



Now and Tomorrow  
Excellence in Everything We Do



October 2009

# Summative Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures in the Ontario Region

*Final Report*  
**October 2009**



# ***Summative Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures in the Ontario Region***

**Final Report**

***Prepared for:  
Labour Market Partnership Unit  
Evaluation Directorate  
Human Resources and Skills Development Canada***

***October 2009***

**SP-AH-933-01-10E  
(également disponible en français)**

Paper

ISBN: 978-1-100-14665-2

Cat. No.: HS28-164/2010E

PDF

ISBN: 978-1-100-14666-9

Cat. No.: HS28-164/2010E-PDF

# *Table of Contents*

<b>List of Abbreviations and Terms.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Management Response .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 EBSMs in the Ontario Region .....	1
1.1.1 Employment Benefits Delivered in Ontario.....	2
1.1.2 Support Measures Delivered in Ontario.....	3
1.1.3 Who Can Participate in EBSMs? .....	3
1.2 Purpose and Scope of the Summative Evaluation .....	4
<b>2. Evaluation Methodologies .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Evaluation Strategy .....	5
2.1.1 Quantitative Methods .....	5
2.1.2 Qualitative Methods .....	6
2.2 Key Strengths and Limitations.....	6
<b>3. EBSM Participation.....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 Overview of Participation .....	9
3.1.1 The Action Plan Approach.....	9
3.1.2 Profile of Participants.....	10
3.1.3 Program Access.....	11
3.2 In-Program Experience .....	13
3.2.1 Skills Development .....	13
3.2.2 Self-Employment Assistance .....	14
3.2.3 Targeted Wage Subsidies .....	15
3.2.4 Job Creation Partnership .....	15
3.2.5 Employment Assistance Services.....	16
<b>4. Impacts and Effects.....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 Key Employment Impacts.....	17
4.1.1 Approach Used to Examine Impacts .....	17
4.1.2 Impacts on Employment and Earnings.....	17
4.1.3 Impacts on EI Benefits and Income Assistance .....	19
4.1.4 Impacts on Skills and Employability .....	19
4.2 Other Findings .....	21
<b>5. Cost-Effectiveness .....</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1 Benefit-Cost Estimates.....	23
5.1.1 Approach Used to Measure Benefits and Costs .....	23
5.1.2 Discussion of Benefit-Cost Estimates .....	24
5.2 Cost-Effectiveness Estimates.....	25
<b>6. Conclusions.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Appendix A .....</b>	<b>31</b>



## *List of Tables*

Table 1	EBSM Participants* by Type of Participant and Intervention (For Principal EBSM and Reference Year 2001/02) .....	10
Table 2	Benefit-Cost Estimates .....	25
Table 3	Cost-effectiveness Measures .....	27
Table A-1	Main Demographic and Work-Related Characteristics of Participants (For Principal EBSM and Reference Year 2001/02) .....	31
Table A-2	Estimated Impacts on Hours of Employment and Earnings (Annualized Estimates For Principal EBSM and Reference Year 2001/02) .....	32
Table A-3	Estimated Impacts on EI Benefits, SA Benefits and Dependence on Income Support (Annualized Estimates For Principal EBSM and Reference Year 2001/02) .....	33





# *List of Abbreviations and Terms*

APE	Action Plan Equivalent
EAS	Employment Assistance Services
EB	Employment Benefit
EBSM	Employment Benefits and Support Measures
EI	Employment Insurance
HRCC	Human Resource Center of Canada
HRDC	Human Resources Development Canada
HRSDC	Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
JCP	Job Creation Partnerships
JFC	Job Finding Clubs
LMA	Labour Market Agreements
LMP	Labour Market Partnerships
LMDA	Labour Market Development Agreement
RHQ	Regional Headquarters
SA	Provincial social/income assistance
SD	Skills Development
SEA	Self-Employment Assistance
TWS	Targeted Wage Subsidies
SM	Support Measure

*EI Part I Benefits* These benefits are income benefits. They are also called "income support" and are paid to eligible unemployed individuals. These income benefits are temporary and vary in amount and duration according to various criteria.

*EI Part II Benefits* These benefits often supplement or replace Part I income benefits and provide Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs) designed to help individuals return to work.



# *Executive Summary*

This report provides a summary of the summative evaluation of the Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs) in the Ontario region. EBSMs are designed to use an action plan approach to assist workers who are or have been Employment Insurance (EI) recipients to return to work and reduce their dependency on EI and provincial social/income assistance.

During the period examined by the summative evaluation, EBSMs were delivered by the federal government because a Labour Market Development Agreement had not yet been signed with the Government of Ontario. The following EBSMs were delivered in Ontario:

- ***Skills Development (SD)*** is designed to assist eligible individuals pay for skills training courses and related expenses while enrolled in a training program from a registered institution;
- ***Self-Employment Assistance (SEA)*** is designed to help individuals with sound business ideas to start their own businesses. SEA offers financial assistance, mentoring/coaching, and technical help such as advice on business planning;
- ***Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS)*** is designed to encourage employers to hire individuals that they would not normally hire in the absence of a subsidy;
- ***Job Creation Partnerships (JCP)*** is designed to create incremental and meaningful work opportunities for clients through partnerships involving Human Resource Centres of Canada, employers, and second-party organizations; and
- ***Employment Assistance Services (EAS)*** provide for employment counselling and other services, such as computer access, to help unemployed individuals obtain employment.

## **Evaluation Scope and Methodology**

The evaluation was focused on examining whether EBSMs are having incremental impacts on participants. It also examined whether EBSMs are successful in achieving the objectives of Part II of the *EI Act* – that is, whether they are assisting persons to “obtain or keep employment”.

Incremental impacts were examined primarily using data from administrative files, a survey of program participants (yielding a final sample of 2,721 participants), and a comparison group survey (yielding 3,110 completed survey interviews with individuals selected as comparison group members). The participants surveyed were selected randomly from participants who completed an **action plan equivalent (APE)** in the reference year of 2001/2002. APEs consist of one or more individual EBSMs with less than six months between the end of one intervention and the start of the next. The APEs were created using administrative data. Most of the survey interviews were conducted in June, 2004. This enabled the survey to obtain information on a post-program period of 26 to 38 months, depending on the month in which EBSM participation was completed during the reference year.

Each participant was classified into one of two groups according to their use of EI: *active claimants* were on an active EI claim at the start of their APE; *former claimants* qualified for EBSMs under the reachback provisions of the *EI Act*.

The comparison group for active claimants consisted of non-participants matched to participants according to their characteristics, use of EI, and estimated probability of taking up one of the EBSMs. In the case of former claimants, the lack of information on non-participants led to the selecting of former claimants only using EAS to be the comparison group. The overall approach, including the data collection and comparison group analysis, was designed to provide the best possible estimates of incremental impacts. As for any non-experimental evaluation, however, there remains the possibility that unmeasured differences between participants and members of the comparison group may have affected the estimated results.

Qualitative methods were used to help explore the quantitative results and examine areas not addressed by the quantitative research. The qualitative methods included a review of documents, 38 key informant interviews, 11 focus groups, and a case study of new immigrants.

## Key Employment and EI Impacts

The statistical analysis indicated that program participation produced mixed results. There were no consistent impacts on earnings or EI collections across all interventions and claimant groups. For both claimant groups, however, the results tended to improve over time.

- Active claimants experienced earnings losses (relative to the comparison group) during the first year after the end of their action plans. Following that year, hours and earnings tended to improve, though these gains were not always statistically significant. Former claimants had more consistently positive post-program employment experiences with statistically significant gains in earnings and hours after the first post-program year.
- Active claimants collected significantly less in EI benefits after the first post-program year than did members of the comparison group. Former claimants did not show such gains, however.
- Earnings and employment patterns for SD participants mirrored those for all participants with some modest employment gains after the first post-program year. Active claimants who participated in SD also had significant reductions in collections of EI benefits in the post-program period.
- SEA exhibited the most consistent patterns of significant positive results. There were positive gains in hours of work (though not in earnings) for both active and former claimants throughout the post-program period. There were also large reductions in EI collections in the post-program period, though this reduction probably resulted primarily from the fact the self-employment earnings are not insurable under EI.

- Former claimants in TWS experienced significant gains in hours and employment during the post-program period. Active claimants did not exhibit such gains, however. Participants in TWS also exhibited no clear pattern in EI collections.
- Experiences of claimants in JCP were varied. Active claimants experienced relatively large earnings losses in the post-program period whereas former claimants experienced gains. Patterns in EI collections for JCP recipients were similarly varied.

The majority of surveyed participants felt that program participation was important to their ability to obtain a job and keep a job. Most focus group participants also felt that their program experience was helpful, but felt that the program did not do enough to help them find work. Specifically, they felt there were too little counselling and too little follow-up support. In addition, they would like to see better information to support program selection, better information on skills required in the labour market, and closer coordination with employers and job opportunities.

## **EBSM Participation**

The participant survey and key informant analysis indicated that participation of equity groups has improved in recent years, particularly in the case of persons who are members of a visible minority or the long-term disabled. In addition, the participant survey indicated that satisfaction was generally high across all equity groups. In the case of active claimants, for example, satisfaction ranged from 81% for those who immigrated in 1988 or more recently, to 72% for those who were Aboriginal persons.

Regarding other groups, the case study analysis indicated that new immigrants are experiencing some difficulties in accessing EBSMs. In addition, the case study found that many new immigrants do not qualify for Employment Benefits because they do not have enough insured employment in Canada to be eligible for EI.

## **In-Program Experience**

The participant survey and focus group analysis indicated that the in-program experience for each of the Employment Benefits generally proceeded as expected. For example, two-thirds of the surveyed participants using SD felt their acquired skills were related to their first post-program job. Nineteen percent of the active and 34% of the former claimants using TWS were still with their TWS employers at the time of the survey.

In the case of EAS, survey participants (active claimants) and focus group participants were more critical of their in-program experience. Most focus group participants who used EAS indicated that the program provided some assistance, but felt that nothing would have been different in the absence of EAS. Most felt that EAS should include more case management and that service providers should know more about the resources in the community and do more to point clients in the right direction.

Certain areas were identified for improving/strengthening the program experience for each type of intervention and for EBSMs in general. Examples of these areas include providing support during the later (follow-up) stage of SEA and increasing the likelihood that skills acquired through TWS will be useful in other jobs. At the more general level, there is a need to improve the understanding and/or use of the action plan concept among participants. For example, the evaluation found that most of the focus group participants who used SD did not recall developing an action plan.

## **Cost-Effectiveness**

The impact analysis and estimated cost data were used to examine the cost-effectiveness of each type of intervention. The results are summarized below:

- Most of the interventions involved rather large estimated opportunity costs (in terms of foregone earnings) for participants. Such costs were highest for active claimants in SD.
- For active claimants who participated in SD and SEA, the cost-effective analysis indicated that:
  - With an average hourly rate of paid employment of \$18.50, the payback period for direct costs in terms of hours worked was 3.5 years for SD and 2 years for SEA.
  - The payback period for direct costs in terms of EI receipt was relatively long amounting to 19 years for SD and 11 years for SEA.
- For active claimants using JCP as their main intervention, there were negative gains for all cost-effectiveness measures computed.
- For active claimants who participated in SD, TWS and JCP, the cost-effectiveness measures for EI savings were negative.
- In the case of former claimants, the analysis indicated that TWS was more cost-effective than the other types of employment benefits in achieving an additional hour of employment and in achieving a dollar gain in annualized earnings.
- For former clients who participated in TWS and SEA, the cost-effective analysis indicated that:
  - With an average hourly rate of paid employment of \$18.50, the payback period for direct costs in terms of hours worked was 7 months for TWS and 2 years for SEA.

# *Management Response*

## **Introduction**

The purpose of the Summative Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs) in Ontario was to examine whether EBSMs have incremental impacts on participants. The Summative Evaluation was conducted by HRSDC and Service Canada, in accordance with Treasury Board evaluation policy, during the period 2003-2006. The evaluation reference period for this study was 2001-2002. HRSDC recognizes the importance of these findings for the ongoing improvement of its programs and services and would like to thank all of those involved in the evaluation or in delivering employment services to Ontarians during the evaluation study period.

The EBSMs, introduced by Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC)<sup>1</sup> under Part II of the *EI Act*, aim to improve clients' employment and earnings and to reduce reliance on government income support in the period following program participation as well as to augment participant skills through programs relevant to both employers and communities.

The EBSMs were delivered in the province of Ontario by the federal government from the time of their introduction in 1996 to January 2007, through a combination of federal Human Resource Centres of Canada, contribution agreements with third parties and co-location of service delivery with other government or community-based organizations.

On January 1, 2007, the design and delivery of EBSM programming was transferred to the Province of Ontario. Evaluation results were made available to the Province through the LMDA Management Committee for consideration in provincial EBSM program policy, design and refinement while HRSDC and Service Canada staff focused on facilitating the transfer without interrupting service delivery.

## **Key Findings and Responses**

The Summative Evaluation highlights a number of successes:

- Active EI claimants who participated in EBSMs experienced a reduction in subsequent EI use across all programs and services.
- There was a high level of in-program satisfaction among participants in all EBSMs, a finding which held across equity groups and genders.
- The majority of those surveyed felt that program participation was important to their ability to obtain a job and keep a job. Most focus group participants also felt that their program experience was helpful.

---

<sup>1</sup> HRDC has since become Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC).

- Active EI claimants who participated in Skills Development (SD) experienced an increase in employment and reduction in EI use.
- Former claimants participating in Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS) experienced gains in employment and earnings during the post-program period. Nearly half of claimants engaging in TWS interventions continued working for their TWS employer after the program ended.
- Self-employment Assistance (SEA) exhibited the most consistent patterns of achieving significant positive results in improving employment and reducing the use of EI in the post-program period for Active and Former EI claimants. HRSDC acknowledges that this reduction in EI use resulted primarily from the fact that self-employment earnings are not insurable under EI.

Specific observations on areas for improvement addressed below.

## ***The Action Plan Approach***

**There appears to be a need to improve the understanding and/or use of the action plan concept among participants.**

Management agrees with this finding. Since the reference period for the evaluation, the role of the client in selecting their training objectives has been fully integrated into the operational procedures. Expectations were standardized for clients to develop action plans to direct their training, based on an analysis of their personal interests, qualifications/experience, and on labour market information related to existing job vacancies and future labour market needs.

## ***Program Access***

**The case study analysis indicated that new immigrants are experiencing some difficulties in accessing EBSMs.**

HRSDC acknowledges the challenges faced by new immigrants in accessing labour market programs. HRSDC works with its various stakeholders to address these challenges, within the legislation governing EBSMs. During the evaluation period, Ontario Region supported several new immigrant-specific initiatives in Toronto. Through the private/public sector initiative, the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council, HRSDC funded a number of projects aimed at addressing the barriers to labour market entry faced by new immigrants who do not qualify for the Employment Benefit components of the EBSMs. HRSDC continues to be a member of the Council.

The Budget 2007 announcement of \$500 million per year in new labour market agreements (LMAs) with provinces and territories should directly improve access to programs for new immigrants in the future. The LMA funding will ensure availability of labour market programming for all Canadians, including those unable to access employment programming under Part II of the *EI Act*.



**There is a need to promote a greater awareness of the available programs and services.**

In order to promote greater awareness, Service Canada has implemented changes to the online application process for EI benefits, whereby applicants are notified they may be eligible to participate in EBSMs.

***In Program Experience***

**The general view is that better information is needed to support program selection.**

Management accepts this finding. Since the evaluation period, expectations were standardized for clients to develop action plans to direct their training. The focus is put on facilitating choices of individual clients based on an analysis of personal interests, qualifications/experience, and on labour market information related in job vacancies and future needs.

***Skills Development (SD)***

**The process of accessing SD was identified as being particularly complex.**

HRSDC acknowledges that the process of applying for SD may be seen as complex. Since 2002, HRSDC has made changes in program processes designed to help streamline the movement of clients into EBSMs. In the case of SD, beginning in fiscal year 2004-2005 a list of occupations in shortage was developed to simplify training needs analysis and speed-up the approval of clients' training plans. The list was compiled through consultations between the Ontario region, local offices, trainers, employers and other stakeholders in order to identify local labour market needs.

Management would also like to highlight the high level of satisfaction among participants in SD. A large majority (87%) indicated they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their program experience. Nearly all surveyed participants received a certificate or diploma following their participation, and a majority of clients indicated that their post-program job was related to the skills they acquired on the program.

Following the evaluation, findings have been communicated to the province of Ontario in order to continue to improve and streamline the delivery of EBSMs. The formative LMDA evaluation is being developed for the Canada-Ontario LMDA. This evaluation will examine the opinion of SD clients on the relationship between their post program job and their SD intervention.

## **Self-Employment Assistance (SEA)**

Eighty-nine percent of participants were very satisfied or satisfied with their SEA program experience. The Department acknowledges that the value of courses would be improved by including industry specific information.

During the last two years HRSDC and Service Canada have worked on a joint Labour Market Information (LMI) Performance Management Framework to ensure timely, quality occupational and industry specific information will be available to all Canadians.

Further, the formative LMDA evaluation currently being developed for the Canada-Ontario LMDA will examine the opinion of clients and stakeholders on adequacy of in-program supports and follow-up.

## **Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS)**

Some participants in TWS described the application process as cumbersome. HRSDC acknowledges that employers are required to provide documentation, but underscores that this process is designed to ensure that employment supported by TWS will result in permanent or long-term employment to the participant. Informants' observations were made available to the Province through the LMDA Management Committee for consideration in provincial EBSM program policy, design and refinement.

## **Job Creation Partnerships (JCP)**

Focus group participants noted inconsistencies in the support and commitment provided by the organizations delivering JCP programming. With the signing of the Canada-Ontario LMDA and the transfer of responsibility for EBSM administration and delivery to the province, HRSDC will continue to explore options to promote high quality service delivery of EBSMs across the country.

## **Employment Assistance Services (EAS)**

Most focus group participants who used EAS reported that the program provided some assistance, but indicated that the employment resources centres could have provided more direction to clients. Individuals who used the Job Finding Club particularly felt that insufficient direction or contacts with the labour market were provided by the resources centres.

HRSDC accepts that better EAS support could have been provided. Changes in program administration introduced during the period of the evaluation have resulted in considerable changes in EAS service delivery. The Department, as part of Canada's Action Plan to Reform the Administration of Grant and Contribution Programs, instituted a competitive process to allow new agencies in the community to offer to supply EAS. At the same time, monitoring of contracted service providers was increased. As a result, some service providers lost their contracts and others became more efficient.

However, it is also important to note that the employment resource centres were put in place to offer clients access to the equipment, information and research support needed to develop their personal return to work action plans. Clients improve their transferable job skills through the process of developing these plans, so the role of staff is to offer support to clients but not to undertake the research, produce the return to work action plans or find jobs on behalf of the clients.

In terms of labour market information, HRSDC administers two self-serve sources of information to help job seekers connect with employers: LMI (described above) and the Job Bank. The Job Bank, available to all Canadians, has recently added a free application offering daily email alerts of new job postings.

## **Impacts and Effects**

Management acknowledges that employment, EI and income impacts for clients were mixed. The modest positive impacts identified in the Ontario evaluation are similar to those found in other LMDA evaluations as well as results reported in international studies. Ontario's 2007-08 LMDA Annual plan included measures to improve access to high quality labour market information on demand and supply conditions and to provide support for employers to hire and train individuals facing barriers to employment.

## **Conclusions**

The findings from the Ontario EBSMs Evaluation provide valuable insight into areas for EBSM policy improvement. Given the devolution to the Province on January 1, 2007 for EBSM design and delivery, the Summative Evaluation has been shared with the Province for their consideration in planning future refinements to the provincial EBSMs. In December 2007, the Ontario region hosted a presentation by HRSDC Evaluation officials to provincial program staff on evaluation results.

Ontario has introduced some changes influenced by these evaluation results; notably running a limited pilot testing the Targeted Earnings Supplement in 2007, and introducing the Second Career Strategy in 2008. This latter strategy was announced as layoffs in the auto sector began and included a tool focused on longer term re-training needs.

Ontario Region Service Canada and national HRSDC members of the Canada-Ontario LMDA Evaluation Sub-Committee are committed to working with their provincial counterparts to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of programs funded under the new LMDA. Many of the issues identified in the evaluation are now being included in the design of the formative LMDA evaluation currently being developed for the Canada-Ontario LMDA. If these issues are found to remain, Ontario will work with HRSDC to address them.



# ***1. Introduction***

This report provides a summary of the summative evaluation of the Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs) delivered in the Ontario region. This final report draws from the technical reports prepared by the evaluators<sup>2</sup> and consists of six sections:

- Section 1 provides a description of EBSMs in the Ontario region, and highlights the purpose and scope of the summative evaluation;
- Section 2 discusses the evaluation methodology;
- Section 3 presents the main findings regarding program participation;
- Section 4 presents the main findings regarding impacts on participants and the effects on the labour market, employers and communities;
- Section 5 presents the main findings regarding cost-effectiveness; and
- Section 6 highlights the overall conclusions.

## **1.1 EBSMs in the Ontario Region**

EBSMs were introduced by Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC)<sup>3</sup> under Part II of the *Employment Insurance (EI) Act* in 1996. They are a comprehensive set of tools designed to assist workers who are or have been EI recipients to return to work and reduce their dependency on EI and provincial social/income assistance (SA).

The federal government was responsible for the delivery of EBSMs in the province of Ontario during the evaluation period. Although devolution of labour market programs and services under a Labour Market Development Agreement (LMDA) was offered by the federal government when EBSMs were introduced, the Province of Ontario had not yet signed an LMDA. Delivery of EBSMs by the federal government was conducted through a combination of federal Human Resource Centres of Canada (HRCC) staff, contracted service delivery agreements, and co-location of service delivery with other government or community-based organizations.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures, Ontario Region: Quantitative Data Analysis Technical Report*, March 31, 2005, prepared for HRSDC by TNS Canadian Facts. *Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures, Ontario Region: Quantitative Data Analysis Final Report*, August 5, 2005, prepared for HRSDC by TNS Canadian Facts. *Summative Evaluation of Ontario Region EBSMs Technical Report on Focus Groups*, March 2006, prepared for HRSDC by TNS Canadian Facts. *Summative Evaluation of Ontario Region EBSMs Technical Report on Key Informants*, March 2006, prepared for HRSDC by TNS Canadian Facts. *Ontario EBSM Evaluation: Immigration Case Study Technical Report*, March, 2006, prepared for HRSDC by TNS Canadian Facts. *Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures, Ontario Region: Qualitative Analysis Final Report*, March 21, 2006, prepared for HRSDC by TNS Canadian Facts.

<sup>3</sup> Part of HRDC has become Human Resources and Skills Development Canada.

### 1.1.1 **Employment Benefits Delivered in Ontario**

Employment Benefits generally involve longer duration interventions. They focus on providing assistance with skills development, self-employment, wage subsidies and job creation. During the evaluation period, four Employment Benefits were delivered in Ontario.

- **Skills Development (SD)** is designed to provide support directly to eligible individuals to assist with the costs of taking skills training courses that are a part of a return-to-work plan. The emphasis is on obtaining skills in occupations experiencing employment demand. SD can also assist with related expenses while participants are enrolled in a training program. SD establishes a contribution agreement directly with individual clients to provide them with a negotiated level of financial assistance. Where appropriate, clients are expected to share some of the costs of their training.
- **Self-Employment Assistance (SEA)** is designed to help individuals with sound business ideas create jobs for themselves by starting and developing their own business. SEA offers financial assistance, mentoring/coaching, and technical help such as advice on business planning and operations. Clients approved for SEA and who are eligible for EI benefits continue to receive their EI benefits. When their EI claim expires, they may continue to receive income support through EI Part II.<sup>4</sup>
- **Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS)** is designed to encourage employers to hire individuals that they would not normally hire in the absence of a subsidy. The targeted clients include those facing particular disadvantages, and there is a hope that employers will ultimately hire TWS participants on an ongoing basis. The subsidy may be up to 52 weeks, or 78 weeks for persons with a disability. The subsidy covers a percentage of the wages and mandatory employment related costs. Under normal circumstances, the wage subsidy does not exceed 60% of the total wages paid to the individual for the period of the agreement.
- **Job Creation Partnerships (JCP)** is designed to create incremental and meaningful work opportunities for clients through partnerships involving HRCCs, employers and second-party organizations. Participation is aimed at allowing workers who have lost their jobs to gain work experience that will enhance their opportunities for long-term employment. JCP projects are also expected to benefit the community. Clients in receipt of EI benefits continue to receive their EI benefits, and their benefits are “topped up” to the local prevailing wage rate for the occupation. When their EI claim expires, clients may move to support under EI Part II. Former claimants receive Part II allowances based on the prevailing wage rate. JCP earnings are not insurable under EI.

---

<sup>4</sup> EI Part I Benefits are income benefits and are paid to eligible unemployed individuals. The benefits are temporary and vary in amount and duration according to various criteria. EI Part I Benefits can also be called “EI benefits”, “income support” or “Employment Insurance”. EI Part II Benefits supplement Part I income benefits and provide for EBSMs designed to help individuals return to work.

### 1.1.2 Support Measures Delivered in Ontario

Support Measures generally involve short duration interventions. They are designed to facilitate community-based delivery of employment services, and to assist community level partners to enhance employment prospects in their areas. During the evaluation period, the following Support Measure was delivered in Ontario.<sup>5</sup>

- **Employment Assistance Services (EAS)** provides funds to help unemployed individuals to obtain and maintain employment through services such as individual counselling, job finding clubs, job-search workshops, employment resource centres, and case management. The services are often provided by second party organizations through service delivery agreements.

Job Finding Clubs (JFC) were examined separately in parts of the evaluation, to provide a closer look at this type of intervention.

### 1.1.3 Who Can Participate in EBSMs?

In order to participate in an Employment Benefit under the *EI Act*, individuals must be an “EI client” or “insured participant” under the Act. This means that an individual must be one of the following:

- An **active claimant**, which refers to individuals currently receiving EI; or
- A **former claimant**, which includes two groups:
  - a) Former EI claimants (also called “reachback” clients) whose EI benefit period ended within the past three years; and
  - b) Clients who have had a claim for EI maternity/parental benefits within the past five years and who are returning to the labour force for the first time after caring for their new child or newly adopted child.

Support Measures do not necessarily target specific groups. Participants can include unemployed individuals who are not “insured” and those who are employed and threatened with layoff. Clients who are not EI clients are referred to as non-insured clients.

---

<sup>5</sup> Labour Market Partnerships (LMP) was delivered as an additional Support Measure during the evaluation period, but was not included in the evaluation. LMP encourage and support employers, employee and/or employer associations and communities to improve their capacity for dealing with human resource requirements and implementing labour force adjustments.

## 1.2 Purpose and Scope of the Summative Evaluation

A formative evaluation of EBSMs in the Ontario region was conducted during 1998 and 1999.<sup>6</sup> The formative evaluation focused on providing information to improve the design and delivery of interventions early in the implementation stage.

The summative evaluation was undertaken to examine impacts, outcomes and cost-effectiveness, particularly whether the EBSMs are having incremental impacts on individuals and effects on employers and communities. The summative evaluation also focused on determining whether the EBSMs are successful in achieving the objectives of Part II of the *EI Act* – that is, whether EBSMs are assisting persons to “obtain or keep employment”.

The summative evaluation examined the experience of individuals completing their program participation during the reference period of April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2002. The individual survey data were generally collected in June, 2004.<sup>7</sup> This enabled the evaluation to examine a post-program period of between 26 and 38 months, depending on the month in which program participation was completed.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Formative Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures in the Ontario Region*, September, 2000, Evaluation and Data Development, HRDC.

<sup>7</sup> The reference year was chosen to allow for a sufficient post-program period. Measuring impacts too soon would underestimate impacts because some time is usually needed for clients to find employment after their EBSM participation.



## 2. Evaluation Methodologies

This section provides an overview of the approach used to conduct the summative evaluation. It also highlights the key strengths and limitations of the approach.

### 2.1 Evaluation Strategy

The strategy developed for the summative evaluation employed a multiple-lines-of-evidence approach that included both quantitative and qualitative methods. Particular care was taken to ensure that the analysis of program impacts used state-of-the-art methods and considered all of the relevant lines of evidence.

#### 2.1.1 Quantitative Methods

As indicated in Section 1.2, the main focus of the summative evaluation was on measuring the impacts of the EBSMs on program participants. The impacts were measured primarily through quantitative research.<sup>8</sup>

*Administrative data* were used to examine EBSM participation, develop the sample frame for the survey of participants, and choose the best possible comparison group sample frame.

A *participant survey* was conducted by Statistics Canada and yielded a final sample of 2,721 participants.<sup>9</sup>

A *comparison group survey* yielded 3,110 completed survey interviews with individuals selected as comparison group members.<sup>10</sup> The comparison group was over sampled to facilitate close matching with participants and to provide a sound basis for estimating client impacts.<sup>11</sup>

*Econometric modelling* and statistical estimation analyses were carefully designed and used to provide the best possible estimates of client impacts attributable to participation in EBSMs.

---

<sup>8</sup> For further details, see the methodology report entitled “Summative Evaluation of EI Part II Employment Benefits and Support Measures, Ontario Region: Quantitative Data Analysis Methodology Report”.

<sup>9</sup> The surveyed participants were selected according to a stratified random sample. The final sample consisted of participants who agreed to share their data with HRSDC and agreed to allow HRSDC to link their survey data to tax data from the Canadian Revenue Agency.

<sup>10</sup> At this stage, administrative data were used to match comparison group members to participants according to the following characteristics: sex, geographic region, timing of EI benefit period (i.e. the benefit period for the comparison group member began in the same fiscal year as the participant’s benefit period), length of EI benefit period (i.e. the benefit period for the comparison group member was at least as long as the period between the participant’s benefit period commencement and the start date of EBSM participation), and propensity score (derived from models to estimate the theoretical probability that an insured EI recipient would take up one of the EBSMs).

<sup>11</sup> A small number of comparison group members were found to have used Job Finding Clubs, and were shifted to the participant group during the process of developing the final sample of 2,721 participants.

## 2.1.2 Qualitative Methods

The summative evaluation also included significant qualitative research.<sup>12</sup>

A *review of documents and other data* was undertaken to obtain a better understanding of the context of EBSMs in Ontario.

*Focus groups* (11) with clients were used to gather the perspectives of various client groups. Separate focus groups were conducted for visible minorities, persons with disabilities, and participants in each of the EBSMs.

*Key informant interviews* (38) were conducted in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), Kitchener-Waterloo and North Bay. These interviews were with service providers (16), HRCC officials (13), Regional Headquarters (RHQ) officials (4), community representatives (2), and employers (3).

A *case study of new immigrants* was undertaken to take a closer look at the EBSM and labour market experience of new immigrants in the Toronto area. The case study drew together the results from:

- key informants with some experience with new immigrants;
- an expert panel of three specialists in the labour market experience of immigrants in the Toronto area (two from organizations that are service providers, one from an advocacy group for new immigrants that does not directly provide service to new immigrants); and
- three focus groups with new immigrants.

The three focus groups with new immigrants were with professional newcomers, non-professional newcomers, and newcomer women. Many of the new immigrants were involved in the Newcomer Opportunities for Work Experience Program (NOW). Some had taken Newcomer Employment Services, Skills for Change (SKIP program), ACCESS (which includes resumés, interview skills, etc.), ITAP (a program for accountants and bookkeepers), and advanced English courses.

## 2.2 Key Strengths and Limitations

The use of the multiple-lines-of-evidence approach served to validate findings by cross-referencing a number of sources to explore issues in greater depth. For example, the qualitative research was used to:

- help explore and better understand the quantitative findings (e.g. the qualitative research was delayed until the quantitative results were obtained, and some of the qualitative research involved further exploring the quantitative results);

---

<sup>12</sup> For further details, see the methodology report entitled “Summative Evaluation of EI Part II Employment Benefits and Support Measures, Ontario Region: Qualitative Methodology Report”.

- explore issues beyond the quantitative work, including effects on employers and communities; and
- take a closer look at the experience of new immigrants.

The quantitative methodology was carefully designed to ensure scientific rigour and to use state-of-the-art matching and econometric techniques. The measurement of the incremental or net impacts<sup>13</sup> of program participation on participants was at the core of the methodology. The approach emphasized comparing the post-program experience of participants to the experience of similar individuals<sup>14</sup> who did not participate in the program.

In addition, a large number of participant and comparison group members were surveyed to obtain data for the quantitative analysis (and to help explore issues beyond the quantitative work). Two types of statistical estimation analysis (“kernel matching” estimation and Ordinary Least Squares (O.L.S.) regression) were used to examine the consistency of the estimated impacts. In general the results were rather similar. In this report we discuss only the matching estimates. An external expert advised on the methodology and reviewed the results.

A notable limitation of the quantitative analysis arises from the lack of information needed to identify non-participants in the case of former claimants. This lack of information led to the selecting of former claimants who only used EAS (other than JFC) to be the comparison group in the analysis of former claimants. The rationale for this choice was that EAS could be viewed as the least intensive intervention. As a consequence, however, the estimated impacts for former claimants are not directly comparable to the estimated impacts for active claimants – because non-participants were used as the comparison group for active claimants.

---

<sup>13</sup> Incremental or net impacts refer to impacts on individuals over and above what would have occurred without the assistance of the program. Net or incremental impacts differ from “gross measures” because gross measures do not take account of what would have happened in the absence of the program.

<sup>14</sup> A two-stage matching process was used to ensure that the comparison group members were as similar as possible to program participants. The first-stage matching used available administrative data to match comparison group members to participants according to their characteristics (sex, geographic regions, etc.), use of EI, and propensity scores (which were derived from models fitted by HRSDC to estimate the theoretical probability that an insured EI recipient would take up one of the EBSMs). The second-stage matching used propensity scores that incorporated additional information collected by the survey. Despite these efforts, there is the possibility that participants and comparison group members may differ in some unobservable characteristics (e.g. motivation).



## 3. *EBSM Participation*

This section summarizes the main findings regarding EBSM participation in the Ontario region and the in-program experience of participants.

### 3.1 Overview of Participation

This overview examines how well the action plan approach is working, the characteristics of program participants and issues of program access.

#### 3.1.1 *The Action Plan Approach*

EBSMs were designed for use with an action plan approach. Each EBSM client typically develops a return-to-work action plan with the aid of an employment counsellor. These action plans involve one or more interventions designed to help the individual return to work.

*Service provider key informants were very positive about the action plan concept.* The general view was that the client starts the process wanting a job and leaves the process knowing how to find a job. In addition, some service providers felt that the action plan concept was a good way to emphasize goal achievement. Some also felt that the action plan approach increased client motivation because clients are required to talk to employers, rather than simply use Job Futures or other Labour Market Information (LMI) to learn about the labour market situation.

*Factors affecting the timing of action plans may need to be examined.* Service provider key informants noted that many action plans started “late”, but provided no explanation.<sup>15</sup> One possibility is that potential participants are not adequately informed of EBSMs early in their unemployment. The issue of program information is examined in Section 3.1.3.

*There appears to be a need to improve the understanding and/or use of the action plan concept among participants.* A large majority of focus group participants said they had not developed an action plan. The focus group participants who used SEA indicated that they had developed business plans, but no action plan. Most of the focus group participants who used SD indicated that they had met with counsellors to fill out forms and determine needs, but did not recall developing an action plan. This could be a continuation of a finding noted by the formative evaluation, where the administrative data indicated that just over one-third of the EBSM clients (34%) were reported to have committed to an action plan.

---

<sup>15</sup> Administrative data for the survey respondents indicated that active claimants were 112 days into their EI claim, on average, when they started their (first) EBSM intervention. In the case of former claimants, an average of 425 days had passed from the end of their previous claim to the start of their (first) EBSM intervention. The formative evaluation found that, on average, EBSM participants started their (first) intervention 19 weeks into their EI claim. The formative evaluation also found that this figure was higher for SEA and TWS and slightly lower for EAS.

### 3.1.2 Profile of Participants

To examine program participants and their experience, the summative evaluation used administrative data to construct *action plan equivalents (APEs)*. An APE was constructed for each participant on the basis of the start and end dates of individual EBSMs (including EAS) accessed by a client. For an APE to end, there had to be no new service starting within six months of the end of the previous service.<sup>16</sup> A participant was then defined as an individual completing an APE during the reference year (2001/02).

The analysis of the administrative data found that close to 61,900 individuals completed an APE in Ontario in 2001/02.

- Just over two-thirds (69%) of the participants were active claimants and the rest (31%) were former claimants.
- Close to half (47%) of the participants were located west of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), another 26% were located in the GTA, and the remaining participants were located either east of the GTA (19%) or north of the GTA (8%).
- As shown in Table 1, 42% of all participants used an Employment Benefit as their principal intervention. The principal intervention was defined as the intervention with the longest duration. The rest of the participants used EAS only.

<b>Table 1</b> <b>EBSM Participants* by Type of Participant and Intervention</b> <b>(For Principal EBSM and Reference Year 2001/02)</b>							
Type of Claimant and EBSM	Active Claimants			Former Claimants			Total Participants
	No.	%	% of EBs	No.	%	% of EBs	% of Total**
<b>Employment Benefits (EBs)</b>							
SD	13,982	33	73	2,806	15	40	27
SEA	2,258	5	12	1,106	6	15	5
TWS	1,893	5	10	2,340	12	33	7
JCP	911	2	5	835	4	12	3
Total for EBs	19,044	45	100	7,087	37	100	42
<b>Support Measures</b>							
EAS	23,612	55	-	12,198	63	-	58
Total Participants	42,656	100	-	19,285	100	-	100
Source: Administrative data.							
* Refers to those completing an APE during the reference period, and therefore differs from the data published in the EI Monitoring and Assessment Report.							
** The total number of participants was 61,941.							

<sup>16</sup> Details on the construction of APEs can be found in methodology report for the quantitative analysis.

- The most frequently used Employment Benefit was SD. Active claimants were considerably more likely to use SD than were former claimants. TWS was the second most popular intervention, mainly because many former claimants opted for this program.
- SEA had the longest average length. The average length of the principal intervention was 307 days in the case of SEA, 173 days in the case of TWS, 167 days in the case of JCP, and 159 days in the case of SD.
- Many participants used a combination of EBSMs. Administrative data showed that the surveyed participants used, on average, a combination of two interventions in their APE. The number of interventions ranged from 1.5 for those using EAS to 2.8 for those using SD.

Data collected by the participant survey<sup>17</sup> was used to examine the main demographic and work-related characteristics of EBSM participants in Ontario during the reference year. A summary is provided in Table A-1 of Appendix A. Some of the principal findings were;

- Participants using an Employment Benefit were more likely to be in the 35 to 49 age group, were somewhat better educated and slightly less likely to be female than in the case of the overall Ontario labour force in 2001.
- Active claimants using an Employment Benefit had considerable labour force attachment prior to program participation – and more labour force attachment than former claimants using an Employment Benefit.
- The demographic characteristics of active claimants only using EAS were generally similar to the active claimants using an Employment Benefit, but those only using EAS had a stronger labour force attachment.<sup>18</sup>

### 3.1.3 Program Access

Most key informants believed that *participation by equity group has improved since the formative evaluation*.<sup>19</sup> The participant survey also indicated that participation by equity group has increased (see Table 1-A of Appendix A):

- Visible minority accounted for 30% of active and 27% of former claimants using an Employment Benefit – and 26% of active claimants using only EAS – compared to 11% of the EBSM participants surveyed by the formative evaluation.

<sup>17</sup> Participant survey included 2,276 active claimants and 445 former claimants.

<sup>18</sup> Recall that former claimants using EAS only were selected to be the comparison group for former claimants, and therefore were not included in the participant sample.

<sup>19</sup> The formative evaluation was focused on participants ending an EBSM intervention between January 1, 1997 and March 31, 1998. It found that participation of equity groups was below that of the group's share of the unemployment rate in Ontario, particularly for visible minority and disabled clients. The formative evaluation used the 1996 Census to estimate that 23% of the unemployed in Ontario were visible minority. It used the 1991 Health and Limitation Survey to estimate that 10% of the unemployed in Ontario were disabled and it used the 1996 Census to estimate that 2% of the unemployed in Ontario were Aboriginal.

- Long-term disabled accounted for 9% of active and 15% of former claimants using an Employment Benefit – and 10% of active claimants using only EAS. By comparison, the formative evaluation found that 3% of the surveyed EBSM participants were disabled.
- Aboriginal persons accounted for 3% of active and 6% of former claimants using an Employment Benefit – and 2% of active claimants using only EAS – compared to 2% of the EBSM participants surveyed by the formative evaluation.

Regarding other groups, *the case study analysis indicated that new immigrants are experiencing some difficulties in accessing EBSMs*. Both service providers and the expert panel indicated that the process for accessing EBSMs often does not work smoothly or well for new immigrants. For example, the need to go to assessment centres to obtain interventions, including services under EAS, is often confusing for new immigrants. The newcomer focus groups also indicated that new immigrants found the process to be confusing. Both focus groups and the expert panel would like to see a “single door” into federal and provincial programs.

The experience with identifying participants for the new immigrant focus groups suggests that *program officials and service providers lack a clear picture of the characteristics and labour market needs of new immigrants*. In the case of one of the focus groups, the intention was to have the group consist of recent immigrants with no work experience. When the group was brought together, however, it was discovered that the members had considerable education and work experience outside Canada. As an additional concern, the expert panel emphasized that new immigrants typically are unable to access Employment Benefits because new immigrants often have not accumulated enough hours of insured work to become EI clients.

Regarding general access to EBSMs, both focus group participants and key informants felt *there is a need to promote a greater awareness of the available programs and services*, particularly in large cities and to former claimants.

Regarding the individual interventions, *the process of accessing SD was identified as being particularly complex*. Service providers involved in SD considered the process to be particularly complex and time consuming for both clients and assessment center counsellors. Many felt that clients found the application for financial assessment to be difficult to complete – particularly when the client lacked literacy skills. The focus group participants who had SD experience reported that the process of negotiated financial assistance for SD was intimidating for them. In addition, some service providers reported variations in financial treatment among HRCCs within the same region. They felt the variations were unfair and confusing for participants and service providers.

In contrast with SD, service provider key informants generally felt that the process for the other EBSMs was not particularly complex.



## 3.2 In-Program Experience

This section examines the in-program experience in general and for each intervention.

*Most of the participants surveyed indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their program experience.* In the case of active claimants, 80% were either very satisfied (34%) or satisfied (46%). In the case of former claimants 85% were either very satisfied (43%) or satisfied (42%).

*Satisfaction was high across all of the equity groups.* Satisfaction was highest for surveyed participants who immigrated in 1988 or more recently. Satisfaction was slightly lower for surveyed participants who were long-term disabled and who were Aboriginal persons.

*Satisfaction was high for both male and female participants.* There were only minor differences by gender for both active and former claimants.

Regarding areas identified for improvement, *the general view is that better information is needed to support program selection.* Both key informants and focus group participants agreed that clients should receive better information to help them with program selection. Most focus group participants said they had received too little counseling and too little information about interventions.

The focus group analysis suggests that *support by the staff of some service providers is weak and/or that client expectations regarding the role(s) of service staff need to be better managed.* Some focus group participants described service provider staff as not returning telephone calls, offering little personal attention, and not taking client needs seriously. Many focus group participants (particularly new immigrants) felt there was a lack of one-on-one support, direction and follow-up.

*The focus group analysis also indicated that some variations in service are occurring in the case of persons with disabilities.* Focus group participants with disabilities indicated wide variations in their experience with resource centers (some were very satisfied, while others were not satisfied) and with the amount of counseling (some received no counseling).

*The new immigrant case study identified a number of areas for consideration/improvement for new immigrants.* These areas included more personalized/one-on-one service, industry specific information, guidance on meeting required professional/job qualifications, and networking opportunities to facilitate placement.

### 3.2.1 Skills Development

As noted in Section 1.1.1, SD is designed to assist eligible individuals pay for the costs of skills training courses and related expenses while enrolled in a training program from a registered institution.

- SD participants tend to be less educated than participants in other Employment Benefits.

- SD participants were more likely to be male, visible minority or immigrants than in the case of other interventions.
- Most (83%) of SD participants were active claimants.
- SD participants tended to have stronger labour force attachment prior to program participation, compared to some other Employment Benefits.
- Nearly all of the surveyed participants who used SD received a certificate or diploma.
- Many SD participants took courses in areas affected by the economic slowdown in Ontario such as computer and information support services and transportation and material moving services.
- Most (87%) of the surveyed SD participants indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their program experience. Most focus group participants who used SD were satisfied with the courses they took and felt that the acquired skills had helped them to find work.
- Close to two-thirds of the surveyed participants using SD felt that their acquired skills were related to their first post-program job.<sup>20</sup>
- Accessing SD was considered to be more complex and time consuming than accessing the other Employment Benefits. In addition, the process of negotiating financial assistance was found to be intimidating for some participants.

### **3.2.2 Self-Employment Assistance**

SEA is designed to help individuals with sound business ideas to start their own businesses.

- SEA participants tended to be older than participants in the other Employment Benefits.
- SEA participants were better educated and more likely to be female, but less likely to be visible minority or immigrants, compared to SD and TWS participants.
- Two-thirds of SEA participants were active claimants.
- Nearly all of the SEA participants surveyed started a business as planned and most were still operating the business at the time of the survey. Eighteen percent of the started businesses had one to three employees.
- Most (89%) of the surveyed participants indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their program experience and most felt the financial support and information provided by the program was very important.

---

<sup>20</sup> The survey asked participants a series of questions about their perceptions about their first post-program job. Additional results are discussed in Section 4.1.4.

- Focus group participants identified two areas for consideration/improvement: support during the follow-up stage could strengthen SEA, and the value of SEA courses would be increased by including industry specific information.

### **3.2.3 Targeted Wage Subsidies**

TWS is designed to encourage employers to hire individuals that they would not normally hire in the absence of a subsidy.

- TWS participants were similar to SD participants in that they were more likely to be male, visible minority or immigrants than in the case of SEA and JCP participants.
- Less than half (44%) of TWS participants were active claimants.
- Most of the surveyed participants who used TWS worked for the TWS employer for the entire planned period. Nearly half of these participants continued to work for their TWS employer after the program ended and many were still with this employer at the time of the survey.
- Most of the surveyed participants who used TWS felt they received training from their TWS employer that will help them in a new job. Skills acquired included problem solving, working with computers, working in teams, or working with the public.
- Most (77%) of the surveyed participants indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their program experience.
- Focus group participants and key informants identified three areas for consideration/improvement. Several felt they had not developed skills they could take elsewhere. And a majority of the focus group participants were dissatisfied with their counsellors, frequently describing them as “uninformed”.
- Service provider and HRCC informants suggested that some employers were not participating in TWS because they found the program to be too cumbersome.

### **3.2.4 Job Creation Partnership**

As noted in Section 1.1.1, JCP is designed to create incremental and meaningful work opportunities for clients through partnerships involving HRCCs, employers, and second-party organizations. Participation is aimed at enabling workers who lost their jobs to gain work experience that will enhance their opportunities for long-term employment.

- JCP participants were younger and more likely to be female compared to participants using other Employment Benefits. JCP participants were less likely to be immigrants, however.
- JCP participants were more likely to have a university degree, and less likely to be visible minority, compared to TWS and SD participants.

- About half (51%) of JCP participants were active claimants. Former claimants in JCP tended to be older, and more likely to be Aboriginal or long-term-disabled, compared to active claimants.
- Most JCP participants worked for the JCP employer for the entire planned period.
- Many of the surveyed JCP participants indicated that they had acquired skills from their JCP employer that would help them in a new job. Most focus group participants who used JCP felt their JCP job gave them organization and time-management skills as well as more confidence.
- Most (77%) of the surveyed JCP participants indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their program experience. Specifically they indicated that the supervisors were highly regarded, although many participants felt they were left on their own when their supervisor's attention towards them diminished during periods of peak activity. Most felt that the JCP was a good alternative to collecting EI.
- As an area for consideration/improvement, focus group participants using JCP noted inconsistencies in the support and commitment provided by the organizations delivering the program.

### **3.2.5 Employment Assistance Services**

The surveyed and focus group participants were less positive about the in-program experience with EAS. Although many (72%) of the surveyed EAS participants indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their program experience, this was lower than for each of the Employment Benefits. Most focus group participants who used EAS reported that the program provided some assistance, but indicated:

- wide differences in the quality of EAS provided by different agencies;
- most felt that nothing would have been different in the absence of EAS;
- most were critical of employment resource centres – and felt agencies should know more about the resources in the community and do more to point clients in the right direction; and
- most wanted EAS to include more case management.

The evaluation took a separate look at JFC. The JFC focus group participants were quite positive about the resources centers, particularly the access to computers, faxes, the internet and job postings, but felt that:

- the courses were too basic and did not actually help participants to prepare for, find and keep jobs;
- not enough direction was provided; and
- the program did not provide contacts to the job market.

## ***4. Impacts and Effects***

This section summarizes the main findings regarding the impacts of program participation on employment and on skills and employability. The main findings regarding effects on the labour market, employers and communities are also summarized.

### **4.1 Key Employment Impacts**

#### ***4.1.1 Approach Used to Examine Impacts***

A comparison group approach was taken to estimate the impacts of program participation on employment, earnings, EI benefits and SA. Considerable effort was taken to ensure that individuals selected into the comparison group had similar characteristics to program participants<sup>21</sup>. Given this comparison group, two statistical procedures were used to generate the estimates: Kernel matching using propensity scores and O.L.S. regressions. Results for both of these techniques were quite similar. In this report we discuss only the results from the kernel matching procedure (see Table A-2 of Appendix A).

As noted earlier, the comparison group for active claimants consisted of non-participants who were selected to be similar to the participants. The comparison group for former claimants consisted of former claimants using only EAS (other than Job Finding Clubs). This approach was used due to the lack of relevant information on former claimants who were non-participants. The difference in the two comparison groups means that the impact analysis should be interpreted differently in the case of active and former claimants. For active claimants, the analysis estimated the impact of program participation relative to non-participation. For former claimants, the analysis estimated the impact of using an Employment Benefit as the principal EBSM, relative to using EAS only.

#### ***4.1.2 Impacts on Employment and Earnings***

##### **Active Claimants**

In the case of active claimants, the impact analysis indicated that program participation resulted in a few significant positive net impacts on employment, but the results overall were mixed. The analysis also indicated that the post-program experience improved over time.

- **Active claimants experienced earnings losses (relative to the comparison group) during the first year after the end of their action plans.** Following that year earnings tended to improve but the overall gains were not statistically significant.

---

<sup>21</sup> For details, see the methodology report for the quantitative analysis.

- ***For active claimants, program participation resulted in a positive net overall impact on hours worked after the first post-program year that averaged about 93 hours on an annual basis.*** Because hours worked fell somewhat in the first year after program participation, however, there was no statistically significant impact on hours of employment for active claimants for the entire post-program period.
- ***For active claimants using SD, there was a positive net impact on hours worked after the first post-program year that amounted to 119 hours on an annual basis.*** Over the entire post-program period, however, there were no statistically significant gains in hours or earnings.
- ***For active claimants using SEA, there was a large positive net impact on hours worked for the full post program period*** – with an average increase of 347 hours per year. Such hours gains were not accompanied by statistically significant gains in earnings, however.
- ***There were no statistically significant gains in hours worked for active claimants in TWS or JCP.*** Active claimants in JCP experienced statistically significant earnings losses during the post-program period relative to claimants in the comparison group.
- ***For active claimants who were visible minority, program participation resulted in a positive net impact on hours worked after the first post-program year*** – with an increase of 158 hours of employment. However, the increase in hours of employment for the entire post-program period was not statistically significant. Estimated earnings gains after the first post-program year were also fairly large, though not statistically significant.

## Former Claimants

In the case of former claimants, the impact analysis indicated that program participation resulted in some significant positive net impacts on hours and earnings. Once again the results were mixed, but tended to improve over time.

- ***For former claimants, program participation resulted in a positive net overall impact on hours worked for the full post-program period – an average gain of 154 hours on an annual basis.*** There was also a statistically significant gain in annual earnings of \$1,735 after the first post-program year.
- ***Most of the gains in hours of employment came for former claimants in the SEA and TWS interventions.*** Former claimants in TWS also experienced increased earnings over the entire post-program period. Former claimants in JCP had relatively large gains in hours worked and in earnings, but none of these outcomes was statistically significant.
- ***Employment and earnings gains tended to be larger for males than for females among former claimants.*** There were no significant gains for visible minorities among former claimants.

### **4.1.3 Impacts on EI Benefits and Income Assistance**

Impact results for EI and SA receipt are reported in Table A-3 of Appendix A. We discuss these results for active and former claimants separately.

#### **Active Claimants**

- *The impact analysis found significant reductions in EI benefit receipt for active claimants in the post-program period (relative to the comparison group).* Such changes were not found for SA, however, in part because the overall level of receipt of SA was quite low in the active claimant sample.
- *For active claimants overall, program participation resulted in a net decrease in EI benefits of \$321 per year.* Significant reductions for specific interventions were:
  - SD participants – by an average of \$759 per year;
  - SEA participants – by an average of \$1,445 per year; and
  - TWS participants – by an average of \$389 per year.
- *Most of the reductions in EI collections for active claimants occurred for males.* Reductions in EI collections for females were not statistically significant.
- *Program participation also resulted in a significant net decrease in overall dependence on income support for male active claimants.* For females the decline in dependence was not statistically significant.

#### **Former Claimants**

- *For former claimants there were few statistically significant impacts on EI collection overall.* Similarly there were no overall impacts on SA receipt or on overall income dependence.
- *For former claimants using SEA, there was a net decrease in EI benefits of \$530 per year in the post-program period.* Again, this may have resulted in part from the fact that self-employment is not insurable under EI.
- *For former claimants using TWS and JCP there was a net increase in EI benefits during the post-program period.*
- *Former claimants using SEA and TWS exhibited statistically significant declines in SA benefits during the post-program period.*

### **4.1.4 Impacts on Skills and Employability**

Survey questions were used to explore the perceived impact of program participation on skills and on the ability to obtain and keep a job.

## **Perceived Importance for Skills and Work Experience**

*The majority of surveyed participants felt that their program participation was important in acquiring skills and work experience.* More than 70 percent of participants perceived their program participation to be important in the areas of:

- self-esteem/confidence ;
- ability to develop skills;
- interest in further training and skills development; and
- work experience.

## **Perceived Importance in the Ability to Obtain and Keep a Job**

*About three-fourths of surveyed participants perceived their program participation to be important to their ability to obtain a job.* This view was somewhat more likely to be held by females than by males.

*Over half of the surveyed participants perceived their program participation to be important to their ability to obtain a long-term job.* This fraction was highest for participants using SD and lowest for active claimants using EAS only.

*Close to half of the surveyed participants considered their program participation to be important to obtaining their first post-program job.* This number was highest for participants using SD and significantly lower for active claimants using EAS only.

*Close to two-thirds of the surveyed participants using an Employment Benefit felt their first post-program job was related to what they had accomplished in the program.* The number was highest for active participants using SEA and lowest for participants using JCP.

*More than one-third of the surveyed participants using an Employment Benefit indicated that a specific set of skills was required to obtain their post-program job and that they had obtained those skills as a result of their program participation.*

*Most focus group participants felt that program participation was helpful, but did not do enough to help them find work.* Specifically they felt that the program:

- provided too little counselling and too little follow-up support;
- needs better information to support program selection;
- needs better information on skills required in the labour market; and
- needs closer coordination with employers and job opportunities.



*Over half of the surveyed participants perceived their program participation to be important to their ability to keep a job.* The percentage perceiving their program participation to be important to their ability to keep a job was similar for both male and female participants.

## **4.2 Other Findings**

### **Effects on the Labour Market**

*The evaluation study found evidence of considerable change in the occupation distribution of surveyed participants after program participation, but there was no clear pattern of improvement or decline.* The survey of participants indicated that 23% of those who found employment following program participation were in occupations considered by regional officials to be at the highest level of demand. Another 15% were in occupations considered by regional officials to be at the lowest level of demand. The rest were in occupations with a level of demand between these two extremes.

### **Effects on Employers**

*Some key informants considered EBSMs to be relevant to employers, but most did not see EBSMs as a key element in employers' plans to fill job vacancies.* Some HRCC key informants saw EBSMs as relevant to employers because they felt that the need for clients to conduct job searches resulted in a better fit with the needs of employers. The RHQ key informants saw EBSMs as having only an indirect link with employers' needs.

*It is difficult to say to what extent TWS is encouraging employers to hire individuals that they would not normally have hired in the absence of the subsidy.* Key informants stated that employers generally prefer to hire candidates who are not receiving EI, rather than EBSM participants. The focus groups with EBSM participants suggested that some employers lay off existing workers and then hire someone with the subsidy.

### **Effects on Communities**

*The key informants indicated that the effects of EBSMs on communities depended on the size of the community.* In large communities, key informants indicated that it is difficult to attribute much of an impact to EBSMs, beyond the impacts on clients. In smaller communities, however, key informants indicated that EBSMs can be very helpful if enough community members participate. The few community stakeholders who were key informants indicated that they were happy to have EBSM support, but found EBSMs were generally not dominant factors in community improvement programs.



## 5. *Cost-Effectiveness*

This section draws together the findings from the impact analysis with estimated cost data to estimate the cost-effectiveness of the various EBSM interventions

### 5.1 **Benefit-Cost Estimates**

#### 5.1.1 ***Approach Used to Measure Benefits and Costs***

A straight-forward approach was taken to the estimation of benefits and costs. For benefits only impacts on annual earnings were considered. Other possible beneficial program impacts (such as changes in family well-being) were not considered. Annualized earnings impacts were measured over the entire post-program period. These impacts were assumed to last for five years<sup>22</sup> and they were discounted at an interest rate of 5 percent<sup>23</sup>.

Two types of costs were considered: (1) Direct program costs; and (2) Opportunity costs incurred by clients in the form of lost earnings during their program participation<sup>24</sup>. Estimates for the first of these costs are provided for each intervention type in the Methodology Report. Estimates for opportunity costs were derived using the same methodology used to derive the impact estimates. Detailed estimation of opportunity costs was an important innovation in this research. In general these costs were found to be quite large for most of the interventions. It should be pointed out, however, that these estimates are subject to significant uncertainties associated with precisely aligning the timing of participant and comparison groups.

Because important components of both benefit and cost estimates were derived from sample data, it was important to recognize that these are subject to sample variability. Hence, all point estimates for net benefits from the interventions have (rather wide) confidence intervals. In Table 2 we show ranges for net benefits that constitute 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates.

---

<sup>22</sup> The five-year assumption is consistent with some longer terms studies of the effects of labour market programs (see Hackman, Lalonde, and Smith, 1999). The evaluation did not discuss the validity of this assumption.

<sup>23</sup> This represents the approximate interest rate on long-term government bonds. It is generally consistent with figures for the social discount rate in Canada quoted in Burgess (1981).

<sup>24</sup> These lost earnings are a true cost from the perspective of clients and of society as a whole. From the perspective of the government's budget, however, it is only the foregone taxes on these earnings that should be counted as a cost. Some authors also include in costs the "excess burden" of the taxes necessary to pay for labour market programs. If this component was included here, program cost would be about 25 percent higher than those used to construct Table 2 (see Snow and Warren, 1996).

## 5.1.2 Discussion of Benefit-Cost Estimates

### Active Claimants

Benefit-cost estimates for active claimants had very wide confidence intervals. Usually the estimates showed that costs exceeded benefits, sometimes by a wide margin. In assessing these results, however, it is important to keep in mind that participants were only followed for a relatively brief time and it is possible that payoffs may be more positive in the future.

- ***Benefit-cost ranges were predominantly negative for all interventions for active claimants.*** Upper bounds for the estimates were sometimes positive, but the lower bounds had costs exceeded benefits by about \$15,000 or more.
- ***Benefit-cost ranges were much more negative when opportunity costs were included.*** The estimates suggested that most active claimants incurred substantial opportunity costs as a result of their participation in the program. When only direct costs were considered, most interventions had positive upper bound estimates of benefits minus costs.
- ***TWS and EAS interventions had the most positive benefit-cost findings.*** For these interventions upper bound estimates were quite positive even when all opportunity costs were considered.

### Former Claimants

The results for former claimants mirrored those for active claimants.

- ***Benefit-cost ranges were predominantly negative for former claimants.*** Lower bound estimates again suggested that costs exceeded benefits by more than \$15,000.
- ***Opportunity costs did not play such a major role in the calculations for former claimants.*** For this group estimates based only on direct costs were fairly close to estimates that took opportunity costs into account.
- ***Results for TWS were the most positive of all interventions for former claimants.*** SD also had positive upper bound estimates for this group.

<b>Table 2</b>				
<b>Benefit – Cost Estimates</b>				
	<b>Benefits – Direct Costs</b>		<b>Benefits – Total Costs</b>	
<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Upper Bound</b>	<b>Lower Bound</b>	<b>Upper Bound</b>	<b>Lower Bound</b>
<b>Active Claimants</b>				
SD	1,638.275	-17,998.3	-4,500	-24,293.2
SEA	-664.24	-25,535.8	-3,726.66	-29,239.6
TWS	7,891.525	-17,157.5	5,078.925	-20,237.8
JCP	-5,956.47	-26,229.5	-11,859.7	-32,352.3
EAS	10,372.64	-13,524.6	9,421.674	-14,501.6
<b>Former Claimants</b>				
SD	3,091.165	-16,831.2	-6.35336	-20,181.2
SEA	-1,467.66	-25,252.3	-1,885.63	-26,265.1
TWS	10,277.68	-12,649.7	13,605.77	-9,588.69
JCP	-462.635	-22,463.4	-2,119.7	-24,357.5
Sources: Technical Report Table IV-1 and Methodology Report.				

## 5.2 Cost-Effectiveness Estimates

### Approach Used to Estimate Cost-Effectiveness

Cost effectiveness analysis seeks to measure the dollar costs of specific incremental outcomes. Three such outcomes were the primary focus of the analysis:

- A one dollar gain in annualized earnings;
- A one hour increase in annualized hours worked; and
- A one dollar reduction in annualized EI benefits.

For earnings and EI outcomes, these estimates can be regarded as “payback periods”. That is, if the estimated gains were to continue for that many years, total program costs would be recovered (without discounting). For example, a cost-effectiveness ratio of 5 for earnings gains implies that total earnings gains (without discounting) over a five year period would precisely equal program costs. For hours impacts one would need to assume an hourly wage to estimate payback periods. For example, if one assumed a wage of \$18.50<sup>25</sup>/hr and the results showed that a gain of one hour worked per year cost \$65, the payback period would also be 3.5 years.

Because (as Tables A-2 and A-3 show) the size of these gains did not stabilize until a year after the APE end dates, all such gains were measured after that year. As in the cost-benefit calculations, two measures of costs were used: (1) Incremental direct cost per

<sup>25</sup> The \$18.50 figure represents the average hourly rate of paid employees across all industries based on Statistics Canada data for 2004 (time of survey) in the province of Ontario.

unit gain; and (2) Incremental total cost (including opportunity costs) per unit gain<sup>26</sup>. When the impact results showed that the gains were negative, that conclusion is reported in the Table 3.

Because the impact estimates in the evaluation are subject to sampling variability, the estimates used to construct the entries in Table 3 are subject to significant uncertainties. In fact, few of the impact estimates derived in the Ontario evaluation were large enough to meet customary levels of statistical significance. Despite this, all of the positive estimates obtained from the evaluation were used to construct Table 3. Cases for which the estimates were significantly different from zero (at the .05 level) are denoted by an asterisk (\*) in the table. In this section we only highlight the significant estimates. Positive and non-statistically significant estimates represent the best estimate of the impact given the available data but they should, however, be treated with caution.

### Active Claimants

Most interventions showed positive gains for active claimants though, because of the small sizes of many of the impacts, these gains were often not statistically significant and quite costly to achieve.

- **Estimated gains were statistically significant only for hours worked by SD and SEA participants.** With an average hourly rate of paid employment of \$18.50, these figures imply a payback period for direct costs of 3.5 years for SD and 2 years for SEA. When opportunity costs are considered these periods lengthen to 6.4 years for SD and 2.6 years for SEA.
- **SD and SEA also had significant impacts on EI receipt.** Payback periods for direct costs were relatively long for these impacts, amounting to 19 years for SD and 11 years for SEA.
- **The JCP intervention had negative gains for all cost-effectiveness measures computed.** This mirrored the cost-benefit results which showed that even the upper bound estimates for JCP were quite negative. Potential social benefits from JCP projects were not included in such calculations, however.

### Former Claimants

Cost effectiveness measures based on employment were also generally positive for former claimants, though quite variable in magnitude. For most interventions the cost-effectiveness measures for EI savings were negative.

- **The cost-effectiveness analysis indicated that TWS was more cost-effective than the other types of Employment Benefits in achieving an additional hour of employment or a dollar gain in annualized earning.**

---

<sup>26</sup> The estimates do not consider the possibility that gains may not persist in future years. Hence, some care should be taken, for example, in interpreting the earnings figure as representing a “payback period”.

- **Cost-effectiveness measures for hours worked by former claimants were statistically significant only for SEA and TWS.** With an average hourly rate of paid employment of \$18.50, the estimated payback period for direct costs for SEA was 2 years – quite consistent with the results for active claimants. For TWS, estimated payback periods were very short, only 7 months for total costs and even shorter for total costs (because opportunity costs for TWS were estimated to be negative – workers on TWS actually worked more than workers in the comparison group).
- **Only SEA offered significant EI savings for former claimants.** In part these savings may have occurred because self-employment earnings are not insurable under EI.

<b>Table 3</b> <b>Cost-effectiveness Measures</b>						
Intervention	Direct Costs			Total Costs		
	Earnings	Hours	EI	Earnings	Hours	EI
<b>Active Claimants</b>						
SD	10.6	65.4*	18.6*	19.1	117.6*	33.5*
SEA	14.4	38.8*	10.8*	18	48.4*	13.5*
TWS	43.4	34.5	19.3	75.5	59.9	33.5
JCP	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative
EAS	1.8	7.1	3.674419	3.655788	14.37577	7.4
<b>Former Claimants</b>						
SD	4.5	93.7	Negative	6.3	132.6	Negative
SEA	22.9	36.6*	24.8*	24.1	38.5*	26.0*
TWS	1.2*	13.4*	Negative	0.2*	2.7*	Negative
JCP	6.3	107.3	Negative	7.1	121.2	Negative
Sources: Technical Report Table IV-1 and Methodology Report.						
* Impact estimate significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level.						





## 6. Conclusions

The summative evaluation covered a wide variety of areas of interest to policy makers. The *impact analysis* focused primarily on measuring the effect that participation in EBSM interventions had on claimants. In general the results indicated that *participation resulted in some beneficial net impacts on employment and EI benefits' collections, but the results were mixed.*

- Active claimants experienced earnings losses (relative to the comparison group) during the first post-program year. Following that year, hours and earnings tended to improve, but these gains were not always statistically significant.
- Active claimants collected significantly less in EI benefits after the first post-program year.
- Active claimants who participated in SD (the largest Employment Benefit) reflected the overall pattern of modest employment gains after the first post-program year and statistically significant reductions in EI benefits during that period.
- Former claimants had relatively consistent gains in earnings and hours worked in the post-program period. They did not, however, exhibit the sort of reductions in EI benefits that active claimants did.
- Both active and former claimants in SEA had large increases in hours worked during the post-program period. These increases were not, however, accompanied by statistically significant earnings gains.
- Former claimants in TWS had statistically significant gains in hours and earnings during the post-program period. Such gains were not found in the active claimant sample, however.

The *cost-effectiveness analysis found the following result:*

- *For active claimants who participated in SD and SEA, the cost-effective analysis indicated that:*
  - *With an average hourly rate of paid employment of \$18.50, the payback period for direct costs of in terms of hours worked was 3.5 years for SD and 2 years for SEA.*
  - *The payback period for direct costs in terms of EI receipt was relatively long amounting to 19 years for SD and 11 years for SEA.*
- *For active clients who participated in JCP, there were negative gains for all cost-effectiveness measures computed.*
- *For former claimants, the cost-effectiveness analysis indicated that TWS was more cost-effective than the other types of Employment Benefits in achieving an additional hour of employment or a dollar gain in annualized earning.*

- *For SD, TWS and JCP the cost-effectiveness measures for EI savings were negative.*
- *For former clients who participated in TWS and SEA, the cost-effective analysis indicated that:*
  - *With an average hourly rate of paid employment of \$18.50, the payback period for direct costs in terms of hours worked was 7 months for TWS and 2 years for SEA.*

The survey used in the summative evaluation also indicated a number of important ***qualitative results***.

- ***The majority of surveyed participants felt that program participation was important to their ability to obtain a job and keep a job.***
- ***The in-program experience for each of the Employment Benefits generally proceeded as expected, although certain areas were identified as possible areas for improving/strengthening the program experience. In the case of EAS, however, focus group participants and survey participants (active claimants) were more critical of their in-program experience.***
- Certain areas were identified for ***improving/ strengthening the program experience for each program***. Examples include considering ways to:
  - provide support during the later (follow-up) stage of SEA;
  - increase the likelihood that skills acquired through TWS will be useful in other jobs; and
  - make more effective use of EAS – including increasing the links with opportunities in the job market.
- Certain areas were identified for ***improving/ strengthening EBSMs in general***. Examples include:
  - providing more/better information to support/improve the action plan process – including program selection; and
  - developing better ways to take account of particular circumstances of certain client groups at the HRCC/service delivery level – including recent immigrants.

# Appendix A

**Table A-1**  
**Main Demographic and Work-Related Characteristics of Participants**  
**(For Principal EBSM and Reference Year 2001/02)**

Characteristic	Participants Using Employment Benefits			Participants Using EAS*	Ontario Labour Force (2001)
	Active Claimants %	Former Claimants %	Total EBs %	Active Claimants %	%
<b>Age</b>					
19 to 23	34	31	34	34	30
35 to 49	47	49	47	45	34
50 or over	19	20	19	21	37
<b>Education</b>					
Less than high school	15	13	14	16	25
High school	29	26	28	25	21
Some post secondary	10	13	11	11	9
Certificate or diploma	30	33	31	31	27
Bachelor's degree or more	15	15	15	16	18
<b>Employment Equity Group</b>					
Female	41	46	43	45	49
Aboriginal person	3	6	4	2	
Visible minority	30	27	29	26	
Long-term disabled	9	15	11	10	
Immigrant	29	25	28	28	
<b>Months employed in year before program</b>					
0 months	12	21*	15	12	
1 to 6 months	18	29*	21	13	
7 to 12 months	70	50*	64	74	
<b>Weeks of EI in 5 years before program</b>					
0 weeks	13	7	11	20	
1 to 39 weeks	67	57	64	66	
40 or more weeks	20	36	25	14	
<b>Weeks of SA in year before program</b>					
0 weeks	93	87	91	94	
1 to 13 weeks	3	4	4	3	
14 or more weeks	4	10	6	3	
<b>Number of Participants</b>	989	371	1,360	1,189	
* Excludes participants using JFC (98 active claimants, 74 former claimants). See Section 3.2.5 for a discussion of JFC. Source: Survey of participants. Information on the Ontario Labour Force for 2001 is taken from Statistics Canada data.					

**Table A-2**  
**Estimated Impacts on Hours of Employment and Earnings**  
**(Annualized Estimates For Principal EBSM and Reference Year 2001/02)**

Subgroups and Period	Active Claimants		Former Claimants	
	Hours	Earnings	Hours	Earnings
<b>All</b>				
Full post-program period	28	-\$425	154*	\$1,371
First post-program year	-80	-\$2,511*	112*	\$874
After first year	93*	\$700	178*	\$1,735*
<b>Males</b>				
Full post-program period	-4	-\$2,647	182*	\$2,566
First post-program year	-156*	-\$6,018*	127	\$1,931
After first year	90	-\$827	215*	\$3,053*
<b>Females</b>				
Full post-program period	18	\$756	109	\$870
First post-program year	-52	-\$192	103	\$745
After first year	62	\$1,338	114	\$983
<b>Visible Minority</b>				
Full post-program period	60	\$340	62	-\$146
First post-program year	-104	-\$2,202	-15	-\$1,030
After first year	158*	\$1,847	108	\$396
<b>SD</b>				
Full post-program period	54	-\$402	28	\$906
First post-program year	-46	-\$2,330	-67	-\$347
After first year	119*	\$734	83	\$1,734
<b>SEA</b>				
Full post-program period	347*	\$590	372*	\$330
First post-program year	333*	\$17	380*	-\$14
After first year	353*	\$949	374*	\$598
<b>TWS</b>				
Full post-program period	74	-\$636	275*	\$2,811*
First post-program year	-8	-\$2,056	234*	\$2,102
After first year	116	\$92	298*	\$3,319*
<b>JCP</b>				
Full post-program period	2	-\$2,471*	133	\$2,159
First post-program year	6	-\$3,123*	135	\$2,141
After first year	-4	-\$2,203*	127	\$2,178
<b>EAS</b>				
Full post-program period	60	-\$628	n/a	n/a
First post-program year	-59	-\$2,802	n/a	n/a
After first year	133	\$523	n/a	n/a
Estimates derived from survey data and CRA taxation data. All estimates were made using the kernel matching technique. n/a: Not applicable. * Indicates that the estimate is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.				

**Table A-3**  
**Estimated Impacts on EI Benefits, SA Benefits and Dependence on Income Support**  
**(Annualized Estimates For Principal EBSM and Reference Year 2001/02)**

Subgroups and Period (relative to APE)	Active Claimants			Former Claimants		
	EI Benefits	SA Benefits	Depen- dence**	EI Benefits	SA Benefits	Depen- dence**
<b>All</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$321*	\$11	-0.023	\$44	-\$34	-0.021
First post-program year	-\$206	n/a	n/a	\$5	n/a	n/a
After first year	-\$374*	n/a	n/a	\$81	n/a	n/a
<b>Males</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$604*	-\$11	-0.038*	-\$79	-\$29	-0.044
First post-program year	-\$364	n/a	n/a	-\$98	n/a	n/a
After first year	-\$752*	n/a	n/a	-\$45	n/a	n/a
<b>Females</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$105	\$23	-0.012	\$208	-\$48	0.008
First post-program year	-\$267	n/a	n/a	\$125	n/a	n/a
After first year	\$21	n/a	n/a	\$265	n/a	n/a
<b>Visible Minority</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$158	\$74	-0.018	\$239	-\$45	0.040
First post-program year	\$57	n/a	n/a	\$19	n/a	n/a
After first year	-\$296	n/a	n/a	\$369	n/a	n/a
<b>SD</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$759*	\$17	-0.052*	\$100	\$18	0.004
First post-program year	-\$1,337*	n/a	n/a	-\$77	n/a	n/a
After first year	-\$418*	n/a	n/a	\$208	n/a	n/a
<b>SEA</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$1,445*	-\$28	-0.004	-\$530*	-\$130*	-0.073*
First post-program year	-\$1,730*	n/a	n/a	-\$470*	n/a	n/a
After first year	-\$1,264*	n/a	n/a	-\$553*	n/a	n/a
<b>TWS</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$389*	\$6	-0.071*	\$385*	-\$121*	-0.022
First post-program year	-\$574	n/a	n/a	\$476*	n/a	n/a
After first year	-\$207	n/a	n/a	\$345	n/a	n/a
<b>JCP</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$92	-\$22	-0.017	\$367*	\$104	-0.004
First post-program year	-\$680*	n/a	n/a	-\$249	n/a	n/a
After first year	\$283	n/a	n/a	\$729*	n/a	n/a
<b>EAS</b>						
Full post-program period	-\$29	-\$20	-0.020	n/a	n/a	n/a
First post-program year	\$355	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
After first year	-\$258	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Estimates derived from survey data analysis. The source is the survey of participants and comparison group. All estimates were made using the kernel matching technique.

n/a: Not applicable.

\* Indicates that the estimate is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Refers to dependence on income support, which was measured as (EI + SA) and a percentage of (EI + SA + earnings).