

The University of Manitoba

**AN EVALUATION OF THE
COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT
TO DETERMINE ITS IMPACT UPON
TRAINEES AND CUSTOMERS**

by

Robin Wright BA, BSW.

A Practicum

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Social Work

Faculty of Social Work

Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) June, 1993



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-86085-5

Canada

Name

ROBIN WRIGHT

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

SOCIAL WORK

SUBJECT TERM

0452

U·M·I

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
General 0679
Ancient 0289
Linguistics 0290
Modern 0291
Literature
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0318
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0272
Banking 0770
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce-Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and
Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family
Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor
Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and
Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and
Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and
Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and
Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences

Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and
Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and
High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451



AN EVALUATION OF THE COMMUNITY HOME
SERVICES PROJECT TO DETERMINE ITS IMPACT
UPON TRAINEES AND CUSTOMERS

BY

ROBIN WRIGHT

A practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in
partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

(c) 1993

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend
or sell copies of this practicum, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
practicum and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to
publish an abstract of this practicum.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the practicum nor extensive
extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written
permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| ABSTRACT..... | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | vi |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Statement of Objectives..... | 7 |
| Overview of Practicum Report..... | 11 |
| CHAPTER I | |
| Program Description..... | 14 |
| Methods of Data Collection..... | 20 |
| Evaluation Committee..... | 27 |
| CHAPTER II | |
| Trainee Profile..... | 29 |
| Current Trainees..... | 29 |
| Former Trainees..... | 33 |
| CHAPTER III | |
| Trainee Questionnaires..... | 45 |
| Trainee Perception of the Project..... | 45 |
| Results of Psychological Testing..... | 51 |
| CES-D Scale..... | 51 |
| Rosenberg Self-Esteem Questionnaire..... | 56 |
| CHAPTER IV | |
| Project Customer..... | 60 |
| Customer Questionnaire Results..... | 61 |
| CHAPTER V | |
| Evaluation Committee..... | 69 |
| Evaluation Committee survey..... | 73 |
| CHAPTER VI | |
| Trainee Summary..... | 75 |
| Customer Summary..... | 78 |
| Recommendations..... | 79 |
| Conclusions..... | 81 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 84 |

APPENDICES.....88

Appendix A. Community Home Services Application

Appendix B. Trainee Evaluation Questionnaire

Appendix C. Trainee Responses to Questionnaire

Appendix D. CES-D Scale

Appendix E. Rosenberg Self-esteem Questionnaire

Appendix F. Customer Evaluation Questionnaire

Appendix G. Customer Responses to Questionnaire

Appendix H. Evaluation Committee meeting agenda

Appendix I. Evaluation Committee completed Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

This practicum was designed to evaluate the impact of a specific training program, the Community Home Services Project, upon its trainees and customers. This project was initiated in the late 1970's by the City of Winnipeg Social Services Department to help their clients develop job skills and lessen their dependence on social assistance, while at the same time offering free yard and home services to low income seniors.

This study is a program evaluation. It utilized questionnaires and an analysis of trainee records to determine the Project's impact upon the trainees and senior citizens who utilized the service.

The research determined that the Project had a positive impact upon both trainees and customers. It revealed that approximately half the trainees left the Project as a result of employment, other training programs or school, and that almost 60% of former trainees had not reapplied for welfare within four months of Project termination. As well, approximately two-thirds of the customers using the service stated that without the Project, they would not be able to maintain their homes.

The evaluation also provided concrete information to support ongoing funding requests, suggested changes which would increase Project effectiveness, and raised additional areas of study for future endeavours.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Practicum could not have been completed without the cooperation of the many trainees and customers of the Community Home Services Project who answered the questionnaires. In addition, I wish to thank the members of the City of Winnipeg Social Services Department's Evaluation Committee: Joe Egan, Heather Gibson, Cindy Gammon, Susan Jackman, and especially Juergan Hartmann, for their interest and assistance.

I want to acknowledge my Practicum Committee: Sharon Boyd, Len Spearman and Don Fuchs for their time, effort and direction. Thank you Don, for your patience and encouragement while steering me through the reefs and shoals of the Master's program.

Finally, to my wife Marilyn, son Colin and daughter Kimberly; thank you for your love and understanding. Without your support I could not have successfully completed the program.

PRACTICUM REPORT

INTRODUCTION

A Decima Research poll, cited in **Transitions** (1988), conducted in the late 1980's found that 71% of Canadians consider work "very important" as compared to other aspects of life. Furthermore, the great majority of Canadians said they would continue to work even if they didn't need the money. This is similar to the finding of **Jahoda** (1982), who wrote that among the hard core unemployed a survey found that 84% of respondents want to work, even if it were not an economic necessity. Employment provides not only income, but time structure, social identity, activity and social status.

Kirsh (1983) wrote that society doesn't value us for who we are but according to what we do. Most of us want to be employed. It is a myth that most unemployed people are lazy and would rather collect welfare than work. When we are unemployed we are blamed, made dependent upon social assistance and stripped of our sense of integrity. We come to blame ourselves for our unemployment. Our anger is internalized and we become depressed.

Krystal et al (1983) wrote that the unemployed suffer from low self-esteem as a result of job loss. **Madonia** (1983) in a study of psychological reactions to unemployment found that self-esteem is negatively affected by unemployment. **Sherraden**

and **Adamek** (1985) studied adolescents and stated that employment-oriented interventions were more constructive than those focusing on psychological issues. When adolescents were unable to find a job self-esteem decreased. **Levine** (1980) stated that unemployed youth had lower self-esteem than those still in school or working.

However **Founce** (1989) wrote that research evidence does not support the assumption that work necessarily affects self-esteem. Founce was studying occupational status rather than employment vs unemployment. **Shamir** (1986) concluded in his study of the psychological impact of unemployment that self-esteem is not sensitive to employment status. His study focused on highly educated adults recently unemployed. He found that low self-esteem persons were more dependent upon employment status than were those with high self-esteem. **Feather** (1990) argued that the experience of unemployment does have negative effects, though the effects vary depending on the populations studied and the sampling methods used. He sees the need for further studies to assess the psychological impact of unemployment. **Patton and Noller** (1984) in their study of unemployed youth found that unemployment is related to decreased self-esteem. **O'Brien** (1986) and **Puglies** (1989) stated that many unemployed persons experience depressive affect and a loss of self-esteem. This could impact on a person's ability to secure future employment.

If employment is essential to our well-being, how do we

cope with today's high unemployment and soaring welfare rolls? How do marginal workers, "the last hired and first fired", compete in today's competitive job market? Those able bodied welfare recipients who lack skills and job references, who have a sporadic work history, low education, little confidence and who have not yet developed good work habits will find it increasingly difficult to obtain and maintain employment. Those who must ask for financial assistance from the current welfare system because they can't get a job find their self-esteem and self-confidence greatly eroded.

Nichols-Casebolt and McClure (1989) stated that rather than a guaranteed income, American social workers now believe that self-sufficiency through employment should be a major strategy in welfare reform. **Spencer** (1980) recommended that training in vocational intervention form part of social work education. He contends that meaningful employment is often crucial to the client's well being yet few social workers are prepared to help their clients find jobs. **Fineman** (1986) wrote that the support social workers offer unemployed persons tends to focus on financial and emotional problems. Far less support is given in relation to helping their clients find work. **Hayes and Nutman** (1981) found that long term unemployment can lead the individual to give up job searching. The more a person is convinced that he has no chance of getting a job the less likely he is to continue to make an effort to get work. They also emphasized the importance of supportive supervision for

programs employing the hard core unemployed.

Levine (1980) found that many unemployed people have depressive affect and mood. This state is related to a variety of losses such as opportunities, structure to their lives, relationships and respect from others. They are mutually affected by low self-esteem, fears, anger at the self and shame. He suggests that while psychotherapy and medication might be helpful if a serious depression evolves, what the majority of unemployed young people need is meaningful, gainful employment.

Transitions, the 1988 Report of the Ontario Social Assistance Review Committee, stated that employment was the key element in the transition from dependence upon social assistance to self reliance and community integration. It strongly supported programs to help recipients get employment because it postulated that employment is the best form of income security. The Committee gave two reasons for their belief that employment was essential. First, employment provides income which enables people to be self-reliant. Second, employment provides people with a sense of belonging or contributing and participating in the community. This can increase a person's self-esteem and self-worth.

One solution for the unemployed is the development of programs which provide employable welfare recipients with the opportunity to break the cycle of welfare dependence by developing good work habits, a stable work history and

positive employment references. **Gueron** (1986), looking at work for welfare recipients, found that participation of employable welfare recipients in employment initiatives was feasible provided the work was meaningful and only three months in duration.

Windschuttle (1990) wrote that, rather than being viewed as a form of deterrent, workfare can be seen as the basis of a full employment policy in which all adults who are capable of working are provided with guaranteed jobs. He stated that in terms of available income, employment is preferable to welfare as work confers status and self-esteem. Providing employment for welfare recipients is good policy and is in the long term interests of recipients and their dependents.

The Community Home Services Project (the Project), developed and managed by the City of Winnipeg Social Services Department, is a program designed to help unemployed welfare recipients and low-income senior citizens and disabled persons. It is not a work for welfare (workfare) program. The Federal government, under the Canada Assistance Plan, effectively prohibits all workfare programs by refusing to cost share. Participants are paid a wage for the work they do while employed by the Project. Social Assistance recipients who express interest in working for the Project meet with a social services worker and together they complete a Project referral. The social services worker then arranges an interview with the Project worker which is similar in

structure to a standard job interview. The duties of the job and the rates of pay are explained and the benefits the trainee will derive from participation in the Project are reviewed. These benefits include obtaining a recent job history and, hopefully, a positive employment reference. Those applicants who state that they want the job are considered for hiring.

In this era of cutbacks and restraint it is important that the Social Services Department be able to demonstrate that the Community Home Services Project is an effective program so that continued funding can be ensured. It is not enough to say that we think the Project reduces participants' dependence upon welfare or that we believe it is meeting the needs of low-income senior citizens whom the Project serves. Increasingly, program funders are demanding data to back up the assertions of program managers. Increasingly, funders are insisting upon greater accountability from program managers.

The 1983 Ryant Report studied the Manitoba Social Assistance system and noted that the system had not been able to consistently provide sufficient services necessary to help welfare recipients gain access to labour market opportunities. It pointed out that due to under-funding, work activity projects which provided employment preparation services were unavailable to many recipients who needed and wanted them. In 1982/83 these services received less than 2% of the Department of Community Services and Corrections budget.

The **Ryant Report** also stated that work activity projects collect but do not systematically report information regarding the job status of those participants who have left the projects. They considered this to be regrettable since the effectiveness of the programs could not be assessed without such information.

One of the many recommendations of the 1988 Ontario Social Assistance Review Committee was that "high priority should be assigned to the evaluation of all employment and training programs utilized by social assistance recipients in order to determine their effectiveness in helping participants move into the labour force." (Recommendation #113)

Clearly, if managers of projects such as Community Home Services hope to obtain continued and increased funding they must demonstrate their effectiveness through systematic evaluation. Otherwise their programs may fall victim to governmental down-sizing. One need only look at Winnipeg City Council's recent attempt to freeze municipal taxes by cutting social programs to understand the need for managers to clearly prove that their programs are effective and efficient.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The question this Practicum has addressed is how the Community Home Services Project meets the needs of its two

main target groups: the welfare recipients who use the Project as a training ground and stepping stone to competitive employment; and the low-income senior citizens and disabled persons who receive free services from the Project. The literature review cited the importance of employment in our lives. Unemployment can have a devastating effect upon our psychological well-being. It was also suggested that social workers help the unemployed to find and maintain employment. One way to help the unemployed is through the development of employment training programs. These programs provide the unemployed with the opportunity to develop the job and social skills necessary to get and keep a job. The literature states that such programs can be effective if they offer meaningful, short term work coupled with supportive supervision.

If employment programs are to receive continued government funding program managers must systematically evaluate these programs to demonstrate their effectiveness in helping the unemployed. In the case of a program such as the Community Home Services Project the two most obvious methods of determining effectiveness are by recording the number of Project trainees who leave the Project to go to competitive employment and by recording the number of jobs the Project does for its customers. Both are important measures.

However, the number of trainees obtaining outside employment as a result of their Project participation is dependent upon economic conditions and the availability of

jobs. In good economic times trainees are more likely to find jobs than in times of high unemployment. Similarly the number of jobs done for customers is dependent upon Project funding. Increased funding enables the program to hire more trainees and provide services for a greater number of customers. Therefore, in addition to collecting information about trainees who secure competitive employment and recording the number of jobs done for customers, this Practicum looked at alternative methods of measuring the impact of the Project upon its trainees and customers.

To further determine this impact certain questions needed to be addressed. Who were the Project trainees? Who were the Project customers? What did they think about the Project? What impact did the Project have upon them? The Practicum methodology outlined in Chapter I was developed to collect data which would address these questions. This data was then analyzed and developed into the Practicum's conclusions and recommendations.

As a social worker employed full time by the City of Winnipeg, Social Services Department, I was Project Coordinator of the Community Home Services Project at the time of the study. Consequently my position afforded me access to both trainees and customers of the Project. My objectives for evaluating the program were both professional and personal. In addition to answering the major questions just outlined, additional professional objectives included:

1. To develop from within the Social Services Department an Evaluation Committee which would have input into the evaluation process, to whom the evaluation results would be disseminated and which would provide feedback concerning the utility of the evaluation.

2. To obtain or develop instruments capable of collecting the information and data necessary to effectively analyze certain aspects of the Project.

3. To computerize and analyze the data and interpret the results.

4. To utilize the results to develop recommendations for strengthening policy and improving the Project.

My personal objectives for undertaking this practicum were as follows:

1. To learn the impact of the Project upon its trainees.

2. To learn the impact of the Project upon its customers.

3. To develop group skills by setting up and working with an Evaluation Committee.

4. To gain a better understanding of program evaluation.
5. To gain experience in computerizing raw data.
6. To learn to develop and administer instruments and to analyze resultant data in order to make recommendations.

OVERVIEW OF THE PRACTICUM REPORT

The Practicum report has been ordered as follows. The Introduction has discussed the need for programs which provide welfare recipients with training opportunities and has provided a statement of objectives, both professional and personal. The Introduction contained a review of the literature which outlined the importance of employment for a person's psychological well being and the need for governments to help welfare recipients gain access to labour opportunities. The Introduction also emphasized the importance of employment programs set up to address this need being able to demonstrate their effectiveness through systematic evaluation.

Chapter I offers a description of the Community Home Services Project and outlines the methods of data collection used to evaluate its impact on its trainees and customers. The Project goals and rationale are discussed, the Project

trainees and customers are described. Furthermore this chapter discusses how the utility of the Practicum was to be evaluated by the City of Winnipeg Social Services Department.

Chapter II establishes a profile of the Project's trainees by means of an analysis of the personnel information of the current trainees (July/92) and of those former trainees who had left the Project between January 1st, 1992 and July 24th, 1992.

Chapter III examines the results of the Trainee questionnaire, administered to current trainees in July, 1992 in order to determine their level of satisfaction with the Project. This chapter also looks at the current trainees' responses to the two psychological questionnaires: the Rosenberg Self-esteem Questionnaire and the Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depressed Mood Scale (CES-D Scale). This testing occurred over a three month period, ending in July, 1992.

Chapter IV looks at the effect of the Project upon its customers: low income senior citizens and/or disabled persons. The results of the Customer questionnaire are discussed.

Chapter V discusses the feedback obtained from the Department's Evaluation Committee. The results of the

Committee Questionnaire are examined in order to assess the Practicum's usefulness for the Social Services Department.

Chapter VI presents the Practicum's implications, recommendations and conclusions. In addition the significance of the exercise in terms of the writer's personal learning is explored.

CHAPTER I

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

The Community Home Services Project was developed in the late 1970's to assist single, employable, adult welfare recipients who were having difficulty obtaining and/or maintaining employment in the competitive job market. These clients were often characterized by factors such as low education, lack of work skills, poor work record and poor social skills which impacted on their ability to sustain full-time, long term employment. Most had been receiving municipal social assistance (welfare) from the City of Winnipeg for some time. The Project was intended to be a stepping stone between welfare and employment in the community. It offered a combination of work experience, life skills training, employment skill development and individual counselling as a means of helping participants to become better able to compete in the competitive labour market. It was anticipated that trainees would experience difficulty (at least initially) on the job. Consistent with **Hayes and Nutman's** (1981) belief in supportive supervision, a project social worker was assigned to help trainees identify and resolve problems that impacted upon their work performance. The overall major goals for the Project trainees included:

1. Developing good work habits and employment skills.
2. Developing a sense of pride.
3. Improving work history.
4. Enabling participants to get off welfare and become self-supporting.

In order to be considered for the Project applicants must have expressed an interest in working for the Project and have been in receipt of social assistance from the City of Winnipeg Social Services Department. In line with municipal assistance criteria, the recipient must have been aged 18 years or older. Most were single participants falling between the ages of 18 and 30 years. In addition the applicant had to be in good health, bondable, interested in working for the Project and enjoy working with the elderly. Although exceptions had been made, in general trainees had to be functionally literate as they were expected to read street maps and signs. The Project was set up to assist a specific client group: the single welfare recipient who had experienced difficulty finding work because of factors such as low education, poor work history, few job skills and/or poor work habits. An education of grade 10 or less was considered to be low. A pattern of quitting or being fired from a series of short-term jobs, often with lengthy gaps between jobs collecting welfare, constituted a poor work history. An individual who had a history of losing jobs because of absenteeism, time keeping problems or

difficulty getting along with supervisors and/or co-workers would be categorized as having poor work habits.

All clients were interviewed by the Project co-ordinator prior to being hired. If the applicant was considered appropriate for the Project a decision was made to hire if there were openings, or to place on the waiting list if there were no positions available. Participants were hired for a three month term, although there was some flexibility depending upon the participant's needs. Extension of the three month term required the mutual consent of the Project and the participant. Each participant attended an orientation prior to commencing work. At the orientation the conditions of work were explained and a contract was signed. Special needs, such as work clothing, the first month's bus pass, and financial assistance were arranged through the Social Services Department. Subsequent to hiring the trainee attended a health and safety seminar where he/she learned about the importance of safe working habits.

Trainees reported for work to the Project office each morning at 8 A.M. They received their work sheets and then travelled to the customers' homes. There the trainees provided the low-income senior citizens or disabled persons with free services such as light housekeeping, yard work, snow shovelling and one-way transportation to medical appointments. Upon completion of the job the customer recorded the time of arrival and completion, commented on the quality of work,

signed the work sheet and returned the sheet to the trainee. The trainee returned the daily work sheets to the Project the next morning when he/she picked up the next assignment. Office workers at 103 Water recorded data such as the nature of the job, the date completed and the name of the trainee completing the job, on customer cards which were then filed in the Project office.

The trainee worked a 35 hour week: 8 A.M. to 4 P.M., Monday through Friday. The rate of pay depended upon the funding source. Usually trainees' pay started at \$280 (net) biweekly, based on full attendance. After working one month trainees were eligible to receive a pay raise to \$300 biweekly. A final raise to \$5.00 an hour was also available. This raise was determined by such factors as seniority, job performance and availability of the funding. The starting rate of \$280 biweekly was less than the minimum wage. However the pay was sufficient to eventually enable all single trainees to become independent of municipal social assistance. Funding came from the City of Winnipeg Social Services budget and to a lesser extent from the Provincial Government via the Winnipeg Human Resources Opportunity Centre (WHROC). In 1992 funding from the City of Winnipeg Social Services amounted to \$378,000.00. This figure did not include the salaries of the Project social worker or clerk. In 1991 a total of 403 participants took advantage of the program. Staff size varied depending upon the season. At the time of the study

(July, 1992) approximately 65 persons were employed by the Project, working as dispatchers, drivers, house cleaners or labourers.

It was hoped that provision of free services to senior citizens would enable many to continue to live independently in the community rather than being forced to leave their homes or apartments and move out of their communities, perhaps to nursing homes. The Project advertised its services in city-wide and community newspapers as well as senior citizens publications such as the **Manitoba Senior Citizens' Handbook**. In July, 1992 the **Winnipeg Free Press** published an article about the Project. The article included interviews with managers, a trainee and a customer and several photographs. Similarly, **CBC Radio** taped an interview with some of the management, staff and customers of the Project in the summer of 1992.

The Project also received referrals from agencies such as Age and Opportunity, Home Care, Provincial and municipal health departments, the Victorian Order of Nurses and the Social Services Departments of Winnipeg hospitals. These outside agencies referred approximately 1500 new customers to the Project in 1992. Much of the Project's business was generated by word of mouth as many seniors told their friends about the Project. At the time of the study the Project had approximately 5000 active customers. Customers were considered to be active if they had been served once in the previous

year.

Initially, a new customer's financial eligibility was determined by phone. Subsequent to the phone call customers were asked to sign a document acknowledging that they were aware that the service was only for low-income senior citizens or disabled persons who could not afford to pay and had no one who could do the work for them. (See Appendix A for a copy of the Community Home Services Application). Eligibility for Project services was based on the Statistics Canada definition of low-income for Winnipeg in 1992. Single persons who had an income less than \$15000 per annum and couples whose income was less than \$20,000 per annum qualified. Seniors were asked to supply the necessary equipment (ie. lawn mower, shovel, cleaning supplies, etc) while the Project supplied the labour.

Customers phoned the Project and scheduled the jobs through one of the five dispatchers working at the Project office who were also responsible for assigning the trainees. The dispatchers monitored quality control by reviewing each returned job sheet which provided the worker's time of arrival and departure and customer comments. In addition a random number of seniors were phoned each day to elicit feedback about quality of work completed. The Project social worker met each day with those trainees who were experiencing difficulty and to provide positive feedback to those who received compliments from their customers. The Project social worker also met with each participant on a monthly basis to formally

evaluate the participant's progress. The participant received a copy of this evaluation, a copy was kept on file and a copy sent to the funding body.

These meetings also included discussions about the trainee's future plans such as his/her short and long term goals. Each trainee was assisted in preparing a typed resume and encouraged to conduct job searches and attend job interviews. Paid days-off were available for this purpose. In addition trainees were encouraged to consider enrolling in other training programs or upgrading their education. The Social Services Department's Employment Section workers assisted trainees in finding regular employment prior to their leaving the program.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

In order to identify the Project's trainees and customers, determine what they thought about the program and assess its impact upon them, several methods of data collection were utilized. These included reputability assessments, trainee and customer questionnaires and a computer analysis of present and past trainee data.

Reputability assessments were conducted for all current trainees of the Project as of July, 1992. The Trainee Questionnaire, which was voluntary and confidential, asked the trainees to assess the value of the program for themselves.

Did it meet their needs? (Refer to Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire). Trainees were asked to rate the program on a five point scale in terms of the degree the Project had helped them. A score of one indicated the Project was not helpful while five signified the project was very helpful. Trainees were asked to define how the Project had helped them, what they liked most and least about the Project and how the Project could be improved. Although trainees were not asked to put their names on the questionnaires, they were asked to record their sex, age, length of time on welfare prior to hiring and length of time they had worked for the Project. Completed questionnaires were deposited in a collection box by the trainees rather than handed to me directly.

I was aware that I brought to this evaluation a degree of bias about the value of the Project. I believe training programs such as Community Home Services have a positive impact upon welfare recipients. Consequently I attempted to develop unbiased questionnaires which would allow both the Project trainees and customers to provide their opinions about the program. Hopefully the practicum represents their views, not mine.

I was also aware that my dual role of researcher and supervisor of the trainees might present a problem in that the trainees might think they had to cooperate or compromise their jobs. I made it clear to trainees both verbally and in writing that they could refuse to complete the questionnaires without

fear of negative consequences. To distance myself from the process I brought a large cardboard box with a slit in the top to the office and used it as a drop off point for the questionnaires. I handed out the questionnaires to small groups of trainees, explained their purpose and how to complete them and then instructed the respondents to place the completed questionnaires in the box; I then left the room. Trainees placed their completed (or if they wished - uncompleted) questionnaires in the box and then left for their first job of the day. Since respondents did not put their names on the documents I had no way of knowing who had completed a particular questionnaire.

In attempting to determine the impact of the Project upon its trainees, I studied the personnel records of 65 trainees employed at the time of the study (July, 1992) and 164 trainees who had left the program between January and July of that year. By utilizing the substantial amount of Project raw data available in the Project's manual personnel files and the Social Services Department's computer system the characteristics of these participants, such as age, education, length of time on welfare, length of time on the Project and reason for leaving, were analyzed and a profile of the Project personnel was developed.

Over the years Project managers have stated that 60% of those welfare recipients who participate in the Project do not return to welfare. Recently the Social Services Department

computerized its records. It was possible therefore to conduct a study of those clients who have been employed by the Project over the past three years. The amount of time a client was receiving welfare from the City of Winnipeg in the one year prior to hiring by the Project was contrasted to the amount of time the same individual received welfare in the one year subsequent to leaving the Project. I believe that it is somewhat risky to base the Project's success on the percentage of participants who don't return to welfare. Such a standard may enable the Project to appear effective in good economic times and ineffective during recessionary times. Would the results of the study show a decrease in the amount of time spent on welfare subsequent to Project participation despite the economic downturn of the past two years?

In order to determine the psychological impact of Project employment upon trainees two psychological instruments were administered to the current Project trainees on three occasions during the period May to July, 1992. Trainees were tested at point of hiring for the Project, at the midway point and at the end of the third month. In addition, the scales were administered once, in June, 1992, to a outside group of persons receiving welfare from the City but not connected with the Project. Half the trainees completed the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale and the other half the Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D Scale). Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary and trainee

confidentiality was assured. I was interested in the group mean score at each stage of evaluation rather than individual scores. Trainees did not necessarily complete all three tests due to the high turnover of participants on the program. Trainees were asked to state their sex, age, length of time on welfare prior to hiring and the length of time they had worked for the Project. My hypothesis was that scores for self-esteem should increase with time spent in the Project and scores for depression should decrease. One would expect the unemployed group to have the lowest level of self-esteem and the highest level of depression of all the groups tested. However, the fact that the same trainees were not necessarily tested at each point, and the trainees were not tested prior to being hired by the Project, limited the ability of the testing to draw conclusions as to the psychological impact of the Project upon the trainees. Future research studies should track individual trainees as they move from unemployment to employment with the Project.

The Rosenberg Self-esteem Questionnaire (**Rosenberg, 1965**) is a simple instrument to complete, having only ten statements. The respondent is asked to circle a number between 1 and 7 depending upon how strongly he/she agrees or disagrees with the statement. The Rosenberg Self-esteem Inventory (RSE) is a standardized scale widely used for the measurement of self-esteem. Its repeatability reliability coefficient is 0.92. (See Appendix E for an example of the scale).

The Centre for Epidemiologic Studies-Depressed Mood Scale (CES-D Scale) was designed for the general population as a measure of current level of depressive symptomology. The twenty item scale requires a frequency distribution response for each depressive symptom over the past week. The CES-D Scale was normed on a sample of over 3000 respondents from the general population and 105 psychiatric patients. It has an internal consistency of .85 for the general population and .90 for the psychiatric group. Test-retest correlations are reported to range from .51 to .67 when tested over two to eight weeks. The Scale is reported to have excellent concurrent validity. **Radloff** (1977). (See Appendix D for an example of the CES-D Scale).

The critical elements in determining the Project's impact on customers included identifying the percentage of senior citizens receiving the free service, the nature and frequency of the jobs completed and the monetary value of those jobs. Feed-back was obtained from the consumers of the service themselves: the low-income senior citizens and disabled persons who stated they could not afford to pay for the service and had no one who could do it for them. A questionnaire was designed for the purpose of determining how the Project impacted upon its customers and in what ways it might be improved. (Refer to Appendix F). The questionnaire was delivered to a random selection of customers during a two week period in June, 1992 by Project participants whenever

work was scheduled. Whichever customers were scheduled to have work done in that period of time received questionnaires. A letter of explanation accompanied the questionnaire, outlining its purpose and informing the customer that completion was voluntary. I did not ask the customers to sign their names, hoping to ensure them of anonymity. Utilizing the trainees to deliver and collect the questionnaires resulted in a high response rate. However some customers may have been concerned about anonymity since they were asked to hand the completed questionnaire to a trainee. Envelopes were provided so that the customers could place the questionnaires inside sealed envelopes before returning them to the Project trainees at the completion of the jobs. It is possible that a mailed survey might have elicited a different response from the Project's customers.

The quantitative data obtained from the various questionnaires and gleaned from an examination of the Project's personnel files was analyzed by means of computer statistical analysis software entitled **Statpac**, obtained from the Faculty of Social Work. Codebooks and data files were developed for the trainee questionnaire, trainee profile of present and former trainees, the two psychological scales and the customer questionnaire. Analysis control files were set up to analyze the raw data. Frequency distribution, descriptive statistics and breakdown were the statistical procedures used to analyze the quantitative data.

Qualitative data was analyzed manually. This included trainee and customer responses to survey questions such as "what do you like most about the Project?" These responses were studied for recurrent themes. Any response to a particular question having a frequency of three or more was reported. Similar responses were grouped together in a category. Using the question "how has the Project helped you?" as an example: customers who cited poor health were placed in the same category as customers who said they could not do the work themselves. Responses which didn't provide useful information, such as the comment "nothing" when respondents were asked what they liked least about the Project, were eliminated. These categories and the frequency of the response for each category are offered in a later chapter. Most of these qualitative responses can be found in the Appendix in the form of trainee and customer verbatim responses to these subjective questions.

EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Both the City of Winnipeg Social Services Department Program Manager and Supervisor responsible for the Project agreed to sit on an Evaluation Committee to ensure the Practicum would have utility for the City of Winnipeg Social Services. In addition, two of the Department's social workers who had previously managed the Project agreed to participate.

The Evaluation Committee's initial meeting took place in the Social Services Department's boardroom in May, 1992. I presented my proposal and we then discussed ways of increasing the practicum's usefulness for the Department. The Committee suggested the study attempt to determine the percentage of customers who would be unable to remain in their homes without assistance from the Project. We developed a question to elicit this information and included it in the Customer Questionnaire. The positive response of the Committee was encouraging. The consensus was that the evaluation information could benefit the Department. Members of the Committee were kept regularly informed of the evaluation's progress on an informal basis. Copies of questionnaires and the resultant data were sent to the Program Manager periodically.

One of the goals of this practicum was to gather and disseminate information about the Project to the Social Services Department, therefore it was important that relevant stakeholders from the Department agree to the evaluation, have a say in its direction, and be kept apprised of its progress. The evaluation addressed managerial concerns of maintaining and improving program effectiveness and efficiency. Upon completion of the evaluation the Committee was to be asked to assess the usefulness of the exercise for the organization.

CHAPTER II

TRAINEE PROFILE

This chapter focuses upon the current trainees employed at the time of the study (July, 1992) and those former trainees of Community Home Services who left the Project between January 1st and July 24th, 1992. The information was obtained by reviewing the trainees' personnel files. Variables studied include sex, age, education, length of time on welfare prior to hiring, length of time working for the Project, job description, treaty status, reason for leaving the Project and welfare status subsequent to completion of the program. In addition the chapter looks at the impact of possession of a phone and a driver's licence on the trainee.

CURRENT PROJECT TRAINEES

At the time of the study (July, 1992) the Project had a staff complement of 65 trainees. Analysis of certain trainee variables provided the following information.

Forty-eight trainees were male and seventeen were female. Although all Project positions are open to men or women; in general men preferred the outdoor yard work and women the indoor housecleaning. Since there was more demand for yard work than for housecleaning men usually outnumbered women on

the Project by a ratio of 3:1. Office staff were usually more equally divided between men and women.

The average age of participants was 28.6 years. Their ages ranged from 18 to 50 years. Over forty-one percent of trainees were 18 to 24 years of age. This large percentage of young trainees has implications for the Project. Many of these trainees had little work experience and few skills. The Project may have been their first full time job. At this point in their lives it was imperative that such trainees be provided with information about educational and training programs in order to help them to determine their course of action once they left the Project.

Trainees were required to have at least a basic level of literacy. The mean self-reported grade level for the current trainees was 10.57. Grade levels ranged from grade 6 at the low end to grade 12 at the high end. Trainees with treaty rights tended to report a lower grade level (9.5) than those without treaty rights (10.8). In the past the occasional trainee has possessed a university degree. Forty-one percent of the trainees reported a grade 12 education while almost twenty-eight percent had less than grade 10. The sixty percent of trainees without a high school diploma should be encouraged to complete their education. The lower the grade level the more difficult it will be for trainees to secure meaningful, well paid employment. Today even parking lot attendants may be required to have successfully completed high school. While a

grade 12 education is not required to park cars it indicates to the employer that the employee has had the maturity to complete his/her education.

The current trainees reported they had received welfare an average 8.3 months in the three years prior to commencing work with the Project. Those trainees having treaty rights had received welfare longer (14.7 months) than those without (6.9). Most trainees were not long term welfare recipients. Rather, they appeared to move on and off the welfare roll, getting short term employment and then losing it. Those with treaty rights were on welfare more than twice as long as those without. Their lower educations would be one factor making it difficult for them to get a job. Almost seventeen percent of the trainees (11) reported they had treaty rights. In my opinion the percentage of trainees having an aboriginal background was considerably higher but the Project did not have a means of accurately determining the actual number at the time of the study.

Over one-third (33.8%) of the current trainees were in possession of a driver's licence at the time of the study. Many jobs require that an employee have a valid licence. Those having driver's licences have more job options open to them than those without.

Trainees were grouped into three job categories: yard workers responsible for grass cutting, snow shovelling and the heavier indoor work; housecleaners assigned to light

housekeeping; and office workers whose duties included typing, answering the phones and coordinating the work assignments of the yard workers and housecleaners. For the sake of simplicity the two Project drivers were included with the office workers. Yardworkers comprised 70.8% of the staff; housecleaners 16.9% and office workers 12.3%.

Although the Project was funded primarily by the City of Winnipeg through its Social Services Department budget, the Winnipeg Human Resources Opportunity Centre (WHROC) also provided financial support. WHROC provided funding to pay trainees a salary of \$140 per week (no deductions). After one month's satisfactory employment with the Project the trainee was eligible for a raise in pay to \$150 per week. Generally trainees were hired at a rate of pay of \$140 per week, raised to \$150 per week and then, depending upon job performance and the availability of City funding were given a raise to \$5 per hour. Consequently two trainees may have been receiving different rates of pay for doing the same job. Because those trainees earning minimum wage had usually worked for the Project longer than those earning \$140 per week, they were expected to perform at a higher level of competency in terms of their job performance, attendance and punctuality. Forty-five of the current trainees were getting \$5 an hour and the remaining twenty were being paid \$140 per week at the time of the study.

In July, 1992 the mean length of time that current

trainees had been employed by the Project was 12.8 weeks. Women (16.4 weeks) had worked considerably longer than men (11.5 weeks). For those getting City funding (\$5/hour) the average number of weeks of employment with the Project was 16.9. Those receiving funding via the Winnipeg Human Resources Opportunity Centre had worked only 3.6 weeks.

FORMER PROJECT TRAINEES

At the end of July, 1992 I reviewed the personnel files of all former trainees (164) who had left the Project during the period January 1st, 1992 to July 24th, 1992. Former participants provided a larger group of trainees for the study and this group also provided data as to their reason for leaving the Project and their welfare status subsequent to leaving. Twelve trainee variables were analyzed. These included:

- sex of trainee
- age of trainee
- self reported grade level
- time on welfare prior to hiring (self-report)
- time on welfare prior to hiring (computer check)
- treaty status
- possession of driver's licence
- possession of telephone
- job function of trainee
- length of Project employment
- reason for leaving the Project
- welfare status subsequent to leaving

One hundred and five trainees were male, fifty-nine female. In general housekeepers were female and yard workers

male. Of the ten office workers who left the Project seven were male. The mean age of the trainee was 24.99 years. Ages ranged from 18 to 51 years. Almost sixty percent (59.5%) of the trainees were ages 18 to 24. Those trainees holding treaty rights or a driver's licence tended to be older. On average housecleaners were youngest and office workers oldest. (Refer to Table 1).

TABLE 1
AGE OF FORMER TRAINEES

| AGE OF TRAINEE | MEAN (YRS) | STANDARD DEVIATION | NUMBER |
|--|---------------|-----------------------|--------|
| For entire sample | 24.988 | 6.705 | 164 |
| SEX OF TRAINEE | | | |
| MALE | 25.971 | 7.013 | 105 |
| FEMALE | 23.237 | 5.770 | 59 |
| DOES TRAINEE HAVE DRIVER'S LICENCE? | | | |
| YES | 26.696 | 5.287 | 56 |
| NO | 24.828 | 6.232 | 108 |
| DOES TRAINEE HAVE TREATY RIGHTS? | | | |
| YES | 26.211 | 5.287 | 19 |
| NO | 24.828 | 6.868 | 145 |
| JOB CLASSIFICATION OF TRAINEE | | | |
| LABOURER | 25.724 | 6.913 | 98 |
| HOUSECLEANER | 22.661 | 5.268 | 56 |
| OFFICE WORKER | 30.800 | 7.239 | 10 |

The mean self-reported grade level for all former trainees in this study was 10.6. (See Table 2). Women had a slightly

higher grade level than men. Those trainees having treaty rights reported a full grade level less than did those without treaty rights. Only 37% of the trainees had a grade 12 education. As was the case with the current trainees, the implication is that the Project should be counselling and helping most trainees to return to school to obtain their high school diploma.

TABLE 2
SELF-REPORTED FORMER TRAINEE GRADE LEVEL

| EDUCATION OF TRAINEE | MEAN (GRADE) | S.D. | NUMBER |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| For entire sample | 10.604 | 1.295 | 164 |
| SEX OF TRAINEE | | | |
| MALE | 10.590 | 1.357 | 105 |
| FEMALE | 10.627 | 1.473 | 59 |
| DOES TRAINEE HAVE TREATY RIGHTS? | | | |
| YES | 9.737 | 1.628 | 19 |
| NO | 10.717 | 1.327 | 145 |

Trainees who left the Project between January and July 24, 1992 reported they had been receiving social assistance on average 6.457 months in the three years prior to being referred to the Project. I was able to determine the City of Winnipeg welfare histories of one hundred and fifty-one of the former trainees by accessing the Department's computer system. (Refer to Table 3). It is not known if former trainees

collected welfare in different municipalities. I found that trainees had a tendency to under-report the length of time they had been collecting welfare prior to hiring. According to the results of the computer search the former trainees' mean number of months receiving welfare was somewhat higher than their self-reported times at 7.285 months compared to 6.457 months. These were not long term recipients. Rather they appear to intersperse short term employment with brief periods of assistance.

There was little difference in time spent on welfare between men and women. There was, however, a significant difference in time on welfare for those having treaty rights compared to non-treaty. Those trainees who possessed treaty rights were more likely to have had a lower education than those without. They had probably grown up on a reserve and may therefore have lacked urban job skills. They may also have been unfamiliar with the city and its bus routes. As a result they tended to collect welfare longer than those without treaty rights.

TABLE 3
FORMER TRAINEE TIME ON WELFARE

| MTHS ON AID IN 3 YRS PRIOR TO HIRING (C) | MEAN (MTHS) | STANDARD DEVIATION | NUMBER |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|--------|
| For entire sample | 7.285 | 4.982 | 151 |
| SEX OF TRAINEE | | | |
| MALE | 7.429 | 5.137 | 98 |
| FEMALE | 7.019 | 4.717 | 53 |
| DOES TRAINEE HAVE DRIVER'S LICENCE? | | | |
| YES | 6.750 | 3.990 | 52 |
| NO | 7.566 | 5.429 | 99 |
| DOES TRAINEE HAVE TREATY RIGHTS? | | | |
| YES | 10.933 | 9.208 | 15 |
| NO | 6.882 | 4.140 | 136 |
| POSSESSION OF PHONE AT POINT OF HIRING | | | |
| YES | 6.763 | 4.090 | 118 |
| NO | 9.152 | 7.111 | 33 |
| WELFARE STATUS AS OF NOVEMBER 20, 1992 | | | |
| CASE ACTIVE | 7.831 | 5.567 | 65 |
| CASE CLOSED | 6.872 | 4.479 | 86 |

The November, 1992 examination of the City of Winnipeg Social Services computer records indicated that those former trainees who were again in receipt of social assistance subsequent to leaving the Project had received aid for a longer period of time prior to hiring than had those former trainees who were not on assistance as of November 20.

Almost two-thirds (65.9%) of the former trainees did not have a driver's licence. Most trainees (78%) were in possession of a phone when they were referred to the Project. Those trainees who said they did not have a phone had been on

welfare longer than those who had a phone at the time they were referred to the Project. Clearly it is more difficult to get a job if the employer cannot contact the job applicant by phone to arrange a job interview. By providing employable welfare recipients with a telephone allowance the City of Winnipeg may be able to cut its welfare costs by enabling recipients to get off welfare more quickly.

The question of treaty rights was originally on the Project referral for billing purposes because the Federal Government reimbursed to the Province 100% of the welfare costs of treaty Indians. Only nineteen trainees (11.6%) indicated on the Project referral that they had treaty rights. Although I was aware that the number of trainees having aboriginal ancestry was greater than 11%, the Project had no formal method of determining the exact number at the time of the study. The percentage of "treaty Indians" who left the Project to employment, school/training (68.4%) was greater than the Project average (49.4%). This may have been as a result of the numerous training programs available that targeted persons having aboriginal backgrounds.

Ninety-eight (60%) of the former trainees were yard workers (labourers); fifty-six (34%) were housecleaners and ten (6%) were office workers. Overall the former trainees worked an average 12.09 weeks for the Project. Office workers worked longest, followed by yard workers and housecleaners. Men stayed with the Project longer than women. (See Table 4).

TABLE 4
TIME FORMER TRAINEE EMPLOYED BY PROJECT

| TIME WORKED ON PROJECT | Mean (Weeks) | S.D. | Number |
|--|-----------------|--------|--------|
| For entire sample | 12.098 | 11.000 | 164 |
| SEX OF TRAINEE | | | |
| MALE | 13.238 | 11.571 | 105 |
| FEMALE | 10.068 | 9.667 | 59 |
| DOES TRAINEE HAVE DRIVER'S LICENCE? | | | |
| YES | 13.393 | 10.472 | 56 |
| NO | 11.426 | 11.253 | 108 |
| DOES TRAINEE HAVE TREATY RIGHTS? | | | |
| YES | 11.684 | 13.417 | 19 |
| NO | 12.152 | 10.698 | 145 |
| JOB CLASSIFICATION | | | |
| LABOURER | 11.673 | 9.614 | 98 |
| HOUSECLEANER | 8.911 | 7.126 | 56 |
| OFFICE WORKER | 34.100 | 16.796 | 10 |

The 164 former trainees who left the Project between January 1st and July 24th, 1992 did so for the following reasons:

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----|---------|
| TO EMPLOYMENT..... | 68 | (41.5%) |
| TO SCHOOL/TRAINING..... | 13 | (07.9%) |
| QUIT (NO SHOW)..... | 24 | (14.6%) |
| QUIT (HEALTH)..... | 21 | (12.8%) |
| QUIT (OTHER)..... | 12 | (07.3%) |
| LAID OFF (END OF TERM)..... | 19 | (11.6%) |
| FIRE..... | 7 | (04.3%) |

Approximately forty-nine percent of these former trainees went directly to competitive employment, school or training courses. Almost forty-two percent of trainees found work in the competitive job market while employed by the Project. These trainees either found employment on their own or were

referred to jobs by social workers from the City of Winnipeg's Employment section. Had the study included the month of September the percentage of trainees leaving to return to school would have been higher. If we exclude those trainees who quit or were fired, over eighty percent of the trainees left the Project to jobs, school or training courses. Many of those trainees who quit, were fired or laid off applied for and collected unemployment insurance and so did not immediately return to the welfare system.

Utilizing computer analysis I was able to obtain the following information about those 68 former trainees who obtained regular employment prior to Project termination. I then compared this data to information gathered about the 164 trainees who left the program between January 1st and July 24th, 1992. The results are as follows:

| | | |
|---------------------------------|----|-------|
| Males..... | 42 | (62%) |
| Females..... | 26 | (38%) |
| Age 18-24..... | 40 | (59%) |
| Age 25-65..... | 28 | (41%) |
| Grade 12..... | 24 | (35%) |
| Less than Grade 12..... | 44 | (65%) |
| Possessed driver's licence..... | 27 | (40%) |
| No driver's licence..... | 41 | (60%) |
| Treaty rights..... | 8 | (12%) |
| No treaty rights..... | 60 | (88%) |
| Possessed telephone..... | 53 | (78%) |
| No telephone..... | 15 | (22%) |

Of the 164 former trainees who left the program sixty-four

percent were male. Only sixty-two percent of the 68 trainees who left to employment were male. Therefore, a slightly greater proportion of females got jobs than males. In terms of age, those under the age of 25 got jobs in approximately the same proportion as their percentage of the total number of trainees studied (164). The same holds true for those trainees having treaty rights or a telephone. However 35% of those trainees getting jobs had a grade 12 education while almost 38% of the of the total study had grade 12. One would expect that those trainees with a grade 12 would be more likely to obtain employment than those without, but this was not the case. Almost 40% of trainees leaving to employment had a driver's licence while only 34% of the 164 trainees studied had licences. It appears that having a driver's licence increases the likelihood of obtaining employment.

On November 20, 1992 I conducted a computer search at City of Winnipeg Social Services in order to determine how many of these 164 trainees were again receiving welfare from the City of Winnipeg. I was able to locate 151 files. Fifty-seven percent of these files were closed; the remainder of the former trainees were receiving welfare. I analyzed the 86 former trainees who had not returned to welfare as of November 20, 1992. The percentages listed are the percentage of the 151 trainees who left the Project. For example since a total of 98 males left the program and 57 had not returned to welfare, 58% of the males had not reapplied for welfare.

TRAINEES WHO DID NOT RETURN TO WELFARE (86)

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|-------|
| Males..... | 57/98 | (58%) |
| Females..... | 29/53 | (55%) |
| Age 18-24..... | 53/90 | (59%) |
| Age 25-65..... | 33/61 | (54%) |
| Grade 12..... | 35/58 | (60%) |
| Less than grade 12..... | 51/93 | (55%) |
| Possessed driver's licence..... | 36/52 | (69%) |
| No driver's licence..... | 50/99 | (51%) |
| Possessed treaty rights..... | 7/15 | (47%) |
| No treaty rights..... | 79/136 | (58%) |
| Possessed telephone..... | 65/118 | (55%) |
| No phone..... | 21/33 | (64%) |

The study found that a greater percentage of men than women, trainees aged under 25, high school graduates and trainees without treaty rights had not returned to welfare by November, 1992. Interestingly, 64% of those trainees without a telephone were not back on welfare. Could transiency be a factor here? Finally, almost 70% of trainees with driver's licences had not reapplied.

Further analysis compared the trainees' reasons for leaving the Project to the number of trainees in each category who had not reapplied for welfare by November 20, 1992. The percentages listed refer to the percentage of that category who had not returned to welfare. For example a total of 68 trainees left the Project to employment and 42 or 62% had not returned to welfare.

| REASON FOR LEAVING | NOT BACK ON WELFARE | PERCENTAGE |
|--------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Employment | 42/68 | 62% |
| School/training | 3/13 | 23% |
| Quit (no show) | 14/24 | 58% |
| Quit (health) | 9/21 | 43% |
| Quit (other) | 4/12 | 33% |
| Laid off | 10/19 | 53% |
| Fired | 4/7 | 57% |

Trainees who left the Project to go to outside employment had the highest percentage of not returning to welfare, followed closely by those trainees who quit without explanation (no show) and trainees who were fired. On the other hand only 23% of trainees who went to school or training programs had not returned to welfare by November 1992. These trainees may have been getting a financial supplement from welfare in order to attend a training course. Further research in this area is indicated.

In summary, the trainee least likely to have returned to welfare in November, 1992 had left the Project to employment, was male, under the age of twenty-five, had a grade 12 education, did not possess treaty rights but had a driver's licence.

The findings of this study show that approximately fifty-seven percent of the participants did not return to welfare (at least in the short term). To further determine Project effectiveness it would be useful for the Department to initiate regular follow-up studies of trainees. Studies could be conducted at intervals of six months and one year subsequent to termination from the Project to determine former

trainee welfare status at those times.

To further demonstrate the impact of the Project, in October, 1991, the City of Winnipeg Social Services Department conducted a review of its training programs. For the purpose of the review training program success was defined as a decrease in the number of days the trainee was on assistance subsequent to completion of the training program. The Community Home Services Project was one of the programs examined. It was determined that the Project trainees received assistance a total of 34,887 days in the twelve months prior to starting the program. In the twelve months subsequent to leaving the program these same individuals received assistance 23,682 days. This represents a 32.1% decrease from the twelve month pre-employment period. However there may be many reasons to explain this decrease other than assuming the individuals are employed. Trainees could be receiving unemployment insurance, provincial welfare, be incarcerated or have left the city. Still, this reduction in time on welfare represents a considerable cost saving for the City.

CHAPTER III

TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRES

In order to obtain trainee perceptions about the Project and to determine its psychological impact a questionnaire and two psychological scales were administered to current Project trainees.

TRAINEE PERCEPTION OF PROJECT

The Trainee Questionnaire was administered to current staff of the Project during the month of July 1992. (See Appendix B). Sixty-four trainees responded. Five questions were asked. The number of respondents for each question varies as not every trainee answered every question. The trainee was asked to rate the Project on a scale of 1 to 5 in terms of how much it had helped him, with 1 signifying " not at all" and 5 indicating the project was " very helpful". (See Table 5). The trainee was also asked how the Project had helped, what he/she liked most and least about the Project and finally to list any suggestions he/she had about ways to improve the Project. (See Appendix C) .

TABLE 5
TRAINEE PERCEPTION OF PROJECT HELPFULNESS

| HAS THE PROJECT HELPED YOU? | MEAN | S.D. | NUMBER |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|
| For entire sample | 4.254 | 0.822 | 63 |
| SEX OF TRAINEE | | | |
| MALE | 4.167 | 0.859 | 48 |
| FEMALE | 4.533 | 0.640 | 15 |
| AGE OF TRAINEE | | | |
| 18-24 YRS | 4.115 | 0.864 | 26 |
| 25-34 | 4.296 | 0.823 | 27 |
| 35-44 | 4.429 | 0.787 | 7 |
| 45 & OVER | 4.667 | 0.577 | 3 |
| JOB CLASSIFICATION | | | |
| LABORER | 4.136 | 0.878 | 44 |
| HOUSECLEANER | 4.400 | 0.699 | 10 |
| OFFICE WORKER | 4.667 | 0.500 | 9 |
| PREVIOUS QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED | | | |
| (missing) | 4.318 | 0.839 | 22 |
| 1 | 4.364 | 0.822 | 33 |
| 2 | 3.625 | 0.518 | 8 |

Sixty-three trainees rated Project helpfulness. Almost forty-eight percent (30 persons) circled 5 (very helpful) and an additional 31.7% (20 persons) circled 4. Only one trainee rated the Project's helpfulness at less than 3. The trainees' mean helpfulness rating was 4.254. Women rated Project helpfulness higher than men. Job differentiation seemed to affect the helpfulness rating: office workers rated the Project helpfulness higher than housecleaners who in turn rated it higher than did yard workers. Perception of helpfulness increased with time spent with the Project: 3 (10 weeks), 4 (12.3 weeks) and 5 (13.4 weeks). (See Table 6). The

helpfulness rating increased with the trainee's age. The mean helpfulness rating for trainees aged 18-24 was 4.115, for those aged 25-34 the rating was 4.296, for trainees aged 35-44 it was 4.429 and for those over 44 years of age (3 persons) the helpfulness rating was 4.667.

TABLE 6
TIME EMPLOYED BY PROJECT

| WEEKS WORKED FOR PROJECT | MEAN (WEEKS) | S.D. | NUMBER |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------|--------|
| For entire sample | 12.047 | 10.203 | 64 |
| SEX OF TRAINEE | | | |
| MALE | 10.429 | 10.310 | 49 |
| FEMALE | 17.333 | 8.059 | 15 |
| HAS THE PROJECT HELPED? | | | |
| 2= | 1.000 | 0.000 | 1 |
| 3= | 10.083 | 5.600 | 12 |
| 4= | 12.300 | 10.559 | 20 |
| 5= | 13.400 | 11.370 | 30 |
| (missing) | 1.000 | 0.000 | 1 |

The average length of time a trainee worked for the Project was 12 weeks. Women worked considerably longer than men. The results suggest that the longer a trainee is receiving welfare in the three years prior to being hired by the Project the more likely he/she is to perceive the Project as being helpful. See Table 7. The mean number of months on welfare for those trainees giving the Project a helpfulness rating of 5 was 7.81 months; those rating the Project at 4 were on aid an average 4.95 months and those rating it at 3

received welfare 3.864 months prior to hiring.

TABLE 7
TRAINEE TIME ON WELFARE

| MTHS ON AID IN 3 YRS PRIOR TO HIRING | MEAN (MTHS) | S.D. | NUMBER |
|---|----------------|--------|--------|
| For entire sample | 6.067 | 6.731 | 60 |
| SEX OF TRAINEE | | | |
| MALE | 5.468 | 5.419 | 47 |
| FEMALE | 8.231 | 10.183 | 13 |
| HAS THE PROJECT HELPED? | | | |
| 2= | 1.000 | 0.000 | 1 |
| 3= | 3.864 | 2.050 | 11 |
| 4= | 4.947 | 3.876 | 19 |
| 5= | 7.810 | 8.802 | 29 |

Question #2 asked trainees how the Project had helped them. Sixty-two trainees responded. Many of their responses are found in Appendix C. This question provided three major categories of responses. Thirty-two said the Project helped by providing work experience. Sixteen trainees stated they felt better about themselves and ten said it got them off welfare.

Fifty-nine trainees answered Question #3, stating what they liked best about the Project. Twenty mentioned they enjoyed the people (fellow workers and customers), Seventeen liked the work environment, and sixteen said they liked helping the senior citizens. These comments indicate that many of the trainees derive positive social benefits in working for the Project.

When asked what they liked least about the Project

(Question #4) fifty-three trainees responded. Twenty-six trainees complained about the low pay. Four trainees said they didn't like the attitude of some of the customers.

Fifty-four trainees responded when asked in Question #5 for suggestions on ways to improve the Project. The most common suggestion (20) was that the Project give a pay raise to trainees. Others said they should be allowed to work for the Project for a longer period of time (5). Four trainees suggested that he or she be sent to the same customer every time. A similar suggestion was voiced by many of the customers in response to their questionnaire.

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

The questionnaire results indicate that the Project is perceived as being helpful by the great majority of the trainees surveyed. Almost eighty percent gave the Project a helpfulness rating of four or five. Factors such as trainee age, length of time receiving welfare prior to hiring, length of time working for the Project and job function affected trainee perception of helpfulness. Trainees commented they liked the work experience, were glad to get off welfare and felt better about themselves. A number said they enjoyed helping old people and liked the pleasant work environment.

Most of the negative comments about the Project had to do with the rate of pay. Most trainees thought the pay was too

low and recommended it be raised. Trainee comments respecting the low rate of pay have ramifications for the Project, which attempts to hire single people so that the Project pay enables them to become self-supporting. At a rate of pay of \$140 per week each trainee took home \$606 monthly. Trainees also received a monthly bus pass from the Project, valued at \$43. In 1992 the welfare rate for a single person (including rent) amounted to \$493 monthly. The City of Winnipeg allowed a \$130 per month exemption on earned income of welfare recipients. Were it not for the provision of a bus pass trainees would continue to have eligibility for a welfare subsidy even though they were employed full time for the Project. At \$150 weekly trainees took home \$650 per month and at \$5 per hour trainees earned \$700 monthly (net). The latter two wage rates render single trainees ineligible for welfare.

Unless the Project pay keeps pace with increases in welfare rates soon all participants will be back in the welfare system getting financial assistance to supplement their earnings. I believe this would have a negative impact upon trainee self-esteem and would increase the prevalence of depression amongst the trainees.

The Project trainees could have had almost as high an income if they were unemployed and collecting social assistance. Although many trainees complained about the low pay, it was not unusual for former trainees, off the program for many months but who found themselves unemployed, destitute

and forced to reapply for welfare, to contact the Project. They asked that they be rehired by the Project so they wouldn't have to return to welfare. Contrary to a commonly held perception, many welfare recipients want to work even when there is little financial incentive for them to do so.

RESULTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING

The previous questionnaire was administered to trainees employed by the Project in July, 1992. Trainees who were employed by the Project during the months May to July, 1992 were asked to complete two psychological questionnaires designed to measure their levels of depression and self-esteem.

CENTRE FOR EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES-DEPRESSED MOOD SCALE (CES-D)

The CES-D Scale is a twenty item scale that was originally designed to measure depression in the general population for epidemiological research. (See Appendix D). Means for the general population of white respondents ranged from 7.94 to 9.25. The mean score for 70 psychiatric patients tested in the development of the scale was 24.42. In general the higher the score the higher the level of depression in the

respondent.

The testing took place over a three month period during the late spring and early summer of 1992. Project trainees at three time points in time were randomly asked to complete either the CES-D Scale or the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale. Trainees completed the scales at the point of hiring; at the six week point in their employment with the Project and at the three month point. Trainees did not necessarily complete the same questionnaire each time. Individual scores were not tracked, instead the mean score for each group was tabulated. A fourth group of men and women was also tested. This group was not connected with the Project. They were unemployed welfare recipients who were attending employment preparation classes (EPG) in the same building that houses the Project. It was hoped that the scores from the unemployed group could be compared to scores of the employed trainees. This group was similar in many ways to the Project trainees prior to hiring because they were also receiving welfare from the City, were classified as employable and were having difficulty finding employment. It was not unusual for persons attending these classes to be referred to the Project for hiring interviews. However, the two groups were not perfectly matched so no inferences could be made about the impact of the Project upon the unemployed. (See Table 8).

TABLE 8
CES-D SCORES

| CES-D SCORES | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION | NUMBER |
|------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
| Unemployed Group | 17.346 | 7.615 | 26 |
| First Day of Work | 13.579 | 7.081 | 19 |
| Tested at six weeks | 15.5 | 8.652 | 18 |
| Tested at three months | 17.2 | 10.255 | 15 |

1. UNEMPLOYED GROUP (EPG)

Twenty-six members of the unemployed EPG Group voluntarily completed the CES-D Scale; fourteen women and twelve men. Thirteen were aged 18-24 years of age, twelve were aged 25-34 years and one was aged 35-44 years. The mean CES-D score for this group was 17.346. This score was higher than the mean for the general population and indicated many in the group had a high level of depression at the time of testing.

2. JUST HIRED GROUP

Nineteen trainees were tested the day before they commenced employment with the Project. The respondents were aware they had been hired. Four women and fifteen men were tested. Eleven were ages 18-24 and eight were 25-34 years of age. This group had been receiving welfare a mean of 5.6 months before being hired (self-report). The CES-D mean score for this group was 13.58, considerably lower than the scores

of the unemployed group.

3. TESTED AT SIX WEEKS

Eighteen trainees were tested at the six week point of their tenure with the Project, five women and thirteen men. Twelve of the trainees were aged 18-24 years; four were 25-34 and two were 45 years and over. They reported being on welfare a mean of 5.3 months prior to hiring. Their mean CES-D score was 15.5, an increase in the level of depression compared to those tested at point of hiring.

4. TESTED AT THREE MONTHS

Fifteen trainees were tested, five women and ten men. Four were aged 18-24; eight aged 25-34; two aged 35-44 and one over the age of 44 years. This group had received welfare a mean of 10.6 months. The mean CES-D score for the three month group was 17.2, the highest level of depression except for the unemployed group.

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

The mean CES-D rating for all those tested was 15.98. Men scored slightly higher (16) than women (15.86). The high overall mean scores are of concern as they indicate that some

of the respondents were quite depressed. The CES-D means for the general population of white respondents range from 7.94 to 9.25. Psychiatric patient mean score was 24.42.

The incidence of depression was relatively high for the unemployed welfare recipient group (17.3) and was markedly lower for those who had just been hired to work on the Project (13.6). However those employed by the Project for six weeks had a higher depression rating (15.3) and those working three months for the Project had a score almost as high as the unemployed group (17.2).

Because the same individuals were not tested at each stage in the process little can be inferred about the psychological effect of the Project upon its trainees. I chose not to identify and track individual trainees because of my dual role as supervisor and researcher. I considered it unfair to ask the trainees to provide sensitive psychological information to someone who also evaluates their work performance. Therefore trainee anonymity was assured. As a result the cross-sectional studies provide psychological information about each of the four groups but do not address changes between groups. Further research in this area is indicated.

The high levels of depression, especially in the group of unemployed welfare recipients should be cause for concern. Much of the literature cited in the Introduction points out the damaging psychological impact of unemployment. Rather than treating the depression of the unemployed person clinically,

social workers might be advised to focus on helping the individual to get a job. Success in this area may alleviate many clients' levels of depression without the need for professional intervention.

ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

Completion of the Rosenberg Self-esteem Questionnaire took place in the same manner and at the same time as did the CES-D Scale. That is, half of any group of trainees were asked to complete the Rosenberg Questionnaire, the other half the CES-D Scale. The two scales were randomly distributed to the respondents. Four groups of individuals were asked to complete the scale: the unemployed EPG Group, Project trainees at the point of being hired to the Project, trainees who had worked six weeks for the Project and trainees who had completed three months employment with the Project. Table 9 contains the statistical information collected. The higher the trainee's score the higher the trainee's level of self-esteem. The overall mean self-esteem score for those tested was 54.2.

TABLE 9
ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCORES

| ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCORES | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION | NUMBER |
|------------------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|
| Unemployed Group | 51.208 | 13.008 | 24 |
| First Day of work | 54.440 | 7.600 | 25 |
| Tested at six week | 56.125 | 9.958 | 24 |
| Tested at three months | 56.625 | 8.585 | 8 |

1. UNEMPLOYED GROUP (EPG)

This group was comprised of 24 individuals; 11 men and 13 women. Fifteen were between the ages of 18-24, seven were aged 25-34 and two aged 35-44 years. The mean self-esteem score for this group of unemployed welfare recipients was 51.2.

2. JUST HIRED GROUP

A total of twenty-five trainees were tested at point of hiring, twenty-four men and one woman. Fourteen were aged 18-24, nine aged 25-34 and one was over the age of 45. The mean self-esteem score for this group was 54.4. The self-esteem level for this group was higher than the unemployed group.

3. TESTED AT SIX WEEKS

Twenty-four trainees were tested at the six week point of their employment with the Project. Eighteen men and six women

responded. Thirteen were aged 18-24, eight aged 25-34 and three were aged 35-44 years. Their mean self-esteem score was 56.1.

4. TESTED AT THREE MONTHS

Only eight trainees completed the scale at the three month point in their tenure with the Project, four men and four women. Two were aged 18-24, three were aged 25-34 and three were 35-44 years of age. The mean self-esteem score of this group was highest at 56.6.

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

The overall Rosenberg scale mean score for all those tested was 54.2. The overall trainee mean score was 55.73. Of those who completed the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale the unemployed EPG group scored lowest (51.2). The "Just Hired" group's mean self-esteem score was higher (54.4) and the Six week group's score was higher still (56.1). Highest score of all belonged to the group that had been employed at the project for three months (56.6).

Caution should be used in making inferences from the results due to the small number of respondents, especially in the three month group. In addition; the groups were not perfectly matched in terms of variables and the same

individuals were not necessarily tested at all three stages during their tenure with the Project. As was discussed in the previous section a study which traced individual trainees from the time they were unemployed to point of hiring on the Project and at six weeks and three months would have provided more generalizable information about the effect of the Project upon trainees' psychological state. However this was not possible to accomplish for a number of reasons, not the least of which were the power relationship between researcher and trainee, difficulty in tracking individuals, the high turnover of participants and my desire to be as unobtrusive as possible about the testing. Indeed the results indicate that trainee perception of project helpfulness was inversely proportional to the number of questionnaires a trainee completed.

CHAPTER IV

PROJECT CUSTOMER

The target customer of the Project was the low-income senior citizen and/or disabled person who utilized the service. As stated, a major goal of the Community Home Services Project was to provide a needed service for its customers. It has been suggested that the Project supported the independence of senior citizens living in the community. This chapter looks at the impact of the Project upon these customers.

At the time of the study the Project had approximately five thousand active customers. An exact figure was not available. Customers were considered active if they had received service at least once in the past year.

According to Project statistics for the year 1991 a total of 28,047 jobs were completed:

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Walls/windows..... | 2434 |
| Yards/snow..... | 13788 |
| Heavy cleaning..... | 533 |
| Odd jobs..... | 2329 |
| Housecleaning..... | 7160 |
| Transportation..... | 1803 |
| Total..... | 28047 |

Most jobs were booked for a half day, either morning or afternoon. Some jobs were booked for the entire day while others (such as snow shovelling) may have taken an hour or

less to complete. In order to place a monetary value on this service Manpower Temporary Services, a local casual employment agency, was contacted to determine the cost to the customer of a service such as yard work. It charged \$9.30/hour with a minimum 4 hour charge. It was assumed that the average Project job took two hours to complete at an hourly cost of approximately ten dollars to hire one person to do the work. In addition Project transportation services could be valued at five dollars per trip (the average cost of a one-way taxi trip). Using these figures the Project provided a service to the community in 1991 having a monetary value of approximately \$532,000.00.

CUSTOMER QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

A total of 160 questionnaires were sent out to Project customers during a two week period in June 1992. (See Appendix F). Of these, 147 were completed by the customers and returned to me by the trainees. The typical jobs being done by the Project during this time were yard work and light housecleaning.

Respondents were asked to rate Project helpfulness by circling the number from 1 to 5 which best reflected the degree to which the Project had helped them. The number one indicated the Project was "not at all helpful" while the number five signified that the Project was "very helpful" to

the customer. The results are outlined in Table 10.

TABLE 10
CUSTOMER PERCEPTION OF PROJECT HELPFULNESS

| Has the Project helped? | Mean | S.D. | Number |
|---|-------|-------|--------|
| For entire sample | 4.776 | 0.594 | 147 |
| WOULD YOU CONTINUE TO LIVE IN YOUR HOME? | | | |
| YES | 4.548 | 0.961 | 31 |
| NO | 4.845 | 0.436 | 71 |
| ARE YOU AGED 65 OR OVER? | | | |
| YES | 4.817 | 0.502 | 120 |
| NO | 4.538 | 1.127 | 13 |

Of the 147 persons responding 123 (83.7%) thought the Project very helpful (5) while only one customer stated it was not helpful at all (1). The mean rating for customer satisfaction was 4.776. Senior citizens rated Project helpfulness higher than did those customers under the age of 65. Those homeowners who said they could not remain in their homes without the service gave it a higher helpfulness rating on average than did those who said they could. According to these results the project was perceived by most of the customers surveyed to be very helpful.

Question #2 asked customers to state how the Project had helped them. Many simply stated the type of job done for them that day (ie. yard work). These were omitted. The remainder of the responses fell into two categories. Sixty-eight customers said they could not do the work themselves and eighteen said

the Project helped them to stay in their homes or apartments. Many of the one hundred and thirty-seven responses to this question are included in Appendix G.

TABLE 11
TIME CUSTOMER HAS USED THE PROJECT

| How many months have you used the Project? | Mean (mths) | S.D. | Number |
|--|-------------|--------|--------|
| For entire sample | 42.504 | 34.860 | 133 |
| WOULD YOU CONTINUE TO LIVE IN YOUR HOME? | | | |
| YES | 32.333 | 21.082 | 27 |
| NO | 48.672 | 38.057 | 64 |
| ARE YOU AGE 65 OR OVER? | | | |
| YES | 43.306 | 34.665 | 108 |
| NO | 24.250 | 20.298 | 12 |

The mean number of months respondents have used the service was 42.502 or approximately three and a half years. As can be observed in Table 11 senior citizens had used the service considerably longer than those customers under the age of 65. Since the question did not specify weeks, months or years several respondents answered "a long time" or "many years". These responses were not used in the analysis. The Project appears to have many long-term customers who have come to rely on its services over time.

Because the questionnaires were marked prior to distribution to indicate the service requested on the day of delivery, it was possible to determine that 73.6% (106) of the jobs done on the day the questionnaires were delivered were

yard work while the remainder (38) were light housecleaning. Asking respondents to state the type of work done by the Project was the least productive of the questions asked as most simply listed the job being done that day. However some mentioned winter work and transportation as well. It is not known if the results to this survey would have been different had customers been tested during the winter.

Only 64.6% (95) of customers responded to the question asking whether they could afford to pay for the service. A high percentage failed to respond. Of those responding, 83.2% (79) said they could not afford to pay the project any amount. Three customers stated they could afford to pay \$20, five said \$10, one said \$6, four said \$5, two \$3 and one wrote \$2. It should be remembered that customers of the Project were asked to declare whether they qualify for the free service. The Project did not have a stringent means test so it is quite possible that some of the customers getting the service did not meet the low income guideline and so did not qualify for the services. However the managers of the Project have always believed that many eligible customers would go without the service rather than be subjected to a detailed means test. Eligibility for the service therefore to a large extent was based upon trust.

When customers were asked whether they would continue to live in their homes if the service were not available almost seventy percent (102) responded. Only home owners were asked

to respond. Those customers who did not respond either lived in apartments, overlooked the question or chose not to respond. Of those who did respond 69.6% (71) answered that they would not continue to live in their own home without the help of the Project. The remaining home owners (31) indicated they would still live in their homes if Project help were not available. The results indicated that Project dependency increased with the length of time the customer used its services. Those customers who stated they would stay in their homes if the service was not available had used the service on average less than three years. Those customers who stated they would have to move if not for the Project had used the service in excess of four years on average. It would seem that, according to the customer response, the Project goal of assisting seniors to remain in their own homes in the community was being realized.

Question #7 asked customers what they liked most about the Project. Sixty-one customers said it was helpful, twenty-five liked the trainees' attitude and nine appreciated the free service. In addition five customers said the Project helped them stay in their homes and three liked the fact the Project provided jobs for the trainees. Customer comments are located in the Appendix G. A total of 125 persons answered this question.

Eighty-seven customers responded to Question #8, stating what they liked least about the Project. Some of their

responses are available in Appendix G. Twenty-one customers said the service was not frequent enough and thirteen complained that the trainees had poor job skills. Ten customers disliked the fact that a different trainee was sent to them each time and eight complained that jobs were sometimes cancelled.

Question #9 asked for customer suggestions to improve the Project. Fifteen customers wanted the same trainee to be sent to them each time, thirteen suggested that jobs be regularly scheduled rather than having to phone for service each time and twelve customers wanted the Project to provide better training for its trainees. Six customers said service should be more frequent and six suggested the Project hire more workers. Ninety-three customers responded to this question.

One hundred and thirty-three (90.5%) customers responded when questioned about their age. Over ninety percent (120) of those customers who responded said they were 65 years of age or older. Only thirteen customers said they were not senior citizens. Although customers were not asked to give their age forty-two persons did so. The average age of this group was 78.8 years. Sixteen seniors were in their 80's and two were aged 90 or older.

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

The findings indicate that most of the Project customers who responded were senior citizens who stated that they could not afford to pay for the service. A surprisingly high seventy percent of the home-owning customers surveyed stated they could not continue living in their homes without Project assistance.

Most customers stated they found the Project to be very helpful by doing work around their house or apartment that they could no longer do themselves and could not afford to pay for. Some customers did complain that the service was not provided frequently enough to suit their needs, that the Project sent a different trainee each time or that it needed to become more reliable.

The great majority of customers gave the Project a high helpfulness rating. For most respondents the Project service was long term in nature. The average length of service was three years. The longer the customer utilized the service the more likely the customer would say he/she could not remain in the home without it. It would appear that over time customers develop a dependency on the program. This may reflect the physical reality that as customers age they are less able to care for themselves.

In conclusion, data gathered by this practicum indicates that the Project appeared to be reaching its intended target

group of low income senior citizens and disabled people who need help with their yard work and light housecleaning in order to help them live independently in their communities.

CHAPTER V

EVALUATION COMMITTEE

As was discussed in Chapter I, the purpose of the Evaluation Committee was to allow the Social Services Department to provide input into the evaluation process so that its utility for the Department could be increased. This chapter describes the final meeting of the Evaluation Committee.

The Committee met March 29th to discuss the Project evaluation. A copy of the meeting agenda is located in Appendix H. All members of the committee were professional social workers employed by the City of Winnipeg Social Services Department. In attendance were Juergen Hartmann: Program manager for Employment Services, Joe Egan: supervisor of Employment Services and Heather Gibson: co-ordinator of the Project's sister program: the Community Service Worker Project and myself. Two other social workers who had attended the initial meeting of the committee in 1992 were not available as both were on maternity leave. Copies of the Project evaluation were distributed to the above-named members three weeks prior to the meeting.

At the meeting the purpose of the Evaluation Committee was reviewed and the paper's conclusions and my initial recommendations were presented. Feedback was solicited and a

discussion took place. At the completion of the meeting an evaluation questionnaire (Appendix I) was distributed to each member. The initial recommendations I submitted to the Committee were:

1. The Department continue developing and funding employment projects.
2. The trainee starting wage should be increased.
3. Trainees should be encouraged to upgrade their educations perhaps while employed part-time with the Project.
4. The Department should develop a method of tracking former trainees at regular intervals to determine how long they stay off welfare.
5. Project information such as customer and trainee data should be computerized.
6. The Department should develop a method of determining the ethnic background of its trainees.
7. Employable welfare recipients should be provided with a telephone allowance to assist them in their job search.

The feedback from the members was both positive and helpful. The Committee indicated that the evaluation had already proven to be of use to the Social Services Department. Some of this evaluation information, specifically customer comments about Project helpfulness, had been included in a presentation to City Council in February, 1993 as part of the

Department's effort to obtain continued funding for the Project. That effort had been successful and funding for the coming year was not cut or reduced.

Considerable time was spent discussing trainee wage rates and the importance of removing trainees from the welfare system as opposed to supplementing their Project earnings with welfare. It was suggested that trainee tenure on the project be increased to six months with a raise to \$150 weekly after the first month and to \$5 hourly after the second. We were advised that the Department was negotiating with the provincial funders to raise the trainee starting wage.

The Committee agreed that trainees should be encouraged to complete their high school education. It was recommended that a study be implemented to measure the trainees' actual level of education before proceeding with any plans to add an educational component to the project.

The Committee agreed that systematic follow-up information was needed in order to determine trainees' status subsequent to their leaving the Project. The Department had just purchased two personal computers for the Project so that in the future all trainee and customer data could be computerized. This computerized data will be linked to the Department's main frame computer. Consequently it will be possible to determine if former trainees have reapplied for welfare. The proposed computerization of trainee and customer information should greatly assist Project managers in the

future.

The Committee was interested in being able to identify the ethnic background of the Project's trainees to ensure that minorities are taking advantage of the program. The University of Manitoba Faculty of Social Work has provided a question which might be used to obtain a trainee's ethnic background. This has been forwarded to Departmental managers for consideration.

While it was acknowledged that possession of a telephone makes it easier for welfare recipients to find a job, the Committee thought it unlikely, at least in the short term, that the Department could persuade politicians to provide extra funding for this purpose. A recent study by the Department had looked at the cost of providing a telephone allowance to all welfare recipients. It was found that the proposal would cost the City over five million dollars a year.

The Committee thought that the results of the psychological testing would have been stronger had the same individuals been tested while unemployed and then while employed by the Project. They expressed interest in developing such testing in the future. The high level of depression registered by the unemployed group was of great concern to the committee. This reaffirmed for the Committee the negative effects of unemployment and the importance of the Department continuing to help welfare recipients find and hold jobs.

Other findings of interest to the Evaluation Committee

included the request by some customers and trainees that they be allowed to be paired up on a regular basis and a concern that the Project could be teaching trainees to do a better job of cleaning and yard work. Finally, there was a concern that new Project customers who phoned to apply for the program be interviewed by an experienced dispatcher when determining eligibility to ensure that only those who qualified for the program be served. The Practicum's final recommendations, developed in conjunction with the Evaluation Committee, are outlined in Chapter VI.

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SURVEY

The Committee members each completed a questionnaire designed to measure the utility of the Project evaluation. (See Appendix I). The Committee was asked to rate the evaluation's utility for the Department, whether it had provided the respondent with useful information and whether the participation of the Committee had increased its relevance for the Department. The minimum score possible was one and the maximum five. The Committee's average response was 4.66 with two members giving it a rating of five and one a rating of four. This score indicates that, in the opinion of the Committee members, the evaluation possessed a high degree of utility.

Areas of the evaluation which the Committee said had the

greatest impact were the systematic review of the program, feedback from the trainees and customers, statistical information and information on the respondents' levels of depression. Certain Committee members thought the complexity of the testing could be improved and more frequent committee meetings throughout the written process would have been helpful. Committee members stated that they had received an opportunity to discuss all Project recommendations.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

PROJECT TRAINEE SUMMARY

The study found that the typical Project trainee was a single, employable person in his/her mid twenties who had less than a grade 11 education. He/she probably had a phone at home but did not possess a driver's licence. Those trainees not in possession of a telephone had received welfare considerably longer than those who had a phone. The typical trainee had collected short-term welfare assistance from the City of Winnipeg and had agreed to accept a job with the Project. The trainee worked approximately 13 weeks for the Project before leaving.

About half the former trainees in this study went directly to competitive employment, school or enrolled in a training program upon leaving the Project. Less than half of the trainees who left the Project between January and July 24, 1992 were on welfare with the City of Winnipeg on November 20, 1992. This is the type of information that, according to the **Ryant Report** cited in the Introduction, is essential in demonstrating a project's value. An employment project in which more than half the participants move directly to real

jobs, school or training programs, and where less than half its participants have returned to welfare months later, can be said to have demonstrated some degree of effectiveness.

Almost eighty percent of trainees in the study gave the Project a high helpfulness rating. Many trainees reported feeling better about themselves because they were working rather than collecting welfare. This supports the findings of authors such as **Levine** (1980) and **Puglies** (1989) who point out that employment affects our psychological state. It is not surprising therefore that trainees reported an improved self-image as a result of their employment.

In general the longer a trainee had been collecting welfare in the three years prior to being hired by the Project the greater his/her perception of Project helpfulness. According to **Hayes and Nutman** (1981), the longer one is unemployed and on welfare the greater the psychological damage to the self. Many reach a point where they give up looking for work. The long term unemployed trainee might therefore consider the Project to be more helpful than would a trainee who had only been unemployed and on welfare for only a few weeks.

Some of the trainees surveyed commented that they enjoyed helping senior citizens. **Gueron** (1986) wrote that welfare recipients should be doing meaningful work in order for the employment initiative to be effective. Perhaps many trainees considered helping the elderly to be more meaningful than

working in a factory.

Most trainees stated that Project wages were too low and needed to be increased. In the past few years project pay has not kept pace with inflation or increases in the municipal welfare rates. Consequently many trainees being paid \$140 per week are eligible for welfare supplements even though they are working full time. Trainees have stated in this study that they were happy to get off welfare. Indeed one of the Project's goals is to help social assistance clients become self-supporting. Unless trainee wages are increased many project trainees will need to return to the welfare system in order to make ends meet. They may then perceive themselves to be "working for welfare".

The majority of writers previously cited stated that our psychological state is greatly affected by employment. The psychological testing done in this Practicum found that many of the unemployed welfare recipients tested had high levels of depression. However the testing did not demonstrate that participation on the Project had a positive impact on individual trainee's psychological state. Further studies are warranted.

While the literature suggests that employment has a positive psychological effect upon welfare recipients, any study to confirm these effects should test the same individuals while unemployed, upon being hired, at the six weeks and three month point in their tenure with the Project

in order to determine the psychological benefits of the program.

PROJECT CUSTOMER SUMMARY

Customers were randomly selected to complete these questionnaires. Seventy percent of those customers owning their own homes said they could not continue to live in them without Project help. Ninety percent of the customers said they were senior citizens, 65 years of age or older. These results suggest the Project is meeting its goal of helping senior citizens to continue to reside in their own homes in the community. The Project customers who responded to the questionnaire gave the Project a very high helpfulness rating. Almost 84% gave it the maximum rating possible. Most had been using the service for some time; more than three years on average. Furthermore most customers who responded claimed they could not afford to pay for the service. There were some customer concerns about the quality and frequency of the service. The customer comments located in Appendix G indicate many customers surveyed perceived the Project to be an essential service.

EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the City of Winnipeg continue to develop and fund training projects such as Community Home Services in order to assist welfare recipients in becoming self-sufficient.
2. That the trainee starting wage be raised to a level which permits single trainees to become independent of the welfare system while they are working full time for the Project.
3. That the Project encourage all trainees who lack a grade 12 education to return to school to obtain their high school diploma.
4. That a study be implemented to determine the actual educational level of the Project's trainees.
5. That the Project add an educational component to its training package to allow trainees to upgrade their education while working part-time at full pay.
6. That follow-up studies be conducted at regular intervals subsequent to trainees leaving the Project, possibly at six months and one year, in order to monitor Project effectiveness.

7. That the Project develop a master list in order to obtain an accurate record of its active customers.

8. That the customer and trainee data be computerized to enable Project managers to gain easier access to Project information.

9. That the Project develop an instrument to determine whether trainees have an aboriginal background to ensure that native people are gaining fair access to the Project and to the various training programs which target aboriginal persons.

10. That the City of Winnipeg provide employable welfare recipients with a telephone allowance in order to help them in their job search.

11. That a series of psychological tests be administered to the same trainees prior to hiring and while they are employed by the Project to measure changes in the individual's levels of self-esteem and depression.

12. That trainees, once they have done an initial job for a customer, do subsequent jobs for that customer whenever possible as the customer is then familiar with the trainee and the trainee understands how the customer wants the job done.

13. That the Project spend more time teaching trainees' appropriate job skills to ensure improved work performance.

14. That all new referrals be screened by an experienced dispatcher to ensure new customers understand eligibility requirements.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the results of the Practicum demonstrate that the Project was impacting in a positive fashion upon its intended target group of single, employable welfare recipients who, because of factors such as low education and poor work history, were having difficulty finding employment. The Project was perceived by most trainees as being very helpful to them. It assisted them in getting competitive employment, schooling and training courses which in turn enabled them to stay off welfare. In the process trainees felt better about themselves.

In addition, the findings indicate that the Project was having a positive impact upon its intended target population of low income senior citizens living independently in the community. The Project's customers perceived the service to be most helpful in assisting them to maintain their homes and apartments. The majority of home owners who responded stated they could not live in their homes without help from the

Project.

COMMENTS ABOUT PERSONAL LEARNING

In undertaking this Practicum I have planned, developed and implemented an evaluation of the Community Home Services Project. This Practicum was designed to study the impact of the Project upon its trainees and customers. I have designed questionnaires in order to elicit feedback from trainees and customers about how they perceived the impact of the program, and from the Evaluation Committee to determine the utility of the evaluation. I utilized two existing psychological instruments to measure the psychological impact of the program on its trainees. I initiated the formation of an Evaluation Committee, developed for the purpose of shaping the evaluation process to ensure relevancy for the Social Services Department.

The questionnaires have been completed and the raw data obtained from Project and Social Service Department records. The quantitative data has been computerized, analyzed and, together with the qualitative information, developed into conclusions and recommendations. This information has been presented to the Evaluation Committee and is written up in this practicum.

In the process of completing this Practicum I have greatly expanded my knowledge of program evaluation. I have gained

skills in developing, explaining, administering and analyzing information obtained from questionnaires and psychological instruments. I have become more proficient at computerizing raw data and using statistical software. My experience with the Evaluation Committee has helped me strengthen my presentation and group skills. I consider the Practicum process to have been a profound learning experience; difficult and time consuming, but most rewarding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Babbie, Earl (1986) **The Practice of Social Research**, Wadsworth Inc. Belmont, California

Babbie, Earl; Wagenaar, Theodore (1986) **Practicing Social Research**, Wadsworth Publishing Co., Belmont, California

Braskamp, Larry; Brown, Robert (1980) **Utilization of Evaluation Information**, New Directions For Program Evaluation #5, Jossey-Bass Inc. San Francisco

Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre Task Force Report (1989) **Symposium On Programs For Social Assistance Recipients**

City of Winnipeg Social Services unpublished document (1991) **Social Services Department Review of Training Programs**

Council on Aging (1990) **Manitoba Senior Citizens' Handbook**, Province of Manitoba Publication

Feather, Norman T. (1990) **The Psychological Impact of Unemployment**, Springer-Verlag New York Inc.

Fineman, Steven (1986) **Unemployment: Personal and Social Consequences**, edited by Steven Fineman, Tavistock Publications, London England

Founce, William A. (1989) **The Effect of Status on Self-esteem**, American Journal of Sociology, 95, 2, Sept, 378-400

Gueron, J. M. (1986) **Work for People on Welfare**, Public Welfare, 44(1) 7-12, 49

Gueron, J. M. (1987) **Reforming Welfare with Work**, Public Welfare, 45(4) 13-25

Hurd, Michael, (1976) **The Welfare Implications of the Unemployment Rate**, Stanford University, Menlo Park, California

Hutchison, G. (1981) **Work Activity Projects-A training method for the hard core unemployed**. A paper presented to the Joint Conference of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges and The Vocational Association.

Isaac, Stephen; Michael, William (1985) **Handbook in Research and Evaluation**, EdITS publishers, San Diego, California

Jahoda, Marie, (1982) **Employment and Unemployment: A Social-Psychological Analysis**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Kirsh, Sharon, (1983) **Unemployment, Its Impact On Body and Soul**. Prepared by Sharon Kirsh for CMHA National Working Subcommittee on the Human Impact of Unemployment. Canadian Mental Health Association

Krystal, E.; Moran-Salkett, M; Thompson, S.V.; Cantoni, L, (1983) **Serving the Unemployed**, Social Casework, 64(2) 67-76

Levine, Saul V. (1980) **The Psychological and Social Effects of Youth Unemployment**, Child in the City Report #9, University of Toronto

Love, Arnold J. (1983) **Developing Effective Internal Evaluation**, New Directions for Program Evaluation #20, Jossey-Bass Inc. San Francisco

Madonia, J.F. (1983) **The Trauma of Unemployment and Its Consequences**, Social Casework, 64(8) 482-488

Nichols-Casebolt, A.M.; McLure, J. (1989) **Social work support for welfare reform: the latest surrender in the war on poverty**, Social Work, 34(1) 77-80, January

O'Brien, Gordon E. (1986) **Psychology of Work and Unemployment**, John Wiley and Sons Ltd. Great Britain

Patton, Wendy; Noller, Patricia, (1984) **Unemployment and Youth: a longitudinal study**, Australian Journal of Psychology, 36, 3, Dec, 399-413

Puglies, Karen, (1989) **Social support and self-esteem as intervening variables in the relationship between social roles and women's well-being**, Community Mental Health Journal, 25, 2, summer, 87-100

Riches, Graham; Ternowetsky, Gordon (1990) **Unemployment and Welfare, Social Policy and the Work of Social Work**, Garamond Press, Toronto

Rosenberg, Morris, (1965) **Society and the Adolescent Self-Image**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey

Rossi, Peter H.; Freeman, Howard E. (1989) **Evaluation, A Systematic Approach**, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, California

Ryant, Joseph C. (1983) **Report of the Manitoba Task Force on Social Assistance**

Schram, S.F. (1982) **The Myth of Workfare**, Catalyst 4(1) 49-60

Shamir, Boas (1986) **Self-esteem and the Psychological Impact of Unemployment**, Social-Psychology Quarterly, 49, 1, March, 61-72

Sherraden, M.; Adamek, M. (1985) **Treating Unemployed Adolescents**, Social Casework-The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 66(8) 467-474

Spencer, F. (1980) **Vocational Intervention: a need for social work training**, Social Work 25(5), 394-396

Transitions - Report of the Social Assistance Review Committee (1988) Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Queens Printer, Toronto, Ontario

Verstraete, Josephine A. (1991) An evaluation of a residential program for families of persons with developmental disabilities: client satisfaction and staff perspectives. University of Manitoba

APPENDIX



THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO:

FAX: (204) 986-6702

COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT
103 Water Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0J2
Telephone: 986-3702

Dear Sir/Madam:

The Community Home Services Program provides free services such as yard maintenance, snow removal, heavy housecleaning, one-way transportation to medical appointments, minor repairs/painting and general housekeeping to low income seniors citizens and physically incapacitated persons throughout the City of Winnipeg.

Due to the increasing number of request for services, it has become necessary to ensure that the Program assists those persons who most require the services.

As such, your cooperation is requested in completing the attached application form which outlines the eligibility requirements of the Community Home Services Program. To obtain further service you must complete, sign and return this form.

If you have any questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

KH/da
Enclosure

WINNIPEG
ONE GREAT CITY!

APPENDIX A 1



THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES
103 Water Avenue
Winnipeg, MB
R3C 0J1
986-3702

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO:

FAX: (204) 986-6702

ELIGIBILITY:

The project serves low income senior citizens and low income disabled: those who cannot afford to pay for these services and have no others available to help them. Questions about eligibility can be discussed with the program supervisor.

SERVICES OFFERED:

1. One way transportation to medical appointments.
2. Lights housekeeping duties such as:
 - a) cleaning of the livingroom
 - b) cleaning of the kitchen
 - c) cleaning of the washroom
 - d) vacuuming
 - e) dusting and polishing furniture
 - f) washing and waxing floors
 - g) defrosting the refrigerator
 - h) cleaning the oven
 - i) cleaning the kitchen cupboards
3. Heavy housekeeping duties such as:
 - a) wall washing
 - b) window cleaning
 - c) moving the fridge or stove
 - d) yard work (including snow shovelling in the winter)
 - e) basement work
 - f) garage cleaning

The individuals receiving services must provide all necessary cleaning materials, and they must be at home at all times while the services are being delivered.

NOTE:

The service DOES NOT include:

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1. ironing | 5. polishing silver |
| 2. grocery shopping | 6. laundry |
| 3. sewing | 7. bed making |
| 4. cooking and dishwashing | 8. and housework in <u>deplorable conditions</u> |

Clients must call in advance for L.H.C. or H.H.C. service booking.

WINNIPEG
ONE GREAT CITY!

APPENDIX A 2



THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO:

COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT

103 Water Avenue
Winnipeg, MB
R3C 0J2

Telephone: 986-3702

FAX: (204) 986-6702

I, the undersigned, do hereby make application for the Community Home Services Program.

NAME OF APPLICANT: _____

ADDRESS: _____

TELEPHONE: _____

I certify the following to be true:

1. I am a senior citizen and/or physically incapacitated.
2. I am physically unable to do the required work myself.
3. There are no other able bodied persons living in my household and/or living in the city who can provide the required service.
4. I have limited financial resources and cannot afford to pay to have this service provided.

NOTE: All four factors listed above must apply in order for an individual to qualify for services from the program.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 19__

Signature of Applicant

WINNIPEG
ONE GREAT CITY

APPENDIX A 3

Please complete the attached questionnaire. Your responses will be kept confidential. Do not put your name on the questionnaire. You have the right to refuse to complete the questionnaire or to withdraw from the study at any time.

Sincerely,

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- 2) AGE
- 18 - 24
- 25 - 34 (Circle)
- 35 - 44
- 45 & OVER

- 4) How long have you worked for Community Home Services?

6 WEEKS (Circle)

OTHER

**COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT
TRAINEE EVALUATION**

1. HAS THE PROJECT HELPED YOU? (CIRCLE)

NOT AT ALL

VERY HELPFUL

1

2

3

4

5

2. HOW HAS THE PROJECT HELPED YOU?

3. WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE PROJECT?

4. WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE PROJECT?

5. DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE PROJECT?

TRAINEE EVALUATION

#2 HOW HAS THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT HELPED YOU?

- By giving me reason to get up in the morning and I seem to enjoy helping other people.
- It kept me off social assistance.
- To get work experience.
- Giving me income until I can find something else.
- I feel better about myself, I have something to go get in the morning and I feel grateful helping out the customers, I don't sleep as much as I used to.
- Gaining experience in variety of fields, knowing the City well, dealing with people.
- It has taught me to work a 40 hour week.
- It has given me a chance to stay in the work force while trying to find alternative full-time work. It has also given me a chance to keep my skills polished.
- Got me to have better work habits. Also help me to improve myself. Help me during the slow work force.
- It gets me going to work and having a better point of myself.
- It gave me experience in working with elderly and how to clean properly.
- Helped me to learn how to work with seniors.
- To slowly gain confidence in myself and learn to handle certain situations in a productive and for positive way.
- The project gives you the ability to work with people and you are in homes with people with disabilities and many with great needs of assistance. I have been able to work independently.
- Helped me to learn responsibility. Also helped me to get up earlier.
- It's given me motivation to go out and look for other work.
- It has gotten myself out of bed in the morning. And given me new ideas about self employment.
- I haven't held a job ever though my performance so far is a little shakey. The people here are patient. I think after my experience here I will be able and disciplined enough to hold a job.
- Provided a job, better salary than welfare.
- Learning how to get back into the workforce.
- Money Management - more responsibilities.
- Because I enjoy this work I have become more punctual and dependable.
- It has given me work and confidence.
- It has given me work so I don't have to be on welfare. There's still very few jobs available.

TRAINEE EVALUATION

#2 HOW HAS THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT HELPED YOU?

- It helped me get back into the hang of things like getting up early. It helped me get my confidence back. Also my office skills have gotten a lot better than they were at the beginning of January.
- I have been able to get back into a good work habit.
- Its let me update my resume and get some work experience.
- I've regained my speed in typing and at least I'm not totally on welfare.
- I've been working whereas I would have been on welfare.
- It has helped to better my people skills. It has also helped me to learn control my temper. It also gives me good work experience.
- Reference for jobs, worked at a job when applying for jobs, extra money.
- By trying to find me other jobs, by preparing a complete resume, by orientation in how to find better jobs and how to handle interviews etc. In general the project has been very helpful to me.
- The project has given me a lot of confidence and it has given me some good work experience.
- By getting back into the work force and establishing a morning schedule.
- Project has made me more confident and raised my self esteem.
- I know the City a lot better, got me up in the morning.
- Just having a reason to get up every morning is reason enough.
- I feel I am starting to become more self-sufficient and re-evaluating my job prospects and for possible job training. When one is without work it is very easy to become lost or unsure of the future. The project has somehow smoothed out some rough edges in my life.
- Confidence, exercise, faith in other people.
- Financially and it has helped me with my english, given me some self confidence.
- Kept me off welfare.

TRAINEE EVALUATION

#3 WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- I like helping other people who can't help themselves. The work environment is very nice too!
- I work by myself and it is very easy and mostly outdoors.
- Even though its going to last for only 3 months but I'm out of welfare, help get people into another atmosphere.
- Painting in different places, working with older people, and their satisfaction.
- I like the kind co-workers I have.
- I get to go to work every day.
- I like the people I work with because we all come from the same boat and nobody's any better than the other.
- Being able to help those that can't do work for themselves.
- Variety in an occupation and not being stuck in a monotonous situation.
- The people I meet through the project (co-worker, senior citizens).
- The meeting of the people, 90% have been friendly and good natured.
- It keeps you in a working mode. Sitting at home collecting checks will only ensure it being harder to accept work.
- Outdoor work, helping senior citizens that need help.
- Something new every day, the people, (co-workers, clients).
- Friendly people, learning how to deal with the public.
- The responsibility and that it helps out old people who need it.
- The people that are employed here are in the same situation. The staff here are very understanding.
- The people are nice and understanding. Everyone works hard as a team. It has given me back my self respect and boosted my self esteem.
- I enjoy seniors and working on my own.
- The social workers in the office are of work and people oriented ie. they are very sociable and helpful for a person who might be lost if he was by his own; at the same time their service for seniors is neat and appreciable.
- Helping the seniors to continue to live in their homes by providing the services we do.
- The way the project takes time to deal with each employee individually and tries to keep them the best they can.
- Working every day and meeting people.
- Travelling around the City, meeting with people, working outside.
- Supervisor is good, trains people to become responsible.
- Making the senior citizens feel happy.
- The people and the working atmosphere is very pleasant and positive. It makes it enjoyable to get up in the morning regardless of the weather.
- Put me out of the welfare rut.

TRAINEE EVALUATION

#4 WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- The pay.
- The paycheque could be more.
- The pay.
- The low rate of pay, we do more work than what we are paid to do - at least some of us.
- Its ok I guess.
- Nothing.
- The wage.
- Nothing.
- The fact that you eventually have to leave.
- There is nothing I do not like about the project. I think it is very helpful to people but would like the wages to be increased so that I would stay here on a full-time basis.
- The rate of pay.
- The pay.
- I feel we don't get paid enough for the work we do.
- The workers are criticized and the client is more in a better position when a dispute happens.
- No complaints.
- Minimum wage.
- Wages.
- The hour lunch, it doesn't take a person 1 hour to eat lunch, it's expected for us to commute to our next job during that time. I think 1/2 hour would be reasonable.
- Amount of pay.
- The pay is below minimum wage. It is hard work and difficult to keep motivated.
- Paid under minimum wage for the type of work done (sometimes).
- Amount of pay. Some clients that can afford to pay for the service.
- Paying for coffee.
- The amount of money given for the work done.
- Wages.
- When some people (clients) are very mean and nasty and put down some of the girls because of their weight, race or colour.
- Paying for coffee.
- Nothing.
- The money.
- Travelling on the bus.
- Work with the bad people.

TRAINEE EVALUATION

#4 WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- Not knowing where I go until the last minute (every morning) far distances of travel.
- When you work in dirty place.
- The wage paid for the workers is too small compared to the cost of living in Winnipeg.
- Having to cancel jobs due to a lack of staff.
- The starting wage. I don't think \$280/2 weeks is enough. Some of the work we do is hard work and I think we should be paid more.
- The money.
- The pay isn't too good.
- Pay irregularities.
- Wages.
- Rate of pay, too few hours, should operate a 6 day week.
- It would be nice if the pay was scale or a bit more.
- Like job very good.
- Some of the people I get.
- Coming in office every morning.
- The wage.

TRAINEE EVALUATION

#5 DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- Give raises.
- How about a raise.
- More of a dress code, more necessary supplies.
- To allow the good workers to stay as long as they want.
- I think they should send people to the same places so we know what to do when we get here.
- Send us to the same client each week. Expand the workers so they can get someone every two weeks.
- Keep the wage in tune with the cost of living.
- Give out the work sheets once a week, let us leave from our homes instead of having to come to the office every day.
- Many of the senior citizens would appreciate having one person to clean their home, they like the idea that they get to know you, and you know where to find their cleaning supplies, you also don't have to take time for instruction because you are familiar with their home. They appreciate that you understand one another.
- Small pay raise.
- Half hour lunch break instead of one hour.
- More pay.
- I think the quality of work done is important also and that it should be calculated and deserves a response from the employer. In a normal job situation workers would receive a raise for outstanding work constantly. I think simple acknowledgement in our case would be fine. May keep good work good and bad work may get better.
- Provide service only to seniors who need help, (better screening for those who qualify or not).
- When doing referrals do them in person not over the phone.
- Not pay for coffee.
- Make the work permanent.
- No - I think its very good.
- A couple more workers, a day off once a month or half a day, also it would be nice to have all the dispatchers go out to lunch.
- Make the dispatcher job permanent.
- Stop charging office people for coffee.
- A little better pay, its hard to survive on the money.
- Just dress properly, take shower, clean every day.
- Get some of same people, closer areas.
- The ladies would like the same people all of the time.

TRAINEE EVALUATION

#5 DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- The wages paid to the workers is not enough to last two weeks (plus rent) and suggest that this increasement will improve the project. Expanding more information to the general public, private projects may also be helpful to this project if they have enough information about it.. etc..
- To hire staff permanently and a better wage.
- I think the project is excellent and can't think of any thing to improve it.
- Better wages.
- Full 8 hours, minimum wage salary, company or contract jobs (painters, construction etc.).
- Workers should be paid for 8 hour pay rather than 7 hour pay per day.
- More pay.
- Should operate 6 day week, train employees on good manners.
- Get more people on the project from assistance and maybe some media involvement in showing the public that people do want to work because I do believe the project has been successful for a number of individuals.
- More pay.
- The work could be easier if we work with partners.
- I like to have first dibs on City jobs, more money.
- More money.

Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or behaved. Using the scale below, please fill in the blank beside each question with the number representing how often you have felt this way during the past week.

| Rarely or none of the time (Less than 1 day) | Some or a little of the time (1-2 days) | Occasionally or a moderate amount of the time (3-4 days) | Most or all of the time (5-7 days) |
|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

During the past week:

- _____ 1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me.
- _____ 2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.
- _____ 3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends.
- _____ 4. I felt that I was just as good as other people.
- _____ 5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.
- _____ 6. I felt depressed.
- _____ 7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.
- _____ 8. I felt hopeful about the future.
- _____ 9. I thought my life had been a failure.
- _____ 10. I felt fearful.
- _____ 11. My sleep was restless.
- _____ 12. I was happy.
- _____ 13. I talked less than usual.
- _____ 14. I felt lonely.
- _____ 15. People were unfriendly.
- _____ 16. I enjoyed life.
- _____ 17. I had crying spells.
- _____ 18. I felt sad.
- _____ 19. I felt that people dislike me.
- _____ 20. I could not get "going."

CENTER FOR EPIDEMIOLOGI
STUDIES-DEPRESSED MOOD SC
(CES-D)

Please circle one number on each scale below to indicate to what extent you agree with each statement.

I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

I feel I have a number of good qualities.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

I am able to do things as well as most other people.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

I take a positive attitude toward myself.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

I wish I could have more respect for myself.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

I certainly feel useless at times.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

At times I think I am no good at all.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

(RSE)

**COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT
CUSTOMER EVALUATION**

1. HAS THE PROJECT HELPED YOU? (CIRCLE)

NOT AT ALL

VERY HELPFUL

1

2

3

4

5

2. HOW HAS THE PROJECT HELPED YOU?

3. HOW LONG HAVE YOU USED THE PROJECT?

4. WHAT KIND OF WORK IS DONE FOR YOU BY THE PROJECT WORKERS?

5. WHAT COULD YOU AFFORD TO PAY FOR THE SERVICE?

6. IF YOU OWN YOUR HOME, WOULD YOU CONTINUE TO LIVE IN IT IF THIS SERVICE WAS NOT AVAILABLE TO YOU?

7. WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE PROJECT?

8. WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE PROJECT?

9. DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE PROJECT?

10. ARE YOU AGED 65 OR OLDER?

CUSTOMER EVALUATION

#2 HOW HAS COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT HELPED YOU?

- Keeps you independent & able to live alone.
- Can't do housekeeping myself.
- Can't look after house or yard by myself.
- Let me stay in my own apartment.
- Helps me when I am sick.
- Helps me stay in my own home.
- I can't bend to wash floors.
- I have bad back, ulcer and arthritis in both knees and can't bend. I am a widow on low income and could not stay in my lovely small home, I would have to go to nursing home. I am happy as I can look for myself.
- Helped me with upkeep of my house. Also my spirits having somebody helping improved - its nice to know that people out there to help you.
- They do things I can no longer do myself.
- Doing chores I am unable to do because of arthritis.
- I can't do it because arthritis in knees & wrist.
- I've had back injuries over the years and consequently a great help.
- I have arthritis "bad" and am limited in what I can do.
- I haven't much use of my left arm and as a result the help I get is most appreciated.
- I am reaching 90 years of age and not able to do cleaning the way it should be done.
- Can't bend, got a sore leg.
- By doing work I cannot do myself.
- I can't clean.
- Have heart trouble.
- With my stroke and spouses hip problem very helpful.
- I can't shovel snow - and it is hard to do yard work.
- I am just recovering from a heart attack and disabled in walking. I love my home and like to stay here and I can do it with your help.
- By keeping my yard clean which I cannot maintain. I am 77 yrs. & cannot do the work anymore. I did it myself for 44 years. My husband passed away in 1985.
- Well I'm a widow and I can't cut it. I live alone - neighbours won't do anything for a person.
- I can't do anything myself and have no family of my own and no husband.
- In many ways they do the work I can't do also what I can't afford to pay.
- I am not able to do most of the jobs around the house. I just would not do without the help.
- Less strain on my back - also attend to my wife's needs (bed redden & wheel chair)

CUSTOMER EVALUATION

#2 HOW HAS COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT HELPED YOU?

- I'll be 74 in Sept/92 - not in best health & wish I could do it.
- I couldn't stay in my house without your help.
- It lets me stay in my house.
- I am 88 years old and want to remain in my own home forever. I think this project is helping me to do so.
- Be independent of family and stay in my own home.
- Having a serious cancer operation I just could not do it.
- Since I am physically handicapped (crutches) I can't do it myself.
- With inflation it is becoming more costly and difficult to look after a house.
- I am 81 year old senior citizen - had open heart surgery one month ago.
- Has helped me stay in my home.
- Has helped me get my garage in the best shape its been since my husband's death.
- My husband is a kidney patient unable to work or do grass cutting so it is very helpful.
- Since my husband is disabled with a stroke it is very helpful to me.
- Unable to do work because of stroke.
- Need my energy and time for other priorities.
- I am a widow and I have a bad heart and arthritis and they have help a lot.
- I can't do this work myself. I am a widower and I am 70 years old. I would have to move if I didn't have this help.
- We are unfortunately both handicapped.
- If it wasn't for the services I would have to have sold my house. As I cannot do any yard work or some of the house chores.
- I am handicapped, 2 bionic knees, has helped to live in my own home.
- It has helped me to stay in my own house.
- I have had a triple bi-pass and a severe case of asthma.
- Couldn't live here without the help - can't afford to hire people.
- I am allergic to grass.
- First of all I am over 65. I could not stay in my house otherwise.
- I am a widow and have respiratory problems.

CUSTOMER EVALUATION

#7 WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- Helpful. (most common response)
- The workers.
- They help me keep it clean.
- Good work.
- Enables me to be a bit independent.
- Pleasant ladies.
- People you send are all good workers and a pleasure to be with.
- If an appointment is made it is usually fulfilled.
- The way some of them do the work - some don't bother how they work.
- The willingness of the girls who come to do what I need done.
- No cost.
- Its a great thing for people who really need it.
- The security of knowing that once a month I have someone to help me otherwise I couldn't do it on my own.
- Courteous and friendly ladies that do the work.
- Having work I can't do myself done without charge.
- Our apartment gets cleaned.
- Helps maintain the yard.
- You can get the same person to do this.
- Everything - I am dependent on it.
- The good and valuable service.
- My wife died 2 years ago. I am disabled, one leg, one eye. I would not live in my home without this service.
- Very dependable.
- The fellows that do the work are very good.
- They're very polite and always willing to do what needs to be done.
- Do cleaning we can't do.
- Friendly people.
- Making it possible to have my lawn looking neat & making it possible for me to venture out in the winter.
- Work is done, friendly & helpful, free service.
- It is a little easier to find help with the nice office staff there is now.
- The boys are very nice and polite.
- It lets me stay in my home.
- The people you have sent out have been very cooperative & try to please as much as possible.
- Its there for us who really need it.

CUSTOMER EVALUATION

#7 WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- They try to oblige.
- It does not take long to get the service.
- Knowing the service is available, it makes it much easier to cope.
- The courteous people, and most jobs well done.
- The work has always been satisfactory.
- Good workers and gentleman - very polite.
- Cheerful Worker.
- Free Services.
- Just knowing they are there for me.
- Enables me to carry on in my home and gives work to young people.
- I appreciate the work getting done instead of becoming frustrated at myself for not being able to do it.
- Caliber of workers sent, lack of charge.
- The work I can not do is done.
- The people are very nice.
- I like to have my yard as neat as my neighbours.
- It makes work for other young men who want to be working.
- The workers for the most part are polite and obliging.
- They have never refused to help me.
- They always send somebody when we phone and always do good work.
- I live on a limited income so not paying is the best feature. I also like that people are being given a chance to learn job skills.
- Most of them are good workers, most of them are prompt.
- The attitude of the men and the work is nicely done.
- So that I can enjoy my home and not have to move.
- I appreciate all that is done to help me live in my home.

CUSTOMER EVALUATION

#8 WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- Would like you to come more regularly.
- Like everything.
- Have to wait too long sometimes.
- Having a different girl every time.
- Too bad we can't have the same girl every time. Some help is excellent & other help leaves a lot to be desired.
- Few I had need more training in cleaning.
- Yard work is not offered enough.
- Don't send the same girl.
- The fact a different girl is sent each time. Most of the girls are pleasant & cooperative.
- I like the least when some girls don't clean properly or when I phone the office for booking appointment the girl front desk book appointment for me for certain day and sometimes she doesn't send me the girl she says the girl is sick.
- Phoning always - there should be a weekly schedule for each home.
- Some people need it more often than every three weeks.
- Waiting time before you get some work done.
- When they promise someone and then they don't turn up.
- The cancellations.
- When I phone appointments not kept or if someone does turn up they are full of negativeness.
- Sometimes not very reliable - no one shows up, especially snow clearing.
- Not always having service available when required.
- Disappointed on days when no one appears.
- Having to wait with appointments.
- They don't send the same person every time.
- One has to wait too long for the services especially when it comes to cutting grass.
- People who take too many tea breaks.
- Sometimes have to wait a little long to get job done.
- I wish I would have them once a month.
- You have to wait weeks sometime for help.
- When someone is booked to come on a certain day and then they do not show. It is extremely irritating.

CUSTOMER EVALUATION

#8 WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- Sometimes they are careless.
- We need more help.
- Busy line.
- There aren't enough workers to go around & I wish one person could be assigned to my case instead of a different person coming all the time.
- Phoning to reschedule for appointments.
- Some of the fellows don't know the difference between flowers and weeds.
- Having to almost plead for this necessary service at times.
- Some of the workers are very dumb and need instructions very badly.
- The way they cut the grass they have no idea.
- The inconsistency in quality of work and availability of workers. I need my walks shovelled when it snows not two weeks later. Same with grass mowing.
- Difficulty in getting a good worker to return.
- Some of the people do a poor job, most are good.
- I need transportation both ways.
- Some workers are not as thorough as others, but for most part are good.

CUSTOMER EVALUATION

#9 SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- Would like the same person if possible.
- If you could send some of the good workers for repeat help.
- It is fine the way it is.
- If it could be arranged to send out the same girl each time on a regular basis. And a little more training given to the girls ahead of time eg. put things back where they were. this is very difficult for the girls when they are sent to a different place each time.
- Train the girls - if the girls aren't experienced in house work you can't expect them to do a proper job.
- You seem to have everything under control.
- The only thing I would like to know if I could be sure of having someone each month.
- Send me the same girl.
- Giving the girls some basic training and assigning the same girl whenever possible.
- You should hire more girls for this service.
- It would be nice if you could send the same girl instead of a new one each time.
- Should be every two weeks.
- It would be nice if the workers were informed how to clean the stove.
- Should be a weekly schedule for each home.
- Nice if you could have the same girl each time instead of changing all the time.
- To have a fixed day as to when help will be there, eg. we have called to have the lawn raked in april but it is June and they haven't come.
- Make a list of the people on this program send in a doctor's referral.
- Have the grass cut more often.
- A few years ago the office would inform us by phone a day or so previous to sending help, as records were kept. Now one has to call the office and almost plead for a worker.
- Charleswood a long way by bus - find speedier transportation.
- Have someone come every two weeks or if needed sooner.
- Have a day assigned to you that someone will be coming to do your grass or any other job that needs to be done instead of phoning every time.

CUSTOMER EVALUATION

#9 SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROJECT?

- Send out the same workers and give us more than once a month for light housekeeping - more like once every two weeks sounds good.
- Automatic booking.
- Send two people out to do wall washing at the same time it wouldn't take so long.
- I would like to get more young people especially during the summer time.
- Do away with Home Care, and so we can have the service more often.
- Be polite to your customers.
- Perhaps check and make sure the worker does arrive on time and finishes the job.
- Could be easier to get through over phone to Community Home Services.
- More workers would help.
- Its too bad we have to wait over two weeks to get a helper when we call for help.
- A definite time arranged.
- Attitude needs to be improved with some ex. streaked ceiling "can't be better".
- Hire more workers to help people who cannot do it themselves.
- When fellows shovel snow - dig a little deeper.
- If this service were given on a more systematic basis - not having to wait sometimes for two weeks after request.
- If I could get someone to cut grass and know what to do, instead of you having to tell them - some of them are not bad, but you have to watch them.
- I would like to see the same workers assigned once a week to go to the same clients as long as they are with the project. I would also like to see workers, put thru training before being sent out. This is why I no longer use house cleaning as I had to train each one each time - they didn't know what to do.
- A person should be able to contract to get the service on a regular basis ie. once a week and to get the worker of choice who turns out to be reliable.
- Send people that can do a neat job, use a weed eater and pull weeds.
- If we could get the same person if of course we liked him or her.
- There are times when I need the help and must wait one week. Please hire more workers if at all possible.

March 29, 1993

Evaluation Committee

Agenda

- I. Introduction. - purpose of committee**
- II. Summary of conclusions**
 - a) Trainee summary**
 - b) Customer summary**
- III. Recommendations**
- IV. Additional conclusions, recommendations and discussion.**
- V. Evaluation form.**

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SURVEY

1. TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROVIDED YOU WITH USEFUL INFORMATION?

NOT AT ALL

VERY MUCH

1

2

3

(4)

5

2. DO YOU THINK THE PARTICIPATION OF THIS COMMITTEE INCREASED THE LIKELYHOOD THE EVALUATION WOULD BE RELEVANT TO THE DEPARTMENT?

NOT AT ALL

VERY MUCH

1

2

3

4

(5)

3. WHAT AREAS OF THE EVALUATION HAD THE GREATEST IMPACT UPON YOU?

Hearing the comments of the seniors + trainees during the data to life

4. WHAT AREAS OF THE EVALUATION COULD BE IMPROVED?

More frequent meetings throughout the written process

5. PLEASE LIST ANY PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS NOT DISCUSSED.

Can't think of any

6. IN YOUR OPINION RATE THE UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION FOR THE SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT.

NOT USEFUL

VERY USEFUL

1

2

3

4

(5)

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SURVEY

1. TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROVIDED YOU WITH USEFUL INFORMATION?

NOT AT ALL

VERY MUCH

1

2

3

4

5

2. DO YOU THINK THE PARTICIPATION OF THIS COMMITTEE INCREASED THE LIKELYHOOD THE EVALUATION WOULD BE RELEVANT TO THE DEPARTMENT?

NOT AT ALL

VERY MUCH

1

2

3

4

5

3. WHAT AREAS OF THE EVALUATION HAD THE GREATEST IMPACT UPON YOU?

- STATISTICAL INFO.
- CLIENT COMMENTS
- CUSTOMER COMMENTS
- info on depression

4. WHAT AREAS OF THE EVALUATION COULD BE IMPROVED?

- ~~Larger samples to be studied~~

5. PLEASE LIST ANY PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS NOT DISCUSSED.

Discussed at March 29 Session

6. IN YOUR OPINION RATE THE UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION FOR THE SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT.

NOT USEFUL

VERY USEFUL

1

2

3

4

5

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SURVEY

1. TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY HOME SERVICES PROVIDED YOU WITH USEFUL INFORMATION?

NOT AT ALL

VERY MUCH

1

2

3

4

5

2. DO YOU THINK THE PARTICIPATION OF THIS COMMITTEE INCREASED THE LIKELYHOOD THE EVALUATION WOULD BE RELEVANT TO THE DEPARTMENT?

NOT AT ALL

VERY MUCH

1

2

3

4

5

3. WHAT AREAS OF THE EVALUATION HAD THE GREATEST IMPACT UPON YOU?

*Systematic review of the program
feedback from employees, managers, customers*

4. WHAT AREAS OF THE EVALUATION COULD BE IMPROVED?

The complexity of the testing conducted

5. PLEASE LIST ANY PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS NOT DISCUSSED.

as discussed.

6. IN YOUR OPINION RATE THE UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION FOR THE SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT.

NOT USEFUL

VERY USEFUL

1

2

3

4

5