |
| e. Referred by Private College | 0 | 0% |
| f. Other (please specify) | 43 | 54% |
| • We recruited students through the school. | | |
| • Referred by a personal contact. | | |
| • The local community channel (TV) | | |
| • We hired previous employees that were not involved in this program. | | |
| • Local Advertising – community bulletin boards/schools/churches etc. | | |
| • We advertised [not specified how] | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| • I knew the person personally. | | |
| • Used the government job bank. | | |
| • By word of mouth. | | |
| • The Board of Directors sits down and looks at all of the applications, and we also assess need. | | |
| • I phoned people to see if they knew anyone who was looking for a job. | | |
| • Job Postings | | |
| • It was through Youth and Opportunities Canada | | |
| Total Responses | 80 | |
| 12. How would you rate the person's employability skills when they started with your organization? (1 = excellent and 5 = poor, 6 =No Answer/Not applicable) | | |
| a. 1- Excellent | 17 | 23% |
| b. 2 | 26 | 36% |
| c. 3 | 22 | 30% |
| d. 4 | 4 | 5% |
| e. 5 - Poor | 4 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 12a. Could these have been improved before employment started? | | |
| a. Yes | 4 | 50% |
| b. No | 2 | 25% |
| c. Not sure | 2 | 25% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 8 | |
| 12ai. In what skill areas do you think the person would have benefited from training? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Work Ethic | 1 | 8% |
| b. Punctuality | 0 | 0% |
| c. Workplace Behaviour | 1 | 8% |
| d. Interpersonal Skills | 1 | 8% |
| e. Communication skills | 2 | 15% |
| f. Team work skills | 0 | 0% |
| g. Computer Skills | 0 | 0% |
| h. Dress & Attitude | 1 | 8% |
| i. Self-esteem | 0 | 0% |
| j. Motivation | 1 | 8% |
| k. Other (List) | 2 | 15% |
| • It would be initiative. | | |
| • I have a really bad thing with the way the system is set up. It shouldn't be grade | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| <p>twelve and above. They don't have the opportunity to get work skills. All students need a chance earlier to build up skills. It would be wonderful to hire a grade nine student, so I can hire them every year. Then, they leave me with lots of skills. I prefer to hire grade nine students. They will have learned something. How much can you learn in six to eight weeks? They are easier to train in attitude. They are more willing to learn and accept what you tell them. In grade twelve, they think they know a lot. Grade nine students are willing to take instruction and are more accepting and easier to train.</p> | | |
| Total Responses | 13 | |
| 12b. Were their employability skills adequate at the end of the Program? | | |
| a. Yes | 67 | 92% |
| b. No | 6 | 8% |
| c. Not sure | 0 | 0% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 12bi. If no, how can the program be improved to assist in this area? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| • HRLE should provide training | 1 | 17% |
| • HRLE should evaluate the graduate midway through | 0 | 0% |
| • There should be a requirement for mentoring in the program | 0 | 0% |
| • Other, please explain | 5 | 83% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should be able to let go of the ones who don't want to work. There should be a simple firing process like get rid of the people that are too lazy to do anything. • I think we had a limited number of applicants who fit the requirements. We had a small pool to draw on. • We should have interviewed the applicant. We need to be more forward with these kids. • There should be an earlier call for applications, so the work is more competitive to the jobs offered to the students. • They can improve by opening it up to grade nine students so they can start at a younger age. In a smaller area, there is no work, and they don't work until grade twelve. I loved to have a grade nine student in the past, and I would love to have one again. | | |
| Total Responses | 6 | |
| 14. Did the program benefit you as an employer? | | |
| a. Yes | 65 | 89% |
| b. No | 4 | 5% |
| c. Somewhat | 4 | 5% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 14a. How was this program of benefit? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Subsidized the cost of worker(s) | 18 | 19% |
| b. It provided an opportunity to determine suitability of an individual | | |
| c. for future possible full or part-time employment | 4 | 4% |
| d. It provided an opportunity to train an individual | 4 | 4% |
| e. Assistance with a specific project at work | 24 | 26% |
| f. Obtained new staff: to fill existing vacancies | 7 | 7% |
| g. Obtained new staff: because of Business Growth | 4 | 4% |
| h. It brought new skills into an organization | 3 | 3% |
| i. Opportunity to positively influence a young person's life | 9 | 10% |
| j. Other (please list) | 21 | 22% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It helped because the student was able to help out in areas that usually fall by the wayside. • We are the busiest that time of year, and she knew the schedule of the trucks and when they came in. • The students allow us to get more work done and to better maintain our ball field. • It's good to hire students. • It helped us save some money. • It improved the quality and the amount of service, which I normally can't afford. • We weren't short-staffed in the summer because our regular staff took time off, so we didn't get behind. • It gave us full week accessibility to our CAP site office, and went to the public for camps with kids. • We were able to keep our museum open. • It provided meaningful work through the community with sports programs and work experience. • Financially, we would have never been able to do it without the program. • It created community involvement. • We are a volunteer organization, and we would not have been able to open without her. • The program gave me more labour when I needed it. • They were a great help. | | |
| Total Responses | 94 | |
| 15. Do you have any specific suggestions on how the program could be improved? | | |
| a. Increase program length | 14 | 15% |
| b. Decrease program length | 0 | 0% |
| c. Provide a greater subsidy | 12 | 13% |
| d. Provide a training allowance for the student/graduate | 3 | 3% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| e. Provide a completion bonus for the student (if GEP) | 2 | 2% |
| f. Improve the administration of the program | 3 | 3% |
| g. Other (please list) | 59 | 63% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There's no need for improvement. • When we have a person, we only have money for labour only. They should provide more money for equipment and things like that. • I don't know. • Make it easier to get students. • Help make organizations more aware of the program. • No • More students should get work. • They could provide a little bit of training to the student. • It would be better to get more students in to work for me. • The applications should be out earlier. • I feel the number of hours should be extended. It would give them leadership qualities, and they would be able to learn more about the work world. • Improve the attitude of the students to have direction. • These students need a lot of supervision which there is no money for, but there should be. • I don't believe that one student should be working alone. It is just too dangerous. • The program could be improved by increasing flexibility for the owner to extend a week or two and still be compensated for the additional wage cost. • Get the word out to students. • We need money for administration. • There were problems with the applying process this year. A lot of businesses that needed this program the most were left out and not approved. • Do more advertising – schools, radio, television • Allow a little more latitude for the organization in applying and hiring. • They need to be more strict with the qualifications. Give us more leeway if we have a problem with the students. Do we have backup if there is a problem with the student and someone to call with the problems such as a support system or some type. • There could be a representative that went to the businesses to check on how the program is going. • A tuition voucher would be beneficial for students. • There should be a wider diversity of students for choice. • There is too much emphasis put on hiring minorities and people with disabilities. It should be equal between them and qualified people. Sometimes, there are not minorities or disabled people to hire. • Have a shorter wait time for approval. • I suggest they allow grade nine and up. | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to be allowed to take the same student post high school. He has experience, and we don't have to give instructions. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program should be up and running earlier. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think they should make it mandatory that the students work past the 15th of August. | | |
| Total Responses | 93 | |
| 19. Would it be of benefit to stagger the subsidy to enable employers to provide higher wages to the students as they progress in their education - i.e. if they return in subsequent summers? | | |
| a. Yes | 55 | 75% |
| b. No | 11 | 15% |
| c. Not Sure | 6 | 8% |
| d. No answer | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 20. Are there other funding structures that would to allow you to offer competitive wage rates to graduates? (List responses) | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, there are no other programs. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes - The Summer Career Placement Program | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need one with a full subsidy because we are a not-for-profit organization. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't know. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – we do have another program [does not specify which one]. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None that I am eligible for because I haven't been in business for 1 year. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes - Young Canada Works Program from Canadian Heritage. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes - Canada Summer Jobs Program and level one, two, three. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – there is a provincial program | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As long as the wages are reasonable, then it would be good. It would also be good to have longer programs. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think they should have a comparative study done on what other places like McDonald's are paying grade twelve students that they hire for the summer. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They could have a graduated scale, and they could be compensated for their experience. | | |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 21a. Do you think the program Enables young people to stay and work in Newfoundland and Labrador? | | |
| a. Yes | 40 | 55% |
| b. No | 20 | 27% |
| c. Partially | 13 | 18% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| 21b. Are there ways it can be improved to enable young people to stay in the province? | | |
| a. Yes | 49 | 67% |
| b. No | 4 | 5% |
| c. Partially | 8 | 11% |
| d. No answer | 12 | 16% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 21bi. How could it be improved to enable young people to stay in the province? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Must offer higher subsidies to enable employers to pay higher wages | 30 | 43% |
| b. Must have a student debt pay down portion to it | 1 | 1.4% |
| c. Must be longer in duration | 6 | 8.6% |
| d. Must be a tax credit for working in the province | 1 | 1.4% |
| e. Other (Specify) | 32 | 46% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should provide more funding for more placements • It would be if the graduate knew the job was going to be there for them when they were finished. • I don't know. • They could pay expenses for things like paint and garbage bags used in the program. • I think young people getting out of grade twelve need help to learn the ropes of some businesses, so they can actually get hired and have the chance. • There should be further education so the students could use that ability. • If the program was extended for twelve months after the person has graduated, then it would be better. • Increase the number of hours that are worked. • It would depend on the course or trade of the student. There have to be requirements and needs for year round employment. Tourism, like mine, is only seasonal. • The program could give the students a financial incentive to stay in the province. • Suitable jobs for them to stay here. • Increase the tuition voucher • It can't be improved because students at this age do not know what they want to do. • They should make tuition free or something because people are getting so far in debt that they cannot find good enough jobs to pay their way here. • It would improve if it progresses from one year to the next, and it's more goal oriented. • I have employment here, and I happen to seek employment elsewhere. • They should have more tourism around here. We have tourists that come here, but no one is around to tell them anything. We should inform the students about our history, so they can help out the tourists. • Get some industry started up here in Newfoundland | | |
| Total Responses | 70 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|------|
| 21c. Do you think the program Encourages young people to return to Newfoundland and Labrador? | | |
| a. Yes | 21 | 29% |
| b. No | 38 | 52% |
| c. Partially | 9 | 12% |
| d. No answer | 5 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 21d. Are there ways it can be improved to encourage Young people to return to the province? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Must offer higher subsidies to enable employers to pay higher wages | 25 | 30% |
| b. Must have a student debt pay down portion to it | 0 | 0% |
| c. Must be longer | 6 | 7.1% |
| d. Must be a tax credit for working in the province | 2 | 2.4% |
| e. Other (Specify) | 51 | 61% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't know. • Offer good education programs. • They should offer more/new programs. • No, it's hard to compete with jobs and wages out west. • No [reason not specified] • This is a high school student program, and this would not apply. • Need more permanent jobs • Make other provinces aware of the programs offered in Newfoundland. • It should provide incentives to young people to stay in the province. • No comment • If they had on the job training, put them in the retail or construction trades that would give them on the job training. It would give them insight into the professions. • There could be more industry related jobs in Newfoundland. • Offer it at different time periods of the year. • It links young people with long term employers. I think maybe applications solicited from students on campus for employment. • They should have more tourism around here. We have tourists that come here, but no one is around to tell them anything. We should inform the students about our history so they can help out the tourists | | |
| Total Responses | 84 | |
| 22. Have you ever hired a person on income support or whose family is on income support for the program? | | |
| a. Yes | 21 | 29% |
| b. No | 44 | 60% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| c. Not Sure | 8 | 11% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 22a. If yes, was the experience satisfactory? | | |
| a. Yes | 17 | 81% |
| b. No | 3 | 14% |
| c. Not Sure | 1 | 5% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 21 | |
| 22ai. Why was it unsatisfactory? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer) | | |
| a. Candidate had poor employability skills (low work ethic, not punctual, etc.) | 2 | 40% |
| b. Candidate had poor workplace skills | 1 | 20% |
| c. Couldn't pay enough to compete with Income Support system | 0 | 0% |
| d. Other (Specify) | 2 | 40% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They just wanted to get their hours to top up the income support. • He didn't want to be here. | | |
| Total Responses | 5 | |
| 22aii. Was there anything HRLE could have done to improve your satisfaction? Please explain. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. • I guess they could get them out and do more community work. Most are confined to four walls. Get them out and do more exciting, more rewarding work like helping seniors or cleaning up, and that sort of thing. • The case was very difficult because we had to take that person or get no one. | | |
| Total Responses | 4 | |
| 23. Would you hire another student/graduate through the program? | | |
| a. Yes | 72 | 99% |
| b. No | 0 | 0% |
| c. Not Sure | 1 | 1% |
| d. No answer | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 24. Would you recommend this program to a colleague? | | |
| a. Yes | 72 | 99% |
| b. No | 0 | 0% |
| c. No answer | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| 25. Rate your overall level of satisfaction with the program: (Very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat unsatisfied, very unsatisfied, unsure) | | |
| a. Very satisfied | 41 | 56% |
| b. Somewhat satisfied | 30 | 41% |
| c. Somewhat unsatisfied | 1 | 1% |
| d. Very unsatisfied | 1 | 1% |
| e. Unsure | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| Information about your Organization... | | |
| 1. What is your postal code? | | |
| 2. What is your Average Number of Employees throughout the year? | | |
| a. 1-3 | 30 | 41% |
| b. 4-10 | 31 | 42% |
| c. 11-25 | 6 | 8% |
| d. 26-50 | 2 | 3% |
| e. 51-100 | 1 | 1% |
| f. 100+ | 1 | 1% |
| g. No Answer | 2 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 73 | |
| 3. What sector is your company? | | |
| a. Retail | 4 | 5% |
| b. Service (Food service, Hospitality, professional services, etc.) | 14 | 19% |
| c. Manufacturing & Processing | 3 | 4% |
| d. Resources (Fishing, mining, agriculture, etc.) | 5 | 7% |
| e. No Answer | 0 | 0% |
| f. Other (Specify) | 48 | 65% |
| • Museum | | |
| • Church/church groups | | |
| • Municipal Government | | |
| • Not-for-Profit Organization | | |
| • Municipality/Municipal Services | | |
| • Tourism | | |
| • Recreation Commission | | |
| • Indian Band Council | | |
| • Charitable Organization | | |
| • Cape Freels Cemetery | | |
| • Local Committee [did not specify] | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| • Volunteer Organization | | |
| • The Lion's Club | | |
| • Government [did not specify] | | |
| Total Responses | 74 | |
| 4. What was the approximate gross revenue of the company last year? | | |
| a. \$50,000 - \$250,000 | 16 | 22% |
| b. \$250,001- \$500,000 | 12 | 16% |
| c. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | 4 | 5% |
| d. \$1,000,001-\$5,000,000 | 4 | 5% |
| e. \$5,000,001+ | 0 | 0% |
| f. Don't know | 14 | 19% |
| g. Not applicable / no answer | 23 | 32% |

Participant Survey Results

GEP

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| 1. Number of GEP Participants surveyed | 61 | |
| 2B. What was your educational status when you participated in the program? | | |
| 1. Private college graduate | 15 | 23% |
| 2. College of the North Atlantic graduate | 16 | 24% |
| 3. University graduate | 26 | 39% |
| 4. Other | 6 | 9% |
| • academy canada | | |
| • pcp | | |
| • centrac college | | |
| • Corona | | |
| • level 3 gr12 | | |
| • keyin college | | |
| Total Responses | 63 | |
| 3. Are you still living in Newfoundland and Labrador | | |
| 1. Yes | 59 | 89% |
| 2. No | 2 | 3% |
| 3. How did you find out about the program? | | |
| 1. Friends or family (Word of mouth) | 10 | 14% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----------|-----|
| 2. Teachers / professors | 9 | 13% |
| 3. Guidance counsellors | 2 | 3% |
| 4. HRLE staff | 4 | 6% |
| 5. Newspaper | 1 | 1% |
| 6. Employer contacted me | 28 | 39% |
| 7. Student employment centre / career information centre | 5 | 7% |
| 8. Internet | 5 | 7% |
| 9. Not sure/don't recall | 4 | 6% |
| 10. Other | 4 | 6% |
| • herself | | |
| • Social Worker | | |
| • co-worker | | |
| • company applied for a job with was looking for a graduate of the program | | |
| Total Responses | 72 | |
| | | |
| 4. How could the program be better promoted to students/graduates? | | |
| 1. Website devoted to youth / graduate employment programs | 6 | 6% |
| 2. Information emailed to all college / university students | 18 | 19% |
| 3. Information sessions held at schools/universities/colleges | 36 | 39% |
| 4. Posters | 15 | 16% |
| 5. Other | 18 | |
| • Don't Know | | |
| • job bank | | |
| • bigger employers promote this route even they are not going to hire student | | |
| • more information given to business | | |
| • promoted by student centers | | |
| • media and and advertising | | |
| • Employers made more aware | | |
| • put in school agendas | | |
| • job skilled class that help put together resumes | | |
| • buy in from employer: Co-op office should promote it. | | |
| • better promoted for students. With post secondary | | |
| • make more employers and students aware of the programs | | |
| • news media | | |
| • newspaper and beacon and employers | | |
| • go to employers | | |
| • Phamplet in with orientation | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|--------------------|-----|
| • Radio advertising | | |
| Total Responses | 93 | |
| 5. With whom did you work when you were applying for the program | | |
| 1. HRLE Staff | 7 | 12% |
| 2. Community Agency | 4 | 7% |
| 3. MUN | 3 | 5% |
| 4. CNA | 0 | 0% |
| 5. Employer | 36 | 62% |
| 6. Teacher / professor/Instructor | 1 | 2% |
| 7. Not sure/don't recall | 3 | 5% |
| 8. Other | 4 | 7% |
| • did not work | | |
| • linkage program with HRDC | | |
| • make aware of the graduate program from employer where I applied for a position | | |
| • evening course teaching at memorial university | | |
| • keyin college | | |
| Total Responses | 58 | |
| 6. How did you find out about your position? | | |
| 1. I found the job myself | 22 | 33% |
| 2. Post-secondary institution referred me to an employer | 5 | 8% |
| 3. Employer found me | 22 | 33% |
| 4. Applied through HRLE and they connected me to employer | 3 | 5% |
| 5. Community agency connected me to employer | *No data collected | |
| 6. Educational institution connected me to the employer | 4 | 6% |
| 7. Not sure/don't recall | 2 | 3% |
| 8. Other | 8 | 12% |
| • contact of his father | | |
| • friend | | |
| • got job through volunteering | | |
| • person that he knew | | |
| • Previous workterm | | |
| • volunteer was my status at the time | | |
| • Word of mouth | | |
| • work there previously | | |
| • Workterm | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|--------|
| Total Responses | 66 |
| 7. Now, I'm going to read some statements about the application process for the program and I would like for you to tell me how much you agree with the statement. On a scale of one to five, where one means strongly agree, and five means strongly disagree, how much do you agree with the statement | |
| 7.1 Information about the program was provided to me promptly | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 29 48% |
| 2 | 15 25% |
| 3 | 10 17% |
| 4 | 3 5% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 3 5% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 1 2% |
| Total Responses | 60 |
| Why did you disagree? | |
| 1. Didn't receive info until already in placement | 2 |
| 2. Didn't receive info at all | 1 |
| 3. Other | 1 |
| • 6 weeks waiting to go to work | |
| 7.2 Information about the program was accurate | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 42 69% |
| 2 | 10 16% |
| 3 | 4 7% |
| 4 | 4 7% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 1 2% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 61 |
| Why did you disagree? | |
| 1. Didn't receive info until already in placement | 0 |
| 2. Didn't receive info at all | 4 |
| 3. Other | |
| • employment conditions changed was not checked on until end of program | |
| • Had to ask questions | |
| • not communicated well from program to me | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wasn't a set out program | | |
| 7.3 Information about the program was easily available | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 24 | 39% |
| 2 | 10 | 16% |
| 3 | 20 | 33% |
| 4 | 3 | 5% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 4 | 7% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 61 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. No one to ask | 0 | |
| 2. Not available on website | 2 | |
| 3. No contact information for HRLE provided | 1 | |
| 4. No one to talk to about the program | 5 | |
| 5. Other | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • had to go searching • make several trips to find out about program | | |
| 7.4 The application form was easy to understand. | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 31 | 54% |
| 2 | 18 | 32% |
| 3 | 5 | 9% |
| 4 | 1 | 2% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 2 | 4% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 4 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 57 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Was poorly written | 0 | |
| 2. Print was too small, small print) | 0 | |
| 3. Other | 1 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • info was a little too much | | |
| 7.5 The application form was the proper length? | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 31 | 62% |
| 2 | 12 | 24% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| 3 | 4 | 8% |
| 4 | 1 | 2% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 2 | 4% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 11 | 22% |
| Total Responses | 50 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Too much information required | 2 | |
| 2. Other | | |
| 7.6 Questions about the program were addressed promptly. | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 31 | 54% |
| 2 | 14 | 25% |
| 3 | 7 | 12% |
| 4 | 3 | 5% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 2 | 4% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 4 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 57 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Couldn't contact a real person | 2 | |
| 2. Couldn't email | 0 | |
| 3. Always went to voice mail | 1 | |
| 4. Didn't have contact information | 1 | |
| 5. Other | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • could not get in touch with person supposed to ok the grant, was forever trying to get it straightened out • had to wait 3to 4months for approval | | |
| 7.7 Questions about the program were answered accurately. | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 38 | 66% |
| 2 | 9 | 16% |
| 3 | 7 | 12% |
| 4 | 2 | 3% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 2 | 3% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 3 | 5% |
| Total Responses | 58 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| 1. Given incorrect information | 0 | |
| 2. Information did not apply to my placement | 1 | |
| 3. Didn't understand response | 1 | |
| 4. Other | | |
| things that were not aware of and found out later | | |
| 9. When you reflect upon the length of the program, would you say it was: | | |
| 1. Too short | 11 | 18% |
| How long should it have been (11 responses - average was (in Months) | 23 | |
| 2. Just right | 39 | 64% |
| 3. Too long | 3 | 5% |
| How long should it have been (3 responses - average was (in Months) | 3.5 | |
| 4. Not sure | 7 | 11% |
| 5. Refused | 1 | 2% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think there should be flexibility in length. I would have benefited from a less hours/longer duration for some months | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 61 | |
| 10. Do you think your employability skills improved by the end of the program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 52 | 85% |
| 2. No | 7 | 11% |
| 3. Not sure | 1 | 2% |
| 4. Refused | 1 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 61 | |
| 10.1 How can the program be improved to assist in this area? (if they answered 2 in 10.) | | |
| 1. More mentoring as part of the program | 0 | |
| 2. More training as part of the program | 4 | |
| 3. Other | 3 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employer needs to be checked on more often • interview employer more thoroughly • just an incentive for the employer | | |
| 11. Was your placement related to your education or chosen career area? | | |
| 1. Directly related | 44 | 72% |
| 2. Somewhat related | 14 | 23% |
| 3. Not at all related | 3 | 5% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----------|-----|
| 4. Unsure | 0 | 0% |
| 5. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 61 | |
| 12. Did you make any contacts during the program that might assist you in finding future employment? | | |
| 1. Yes | 45 | 74% |
| 2. No | 12 | 20% |
| 3. Not sure | 4 | 7% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 61 | |
| 13. Please evaluate the following components of the program and rate them from 1 = Excellent to 5 = Poor | | |
| 13.1 relevance of placement to career goals | | |
| Excellent 1 | 37 | 63% |
| 2 | 10 | 17% |
| 3 | 9 | 15% |
| 4 | 1 | 2% |
| Poor 5 | 1 | 2% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 1 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. More detailed job descriptions should be available up front | 0 | |
| 2. There should be more monitoring throughout placement to ensure placement is what it was supposed to be | 0 | |
| 3. Other | 1 | |
| • make work more inline with my qualifications | | |
| 13. 2 On the job support and training | | |
| Excellent 1 | 12 | 20% |
| 2 | 9 | 15% |
| 3 | 8 | 14% |
| 4 | 3 | 5% |
| Poor 5 | 1 | 2% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 59 | |
| Total Responses | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|--|--------|
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | |
| 1. More formal orientation process | 3 |
| 2. Ongoing assessments | 1 |
| 3. Have someone to be able to call at HRLE with complaints about the placement | 2 |
| 4. Other | 7 |
| • Not sure | |
| • Didn't know the program was involved | |
| • employer give more orientation | |
| • make match with receipant and employer more compatible | |
| • not sure | |
| • place in position where she could learn somethingg | |
| • when they come in for interviews, done somewhere other than job site | |
| | |
| 13.3 Opportunities to learn new employment related skills | |
| Excellent 1 | 34 58% |
| 2 | 15 25% |
| 3 | 8 14% |
| 4 | 0 0% |
| Poor 5 | 2 3% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 59 |
| | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | |
| 1. More formal training opportunities on the job | 1 |
| 2. More interaction with experienced staff | 0 |
| 3. Other | 0 |
| | |
| 13.4 Training before placement | |
| Excellent 1 | 29 49% |
| 2 | 8 14% |
| 3 | 13 22% |
| 4 | 5 8% |
| Poor 5 | 3 5% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 1 2% |
| Total Responses | 59 |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. Formal orientation provided by HRLE | 1 | |
| 2. Orientation provided by the employer | 4 | |
| 3. Other | 2 | |
| • make it more available. | | |
| • more training | | |
| | | |
| 13.5 Rate of pay | | |
| Excellent 1 | 14 | 24% |
| 2 | 14 | 24% |
| 3 | 16 | 27% |
| 4 | 7 | 12% |
| Poor 5 | 7 | 12% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 1 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |
| | | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. Provide a completion bonus for GEP | 2 | |
| 2. Other | 11 | |
| • Not sure | | |
| • employers offer more money | | |
| • employers pay more | | |
| • experience, if I worked in the field for ten years | | |
| • gov. encourage paying at level comparable to industry , wanted to stay in prov. so took a pay cut | | |
| • More pay | | |
| • more responsibility on company side | | |
| • Own fault | | |
| • Rate of pay higher | | |
| • rate of pay was not in line with skills | | |
| • workers in NL should receive equal pay across Canada | | |
| | | |
| 14. Were the following factors barriers to your participation in the program? | | |
| 14.1 Lack of transportation to and from placement location | | |
| 1. Yes | 4 | 7% |
| 2. No | 54 | 92% |
| 3. Refused | 1 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Provide transportation allowance | 3 | |
| 2. Other | 0 | |
| (no further responses provided) | | |
| 14.2 Lack of child care | | |
| 1. Yes | 6 | 10% |
| 2. No | 51 | 86% |
| 3. Refused | 2 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Provide child care allowance | 4 | |
| 2. Other | 0 | |
| • child care places | | |
| • I don't know | | |
| • Newspaper | | |
| • not too sure, some sort of day care | | |
| • Workterm | | |
| 14.3 Lack of career counseling | | |
| 1. Yes | 11 | 19% |
| 2. No | 48 | 81% |
| 3. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Make information available on a single website | 3 | |
| 2. Send information to participants | 2 | |
| 3. Provide career counseling for participants | 7 | |
| 4. Other | 2 | |
| • more support from hr | | |
| • salary too low | | |
| 15. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means Very satisfied and 5 means Very unsatisfied, please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the program you participated in. | | |
| Very Satisfied 1 | 28 | 47% |
| 2 | 19 | 32% |
| 3 | 6 | 10% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| 4 | 5 | 8% |
| Very Unsatisfied 5 | 1 | 2% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |
| If you were unsatisfied (4 or 5 was selected) | | |
| 1. Work not related to training/career goal | 2 | |
| 2. Work not challenging enough | 0 | |
| 3. Poor supervision | 0 | |
| 4. Lack of supervision | 0 | |
| 5. Pay too low | 1 | |
| 6. Placement too short | 0 | |
| 7. Other | 3 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not much out there for the job I was training for, a lot of work for nothing I feel • could not go to anyone without putting you in a difficult position with any complaints, lack of someone in the firm assisting new staff • placement was poor not a positive experience | | |
| 16. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 mean Very positive influence, and 5 means Very negative influence, please rank the level of influence your experience in the program had on your choices in the following areas: | | |
| 16.3 Pursuing further education | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 22 | 37% |
| 2 | 14 | 24% |
| 3 | 7 | 12% |
| 4 | 2 | 3% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 7 | 12% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 7 | 12% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |
| What would make a difference (if 4 or 5 were selected) | | |
| 1. Lower cost of education | 0 | |
| 2. Access to larger grants | 0 | |
| 3. Possibility of debt reduction | 0 | |
| 4. Access to accurate labour market information | 0 | |
| 5. Don` t Know | 2 | |
| 6. Other | 6 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a better experience at the company with a better environment | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already had degree | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • didn't need further education | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extension of program | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • finished | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • my experience was not relevant to other areas, trying to get back and told not allowed because I am employable, only employable in a very specific area -business management concentration in accounting | | |
| | | |
| 16.4 Choosing a career | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 27 | 46% |
| 2 | 15 | 25% |
| 3 | 7 | 12% |
| 4 | 4 | 7% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 2 | 3% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 4 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |
| | | |
| What would make a difference? | | |
| 1. Access to career counseling | 3 | |
| 2. Access to accurate labour market information | 4 | |
| 3. Other | 0 | |
| 4. Don't know | 1 | |
| | | |
| 16.5 Staying in Newfoundland and Labrador | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 36 | 61% |
| 2 | 7 | 12% |
| 3 | 8 | 14% |
| 4 | 6 | 10% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 1 | 2% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 1 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 59 | |
| | | |
| What would make a difference? | | |
| 1. Access to current job opportunities | 1 | |
| 2. Higher wages | 2 | |
| 3. Debt reduction programs | 0 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|--------|
| 4. Interest relief programs, | 0 |
| 5. job security | 2 |
| 6. Don't know | 0 |
| 7. Other | 2 |
| • salary, communications, and career counseling | |
| • did not provide opportunities within company | |
| | |
| 16.6 Returning to Newfoundland and Labrador | |
| (only asked if it was a GEP who was not currently living in NL) | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 0 |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 0 |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 0 |
| Total Responses | 2 |
| | |
| What would make a difference? | |
| 1. Access to current job opportunities | 0 |
| 2. Higher wages | 0 |
| 3. Debt reduction programs | 0 |
| 4. Interest relief programs, | 0 |
| 5. Job security | 0 |
| 6. Don't know | 0 |
| 7. Other | 0 |
| | |
| 20. Did you stay with your employer the full length of the GEP? | |
| 1. Yes | 33 58% |
| 2. No | 24 42% |
| 3. Refused | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 57 |
| | |
| 20.1 (if yes) Did you continue to work with the employer after the GEP program was completed (12 months)? | |
| 1. Yes | 27 82% |
| 2. No | 6 18% |
| 3. Refused | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 33 |
| | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| 20.1.1 (If yes to 20.1) Are you working at the same position? | | |
| 1. Yes | 18 | 67% |
| 2. No | 9 | 33% |
| 3. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 27 | |
| 20.1.2 (If yes to 20.1) Have you worked at different jobs within your company | | |
| 1. Yes | 4 | 15% |
| 2. No | 23 | 85% |
| 3. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 27 | |
| 20.1.3(If yes to 20.1) Have you received a higher salary? | | |
| 1. Yes | 20 | 74% |
| 2. No | 7 | 26% |
| 3. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 27 | |
| 20.1.4 (If no to higher salary) Are there career development supports HRLE could provide to enable you to be promoted to higher paying positions? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure what is available • Be trained more • If they sponsored upgrading • no (2) • Not sure (2) | | |
| 20.1.5 How long after the program was over (12 months) did you remain with the employer? | | |
| Number respondents | 9 | |
| Average in months | 13 | |
| 20.2 (If no to 20.1) Why did you not remain with the same employer after completing the GEP? | | |
| 1. The job didn't pay enough | 1 | 33% |
| 2. The employer couldn't afford to keep me on | 0 | 0% |
| 3. Unsuitable employer | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Position no longer required | 0 | 0% |
| 5. You left for other opportunities | 1 | 33% |
| 6. Spouse /partner relocated | 1 | 33% |
| 7. Other | 3 | 100% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not a member of the union, hired two people to replace me, could not join union because I was part of the GEP program | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> relocating to Alberta | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not suitable for job | |
| Total Responses | 3 |
| 20.3 Are there supports that could have been provided that would have continued the employment? | |
| 1. Yes | 2 |
| 2. No | 3 |
| 3. Don't know | 1 |
| 4. Refused | 0 |
| Total Responses | 6 |
| (If you answered yes to 20.3...) | |
| 20.4 Can you tell me what these supports would have been? | (Do not prompt) |
| 20.3.1 Higher salary | 1 |
| What should your salary have been (no responses) | |
| 20.3.2 Bigger subsidy to my employer | 1 |
| What should the subsidy have been? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$45,000 starting | |
| 20.3.3 Program should have been longer | 0 |
| How long should the program have been – in months? (no responses) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a year was a good time, the 60/40, they should go 80/20 to make it more attractive | |
| 20.3.4 More training/support covered by the program | 1 |
| What suggestions can you give for training or support? (no responses) | |
| 20.4.5 Completion bonus for the Graduate | 0 |
| Do you have any suggestions what the bonus should be? (no responses) | |
| 20.4.6 Other | 0 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> if school could have extended the length of funding communications with staff, transportation, having three children | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| difficulty in many areas | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuation of financial support, higher salary, have communication with course organizers away from work environment | | |
| 20.5 Why did you not complete the GEP? | | |
| 1. Wages too low | 2 | 8% |
| 2. Unsuitable employer | 3 | 13% |
| 3. Position no longer required | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Graduate left for other opportunities | 10 | 42% |
| 5. Spouse /partner relocated | 0 | 0% |
| 6. Other | 9 | 38% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> baby Employer could not sustain the number of hours per week required within the position - we were literally making up work for me to do. If the flexibility had been there to relocate hours I may have finished out the program Employer couldn't afford to keep health reasons laid off had time to go back to school maternity leave never got paid for training, had to 700 hours to get diploma, just part of course personal reasons, combination of issues at work going against what I believed | | |
| Total Responses | 24 | |
| 20.5.1 Are there any supports that could have been provided that would have kept you there to the end of the GEP? | | |
| 1. Yes | 8 | 33% |
| 2. No | 13 | 54% |
| 3. Don't know | 3 | 13% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 24 | |
| 20.5.2 (If Yes) What would these supports have been? | | |
| 20.5.3 Higher salary | 4 | |
| What should your salary have been | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> within competitive standards additional 8000-10,000 | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|--|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$30,000 • \$25,000 per year after second year | |
| 20.5.4 | Bigger subsidy to my employer | 1 |
| | What should the subsidy have been? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over Half the wage. | |
| 20.5.5 | Program should have been longer | 0 |
| | How long should the program have been – in months? (No Responses) | |
| 20.5.6 | More training/support covered by the program | 1 |
| | What suggestions can you give for training or support? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I needed to know up front what I was getting my self into. • Someone out side of work to talk to. | |
| 20.5.7 | Completion bonus for the Graduate | 1 |
| | Do you have any suggestions what the bonus should be? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A tuition subsidy if a loan exists, or another form of debt reduction for the graduate | |
| 20.5.8 | Other | 2 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • better communication between herself and program coordinator • Agreement based on wages | |
| 21. If there were a completion bonus included for the participants in the GEP that provided a student debt reduction voucher, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is Very strong, and 5 is Not at all strong, how strong an enticement would that be to participate in and to complete the program? | | |
| | Very Strong 1 | 36 63% |
| | 2 | 11 19% |
| | 3 | 4 7% |
| | 4 | 3 5% |
| | No at all Strong 5 | 3 5% |
| | No Response or Not Applicable | 0 0% |
| | Total Responses | 57 |
| 21.2 | How much should the student debt voucher be? | |
| | Number of numeric responses | 42 |
| | average amount | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|---------|
| | 2021.43 |
| based on your loan, 10-25% of your student loan | |
| • Depend on ;the cost of the program | |
| • depend on how much your loan was, maybe a percentage of the loan | |
| • depending on courses / semesters | |
| • depends on amount of cost incurred, government should over 50% | |
| • minimum of a semester\'s worth | |
| • more of a percentage of time work with lower wage go towards your amount rather a percentage of your loan | |
| • similar to a lot of scholarships in the range of \$4000 to \$5000 | |
| • 10% of tuition (2) | |
| 21.2 (if 4 or 5 to 21) Why would you say that the debt reduction voucher would not be a strong incentive to complete the program? | |
| 1. I don't have any student debt | 3 |
| 2. The pay and the voucher still wouldn't allow me to live and pay my expenses | 2 |
| 3. Other | 0 |
| 22 Does this program encourage you to stay in Newfoundland and Labrador to work? | |
| 1. Yes | 48 84% |
| 2. No | 5 9% |
| 3. Not sure | 4 7% |
| 4. Refused | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 57 |
| 22.1 (if no) How can it be strengthened to accomplish that goal? | |
| 1. It can't – I want to go away for the experience/freedom | 0 0% |
| 2. It can if you pay sufficient wages that enable me to live and to service my student loan | 2 40% |
| 3. It can't – I can only get the career experience I need outside the province | 0 0% |
| 4. My spouse/partner left the province and I went with them. | 0 0% |
| 5. Other | 3 60% |
| Was going to stay anyway | |
| Total Responses | 5 |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| 23. While you were on this program, did you receive support through the Income support program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 7 | 12% |
| 2. No | 47 | 82% |
| 3. Not sure | 3 | 5% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 57 | |
| 24 Did you find there were any obstacles or barriers to this program because you were on Income Support? | | |
| 1. Yes | 2 | 29% |
| 2. No | 5 | 71% |
| 3. Not sure | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 7 | |
| 25. (if yes) What were the obstacles or barriers to the program? | | |
| 1. Employers not interested in Income Support recipients working for them | 0 | |
| 2. Colleagues critical of me because I was on Income Support | 1 | |
| 3. Too much paperwork/bureaucracy with HRLE | 1 | |
| 4. Problems with the child benefit in the following year | 0 | |
| 5. Other | 0 | |
| • not enough income to live on | | |
| 26. Did you complete the program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 35 | 61% |
| 2. No | 18 | 32% |
| 3. Refused | 4 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 57 | |
| 27. (If no) Was there anything HRLE could have done to make it more successful? | | |
| 1. Yes | 6 | 33% |
| 2. No | 11 | 61% |
| 3. Don't know | 1 | 6% |
| Total Responses | 18 | |
| 28. What could HRLE have done to make it more successful? | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Transportation allowance | 2 |
| 2. Child care allowance | 1 |
| 3. Continuation of drug card benefits | 2 |
| 4. Other | 5 |
| • flexible hour location | |
| • higher income | |
| • if government had put wages higher I would have stayed in the position | |
| • more understanding of both parties | |
| • Talked to me about the work | |
| | |
| <i>Information about you...</i> | |
| 1. Sex: | |
| 1. Male | 21 38% |
| 2. Female | 35 63% |
| Total Responses | 56 |
| | |
| 2. What is your postal code? | |
| | |
| 3. Where in the province did you participate in the program? | |
| 1. St. John's and metro | 33 58% |
| 2. Bay Roberts area | 3 5% |
| 3. Gander | 5 9% |
| 4. Grand Falls – Windsor | 7 12% |
| 5. Corner Brook | 1 2% |
| 6. Labrador City | 2 4% |
| 7. Happy Valley - Goose Bay | 0 0% |
| 8. Labrador Coast | 0 0% |
| 9. Other (please specify) | 6 11% |
| Total Responses | 57 |
| | |
| 4. Please indicate if you are a member of one or more of following groups. Choose all that apply. | |
| 1. Aboriginal | 2 |
| 2. Immigrant | 0 |
| 3. Visible minority | 1 |
| 4. Person with a disability | 1 |
| 5. Other (please specify) | 0 |
| Total Responses | 4 |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| 5. Do you have any children? | | |
| 1. No | 27 | 52% |
| 2. One | 13 | 25% |
| 3. Two | 9 | 17% |
| 4. Three | 2 | 4% |
| 5. Four or more | 1 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 52 | |
| 6. Which of the following options best describes your marital status? | | |
| 1. Single | 28 | 49% |
| 2. Married | 19 | 33% |
| 3. Separated | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Divorced | 1 | 2% |
| 5. Widowed | 0 | 0% |
| 6. Engaged | 2 | 4% |
| 7. Cohabiting (living with a boyfriend, girlfriend, or partner) | 7 | 12% |
| Total Responses | 57 | |
| 7. Who do you currently live with? (choose all that apply) | | |
| 1. Your children | 5 | 10% |
| 2. Your siblings (brothers or sisters) | 11 | 22% |
| 3. One of your parents | 5 | 10% |
| 4. Both of your parents | 6 | 12% |
| 5. Grandparents | 4 | 8% |
| 6. Other relatives | 7 | 14% |
| 7. Your spouse or partner (wife, husband, boyfriend, girlfriend, fiancé) | 0 | 0% |
| 8. Roommates | 7 | 14% |
| 9. Other | 4 | 8% |
| Total Responses | 49 | |
| 8. What is your average annual household income? | | |
| 1. \$0 - \$15,000 | 5 | 10% |
| 2. \$16,000 - \$25,000 | 11 | 22% |
| 3. \$26,000 - \$35,000 | 5 | 10% |
| 4. \$36,000 - \$45,000 | 6 | 12% |
| 5. \$46,000 - \$55,000 | 4 | 8% |
| 6. \$56,000 - \$65,000 | 7 | 14% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| 7. \$66,000 - \$75,000 | 0 | 0% |
| 8. \$76,000 or more | 7 | 14% |
| 9. Don't know | 4 | 8% |
| Total Responses | 49 | |
| 9. Do you or your family currently receive Income Support? | | |
| 1. Yes | 2 | 4% |
| 2. No | 48 | 96% |
| 3. Don't know | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 50 | |
| 10. Have you or your family ever received Income Support? | | |
| 1. Yes | 11 | 20% |
| 2. No | 40 | 74% |
| 3. Don't know | 3 | 6% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 54 | |
| 11. Please indicate your highest level of education achieved to date. | | |
| 1. Some High School | 1 | 2% |
| 2. High School Diploma | 0 | 0% |
| 3. Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma | 1 | 2% |
| 4. Some public or private college | 1 | 2% |
| 5. Public or private college certificate or diploma | 23 | 41% |
| 6. Some university | 4 | 7% |
| 7. Bachelor's degree | 22 | 39% |
| 8. Other | 4 | 7% |
| 9. None of the above | 0 | 0% |
| • CA | | |
| • Graduate Degree | | |
| • MASTERS | | |
| • phd | | |
| Total Responses | 56 | |
| 12. Did you attend an educational institution outside of Newfoundland and Labrador? | | |
| 1. Yes | | |
| 2. No | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| |
|--|
| Total Responses |
| 12.1 If yes, please indicate province below: |
| AB |
| MN |
| NS (4) |
| ON (3) |
| QU |
| SK |
| UK |
| <i>General Comments</i> |
| definitely think, consider union factor when considering placement of students, lot of problem being a non union member, could not become a member of the union because I was in the GEP program (doing accounting work) |
| excellent program |
| excellent program, got work experience that I needed and got another good job which I would not have gotten without the program - make sure other students are aware of program |
| good idea, need to think more about keeping wages more competitive, higher somebody who is qualified to do job. position does let you use your skills, government should compensate for salary difference, make more competitive to keep more graduates around, need entry level positions for graduates to get experience |
| good program |
| Good program and got her back on feet |
| good program, re issue with lack of experience, excellent for people wanting to stay in 2L |
| great if word of program reaches every one interested |
| great program and more information about it to employers |
| Hope the programs continues |
| Just getting the application process speeded up would be great because some people would leave while they are waiting so that they can get a job quicker. |
| loved it |
| Make employers more aware and to take on more students |
| Overall, my experience was a good one. I left my job after the program was over because I got married and we were re-locating (for employment) to another area of the province. I recommend the program to other graduates. |
| perfect, hope it continues for others |
| program was excellent |
| program was fabulous wishes placement was more suitable to both parties |
| promoting students of program |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| |
|---|
| Really awesome program. |
| really good program and very appreciative of it |
| should be easier to get, waiting period was very long |
| should offer something to students who have to travel outside of province to do courses related to their career, ie dental hygiene, and I did not qualify for ui and make it very difficult |
| supplied more information to the new worker re their life at work and ways to further themselves in their field here in 2L |
| The program is fantastic and it can work for other people as well |
| The program is great and it gives great opportunities to gain experience |
| thought the program was very good except that there was not enough promotion on this |
| would have enjoyed program if employer had been more cooperative and was geared in direction of her career |
| Would recommend to anyone trying to gain work |
| |

SWASP Post Secondary

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 1. Number of SWASP Post Secondary Participants surveyed | 175 | |
| 1A Did you receive | | |
| 1. A salary and a tuition voucher, or | 137 | 79% |
| 2. A stipend and a tuition voucher? | 24 | 14% |
| 3. Don't recall | 12 | 7% |
| Total Responses | 173 | |
| 2A What was your educational status when you participated in the program? | | |
| 1. High school graduate | 43 | 25% |
| 2. College of the North Atlantic student | 33 | 19% |
| Average 1.39 years completed | | |
| 3. Private College student | 3 | 2% |
| Average 7.00 years completed | | |
| 4. University student | 89 | 51% |
| Average 2.47 years completed | | |
| 5. Other | 7 | 4% |
| Total Responses | 175 | |
| 3. How did you find out about the program? | | |
| 1. Friends or family (Word of mouth) | 50 | 29% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| 2. Teachers / professors | 10 | 6% |
| 3. Guidance counsellors | 6 | 3% |
| 4. HRLE staff | 4 | 2% |
| 5. Newspaper | 1 | 1% |
| 6. Employer contacted me | 64 | 37% |
| 7. Student employment centre / career information centre | 12 | 7% |
| 8. Internet | 8 | 5% |
| 9. Not sure/don't recall | 8 | 5% |
| 10. Other | 10 | 6% |
| • Canadian Red Cross | | |
| • Church sent e-mail | | |
| • Community | | |
| • previous employment | | |
| • Public notified | | |
| • Sign Posted | | |
| • town council (3) | | |
| • was in program previously | | |
| Total Responses | 173 | |
| | | |
| 4. How could the program be better promoted to students/graduates? | | |
| 1. Website devoted to youth / graduate employment programs | 45 | 17% |
| 2. Information emailed to all college / university students | 75 | 28% |
| 3. Information sessions held at schools/universities/colleges | 84 | 31% |
| 4. Posters | 59 | 22% |
| 5. Other | 8 | 3% |
| • Talk about it more during the year and not during exams. | | |
| • student union newsletter online | | |
| • Promote to employers | | |
| • Student development programs in high school | | |
| • local newspapers | | |
| • more people offered voucher | | |
| • employers should promote | | |
| • was in program previously | | |
| Total Responses | 271 | |
| | | |
| 5. With whom did you work when you were applying for the program | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 1. HRLE Staff | 4 | 2% |
| 2. Community Agency | 38 | 24% |
| 3. MUN | 7 | 4% |
| 4. CNA | 83 | 52% |
| 5. Employer | 2 | 1% |
| 6. Teacher / professor/Instructor | 20 | 12% |
| 7. Not sure/don't recall | 0 | 0% |
| 8. Other | 7 | 4% |
| • CSC | | |
| • full time student | | |
| • not working | | |
| • parents | | |
| • Students | | |
| • Town Council (2) | | |
| Total Responses | 161 | |
| | | |
| 6. How did you find out about your position? | | |
| 1. I found the job myself | 88 | 51% |
| 2. Post-secondary institution referred me to an employer | 2 | 1% |
| 3. Employer found me | 68 | 39% |
| 4. Applied through HRLE and they connected me to employer | 4 | 2% |
| 5. Community agency connected me to employer | 4 | 2% |
| 6. Educational institution connected me to the employer | 3 | 2% |
| 7. Not sure/don't recall | 0 | 0% |
| 8. Other | 5 | 3% |
| • friend (3) | | |
| • Government Website | | |
| • Relative | | |
| Total Responses | 174 | |
| | | |
| 7. Now, I'm going to read some statements about the application process for the program and I would like for you to tell me how much you agree with the statement. On a scale of one to five, where one means strongly agree, and five means strongly disagree, how much do you agree with the statement | | |
| 7.1 Information about the program was provided to me promptly | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 62 | 37% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|------------|--------------|
| 2 | 55 | 33% |
| 3 | 38 | 22% |
| 4 | 9 | 5% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 5 | 3% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 169 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Didn't receive info until already in placement | 10 | |
| 2. Didn't receive info at all | 3 | |
| 3. Other | | |
| • didn't know I participated in program | | |
| • in the dark | | |
| 7.2 Information about the program was accurate | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 115 | 68% |
| 2 | 40 | 24% |
| 3 | 10 | 6% |
| 4 | 3 | 2% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 0 | 0% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Didn't receive info until already in placement | 0 | |
| 2. Didn't receive info at all | 0 | |
| 3. Other | 3 | No responses |
| 7.3 Information about the program was easily available | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 68 | 41% |
| 2 | 46 | 28% |
| 3 | 37 | 22% |
| 4 | 13 | 8% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 3 | 2% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 3 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 167 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|--------------|
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. No one to ask | 2 | |
| 2. Not available on website | 1 | |
| 3. No contact information for HRLE provided | 4 | |
| 4. No one to talk to about the program | 9 | |
| 5. Other | 0 | No responses |
| 7.4 The application form was easy to understand. | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 119 | |
| 2 | 33 | |
| 3 | 8 | |
| 4 | 2 | |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 0 | |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 8 | |
| Total Responses | 162 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Was poorly written | 0 | |
| 2. Print was too small, small print | 2 | |
| 3. Other | 0 | No responses |
| 7.5 The application form was the proper length? | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 119 | 77% |
| 2 | 30 | 19% |
| 3 | 5 | 3% |
| 4 | 1 | 1% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 0 | 0% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 15 | 10% |
| Total Responses | 155 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Too much information required | 1 | |
| 2. Other | 0 | |
| 7.6 Questions about the program were addressed promptly. | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 92 | 56% |
| 2 | 57 | 35% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|------------|-----|
| 3 | 10 | 6% |
| 4 | 6 | 4% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 0 | 0% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 3 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 165 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Couldn't contact a real person | 1 | |
| 2. Couldn't email | 0 | |
| 3. Always went to voice mail | 1 | |
| 4. Didn't have contact information | 3 | |
| 5. Other | 0 | |
| 7.7 Questions about the program were answered accurately. | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 108 | 66% |
| 2 | 41 | 25% |
| 3 | 10 | 6% |
| 4 | 4 | 2% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 0 | 0% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 5 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 163 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Given incorrect information | 1 | |
| 2. Information did not apply to my placement | 0 | |
| 3. Didn't understand response | 1 | |
| 4. Other | 0 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were used to program and was hard to contact people and was set up so late. • Employer didn't understand Program | | |
| 8. Was the date when you were told you had the job appropriate? | | |
| 1. Yes | 153 | 94% |
| 2. No | 9 | 6% |
| 3. Don't remember | 162 | |
| 8.1 In what month were you notified? | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| 1. March | 0 | 0% |
| 2. April | 0 | 0% |
| 3. May | 0 | 0% |
| 4. June | 9 | 100% |
| 5. July | 0 | 0% |
| 6. Don't remember | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 9 | |
| 8.2 In what month do you think you should have been notified? | | |
| 1. March | 1 | 11% |
| 2. April | 2 | 22% |
| 3. May | 5 | 56% |
| 4. June | 1 | 11% |
| 5. July | 0 | 0% |
| 6. Doesn't matter | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 9 | |
| 9. When you reflect upon the length of the program, would you say it was: | | |
| 1. Too short | 31 | |
| How long should it have been (34 responses - average was (in Months) | | 4 |
| 2. Just right | 121 | |
| 3. Too long | 11 | |
| How long should it have been (2 responses - average was (in Months) | | 2 |
| 4. Not sure | 0 | |
| 5. Refused | | |
| Total Responses | 170 | |
| 10. Do you think your employability skills improved by the end of the program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 159 | 94% |
| 2. No | 7 | 4% |
| 3. Not sure | 3 | 2% |
| 4. Refused | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 170 | |
| 10.1 How can the program be improved to assist in this area? (if they answered 2 in 10.) | | |
| 1. More mentoring as part of the program | 2 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 2. More training as part of the program | 5 | |
| 3. Other | | |
| 11. Was your placement related to your education or chosen career area? | | |
| 1. Directly related | 31 | 18% |
| 2. Somewhat related | 52 | 31% |
| 3. Not at all related | 83 | 49% |
| 4. Unsure | 3 | 2% |
| 5. Refused | | |
| Total Responses | 169 | |
| 12 Did you make any contacts during the program that might assist you in finding future employment? | | |
| 1. Yes | 93 | 55% |
| 2. No | 65 | 38% |
| 3. Not sure | 11 | 7% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 169 | |
| 13 Please evaluate the following components of the program and rate them from 1 = Excellent to 5 = Poor | | |
| 13.1 relevance of placement to career goals | | |
| Excellent 1 | 40 | 24% |
| 2 | 31 | 18% |
| 3 | 43 | 26% |
| 4 | 25 | 15% |
| Poor 5 | 27 | 16% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. More detailed job descriptions should be available up front | 16 | |
| 2. There should be more monitoring throughout placement to ensure placement is what it was supposed to be | 21 | |
| 3. Other | 7 | |
| • it couldn't | | |
| • just her choice | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| • Money | | |
| • More positions in different fields. | | |
| • She knew that placement wasn't relevant | | |
| • Something closer to own profession | | |
| • Tell what your career is and they can match jobs | | |
| | | |
| 13.2 On the job support and training | | |
| Excellent 1 | 82 | 49% |
| 2 | 59 | 35% |
| 3 | 21 | 13% |
| 4 | 4 | 2% |
| Poor 5 | 1 | 1% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| | | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. More formal orientation process | 2 | |
| 2. Ongoing assessments | 1 | |
| 3. Have someone to be able to call at HRLE with complaints about the placement | 1 | |
| 4. Other | | |
| • not difficult | | |
| • more experience needed in instruction | | |
| | | |
| 13.3 Opportunities to learn new employment related skills | | |
| Excellent 1 | 82 | 49% |
| 2 | 47 | 28% |
| 3 | 28 | 17% |
| 4 | 5 | 3% |
| Poor 5 | 3 | 2% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 3 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| | | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. More formal training opportunities on the job | 0 | |
| 2. More interaction with experienced staff | 7 | |
| 3. Other | 2 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| not difficult | | |
| more experience needed in instruction | | |
| | | |
| 13.4 Training before placement | | |
| Excellent 1 | 83 | 49% |
| 2 | 56 | 33% |
| 3 | 21 | 13% |
| 4 | 5 | 3% |
| Poor 5 | 1 | 1% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| | | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. Formal orientation provided by HRLE | 0 | |
| 2. Orientation provided by the employer | 7 | |
| 3. Other | 0 | |
| | | |
| 13.5 Rate of pay | | |
| Excellent 1 | 39 | 23% |
| 2 | 55 | 33% |
| 3 | 50 | 30% |
| 4 | 12 | 7% |
| Poor 5 | 11 | 7% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| | | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. Increase weekly stipend | 9 | |
| 2. Provide at least minimum wage plus tuition voucher (i.e. instead of the stipend) | 8 | |
| 3. Other | | |
| • employer add on to minimum wage | | |
| • increase both | | |
| • increase pay | | |
| • increase tuition voucher | | |
| • provide what they say they are going to pay and pay the amount | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should have been more bases on Q\'s | | |
| 13.6 Amount of tuition voucher | | |
| Excellent 1 | 70 | 42% |
| 2 | 51 | 30% |
| 3 | 35 | 21% |
| 4 | 5 | 3% |
| Poor 5 | 4 | 2% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 3 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| How could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Increase tuition voucher | 5 | |
| 2. Other | 3 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flexibility with voucher not enough time for expiry date • increase wage • stipend increased | | |
| 14. Were the following factors barriers to your participation in the program? | | |
| 14.1 Lack of transportation to and from placement location | | |
| 1. Yes | 11 | 7% |
| 2. No | 157 | 93% |
| 3. Refused | 0 | |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Provide transportation allowance | 8 | |
| 2. Other | 2 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • better trans with family • extended bus service | | |
| 14.2 Lack of child care | | |
| 1. Yes | 3 | 2% |
| 2. No | 162 | 96% |
| 3. Refused | 3 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Provide child care allowance | 3 | |
| 2. Other | 1 | |
| • allow child at work | | |
| 14.3 Lack of career counseling | | |
| 1. Yes | 9 | 5% |
| 2. No | 157 | 93% |
| 3. Refused | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 168 | |
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Make information available on a single website | 2 | |
| 2. Send information to participants | 5 | |
| 3. Provide career counseling for participants | 5 | |
| 4. Other | 0 | |
| 15 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means Very satisfied and 5 means Very unsatisfied, please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the program you participated in. | | |
| Very Satisfied 1 | 82 | 49% |
| 2 | 69 | 41% |
| 3 | 11 | 7% |
| 4 | 4 | 2% |
| Very Unsatisfied 5 | 1 | 1% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 167 | |
| If you were unsatisfied (4 or 5 was selected) | | |
| 1. Work not related to training/career goal | 2 | |
| 2. Work not challenging enough | 0 | |
| 3. Poor supervision | 2 | |
| 4. Lack of supervision | 0 | |
| 5. Pay too low | 1 | |
| 6. Placement too short | 0 | |
| 7. Other | | |
| • not flexible with hours | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|------------|-----|
| 16. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 mean Very positive influence, and 5 means Very negative influence, please rank the level of influence your experience in the program had on your choices in the following areas: | | |
| 16.2 Completing a post-secondary education / Training program | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 56 | 34% |
| 2 | 55 | 33% |
| 3 | 33 | 20% |
| 4 | 15 | 9% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 4 | 2% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 3 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 166 | |
| What would make a difference (if 4 or 5 were selected) | | |
| 1. Lower cost of education | 6 | |
| 2. Access to larger grants | 2 | |
| 3. Possibility of debt reduction | 3 | |
| 4. Access to accurate labour market information | 6 | |
| 5. Don` t Know | 6 | |
| 6. Other | 4 | |
| • no factor | | |
| • not related | | |
| • more information (2) | | |
| 16.3 Pursuing further education | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 75 | 45% |
| 2 | 53 | 32% |
| 3 | 25 | 15% |
| 4 | 5 | 3% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 4 | 2% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 4 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 166 | |
| What would make a difference? | | |
| 1. Lower cost of education | 2 | |
| 2. Access to larger grants | 2 | |
| 3. Possibility of debt reduction | 1 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 4. Access to accurate labour market information | 2 | |
| 5. Don't Know | 2 | |
| 6. Other | 0 | |
| | | |
| 16.4 Choosing a career | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 57 | 34% |
| 2 | 50 | 30% |
| 3 | 36 | 22% |
| 4 | 12 | 7% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 6 | 4% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 5 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 166 | |
| | | |
| What would make a difference? | | |
| 1. Access to career counseling | 5 | |
| 2. Access to accurate labour market information | 6 | |
| 3. Other | 4 | |
| 4. Don't know | 3 | |
| • not related | | |
| • already had a career picked out | | |
| • employer could make a difference | | |
| | | |
| 16.5 Staying in Newfoundland and Labrador | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 51 | 31% |
| 2 | 32 | 19% |
| 3 | 51 | 31% |
| 4 | 17 | 10% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 13 | 8% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 166 | |
| | | |
| What would make a difference? | | |
| 1. Access to current job opportunities | 6 | |
| 2. Higher wages | 18 | |
| 3. Debt reduction programs | 6 | |
| 4. Interest relief programs | 3 | |
| 5. job security | 12 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| 6. Don't know | 1 | |
| 7. Other | 4 | |
| • nothing | | |
| • couldn't | | |
| • job prospects | | |
| • climate change | | |
| | | |
| 17. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is Very important, and 5 is Very Unimportant, how important was the Tuition Voucher in your decision to participate in the SWASP? | | |
| Very Important 1 | 74 | 45% |
| 2 | 43 | 26% |
| 3 | 28 | 17% |
| 4 | 10 | 6% |
| Very Unimportant 5 | 11 | 7% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 166 | |
| | | |
| 18 On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is Very valuable, and 5 is Not at all valuable, how valuable is the tuition voucher credit in helping you to lower the cost of Post secondary education? | | |
| Very valuable 1 | 103 | 62% |
| 2 | 34 | 20% |
| 3 | 17 | 10% |
| 4 | 7 | 4% |
| No at all Valuable 5 | 5 | 3% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 166 | |
| | | |
| 19. Do you think the way SWASP is structured to pay participants should continue? | | |
| 1. Yes | 151 | 97% |
| 2. No | 2 | 1% |
| 3. Not Sure | 3 | 2% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 156 | |
| | | |
| 19.1 If no, What should replace it | | |
| 1. Just salary no voucher | 1 | |
| 2. Increase both the salary and the voucher | 0 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 3. Other | 0 | |
| 19.1.1 How much should the salary be increased to? | | |
| No responses | | |
| 19.1.2 How much should the voucher be increased to? | | |
| No responses | | |
| 22. Does this program encourage you to stay in Newfoundland and Labrador to work? | | |
| 1. Yes | 90 | 54% |
| 2. No | 55 | 33% |
| 3. Not Sure | 21 | 13% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 166 | |
| 22.1 (if no) How can it be strengthened to accomplish that goal? | | |
| 1. It can't – I want to go away for the experience/freedom | 4 | 7% |
| 2. It can if you pay sufficient wages that enable me to live and to service my student loan | 26 | 47% |
| 3. It can't – I can only get the career experience I need outside the province | 6 | 11% |
| 4. My spouse/partner left the province and I went with them. | 0 | 0% |
| 5. Other | 19 | 35% |
| • can't keep younger generation here | | |
| • higher wages longer term | | |
| • job not related to education | | |
| • more emphasis on jobs towards staying Newfoundland | | |
| • more money | | |
| • not related to job | | |
| Total Responses | 55 | |
| 23. While you were on this program, did you receive support through the Income support program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 10 | 6% |
| 2. No | 128 | 78% |
| 3. Not Sure | 26 | 16% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 164 | |
| 24. Did you find there were any obstacles or barriers to this program because you were on Income Support? | | |
| 1. Yes | 1 | 10% |
| 2. No | 9 | 90% |
| 3. Not Sure | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 10 | |
| 25. (if yes) What were the obstacles or barriers to the program? | | |
| 1. Employers not interested in Income Support recipients working for them | 0 | |
| 2. Colleagues critical of me because I was on Income Support | 0 | |
| 3. Too much paperwork/bureaucracy with HRLE | 0 | |
| 4. Problems with the child benefit in the following year | 0 | |
| 5. Other | 1 | |
| • Hard to find work | | |
| 26. Did you complete the program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 158 | 96% |
| 2. No | 6 | 4% |
| 3. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 164 | |
| 27. (If no) Was there anything HRLE could have done to make it more successful? | | |
| 1. Yes | 2 | 33% |
| 2. No | 3 | 50% |
| 3. Don't know | 1 | 17% |
| Total Responses | 6 | |
| 28. What could HRLE have done to make it more successful? | | |
| 1. Transportation allowance | 0 | |
| 2. Child care allowance | 0 | |
| 3. Continuation of drug card benefits | 1 | |
| 4. Other | 2 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> if they had to continue on with the support for my family | | |
| program improved | | |
| <i>Information about you...</i> | | |
| 1. Sex: | | |
| 1. Male | 55 | 36% |
| 2. Female | 99 | 64% |
| Total Responses | 154 | |
| 2. What is your postal code? | | |
| 3. Where in the province did you participate in the program? | | |
| 1. St. John's and metro | 61 | 40% |
| 2. Bay Roberts area | 12 | 8% |
| 3. Gander | 4 | 3% |
| 4. Grand Falls – Windsor | 4 | 3% |
| 5. Corner Brook | 12 | 8% |
| 6. Labrador City | 2 | 1% |
| 7. Happy Valley - Goose Bay | 3 | 2% |
| 8. Labrador Coast | 0 | 0% |
| 9. Other (please specify) | 55 | 36% |
| Total Responses | 153 | |
| 4. Please indicate if you are a member of one or more of following groups. Choose all that apply. | | |
| 1. Aboriginal | 3 | |
| 2. Immigrant | 1 | |
| 3. Visible minority | 2 | |
| 4. Person with a disability | 2 | |
| 5. Other (please specify) | 1 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International Student | | |
| Total Responses | 9 | |
| 5. Do you have any children? | | |
| 1. No | 146 | 95% |
| 2. One | 3 | 2% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----|
| 3. Two | 3 | 2% |
| 4. Three | 1 | 1% |
| 5. Four or more | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 154 | |
| 6. Which of the following options best describes your marital status? | | |
| 1. Single | 144 | 95% |
| 2. Married | 2 | 1% |
| 3. Separated | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Divorced | 1 | 1% |
| 5. Widowed | 0 | 0% |
| 6. Engaged | 4 | 3% |
| 7. Cohabiting (living with a boyfriend, girlfriend, or partner) | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 152 | |
| 7. Who do you currently live with? (choose all that apply) | | |
| 1. Your children | No answers for this group | |
| 2. Your siblings (brothers or sisters) | | |
| 3. One of your parents | | |
| 4. Both of your parents | | |
| 5. Grandparents | | |
| 6. Other relatives | | |
| 7. Your spouse or partner (wife, husband, boyfriend, girlfriend, fiancé) | | |
| 8. Roommates | | |
| 9. Other | | |
| Total Responses | | |
| 8. What is your average annual household income? | | |
| 1. \$0 - \$15,000 | 42 | 29% |
| 2. \$16,000 - \$25,000 | 4 | 3% |
| 3. \$26,000 - \$35,000 | 6 | 4% |
| 4. \$36,000 - \$45,000 | 1 | 1% |
| 5. \$46,000 - \$55,000 | 3 | 2% |
| 6. \$56,000 - \$65,000 | 5 | 3% |
| 7. \$66,000 - \$75,000 | 1 | 1% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 8. \$76,000 or more | 7 | 5% |
| 9. Don't know | 76 | 52% |
| Total Responses | 145 | |
| 9. Do you or your family currently receive Income Support? | | |
| 1. Yes | 15 | 10% |
| 2. No | 125 | 83% |
| 3. Don't know | 10 | 7% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 150 | |
| 10. Have you or your family ever received Income Support? | | |
| 1. Yes | 25 | 17% |
| 2. No | 101 | 67% |
| 3. Don't know | 24 | 16% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 150 | |
| 11. Please indicate your highest level of education achieved to date. | | |
| 1. Some High School | 0 | 0% |
| 2. High School Diploma | 22 | 14% |
| 3. Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma | 1 | 1% |
| 4. Some public or private college | 26 | 17% |
| 5. Public or private college certificate or diploma | 6 | 4% |
| 6. Some university | 83 | 55% |
| 7. Bachelor's degree | 14 | 9% |
| 8. Other | 0 | 0% |
| 9. None of the above | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 152 | |
| 12. Did you attend an educational institution outside of Newfoundland and Labrador? | | |
| 1. Yes | | |
| 2. No | | |
| Total Responses | | |
| 12.1 If yes, please indicate province below: | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| |
|---|
| Nova Scotia (7) |
| New Brunswick |
| BC (3) |
| ON |
| PEI |
| |
| <i>General Comments</i> |
| excellent program |
| Fine |
| Found the program good and benefited. Help with socially skills |
| good and helped out in the end |
| Good evaluation, like the program |
| good for students |
| good opportunity for getting money for school |
| good students got a salary and voucher |
| Good tuition voucher. |
| good way to help |
| Great Experience would do it again |
| great help |
| great program (3) |
| Happy, landed a job |
| hoping pay increases not enough grants with some employers |
| I think more information is need for the person getting involved, let them know the amount of financial assistance going to receive is accurate |
| information should be more readily available to students |
| It was a great program. Helped out with tuition. |
| It was good |
| It was really good and you would do it again |
| It was really good and I really enjoyed it. It put money towards laptop. |
| It's great. |
| Like to see stipend value increased. |
| Really enjoyed the program. |
| |

SWASP High School

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 1. | Number of SWASP High School Participants surveyed | 165 |
|----|---|-----|

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 1. What was your educational status when you participated in the program? | | |
| 1. High school student Level I | 49 | 30% |
| 2. High school student Level II | 47 | 29% |
| 3. High school student Level III | 68 | 41% |
| Total Responses | 164 | |
| 3. How did you find out about the program? | | |
| 1. Friends or family (Word of mouth) | 91 | 55% |
| 2. Teachers / professors | 22 | 13% |
| 3. Guidance counselors | 8 | 5% |
| 4. HRLE staff | 1 | 1% |
| 5. Newspaper | 1 | 1% |
| 6. Employer contacted me | 26 | 16% |
| 7. Student employment centre / career information centre | 4 | 2% |
| 8. Internet | 4 | 2% |
| 9. Not sure/don't recall | 0 | 0% |
| 10. Other | 7 | 4% |
| • Canadian paraplegic assoc | | |
| • church | | |
| • Community | | |
| • Grandfathers on town council | | |
| • learned about it on poster | | |
| • on radio | | |
| • Presentation | | |
| Total Responses | 164 | |
| 4. How could the program be better promoted to students/graduates? | | |
| 1. Website devoted to youth / graduate employment programs | 41 | 16% |
| 2. Information emailed to all college / university students | 50 | 19% |
| 3. Information sessions held at schools/universities/colleges | 100 | 39% |
| 4. Posters | 59 | 23% |
| 5. Other | 7 | 3% |
| • Ad on TV (2) | | |
| • found it really good | | |
| • More Advertising Anywhere | | |
| • newspaper and on TV | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| • on radio | | |
| • TV community channels | | |
| Total Responses | | 257 |
| | | |
| 5. With whom did you work when you were applying for the program | | |
| 1. HRLE Staff | 2 | 1% |
| 2. Community Agency | 40 | 25% |
| 3. MUN | 1 | 1% |
| 4. CNA | 0 | 0% |
| 5. Employer | 49 | 31% |
| 6. Teacher / professor/Instructor | 14 | 9% |
| 7. Not sure/don't recall | 33 | 21% |
| 8. Other | 18 | 11% |
| • no one (5) | | |
| • another student | | |
| • aunt (2) | | |
| • Canadian paraplegic assoc | | |
| • family member referred me | | |
| • gd bk Heritage society | | |
| • other students | | |
| • PARK | | |
| • Protective area Ass. of NL | | |
| • Through work | | |
| • town council | | |
| • volunteer | | |
| • volunteer agency | | |
| Total Responses | | 157 |
| | | |
| 6. How did you find out about your position? | | |
| 1. I found the job myself | 71 | 44% |
| 2. Post-secondary institution referred me to an employer | 2 | 1% |
| 3. Employer found me | 50 | 31% |
| 4. Applied through HRLE and they connected me to employer | 3 | 2% |
| 5. Community agency connected me to employer | 6 | 4% |
| 6. Educational institution connected me to the employer | 10 | 6% |
| 7. Not sure/don't recall | 10 | 6% |
| 8. Other | 9 | 6% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|------------|
| • a family member (4) | | |
| • tour guide | | |
| • friend | | |
| • Friend found it for him | | |
| • posted around community | | |
| • poster in the post office | | |
| Total Responses | | 161 |
| | | |
| 7. Now, I'm going to read some statements about the application process for the program and I would like for you to tell me how much you agree with the statement. On a scale of one to five, where one means strongly agree, and five means strongly disagree, how much do you agree with the statement | | |
| 7.1 Information about the program was provided to me promptly | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 53 | 34% |
| 2 | 50 | 32% |
| 3 | 40 | 26% |
| 4 | 10 | 6% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 2 | 1% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | | 155 |
| | | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Didn't receive info until already in placement | 4 | |
| 2. Didn't receive info at all | 4 | |
| 3. Other | | |
| • not enough information about job | | |
| • all information wasn't given | | |
| • Didn't receive info about the program | | |
| | | |
| 7.2 Information about the program was accurate | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 100 | 66% |
| 2 | 39 | 26% |
| 3 | 8 | 5% |
| 4 | 4 | 3% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 1 | 1% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 5 | 3% |
| Total Responses | | 152 |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| | | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Didn't receive info until already in placement | 4 | |
| 2. Didn't receive info at all | 4 | |
| 3. Other | | |
| • not enough information about job | | |
| • all information wasn't given | | |
| • Didn't receive info about the program | | |
| | | |
| 7.3 Information about the program was easily available | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 74 | 48% |
| 2 | 35 | 23% |
| 3 | 30 | 19% |
| 4 | 12 | 8% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 4 | 3% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 2 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 155 | |
| | | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. No one to ask | 0 | |
| 2. Not available on website | 2 | |
| 3. No contact information for HRLE provided | 6 | |
| 4. No one to talk to about the program | 8 | |
| 5. Other | 0 | |
| | | |
| 7.4 The application form was easy to understand. | | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 97 | 64% |
| 2 | 43 | 28% |
| 3 | 7 | 5% |
| 4 | 4 | 3% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 1 | 1% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 5 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 152 | |
| | | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Was poorly written | 2 | |
| 2. Print was too small, small print) | 0 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|---------|
| 3. Other | 0 |
| • not familiar with forms | |
| • didn't understand | |
| • hard to understand | |
| <hr/> | |
| 7.5 The application form was the proper length? | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 103 68% |
| 2 | 39 26% |
| 3 | 8 5% |
| 4 | 1 1% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 0 0% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 6 4% |
| Total Responses | 151 |
| <hr/> | |
| Why did you disagree? | |
| 1. Too much information required | 1 |
| 2. Other | |
| <hr/> | |
| 7.6 Questions about the program were addressed promptly. | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 89 58% |
| 2 | 46 30% |
| 3 | 16 10% |
| 4 | 2 1% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 1 1% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 3 2% |
| Total Responses | 154 |
| <hr/> | |
| Why did you disagree? | |
| 1. Couldn't contact a real person | 0 |
| 2. Couldn't email | 1 |
| 3. Always went to voice mail | 0 |
| 4. Didn't have contact information | 2 |
| 5. Other | |
| <hr/> | |
| 7.7 Questions about the program were answered accurately. | |
| Strongly Agree 1 | 102 68% |
| 2 | 40 26% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|------------|-----|
| 3 | 7 | 5% |
| 4 | 2 | 1% |
| Strongly disagree 5 | 0 | 0% |
| No Answer or Not applicable | 6 | 4% |
| Total Responses | 151 | |
| Why did you disagree? | | |
| 1. Given incorrect information | 0 | |
| 2. Information did not apply to my placement | 1 | |
| 3. Didn't understand response | 1 | |
| 4. Other | | |
| 8. Was the date when you were told you had the job appropriate? | | |
| 1. Yes | 142 | 91% |
| 2. No | 8 | 5% |
| 3. Don't remember | 6 | 4% |
| Total Responses | 156 | |
| 8.1 In what month were you notified? | | |
| 1. March | 0 | |
| 2. April | 0 | |
| 3. May | 1 | |
| 4. June | 4 | |
| 5. July | 2 | |
| 6. Don't remember | 0 | |
| Total Responses | 7 | |
| 8.2 In what month do you think you should have been notified? | | |
| 1. March | 1 | |
| 2. April | 1 | |
| 3. May | 3 | |
| 4. June | 3 | |
| 5. July | 0 | |
| 6. Don't remember | 0 | |
| Total Responses | 8 | |
| 9. When you reflect upon the length of the program, would you say it was: | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|------|-----|
| 1. Too short | 25 | 16% |
| How long should it have been (- average was (in Months) | 2.39 | |
| 2. Just right | 119 | 76% |
| 3. Too long | 4 | 3% |
| How long should it have been (- average was (in Months) | 3.50 | |
| 4. Not sure | 8 | 5% |
| 5. Refused | | |
| Total Responses | 156 | |
| | | |
| 10. Do you think your employability skills improved by the end of the program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 151 | 97% |
| 2. No | 2 | 1% |
| 3. Not sure | 3 | 2% |
| 4. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 156 | |
| | | |
| 10.1 How can the program be improved to assist in this area? (if they answered no in 10.) | | |
| 1. More mentoring as part of the program | 0 | |
| 2. More training as part of the program | 2 | |
| 3. Other | 0 | |
| | | |
| 11. Was your placement related to your education or chosen career area? | | |
| 1. Directly related | 15 | 10% |
| 2. Somewhat related | 55 | 37% |
| 3. Not at all related | 78 | 52% |
| 4. Unsure | 0 | 0% |
| 5. Refused | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 150 | |
| | | |
| 12. Did you make any contacts during the program that might assist you in finding future employment? | | |
| 1. Yes | 74 | 47% |
| 2. No | 68 | 43% |
| 3. Not sure | 14 | 9% |
| 4. Refused | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 157 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|--------|
| 13. Please evaluate the following components of the program and rate them from 1 = Excellent to 5 =Poor | |
| 13.1 relevance of placement to career goals | |
| Excellent 1 | 30 20% |
| 2 | 42 28% |
| 3 | 38 25% |
| 4 | 23 15% |
| Poor 5 | 18 12% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 5 3% |
| Total Responses | 151 |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | |
| 1. More detailed job descriptions should be available up front | 14 |
| 2. There should be more monitoring throughout placement to ensure placement is what it was supposed to be | 16 |
| 3. Other | |
| • not sure (2) | |
| • couldn't be improved | |
| • currently had the job anyway | |
| • more choice | |
| • wasn't looking any particular job | |
| 13.2 On the job support and training | |
| Excellent 1 | 70 45% |
| 2 | 53 34% |
| 3 | 25 16% |
| 4 | 5 3% |
| Poor 5 | 3 2% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 156 |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | |
| 1. More formal orientation process | 4 |
| 2. Ongoing assessments | 3 |
| 3. Have someone to be able to call at HRLE with complaints about the placement | 2 |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 4. Other | | |
| 13.3 Opportunities to learn new employment related skills | | |
| Excellent 1 | 71 | 46% |
| 2 | 48 | 31% |
| 3 | 30 | 19% |
| 4 | 4 | 3% |
| Poor 5 | 2 | 1% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 155 | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. More formal training opportunities on the job | 3 | |
| 2. More interaction with experienced staff | 2 | |
| 3. Other | | |
| 13.4 Training before placement | | |
| Excellent 1 | 71 | 46% |
| 2 | 28 | 18% |
| 3 | 37 | 24% |
| 4 | 12 | 8% |
| Poor 5 | 7 | 5% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 155 | |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | | |
| 1. Formal orientation provided by HRLE | 3 | |
| 2. Orientation provided by the employer | 16 | |
| 3. Other | | |
| 13.5 Rate of pay | | |
| Excellent 1 | 54 | 35% |
| 2 | 46 | 30% |
| 3 | 40 | 26% |
| 4 | 9 | 6% |
| Poor 5 | 5 | 3% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 2 | 1% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|---------|
| Total Responses | 154 |
| How could this have been improved (if 4 or 5 response) | |
| 1. Increase weekly stipend | 3 |
| 2. Provide at least minimum wage plus tuition voucher (i.e. instead of the stipend) | 9 |
| 3. Other | |
| higher hourly rate | |
| 13.6 Amount of tuition voucher | |
| Excellent 1 | 42 37% |
| 2 | 30 27% |
| 3 | 28 25% |
| 4 | 10 9% |
| Poor 5 | 3 3% |
| No Answer or not applicable | 41 36% |
| Total Responses | 113 |
| How could this have been improved? | |
| 1. Increase tuition voucher | 12 |
| 2. Other | |
| 14. Were the following factors barriers to your participation in the program? | |
| 14.1 Lack of transportation to and from placement location | |
| 1. Yes | 8 5% |
| 2. No | 145 94% |
| 3. Refused | 2 1% |
| Total Responses | 155 |
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | |
| 1. Provide transportation allowance | 6 |
| 2. Other | |
| hired someone to pick up workers | |
| 14.2 Lack of child care | |
| 1. Yes | 1 1% |
| 2. No | 153 99% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|--|------------|-----|
| 3. Refused | 1 | 1% |
| Total Responses | 155 | |
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Provide child care allowance | 0 | |
| 2. Other | 0 | |
| 14.3 Lack of career counseling | | |
| 1. Yes | 8 | 5% |
| 2. No | 143 | 92% |
| 3. Refused | 4 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 155 | |
| If yes, how could this have been improved? | | |
| 1. Make information available on a single website | 1 | |
| 2. Send information to participants | 4 | |
| 3. Provide career counseling for participants | 4 | |
| 4. Other | | |
| 15 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means Very satisfied and 5 means Very unsatisfied, please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the program you participated in. | | |
| Very Satisfied 1 | 71 | 46% |
| 2 | 64 | 41% |
| 3 | 16 | 10% |
| 4 | 3 | 2% |
| Very Unsatisfied 5 | 1 | 1% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 155 | |
| If you were unsatisfied (4 or 5 was selected) | | |
| 1. Work not related to training/career goal | 1 | |
| 2. Work not challenging enough | 0 | |
| 3. Poor supervision | 0 | |
| 4. Lack of supervision | 0 | |
| 5. Pay too low | 0 | |
| 6. Placement too short | 0 | |
| 7. Other | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 16. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 mean Very positive influence, and 5 means Very negative influence, please rank the level of influence your experience in the program had on your choices in the following areas: | | |
| 16.1 Starting a post-secondary education program | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 48 | 32% |
| 2 | 58 | 38% |
| 3 | 31 | 21% |
| 4 | 9 | 6% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 5 | 3% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 3 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 151 | |
| What would make a difference? | | |
| 1. Lower cost of education | 4 | |
| 2. Access to larger grants | 1 | |
| 3. Possibility of debt reduction | 1 | |
| 4. Access to accurate labour market information | 0 | |
| 5. Don` t Know | 6 | |
| 6. Other | | |
| • if job had been more related to career plan | | |
| • only a summer job | | |
| • already had a career picked out | | |
| 16.3 Pursuing further education | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 66 | 44% |
| 2 | 46 | 31% |
| 3 | 32 | 21% |
| 4 | 3 | 2% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 2 | 1% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 5 | 3% |
| Total Responses | 149 | |
| What would make a difference? | | |
| 1. Lower cost of education | 1 | |
| 2. Access to larger grants | 0 | |
| 3. Possibility of debt reduction | 0 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 4. Access to accurate labour market information | 1 | |
| 5. Don't Know | 2 | |
| 6. Other | | |
| job unrelated to career plan | | |
| | | |
| 16.5 Staying in Newfoundland and Labrador | | |
| Very Positive Influence 1 | 50 | 34% |
| 2 | 35 | 24% |
| 3 | 47 | 32% |
| 4 | 11 | 7% |
| Very Negative Influence 5 | 5 | 3% |
| No Response or Not Applicable | 6 | 4% |
| Total Responses | 148 | |
| | | |
| What would make a difference? | | |
| 1. Access to current job opportunities | 5 | |
| 2. Higher wages | 9 | |
| 3. Debt reduction programs | 1 | |
| 4. Interest relief programs | 0 | |
| 5. job security | 4 | |
| 6. Don't know | 2 | |
| 7. Other | | |
| Want to go | | |
| | | |
| 23. While you were on this program, did you receive support through the Income support program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 3 | 2% |
| 2. No | 0 | 0% |
| 3. Not sure | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Refused | 162 | 98% |
| Total Responses | 165 | |
| | | |
| 24. Did you find there were any obstacles or barriers to this program because you were on Income Support? | | |
| 1. Yes | 0 | 0% |
| 2. No | 3 | 2% |
| 3. Not sure | 0 | 0% |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 4. Refused | 162 | 98% |
| Total Responses | 165 | |
| 25. (if yes) What were the obstacles or barriers to the program? | | |
| 1. Employers not interested in Income Support recipients working for them | 0 | |
| 2. Colleagues critical of me because I was on Income Support | 0 | |
| 3. Too much paperwork/bureaucracy with HRLE | 0 | |
| 4. Problems with the child benefit in the following year | 0 | |
| 5. Other | 0 | |
| 26. Did you complete the program? | | |
| 1. Yes | 144 | 94% |
| 2. No | 7 | 5% |
| 3. Refused | 3 | 2% |
| Total Responses | 154 | |
| 27. (If no) Was there anything HRLE could have done to make it more successful? | | |
| 1. Yes | 2 | 29% |
| 2. No | 5 | 71% |
| 3. Don't know | 0 | 0% |
| Total Responses | 7 | |
| 28. What could HRLE have done to make it more successful? | | |
| 1. Transportation allowance | 2 | |
| 2. Child care allowance | 0 | |
| 3. Continuation of drug card benefits | 0 | |
| 4. Other | | |
| <i>Information about you...</i> | | |
| 1. Sex: | | |
| 1. Male | 58 | 39% |
| 2. Female | 90 | 61% |
| Total Responses | 148 | |
| 2. What is your postal code? | | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 3. Where in the province did you participate in the program? | | |
| 1. St. John's and metro | 32 | 22% |
| 2. Bay Roberts area | 11 | 7% |
| 3. Gander | 5 | 3% |
| 4. Grand Falls – Windsor | 12 | 8% |
| 5. Corner Brook | 11 | 7% |
| 6. Labrador City | 2 | 1% |
| 7. Happy Valley - Goose Bay | 1 | 1% |
| 8. Labrador Coast | 2 | 1% |
| 9. Other (please specify) | 72 | 49% |
| Total Responses | 148 | |
| 4. Please indicate if you are a member of one or more of following groups. Choose all that apply. | | |
| 1. Aboriginal | 11 | |
| 2. Immigrant | 0 | |
| 3. Visible minority | 3 | |
| 4. Person with a disability | 4 | |
| 5. Other (please specify) | | |
| Total Responses | | |
| 5. Do you have any children? * | | |
| 1. No | 13 | |
| 2. One | 0 | |
| 3. Two | 0 | |
| 4. Three | 0 | |
| 5. Four or more | 0 | |
| * Most were blanks - assume agent did not ask | | |
| Total Responses | 13 | |
| 6. Which of the following options best describes your marital status? * | | |
| 1. Single | 12 | |
| 2. Married | 0 | |
| 3. Separated | 0 | |
| 4. Divorced | 0 | |
| 5. Widowed | 0 | |
| 6. Engaged | 0 | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|--|----|
| 7. Cohabiting (living with a boyfriend, girlfriend, or partner) | 1 |
| Most were blanks - assume agent did not ask | |
| Total Responses | 13 |
| 7. Who do you currently live with? (choose all that apply)* | |
| 1. Your children | |
| 2. Your siblings (brothers or sisters) | |
| 3. One of your parents | |
| 4. Both of your parents | |
| 5. Grandparents | |
| 6. Other relatives | |
| 7. Your spouse or partner (wife, husband, boyfriend, girlfriend, fiancé) | |
| 8. Roommates | |
| 9. Other | |
| * Agents did not ask High School student | |
| 8. What is your average annual household income? * | |
| 1. \$0 - \$15,000 | |
| 2. \$16,000 - \$25,000 | |
| 3. \$26,000 - \$35,000 | |
| 4. \$36,000 - \$45,000 | |
| 5. \$46,000 - \$55,000 | |
| 6. \$56,000 - \$65,000 | |
| 7. \$66,000 - \$75,000 | |
| 8. \$76,000 or more | |
| 9. Don't know | |
| *Agents did not ask High School student | |
| 9. Do you or your family currently receive Income Support? * | |
| 1. Yes | |
| 2. No | |
| 3. Don't know | |
| 4. Refused | |
| *Removed as it was proven too sensitive for High School Students | |
| 10. Have you or your family ever received Income Support? | |
| 1. Yes | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | |
|---|--------|
| 2. No | |
| 3. Don't know | |
| 4. Refused | |
| *Removed as it was proven too sensitive for High School Students | |
| 11. Please indicate your highest level of education achieved to date. | |
| 1. Some High School | 87 60% |
| 2. High School Diploma | 16 11% |
| 3. Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma | 0 0% |
| 4. Some public or private college | 10 7% |
| 5. Public or private college certificate or diploma | 3 2% |
| 6. Some university | 30 21% |
| 7. Bachelor's degree | 0 0% |
| 8. Other | 0 0% |
| 9. None of the above | 0 0% |
| Total Responses | 146 |
| 12. Did you attend an educational institution outside of Newfoundland and Labrador? | |
| 1. Yes | |
| 2. No | |
| Total Responses | |
| 12.1 If yes, please indicate province below: | |
| AB (2) | |
| NB | |
| NS | |
| ON (2) | |
| QC (2) | |
| <u>General Comments</u> | |
| A really good program and really flexible | |
| all good | |
| Don't really have any | |
| Evaluation is very good SWASP was wonderful | |
| Good learning experience | |
| good program (4) | |
| Good program and love it | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| |
|---|
| good program, met a lot of kids and learned what could handle and what you could not handle |
| Good summer job |
| Good. It was fun. Met new people |
| GREAT |
| Great opportunity to get money for tuition |
| If handled right, it would be good |
| It was a good program and I learned a lot and it was enjoyable. |
| loved working with the program |
| Make the jobs more equal for same hours and same amount of money. |
| The program was great and I would do it again. |
| |

8. Focus Group Reports

GEP Participant

Tuesday March 4, St. John's – 8 participants

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|--|--|---|
| How did you become aware of the Program? | Most found out about the GEP through word of mouth and they used the internet as a place to get further information about it. No one mentioned their educational institution as a source | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through Other employers (word of Mouth) • Found it on the website • The Employer knew about it • Brought it to the employer as an incentive to hire her • Went looking for info on it when I heard about it from someone |
| How could it be better promoted? | Participants had many ideas – most were focused on specific mechanisms to reach the students through their educational institutions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not well known • Approach the schools in the final years of peoples' programs • Have a brochure and posters • Use the Centre for Career Development. • They send postings to students, gov't should piggy back on those emails to promote the GEP • MUN and Other schools websites would be a good place –especially their career sections • Co-ordinate with the Service Canada Student Office • Have it in the orientation package for |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>the College and Graduate package for MUN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put it in the scholarship packages • Use the professors and the instructors • Take an ad in Luminus (MUN Alumni magazine) • Promote it to the employers |
| Why did you apply for the program? | Most participants said it was to give them an edge to get a position. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To get a job • To extend my job • To get extra money • It gave me a leg-up on the competition for a job • Looking for a mentor |
| Administration-Duration | Most (though not all) thought 2 years is a better length of time and there should be some sort of transition period for the subsidy so that it decreases as the graduate becomes more productive. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be 24 months – then it would be a full work experience. 1 year is not enough. • 2 years is too much • After 1 year, have a higher scale – more of a transition. • We are just getting trained after one year. • It takes 6-9 months just to get your fee in under you! • There should be a reverse scale – pay more to the graduate and the employer at the end |
| Monitoring of placement | There was some monitoring – but there should be more. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They didn't have to do any reports |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---------------------|--|---|
| | Employers & Graduates should both have some sort of checkup midstream to ensure the placement is mutually satisfactory. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They met often with HRLE people who reviewed the work placement and visited the worksite. • Many thought there should be more checkups • The HRLE person should contact both the employer and the employee to ensure everyone's expectations are being met. • It would have been nice to have career counselling • There should be performance reviews and assessments (at 6 and 11 months) • A few of the participants had employers that gave them good feedback – others not so lucky • Employers should be told that is part of the job – to give feedback and mentoring. |
| Application process | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments – it was a straightforward process. |
| Flexibility | Several though the program should be more flexible around hours. They would rather work harder in the busy times and not have to “find work” in the less busy times. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of flexibility in the # of hours; would have like to stretch the same number of hours out over more months • It would have been good to suspend it for a few months during the seasonal down time. – you can't take a lull in the GEP which is unfortunate. Lots of good businesses are seasonal (cultural, tourism, etc.) • The program should be more flexible – it should fit the person you are working with. |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|--|---|--|
| Wages/Subsidy | All were somewhat satisfied with what they received – all would have liked to have been paid more. But they were able to manage on that. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not too bad • They are competitive for a recent graduate • There have been continual increases • Some participants left their GEP position due to the poorer wages or the too few hours. • Wages were a little above average |
| Completion Bonus? | Everyone was interested in the idea of a completion bonus with different options – pay down on student debt, tuition voucher for future education or cash. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone was interested in the idea of a completion bonus with different options – pay down on student debt, tuition voucher for future education or cash. • There should also be a bonus to the employer who provided a good placement, based upon mutual assessment. |
| Is this program helpful for graduates on Income Support? | For one participant in the room, it was a powerful support and enabled her to get off IS as a single parent. Others saw no reason why it wouldn't be a good tool for people on IS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GEP took me off the Income Support system for the first time in 18 years. I am a single parent and got through the College admin program. When she first went to work on her GEP, the salary was too low – it was lower than what she would get on IS. SO she went to the employer and reviewed this and they agreed to increase her wages to be higher than IS. It was fabulous and she loved the work. She stayed for 2.5 years, but funding ran out for her project and she was let go. She now has started her own business doing accounting work for people and loves it. • Other participants didn't see any reason why GEP wouldn't be a good tool for |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---|--|---|
| <p>What role does this program play in keeping and attracting Newfoundland and Labrador students to stay in the province?</p> | <p>Very little. The people that leave need big money to pay off their loans and the amount a GEP pays won't touch that Those that stay make a conscious decision to stay and make sacrifices to do so.</p> | <p>people who were on Income Support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping young people in Newfoundland and Labrador is all about \$\$\$ • Most graduates would rather stay here • We should use the tax system to entice people to stay • Anyone who stays makes a financial sacrifice to live in this province. • GEP is just a bandaid to a lot of students – it isn't enough to sustain them here • They have to service their student loans and that is very expensive. • There should be a commitment from the provincial government to hire new graduates (as the federal government has) • We aren't going to attract anyone back – once they get used to the wages away, they can't adjust to earning so little here. • Those of us that do stay should be celebrated! • We need to promote the positive aspects of staying in Newfoundland and Labrador and there are many! |
| <p>Success of the GEP</p> | <p>Everyone considered it a success and highly recommended the program</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 of the 8 participants are still working with their original GEP placements • Of the rest, 2 did not complete because they were offered a better opportunity financially with more security – although they both said the GEP was a great bit of experience |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|----------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEP was a very positive experience. • The final 2 completed their GEP, but did not stay with the employer – 1 stayed for 2.5 years after and 1 stayed for an extra 7 months until some of the organizations key funding was cut (they lost a big project) and could no longer keep her on.) • I learnt more in the 12 months of the GEP than everything at school • All would recommend it to students and employers |
| Other | Need for credit counselling during post-secondary. Most though admitted they may not have taken it. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should all have had credit counselling earlier on. There should be a session on personal finance at Orientation in first year college and university. I was given a Molson Canadian Credit card where they would send me a coupon for beer every month based on how much I put on the card! |

GEP Employer Excerpts

Eight Employer Focus groups held in Corner Brook February 24-25 (3 FGs) & St. John's Feb 27 (3 FGs) and March 4 (2 FGs) (2008)

Groups were mixed – there were employers with experience with GEP, SWASP PS, SWASP HS, and they were from the private and the not for profit sectors. **The following are the excerpts relevant to the GEP only.**

Susan Hollett moderated all focus groups. The notes were taped and transcribed.

The average length of the FG was 75 minutes.

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| How did you become aware of it? | Most knew about it through word of mouth or they had done it before | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I did the GEP so I knew about it. • Word of mouth • Did it before |
| How to better promote | All thought it could be better promoted and techniques such as a mail out to all and a good website would be effective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mail GEP info to all the SWASP people • There should be a website devoted to subsidies and grants • Mail out generally to businesses • Needs to be better promoted • Let the students help promote it as well |
| Applications for people on IS? | No noted concerns | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I had an IS person on the GEP and it worked out perfect – no adjustments had to be made and she had a great work ethic. There are no barriers to IS people working in the GEP. |
| Wage/Subsidy | <p>The subsidy should be increased – it has been the same for 20 years and no longer reflects the changes in the labour market</p> <p>Most suggested an extra \$2,000 - \$5,000 per year.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an incentive at the end of the program and then they have to work toward that goal. • Need to pay an increase wage for the GEP There should be some incentive to the employer to continue to keep the person after 12 months. • GEP should be 100% for non profits. • Need to build in a further \$2000 for the employer to help with operational support • They should get a student voucher for |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|----------|---|---|
| | | <p>completion...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsidy should be increased to \$15,000 • GEP should be multi-year and phased funding so that it is reduced. • It is more difficult to pay people at that level - graduates want at least the mid=20s. • Subsidy should be more like \$15,000 • It was \$10,000 20 years ago and it is still \$20,000 • Perhaps the subsidy should be based upon their education – an engineer and an admin assistant get access to the same \$10,000 or increase the base amount and keep the 60%. • A completion bonus for the graduate is a good idea |
| Payment | No problems at all with this were recorded. The only suggestion was to have it online | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment is fine • Get it right on time – as long as I have my payment claim in on time • I wish I could submit it online... it would make it much easier. |
| Duration | Several thought one of the biggest benefits of the GEP was the 12 month duration and if it could be increased to 16, that would be even better. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GEP should be longer (unless this then waters down the money – to be clear it should be longer with more money) • Have a probationary period before the program starts • Duration is perfect |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 months is good – 16 months would be great. • If there was a multi-year employment contract, the graduates would know they were going to be reducing their debt. |
| <p>Retaining graduates in Newfoundland and Labrador</p> | <p>GEP doesn't pay enough to keep people in Newfoundland and Labrador who are seeking lots of money</p> <p>But it does let those who want to work here get an attachment to the labour force and stay.</p> <p>Student debt is the primary cause of graduates leaving</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEP does not work for retention because it is not wage competitive – the gap is too large for small businesses in what people expect to be paid that are going to go away – they are looking for \$40-\$50k • GEP Enables them to get an attachment. • Reduce the interest on the loan. The federal government is making money on student loans – at least the province is trying to reduce the debt burden. • Students have to be educated on the debt issue – tell them what the reality of living with so much debt will be. • We are blindly loaning people \$\$\$ that we know they will never be able to pay back because their careers will be low paying. |
| <p>Why did you participate in the program?</p> | <p>Primarily for the wage subsidy</p> <p>Some as a way to screen permanent employees – a trial period</p> <p>A way to defray the expense</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables you to hire someone full time for a year • I was interested in this because it enabled me to help someone plus the business gets \$10,000 to defray costs |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>of training someone to be productive.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vice President of our company started as a GEP as well as our accounting person and two others in the firm. We have had great success with the GEP. We think it is because they all went through a shorter employment with us first (usually a SWASP). • Students don't realize "fresh out of school" means unskilled – it is a way of training them when they are so green. • If we had more staff we'd do more stuff |
| <p>Application Process</p> | <p>The time it takes to get the GEP approved has been problematic for a number of the employers and it is made more difficult because the graduates are unemployed and waiting while the application is pending.</p> <p>Employers would like to be pre-approved and then go find their graduate so they can start when the offer is made.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEP Application process is far too long – can take 2-3 months and we lose applicants • Staff with the GEP were particularly slow though. It took 4 weeks to get the application approved – which is a long time when someone is waiting for a salary and you can't hire them • the application is ridiculously easy • Approval process is very slow – took 4.5 weeks to get it approved. We need a faster track process as these graduates are waiting for that long. Perhaps we should be approved as a company and then let us recruit the students separately. • Everything is great otherwise |

SWASP Employer Excerpts

Eight Employer Focus groups held in Corner Brook February 24-25 (3 FGs) & St. John's Feb 27 (3 FGs) and March 4 (2 FGs) (2008)

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Groups were mixed – there were employers with experience with GEP, SWASP PS, SWASP HS, and they were from the private and the not for profit sectors. The GEP responses were separate into a separate report; **these responses are of SWASP only.**

Susan Hollett moderated all focus groups. The notes were taped and transcribed.

The average length of the FG was 75 minutes.

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---|---|--|
| <p>How did you become aware of the Program?</p> | <p>Most became aware of the program through word of mouth, the organization had used it consistently over the years and HRLE mails applications to them or they went looking for it. A few were referred to it by their MHA or the schools.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Word of mouth • Employer to employer • Mailed to them from the department automatically • They knew it was coming and were on the look out for it. • One of the instructors at the college told me about it. • The feds made me aware of it • My MHA told me about it • I called HRLE to see what programs were available • Once you are on the program once, they keep sending it to you • I generally new there were summer employment programs • I went to the career development centre • I have years of experience in summer programs • Students come in and ask us if we are hiring any SWASPs? So caused us to go looking for it. • Saw it in the newspaper ages ago. • Our MHA sends out a package every year – and then they call to remind us about the deadlines! • The communist Services Council promotes • As a student, I knew there were student subsidies out there. |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---|--|---|
| <p>How could it be better promoted?</p> | <p>The most frequent responses were to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. mail out a brochure with all of the information in it to businesses 2. Have a website with good info (and applications on it) on all the programs 3. Promote through business associations 4. Promote it at the schools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mail out to every business in the province every year about the programs (they have no trouble finding us for the taxes!) • We don't want it better promoted if it means we don't get as many approvals. • Co-ordinate the promotion with the federal government • There should be public sessions • Should be on the internet • There should be presentations made at AGMs and other gatherings of industry associations • Displays at trade Shows • The Banks and the lenders should have the info when businesses come looking for financing • It isn't advertised in the area – should be in the newspaper • When a new company is incorporated, it should receive a package of information about wage subsidy programs • Promote to new businesses • Need a booth to co-promote with the feds • Educate the students – they are the ones looking for the job. • Mail out with WHSCC bills. • Career employment counsellors on campus • Contact the students themselves through the schools • Build an email list and email people about it every year • Have a web based clearinghouse of provincial employment programs that we can use. And have it well linked to other employment sites and employer associations |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Why did you apply for the program?</p> | <p>The most frequent answers were to subsidize wages; to enable them to hire staff during the busy time, to be able to offer their programs and to be able to offer the tuition voucher as this is a real incentive to the students and makes the position more attractive than other retail or service sector positions.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different list serves for not for profits • Because of the tuition voucher – this is the better one than the federal because the students like the voucher. • Wanted to help out a university or college student • Wage subsidy is important • Helps to defray the rising costs of small businesses • Wage subsidy • The voucher is really good for students • It is a win/win • Needed a lot of summer relief – we are really busy then. • Need the bodies to run our program • As a not for profit, it enables us to enhance our programs. • It is career exploration for the students. • Accomplish a specific work project. • We mentor the students to carry on our environmental mandate – they become messengers for us. • Let’s us keep the cost of our programs down by keeping the wage costs down • I use it as a 4 month interview process. It really enables me to screen someone and if I like what I see, I’ll hire them after they graduate. It is a real crap shoot out there now with the attitude of most students. 1 in 20 people are ok • It gives young people exposure to this industry and perhaps identifies it as a possible career for them • Do a bit of maintenance and clean up for us. • Allows us to connect philosophically with the students at an organizational level. We get to “our type “ of people |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Administration-Duration | Almost every employer thought the SWASP should be longer than 8 weeks – ideally up to 12 weeks. | <p style="text-align: center;">(environmental group)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They seem to be cutting back on the # of weeks each year - now we only get 8 weeks. • The lower # of weeks is bad for us, we need all the weeks we can get. • If it is only an 8 week program – say it! Don't lead us to believe it can be for 12 weeks when 12 weeks is never approved! • Should be from May – September • Tie the SWASP High School to the High School community service/volunteer credits and the co-op programs • Why say it can be for 16 weeks when it is really only an 8 week program. • Longer period would be better – we need 16 weeks length. |
| Time of Notice | All employers thought the time of notice was too late – causing them to lose some good candidates. They need to know by April/May in order to plan and recruit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval notice is too late – it causes a lot of uncertainty • The applications should be out now (end of Feb) • I usually hire mine at the beginning of the summer and use them for the SWASP if I get it. • Can't hire before approval is bad – you lose students that way when the approval is late. • You can't plan – the province needs to be on the ball. • Need to know in May or earlier– not in early June. Makes it too difficult to plan. • Last year was really late! (Tangled up with the federal challenges last year) • The students are in a tough spot – they don't know if it will be approved and they need to make plans – they have to earn money over the summer. |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I generally have a student in mind, but not allowed to hire them until I get approval • You should be able to hire the student and apply the grant if you get approved. • Students are out in mid-April and we don't know if we have a SWASP for them until June. You lose the quality people. It is a competitive process getting the students and we need to be able to compete. • Employers need to know by April. • Need earlier notification; to start work earlier (because otherwise we lose the good students.) • Application deadline would be mid-march and approval notice should be by mid-April to be able to plan • Receiving notice in mid-June is no good to me. The students are gone by then. We should receive the SWASP PS notice by April and the High School by May • If we received an earlier notice we could keep some of the summer students that otherwise go off to Alberta with relatives for the summer • We often lobby the MHA to get more hours or another SWASP, but they usually have someone that they want us to hire for it then as well! |
| Application process | <p>Most thought the application process and the application itself was quite good – there was no need to change it. The only exception was many would like to be able to access it online and some would like to be able to submit it online as well as do their progress and payment</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – no problems at all • Quick payment • Easy application • Why can't we have an automatic renewal? So if I was approved last year – why can't I just say yes, I want another one this year, so the file and everything is already established. • Application should be available online |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|-------------|---|---|
| | forms online. | <p>and be able to submit it online</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last time I had to fill out the same application 3 times. • It is the best form ever – 1 page. Short and not onerous. • It is a lot easier than the feds • We should be able to have it electronic. I should have an account number that stores my information year after year. • Still need to keep a paper option though – there are lots of people who like the paper option. • There should be an online evaluation as well – a whole toolbox of application, claim form and evaluation should be online. • Need a guaranteed time when they will know. • There should be web based updates on how the application/approval process is going. • Not have to redo all of the information on the application and the claim form – it should be electronically. • I should be able to track my application the same as I can track a courier package |
| Flexibility | <p>Employers want more flexibility around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how they allocate their # of hours per week (within reason). This enables them to accommodate their busiest periods. • being able to hire a student and then apply the grant to them if they are approved. • Being able to hire people in the slow months when | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shouldn't have to hire a new student when you have one that works well for you and is already trained and the like. • Employers should be given more flexibility over when they “spend” their hours to accommodate business fluctuations. • I get 40 hours for 8 weeks but want to spread it over 10 weeks – they tell me I can't do that. I have to cook up schemes to get everything covered. • Take out the stipulation that you can't |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---------------|--|--|
| | <p>the revenue is scarce, but students still want to work part-time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If they get extra hours as an extension, they should be able to apply it to current employees, not have to hire new ones. • Should be available year round for work terms – not just summer ones. | <p>hire before you are approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students should be able to work there during the slow period as well – Jan, Feb, March part-time which is good for them part-time and it is the lowest revenue period for us. • Not for Profits should not lose their placement if they lose their student – this really doesn't seem fair to the Not for Profit. • If we get our weeks extended, we couldn't use our current students – we'd have to hire someone else. This is ridiculous. Let us back fill a position if someone quits on us. We shouldn't be punished. • SWASP Age limit is 16 could be lowered. • The flexibility depends on the HRLE person you are dealing with. Some are better than others. • Let the public sector hire after they receive notification, not have to have the student selected to apply. This is an onerous process. • It should be available year round for work terms. Not fair that only summer work terms can avail of SWASP. |
| Wages/Subsidy | <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wage subsidy does not pay enough and should be increased to greater than 50% of minimum wage. The rationale is that the actual costs (when MERC and Tax on the subsidy are included, plus other miscellaneous costs of the employer, the 50% is really closer to 20% of the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'd like it to be more • It should cover the other expenses employers have to incur • It should also include benefits • Subsidy should be at least 60-75% of the total cost • We pay a lot more than the amount HRLE pays us! • Because I had an extra person I had to pay extra Workers Compensation • Not that we want to be greedy!! • I usually pay a bit more than |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|-----------------|--|---|
| | <p>cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many employers feel that paying Minimum wage to students doesn't enable them to get the better students – only the very young ones. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minimum wage as an incentive to the student. • It doesn't pay enough – just enough to cover the costs. • Subsidy needs to be better • Shouldn't be based on minimum wage – should be based on a competitive salary. • It is not much money – you can't even pay for your books. • There should be a completion bonus for the employers at the end of it - \$50 per week to cover their extra costs. • Give students the option to choose if they want a higher voucher or a higher salary. • Minimum wage is not competitive – it only gets us young students. If we want older students we have to pay more. |
| Tuition Voucher | <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tuition voucher is very valuable to students and is an excellent way to enforce savings for school and encourages them to stay to the end of the placements • The voucher makes the job more attractive for students taking the position • should be increased • Should be considered for senior high school students as well. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The voucher of \$50 is a pittance - it should be increased to at least \$75/ week • The voucher makes it more like \$10 per hour • The voucher does help the student and they need it – they are pushed to the limit. • Tuition voucher is like gold – it is a great enticement • Voucher should be increased • The Tuition Voucher is the best program ever – it is enforced savings as well as forces them to stay through the summer – don't ever see that go! It just needs to be increased. • It is a 5 star program • There should be tuition vouchers for high school – this would encourage them to go to school. • It is hard to find students to hire and |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>the voucher gives you a bit of an edge over the other service/retail jobs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One year the tuition voucher was mailed earlier in August, before their work was up, and then they left! Even though there were a couple of weeks left to the SWASP. • We'd rather have higher wages rather than higher tuition voucher. • If a person quits for a good reason, they should still get their voucher, but if they quit for no good reason, they shouldn't. • Voucher should also be for tools & books. • Voucher should be a completion bonus – if you don't complete the program you don't get the voucher |
| Payment | <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent. • Only suggestion for improvement was to have the claim forms on line. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Deposit is a good thing. • Taking 60 days is too long – • Prefer cheques than direct deposit – I like to see the money! • Have the claim form electronically as well – make the process online. |
| How prepared were the students for work? | <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally, the students were considered as prepared for work as the general population coming into a new job. • There were some issues with work ethic, but not consistent. • Suggestion to include some information for generic training on customer service and other work type of skills – perhaps through a DVD? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mine came from a professional school so she knew what she was doing. • The placement was career related, so they were very keen • They need some training, but we have never had any trouble. We are a stepping stone type of job (convenience store) but they still learn good employability skills • Work ethic is a problem with some • It would be great if there were a generic training DVD that we could give to or do with the students that covered customer service in particular • The young people think they can stay up all night and then go to work the next morning – and of course they |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>can't!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should have an incentive or a point program – they could get points for punctuality, reliability and not using their sick leave. • Some are great and some are useless • Students don't want to work |
| Stipend | <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stipends are not enough to live on – particularly if you have a family or if you cannot live with your parents rent free. • Many have to take part-time jobs in addition to the SWASP to compensate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stipend is not enough. • I always get people who live in St. John's because the others cannot afford to live on the stipend – they have to live with their parents. Everyone else needs living money. • My SWASP people (with stipend) almost all have a part-time job as well to get some cash. |
| Is this program helpful for students/graduates on Income Support? | <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult to get IS people who are interested in working • No good to have HRLE force them, as the work ethic cannot be given them – they would need more support and training first. • Employers can't with the remuneration they get from HRLE • Sometimes the supports (like daycare) are not available for shift work and the like. • Those that are interested in working are wonderful employees. • There will be increasing pressure on able-bodied IS people to work as the labour market gets tighter. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a fear of losing their Income with nothing to replace it • You need to pay them a lot – Income Support people have it too good on the system now • The system needs to be changed – it is sick the way it is now – they are playing the system – I don't mean that in a derogatory way • Unless you pay good money you won't get them off the system • If they are on disabilities, I can see them getting IS, but if they are able bodied, they should be entitled to it. • Corner Brook is crying for people to work • They need to be rewarded for going to work – still keep some of their benefits. • Day care is an enormous problem, especially if there is shift work involved. • I had an IS person and it was huge trying to get her daycare and the like |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|----------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWASP is not going to get people off IS. | <p>organized – she ended up leaving because of it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I had an IS person and she worked so hard – walked a very long distance to work every day • I am equally receptive to someone on IS as not, as long as they are equally qualified, but many of them are not used to working. • They are better off not working – financially • They don't know how to work because they have never worked • People on IS should have to work – even if it is community service. • The salary and voucher shouldn't be clawed back against their Income Support • They need to be topped up for the first experience in work until they get stabilized. • We don't know if they are on Income Support or not. We can't ask those questions. • Sometimes IS people get referred to us, but they have no interest in working. So we go through the list and talk to them, but we don't hire anyone who isn't interested in working and we won't let HRLE force us to hire them either – it would be too disruptive to our organization. HRLE should not send us people who don't want to work. • There is too much work to bring them up to scratch. They need training In confidence, interview skills, work skills before I can take them. • There will always be people on IS that don't want to work, but there are those that do and these program can help |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An 8 week program won't make a difference to people on IS. It is an attitude problem towards work and there is no home support. |
| <p>What role does this program play in keeping and attracting Newfoundland and Labrador students to stay in the province?</p> | <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Debt is the main reason people leave – they have huge loans and they can't pay them off on what they would earn in NL. • Suggestions for non-wage related ways to keep students here included tax benefits, reduce student debt principal, pay the interest on their loans, top up of salaries and forgive loans. • Attracting people back is not likely and province should focus on keeping those that are here. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student debt is huge – that is why they go away • The tuition voucher is good – but not enough • I would love to be able to pay them more. • Pay off their loan • There should be 0% interest for student loans • Students need career counselling and debt counselling • Why are we training people for jobs that we don't have? (specific reference to the forestry sector) • How do we address the gap between the 13% unemployment rate and the number of positions not filled? There has to be a way • We should top up people's salaries (nurses and Early Childhood Ed., for example) to keep them here. • We have to keep a solid tax base – otherwise soon everyone will be retired and who will pay the bills? • Taxes are too high here – both for businesses and individuals • Gov't should be more lenient on taxes for small businesses • They have to go away because of their student loan • Loans should be interest free • Sometimes they pursue opportunities away – not a bad thing • The longer they stay the more they get. • The chances of getting people to |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|----------|-----------------------------|--|
| | | <p>return once they have left are very slim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People should be rewarded for staying and working here in Newfoundland and Labrador – reduce their student debt, for example. • My friend says his heart is here – not in Alberta, but as they have kids, they get settled in and it is then really hard to get them back. • Wages are not competitive here • Need to focus mostly on the people who have stayed and keeping them here. • Students can't make their debt payments. • Should eliminate tuition so everyone can go to school and not have any debt. • We have to be proactive with our best and brightest • People aren't aware of jobs here • There is no Newfoundland and Labrador discount – the wages need to be competitive. • We need signing bonuses • Need positive spins on what is going on here. • Have to focus on keeping them here...it is too hard to get them back! • Student debt is a grim reality • Graduates want meaningful employment • Anything helps! • If they stay and work here for so long, they should have their debt eliminated |
| Other | The main findings included: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of the wage subsidies for both small businesses and not for profits is huge. Can't over emphasize the necessity of it. • I usually have the student come back |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|----------|----------|---|
| | | <p>15 hours per week during the school year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maybe use grocery vouchers! • Why not be able to use unused vouchers for student debt? • There should be a program for part-time employment as well • There should be a mid-term evaluation done for and by HRLE • We are going to have to go to senior citizens for workers as the number of young people is running out. • Government should not to try to accomplish too much with these programs. The primary goal is to help students and employers. • There is a massive change in the labour market now. The critical issue for business success is around access to a labour force. • We will be recruiting older people more. • Student debt causes significant stress and depression • The increase in the minimum wage causes stress because you have to pay everyone more • Now the students are dictating the terms. • Fewer people applying – last year we hired everyone who applied. These programs enable us not for profits to do good work. • It is cool to help a student and see that student grow and mature and become a great member of society. • I want to be able to talk about the Conservation Corps – it is the best program of its kind across Canada. One of the very few programs that work with the environment. It is |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| Question | Findings | Representative Notes |
|----------|----------|---|
| | | <p>stellar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Young people flip jobs much quicker than they did before and they can because there are lots of jobs out there in retail and service. This causes lots of competition for students.• You don't get to hire the cream of the crop anymore – there is too much competition• The competition for workers is just going to get worse. |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

9. Employer Telephone Interview Reports

GEP Employer

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|------------------------|--|
| Total Sample: | Burin: | 1 | |
| | Marystown: | 2 | |
| | Gander: | 8 | |
| | Grand Falls: | 8 | |
| | Labrador: | 4 | |
| | Carbonear: | 9 | |
| | TOTAL: | 32 | |
| | Survey dates: | Feb 21- March 19, 2008 | |

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----------|--|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | How did you find out about the program? | Mail outs Newspaper Schools Word of Mouth Gov't office Other D/K | 1 0 5 3 9 3 9 | 3.1 0 15.6 9.3 28.1 9.3 28.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most people were unsure. It would seem that once you use the program you will get annual reminders but it is not known how widespread mail outs may be • Business are sometimes approached by students |
| 2 | Do you think most employers know about the program? | Yes No D/K | 6 14 6 | 18.7 43.7 18.7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No confidence in this response. People are unsure • There are lots of programs businesses do not know about. Businesses and potential employees missing out. |
| 3 | Are there other ways to promote the program to employers? If yes, how? | Yes: Mailouts Newspaper Emails Bus Organizations Web Site Students D/K | 19 12 3 0 2 0 4 6 6 | 59.3 37.5 9.3 0 6.2 0 12.5 18.7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Someone should visit individual companies to see what help they need (2) – one on one • Contacting employers – by telephone, follow up with information package (1) • other departments that deal with businesses should be promoting (1) |
| 4 | What were your main reasons for using the GEP program? | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wage subsidy | Yes | 25 | 78.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really enhances their ability to hire |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|---|---|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cushions the cost of on the job training when employee may not be productive to the level required |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring new skills into the organization | Yes | 10 | 31.2 | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was an opportunity to determine suitability of an individual | Yes | 16 | 50 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent way to test out staff and introduce them to the workplace Especially good for apprenticeships and getting through the period when new workers are not as productive as they need to be |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was an opportunity to train an individual | Yes | 13 | 40.6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff need to be trained beyond schooling They are only “book smart” when they are hired Particularly valuable for apprenticeships |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeking help with a specific project at work | Yes | 2 | 6.2 | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needed new staff: (for busy season) | Yes | 16 | 50 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will often need to develop HR capabilities in the event of staff turnover |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wanted to provide an opportunity to positively influence a young person’s life help a student with work experience | Yes | 11 | 34.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under GEP employers are less focused on providing job opportunities and more concerns with their business needs People did not respond to the opportunity to “influence a young person’s life” |
| 5 | Did the program help meet these needs? | Yes Somewhat No | 21 3 2 | 65.6 9.3 6.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inexperience of workers can actually hurt the organization-they take so much time for training Really helps business be proactive and plan for work shortages and/or business growth The program also meets the needs of graduates |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|---|--|--|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 6 | Would you have hired someone if the program had not been in place? | Yes Yes but less hours No D/K | 4 8 7 7 | 12.5 25 21.8 21.8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many employers were not sure of their answer to this question and indicated they would have to judge this based on circumstances at the time. • Many indicated they would delay hiring or may hire for less hours per week • Employers would also be more reluctant to take on people just having graduated as their skills are really elementary – businesses still have to train • Depends on season – some are busier than others • Better opportunity for employer to hire because of the wage subsidy |
| 7 | Did the program contribute to the success of your organization? | Yes Somewhat No D/K | 15 5 5 1 | 46.8 15.6 15.6 3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on how you define success • Most business indicate that the program helps but does not “make” the business • For some business the program definitely enabled them to expand their business and/or increase the quality of service delivery • wage subsidy and skills of participant were positive contribution • Yes, sales did slow but it was still a benefit |
| 8 | When the participant began working for your organization, were they adequately prepared? | Yes Somewhat No: D/K | 14 1 11 0 | 43.7 3.1 34.3 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Job Experience – 11 • Poor Work skills (not knowing what is expected of them)-3 • Always have to provide more training even for those who meet initial expectation-16 • Educational programs only provide very basics – graduates still require training and it can be considerable • Yes, knew about programs and how |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----|---|---------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|--|
| | | | | | to do paper work |
| 9 | Are there additional supports you think should be covered by the program? | Yes: No D/K | 12 12 2 | 37.5 37.5 6.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety / WCC Training -1 • Some businesses incur upwards of \$5000.00 in incremental training. Funding should be available for approved training programs • First Aid –2 • Travel support-1 • Computer-1 • On the job training would be good for individuals who have been out of workforce • Sure there is more the program could do but not sure what it would be specifically |
| 10 | Did the graduate complete the GEP | Yes No D/K | 18 7 1 | 56.2 21.8 3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, another government job came up with more benefits, less than a month short of completion date • Only stayed for 6 months and left for other employment |
| 11 | Was the graduate hired full time/Still there | Yes No Promoted (as well) | 15 10 5 | 46.8 31.2 15.6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed responses – most business were prepared to hire the client once the program was over. • Businesses note that some clients will use the program to secure the experience they need and will then move on to another better paying position and sometimes that is out of province. • Some people will stay for several months after the program but eventually move on. One business indicated that all recruits under the program have left the province. • In one case, when training was concluded, HRDC recruited the individuals (George Parsons, Carbon ear) • Participant learned skills and will have opportunities to progress in the |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----|--|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | company |
| 12 | Administration | | | | |
| | • Application availability (when and how) | Good Poor | 23 1 | 71.8 3.1 | |
| | • Application itself | Good Poor | 21 3 | 65.6 9.3 | |
| | Notification of approval (when and how) | Good Poor | 19 5 | 59.3 15.6 | |
| | client selection | Good Poor D/K | 19 5 1 | 59.3 15.6 3.1 | • Don't know who is out there looking for work, hard to deal with selection process |
| | Duration of the program | Good Poor | 22 2 | 68.7 6.2 | |
| | wage and subsidy rates, | Good Poor | 18 6 | 56.2 18.7 | • Salaries paid are still low in the province relative to rest of Canada. As long as there are better wages people will leave. Need to increase subsidy. |
| | Payment | Good By Cheque Poor | 24 22 1 | 75 68.7 3.1 | • Money for training |
| | Administration overall | Good Poor | 22 2 | 68.7 6.2 | • Payment was terrible - 2-3 months wait for first check, had to call for checks, other things suffered in order to pay participant, they were terrible, phone calls not returned |
| | | | | | • Only one client indicated direct deposit |
| 13 | Is there anything about the program that might be a disincentive or barrier to employers who | Yes: No D/K | 7 17 2 | 21.8 53.1 6.2 | • Sometimes the workers are not good • The waiting period for an employee to qualify. During this wait time there is risk the client will leave the |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----|--|---|-------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | want to use it? If yes, what are they and how could this be changed for the better? | | | | <p>province for work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-profits still have trouble meeting their wage contributions • Paper work is challenging because there is no guide provided. If employers were more informed would be better • wage should be higher |
| 14 | Have you ever hired an Income support client? | Yes No D/K | 2 23 1 | 6.2 71.8 3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most business had no problem with a client's background or circumstances but indicated their criteria would focus on qualifications and work ethic. • Some businesses indicated that they would be looking for professional training and skills and a SA applicant would not be appropriate |
| | Would you hire an Income Support Client | Yes No D/K | 19 3 3 | 59.3 9.3 9.3 | |
| | Would you have any special concerns | Yes No D/K | 3 20 2 | 9.3 62.5 6.2 | |
| | | | | | |
| 15 | Does the GEP program play a role in keeping young people in Newfoundland and Labrador? | Yes Somewhat No D/K | 6 11 5 4 | 18.7 34.3 15.6 12.5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only to a small extent • The main challenge with keeping young people in the province are wages and the fact that higher wages can be secured in Alberta • Finding accommodation in Alberta is no trouble – everyone know someone who will put them up • Program would be more effective if better promoted • There needs to be more of an incentive like higher pay for first 6 months • Competition from other provinces is strong. They go for higher wages. |
| 16 | Thinking of the use of youth employment programs specifically, what can the provincial government do to retain | Financial incentives Job Creation D/K | 20 3 4 | 62.5 9.3 12/5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase wages and wage subsidies-employers cannot afford to increase wages • Provide assistance with paying off student debt • Extend the length of the program |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----|--|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--|
| | more young people here? | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase minimum wage • Ensure students are eligible for program as soon as school is finished • Provide career counseling so that students don't waste their time in school with something they won't stick to • Provide additional subsidies and higher wages, particularly in rural areas • Help small business owners be able to pay higher wages and provide good health benefits • Benefit system • Need to get the word out – lots may not know about program and opportunities for job creation are lost |
| 17 | Would you participate in the SWASP or GEP program again or others like it? Why or why not? | Yes No D/K | 24 1 1 | 75.0 3.1 3.1 | |
| 18 | Do you have any further comments or questions about the evaluation? | Yes No | 16 9 | 50.0 28.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program is not as successful as it could be because a lot of businesses do not know about it. • “It's all about the money”. They have to be paid enough so they will stay • Most comments were positive and hopes that the program would continue • Program is a win/win – employees gain experience, businesses get financial support while employees get up to speed and the provincial economy is enhanced through employment |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|--|----------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gov't representatives should visit work sites • Recognize circumstances of non profits and the fact that they have to apply for other funding to meet their wage contributions. In the time that this takes they can lose candidates • Provide funding support for additional training. • Program needs to be improved in terms of length of time it takes to receive payments • Need to help people in small business to be able to hire someone full time • Make length of program 1.5 yrs and / or increase wages |

SWASP Employers

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Total Sample: | Clarenville: | 8 | |
| | Port-Aux Basques: | 8 | |
| | Labrador: | 7 | |
| | TOTAL: | 23 | |
| | Survey dates: | Feb 21- March 4, 2008 | |

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----------|---|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | How did you find out about the program? | Mail outs Newspaper Schools Word of Mouth Gov't office D/K | 3 4 1 2 3 12 | 13% 17% 4% 9% 13% 52% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most people were unsure. It would seem that once you use the program you will get annual reminders but it is not known how widespread mail outs may be |
| 2 | Do you think most employers know about | Yes No | 14 2 | 61% 9% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No confidence in this response |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | the program? | D/K | 7 | 30% | |
| 3 | Are there other ways to promote the program to employers? If yes, how? | Yes: Mailouts Newspaper Emails Bus Organizations Web Site Students D/K | 9 5 1 2 1 1 6 | 39% 22% 4% 9% 4% 4% 26% | |
| 4 | What were your main reasons for using the SWASP program? | | | | |
| | The wage subsidy | Yes | 23 | 100% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is the primary reasons why employers will use the program |
| | Bring new skills into the organization | Yes | 2 | 9% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a priority Most employers need the extra manpower |
| | It was an opportunity to determine suitability of an individual | Yes | 6 | 26% | |
| | It was an opportunity to train an individual | Yes | 1 | 4% | |
| | Seeking help with a specific project at work | Yes | 0 | | |
| | Needed new staff: (for busy season) | Yes | 20 | 87% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most employers require additional support for the summer months be it to assist with summer holidays of regular staff or increased business due to tourism traffic |
| | Wanted to provide an opportunity to positively influence a young person's life help a student with a summer job / work experience and tuition | Yes | 21 | 91% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was also very important to employers who wanted local youth to realize help with their tuition. Employers did not think in terms of influencing their lives but basically providing them with financial support |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----|--|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | | | | and, to a lesser degree, job experience |
| | Other –Help with tourism season | Yes | 9 | 39% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These respondents specifically noted they need the help during tourism season • Many indicated the value in introducing youth to the tourism industry as a career option |
| 5 | Did the program help meet these needs? | Yes No | 22 1 | 96% 4% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many employers noted that the program would be more helpful if they could secure the full 10 weeks or 12 weeks employment • Also provide funding for training |
| 6 | Would you have hired someone if the program had not been in place? | Yes Yes but less hours No | 7 8 8 | 30% 35% 35% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of employers noted that they could not hire or provide the same level of employment without the subsidy • Some employers noted that the subsidy enabled them to provide a higher standard of service, notably tourism operations |
| 7 | Did the program contribute to the success of your organization? | Yes Somewhat No | 12 5 5 | 52% 22% 22% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primarily in term of man hours • For tourism operators in particular it enhances their level of service |
| 8 | When the participant began working for your organization, were they adequately prepared? | Yes Somewhat No: D/K | 9 7 6 1 | 39% 30% 26% 4% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacked experience/Only book smart-6 • Poor work ethic-7 • Poor people skills-2 |
| 9 | Are there additional supports you think should be covered by the program? | Yes: No D/K | 8 10 5 | 35% 44% 22% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training in Basic Job Skills - 7 • Support for older people – 1 • Travel Subsidies – 1 • Funding with employee costs – 3 • Provide a one day session for basic job training • Travel subsidies (Labrador) |
| 12 | Administration Application availability (when and how) | Good Poor | 18 5 | 78% 22% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some employers noted they had to really look for the application. Some |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|--|---|-----------------------|----------|------------|--|
| | Application itself | Good Poor | 21 2 | 91% 9% | <p>noted the need for electronic copies and other the need for paper copies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few people had problems |
| | Notification of approval (when and how) | Good Poor | 13 9 | 57% 39% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A consistent comment was that the approval process took too long and that employers and students missed out on the opportunity. Employers noted they need more time to get staff in place and that approval should come by the end of April |
| | client selection | Good Poor | 18 4 | 78% 17% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most clients had no comment on this question. Others noted that they have a limited labour pool from which to recruit |
| | Duration of the program | Good Poor | 5 18 | 22% 78% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The duration of the program was the primary area for dissatisfaction with the program. Some employers do not get approval for the full 10 and, while they might get an extension, they cannot guarantee the work to the student until their employment has almost ended |
| | wage and subsidy rates, | Good Poor | 8 15 | 35% 65% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Another consistent issue is to allow the program to extend to 12 weeks and enable employment to start in May when university students are available. Not providing for earlier employment means students are more likely to leave the province to find a longer period of work |
| | | Good By Cheque | 22 21 | 96% 91% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key issue to students is wage rates and many will leave for the summer to earn as much income as they can. Accommodations is no issue as 'everyone knows someone' in Alberta We have to be competitive on wages |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----|--|-----------------------|---------|------------|---|
| | tuition voucher/tuition credit amount | Good Poor | 19 3 | 83% 13% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employers also noted that they actually absorb more than 50% of employee costs in that they have to pay CPP, EI, Workers' Comp and other fees. They may also have to pay for special training or equipment. Subsidies for these components would be welcome Employers very much value this component of the program and the benefits it provides to students. Some will participate on the strength of this component For the most part comments were extremely positive. |
| | Payment | | | | |
| | Administration overall | | | | |
| 13 | Is there anything about the program that might be a disincentive or barrier to employers who want to use it? If yes, what are they and how could this be changed for the better? | Yes: No | 8 15 | 35% 65% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval Time – 5 Program criteria too strict -1 Can't hire replacement if student leaves -1 No info online - 1 |
| 14 | Have you ever hired an Income support client? | Yes No | 4 19 | 17% 83% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be judged by same criteria Work Ethic Employers must retain the ability to select the employee They have transportation Be bondable |
| | Would you hire an Income Support Client | Yes No | 21 2 | 91% 9% | |
| | Would you have any special concerns | Yes No | 4 19 | 17% 83% | |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

| | Question | Quantitative Response | # | % | Qualitative Response |
|----|--|---|------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 15 | Does the SWASP program play a role in keeping young people in Newfoundland and Labrador? | Yes Somewhat No D/K | 5 5 9 2 | 22% 22% 39% 9% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a valuable introduction to tourism sector |
| 16 | Thinking of the use of youth employment programs specifically, what can the provincial government do to retain more young people here? | Financial incentives Job Creation D/K | 13 7 1 | 57% 30% 4% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employers emphasized that “it’s all about the money” – increase wages; provide a larger subsidy Expand program criteria Increase the duration of the program so University students can start early in year Also suggested incentives or mechanisms to help reduce student debt Consider like program for SA clients Consider like programs for unemployed |
| 17 | Would you participate in the SWASP or GEP program again or others like it? Why or why not? | Yes No D/K | 20 0 3 | 87% 13% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hard to hire quality people-1 Takes too long-1 Too much red tape-2 Still can’t afford it -2 |
| 18 | Do you have any further comments or questions about the evaluation? | Yes No | 15 8 | 65% 35% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the duration of the program Increase subsidies Quicker approval Put information on web site Enable employers to hire more than one person under the program Provide a better tuition benefit You can increase the minimum wage but the reality is that employers still have trouble meeting payroll and these costs have to be passed onto customer It’s win-win for everyone-students, families, employers and communities. Consider a like program for seniors |

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Final Observations

| | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Total Sample SWASP: | Clarenville: | 8 |
| | Port-Aux Basques: | 8 |
| | Labrador: | 7 |
| | TOTAL: | 23 |
| | Survey dates: | Feb 21- March 4, 2008 |
| Total Sample GEP: | Gander: | 8 |
| | Grand Falls: | 8 |
| | Labrador: | 1 |
| | TOTAL: | 17 |
| | Survey dates: | Feb 21- March 4, 2008 |

Observations: General

- There is a fundamental difference in how the programs are used: SWASP serves primarily as a summer employment program for students. It is highly valued in that it allows businesses to hire extra staff to cover holidays among FT time and also to provide a higher level of service during busy seasons, particularly the tourism industry. These employers are unlikely to use the program for training or determining if a worker is suitable for FT work;

Observations: SWASP

- Not all businesses will receive approval for the full 10 weeks of the program and many will receive just 6- 8 weeks approval initially and this does not meet all employers' needs;
- Many employers want to see the number of weeks covered by the program extended to no less than 12 weeks. This would position them to recruit university students when they are available in May therein providing them with more employment and tuition subsidies. It also reflects employers' needs in the workplace. Currently, the delay in being able to

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

offer employment to university students under the SWASP results in some leaving the province to access longer periods of employment;

- One of the more consistent comments relates to the timing for program approval. Businesses may have determined who they will hire under the program but will not be able to notify them until approval is forthcoming later in May. Students will sometimes seek employment elsewhere in the absence of knowing approval will be forthcoming;
- While employers are glad of the wage subsidy they note that the employers' costs actually exceed 50% considering that they have to make CPP and EI contributions and may also incur other expenses. Government should realize this and understand that they do not contribute 50% of costs;
- The ability of the program to encourage workers to stay in the province is probably minimum. The wage rates are at or near minimum wages and the main draw for workers to other provinces are the higher wages. If we want to keep people in the province, it is important to match these wages;
- While most employers noted that students are "job ready" when recruited, many also noted that they lack some basic job skills – how to interact with the public, taking initiative, look presentable, work ethics – and suggested that there should be some sort of training program, potentially in schools, to educate workers on the basic standards that they need to meet.

Observations: GEP

- The GEP is also highly valued by employers and is used, not to address temporary staffing needs, but more as a tool to develop their workforce. Employers use the program to assess if workers are suitable for FT work, provide graduates with employment experience and to cushion the costs incurred in training their workers. Some employers noted it is particularly valuable when hiring an apprentice and developing their skills;
- The wage subsidy is largely considered to be quite fair but in some cases employers are still not able to provide wages that will encourage people to stay in the province. In fact, with some experience under their belt, these workers are in a better position to find work in markets where wages are higher;

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

- The program is seen as having limited success in keeping people in the province. As noted, some workers will leave the province once they have secured sufficient experience. Employers were also consistent in their response that what really drives workers to other areas of the country for work are the higher wages and unless the province can meet those wages people will leave;
- Not all employers agreed with the waiting period to hire students. Some complained that they have to pick from workers who otherwise could not find employment and they are getting the “bottom of the barrel”. Other complained that there may not be another place for them to work in their trade and that they and the employer have to wait for this qualifying period. This delay also provides some encouragement for workers to move elsewhere for employment;
- Many employers noted that workers are driven to earn higher wages because of student debt. Programs which would assist students reduce their debt while working in the province were seen as offering potential to retain young people;
- Again, administration of the program seems to be favorable.

Summary Opportunities:

SWASP

- Extend the duration of program to 12 weeks
- Move the application and approval process back on the calendar so that employers can receive approvals no later than the first week in May
- Provide employers with full approval at time of application rather than approve an initial period of 6-8 weeks;
- Allow business to rehire if an funded employee is dismissed or leaves
- Enable applications to be received on line

GEP

- Consider eliminating qualifying period for rural areas;
- Consider categorized for subsidies that reflect wages rates in the related occupation;
- Consider providing funding support for incremental training required for workers – first aid, Worker’s Com...
- Consider other mechanisms to encourage workers continue working in the province beyond the initial year under GEP, especially where skills shortages occur. In particular

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

consider a program to provide tuition repayment vouchers, or other mechanism to repay their student debt, to workers who remain in the province to work. Consider providing such assistance for a 3-5 period.

Primary Research Protocols

Protocols for Employer Focus Group

The Focus Group will start with an introduction of the Focus group process, the roles of the people in the room and discussion of confidentiality. Participants will introduce themselves and asked whether there are any participant questions. Participants will be provided with a list of the programs under review for referral to ensure we are talking about the right programs.

1. How did you find out about the program?
2. How could we better promote the program?
3. What were your main reasons for using the Program?
 - Bring new skills into the organization
 - It was an opportunity to determine suitability of an individual
 - It was an opportunity to train an individual
 - Seeking help with a specific project at work
 - Needed new staff:
 - to fill existing vacancies
 - because of business growth
 - Wanted to provide an opportunity to positively influence a young person's life
 - The wage subsidy
 - Other (please list)_____
4. Did the program help meet these needs?
 - a. Yes - Explain
 - b. No - Explain
5. Would you have hired someone if the Program had not been in place?
6. Are there additional supports you think should be covered by the program (e.g. on-the-job training supports, career counselling...)
7. When the students began working for your organization, were they adequately prepared?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No. - what were their shortcomings
 - c. What needs to be done to make them Job ready?

8. What do you think are the strengths & weaknesses of the Program? How can these be strengthened further? (Probe specifically about:
 - a. duration,
 - b. administration,
 - c. client selection,
 - d. wage rates, Stipend amount
 - e. tuition voucher/tuition credit amount
9. Administration
 - a. Are you satisfied with program administration? If no – how can it be improved?
 - b. Is the length of time for processing subsidy claims adequate? If not, what is needed?
 - c. Are there other ways the payment process can be improved?
10. Are there additional supports you think should be covered by the Program (e.g. on-the-job training supports, career counselling...)
11. Is there anything about the Programs that might be a disincentive or barrier to employers who want to use it? If yes, what are they and how could this be changed for the better?
12. Would you hire a person for the program who is on Income Support?
 - a. If no, why not?
13. Do you think employers face extra challenges when hiring income support clients? If yes, please explain.
14. Would you participate in the program again or others like it? If no, why not?
15. Do you have any further comments or questions about the evaluation?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Protocol for Employer Telephone Interviews

(These replaced the rural employer Focus groups)

My name is ----- and I am calling regarding the Student Work and Services Program (SWASP) which you have used to hire students in the recent past. (Ensure they are clear on which program we are talking about as many employers participate in a fair number of them)

We are evaluating the program and need your opinions on it.

The interview will take approx. 15 minutes. Are you the right contact for this interview?

Can we proceed now or schedule another time?

- Interviewee:
 - Community:
 - Interviewer: KJE/JH/SH
-

16. How did you find out about the program?

17. Do you think most employers know about the program?

18. Are there other ways to promote the program to employers? If yes, how?

19. What were your main reasons for using the SWASP program?

- The wage subsidy
- Bring new skills into the organization
- It was an opportunity to determine suitability of an individual
- It was an opportunity to train an individual
- Seeking help with a specific project at work
- Needed new staff:
 - to fill existing vacancies
 - because of business growth
- Wanted to provide an opportunity to positively influence a young person's life
- Other (please list)_____

20. Did the program help meet these needs?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

- If Yes – Explain
 - If no, where/how did it fall short?
21. Would you have hired someone if the program had not been in place?
22. Did the program contribute to the success of your organization?
- a. If so, how?
 - b. If not, why not?
23. When the participant began working for your organization, were they adequately prepared?
- a. If no, what were their shortcomings?
 - b. If no, are there interventions HRLE could include in the program to make graduates more prepared?
24. Are there additional supports you think should be covered by the program (e.g. on-the-job training supports, career counselling...)
25. [FOR GEP ONLY] Did the graduate complete the GEP?
- a. If no, why not?
 - b. Is there anything HRLE could have done (completion bonus, training, interventions, etc.) to have had the GEP been completed?
26. [FOR GEP ONLY] Is the graduate still working with your company?
- a. If no, why not?
 - b. If yes, have they progressed/taken on more responsibility/been promoted?
 - c. Is there anything HRLE could have done (training, interventions, etc.) to have helped them progress?
27. Let's talk about the administration of the program. How did you find each of the following and how can they be improved to make the SWASP more beneficial for the employer and the student?
- a. Application availability (when and how)
 - b. Application itself
 - c. Notification of approval (when and how)
 - d. client selection
 - e. Duration of the program
 - f. wage and subsidy rates,
 - g. tuition voucher/tuition credit amount (relevant for SWASP)
 - h. Payment (length of time to be paid, use of cheque vs. direct deposit)
 - i. Administration overall

28. Is there anything about the program that might be a disincentive or barrier to employers who want to use it? If yes, what are they and how could this be changed for the better?
29. Have you ever hired an Income support client?
- a. If yes,
 - i. Were there any special considerations you had to take into account?
 - ii. Was the placement satisfactory
 - iii. Are there supports HRLE could have offered to make it a more successful placement?
 - b. If no:
 - i. Have you ever received an application from an income support client
 - ii. If no – would you be interested? WHY/Why not?
 - iii. Any specific challenges that can be anticipated?
30. Does the SWASP program play a role in keeping young people in Newfoundland and Labrador?
- a. If yes, how?
 - b. If no, why not?
31. Thinking of the use of youth employment programs specifically, what can the provincial government do to retain more young people here?
32. Would you participate in the SWASP or GEP program again or others like it? Why or why not?
33. Do you have any further comments or questions about the evaluation?

Protocol for Participants Focus Group

The Focus Group will start with an introduction of the Focus group process, the roles of the people in the room and discussion of confidentiality. Participants will introduce themselves and asked whether there are any participant questions. Participants will be provided with a list of the programs under review for referral to ensure we are talking about the right programs.

1. What were your main reasons for using the Program?

- Money (wages or stipend)
 - Tuition voucher
 - Gain work experience
 - Career exploration
 - Make contacts for future employment
2. Did the program help meet these needs?
- a. Yes - Explain
 - b. No - Explain
3. Are there additional supports you think should be covered by the program (e.g. on-the-job training supports, career counselling...)
4. When you began working, were you adequately prepared?
- a. Yes
 - b. No. - what were your shortcomings
 - c. What needed to be done to make you job ready?
5. What do you think are the strengths of the Preogram? Can these be strengthened further?
(Probe specifically about:)
- a. duration,
 - b. administration,
 - c. selection process,
 - d. wage rates,

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

6. What are the weaknesses of the program? How can these be addressed? (probe specifically about:
 - a. duration,
 - b. administration,
 - c. selection process,
 - d. wage rates,
7. Is there anything about the program that might be a disincentive or barrier to students who want to use it? If yes, what are they and how could this be changed for the better?
8. Can these programs work for graduates and students on income support (or whose families are on income support)? Why or why not?
9. Do you think employers are as willing to hire people associated with income support as those who are not? Why or why not?
10. Would you participate in the program again or others like it? Why or why not?
11. Do you have any further comments or questions about the evaluation?

Protocol for Non-Participants Telephone Interviews

(These were originally focus groups, but had to be cancelled due to weather and were substituted with Telephone interviews. The telephone interview protocol followed the same line of questioning as the FG would have.)

The Focus Group will start with an introduction of the Focus group process, the roles of the people in the room and discussion of confidentiality. Participants will introduce themselves and be asked whether there are any participant questions. Participants will be provided with a list of the programs under review for referral to ensure we are talking about the right programs.

It will be explained that it is important for them to be as specific as possible when answering the questions and that we will probe for specifics!

1. What are the broader challenges, issues and barriers that youth today are facing in education, work, etc.?
2. What supports are helpful in making the transition from school to work? *Probes about types of supports:*
 - To consider work options;
 - To prepare for work entry;
 - To connect with work opportunities;
 - To retain work.
3. We are trying to really understand why people do not participate in programs so we can make changes so they can in the future. With that in mind,
 - Why did you choose not to participate in a student employment program?
 - What were the specific barriers & challenges you faced?
 - How could HRLE have addressed those barriers and challenges?
4. Are there specific challenges or barriers preventing you from pursuing further education or making the transition from school to work?
5. If so, what do you think you need to address those barriers / challenges?
 - Are there programs or supports you have used?
 - What are these?
 - What types of programs and supports would you like to use?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

6. Are there issues and challenges people on income support (or whose families are on income support) face that are different than those who are not?
 - If yes, what are they?

7. What role does student debt play in your decision-making about
 - Program participation?
 - Pursuing post-secondary education
 - Are there things HRLE can do to address those concerns?

8. What do you think HRLE could do to encourage young people to:
 - Stay in Newfoundland and Labrador to work?
 - Return to Newfoundland and Labrador to work?
 - Encourage more young people to pursue post-secondary education?
 - Make the transition from school to work easier?

9. Do you have any further comments relative to this Evaluation?

Participant Telephone Survey

Combined Participant Survey Questions (March 6)

Introduction & Consent

You are being contacted because you were a participant in the Student Work and Service Program (SWASP) or Graduate Employment Program (GEP) recently. The program is currently being evaluated to make improvements and we need your input.

Be assured the information you provide will never be shared in any way that would identify you but will be used for public and departmental reports. Do you give consent for the information you provide to be used and held as outlined above?

- I Agree
- I Do Not Agree and won't do survey

Your experience with the program...

1. Which program did you most recently participate in?
 1. SWASP High School (Go to Question 2)
 2. SWASP Post-Secondary (Go to Question 1A)
 3. GEP (Go to Question 2B)

1A Did you receive

1. A salary and a tuition voucher, or
2. A stipend and a tuition voucher?
3. Don't recall

(Go to Question 2A)

-
2. What was your educational status when you participated in the program?

1. High school student Level I

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

2. High school student Level II
 3. High school student Level III
-

2A. What was your educational status when you participated in the program?

1. High school graduate
 2. College of the North Atlantic student (Go to Q 2A2)
 3. Private College student (how many months completed?)
 4. University student (how many years completed?)
 5. Other (Text box)
-

2A.2 How many years had you completed?
(Text box)

(Go to Question 3)

2A.3 How many months had you completed?
(Text box)

(Go to Question 3)

2A.4 How many years had you completed?
(Text box)

(Go to Question 3)

2B. What was your educational status when you participated in the program?

1. Private college graduate
2. College of the North Atlantic graduate
3. University graduate
4. Other (Text box)

(Go to Question 2B1)

2B.1 Are you still living in Newfoundland and Labrador

- 1 Yes
 - 2 No
-

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

3. How did you find out about the program? (Do not prompt)

1. Friends or family (Word of mouth)
 2. Teachers / professors
 3. Guidance counsellors
 4. HRLE staff
 5. Newspaper
 6. Employer contacted me
 7. Student employment centre / career information centre
 8. Internet
 9. Not sure/don't recall
 10. Other (Text box)
-

4. How could the program be better promoted to students/graduates? (Do not prompt)

1. Website devoted to youth / graduate employment programs
2. Information emailed to all college / university students
3. Information sessions held at schools/universities/colleges
4. Posters
5. Other (Text box)

Check boxes

5. With whom did you work when you were applying for the program (Do not prompt)

1. HRLE Staff
2. Community Agency
3. MUN
4. CNA
5. Employer
6. Teacher / professor/Instructor
7. Not sure/don't recall
8. Other (Text box)

Check boxes

6. How did you find out about your position? (Do not prompt)
1. I found the job myself
 2. Post-secondary institution referred me to an employer
 3. Employer found me
 4. Applied through HRLE and they connected me to employer
 5. Community agency connected me to employer
 6. Educational institution connected me to the employer
 7. Not sure/don't recall
 8. Other (Text box)

Check boxes

In all questions with a scale of 1 to 5, we need 6 = Unsure, 7 = Refused

Follow up questions in these series are triggered by selecting 4 or 5 in the scale.

All follow up questions need check boxes for multiple responses.

7. Now, I'm going to read some statements about the application process for the program and I would like for you to tell me how much you agree with the statement. On a scale of one to five, where one means strongly agree, and five means strongly disagree, how much do you agree with the statement
- 7.1 Information about the program was provided to me promptly
-

7.1.1 Why did you disagree?

1. Didn't receive info until already in placement
 2. Didn't receive info at all
 3. Other (Text box)
-

7.2 What about, Information about the program was accurate

7.2.1 Why did you disagree?

1. Information was not correct
 2. Information was not relevant to my placement
 3. Other (text box)
-

7.3 Information about the program was easily available

7.3.1 Why did you disagree?

1. No one to ask
 2. Not available on website
 3. No contact information for HRLE provided
 4. No one to talk to about the program
 5. Other (Test box)
-

7.4 The application form was easy to understand.

7.4.1 Why did you disagree?

1. Was poorly written
 2. Print was too small, small print)
 3. Other (Text box)
-

7.5 The application form was the proper length?

7.5.1 Why did you disagree?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

1. Too much information required
 2. Other (Text box)
-

7.6 Questions about the program were addressed promptly.

7.6.1 Why did you disagree?

1. Couldn't contact a real person
 2. Couldn't email
 3. Always went to voice mail
 4. Didn't have contact information
 5. Other
-

7.7 Questions about the program were answered accurately.

7.7.1 Why did you disagree?

1. Given incorrect information
 2. Information did not apply to my placement
 3. Didn't understand response
 4. Other (Text box)
-

(Ask Question 8, only if Question 1 was answered with 1 or 2)

8. Was the date when you were told you had the job appropriate?

1. Yes (Go to Question 9)
 2. No (Go to Question 8.1)
 3. Don't remember (Go to Question 9)
-

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

8.1 In what month were you notified?

1. March
 2. April
 3. May
 4. June
 5. July
 6. Don't remember (Skip to Question 9)
-

8.2 In what month do you think you should have been notified?

1. March
 2. April
 3. May
 4. June
 5. July
 6. Doesn't matter
-

9. When you reflect upon the length of the program, would you say it was:

1. Too short (Go to Q 9.1)
 2. Just right
 3. Too long (Go to Q 9.1)
 4. Not sure
 5. Refused
-

9.1 How long do you think the program should have been?

(Note: Record answers in weeks or months)

Text box

10. Do you think your employability skills improved by the end of the program?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

1. Yes
 2. No (Continue at Q 10.1)
 3. Not sure
 4. Refused
-

10.1 How can the program be improved to assist in this area?

1. More mentoring as part of the program
 2. More training as part of the program
 3. Other (Text box)
-

11. Was your placement related to your education or chosen career area?

1. Directly related
2. Somewhat related
3. Not at all related
4. Unsure
5. Refused

12 Did you make any contacts during the program that might assist you in finding future employment?

1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Not sure
 4. Refused
-

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

13 Please evaluate the following components of the program and rate them from 1 = Excellent to 5 = Poor. (Same instructions as at the beginning of Question 7)

13.1 The first one is ... relevance of placement to career goals

13.1.1 How could this have been improved?

1. More detailed job descriptions should be available up front
2. There should be more monitoring throughout placement to ensure placement is what it was supposed to be
3. Other (Text box)

13.2 On the job support and training

13.2.1 How could this have been improved?

1. More formal orientation process
 2. Ongoing assessments
 3. Have someone to be able to call at HRLE with complaints about the placement
 4. Other (Text)
-

13.3 Opportunities to learn new employment related skills

13.3.1 How could this have been improved?

1. more formal training opportunities on the job
2. more interaction with experienced staff
3. Other (Text box)

13.4 Training before placement

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

13.4.1 How could this have been improved?

1. formal orientation provided by HRLE
 2. orientation provided by the employer
 3. Other
-

Ask 13.5 only if Question 1 was 1 or 2

13.5 Rate of pay

13.5.1 How could this have been improved

1. Increase weekly stipend
 2. Provide at least minimum wage plus tuition voucher (i.e. instead of the stipend)
 3. Other
-

Ask 13.5A only if Question 1 was 3

13.5A Rate of pay

3.5A.1 How could this have been improved?

1. Provide a completion bonus for GEP
 2. Other
-

Ask 13.6 only if Question 1 was 1 or 2

13.6 Amount of tuition voucher

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

13.6.1 How could this have been improved?

1. Increase tuition voucher
 2. Other
-

Were the following factors barriers to your participation in the program?

13.7 Lack of transportation to and from placement location

1. Yes (Go to 14.1.1)
 2. No
 3. Refused
-

13.7.1 How could this have been improved?

1. Provide transportation allowance
 2. Other
-

13.8 Lack of child care

1. Yes (Go to 14.2.1)
 2. No
 3. Refused
-

14.2.1 How could this have been improved?

1. Provide child care allowance
 2. Other
-

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

13.9 Lack of career counselling

1. Yes (Go to 14.3.1)
 2. No
 3. Refused
-

14.3.1 How could this have been improved?

1. Make information available on a single website
 2. Send information to participants
 3. Provide career counselling for participants
 4. Other
-

14 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means Very satisfied and 5 means Very unsatisfied, please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the program you participated in.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ask Question 15.1 if 4 or 5 was selected

14.1 Why were you unsatisfied with the program?

1. Work not related to training/career goal
 2. Work not challenging enough
 3. Poor supervision
 4. Lack of supervision
 5. Pay too low
 6. Placement too short
 7. Other
-

15 On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means Very positive influence, and 5 means Very negative influence, please rank the level of influence your experience in the program had on your choices in the following areas:

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Ask Question 16.1 only if Q1 = 1

15.1 Starting a post-secondary education program

Ask Question 16.1.1 if 4 or 5 was selected

16.1.1 What would make a difference?

1. Lower cost of education
 2. Access to larger grants
 3. Possibility of debt reduction
 4. Access to accurate labour market information
 5. Other
 6. Don't know
-

Ask Question 16.2 only if Q1 = 2

15.2 Completing a post-secondary education / Training program

Ask Question 16.2.1 if 4 or 5 was selected

16.2.1 What would make a difference?

1. Larger grant portion of student loans
2. Student debt reduction program
3. Access to accurate labour market information
4. Other
5. Don't know

Everybody answers Question 16.3

15.3 Pursuing further education

Ask Question 16.3.1 if 4 or 5 was selected

16.3.1 What would make a difference?

1. Lower cost of education
 2. Access to larger grants
 3. Possibility of debt reduction
 4. Access to accurate labour market information
 5. Other
 6. Donkt know
-

Ask Question 16.2 only if Q1 = 2 or 3

15.4 Choosing a career

Ask Question 16.4.1 if 4 or 5 was selected

15.4.1 What would make a difference?

1. Access to career counselling
 2. Access to accurate labour market information
 3. Other
 4. Don't know
-

Everybody answers Question 16.5

15.5 Staying in Newfoundland and Labrador

Ask Question 16.5.1 if 4 or 5 was selected

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

16.5.1 What would make a difference?

1. Access to current job opportunities
 2. Higher wages
 3. Debt reduction programs
 4. Interest relief programs, job security
 5. Other
 6. Don't know
 7. Other
 8. Don't know
-

Ask Question 16.6 only if Q1 = 3 AND 2B.1 = 2

15.6 Returning to Newfoundland and Labrador

Ask Question 16.6.1 if 4 or 5 was selected

16.6.1 What would make a difference?

1. Access to current job opportunities
 2. Higher subsidies to enable higher wages
 3. Debt reduction programs
 4. Interest relief programs
 5. job security
 6. Other
 7. Don't know
-

Ask Questions 17, 18, and 19 only if Question 1 = 2

16 On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is Very important, and 5 is Very Unimportant, how important was the Tuition Voucher in your decision to participate in the SWASP?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

17 On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is Very valuable, and 5 is Not at all valuable, how valuable is the tuition voucher credit in helping you to lower the cost of Post secondary education?

If Question 1A = 3, Skip Question 19

18 Do you think the way SWASP is structured to pay participants should continue?

1. Yes
 2. No (Continue at Question 19)
 3. Not Sure
 4. Refused
-

Ask Q 19.1 if 1A = 1

19.1 What should replace it?

1. Just salary no voucher
 2. Increase both the salary and the voucher (Go to Question 19.1.1)
 3. Other
-

19.1.1 How much should the salary be increased to?

Text box

19.1.2 How much should the voucher be increased to?

Text box

Ask Q 19.2 if 1A = 2

19.2 What should replace it?

1. Salary and voucher - eliminate the stipend) (Go to Question 19.2.1)
 2. Increase both the stipend and the voucher (Go to Question 19.2.2)
-

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

3. Other

19.2.1 How much should the salary be?

Text box

19.2.2 How much should the stipend be?

Text box

19.2.3 How much should the voucher be?

Text box

Ask Question 20 only if Question Q1 = 3

20 Did you stay with your employer the full length of the GEP?

1. Yes (Continue at Q 20.1)
 2. No (Continue at Q 20.5)
 3. Refused (Continue at Question 21)
-

20.1 Did you continue to work with the employer after the GEP program was completed (12 months)?

1. Yes (Continue at Q 20.1.1)
 2. No (Continue at Q 20.2)
 3. Refused (Continue at Question 21)
-

20.1.1 Are you working at the same position?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Refused

20.1.2 Have you worked at different jobs within your company?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Refused

20.1.3 Have you received a higher salary?

1. Yes (Continue at Question 20.1.5)
 2. No (Continue at Question 20.1.4)
 3. Refused (Continue at Question 20.1.5)
-

20.1.4 Are there career development supports HRLE could provide to enable you to be promoted to higher paying positions?

Text box

20.1.5 How long after the program was over (12 months) did you remain with the employer?
(Record answer in months)

Text box

Ask only if Question 20.1 = 2

20.2 Why did you not remain with the same employer after completing the GEP?

Radio Buttons

1. The job didn't pay enough
 2. The employer couldn't afford to keep me on
 3. Unsuitable employer
 4. Position no longer required
 5. You left for other opportunities
 6. Spouse /partner relocated
 7. Other
-

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Continue at 20.3

20.3 Are there supports that could have been provided that would have continued the employment?

1. Yes (Continue at Q 20.4)
 2. No (Skip to Question 21)
 3. Don't know (Skip to Question 21)
 4. Refused (Skip to Question 21)
-

20.4 Can you tell me what these supports would have been? (Do not prompt)

20.4.1 Higher salary

20.4.1a What should your salary have been

Text box

20.4.2 Bigger subsidy to my employer

20.4.2a What should the subsidy have been?

Text box

20.4.3 Program should have been longer

20.4.3a How long should the program have been – in months?

Text box

20.4.4 More training/support covered by the program

20.4.4a What suggestions can you give for training or support?

Text box

20.4.5 Completion bonus for the Graduate

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

20.4.5a Do you have any suggestions what the bonus should be?

Text box

20.4.6 Other Text box

20.4.7 No suggestion given

From here, go to Question 21

Ask this question only if Q 20 = 2

20.5 Why did you not complete the GEP? (Do not prompt)

Radio buttons

1. Wages too low
2. Unsuitable employer
3. Position no longer required
4. Graduate left for other opportunities
5. Spouse /partner relocated
6. Other

Continue at Q 20.5.1

20.5.1 Are there any supports that could have been provided that would have kept you there to the end of the GEP?

1. Yes (Continue at Q 20.5.2)
 2. No (Skip to Question 21)
 3. Don't know (Skip to Question 21)
 4. Refused (Skip to Question 21)
-

20.5.2 What would these supports have been? (Do not prompt)

20.5.3 Higher salary

20.5.3a What should your salary have been

Text box

20.5.4 Bigger subsidy to my employer

20.5.4a What should the subsidy have been?

Text box

20.5.5 Program should have been longer

20.5.5a How long should the program have been – in months?

Text box

20.5.6 More training/support covered by the program

20.5.6a What suggestions can you give for training or support?

Text box

20.5.7 Completion bonus for the Graduate

20.5.7a Do you have any suggestions what the bonus should be?

Text box

20.5.8 Other Text box

20.5.7 No suggestion given

Ask this question only if Q 1 = 3

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

21 If there were a completion bonus included for the participants in the GEP that provided a student debt reduction voucher, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is Very strong, and 5 is Not at all strong, how strong an enticement would that be to participate in and to complete the program?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ask 21.1 only if Q 21 is scored 1 or 2

21.1 How much should the student debt voucher be?

Text box

Ask 21.2 only if Q 21 is scored 4 or 5

21.2 Why would you say that the debt reduction voucher would not be a strong incentive to complete the program? (Do not prompt)

1. I don't have any student debt
2. The pay and the voucher still wouldn't allow me to live and pay my expenses
3. Other

Ask Question 22 only if Question 1 = 2 or 3

22 Does this program encourage you to stay in Newfoundland and Labrador to work?

1. Yes
 2. No (Go to 22.1)
 3. Not sure
 4. Refused
-

22.1 How can it be strengthened to accomplish that goal? (Do not prompt)

1. It can't – I want to go away for the experience/freedom
-

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

2. It can if you pay sufficient wages that enable me to live and to service my student loan
 3. It can't – I can only get the career experience I need outside the province
 4. My spouse/partner left the province and I went with them.
 5. Other
-

Everybody answers Questions 23

23 While you were on this program, did you receive support through the Income support program?

1. Yes (Continue at Question 24)
 2. No (Skip to Question 26)
 3. Not sure (Skip to Question 26)
 4. Refused (Skip to Question 26)
-

24 Did you find there were any obstacles or barriers to this program because you were on Income Support?

1. Yes (Continue at Question 25)
2. No
3. Not Sure
4. Refused

25 What were the obstacles or barriers to the program? (Do not prompt)

1. Employers not interested in Income Support recipients working for them
2. Colleagues critical of me because I was on Income Support
3. Too much paperwork/bureaucracy with HRLE
4. Problems with the child benefit in the following year
5. Other

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Continue at Question 26

Everybody answers Question 26

26 Did you complete the program?

1. Yes
 2. No (Continue at Question 27)
 3. Refused
-

27 Was there anything HRLE could have done to make it more successful?

1. Yes (Continue at Question 28)
 2. No
 3. Don't know
-

28 What could HRLE have done to make it more successful? (Do not prompt)

1. Transportation allowance
2. Child care allowance
3. Continuation of drug card benefits
4. Other

Information about you...

1. Sex:
 1. Male
 2. Female
 2. What is your postal code?
 3. Where in the province did you participate in the program?
 1. St. John's and metro
-
-

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

2. Bay Roberts area
 3. Gander
 4. Grand Falls – Windsor
 5. Corner Brook
 6. Labrador City
 7. Happy Valley - Goose Bay
 8. Labrador Coast
 9. Other (please specify)
4. Please indicate if you are a member of one or more of following groups. Choose all that apply.
1. Aboriginal
 2. Immigrant
 3. Visible minority
 4. Person with a disability
 5. Other (please specify)
5. Do you have any children?
1. No
 2. One
 3. Two
 4. Three
 5. Four or more
6. Which of the following options best describes your marital status?
1. Single
 2. Married
 3. Separated
 4. Divorced
 5. Widowed
 6. Engaged
 7. Cohabiting (living with a boyfriend, girlfriend, or partner)
7. Who do you currently live with? (choose all that apply)
1. Your children
 2. Your siblings (brothers or sisters)
 3. One of your parents
 4. Both of your parents

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

5. Grandparents
 6. Other relatives
 7. Your spouse or partner (wife, husband, boyfriend, girlfriend, fiancé)
 8. Roommates
 9. Other
8. What is your average annual household income?
1. \$0 - \$15,000
 2. \$16,000 - \$25,000
 3. \$26,000 - \$35,000
 4. \$36,000 - \$45,000
 5. \$46,000 - \$55,000
 6. \$56,000 - \$65,000
 7. \$66,000 - \$75,000
 8. \$76,000 or more
 9. Don't know
9. Do you or your family currently receive Income Support?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know
 4. Refused
10. Have you or your family ever received Income Support?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know
 4. Refused
11. Please indicate your highest level of education achieved to date.
1. Some High School
 2. High School Diploma
 3. Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma
 4. Some public or private college
 5. Public or private college certificate or diploma
 6. Some university
 7. Bachelor's degree
 8. Other

9. None of the above

12. Did you attend an educational institution outside of Newfoundland and Labrador?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, please indicate province below:

General Comments

Please provide any other comments you have about the program or this evaluation.

Thank you!

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. The results of the evaluation will be provided on the provincial government website when it is released publicly.

Employer Telephone Survey

Employer Survey Questions (March 4)

Introduction & Consent

You are being contacted because your organization was a participant in the Student Work and Service Program (SWASP) or Graduate Employment Program (GEP) recently. The program is currently being evaluated to make improvements and we need your input.

Be assured the information you provide will never be shared in any way that would identify you but will be used for public and departmental reports. Do you give consent for the information you provide to be used and held as outlined above?

- I Agree
- I Do Not Agree and won't do survey (Probe why – is there a better time or person to call, Terminate survey if required)

Your experience with the Program

1. Which program(s) has your organization participated in? (Check only one – if they did more than one, they must pick one (most recent) and are invited to complete another survey for the other program.)
 - a. SWASP Post Secondary;
 - b. SWASP High School
 - c. GEP

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

2. How did you find out about the Program? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 - a. HRLE mailed me an application
 - b. I was in it before
 - c. I heard from other business colleagues
 - d. I went looking for the info online
 - e. I called HRLE looking for info on employment programs
 - f. Other _____
3. How can the program be better promoted? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 - a. Website devoted to all Youth Employment programs
 - b. Brochure delivered to all businesses with a mail-out (such as WHSCC assessment)
 - c. Through Industry, trade or employer associations (Board of Trade, etc.) newsletters
 - d. Advertising in the Newspaper
 - e. Gov't should have meetings that discuss the various programs available
 - f. It should be co-ordinated with the Federal government summer employment program promotion
 - g. Other _____
4. With whom did you work when you were applying for and implementing the program (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 - a. HRLE Staff
 - b. Community Agency
 - c. MUN
 - d. CNA
 - e. Other (Please list) _____

D1. What was the gender of the student/graduate? Male/Female

D2. What was the age of the /student graduate?

5. How would you rate the following aspects of the application and approval process to participate in the program? (1=well done and efficient to 5 = poorly carried out and inefficient, 6 =No Answer/Not applicable) – ***if 4 or 5 probe on why (possible reasons provided for coding) and how it could be improved (Open-ended)***
 - a. information about the program was:
 - i. timely (Possible reasons for 4/5 = too slow; too long to get an answer)
 - ii. accurate (Possible reasons for 4/5 = not correct; not relevant to my region/community; not relevant to my organization)
 - iii. easily available (Possible reasons for 4/5 = couldn't find it online; it was only online; couldn't get a paper copy)
 - b. Application form

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

- i. Ability to be understood (Possible reasons for 4/5 =too hard to read; too small to pick out;)
 - ii. Length (Possible reasons for 4/5 = too long; looking for too much info)
 - c. Questions about the program were addressed
 - i. Promptly (Possible reasons for 4/5 = took too long; I couldn't get hold of a real person; I couldn't email questions; I could only get voice mail)
 - ii. Accurately (Possible reasons for 4/5 = they couldn't answer my questions; the answer they gave me was wrong)
 - d. What was the length of time it took for you to receive approval notice? _____weeks
 - e. Were you satisfied with the length of time it took to pr receive approval notice? (Yes, No, no answer)
 - i. If no, how long should the approval process be? _____weeks
 - f. (SWASP Only) When do you need the approval notification? April, May, June
6. When you reflect upon the length of the program, would you say it was:
 - a. Too short
 - b. Just right
 - c. Too long
 - d. No answer
7. If you answered too short or too long, what, in your opinion, would be the ideal length of time for the program?_____ (in Weeks for SWASP and Months for GEP)
8. How long on average did it take you to have your claim processed for payment?
_____weeks
9. Were you satisfied with the length of time it took to process your wage subsidy claim for payment? (Yes, No, no answer)
 - a. If no, what is a reasonable amount of time to have your claim processed?
_____(weeks)
10. Would you have hired someone for the summer (if SWASP) OR Full-time (if GEP) if the program had **not** been in place? Yes/No/Maybe/No Answer
 - a. (SWASP Only) If yes, would you have hired a student if the program had not been in place? Yes/No/No Answer/Not Sure
 - b. (GEP Only) If yes, would you have hired a recent graduate if the program had not been in place? Yes/No/No Answer/Not Sure
11. How did you recruit the person you hired? (Check one)
__Referred by the student/graduate presented themselves

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

- Referred by HRLE
- Referred by MUN
- Referred by the College of the North Atlantic
- Referred by a Private College
- Other (please specify _____)

12. How would you rate the person's employability skills when they started with your organization? (1 = excellent and 5 = poor, 6 =No Answer/Not applicable) ***If response = 4 or 5, probe:***

a. Could these have been improved before employment started? Yes/No/Not Sure/No Answer

i. *If yes, in what skill areas do you think the person would have benefited from training? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)*

1. Work Ethic
2. Punctuality
3. Workplace Behaviour
4. Interpersonal Skills
5. Communication skills
6. Team work skills
7. Computer Skills
8. Dress & Attitude
9. Self-esteem
10. Motivation
11. Other (List)_____

b. Were their employability skills adequate at the end of the Program? Yes/No/Not Sure/No Answer

i. If no, how can the program be improved to assist in this area? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)

1. HRLE should provide training
2. HRLE should evaluate the graduate midway through
3. There should be a requirement for mentoring in the program
4. Other, please explain _____

13. (GEP Only) Did the person stay with your organization for the full length of the GEP?

Yes/No/No Answer

a. If yes, did the participant continue to work with your organization after the program was completed? Yes/No/No Answer

i. If yes:

1. Is that person(s) working at the same position? Yes/No/No Answer
2. Has that person(s) worked at different jobs within your organization? Yes/No/No Answer

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

3. Has that person(s) received a higher salary? Yes/No/No Answer
 - a. If no, are there career development supports HRLE could provide to enable them to be promoted to higher paying positions?
 4. How long after the subsidy ended did the person remain with your organization? _____ months
- ii. If no, (the person did complete the GEP, but did not remain with the organization)
1. Why not? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 - a. Couldn't continue to pay the person the same wage without the subsidy
 - b. Couldn't pay the salary requested by the person
 - c. Unsuitable candidate
 - d. Position no longer required
 - e. Graduate left for other opportunities
 - f. Other: _____
 2. Are there supports that could have been provided that would have continued the employment? Yes/No/No Answer
 - a. If yes, what would these be?
 - i. More financial resources with the program
 1. Please specify amount: _____
 - ii. Longer program length
 1. How long should the program be in total? _____
 - iii. More training/support covered by the program
 1. What type of training/support? _____
 - iv. Completion bonus for the Graduate
 - v. Other: _____
- b. If no (the person did not complete the GEP)
 - i. Why not? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 1. Lack of financial resources to pay a competitive wage
 2. Unsuitable candidate (if selected, ask why? Lack of workplace skills, lack of employability skills, other _____)
 3. Position no longer required
 4. Graduate left for other opportunities
 5. Other: _____
 - ii. Are there any supports that could have been provided that would have kept the person there to the end of the GEP Yes/No/No Answer
 1. If yes, what would these be?

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

- a. Higher subsidy is needed for the program.
 - i. Please specify amount:_____
- b. More training/support covered by the program
 - i. What type of training/support?_____
- c. Completion bonus for the Graduate
- d. Other:_____

14. Did the program benefit you as an employer? Yes/No/Somewhat/No Answer

- a. If yes, how was this program of benefit? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 - o Subsidized the cost of worker(s)
 - o It provided an opportunity to determine suitability of an individual for future possible full or part-time employment
 - o It provided an opportunity to train an individual
 - o Assistance with a specific project at work
 - o Obtained new staff:
 - o to fill existing vacancies
 - o because of Business Growth
 - o It brought new skills into an organization
 - o Opportunity to positively influence a young person's life
 - o Other (please list)_____

15. Do you have specific suggestions on how the program could be improved? (Accept multiple responses)

- Increase program length (change to _____ total)
- Decrease program length (change to _____ total)
- Provide a greater subsidy (change to _____ \$/total)
- Provide a training allowance for the student/graduate (Approximate _____/ total)
- Provide a completion bonus for the student (if GEP)
- Improve the administration of the program
- Other (please list)_____

16. (GEP Only) If it were a requirement of the GEP for employers to pay minimum wage before a subsidy were added to make it a competitive wage instead of the current subsidy approach, would this make the program more attractive, less attractive, or no difference to you?

17. (GEP Only) Would it be of benefit to stagger the subsidy to provide **higher wages** to the graduates as they get more experienced over time? Yes/No/Not Sure/No Answer.

18. (GEP Only) Would it be of benefit to offer a completion bonus to graduates to encourage them to finish the full GEP? Yes/No/Not Sure/No Answer.

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

- a. If yes, what value should it be for completion (\$_____)
19. (SWASP Only) Would it be of benefit to stagger the subsidy to enable employers to provide **higher wages** to the students as they progress in their education – i.e. if they return in subsequent summers? Yes/No/Not Sure/No Answer.
20. Are there other funding structures that would to allow you to offer competitive wage rates to graduates? (List)
21. Do you think the program:
- a. Enables young people to stay and work in Newfoundland and Labrador?
(Yes/No/Partially/No Answer)
 - b. Are there ways it can be improved to enable young people to stay in the province?
(Yes/No/Partially/No Answer)
 - i. If yes, how? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 - 1. Must offer higher subsidies to enable employers to pay higher wages
 - 2. Must have a student debt pay down portion to it
 - 3. Must be longer in duration (_____ months)
 - 4. Must be a tax credit for working in the province.
 - 5. Other_____
 - c. Encourages young people to return to Newfoundland and Labrador?
(Yes/No/Partially/No Answer)
 - d. Are there ways it can be improved to encourage Young people to return to the province?
(Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 - 1. Must offer higher subsidies to enable employers to pay higher wages
 - 2. Must have a student debt pay down portion to it
 - 3. Must be longer
 - 4. Must be a tax credit for working in the province
 - 5. Other_____
22. Have you ever hired a person on income support or whose family is on income support for the program? Yes/No/ Not Sure/No Answer
- a. If Yes, was the experience satisfactory? Yes/No/ Not Sure/No Answer
 - i. If No, why was it unsatisfactory? (Do not prompt, but can record more than one answer)
 - 1. Candidate had poor employability skills (low work ethic, not punctual, etc.)
 - 2. Candidate had poor workplace skills
 - 3. Couldn't pay enough to compete with Income Support system
 - 4. Other: _____

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

- ii. If No, was there anything HRLE could have done to improve your satisfaction?
Please explain.

23. Would you hire another student/graduate through the program? Yes/No/Not Sure /No Answer
24. Would you recommend this program to a colleague? (Yes/No/No Answer)
25. Rate your overall level of satisfaction with the program: (Very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat unsatisfied, very unsatisfied, unsure)

Information about your Organization...

13. Location of operations
- a. Postal code _____
14. Average Number of Employees throughout the year:
- a. 1-3
- b. 4-10
- c. 11-25
- d. 26-50
- e. 51-100
- f. 100+
- g. No Answer
15. What sector is your company?
- Retail
- Service (Food service, Hospitality, professional services, etc.)
- Manufacturing & Processing
- Resources (Fishing, mining, agriculture, etc.)
- Other _____
- No Answer
16. What was the approximate gross revenue of the company last year?
- \$50,000 - \$250,000
- \$250,001- \$500,000
- \$500,001 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,001-\$5,000,000
- \$5,000,001+
- Don't know
- Not applicable / no answer

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

Thank you!

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. The results of the evaluation will be provided on the provincial government website when it is released publicly.

Protocol for Stakeholder Interviews

Name and Position:

Date:

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Introduction of the interview process and discussion of confidentiality. Discuss the programs we are discussing (and provide them a list). Ask if they have any questions before starting.

1. What are the strengths of the programs with which you are familiar?
2. Weaknesses?
3. Ways it can be improved?
4. What do you think HRLE could do (within these programs) to encourage young people to stay in Newfoundland and Labrador to work? To return to Newfoundland and Labrador to work?
5. Income Support application?
6. What do you think are the barriers for employers? How could these be addressed?
7. Could application / reporting processes be improved? If so, how?
8. Any other comments you would like to add about the program(s) or the evaluation?

Protocol for Interviews from other Jurisdictions

The Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment has hired Hollett and Sons Inc. to conduct an evaluation of a group of employment programs for students.

The programs included in the evaluation fall into the four categories listed below.

- Student work experience programs connected with tuition vouchers for use in post-secondary education studies.
- A wage subsidy program for recent graduates.
- Faculty-focused education and work experience programs.
- Community career, employment, leadership, awareness and early intervention programs to address employment and other barriers youth experience in making a transition to work.

These programs have been designed to support young people in pursuit of educational and employment opportunities. The department has also established goals to take a proactive

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

approach in offering youth an alternative to Income Support and decreasing the number of new youth entrants to Income Support.

As a part of the evaluation we are gathering information about best practices and evaluations of similar types of programs in other jurisdictions. In our report, we will be making recommendations for enhancements or changes to programs to improve their effectiveness in meeting the clients', and program goals along with government priorities. When doing this, we would like to include best practices in other jurisdictions. The following questions are designed to assist us in gathering that information.

This information will be used for the purpose of evaluating these programs and making recommendations on the future of the programs. The results will be shared with the Department of Human Resources Labour and Employment (HRLE) and the Department of Education.

Once the evaluation is complete, data will remain confidential and the property of HRLE.

By agreeing to answer these questions you are providing consent for the information you provide to be used and held as outlined above.

Questions

1. What, if any, programs does the provincial government have to support youth in pursuit of educational and employment opportunities?
 - a. What is the general structure? (for example, wage subsidies for recent graduates, tuition vouchers for student summer employment)
 - b. What is the target group for the program? (for example, high school students, recent graduates, youth receiving income assistance)
 - c. Are there specific additional supports provided for youth at risk?
 - d. Have the programs been evaluated? If so, are copies of the evaluation findings available?

2. Within your department what best practices have been identified related to these programs that would be helpful for departments in other jurisdictions?
 - a. For increasing participation among the target group? Youth at risk?
 - b. For addressing barriers identified by youth?
 - c. For encouraging participation of employers?
 - d. For improving recruitment and retention of recent graduates within the province?

10.Document Source List

(In progress)

Received Dec 4

Ruralurban.xls

Student Investment and Opportunity Corporation Annual Report 2006-2007, NL SIOC (SIOC Annual Report 06-07 Nov 6.doc)

Accountability Framework for the Use of Community Partners for the Delivery of Career and Employment Programs and Services, Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment, May 31 2007 (HRLE Accountability Framework for Community Partners May 31 2007.doc)

Guidelines for Funding Proposals from Community Agencies – Community Partnerships Program, Accountability Framework for the Use of Community Partners for the Delivery of Career and Employment Programs and Services Supporting Documents, Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment, May 31 2007 (HRLE Accountability Framework – Supporting Documents May 31 2007.doc)

Community Partnerships Proposal Assessment and Recommendation Report, Accountability Framework for the Use of Community Partners for the Delivery of Career and Employment Programs and Services Supporting Documents, Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment, May 31 2007 (HRLE Accountability Framework – Supporting Documents May 31 2007.doc)

Received Dec 5

Approval Process for SIOC Grants (SIOC Grants Approval Process.doc)

Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment SIOC Proposal Assessment (SIOC Proposal Assessment Blank.doc)

Application Form 2007 – 2008, Career, Employment and Youth Services Division, Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment, Grants to Youth Organizations Program (Application Form 07-08.doc)

Junior Achievement JAAC Conference Contract.doc

St Francis Foundation Youth Are Working Contract.doc

SIOC Evaluation (Volume II Appendices)

PC Party Blueprint <http://www.pcparty.nf.net/blueprint2007.htm>

Received Dec 19

Program databases (SIOC–GEP.xls, SIOC–SWASP.xls, SIOC–HS.xls) and associated printed manual

Sent via mail Dec 20 (forwarded to Susan, then Joanne)

Final Report for FAM Tour 2007, Exploits Valley Economic Development Corporation and Exploits Heritage Council, 2007

Baccalieu Trail Tourism Ambassador Program 2006 Final Report, Baccalieu Trail Tourism Association

Enhanced Youth Employment in the Irish Loop: Pilot Project Final Report, Irish Loop Tourism Association, 2006

Marine Institute Summer Camps 2007 Final Report, The Fisheries and Marine Institute of Memorial University of Newfoundland

Received Feb 1

SIOC Evaluation CD (Participant Info CSC SWASP.xls, Participant Info CYN Summer SWASP.xls, Participant Info IT TFT.xls, Participant Info marine Co-op.xls, Participant Info Rural Practice Medical.xls, Participant Info TWEP.xls, SWASP CSC Placements_ContactInfo_jan08 revised.xls)

Paper copies (SWASP – CSC 2007-08, CYN Summer SWASP 2007-08, MUN SWASP 2007, CONA SWASP 2007, MUN PACEE 2007 Participant Information, CONA PACEE 2007, Tutoring Work Experience/TWEP 2007-2008, MUN SECPAP Summary 2007-2008, Faculty of Education School Placement 2007, Marine Institute Youth Opportunities Co-op, IT Tutoring for Tuition, Rural Practice Medical, Conservation Corps Newfoundland and Labrador Green Team Program Required Statistics of Employees Hired 2007-08, Marine Pursuits 2007 Participants, Baccalieu Trail – Tourism Ambassador Program 2006-07, St. Francis Foundation Youth are Working, FINALY Career Focus 2005-06)