

Evaluation of the Summer Career Placements (SCP) Program

**Evaluation and Data Development
Strategic Policy
Human Resources Development Canada**

November 1997

**SP-AH052E-11-97
aussi disponible en français**

Acknowledgement

This study was conducted by Goss Gilroy Inc., under the direction of and for the Evaluation and Data Development (EDD) Directorate of the Department of Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC). The team that Goss Gilroy Inc. put together was largely responsible for the development of the methodological approach, the collection of information and data and the analysis of the data and information collected.

EDD officials would like to thank all those who contributed to the study, especially the Summer Career Placements Program clients who spent a considerable amount of time sharing information about their summer experience. We would also like to thank all of the individuals who participated by giving an interview to the evaluators, for similarly taking the time to provide the qualitative information necessary to provide depth to a process evaluation.

We are grateful to the managers and staff at the national headquarters Youth Initiatives Directorate who assisted in the completion of the evaluation.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Management Response	v
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 The Summer Career Placements (SCP) Program	2
1.2 The Context of the Evaluation	3
1.3 Evaluation Issues	5
1.4 Evaluation Methodology	5
2.0 Program Description	7
2.1 Program Objectives	7
2.2 Employer Profile	7
2.2.1 Sector	7
2.2.2 Size	8
2.2.3 Summer Work Load	8
2.2.4 Student Employment	9
2.2.5 Financial Assistance	11
2.2.6 Previous Summer	11
2.3 Participant Profile	11
2.3.1 Age and Gender	11
2.3.2 Equity Group Status	12
2.3.3 Sector	12
2.3.4 September 1995	14
2.3.5 Education Plans	15
2.3.6 Field of Study	16
2.4 Program Expenditures	16
2.4.1 Provincial Expenditure Profile	16
2.4.2 Program Expenditures	18
3.0 Evaluation Findings	21
3.1 Career Development	21
3.1.1 Career Choice	21
3.1.2 Preference	21
3.1.3 Work Versus Career	23
3.1.4 New Skills	27
3.1.5 Future Career Opportunities	28
3.1.6 Job Opportunities	31
3.1.7 Financial Support	32
3.2 Incrementality	33
3.2.1 Job Creation	33
3.2.2 Other Summer Students	36
3.2.3 Importance of Subsidy	36

3.2.4	Displacement	37
3.2.5	In the Absence of the Subsidy	38
3.2.6	Improving Incrementality	38
3.3	Program Efficiency	40
3.3.1	Announcement	40
3.3.2	Budget Allocations	42
3.3.3	Marketing	42
3.3.4	Application Preparation	45
3.3.5	Application Assessment	47
3.3.6	Participant Recruitment	48
3.3.7	Employer Administration Costs	51
3.3.8	Monitoring	53
3.3.9	Claims Payment	54
3.3.10	Roles and Responsibilities	55
3.4	Program Satisfaction	56
3.4.1	Participants' Satisfaction With the Program	56
3.4.2	Employers' Satisfaction With the Program	58
3.5	Continuing Need	59
3.5.1	Participant Perspective	59
3.5.2	Employer Perspective	60
3.5.3	HRDC Perspective	61
3.6	Alternatives	61
3.6.1	Same Subsidy for Large and Small Employers	61
3.6.2	Flat Rate — Same Subsidy for All Sectors	62
3.6.3	Raising or Lowering the Subsidy	64
3.6.4	Other Alternatives	65
3.7	Provincial Summary	65
4.0	Conclusions	69
4.1	Work Experience	69
4.1.1	Career Development	69
4.1.2	Incrementality	69
4.1.3	Future Job Opportunities	70
4.1.4	Sector	70
4.1.5	Education	71
4.2	Program Efficiency	71
4.2.1	Timeliness	71
4.2.2	Marketing	72
4.2.3	Recruitment	72
4.2.4	Employer Costs	73
4.2.5	Monitoring	73
4.2.6	Roles and Responsibilities	73
4.2.7	Alternatives	73
4.3	Profiles	74
4.3.1	Employers	74
4.3.2	Participants	74
4.4	Program Satisfaction	75
4.5	Continuing Need	75

Executive Summary

On March 12, 1996, Human Resources Development Minister Douglas Young unveiled details of the Government of Canada's expanded support for summer job creation, and launched Student Summer Job Action. The program is designed to help secondary and post-secondary students land important career-related jobs. The **Summer Career Placements (SCP) Program**, which focuses on students by providing career-related work experience to in-school youth during summer months, is one of the five components of Student Summer Job Action for 1996. The SCP Program is a government and employer partnership that encourages student hiring and work experience leading to future careers. It is considered to be the main engine of the Government of Canada's student job creation. SCP was expected to create 45,000 summer jobs in 1996 with a total budget of \$90 million.

SCP provides wage subsidies to private, public (educational institutions, hospitals and municipalities) and not-for profit sector employers to create career-related summer jobs for students. The range of subsidy maximums are dependent on a number of factors (employer sector, provincial/territorial adult minimum wage rate per hour, related overhead costs, whether student hired has disabilities, and job accommodation requirements).

The purpose of this evaluation was to review the implementation of the SCP program by provinces and nationally to determine if SCP is achieving its objectives and is being implemented as planned.

The following methodologies were applied to the study:

- **Document review** relating to the SCP Program in particular, as well as to pre-existing summer job creation programs (e.g., SEED, Challenge '85, Opportunities for Youth, etc.);
- **Key informant interviews** with:
 - HRDC staff, in the regions and at HQ, responsible for the design and delivery of the SCP. These included interviews with SCP Coordinators (11), HRCC managers (7: 4 rural, 3 urban), manager of 1 HRCC for Students, and key NHQ staff (2); and
 - a sample of 19 employers representing each of the three main sectors (at least 6 from each category), i.e., private, public and not for profit.
- **A case study** of Labatts (included in the sample of employers to be interviewed) plus two of the charities it helps fund; and

- **A representative survey of 1000 employers and 658 participating students** to examine the impact of SCP in providing students who are returning to school with career-oriented summer employment and assisting with the school-to-work transition.

Findings and Conclusions

The following summarizes our main findings and conclusions.

Work Experience

Career Development

- SCP provides slightly more “career opportunity” and financial support than “work experience”.
- Both participants and employers felt strongly that SCP participants gained new skills.

Incrementality

- While the information collected suggests that the program has resulted in the creation of many new jobs, incrementality can be weakened — for a number of reasons — both with respect to the job created and with respect to the job opportunity.
- Excluding employers who would not have hired a student if the wage subsidy had not been available (69.0%), almost two-fifths (37.2%) of the remainder said that they would not have paid the same wages to their student if they had not received any assistance from the SCP (presumably they would have paid less). This compares with almost three-fifths (57.3%) who would have paid the same wages.

Future Job Opportunities

- The majority (71.3%) of participants feel that their summer job will help them get full-time work in their chosen field compared to 19.7% who do not think it will help (9.0% are unsure or don’t know).
- Almost two-thirds (63.0%) of the employers surveyed said that their organization intended to re-hire their SCP student at a later date.

Sector

- Encouraging private sector participation this year may have weakened the overall work experience — both career development and incrementality — of the program.

Education

- Post-secondary students had a more favorable perception of the program’s benefits to them than high school students.

Program Efficiency

Timeliness

- Employers and staff commented on the lateness of the Ministerial Announcement. They suggest that a “regular” announcement — taking place no later than a week or two before spring break every year — would go a long way towards helping businesses and students plan. Other HRDC programs are not hindered by this.

Marketing

- Very few new employers enter the SCP program as most HRDC staff do not formally market the program.

Recruitment

- About two-fifths (40.4%) of the employers used the HRCCs for Students to hire a student and a few of them (2.8%) felt that the HRCC’s screening of the students could be improved.

Employer Costs

- Employers do not incur any significant administrative costs as a consequence of the current wage subsidy process.

Monitoring

- The regions displayed divergent views on monitoring ranging from 10% to 100%.

Roles and Responsibilities

- While both employers and HRDC staff noted that the roles and responsibilities of the various HRDC players were clearly understood, HRDC staff expressed some concerns about the role of the Members of Parliament.

Alternatives

- In general, both employers and HRDC staff held mixed views about the need to change the wage subsidy.

Profiles

Employers

- More than half (51.6%) of the employers using the SCP came from the non-profit sector. Another third (31.0%) came from the private sector while the remaining fifth (17.4%) came from the public sector.
- Almost two-thirds (62.7%) of the employers surveyed hired just one student under the SCP this summer. Another fifth (21.3%) hired two students under the program while a tenth (10.5%) hired three or four. Of the remaining 5.4%, almost half (2.5%) employed five or six students.

Participants

- Almost two-thirds (65.9%) of the participants are female compared to one-third (34.1%) male.
- A little more than two-fifths (41.2%) of the participants are between 15 and 19 years of age, almost half (46.6%) are 20 to 24 years of age, while the remaining 12.0% are more than 24 years of age.
- Some 71.0% of participants reported attending a post-secondary institution in September 1995 compared to 25.6% who attended high school. About 3.3% of the participants did neither.
- Some 92.4% of SCP participants will be returning to school in September 1996. Of the 7.3% not returning, almost half (48.4%) will be looking for work instead.
- Some 4.2% of participants have disabilities. About 6.4% are aboriginal and 6.7% are members of a visible minority.

Program Satisfaction

- The vast majority (90.7%) of SCP students strongly liked or liked their summer job.
- Almost all employers (94.9%) were fully satisfied with the overall performance of their SCP student.

Continuing Need

- Almost every participant thought that a government program that tries to prepare students for full-time jobs through summer work experience was a good idea.
- Almost every employer (98.6%) would be interested in applying should the SCP, or a similar program, be available next summer.

Management Response

The Summer Career Placements program (SCPP) is a component of Student Summer Job Action and was subject to an evaluation in the Fall of 1996. The results of the evaluation indicated strong support from both participating students and the employer community for the program. HRDC plans to continue to support Summer Career Placements as part of the new Youth Employment Strategy (YES) announced in February 1997.

Although the evaluation indicated the concept of employers as partners with HRDC did not appear evident to employers, this was not a primary focus of the program nor was it promoted as such. The program for the Summer of 1998 will, however, see a partnership focus with the 30th Anniversary celebrations. New promotional material presently under development builds on partnerships.

The observation and concerns raised in the evaluation around the annual announcement of the Summer Program are valid, and have proven somewhat problematic in the past. The YES made a three year commitment which will enable Human Resource Centres of Canada (HRCC) to better plan and partner in their communities. The fact remains that February has traditionally been Youth month during which the Summer promotion begins. In the past the announcement had been tied to budget appropriations. However, with the new strategy, this is no longer the case.

The focus on incrementality and small business certainly does have merit. With the planning process in place at the local level, and in co-operation with the provinces, the delivery of Summer Career Placements has been and will continue to provide a key opportunity for the students to receive that first exposure to a career related work experience. During the Summer of 1997, the concept of students self-marketing to employers proved very successful. This is a model we will continue to support and promote.

Observations on the participation rate of equity groups are a concern for program delivery within HRDC. In 1997, proactive measures for target group representation were introduced for other Youth Employment programs (Youth Internship Canada / Youth Service Canada); however, the Summer Career Placements program is employer-driven and self identification by target group members remains problematic.

In early September of 1997, a National Summer Programs workshop was held with all regional youth consultants. Discussion on the monitoring requirements for Summer Career Placements supported the evaluation findings. Basic agreement was reached that each year a minimum of 20% of Summer Career Placements agreements will be monitored. At the same workshop, there was discussion on additional enhancements, such as operating a year round program, reviewing the rate of reimbursement to employers, and options around capacity to deliver. The Terms and Conditions for the new YES provide the flexibility required to make these

enhancements. The Youth Initiatives Directorate will provide guidance to the Regions to ensure program integrity should these enhancements be endorsed.

The recommendation that SCPP “be the object of a longer term impact evaluation” has also been adopted, and plans are in place to incorporate the initial findings and subsequent follow-up in future evaluations.

1.0 Introduction

On March 12, 1996, Human Resources Development Minister Douglas Young unveiled details of the Government of Canada's expanded support for summer job creation, and launched Student Summer Job Action. The program is designed to help secondary and post-secondary students land important career-related jobs. In launching these initiatives, Minister Young said:

“Youth employment is a priority for this government. This additional funding recognizes the importance of helping young people to gain experience in the workplace and will enable thousands more young people to work this summer ... Our new investment in summer employment for youth will open doors to young workers, their employers and our country. It also underlines our challenge to Canada's business community to do their part in creating opportunities for Canada's young people.”¹

The Summer Career Placements (SCP) Program, which focuses on students by providing career-related work experience to in-school youth during summer months, is one of the five components of Student Summer Job Action for 1996. The other four program components are Student Business Loans, Human Resource Centres Canada for Students (HRCC-S), Partners in Promoting Summer Employment, and Native/Black Internship Program. The HRCC-S were previously known as Canada Employment Centres (CECs) for Students

The purpose of this evaluation was to review the implementation of the SCP program by provinces and nationally to determine if SCP is achieving its objectives and is being implemented as planned.

The structure of the report is as follows:

- **Section 1.0** introduces the reports and briefly describes the SCP, the context of the evaluation, the evaluation issues, and the methodologies employed;
- **Section 2.0** contains the profiles of employers and participating students, as well as details of program expenditures;
- **Section 3.0** contains the evaluation findings related to program design and delivery; dependency on government funding; impact of subsidy; types of employment; value of employment; perceptions of the program; and incrementality; and
- **Section 4.0** contains our conclusions in relation to the nine issue categories.

¹ Human Resources Development Canada. *Human Resources Development Minister Launches Student Summer Job Action*. March 12, 1996, Press Release 96-19.

1.1 The Summer Career Placements (SCP) Program

The **Summer Career Placements (SCP) Program** is a government and employer partnership that encourages student hiring and work experience leading to future careers. It is considered to be the main engine of the Government of Canada's student job creation. SCP was expected to create 45,000 summer jobs in 1996 with a total budget of \$90 million.

The Summer Career Placements Program provides wage subsidies to private, public (educational institutions, hospitals and municipalities) and not-for profit sector employers to create career-related summer jobs for students. The range of subsidy maximums are dependent on a number of factors (employer sector, provincial/territorial adult minimum wage rate per hour, related overhead costs, whether student hired has disabilities, and job accommodation requirements). In particular, under SCP:

- Private sector employers are provided a wage subsidy of up to 50% of the provincial/territorial adult minimum wage paid to a maximum of \$2.50 per hour;
- Public sector employers are eligible to receive a contribution of up to \$4.25 per hour;
- Not-for-profit sector employers are eligible to receive a contribution of up to 100% of the applicable provincial/territorial wage rate per hour. In addition, they are eligible to receive up to a maximum of \$100 per participant for related overhead costs;
- Employers, who hire a student with disabilities, are eligible to receive a contribution of up to 100 % of the applicable provincial/territorial adult minimum wage rate per hour. In addition, funds may be made available for job accommodation requirements to a maximum of \$3,000 per student.

The maximum program contribution to one employer is \$100,000.

Proposed jobs must meet the following criteria:

- Employment must be for between 30 to 40 hours per week for 6 to 16 consecutive weeks. Employment of students with disabilities may be eligible for greater subsidies and part-time work;
- Employment must provide students with the necessary supervision, learning and work experience;
- Jobs must pay at least the provincial/territorial minimum hourly wage and the work must be incremental;
- Jobs must not displace or replace existing employers or volunteers, employees on lay-off, employees absent due to labour management dispute or employees on vacation;

- Employment must not provide personal services to an employer (e.g. a gardener, maid, chauffeur, baby-sitter, etc.);
- Jobs created must not be jobs for which funding will be received or claimed from any other government source, except where such funding is provided pursuant to a federal/provincial agreement designed to harmonize federal and provincial job creation programs; and
- Employment would not be created without the financial assistance provided under the SCP agreement.

Eligible employers in all three sectors, who would not be able to create jobs without funding, are invited to submit a proposal to the program. Proposals are judged on how well they prepare students for the labour market and the type of supervision, learning and work experience they provide. Employers gain through hiring high school, college and university students with relevant job skills, while students benefit by gaining experience in their chosen fields.

Participants must be registered full-time students during the preceding academic year who intend to return to school on a full-time basis in the next academic year, and must be legally entitled to work in Canada. They cannot have another full-time summer job.

1.2 The Context of the Evaluation

The federal government has been involved in summer employment for students since 1971, as exemplified by the Opportunities for Youth Program of the Secretary of State. While initial efforts were successful in creating employment, they were criticized for the lack of correlation with the students' career or study interests. This was due to a funding strategy which directed funds primarily towards the non-profit sector for the creation of "labour intensive community betterment" projects.

In 1985, the federal government introduced the Summer Employment Experience Development (SEED) Program, which stressed the creation of incremental employment and provided wage subsidies to various employer groups who created the positions. A subsequent evaluation (November 1985) of SEED found that, as the employment created was mostly incremental, SEED contributed to a reduction in high seasonal unemployment, while maximizing the long term potential of students placed. In addition, employers benefited through the reduced wage cost, the opportunity to assess the value of the work of the student and whether or not it contributes to the profitability or enhancement of the firm's operations, and the opportunity to assess the potential of the participant for future hiring upon graduation (and also save the related training costs). Students benefited through the acquisition of career-related employment, the opportunity to find out about a particular career field and examine their fit with the skills necessary, and earning money for the subsequent school year's expenses.

It is estimated that approximately 250,000² students enter the workforce each year and this evaluation took place during a period of growing public concern about the problems encountered by youth in entering the job market. In a recent opinion poll³, it was found that, among parents, educators, business people, and youth themselves, a majority said that they wanted to see every effort made to help young Canadians ready themselves for their first job. In their opinion, career-related summer employment can increase first job readiness and reduce the impact of the job-experience paradox, easing the school-to-work transition.

This concern was highlighted in a Task Force commissioned by the HRDC Minister requesting federal Members of Parliament in May of 1996 to consult with Canadians and provide findings that would help shape a National Youth Strategy. The Minister asked the Task Force to find out what was happening to youth in the job market, and to probe some of the root causes of the apparent stall in youth employment. The Task Force report, *Take on the Future: Canadian Youth in the World of Work*, confirmed that Canadians view youth employment as a national priority and that decisive action is needed to improve employment opportunities for Canadian youth. The Task Force heard that youth today are concerned about the availability of jobs, their preparation for work force entry, and the expectations of employers. Youth of all ages reported that they were frequently trapped in “the job-experience paradox” - they need a job to get experience and they need experience to get a job. The Task Force report made ten recommendations, a number of which are met by the SCP Program. In particular:

- The development of *partnerships* between government and business, non-governmental and community groups and youth themselves;
- The acquisition of *information* regarding career choices through on-the-job exposure;
- *Private sector leadership* in the creation of youth employment;
- Exposure to *new technologies*, through some of the on-the-job training opportunities; and
- Additional provisions for *youth at risk* (e.g., students with disabilities).

² Human Resources Development Canada. *Agenda: Jobs and Growth. Improving Social Security in Canada, A Discussion Paper*. October, 1994 (p. 66).

³ *Take on the Future: Canadian Youth in the World of Work*, Report - Ministerial Task Force on Youth, June 15, 1996, p.3.

1.3 Evaluation Issues

The terms of reference identified 28 evaluation issues grouped into 9 categories:

- Program design and delivery;
- Employer/participants characteristics;
- Dependency on government funding;
- Impact of subsidy;
- Types of employment;
- Value of employment;
- Perceptions of the program;
- Incrementality; and
- Other.

Evaluation findings related to the characteristics of employers and participants are provided in Chapter 2, while the evaluation findings related to the remaining issues are provided in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, we provide conclusions in relation to the nine issue categories.

1.4 Evaluation Methodology

The methodology applied to the evaluation has been described in detail in a Methodology Report dated September 16, 1996. In brief, the following methodologies were applied to the study:

- **Document review** relating to the SCP Program in particular, as well as to pre-existing summer job creation programs (e.g., SEED, Challenge '85, Opportunities for Youth, etc.);
- **Key informant interviews** with:
 - HRDC staff, in the regions and at HQ, responsible for the design and delivery of the SCP. These included interviews with SCP Coordinators (11), HRCC managers (7: 4 rural, 3 urban), manager of 1 HRCC for Students, and key NHQ staff (2); and
 - a sample of 19 employers representing each of the three main sectors (at least 6 from each category), i.e., private, public and not for profit.

Key informant interviews involve small numbers of people. For example, there are only 7 HRCC managers. As a result, the inferences are purely qualitative in nature. As such they do not lend themselves to quantitative analysis. However, when key informants repeat the same message and when it echos the results of the employers survey, it is important to convey the information through the use of words such as “many,” “most,” etc. As these are somewhat imprecise terms, the following guidance is suggested. “All” means 100%, “almost all” or “in general” means about 85% to 95%, “most” means about 65% to 85%, “over half” means about 50% to 65%, “many” means about 30% to 50%, “some” means about 15% to 30%, and “a few” means less than 15%.

- **A case study** of Labatts (included in the sample of employers to be interviewed) plus two of the charities it helps fund; and
- **A representative survey of 1000 employers and 658 participating students** to examine the impact of SCP in providing students who are returning to school with career-oriented summer employment and assisting with the school-to-work transition.

Due to the limited time frame for the completion of this evaluation and the lack of available data sources, comparison groups (either non-participants or rejected applicants) were not included in our methodology. However, our use of multiple lines of evidence (i.e., key informants, case study, survey and document review) helped increase the objectivity of the survey results.

2.0 Program Description

2.1 Program Objectives

The objectives of the Summer Career Placements Program are to:

- 1) Assist students in preparing for their future entry into the labour market through career relevant summer employment by means of partnerships between government and employers of all sectors;
- 2) Create incremental jobs that would not have been created without the financial assistance provided under SCP; and
- 3) Provide students with money and allow them to pursue their education.

2.2 Employer Profile

2.2.1 Sector

More than half (51.6%) of the employers using the SCP came from the non-profit sector. Another third (31.0%) came from the private sector while the remaining fifth (17.4%) came from the public sector ⁴.

As **Table 1** shows, non-profit employers were split about equally between community (29.2%) and cultural (22.4%). More than a third (35.5%) of the private sector employers were in retail and wholesale sales. Primary industries, manufacturing and services to business each accounted for another tenth of the private sector employers.

Proportionately more employers came from the private sector in all of the Atlantic provinces (ranging from a high of 52.0% in Newfoundland to a low of 36.0% in Prince Edward Island) and Saskatchewan (37.1%). The bulk of these employers were in retail and wholesale sales and in hotels and restaurants. British Columbia (68.8%) and Ontario (60.2%) tended to rely more heavily on non-profit employers, while Saskatchewan was the heaviest user of the public sector (30.0%). Employer distributions in Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta generally mirrored the national distribution.

⁴ This is very similar to the participant survey — Private (29.6%), Public (21.2%), Not-for-profit (44.1%), Other (0.4%) and Don't Know (4.7%) — especially if adjusted for the other and don't know categories.

Table 1: Employers by Industry

Industry	Frequency	Percent
Primary (agriculture, fishing, forestry, mining)	39	3.9%
Manufacturing	37	3.7%
Construction	15	1.5%
Transportation & Communication	18	1.8%
Retail or wholesale sales	110	11.0%
Services to businesses	35	3.5%
Hotel & restaurant	27	2.7%
Other Services	55	5.5%
Municipal government	84	8.4%
Other government-related	64	6.4%
Non-profit - cultural, economic, training	224	22.4%
Non-profit - community services	292	29.2%
TOTAL	1000	100%

2.2.2 Size

Employers surveyed were generally small — 36.2% had four or fewer employees, while another 28.4% had five to ten employees.

Almost a quarter (23.2%) of the employers had 11 to 50 employees while less than a tenth (9.0%) had more than 50 employees. Not surprisingly, the public sector tended to have proportionately more large employers (See **Table 2**). Almost half the employers in each province in Atlantic Canada were small (four or fewer employees) compared to about a third in each of the other provinces. This is consistent with the fact that the Atlantic provinces had relatively more employers from the private sector.

2.2.3 Summer Work Load

Almost two-thirds (63.4%) of the employers in the survey stated that, generally speaking, their organization's work load in the summer is higher than at other times of the year. For a quarter (24.5%) it is about the same, while for a tenth (11.4%) it is lower.

Table 2: Employers by Sector and Size

# of Employees	Private Sector (310)	Non-profit (516)	Public Sector (174)	Total (1000)
1 or 2 employees	14.2%	21.5%	13.0%	17.8%
3 or 4 employees	21.3%	18.3%	12.6%	18.2%
5 to 10 employees	30.6%	26.9%	28.9%	28.4%
11 to 50 employees	25.4%	21.4%	24.4%	23.2%
51 to 100 employees	3.1%	3.5%	7.3%	4.0%
More than 100 employees	5.0%	2.6%	13.3%	5.2%
Don't know/Non-response	0.4%	5.8%	0.5%	3.2%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

Proportionately more employers in Quebec (15.6%), British Columbia (15.6%) and Ontario (13.8%) are likely to report a lower work load in the summer than at other times of the year.

2.2.4 Student Employment

Almost two-thirds (62.7%) of the employers surveyed hired just one student under the SCP this summer.

Another fifth (21.3%) hired two students under the program while a tenth (10.5%) hired three or four. Of the remaining 5.4%, almost half (2.5%) employed five or six students. The three largest employers in the survey hired 28, 40 and 42 students.

Prince Edward Island (88.0%) and Saskatchewan (85.7%) had the largest proportion of employers who hire one student through SCP while Newfoundland (54.0%), Quebec (56.1%) and Ontario (58.2%) had the least. As **Table 3** shows, the private sector (76.9%) had proportionately more employers who hired only one student through SCP than either the public (56.6%) or the non-profit sectors (56.3%).

On average, employers in the survey hired about two students (1.963) per agreement.

The average number of students over the last four summers ranged from a high of 1.83 in 1994 to a low of 1.61 in 1995.

Table 3: Employers by Sector and Number of SCP Students

# of SCP Students Hired	Private Sector (310)	Non-profit (516)	Public Sector (174)	Total (1000)
1 Student	76.9%	56.3%	56.6%	62.7%
2 Students	14.9%	23.8%	25.4%	21.3%
3 or 4 Students	4.8%	13.7%	11.3%	10.5%
5 to 10 Students	2.0%	4.4%	4.9%	3.8%
More than 10 Students	1.3%	1.6%	1.8%	1.5%
Don't Know/Non-response	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

As mentioned above, 62.7% of all employers surveyed hired only one SCP student. In 82.6% of these cases, it is the only student they hired. This means that 51.8% of all surveyed employers hired no additional student.

Of the remainder, 15.7% hired one other student, 9.2% hired two other students, 9.7% hired three or four others and 4.2% hired five or six other students. Another 8.2% hired seven or more others while the remaining 1.2% did not know how many others their firm hired.

While Newfoundland had the lowest proportion of “one-SCP student” employers (54.0%), for most of them (70.0%), the SCP student was the only student they hired. This was the highest provincial proportion. Alberta had the lowest proportion (30.1%) of employers who hired only one student — the SCP student.

Of those employers who hired additional students this summer about two-thirds (64.9%) received financial assistance for at least one of the students hired.

About a third (33.6%) received assistance for one, 13.6% for two, 9.2% for three or four, 4.4% for five or six students and 4.1% for seven or more (one claiming 25 other students were subsidized). Almost one-third (33.5%) received no financial assistance.

Employers in New Brunswick (76.3%) were most likely to have received financial assistance for at least one of the additional students hired. Employers in Saskatchewan (34.5%) were the least likely.

2.2.5 Financial Assistance

Employers in the survey report hiring a total of 4,128 students, almost half (47.6%) of whom were subsidized by SCP.

Of the 2,165 students not hired through the SCP, more than a third (34.7%) were subsidized in some other way. In total, then, almost two-thirds of all the students hired by employers in the survey were subsidized by some level of government.

2.2.6 Previous Summer

Almost one-fifth (20.1%) of the employers in the survey did not hire any students in the summer of 1995.

Of the remainder, one-quarter (27.2%) hired one student last summer, 17.6% hired two students, 15.3% hired three or four and 5.3% hired five or six students. Almost a tenth (9.3%) hired seven or more students last summer.

Employers in New Brunswick (83.9%) were the most likely to have hired at least one student last summer. Employers in Manitoba (62.7%), Ontario (70.4%) and British Columbia (67.7%) were the least likely.

Of those employers who hired students in the summer of 1995 the vast majority (82.0%) received financial assistance for at least one of the students hired.

Employers in Alberta (88.4%) were the most likely to have received financial assistance, while employers in New Brunswick (75.4%) were the least likely.

In the summer of 1995, these employers reported hiring 3,088 students of whom almost half (48.3%) were subsidized by some level of government.

2.3 Participant Profile

2.3.1 Age and Gender

Almost two-thirds (65.9%) of the participants surveyed are female compared to one-third (34.1%) male.

Ontario (72.3%) had the highest proportion of females, while Saskatchewan (53.8%) had the lowest.

Almost half (46.6%) of the participants are aged 20 to 24 years of age.

A little more than two-fifths (41.2%) are between 15 and 19 years of age while the remaining 12.0% are more than 24 years of age. (See Table 4.)

Proportionately, Prince Edward Island (66.0%) and Newfoundland (56.0%) employed the most young (i.e., aged 15 to 19) students, while Ontario (33.7%) and Quebec (37.6%) employed the least.

Table 4: Participants by Age and Gender

Age	Gender		Total (658)
	Male (225)	Female (433)	
Between 15 and 19	35.6%	44.1%	41.2%
Between 20 and 24	54.4%	42.6%	46.6%
More than 24 years of age	9.7%	13.3%	12.0%
Refused	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

Female participants tended to be both “younger” (i.e., aged 15 to 19) and “older” (i.e., aged 25 or older) than their male counterparts, while there were more male participants than female in the age category 20 to 24. (See Table 4.)

2.3.2 Equity Group Status

Some 4.2% of participants have disabilities. About 6.4% are aboriginal and 6.7% are members of a visible minority.

Aboriginals and visible minorities tended to be concentrated in Western Canada.

2.3.3 Sector

Almost half (44.3%) of SCP participants surveyed worked for non-profit organizations during the summer of 1996, while slightly less than a third (29.6%) worked in the private sector and about a fifth (21.2%) worked in the public sector.

As **Table 5** shows, the distribution of surveyed employers and participants by sector is fairly consistent.

Proportionately, Ontario (62.4%) and British Columbia (58.4%) had the most participants who worked for non-profit organizations during the summer of 1996, while Saskatchewan (57.7%) had the most participants who worked for the private sector and Quebec (21.8%) had the most participants who worked for the public sector.

Table 5: Sector Profile

Sector	Profile	
	% of Employers (sample of 1000)	% of Participants (sample of 658)
Not for Profit	51.6	44.3
Private	31.0	29.6
Public	17.4	21.2
Don't Know	--	4.9

As **Table 6** below shows, the dominance of females among SCP participants is associated with the bulk of the employment being in the not-for-profit (which employs 73.2% females) and public (which employs 80.5% females) sectors. By way of contrast, the private sector tends to be more balanced (53.5% males versus 46.5% females).

Table 6: Participants by Gender and Sector

Gender	Non-profit (292)	Public Sector (139)	Private Employer (195)	Don't Know (32)	Total (658)
Male	26.8%	19.5%	53.5%	46.9%	34.1%
Female	73.2%	80.5%	46.5%	53.1%	65.9%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

As **Table 7** shows, the not-for-profit sector tends to favour older students (68.6% are aged 20 or over) compared to the private (53.5%) and public (52.8%) sectors.

Table 7: Participants by Age and Sector

Age	Non-profit (292)	Public Sector (139)	Private Employer (195)	Don't Know (32)	Total (658)
Between 15 and 19	31.4%	47.2%	46.2%	74.5%	41.2%
Between 20 and 24	49.0%	49.6%	44.9%	22.5%	46.6%
More than 24 years of age	19.6%	3.2%	8.6%	3.0%	12.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2.3.4 September 1995

Some 71.0% of participants reported attending a post-secondary institution in September 1995 compared to 25.6% who attended high school. About 3.3% of the participants did neither.⁵

Proportionately, Prince Edward Island (50.0%) and Saskatchewan (34.6%) employed the most high schools students, while Quebec (18.8%) and Nova Scotia (18.9%) employed the least. (Note: Although in Quebec, the school system is such that students could finish high school and enter the post-secondary level at an earlier age than students elsewhere in Canada, the data shows that most post-secondary students in Quebec (54.7%) fall in the age group 20 to 24, which is similar to the rest of Canada.)

As **Table 8** shows, the non-profit sector (78.5%) employed proportionately more post-secondary students than did the private (69.7%) and public (67.4%) sectors. The higher proportion of post-secondary students in the non-profit sector may reflect the nature of the work and the need for more mature students. As **Table 9** indicates, post-secondary students tend to be older (78.7% are aged 20 and older).

Table 8: Participants by Education and Sector

Did you attend full-time high school/post-secondary Sept 95?	Non-profit (292)	Public Sector (139)	Private Employer (195)	Don't Know (32)	Total (658)
High School	19.0%	29.5%	26.9%	60.6%	25.6%
Post-Secondary	78.5%	67.4%	69.7%	27.2%	71.0%
Neither	2.5%	3.1%	3.4%	12.2%	3.3%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

⁵ This is similar to what employers reported about level of education — 72.8% had completed (17.1%) or had some (55.7%) post-secondary education and 26.1% had completed (12.5%) or were attending high school (13.6%).

Table 9: Participants by Education and Age

Did you attend full-time high school/post-secondary Sept 95?	Age				Total (658)
	Between 15 and 19	Between 20 and 24	More than 24	Refused	
High School (169)	96.2%	3.0%	0.8%	0.0%	100%
Post-Secondary(467)	21.2%	62.4%	16.3%	0.1%	100%
Neither (22)	45.5%	47.3%	7.2%	0.0%	100%

2.3.5. Education Plans

More than nine in ten (92.4%) SCP participants plan to continue their education in the Fall of 1996.

This proportion ranges from a high of 98.1% in Nova Scotia to a low of 87.1% in British Columbia.

Of those returning to school, 90.5% will be full time while 9.5% will be part-time.

Of those not planning to return to school, about half (48.4%) will be looking for work while almost the same proportion (47.9%) will be working.

Of those who will be working, a little more than half will continue to work for their summer employer while the remainder will work at another job.

2.3.5.1 Post-Secondary

Reflecting graduation from high school, the proportion of SCP participants planning to attend a post-secondary institution in September 1996 is significantly higher (81.6%) than the proportion who attended a post-secondary institution in September 1995 (71.0%).

Proportionately, Quebec (91.7%) has the most participants returning to post-secondary studies, while Prince Edward Island (60.9%) has the least.

Of those going to a post-secondary institution in September 1996, more than two-thirds (69.8%) will be going to university, while another one in five (24.2%) will be going to a community college or CEGEP.

Almost all (84.1%) of those going to university will be undergraduates. Nova Scotia (22.2%) will have the most graduates, while Newfoundland (3.7%) will have the least.

Almost one-third (31.0%) of those going to a post-secondary institution will complete their current degree or diploma in one year, while most of the rest expect to take two (24.7%) or three (22.1%) years. About one in five (21.5%) expect to take four years or more.

More than half (50.3%) of the students going to a post-secondary institution intend to continue their education after they complete their current degree or diploma (ranging from a high of 61.5% in Newfoundland, to a low of 37.5% in Quebec), while one-quarter (24.4%) do not. Another quarter (25.3%) are unsure.

2.3.5.2 High School⁶

The vast majority of those going to high school in September 1996 will be entering either grade 12 (62.1%) or 13 (13.7%).

Most of the rest will be entering grade 11 (17.0%). Only a handful will be entering grade 10 (5.8%) or 9 (1.4%).

Almost all (91.0%) of those going to high school intend to go to a post-secondary institution. Of those, slightly more (44.0%) expect to attend a community college than a university (40.5%).

2.3.6 Field of Study

For students going to a post-secondary institution in September 1996, the predominant fields of study are social sciences (14.2%), business and commerce (13.0%) and education (10.7%).

Other significant fields include agriculture or biology (8.2%), health professions (6.1%), fine or applied arts (5.7%), computer sciences (4.7%), engineering (4.4%), architecture (4.1%), social work (4.1%) and mathematics or physics (3.6%). High school students also chose social sciences (17.8%) as the predominant field of study, followed by law (10.7%), health professions (8.8%) and agriculture or biological sciences (8.2%).

2.4 Program Expenditures

2.4.1 Provincial Expenditure Profile

The provincial allocation for program funding is based on the returning student rate, its relation to the national student unemployment rate of 9.5%, and the provincial capacity to create student summer employment. Historical provincial budgetary allocations, as indicated by a review of administrative data, for the years 1989-1996 are outlined in **Table 10** below. (Note: The figures for 1985-1988 were not on file.)

⁶ Secondary school levels from Quebec have been integrated to the equivalent levels of other provinces, such as grade 7 is “secondaire 1”, grade 8 is “secondaire 2”, grade 9 is “secondaire 3”, grade 10 is “secondaire 4”, grade 11 is “secondaire 5” and grades 12-13 are “CEGEP”.

Table 10: Historical Provincial Budgetary Allocations

Province	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
NFLD	\$11,110,000	\$9,513,000	\$9,665,000	\$8,497,749	\$8,601,770	\$9,174,000	\$5,292,000	\$7,672,439
NS	\$6,402,000	\$4,712,000	\$4,948,000	\$4,649,496	\$4,760,402	\$5,248,000	\$3,140,000	\$4,686,002
NB	\$8,534,000	\$6,719,000	\$6,819,000	\$5,948,076	\$6,026,917	\$6,390,000	\$3,691,000	\$5,372,235
PEI	\$707,000	\$528,000	\$581,000	\$563,467	\$572,240	\$626,000	\$374,000	\$559,861
QUE	\$29,400,000	\$17,893,000	\$18,102,000	\$19,002,554	\$20,618,773	\$23,416,000	\$14,465,000	\$22,215,134
ONT	\$15,733,000	\$9,060,000	\$9,966,000	\$13,004,331	\$17,183,822	\$21,275,000	\$13,937,000	\$22,857,134
MAN	\$4,035,000	\$2,869,000	\$2,933,000	\$2,887,925	\$3,025,944	\$3,383,000	\$2,032,000	\$3,079,102
SASK	\$3,540,000	\$2,492,000	\$2,565,000	\$2,539,584	\$2,618,252	\$2,909,000	\$1,752,000	\$2,604,923
ALTA/NWT	\$14,304,000	\$8,532,000	\$8,577,000	\$7,953,868	\$8,270,910	\$9,120,000	\$5,443,000	\$8,145,909
BC/YK	\$21,544,000	\$13,062,000	\$12,844,000	\$11,952,950	\$12,320,970	\$13,459,000	\$7,874,000	\$11,802,002
NHQ	\$2,691,000	\$1,620,000	\$3,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Total Committed	\$118,000,000	\$77,000,000	\$80,000,000	\$83,000,000	\$88,000,000	\$108,000,000	\$59,500,000	\$90,494,999

The budget allocation procedure is as follows ⁷:

- As with all HRDC programs, allocations are made nationally to regions, and subsequently to HRCC's.
- The National Allocation Model for SCP is based on the following formula:

<p>Step 1: Post-elementary school population, multiplied by the unemployment rate (province wide)</p> <p>Based on this calculation, a percentage is established for each region.</p> <p>Step 2: Using the previous year's allocation, a calculation of the comparable allocation based on this year's total budget is made.</p> <p>Step 3: The amount of Step 1 is deducted from Step 2 to establish a variance.</p> <p>Step 4: A deduction of 10% of the variance from the amount established in Step 2 is applied to determine this year's allocation.</p> <p>This process was established to prevent major variances from one year to the next.</p>
--

- In turn, a Regional Allocation Model is applied using the steps as described above, to determine allocations for HRCC's. Regional offices are encouraged to use additional information at their disposal that would permit a more equitable allocation.

2.4.2 Program Expenditures

Table 11 describes the program expenditures, including the number of participants, the number of projects and the cost per job, during the period 1985-1996.

For 1996, the cost per job was over 6% lower than the average for the last 10 years. The actual cost per job was also lower than for 6 of the last 10 years.

The 1996 Federal Budget announced that funding for summer jobs would be doubled. This created the impression that funding for the SCP program would be increased from \$60 million in the summer of 1995 to \$120 million in the summer of 1996. In fact, funding for the SCP program increased by only \$30 million. The other \$30 million was split equally amongst three other departments — Heritage Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada and Industry Canada. This caused considerable confusion amongst program stakeholders.

⁷ Ministerial Briefing Note on the 1996 Program.

Table 11: Program Expenditures 1985-1996⁸

	1985	1987	1988	1989	1990	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
# of part.	86,996	73,000	76,902	71,376	54,000	52,050	53,279	59,043	40,901	55,283*
# of proj			37,349	37,446		29,097	29,792	32,310	25,488	32,163
\$ spent (millions)	\$143	\$127	\$127	\$118	\$77	\$83	\$88	\$108	\$59.5	
Cost per job created	\$1,644	\$1,740	\$1,651	\$1,653	\$1,426	\$1,595	\$1,652	\$1,829	\$1,455	\$1,627

* Preliminary data (not final)

⁸ Detailed program data for 1986 and 1991 were not available in the files.

3.0 Evaluation Findings

3.1 Career Development

3.1.1 Career Choice

Participants' main career choices are dominated by education (13.7%), business and commerce (13.3%), health professions (9.5%), law (9.2%) and social sciences (6.4%).

Some 76.7% of the participants did not have a second career choice.

For 38.3% of the participants, their summer job confirmed their career choices.

For another 18.0% it helped them decide. In 6.1% of the cases it helped them change their career choice. For 37.6% it had no impact. For the three categories where the summer employment had an impact, 8.8% plan to change their education program as a result of the work experience.

One key informant employer summed it up nicely: whether the students like and can do this type of work, they find out who they are and how they are with this type of client (this is not learned in school out of a textbook).

Provincially, participants' summer jobs confirmed their career choices most in Quebec (56.4%) and Ontario (44.6%). The students from Quebec and Ontario represent 45% of all the students who said the experience confirmed their career choice. It was less likely to do this for participants in Atlantic Canada and Saskatchewan (ranging between 20.0% and 26.4%). Participants in British Columbia were the most likely (11.9%) to change their career choice as a result of their SCP job experience.

3.1.2 Preference

Participants would prefer — almost two to one — to have a job paying the minimum wage but providing experience directly related to their career, to having a job paying twice the minimum wage but not related to their career preference.

As **Table 12** shows, this preference tended to be weaker in Western Canada and Nova Scotia than in the rest of the provinces. The strongest was in Newfoundland (72.0% vs. 20.0%).

Table 12: Participants by Preference and Province

	Nfld (50)	NS (53)	NB (50)	PEI (50)	Que (101)	Ont (101)	Man (50)	Sask (52)	Alta (50)	BC (101)
One paying minimum wage but providing experience directly	72.0%	50.9%	66.0%	62.0%	65.3%	61.4%	48.0%	57.7%	50.0%	52.5%
One paying twice the minimum wage but not related to your career	20.0%	41.5%	24.0%	32.0%	26.7%	29.7%	38.0%	30.8%	34.0%	33.7%
Don't know/ depends/ not sure	8.0%	7.5%	10.0%	6.0%	7.9%	8.9%	14.0%	11.5%	16.0%	13.9%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Post-secondary students were more likely to prefer a job paying minimum wage but providing experience directly related to their career (61.5%) than a job paying twice the minimum wage but not related to their career preference (26.4%). Not surprisingly in light of their less immediate career needs, the comparable percentages for high school students are more balanced — 48.3% and 42.4%, respectively. A similar pattern shows up for age — older students (i.e., those aged 20 and over) tend to mirror the post-secondary students while younger students (i.e., those aged 15 to 19 years) tend to mirror the high school students. There were no appreciable differences in participants' preference based on gender or by sector.

Table 13: Participants' Reasons for Taking the Job.

	Nfld (50)	NS (53)	NB (50)	PEI (50)	Que (101)	Ont (101)	Man (50)	Sask (52)	Alta (50)	BC (101)
Experience	26.0%	41.5%	38.0%	46.9%	43.6%	55.4%	52.0%	28.8%	42.0%	48.5%
Pay	66.0%	50.9%	50.0%	49.0%	17.8%	35.6%	40.0%	59.6%	42.0%	41.6%
Related to future career	10.0%	17.0%	16.0%	22.4%	15.8%	34.7%	22.0%	9.6%	22.0%	29.7%
Related to studies	10.0%	13.2%	10.0%	14.3%	16.8%	25.7%	16.0%	5.8%	0.0%	25.7%
Other	14.0%	9.5%	22.0%	18.3%	14.9%	5.0%	8.0%	11.4%	12.0%	12.0%
Close to home	14.0%	7.5%	10.0%	14.3%	5.9%	8.9%	20.0%	13.5%	8.0%	5.9%
Sounded interesting	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.0%	8.9%	4.0%	1.9%	6.0%	3.0%
Don't know	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Note: Column percentages do not add up 100 due to multiple responses.

When asked their reasons for taking the SCP job, participants again favoured experience (47.9%) to pay (37.3%). The next two most important reasons for taking the job were related to future career (22.4%) and related to studies (16.4%). **Table 13** reveals, however, that experience was more important than pay in only four provinces — Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia. It was equally important in Alberta, while pay was more important than experience in the Atlantic provinces and Saskatchewan — sometimes by a margin of more than two to one (Newfoundland).

3.1.3 Work Versus Career

Participants tended to feel that they get slightly more “career opportunity” than “work experience”.

Just over half (54.6%) of participants surveyed felt strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job was related to their career choice compared to 29.3% who felt that it did not (a rating of 1 or 2). Employers’ ratings are similar (58.3% and 21.2%, respectively).

This was confirmed when participants and employers were asked if the job was related to some of the participants’ school subjects. Again, just over half (participants, 54.5%; employers, 56.8%) felt strongly compared to less (participants, 29.8%; employers, 24.1%) who felt it did not.

Furthermore, 89.4% of participants felt strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job increased their understanding of what is expected in a work situation compared to only 2.4% who felt that it did not (a rating of 1 or 2). Again, employers’ ratings are remarkably similar although slightly higher (93.7% and 1.2%, respectively).

As **Tables 14 and 15** show, provincial ratings for these questions were very consistent relative to the national ratings and employers, while slightly more positive, tended to give virtually the same ratings as participants. Career/subject-related was strongest in Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia and weakest in Newfoundland, Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island.

While a link between the career-related work experiences and the level of education is difficult to establish, it is interesting to note that for the three provinces with the least career/subject-related employment, the number of high school students in the program is relatively high. Both PEI (50% high school students) and Saskatchewan (34.6%) had the highest numbers of participants who were attending high school starting in September 1995. As for Newfoundland, it had the fourth highest number of high school participants (30%). This might explain in part why these provinces had the weakest career-related jobs, since high school students are less likely to have made a definite career choice and, thus, tend to feel that their jobs were less career-related than post-secondary students who might be a year or two away from starting a career.

Work-understanding was strongest in Ontario and Alberta and was weakest in New Brunswick and Saskatchewan.

Table 14: Participants Ratings of Job Characteristics

	Nfld (50)	NS (53)	NB (50)	PEI (50)	Que (101)	Ont (101)	Man (50)	Sask (52)	Alta (50)	BC (101)
<i>The job was related to some of your school subjects</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	62.0%	30.2%	40.0%	24.0%	23.8%	13.8%	30.0%	40.4%	30.0%	33.7%
3	14.0%	26.4%	18.0%	30.0%	14.9%	15.8%	10.0%	26.9%	12.0%	21.8%
4 + Very much	24.0%	43.4%	42.0%	46.0%	61.4%	70.3%	60.0%	32.7%	58.0%	44.5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Your employer acted as a mentor or coach</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	2.0%	17.0%	16.0%	8.0%	9.9%	4.0%	10.0%	9.6%	4.0%	11.9%
3	28.0%	3.8%	14.0%	14.0%	18.8%	8.9%	20.0%	15.4%	22.0%	16.8%
4 + Very much	70.0%	79.2%	70.0%	78.0%	71.3%	87.2%	68.0%	73.0%	74.0%	71.3%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Job increased understanding of what is expected at workplace</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	2.0%	0.0%	8.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	4.0%	1.9%	0.0%	4.0%
3	12.0%	11.3%	18.0%	10.0%	9.9%	6.9%	8.0%	15.4%	4.0%	9.9%
4 + Very much	86.0%	88.7%	74.0%	88.0%	89.1%	91.1%	88.0%	82.7%	96.0%	86.1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>The job was related to your career choice</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	58.0%	35.9%	40.0%	40.0%	21.8%	14.9%	28.0%	44.2%	30.0%	25.8%
3	14.0%	17.0%	24.0%	26.0%	21.8%	18.8%	20.0%	23.1%	24.0%	16.8%
4 + Very much	28.0%	47.1%	36.0%	34.0%	56.4%	66.3%	52.0%	32.7%	46.0%	57.4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>You gained new skills from this job</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	8.0%	1.9%	8.0%	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%	2.0%	9.6%	2.0%	4.0%
3	22.0%	7.5%	8.0%	16.0%	9.9%	7.9%	14.0%	13.5%	18.0%	10.9%
4 + Very much	70.0%	90.5%	84.0%	80.0%	85.1%	87.1%	84.0%	76.7%	80.0%	85.2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>You received adequate assistance in carrying out your duties</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	4.0%	1.9%	8.0%	4.0%	2.0%	2.0%	4.0%	3.8%	2.0%	5.0%
3	12.0%	3.8%	10.0%	6.0%	7.9%	5.9%	14.0%	13.5%	14.0%	5.0%
4 + Very much	84.0%	94.3%	82.0%	90.0%	90.1%	91.1%	82.0%	82.7%	84.0%	90.1%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 15: Employers Ratings of Job Characteristics

	Nfld (50)	NS (66)	NB (68)	PEI (50)	Que (244)	Ont (196)	Man (67)	Sask (70)	Alta (93)	BC (96)
<i>The job was related to the student's school subjects</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	50.0%	28.8%	30.8%	40.0%	16.0%	19.4%	31.3%	48.6%	20.4%	14.6%
3	20.0%	19.7%	17.6%	22.0%	11.5%	17.9%	13.4%	21.4%	24.7%	24.0%
4 + Very much	30.0%	48.5%	51.4%	38.0%	72.1%	60.2%	55.2%	24.3%	53.7%	60.4%
Don't know	.0%	3.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	2.6%	.0%	5.7%	1.1%	1.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>The student met your expectations with respect to the skills</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	6.0%	3.0%	1.5%	4.0%	2.8%	1.0%	1.5%	4.3%	4.4%	3.1%
3	12.0%	10.6%	5.9%	6.0%	4.1%	7.7%	11.9%	5.7%	2.2%	5.2%
4 + Very much	82.0%	86.3%	92.7%	90.0%	93.0%	91.3%	85.0%	90.0%	92.5%	91.6%
Don't know	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	1.1%	.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Job increased the student's understanding of the workplace</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	4.0%	1.5%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.5%	.0%	1.4%	1.1%	2.1%
3	4.0%	9.1%	5.9%	8.0%	4.1%	3.6%	6.0%	5.7%	7.5%	2.1%
4 + Very much	92.0%	89.4%	94.1%	92.0%	93.8%	95.9%	94.0%	91.4%	91.4%	95.9%
Don't know	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>The job was related to the student's future career</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	46.0%	19.7%	25.0%	38.0%	18.8%	14.3%	29.8%	35.7%	19.4%	12.5%
3	24.0%	18.2%	23.5%	18.0%	14.8%	16.8%	13.4%	18.6%	18.3%	19.8%
4 + Very much	28.0%	59.1%	48.5%	36.0%	65.6%	64.8%	52.2%	41.5%	58.1%	64.5%
Don't know	2.0%	3.0%	2.9%	8.0%	.8%	4.1%	4.5%	4.3%	4.3%	3.1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>The student gained new skills from this job</i>										
Not at all 1 & 2	2.0%	7.5%	5.9%	.0%	1.2%	1.0%	3.0%	4.3%	.0%	.0%
3	14.0%	4.5%	13.2%	10.0%	9.0%	7.7%	13.4%	17.1%	9.7%	1.0%
4 + Very much	84.0%	87.9%	80.9%	90.0%	89.8%	90.8%	83.5%	78.6%	90.3%	98.9%
Don't know	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

On a *sector basis*, participants in the non-profit sector felt most strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job was related to their career choice and school subjects (both at 65.9%). This compares with ratings of about 60% for the public sector and about 40% for the private sector. The higher ratings in the non-profit sector may reflect the higher proportion of post-secondary students as almost 49% of all post-secondary students worked in non-profit organizations.

On an *educational basis*, post-secondary students felt most strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job was related to their career choice and school subjects (ratings ranging between 54.0% and 59.3%) compared to high schools students (28.7% for career and 43.6% for subjects). Similarly, post-secondary students were more likely to feel strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job increased their understanding of what is expected in a work situation (ratings around 90%) compared to high school students (rating of 32.7%).

On a *gender* basis, females tended to feel more strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) than males that their summer job was related to their career choice and school subjects, but this was largely a matter of *age*. Young females (aged 15 to 19 years) were almost three times more positive than young males. The disparity in the ratings narrows as age increase and virtually disappears with students aged 25 or older. By way of contrast, males and females in all age groups felt strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job increased their understanding of what is expected in a work situation (ratings ranging between about 86% to around 93%).

HRDC staff had no real feel for the “career” nature of the jobs. Their answers ranged from “Very high” to “Fairly limited.” However, they were almost unanimous (as were employers in the key informant interviews) that about 100% (or close to it) of the SCP positions was likely to assist in the “school-to-work” transition.

According to participants, the seven largest job titles, which account for 65.8% of student employment, do not consistently have a strong “career” link.

As **Table 16** shows, participants rated two types of jobs, Youth Camp Counsellor and Child Care Worker (15.2% of the jobs), as having the highest “career-relatedness” compared to the national average. In this case, 94% of students employed as Youth Camp Counselors felt their job was very much related to their career, while this was the case for 79.2% of students working as Child Care Workers.

A small majority of participants rated two more titles, Administrative Assistant and Tour Guide (21.9% of the jobs), as being very much “career-related” (54.1% and 54.7% respectively). Finally, they rated the remaining three titles, General Labourer, Recreation Instructor and Sales Clerk (28.7% of all jobs), as having the lowest “career-relatedness.” Seventy-seven (77%) per cent of students said that working as a General Labourer was not at all career-related, while 35.5% said the same for Recreation Instructor and 46% for Sales Clerk.

Table 16: Participants Ratings of How Career-Related Was Their Summer Job by Main Job Titles

Job Title	% of Jobs	Not at all (rating of 1 or 2)	Average (rating of 3)	Very much so (rating of 4 or 5)
Administrative Assistant	14.9	25.5	20.4	54.1
General Labourer	14.7	77.3	6.2	16.4
Youth Camp Counsellor	8.4	0.6	5.4	94.0
Recreation Instructor	7.9	35.5	28.3	36.2
Tour Guide	7.0	26.9	18.5	54.7
Child Care Worker	6.9	8.9	11.9	79.2
Sales Clerk	6.1	46.0	27.7	26.2
All Jobs	100.0	29.3	16.1	54.6

3.1.4 New Skills

Both participants and employers felt strongly that SCP participants gained new skills.

The majority of participants (80.3%) felt strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that they gained new skills on their summer job compared to just 9.6% who felt the opposite (a rating of 1 or 2). Employers felt somewhat more strongly about this than did participants — 88.7% gave a rating of 4 or 5 compared to just 2.0% who gave a rating of 1 or 2.

Tables 14 and 15 (see pp. 24-25) show, again, that provincial ratings for these questions were very consistent relative to the national ratings and that employers, while slightly more positive, tended to give virtually the same ratings as participants. In general, the ratings were strongest in British Columbia and Ontario and weakest in Newfoundland and Saskatchewan.

On a *sector basis*, participants in the non-profit sector felt most strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that they gained new skills from their summer job (87.8%). This compares with ratings of 81.4% for the public sector and 74.6% for the private sector.

On an *educational basis*, post-secondary students felt most strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job gave them new skills (ratings around 80.0%) compared to high schools students (36.1%).

On a *gender basis*, females, again, tended to feel more strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) than males that their summer job increased their understanding of what is expected in a work situation (ratings around 85%). Again this was largely a matter of *age*. However, unlike career choice and school subjects, where young females (aged 15 to 19 years) were almost three times more positive than young males, there was virtually no disparity in the ratings for younger males (about 86%) and females (about 81%).

3.1.5 Future Career Opportunities

The majority (71.3%) of participants feel that their summer job will help them get full-time work in their chosen field compared to 19.7% who do not think it will help (9.0% are unsure or don't know).

Of those who felt their summer job helped, 89.0% cited the experience gained, 25.6% noted the training received, 18.6% commented on the contacts made while 10.1% stated that it was because they wanted to work in the same type of job.

Almost all (95.2%) employers feel that the summer employment experience of the SCP student will improve the students' chances of finding a full-time job after completing school. The remainder was split between 'don't know' (2.6%) and 'no' (2.2%).

The main reasons why employers felt positively were specific on-the-job experience received (74.0%), gained experience directly related to career (34.4%), improved work habits/attitude to work (27.0%), built confidence (17.3%), formal training received (13.1%), more mature (9.0%) and contacts made/networking (7.0%).

With regards to the summer employment helping them to find work in their chosen field, participants in Ontario (82.2%) and Alberta (82.0%) were the most positive. Participants in Newfoundland (42.0%), New Brunswick (50.0%) and Prince Edward Island (50.0%) were the least positive. Employers in all provinces also strongly believed that the summer job will improve the students' chances of finding full-time work after school (ranging from a low of 92.0% in Newfoundland to a high of 97.9% in British Columbia).

Key informants shared employers' and participants' views. They, too, felt that almost all of the positions assisted in the school-to-work transition.

More than two-thirds (67.4%) of employers felt that post-secondary students would benefit most from the type of employment they provided under the program. A small portion (14.3%) felt that high school students would benefit more while the rest were either ambivalent (18.8%) or didn't know (1.4%).

Table 17 shows that employers in Quebec (80.7%) and New Brunswick (72.1%) were most likely to feel that post-secondary students would benefit most from the type of employment they provided under the program, while employers in Prince Edward Island (26.0%), Newfoundland (22.0%) and Saskatchewan (21.4%) were most likely to feel that high school students would benefit more. It should also be noted that Prince Edward Island was the next most ambivalent province (24.0%) after Ontario (26.6%).

About four-fifths (42.7%) of the employers also thought that academic students would benefit most, while a fifth (23.5%) favoured vocational students. Almost a third (29.3%) were ambivalent while a fraction (4.4%) didn't know.

As **Table 17** shows, employers in Quebec were most likely to feel that academic students (50.4%) would benefit most from the type of employment they provided under the program. They were also the most likely to feel the same about vocational students (36.1%). Employers in Saskatchewan (31.4%) and Newfoundland (32.0%) were the least likely to feel that academic students would benefit most from the type of employment they provided under the program. Employers in Ontario (15.8%), British Columbia (16.7%) and Alberta (17.2%) were the least likely to feel that vocational students would benefit most from the type of employment they provided under the program.

Table 17: Student Who Would Most Benefit from the Type of Employment Provided

	Nfld (50)	NS (66)	NB (68)	PEI (50)	Que (244)	Ont (196)	Man (67)	Sask (70)	Alta (93)	BC (96)
High school students	22.0%	18.2%	14.7%	26.0%	16.4%	10.7%	10.4%	21.4%	8.6%	11.5%
Post-secondary students	54.0%	59.1%	72.1%	48.0%	80.7%	61.2%	68.7%	57.1%	67.7%	63.5%
Neither one nor the other	4.0%	13.6%	7.4%	24.0%	1.6%	11.7%	9.0%	8.6%	14.0%	17.7%
Either/or	16.0%	7.6%	5.9%	.0%	1.2%	14.8%	7.5%	11.4%	7.5%	5.2%
Don't know	4.0%	1.5%	.0%	2.0%	.0%	1.5%	4.5%	1.4%	2.2%	2.1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Academic students	32.0%	42.4%	41.2%	42.0%	50.4%	39.3%	41.8%	31.4%	45.2%	42.7%
Vocational students	20.0%	18.2%	20.6%	20.0%	36.1%	15.8%	20.9%	31.4%	17.2%	16.7%
Neither one nor the other	10.0%	21.2%	26.5%	30.0%	9.0%	23.0%	19.4%	17.1%	18.3%	27.1%
Either/or	26.0%	13.6%	10.3%	6.0%	3.3%	16.3%	11.9%	12.9%	14.0%	8.3%
Don't know	12.0%	4.5%	1.5%	2.0%	1.2%	5.6%	6.0%	7.1%	5.4%	5.2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 18 below shows that employers tend to think that students with specific knowledge of their business/work area (16.0%) are likely to benefit most from summer employment within their organization compared to students with a general background (9.8%). Similarly, they felt that students in specialty majors or professional programs, such as accounting, engineering and management (14.3%) benefit most compared to students in general arts, sciences or social sciences (7.3%), older students (8.7%) compared to younger ones (5.2%) and students with strong computer operations and programming skills (6.1%) compared to students with strong writing and research skills (3.1%). The table also shows that almost half (48.1%) of the employers did not think that there was any particular category of student who is likely to benefit most from summer employment within their organization.

Table 18: Other Particular Category of Student Who Benefits

	Frequency	Percent
<i>Is there any other particular category of student who is likely to benefit most from summer employment in your organization?</i>		
No	481	48.1%
Students with specific knowledge of your business/work area	160	16.0%
Students in specialty majors or professional programs	143	14.3%
Students with a general background	98	9.8%
Older students	87	8.7%
Students in general arts, sciences or social sciences program	73	7.3%
Students with strong computer operations and programming skills	61	6.1%
Younger students	52	5.2%
Students with strong writing and research skills	31	3.1%
Students with an athletic background	15	1.5%
Don't know	11	1.1%
Experience working with children	9	.9%
Agriculture students	9	.9%
Students with tourism interest	5	.5%
Students with a working mechanical knowledge	4	.4%
Students with a mental/physical handicap	4	.4%
Seminary students	3	.3%
Students with skills training	3	.3%
Students with a loan level of education	2	.2%
Students on social assistance	2	.2%
New Canadians	2	.2%
Hotel/restaurant management students	2	.2%
First Nation students	1	.1%
Students with cooking skills/ background	1	.1%

Note: Column total does not add up to 100% due to multiple responses.

One key informant employer suggested that project work is better suited than service work (such as manning a desk from 9 to 5). “Having worked on a project from beginning to end is valuable on a resume — especially for some fields such as engineering. Only in a few, such as medicine and law, can the service dimension work. But project orientation is best for the student and her/his future.” Another noted that all students recognize the value of work experience, but mature students are more selective about what they will do.

3.1.6 Job Opportunities

The work experience may have helped participants get part-time jobs during the coming school year or next summer. It was less likely to lead to a full-time job right away or after graduation.

When asked “Did the employer who hired you this summer offer you any of the following?”, participants replied as follows:

Table 19: Summary of Employment Offers

	Yes	Possibly	No
A part-time job during the coming school year	22.9	8.9	68.2
A summer job next year	30.0	17.5	52.4
A full-time job starting right away	3.7	3.2	93.1
A full-time job after graduation	3.6	6.5	89.9

Some 36.1% of the participants who received (or possibly received) a job offer felt that it was conditional on getting money from the government to cover salary costs.

Almost two-thirds (63.0%) of the employers surveyed said that their organization intended to re-hire their SCP student at a later date.

A fifth (21.7%) said they would not while the remaining 15.3% did not know.

Almost four fifths (80.8%) of the employers who will be offering a job will be offering a job for the summer of 1997. Of the remaining 12.6%, 15.6% said they were considering a full-time job after graduation while 10.5% were considering a full-time job right away. The remaining 72.2% were considering a part-time job during the coming school year.

Employers’ job offers were only modestly influenced by how well their SCP student performed. Almost all employers (98.6%) who were offering jobs at a later date agreed that their student’s performance was fully satisfactory. This compared with 85.0% who were not offering jobs.

Quebec (76.2%) had the highest proportion of employers who said that their organization intended to re-hire their SCP student at a later date, while Newfoundland (40.0%) had the lowest.

3.1.7 Financial Support

The private sector tends to pay somewhat better than the other two sectors.

As **Table 20** shows, 31.6% of private sector employers paid \$8.00 or more per hour to their SCP student. This compares to 26.1% in the non-profit sector and 19.7% in the public sector.

Table 20: Participants by Hourly Wage Rates and Sector

Hourly Wage	Non profit (292)	Public sector (139)	Private employer (195)	Don't know (32)	Total (658)
Less than \$5.00	7.5%	1.5%	2.6%	.0%	4.4%
\$5.00 - \$5.99	11.4%	31.9%	14.3%	33.7%	17.7%
\$6.00 - \$6.99	38.5%	30.5%	24.0%	33.9%	32.3%
\$7.00 - \$7.99	12.4%	16.4%	23.3%	28.4%	17.2%
\$8.00 - \$9.99	14.4%	12.5%	21.5%	1.5%	15.5%
\$10.00 or more	11.7%	7.2%	10.1%	2.6%	9.8%
Refused/don't know	4.2%	.0%	4.2%	.0%	3.1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The majority (55.6%) of participants felt that the money they earned this summer would help a lot in meeting their educational expenses this fall or in the future.

Another third (33.5%) felt it would help some while only about one in ten felt that the money would help a little (7.7%) or not at all (3.1%).

Other principal sources of financing for education include student loans (41.9%), parents/family (35.1%) and part-time job during the school year (25.5%).

Almost a quarter (23.4%) of the SCP participants had more than one job this summer, generally a part-time one (90%).

SCP participants in Prince Edward Island (34.0%), Manitoba (32.0%) and Ontario (29.7%) were more likely to have a second job, while participants in Newfoundland (10.0%), Nova Scotia (15.1%) and Alberta (18.0%) were the least likely.

3.2 Incrementality

The notion of incrementality is a relative concept. At the highest level, something is incremental if it would not have occurred at all, or not at the time or to the extent that it did, without an intervention. In order to estimate incrementality as precisely as possible, detailed quantitative analysis is usually necessary. There were both time and data constraints that prevented such analysis in this case. Instead, using a more qualitative approach, the study presents a series of indicators that, together, point at a certain level of incrementality.

In the following section, the study examines the question of the level of incrementality of the Summer Career Placements program in various ways. First, there is the notion of job creation - would the employer have created the job without the program? Within that concept, the many aspects of job creation are examined. Concepts of displacement, the importance of the financial assistance, the number of students hired, as well as the perception of participants are all pointing to a certain level of incrementality. The data collected as part of the survey and through the key informant interviews shed some light on this issue. Second, within the concept of job creation, there is the notion of the quality and nature of the job created. In the context of this study, this notion is referred to as the career-relatedness of the job.

3.2.1 Job Creation

More than two-thirds (69.0%) of the employers surveyed stated that they would not have hired a student this summer had the wage subsidy not been available.

As **Table 21** shows, this is more prevalent in the not-for-profit (81.9%) sector than in the public (64.3%) and private (50.0%) sectors.

Table 21: Employers by Sector and Incrementality

	Private Employer (310)	Non Profit (516)	Public Employer (174)	Total (1000)
<i>Would your organization have hired a student this summer if the wage subsidy had not been available?</i>				
Yes (all students)	28.0%	6.9%	18.5%	15.5%
Maybe (all)	5.2%	1.9%	3.5%	3.2%
Yes (some students)	6.5%	4.8%	3.9%	5.2%
Maybe (some)	10.2%	4.5%	9.8%	7.2%
No	50.0%	81.9%	64.3%	69.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 22 shows that employers in British Columbia (81.3%), Ontario (75.0%) and Newfoundland (74.0%) were the most likely to think that their jobs were incremental, while those in Saskatchewan (54.3%) and Alberta (63.4%) were the least likely.

Table 22: Employers by Province and Incrementality

	Nfld (50)	NS (66)	NB (68)	PEI (50)	Que (244)	Ont (196)	Man (67)	Sask (70)	Alta (93)	BC (96)
Yes (all students)	16.0%	18.2%	14.7%	16.0%	23.4%	8.2%	17.9%	18.6%	14.0%	6.3%
Maybe (all)	4.0%	1.5%	1.5%	6.0%	1.6%	3.6%	4.5%	4.3%	4.3%	5.2%
Yes (some students)	.0%	4.5%	8.8%	6.0%	4.5%	6.1%	4.5%	2.9%	9.7%	3.1%
Maybe (some)	6.0%	7.6%	4.4%	8.0%	4.5%	7.1%	9.0%	20.0%	8.6%	4.2%
No	74.0%	68.2%	70.6%	64.0%	66.0%	75.0%	64.2%	54.3%	63.4%	81.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

But not all the employers felt their jobs were incremental. Significant proportions of them said that they would have (15.5%) or might have (3.2%) hired *all* of the students they hired even without the wage subsidy. This was most likely in Quebec and least likely in British Columbia. Similarly, significant proportions said that they would have (5.2%) or might have (7.2%) hired *some* of the students they hired even without the wage subsidy. This was most likely in Saskatchewan.

Interpreting data in Tables 21 and 22 above is a little confusing. To help, we define Minimum incrementality as the proportion of employers who answered “No” to the question “Would you have hired a student this summer without the program?” We also define Maximum incrementality as a range. The Upper Maximum incrementality equals 100% minus the proportion of employers who said “Yes (All)”. For example, in the case of Nova Scotia, this is about 82% (100.0% - 18.2% = 81.8%). The Lower Maximum incrementality equals Upper Maximum incrementality minus the proportion of employers who said “Yes (Some)” which, in the case of Nova Scotia is about 77% (81.8% - 4.5% = 77.3%). Using these definitions we can construct **Table 23** below which shows Minimum and Maximum incrementality for Canada and each of the provinces.

Based on both minimums and maximums, overall incrementality is highest in British Columbia, Ontario and Newfoundland and lowest in Saskatchewan, Quebec and Alberta. Care must be taken in interpreting these data. To illustrate, Saskatchewan’s low reported incrementality may be due to its sector mix. It made the lowest use of the non-profit sector (where reported incrementality is highest), the highest use of the public sector (which has low reported incrementality) and high use of the private sector (where reported incrementality is lowest).

Table 23: Incrementality, Canada and by Province

Incrementality	Minimum	Lower – Upper Maximum
Canada	69	81 - 84
Newfoundland	74	84 - 84
Nova Scotia	68	77 - 82
New Brunswick	71	76 - 85
Prince Edward Island	64	78 - 84
Quebec	66	72 - 77
Ontario	75	86 - 92
Manitoba	64	77 - 82
Saskatchewan	54	78 - 81
Alberta	63	76 - 86
British Columbia	81	91 - 94

Although some had no idea, most employers in the key informant interviews felt that all the jobs would be incremental. However, one employer said that the company would have hired other students without a subsidy.

While most HRDC staff felt that most of the jobs created under SCP “should be incremental” some expressed reservations about the private sector, particularly large businesses. This view is supported, to some extent, by the employer survey and by participants (46.1% of whom felt that their SCP job in the private sector would have been created without the subsidy). While almost all HRDC staff felt that the jobs were incremental in the not-for-profit sector, several of the staff suggested that “we may have created a dependency.”

Many of the key informants believed that dependency is often tied to the concept of incrementality. They felt that the longer the period an employer receives uninterrupted funding, the more likely incrementality is eroded. This can occur in all sectors, but it may impact the not-for-profit and public sectors more because the subsidies are relatively high and uninterrupted funding may deter them from searching for alternative sources of funding (e.g., charity drives, grants). Dependency would be diminished if the program witnessed high employer turnover. This does not happen (the proportion of new employers is estimated to be less than 5% a year), largely because the main marketing effort focuses on past employers (due to lack of funds and a desire to fund as many applications as possible). One of the major sources of potential new employer complaints about the SCP program, according to staff, is that they are not aware of it.

When asked if their job would have been available to a student this summer without the help of the program, the majority (56.9%) of participants felt that their summer job was incremental while one in five (20.3%) did not (22.8% were not sure or did not know).

As **Table 24** shows, participants in Ontario (68.3%), British Columbia (68.3%) and Alberta (66.0%) were the most likely to think that their jobs were incremental, while those in Saskatchewan (36.5%) and New Brunswick (42.0%) were the least likely. These rankings, while somewhat less positive, are consistent with those for employers in Ontario, British Columbia and Saskatchewan (see above). However, Alberta, which is ranked high among participants, is ranked low among employers (although the proportions are similar).

Table 24: Percentage of Participants by Province and Incrementality

	Nfld (50)	NS (53)	NB (50)	PEI (50)	Que (101)	Ont (101)	Man (50)	Sask (52)	Alta (50)	BC (101)
<i>Do you think this job would have been available to a student this summer without the help of the SCP Program?</i>										
Yes	20.0%	18.9%	28.0%	30.0%	31.7%	14.9%	18.0%	34.6%	10.0%	14.9%
No	58.0%	62.3%	42.0%	54.0%	52.5%	68.3%	60.0%	36.5%	66.0%	68.3%
Not sure/ couldn't say	22.0%	18.9%	30.0%	16.0%	15.8%	16.8%	22.0%	28.8%	24.0%	16.8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

3.2.2 Other Summer Students

As mentioned above, 62.7% of all employers surveyed hired only one SCP student. In 82.6% of these cases, it is the only student they hired. This means that 51.8% of all surveyed employers hired no additional student.

This was most likely for employers in Newfoundland (70.0%) and least likely for employers in Alberta (30.1%) and Prince Edward Island (40.0%).

Of those employers who hired at least one other student in addition to the SCP student(s) hired this summer, about two-thirds (64.9%) received financial assistance for at least one of the other students hired. This was most likely for employers in New Brunswick (76.3%) and Quebec (72.7%). It was least likely for employers in Saskatchewan (34.5%) and Manitoba (59.3%).

3.2.3 Importance of Subsidy

Excluding those employers who said that they would have hired all of the students they hired even without the wage subsidy (some 15.5%), almost all (92.1%) of the remaining 84.6% employers said that the wage subsidy was important for financial reasons such as bad economic conditions or a poor funding situation.

This was echoed in the key informant interviews with employers, almost all of whom said that the *wage subsidy was very important in their decision to participate* in the SCP program (two noted that it was critical).

Financial reasons are most important in Ontario (95.0%) and Quebec (94.1%) and least important in Manitoba (83.6%). Other reasons why the wage subsidy was important included: necessary to meet the financial need of the students (5.7%), employment specially created (3.1%) and to entice the student to take the job (2.7%). Employers also felt the wage subsidy was important to compensate for: the lower level of experience of the students (2.6%), the extra supervision/special assistance needed (2.5%), the training required (2.5%) and the risk of hiring a student (0.9%).

Most employers in the key informant interviews reported the need for extra resources to do things that would not otherwise get done or to continue/extend service to their clients. While some noted a desire to help students (always short staffed in summer — employee vacations — and it is good PR to hire students) others were more mercenary (take advantage of a subsidy that is there).

Other reasons included: (a) part of our recruitment program and (b) enhances our affirmative action program. One noted a number of reasons: (a) in summer, lots of staff go on holidays; (b) involved with lots of programs in the area; (c) new face, new ideas; and, (d) extra help.

HRDC staff, by way of contrast, had mixed views about the importance of the wage subsidy. The few who were *negative*, suggested that: (1) the subsidy is not much of an incentive for the private sector — the large employers would probably employ students anyway (many of them do not approach us); (2) public sector — the municipalities can fund themselves — maybe the universities too; and (3) it increases the grant pool for the universities.

3.2.4 Displacement

As many as a third (33.3%) of SCP participants may have displaced other workers who would have replaced permanent workers who are on “normal” leave (e.g., pregnancy leave, sick leave, summer vacation).

That is the proportion of surveyed employers who said that the SCP student took pressure off employees or filled in for those on vacation. The proportion varied from a high of 40.0% in Saskatchewan to a low of 26.0% in Newfoundland.

Almost all the employers in the key informant interviews said that the SCP student did not replace permanent workers, except for overtime. A few said partly. Most of them said that nobody would have done the work without the student (always short staffed in the summer), while one said they would have had to reduce services. A few said that if the work has to be done they would have had to hire somebody part-time or divide the work up among existing employees (increasing their workload, overtime).

HRDC staff felt that the SCP student should not be replacing permanent workers (largely because there would be union problem), but that in the real world there is probably a little bit.

3.2.5 In the Absence of the Subsidy

More than a third (36.1%) of employers said that the work done by their SCP student would have been postponed or not done had they not been able to hire the student.

When comparing provinces' results, this was fairly consistent with the exception of Prince Edward Island (28.0%) and British Columbia (53.1%).

The remaining two-thirds of employers would have had the work done by full-time (37.6%) or part-time (7.4%) employees, by volunteers (7.5%), by hiring through a temporary agency (5.2%) by contracting out (1.9%) or by hiring fewer students (1.8%). About 7.3% said that the work was created specifically for the student.

Excluding employers who would not have hired a student if the wage subsidy had not been available (69.0%), almost two-fifths (37.2%) of the remainder said that they would not have paid the same wages to their student if they had not received any assistance from the SCP (presumably they would have paid less). This compares with almost three-fifths (57.3%) who would have paid the same wages.

The proportion who would not have paid the same wages ranges from highs of 61.8% in Alberta and 50.0% in Saskatchewan to lows of 0% in Newfoundland and 26.5% in Quebec.

3.2.6 Improving Incrementality

As mentioned above, the SCP contains two dimensions of incrementality — the incrementality of the job created and the incrementality of the career opportunity created.

While an employer may have created a job without the SCP Program, s/he may have created a different career opportunity because of the SCP Program.

A SCP position will be fully incremental when both the job created and the career opportunity provided are both incremental. The position will be partly incremental when either the job created or the career opportunity is incremental. The position will not be incremental when neither the job nor the career opportunity is incremental.

Job incrementality is weaker:

i) The greater the number of positions an employer receives funding for.

More than a third (37.2%) of employers hired more than one student through SCP.

Table 25 somewhat suggests that incrementality drops as the number of SCP participants that an employer has grows. For example, there is a 25% drop in the number of 1-student employers who would not have hired without the program, and the number of employers of more than 10 students.

Table 25: Employers by Incrementality and Number of SCP Students

# of Students Hired	Would you have hired a student if wage subsidy not available					Total (1000)
	Yes (all students)	Maybe (all)	Yes (some students)	Maybe (some)	No	
1 student (627)	16.2%	3.1%	2.9%	6.3%	71.5%	100%
2 students (213)	12.6%	3.5%	9.8%	8.8%	65.3%	100%
3 or 4 students (105)	15.8%	3.8%	6.1%	8.9%	65.5%	100%
5 to 10 students (38)	14.1%	2.9%	5.7%	8.4%	68.9%	100%
More than 10 students (15)	20.4%	.0%	27.7%	6.6%	45.3%	100%
Don't know/ non-response (1)	100%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100%

ii) The longer the period an employer receives uninterrupted funding.

This is tied to the notion of dependency discussed in Section 3.2.1. As mentioned before, many of the key informants interviewed, believed that the longer an employer receives funding, the less inclined the employer is to seek alternative funding. Therefore, while the job might still provide good career-related work experience, it is quite possible that it could have been funded through other means.

As part of the SCP program, slightly less than half (45.7%) of surveyed employers and all of the key informant employers had participated in SCP in previous years (some for more than ten years).

In addition, HRDC staff estimate the proportion of new employers to be less than 5% a year, largely because the main marketing effort focuses on past employers (due to lack of funds, a desire to fund as many applications as possible, and due to delayed implementation caused by late timing-announcement of the program). Considering that the number of repeat employers is high, and assuming that for a number of these employers the dependency effect is occurring, it is then possible that incrementality is reduced.

Career opportunity incrementality is weaker:

i) The more often the same person is hired by the same employer to do the same job.

Almost a third (32.2%) of the participants worked for the same employer in the summer of 1995 as in the summer of 1996 and fully four-fifths (80.5%) of those performed similar work in both years.

ii) The less defined the work.

Both key informants and participants felt that work, where there was a specific title with a defined set of tasks, tended to be more career-related. To illustrate this, we refer to Table 16 on page 27. According to the participants survey results, 77.3% of students whose job title was “General Labourer” (almost 15% of all jobs), felt that this summer job was not at all career-related. In comparison, 79.2% of participants whose job title was “Child Care Worker” (almost 7% of all jobs) felt that the work was very much career-related. This would seem to support the argument that career opportunity incrementality is weakened the less defined the work.

This data, however, has to be treated with care since two job titles which were similar, i.e., Youth Camp Counsellor and Recreation Instructor, were rated very differently by students. Therefore, although not generalized, in some cases less defined work seems to suggest weakened career opportunity incrementality.

3.3 Program Efficiency

This section reviews how the program operates weaving in feedback from employers, participants and key informants.

3.3.1 Announcement

The Summer Career Placements program does not start until the Minister announces it along with approved budgets for summer programs. HRDC documents show that over the last decade the announcement date has deteriorated by almost three months (from December 19 in 1986 to February 9 in 1990 to March 12 in 1996).

Employers and regional staff commented on the lateness of the Ministerial Announcement of Summer Programs. They suggest that a “regular” announcement — taking place no later than a week or two before spring break every year — would go a long way towards helping businesses and students plan. Other HRDC programs are not hindered by this.

However, it should be noted that the start date of the programs cannot be announced prior to program budgets being approved.

The later the announcement date the shorter the time period for employers to prepare their applications. Since 1986 the time period between the announcement date and the application deadline has dropped from about 13 weeks to just 4 in 1996 (which is somewhat better than the 3 weeks available in 1993). In reality, however, employers do not have all 4 weeks as HRCC staff need part of it to prepare application packages, etc. While they do some

preparatory work, they can only do so much because there are always “last minute changes.” For example, this year the deadline date was changed and this caused problems for those who geared up for the expected date.

Clients complained about the program’s late start. HRCC staff commented on how stressful the situation was and how it hurt HRDC credibility.

HRCC staff noted that not knowing when the program will start, not knowing what changes (if any) will be made, the short time frames to prepare budget allocations and to get information kits out all contribute to the stress. They also suggested that not knowing the start date and whether the program will change eligibility criteria or shift emphasis hurts their credibility when employers call asking when they can apply for the program.

Two employers in the key informant interviews commented on the lateness of the announcement.

- (a) “Announced too late. I literally sit on the edge of my seat every year waiting for an announcement. The reaction time for employers is inadequate — students inquire about summer jobs in January and they cannot afford to wait. They are often already employed by the time the announcement is made. The whole program (announcement and application deadline) should be moved back a month. In addition, I can not remember a year when the application forms were ready at the time of the announcement (this also needs addressing). I had to hand deliver application forms, keep a secretary on standby and virtually keep calling HRDC.”
- (b) “Start date was delayed and there was no notification of this — had to find out on my own. This had an impact as some of the students left the projects for which they would have been hired as they needed 4 months’ work, not 3. The Centre was able to replace them by advertising on campus, but we may not have replaced them with students with the best background for the project. We lapsed about 5 projects because the project officer did not do it and did not inform the Center.”

A review of newspaper coverage shows that only three newspapers covered the 1996 Ministerial announcement. The *Winnipeg Free Press* and the *Halifax Chronicle Herald* carried stories the day after the announcement (giving employers in those cities sufficient notice to be able to apply), while the *Toronto Star* reported on the program on April 5 (a week before the closing date for applying). Coverage was only slightly better in 1995 — four newspapers (the *Calgary Herald*, the *Globe and Mail*, the *Toronto Star* and the *Financial Post*) covered it the day after it was announced. The *Toronto Star* also gave a more in-depth report on April 15. No coverage was found of the 1994 announcement.

However, it is to be noted that in the spring, the Department runs an ad campaign in all major newspapers.

3.3.2 Budget Allocations

NHQ provides budget allocations to the regions and the regions allocate budgets to the HRCCs. (Section 2.4.1 describes how these budget allocations are generated.)

HRDC staff noted that the budget allocations from NHQ are never early enough.

3.3.3 Marketing

The Program Operational Procedures outlines the following marketing approaches.

- 1) NHQ marketing activities are as follows:
 - (a) The Minister announces the program to Members of Parliament, encourages their participation in the promotion; and
 - (b) There is national print advertising as appropriate.

- 2) The Program operational procedures recommend regional and local marketing strategies:
 - (a) Which ensure that funds are distributed appropriately and that all geographic areas, whether rural or urban, benefit, and which meet national, regional and local labour market priorities;
 - (b) Which are based on maintaining an appropriate mix of private, non-profit and public sector employers, according to the local labour market needs, and on an equitable mix of jobs for secondary and post-secondary students;
 - (c) Which address the following social priorities: drug and alcohol abuse, AIDS education, urban crime, environment and literacy;
 - (d) For which activities will allow for employment opportunities for persons with disabilities, visible minorities and native youth; and
 - (e) Which take into account elements such as the types of industries and the number of small employers in the area.

Most HRDC staff do not formally market the SCP program.

They do not really need to sell the program as it tends to be oversubscribed (in some cases up to four times the funding) without marketing it. Most HRCCs use a mailing list (of employers who have previously used the program and those who have expressed an interest in participating in it) to send out application kits. Also, some come in through word of mouth. However, staff report that program awareness among potential new employers could be improved.

Almost half (45.7%) the employers surveyed heard about the SCP because they had participated in the program in previous years. Another fifth (18.2%) learned about the program through the HRCC office.

As **Table 26** shows, employers for all sectors were most likely to have heard of the program because they had participated in previous years. However, non-profit employers were the most likely to have heard about the program through previous years' application or participation. Public sector employers were mostly to have heard about the program from HRCC offices, while private employers were the most likely to have heard about the program through business contacts or the media.

Table 26: How Employers Heard About the SCP Program by Sector

	Private	Non-Profit	Public
Participated or applied in previous years	34.7	52.6	44.7
HRCC Office	20.4	15.2	22.9
Business contact	15.5	11.4	11.0
The media	11.8	3.2	4.9
All other	17.6	17.6	16.5

Interestingly, all employers in the key informant interviews had been involved in the program for a number of years (some for 10 or more). Initially, some had seen the program advertised in the newspaper, others heard by word of mouth and some had been recruited by HRDC. Almost all of them received a notice from HRDC informing them about the 1996 program.

Business contacts (12.6%), the media (6.2%) and their MP (2.3%) were other main ways that employers learned about the program. The rankings of these hold provincially, but **Table 27** shows some interesting geographical differences.

Relative to the West, employers in Atlantic Canada tended to learn about the program more from HRCC offices (ranging from a low of 22.0% in Newfoundland to a high of 27.3% in Nova Scotia) than from either previous participation (ranging from a low of 26.0% in Newfoundland to a high of 39.7% in New Brunswick) or business contacts (ranging between roughly 12% and 14%). The corresponding proportions for Western employers are HRCC offices (from a low of 6.0% in Manitoba to a high of 19.4% in Alberta), previous participation (from low of 40.0% in Saskatchewan to a high of 60.4% in British Columbia) and business contacts (ranging between roughly 15% and 16%).

Employers in Quebec were the least likely in the country to hear about the program through business contacts (7.0%); previous participation (45.9%) and HRCC offices (27.9%) were comparatively more important. Employers in Ontario were among the least likely in the country to hear about the program through HRCC offices (9.7%); previous participation (46.4%) and business contacts (15.3%) were comparatively more important.

Table 27: How Employers Heard About the SCP Program by Province

	Nfld	NS	NB	PEI	Que	Ont	Man	Sask	Alta	BC
HRDC Office	22.0%	27.3%	23.5%	26.0%	27.9%	9.7%	6.0%	17.1%	19.4%	6.3%
Participated in, or applied for, program in previous year	26.0%	37.9%	39.7%	32.0%	45.9%	46.4%	52.2%	40.0%	48.4%	60.4%
Business contact	12.0%	12.1%	11.8%	14.0%	7.0%	15.3%	14.9%	15.7%	16.1%	15.6%
Through school/ university/ college	2.0%	1.5%	1.5%	2.0%	1.2%	4.1%	3.0%	.0%	2.2%	2.1%
Member of Parliament	6.0%	1.5%	8.8%	4.0%	2.0%	2.0%	1.5%	.0%	1.1%	1.0%
The media	10.0%	1.5%	4.4%	8.0%	5.7%	11.2%	1.5%	12.9%	.0%	3.1%
Other (made up of 10 other responses)	22.0%	10.6%	4.4%	6.0%	5.3%	5.1%	10.4%	5.7%	3.2%	4.2%
Don't know	.0%	7.6%	5.9%	8.0%	4.9%	6.1%	10.4%	8.6%	9.7%	7.3%
Total	(50) 100%	(66) 100%	(68) 100%	(50) 100%	(244) 100%	(196) 100%	(67) 100%	(70) 100%	(93) 100%	(96) 100%
<i>Was this the most effective way to reach you?</i>										
Yes	75.7%	83.3%	86.5%	86.7%	90.8%	64.5%	64.0%	63.9%	74.4%	64.5%
No	21.6%	13.9%	13.5%	13.3%	6.7%	32.3%	36.0%	27.8%	20.5%	32.3%
Don't know/not sure	2.7%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	2.5%	3.2%	.0%	8.3%	5.1%	3.2%
Total	(37) 100%	(36) 100%	(37) 100%	(30) 100%	(120) 100%	(93) 100%	(25) 100%	(36) 100%	(39) 100%	(31) 100%

The media was more mixed, with employers in Saskatchewan (12.9%), Ontario (11.2%) and Newfoundland (10.0%) being the most likely to learn about the program from them and employers in Alberta, Manitoba and Nova Scotia learning virtually nothing about the program through the media.

MPs in New Brunswick and Newfoundland were relatively active in informing employers.

While three-quarters (76.6%) of surveyed employers felt that the way they learned about the program was an effective way to be reached, a fifth (20.4%) did not.

Of the 20.4%, 47.3% suggested direct mailing from HRDC, 21.2% suggested better advertising, and 9.5% suggested direct contact from the HRCC office (9.5%) as being more effective in reaching them.

Employers from Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec were more likely to feel that they had been effectively reached (ranging between roughly 83% and 91%) compared to employers in Newfoundland and from Ontario (ranging between roughly 64% and 76%).

3.3.4 Application Preparation

After employers receive their kits from HRCCs, they complete and submit project applications to their local HRCC. HRDC documents show that, over the last decade, deadlines for submitting applications have deteriorated by almost a month (March 8 in 1986 to April 12 in 1996), largely due to lateness in the Ministerial announcement. As mentioned earlier, this leaves employers with less than 4 weeks to prepare their applications.

In general, most employers in the key informant interviews reported that the application process was easy and that they had no problems with it.

Table 28 confirms this — 86.1% of employers surveyed were very satisfied with the ease of the application process (versus only 3.3% who were very dissatisfied). Nova Scotia (90.9%) and Prince Edward Island (90.0%) had the highest satisfaction ratings while Ontario (82.2%), Alberta (82.8%) and British Columbia (83.4%) had the lowest.

Table 28: Employer Satisfaction Ratings with SCP Program Service

	Very satisfied (4 or 5)	Very dissatisfied (1 or 2)
The overall quality of services provided by the SCP program	88.4%	2.2%
The initial information which you received about the program	82.6%	4.7%
The ease of the application process	86.1%	3.3%
The timeliness of the approval process for applications	64.2%	15.1%
The assistance provided by the staff of the HRCC office	82.7%	4.2%
The current method of paying the wage subsidy to employers	79.5%	4.8%

Almost all employers in the key informant interviews received a notice from HRDC informing them about the program. So most had no problems, largely because they already knew about the program. Several noted that it took only 10 to 20 minutes to apply (they said they just copied last year’s). However, a number had problems with deadlines and the lateness of the information. They noted the need for HRDC to get program information out sooner so that they would have time to plan their summer employment programs and not miss the deadline. A frequently heard comment was: “We had very little time to get our application in”.

Most key informant employers felt that they got good service (very responsive and very informative, no problems, very impressive) from their HRCC.

However, one found it irritating to contact someone at HRDC regarding the program — it appears that telephone numbers are not always current. They suggested a 1-800-line for SCP. Another echoed this sentiment saying “The federal government should keep their telephone numbers up to date — either no one answers, you get voice mail or the line is dead.”

Another reported that HRDC staff knew the “what” about the program but they were unable to provide the “when” of the program — timing is especially crucial for them as they need time to carefully screen applicants.

Two wanted to know how HRDC selected proposals — they wanted a better chance at getting more funds.

Most of the key informant employers reported no problems with forms. One volunteered that the forms were getting better — briefer and fewer.

This was confirmed by the employer survey in which 82.6% of employers said they were very satisfied (compared to only 4.7% who were very dissatisfied) with the initial information which they received about the program (see Table 28 above). Newfoundland (94.0%) and Prince Edward Island (94.0%) had the highest satisfaction ratings while Nova Scotia (77.3%) and Ontario (79.1%) had the lowest.

However, one key informant suggested that the forms should be redone (they are too long and not well laid out, but information requested on them was OK). This was echoed somewhat in the employer survey: 3.5% of them suggested improving the application form, 2.8% suggested improving the clarity and simplicity of the regulations and 1.7% suggested improving the program material.

HRDC staff are, perhaps, more affected by the lateness in receiving program information than employers.

They feel that both the variability of announcement and application dates and the lateness of program information diminishes the quality of service they provide to employers. As one manager said: “The delay damages the students because they get a shorter contribution period. The public releases preceded information releases, so staff had difficulty answering queries. Employers complained about the delays.” But, another staff member pointed out resignedly “Nothing really changed from the previous year. Everything is always late so we expect it.”

However, most staff conceded that while information, etc. was late, that it was better this year than previous years.

But they did note that there were typos on the diskette information, that English information comes before French (which is too late to be of use) and that the Operational Procedures for

the program (Chapter 26 of the policy manual) are out-of-date and this causes confusion (e.g., the ineligibility of immediate family members [Section 26.29, Item 2.b] has been successfully challenged in the courts).

3.3.5 Application Assessment

After the proposals come in, HRCC staff assesses each of them based on local and regional needs and in accordance with the established criteria (see Section 1.1 for details). Following the receipt of applications, HRCCs prepare and submit a list of recommendations to the local MPs for review and recommendation. Once reviewed by the MP, the list is returned to the respective HRCC for the manager's approval and signature of agreements. MPs may submit a non-consensus to the Minister if in disagreement.

The timeliness of the approval process caused employers the most concern with the administration of the program.

Table 28 above shows that this was the most dissatisfying aspect of an otherwise well-delivered and well-received program. Only 64.2% of surveyed employers rated this highly compared to 15.1% who rated it lowly. Employers in Prince Edward Island (84.0%) and Manitoba (77.6%) were the most satisfied with timeliness while employers in Ontario (50.0%) and British Columbia (52.1%) were the least satisfied.

Reducing the amount of time taken to approve applications was the number one suggestion from employers about how to improve the program. More than a fifth (21.5%) stated this concern and another 6.0% said that businesses should be allowed to apply earlier.

Employers in the key informant interviews expressed mixed views about their applications being processed in an efficient and timely manner. Many were not sure when they got approval. Many said that they had no delays. Others said that the delay between the closing of applications and the notification of contract awards is too long and that it was particularly late this year.

Most key informant employers said they were informed soon enough to recruit participants as planned.

Typical comments were as follows:

- (a) This year, yes. We had 2 and ½ weeks to find a student whereas last year we had only 2 days.
- (b) Overall HRDC usually informs us soon enough to recruit participants as planned. But, not always. We were told on Friday that we had been approved for 12 weeks which meant that we had to hire on the following Monday.

Many, however, experienced delays which caused them difficulty finding students, for example, losing the best candidate for the job.

Typical comments included delays causing students who had applied earlier to take another job, or start dates which could not be met.

Two suggested earlier notification for the sake of the students. Another felt that the HRCC should explain why they did not get funded. “We don’t always get approved and we do not get an explanation why. We are in contact with other day care agencies and one year we got turned down while another agency got two positions. They do the same work as we do and they have the same type of clients — they are in the core. It does not seem fair.”

Employers’ concern about timeliness was echoed by program staff.

They noted that processing applications was a very intense period (a crash program to process contracts).

Most staff try to fund as many applications as possible.

To do so they may reduce the funding requested — usually the number of participants per application. Some reduce the number of weeks per participant, but not too much as this may affect the quality of the placement.

Very few applications were rejected. Reasons for rejection include (a) the type of work being offered (i.e., not career related, such as stuffing envelopes — although some regions do fund this as it may be the only work available in the area), (b) the proposal does not look like an employer-employee relationship, c) commission work, and (d) poor previous experience with the employer.

Very few approved applications are not actioned by employers.

HRDC staff estimate that between 0% and 10% are not actioned. Withdrawals/cancellations occur mainly in the private sector — usually due to a slow down in business. Some applications are not actioned because the employer does not get the specific student they want or the type of skill (e.g., pharmaceutical students in rural regions). Some regions over-commit (compared to their budget) to cover likely lapses or non-actioned proposals.

3.3.6 Participant Recruitment

Employers, although encouraged to use the HRCCs for Students, may identify the student they wish to hire without assistance from HRDC. In HRCCs for Students, an inventory of eligible students and employers is set up to assist with matching candidates with available positions.

Some local offices use the HRCCs for Students for promotion and monitoring, including the 20% survey of participants (20% is the number of low risk employers HRCC representatives are to visit for purposes of inspection and audit).

About two-fifths (40.4%) of the employers used the HRCCs for Students to hire a student and a few of them (2.8%) felt that the HRCC's screening of the students could be improved.

By way of contrast, only 12.6% of participants reported that they heard about their job from a posting at (6.9%) or had a referral from (5.7%) an HRCC for Students.

Another 5.5% of participants reported a posting at (2.8%) or a referral from (2.7%) a regular HRCC. Most participants say they found their job through friends/relatives (34.5%) or employers (25.0%).

HRCCs were the single most important recruiting vehicle for employers. The next most important source attests to the initiative of the participants — for 17.9% of the employers the students applied directly to them. Only a tenth (10.5%) of employers experienced difficulty finding students with the training or educational background (generally the right set of skills) required to fill the position.

Table 29 shows that employers used HRCCs for Students most heavily in Prince Edward Island (56.0%) and Ontario (50.0%). They were used the least in the Prairie provinces (ranging from a low of 22.9% in Saskatchewan to a high of 28.0% in Alberta). Student initiative was generally stronger in Atlantic Canada (except for Prince Edward Island where it was only 12.0%) — ranging from a low of 21.2% in Nova Scotia to a high of 33.8% in New Brunswick — than in the rest of Canada (where it ranged from a low of 6.5% in Alberta to a high of 20.0% in Saskatchewan).

About a third of employers in the key informant interviews said that they used an HRCC for Students and they got people they were very happy with. Most, however, did not use the HRCCs for Students. They used their own networks (supervisors know people, hire students from previous year, someone in mind, go to universities, go to people they know, there are always students looking for jobs, they like to hire locally) instead.

HRDC staff felt that, although employers are encouraged, they make minor use of the HRCCs for Students because it is not mandatory. However, staff felt that the employers who used them had a generally favourable impression and they estimated that the HRCCs for Students may account for up to 50% of the program's placements.

Participants were highly aware of the program (78.0%) and the federal government's subsidization of their job (85.3%).

However, the response may be biased by the fact that the program was mentioned in the survey introduction. This level of awareness contradicts the impressions of some HRDC staff.

Table 29: What Method Did Employers Use to Find the Student(s) They Hired Under the Program?

	Nfld (50)	NS (66)	NB (68)	PEI (50)	Que (244)	Ont (196)	Man (67)	Sask (70)	Alta (93)	BC (96)
HRCC for Student's Office	40.0%	45.5%	36.8%	56.0%	46.7%	50.0%	26.9%	22.9%	28.0%	33.3%
Student(s) applied directly to company	24.0%	21.2%	33.8%	12.0%	18.9%	15.8%	11.9%	20.0%	6.5%	18.8%
Responded to advertisement in the newspaper	16.0%	10.6%	8.8%	.0%	9.8%	17.3%	14.9%	24.3%	28.0%	10.4%
Through school/university/college	4.0%	6.1%	7.4%	8.0%	14.3%	10.2%	26.9%	12.9%	26.9%	14.6%
Already knew the student(s)	16.0%	10.6%	7.4%	10.0%	12.3%	7.7%	10.4%	12.9%	10.8%	9.4%
Friend/relative	2.0%	10.6%	8.8%	14.0%	1.6%	7.7%	9.0%	10.0%	8.6%	6.3%
Other (made up of 10 other responses)	8.0%	3.0%	11.8%	.0%	2.9%	6.1%	11.9%	.0%	3.2%	10.4%
Business contact	2.0%	1.5%	.0%	4.0%	4.5%	9.7%	6.0%	.0%	6.5%	8.3%
Student had worked for company	4.0%	4.5%	10.3%	4.0%	3.3%	3.1%	7.5%	2.9%	7.5%	4.2%
Postings on church bulletin boards/ community bulletin boards	12.0%	.0%	5.9%	4.0%	2.9%	1.0%	.0%	4.3%	4.3%	3.1%
On-campus recruiting	.0%	1.5%	1.5%	.0%	1.2%	3.1%	1.5%	2.9%	3.2%	3.1%
Don't know	.0%	3.0%	1.5%	.0%	1.2%	2.6%	.0%	2.9%	.0%	.0%

Note: Column totals do not add up to 100% due to multiple responses.

In general, participants in Quebec were most aware about *both* the program (89.1%, the highest) and the federal government's subsidization of their job (92.1%). Participants in New Brunswick tended to be the least aware of both (72.0% and 80.0%, respectively.) Program awareness was the lowest in Alberta (64.0%). Participants in British Columbia (94.1%), Nova Scotia (92.5%) and Saskatchewan (92.3%) were the most aware of the federal government's subsidization of their job; participants in Newfoundland (78.0%) and Prince Edward Island (80.0%) were the least aware.

While a significant proportion (85.0%) of surveyed employers had in mind a particular set of skills and/or knowledge required to fill the student's position when they developed their program submission, fewer than four-fifths (38.0%) of them had identified a particular student.

Employers in Alberta (92.5%), Ontario (92.3%) and British Columbia (91.7%) were most likely to have a particular set of skills and/or knowledge in mind, while employers in Newfoundland (72.0%), Manitoba (73.1%) and Saskatchewan (75.7%) were the least likely.

Employers in Quebec (44.3%), Saskatchewan (41.4%) and Nova Scotia (40.9%) were most likely to have identified a particular student, while employers in Newfoundland (32.0%), Manitoba (32.8%), Ontario (33.2%) and Alberta (33.3%) were the least likely.

Just slightly more than one in ten (10.5%) employers had some difficulty in finding students with the training or educational background required to fill the positions.

The most common (67.6%) reason cited for having difficulty was that applicants did not have the right set of skills. Employers also cited that too few students were available in the area (16.1%) and that the applicants did not have the right personal skills or lacked personal suitability (10.7%).

Employers in Saskatchewan (18.6%), Alberta (14.1%) and Nova Scotia (13.6%) had the most difficulty finding students with the training or background required to fill the positions, while employers in New Brunswick (5.9%) and Prince Edward Island (6.0%) experienced the least difficulty. The latter may be due, at least in part, to the effectiveness of the HRCCs for Students in helping employers find students (employers relied most heavily on them in that province and they also report one of the highest levels of overall satisfaction with the services received).

Almost all (93.5%) employers surveyed felt strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that the student they hired met their expectations with respect to the skills that s/he brought to the job. Only a fraction (2.8%) felt that the student did not (a rating of 1 or 2).

Employers in Quebec (93.0%), New Brunswick (92.7%) and Alberta (92.5%) felt this most strongly, while employers in Newfoundland (82.0%), Manitoba (85.0%) and Nova Scotia (86.3%) felt this least strongly.

3.3.7 Employer Administration Costs

Employers do not incur any significant administrative costs as a consequence of the current wage subsidy process.

Many employers in the key informant interviews said that they only incur the normal costs of employing an employee and applying for and administering the program. They said that the latter were minimal. HRDC staff concurred.

Almost all (85.4%) employers provided their SCP participants with some training.

For almost half (49.5%) of them, this was on-the-job training, coaching or mentoring. Almost as important (42.3%) was formal on-site training. Another quarter (24.3%) provide orientation or preparatory training while less than a tenth (8.4%) provided formal off-site training. By way of contrast, only a quarter (25.6%) of participants reported receiving any formal training. (These categories add to more than 100% as some employers provided their SCP participants with more than one type of training.)

Many employers in the key informant interviews said that they provided some sort of orientation training, the type that is normally given to any new employee when they join a new company (e.g., type of clients, the organization’s activities and the centres with which they will work).

Others reported minimal (they already had the basics, always a supervisor around) or no training (hired students for very basic work — “general hands”). Some train on the job only. Only a few employers reported extensive training. A number of employers said that they viewed the costs of training as an investment.

Table 30 below shows that employers in Newfoundland (68.0%) and Quebec (75.0%) were the least likely to provide training of any kind and that employers in British Columbia (94.8%), Ontario (93.4%) and Alberta (92.5%) were the most likely. As **Table 31** below shows, the type of training provided by employers varied dramatically on a provincial basis.

Table 30: Employers, Did the student receive any training?

	Nfld (50)	NS (66)	NB (68)	PEI (50)	Que (244)	Ont (196)	Man (67)	Sask (70)	Alta (93)	BC (96)
Yes	68.0%	87.9%	89.7%	88.0%	75.0%	93.4%	80.6%	85.7%	92.5%	94.8%
No	32.0%	10.6%	7.4%	12.0%	25.0%	6.6%	19.4%	14.3%	7.5%	5.2%
Don't know/not sure	.0%	1.5%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 31: Employers, What type of training, if any, did your summer student receive?

	Nfld (34)	NS (58)	NB (61)	PEI (44)	Que (183)	Ont (183)	Man (54)	Sask (60)	Alta (86)	BC (91)
On-the-job training/ coaching/mentoring	52.9%	51.7%	70.5%	29.5%	11.5%	68.3%	66.7%	55.0%	54.7%	57.1%
For on-site training	11.8%	44.8%	31.1%	65.9%	66.1%	30.6%	16.7%	36.7%	47.7%	42.9%
Orientation or preparatory training	44.1%	22.4%	31.1%	11.4%	12.0%	38.3%	38.9%	15.0%	15.1%	18.7%
Formal off-site training	.0%	8.6%	3.3%	18.2%	21.3%	2.2%	1.9%	6.7%	2.3%	9.9%
Don't know	2.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%
None	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%

Note: Column totals do not add up to 100% due to multiple responses.

3.3.8 Monitoring

Since 1988, the Department has moved towards a more flexible and individual approach to agreement monitoring. Based on the concept of risk assessment, the approach allows those responsible for the administration of contribution agreements to plan individual agreement monitoring by weighing factors that could contribute to potential problems and then tailoring a monitoring plan accordingly. Factors considered when developing a plan for agreement monitoring include: agreement cost; complexity of the agreement; location of the activity; number of participants; amount of experience the employer/coordinator has in managing agreements; the Department's prior experience in dealing with the employer/ coordinator; the agreement's public profile; and the agreement duration.

Although on-site monitoring is the preferred option, other methods such as telephone contact, visits by the employer/coordinator to the HRCC, or contact with employer/ coordinators at agreement close-out are used.

For those agreements that are low risk and where the agreement value is less than \$15,000, one out of every 5 (or 20 per cent) are generally monitored via an on-site visit.

For agreements which have not been selected for on-site visits, the monitoring activities would, as a minimum, ensure that the fundamental features of the agreement are being met: namely, that students have been hired, that they are being paid the amount stated in the agreement and that they are performing the work described in the agreement.

HRCC representatives are to visit 20% of employers for purposes of inspection and audit of books and records, as well as monitoring the quality of the experience.

When asked “What percentage of SCP Agreements are monitored in your region?”, the regions displayed divergent views on monitoring ranging from 10% to 100%.

Some monitor “high risk” employers — those for which there is some concern (for whom some complaint may have been received) — and also new employers to ensure that they do not make mistakes.

Monitoring is also used to solve problems (such as replacing union workers, which is rare), to check for health and safety concerns and to counsel participants (if necessary). However, problems are few and relatively minor.

In general, regions use simple (paper) systems — as opposed to automated information systems — to support their monitoring.

Two employers in the key informant interviews commented on the monitoring. One said that she was impressed with the on-site monitoring visit, while the other questioned the value of the program’s monitoring.

Only a fraction (3.3%) of participants reported hourly earning which were below their provincial adult minimum wage. Most of these were in Ontario where the proportion was 9.9%.

3.3.9 Claims Payment

Within 30 days of termination of agreements, employers submit claims to receive the balance of their contributions.

Most employers (79.5%) were very satisfied (rating of 4 or 5) with the current method of paying the wage subsidy to employers.

As Table 29 above shows, only a fraction (4.8%) of them were very dissatisfied (rating of 1 or 2).

Key informants shared this view.

When asked whether the method of delivering the wage subsidy should be changed (e.g. a lump sum payment at the termination of a participant’s employment, thereby reducing administrative procedures), most HRDC staff said “No.” They said that they did not want to pay the participants as it would be an administrative nightmare. They also pointed out that the change really applies to not-for-profit employers only. “The only problem is when these employers do not spend all of their advance — and we have only a few of these.” A contrary view held by one staff member was that the Job Opportunities for Youth (JOY) Program gives employers half the money up front and half the money at the end. “This gives us a bit more control and makes us seem more business-like. Businesses like this and many of them have the same cash flow problem as the not-for-profits. So, why shouldn’t everyone be eligible for an advance?”

Generally key informant employers were happy with the current method. Those receiving an advance noted how helpful it was, one of whom would prefer to get all the money at the beginning of the summer (but current approach is OK). Those who get paid at the end felt it resulted in less work for their company (keep the paperwork small). However, two of these indicated that an advance would be helpful. Another argued for a later billing date. Yet another suggested payment in two portions. As Table 29 above shows, the employer survey confirmed that, in general, employers were very satisfied (79.5%) with the current method of paying the wage subsidy to them.

3.3.10 Roles and Responsibilities

Key informants — both employers and HRDC staff — noted that the roles and responsibilities of the various HRDC players were clearly understood.

The program has been operating since 1985 and both employers and HRDC staff have come to know it well.

The only source of confusion this year was the expansion of the program to Industry Canada, Heritage Canada and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. “Growing pains — this needs to be handled better if it continues and/or expands.” Some HRDC staff noted that some employers were confused by the expansion of the program to three additional departments.

Name changes over the years cause some confusion.

Many employers still refer to the program as SEED or Challenge, which were the names of the program in past years.

HRDC staff suggested that some confusion exists on the part of the MPs regarding their role.

The key role of MPs relates to the review of projects under consideration for funding. Staff recommended that the MPs be briefed better.

Generally, employers dealt with project officers at HRCC. Most of them felt that they got good service (very responsive and very informative, no problems, very impressive).

However, one found it irritating to contact someone at HRDC regarding the program — it appears that telephone numbers are not always current. They suggested a 1-800-line for SCP.

Another reported that HRDC staff knew the “what” about the program but they were unable to provide the “when” of the program — timing is especially crucial for them as they need time to carefully screen applicants.

Two wanted to know how HRDC selected proposals — they wanted a better chance at getting more funds.

Regions provide NHQ with very little information or very few reports on the SCP program.

There is no formal requirement, so the staff provide nothing beyond NHQ enquiries, of which we got a lot this summer, particularly for riding information. NHQ can access data bases.

One staff member noted that very little information sharing occurs between the regions — things that have worked well or problems/abnormalities. Sharing is informal.

In general, neither employers nor HRDC staff felt that the SCP constituted a partnership between the government and employers.

HRDC staff suggested that both sides benefit from a financial “partnership” — the government provides the funding and the employer provides employment to a (presumably) young person. But this is more of a contract than a partnership. “Experience Canada is a partnership — SCP is not.” One staff cautioned “The program creates dependency”.

While most employers felt that there was no real partnership in the program, many had a long-standing relationship with HRDC which is a benefit to the community.

One large employer in the key informant interviews expressed a desire to improve the relationship with HRDC. “We would like input to planning and discussion of issues. We would like to pilot various initiatives within the program — where appropriate, e.g., online systems. We would also like to help set the objective(s) for the program and work together to find more inventive approaches to help the students while respecting the requirements of the program. For example, fund projects in 4-week chunks?”

Staff noted that most provinces have a program similar to SCP and that this is confusing to employers. Some suggested possible co-delivery with the province — “one stop shopping”.

Similarly, neither side really saw a “leadership role” for employers.

HRDC staff said “Not sure what this means. Difficult to see this.” Employers said “None. Giving experience to students. We provide quality experiences through the financial support”.

3.4 Program Satisfaction

3.4.1 Participants’ Satisfaction With the Program

There were various elements that contributed to the satisfaction levels of participants. These elements were: the student’s enthusiasm, the training that they received, the role the employer or supervisor played as a mentor, and the degree to which they liked the work they were doing. The following numbers provide insight on each element.

Almost all (93.5%) employers in the survey felt that their SCP student was enthusiastic about his/her job. Only a fraction (2.1%) did not.

Employers in British Columbia (96.9%) and Ontario (96.4%) were the most likely to feel this while employers in Newfoundland (84.0%) and Saskatchewan (87.1%) were the least likely. While the last two had high disagreement percentages (4.0% and 4.3%, respectively), the highest were actually recorded in Nova Scotia (7.6%) and Prince Edward Island (6.0%).

More than four-fifths (85.5%) of the employers provided their SCP student with some training — mostly on-the-job training/coaching/mentoring (49.5%).

Employers also provided formal training — both on-site (42.3%) and off-site (8.4%) — and orientation or preparatory training (24.3%).

The majority of participants (75.9%) felt strongly (a rating 4 or 5) that their employer acted as a mentor or coach.

Just 10.4% felt the opposite (a rating of 1 or 2). Similarly, most (89.5%) of them felt strongly (a rating 4 or 5) that they received adequate assistance in carrying out their duties compared to a fraction (3.6%) that felt they did not (a rating of 1 or 2).

Participants in Ontario (87.2%), Nova Scotia (79.2%) and Prince Edward Island (78.0%) were the most likely to feel that their employer acted as a mentor or coach. Participants in Manitoba (68.0%), Newfoundland (70.0%) and New Brunswick (70.0%) were the least likely. Despite its relatively high rating, New Brunswick also had the highest proportion (17.0%) of participants who felt strongly that their employer did not act as a mentor or coach. A similar pattern holds when participants were asked whether they received adequate assistance in carrying out their duties: Ontario (91.3%) and Nova Scotia (94.3%) traded places as the highest and Manitoba (82.0%) and New Brunswick (82.0%) tied for the lowest.

Only a handful (9.1%) of participants did not have a clear idea of their main tasks.

Overall, the vast majority (90.7%) of SCP students liked (68.2% strongly liked and 22.5% liked) their summer job. Only 0.7% disliked or strongly disliked their summer job while 8.7% had mixed feelings.

Nova Scotia (96.2%), Ontario (96.1%) and Prince Edward Island (96.0%) virtually tied for the highest satisfaction levels while Manitoba (86.0%) and New Brunswick (88.0%) had the lowest.

The thing that participants tended to like most about their summer job was either their duties (53.8%) or the people they worked with (30.2%). Almost half (49.8%) said there was nothing that they disliked about their summer job. For those who disliked something, it was

the duties that they performed in almost a third of the cases (16.4% of 50.2%). Other things that were disliked were the hours of work (7.7%), the pay (6.3%) and, strangely enough, the weather (3.8%).

3.4.2 Employers' Satisfaction With the Program

Similar to participants, there were a variety of factors that contributed to employers' satisfaction with the program. The following information sheds some light on these factors.

Almost all (94.9%) employers were fully satisfied with the overall performance of their SCP student. Only a fraction (2.5%) were not.

Employers were most satisfied in New Brunswick (97.1%), Ontario (96.9%) and Prince Edward Island (96.0%). They were least satisfied in Newfoundland (86.0%) and Nova Scotia (89.4%)

When probed about what, if any, were the advantages of having an SCP student, employers cited the following: Generally provided a useful service/worked well/were helpful (49.8%), took pressure off employees/filled in for those on vacation (33.3%), improved the quality of existing services (26.3%), enabled us to expand an activity (25.4%) and engaged in new activities/services/work (23.9%). Almost one in ten (9.5%) noted that the student brought new ideas/creativity.

Similarly, almost all (93.5%) employers felt that the work provided by their SCP student to the organization added value. Only a fraction (1.6%) did not.

Employers in Ontario (99.0%), British Columbia (99.0%) and Alberta (98.9%) felt this most. Those in Quebec (84.0%), Newfoundland (90.0%) and Nova Scotia (90.9%) felt this least.

Almost two-thirds (63.0%) of the employers said that their organization intended to re-hire their SCP student at a later date.

For the majority (80.8%), this will be a job for the summer of 1997. However, many of the remainder will be offering a part-time job during the coming school year. Some will be offering a full-time job after graduation while a few will be offering a full-time job right away.

When asked what, other than wages subsidies, was the most appropriate way for government to support students and employers in providing career related experience for students, almost a third (31.7%) provided no alternative, while almost a fifth (19.9%) repeated wage subsidies.

A fifth (23.5%) of the employers said funds for training was the most appropriate way. Employers in Atlantic Canada were less likely to repeat wage subsidies than employers in the rest of the country.

The remaining employers (25%) provided numerous other answers, the most important being to provide more work terms for students (7.4%).

Many employers in the key informant interviews were very satisfied with program.

- 1) Students contribute significantly because of their enthusiasm and energy — not tired, rundown employees.
- 2) Of all federal employment programs, it is the best — the one we most enjoy being part of.
- 3) Hate to see it cut — valuable service to our clients. Happy to have it, continue it.
- 4) A big THANK YOU — without the SCP, the summer would not be a very good period for our clients — we would only be able to offer activities indoors and we would probably have to shut down for a period to allow staff to take holidays.

3.5 Continuing Need

3.5.1 Participant Perspective

Very few participants (12.1%) had not worked at least one previous summer.

Only 15.2% had worked one previous summer, while 40.5% had worked two to four previous summers and 32.3% had worked five or more summers.

Participants in Newfoundland (78.0%) and Quebec (84.2%) were the least likely to have worked at least one previous summer while participants in Prince Edward Island (96.0%), Ontario (95.0%) and New Brunswick (94.0%) were the most likely. The same patterns hold for multiple summer jobs.

However, less than half (46.7%) of these previous summer jobs were directly related to the participant's future career.

Despite the multiplicity of previous summer jobs, 23.4% of the participants had only one which was career-related. An almost equal proportion (23.3%) had at least two which were career-related. More than half (53.3%) of the participants' previous summer employment experience was not career-related.

Participants in Nova Scotia (57.3%) and British Columbia (53.3%) were the most likely to have had at least one of their previous summer jobs career-related. Participants in Saskatchewan (37.0%), Newfoundland (38.5%) and Manitoba (38.6%) were the least likely.

About half (48.0%) of the participants had at least one of their previous summer jobs sponsored or subsidized through a government-sponsored summer employment program.

While 52.0% had no previous summer job sponsored or subsidized through a government-sponsored summer employment program, 24.9% had one and another 18.0% had at least two (5.0% of the participants did not know).

Participants in Newfoundland (71.8%) were the most likely to have had at least one of their previous summer jobs sponsored or subsidized through a government-sponsored summer employment program, while participants in Quebec (34.1%) were the least likely. These two stand out in sharp contrast to the rest of the provinces where the proportions ranged between roughly 41% and 54%.

Interestingly, about a third (28.7%) of the participants who were offered jobs next summer by this summer's employer believe that the offer is conditional upon the employer getting money from government to cover their salary costs.

An almost equal proportion (26.7%) do not think so while almost half (44.6%) do not know.

Almost every participant (97.7%) thought that a government program that tries to prepare students for full-time jobs through summer work experience was a good idea.

Only 1.6% had mixed feelings while none felt that it was not a good idea (0.7% did not know).

Support ranged from a high of 100.0% in Prince Edward Island to a low of 94.0% in New Brunswick.

In their closing comments, 43.2% of the participants volunteered that the program provides students with necessary experience. Other comments included great program (17.0%); employers would not have been able to hire the students without the subsidy (16.6%); it helps decide their career (9.5%); and it helps finance students' education (9.2%).

3.5.2 Employer Perspective

Almost every employer (98.6%) would be interested in applying should the SCP, or a similar program, be available next summer.

Only three employers were not interested and they all cited a different reason for not participating — no need, subsidy not large enough and complaints about the program.

Interest in reapplying ranged from a high of 100.0% in Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan to a low of 97.0% in Nova Scotia.

All employers in the key informant interviews said that they would participate in the SCP program next year. Reasons included: (a) it allows them to offer services which would not otherwise be available, (b) it helps them to complete projects that would not otherwise be done, (c) they have been participating for years (one of whom is asking for more and getting less each year), and (d) some get a long term benefit (we have hired some of the students back).

More than two-thirds (69.0%) of the employers stated that they would not have hired a student this summer had the wage subsidy not been available. As mentioned above, 62.7% of all employers surveyed hired only one SCP student. In 82.6% of these cases, it is the only student they hired. This means that 51.8% of all surveyed employers hired no additional student.

In the summer of 1995, these employers reported hiring 3,088 students of whom almost half (48.3%) were subsidized by some level of government.

3.5.3 HRDC Perspective

In general, HRDC staff see a continuing need for the SCP program.

- (a) It works. It generates jobs and provide opportunities for students to network and to learn new skills. It is a very effective program for the money spent. We can lever money in some sectors.
- (b) Employers who resist wage subsidies for the unemployed because of the implicit pressures to eventually offer full-time employment participate eagerly in SCP because jobs are clearly temporary and require no long term commitment from the employer.
- (c) Clear, effective, simple program. It works well. It is well-known, it is not expensive and there is a lot of positive feedback from employers and students. This is a high-profile federal government program — lots of benefits to the federal government. Small employers appreciate it — if it was dropped it would be missed.

3.6 Alternatives

3.6.1 Same Subsidy for Large and Small Employers

More than half (55.7%) of the employers surveyed felt that the wage subsidy should be the same for both large and small employers⁹ (which is the current arrangement).

About a quarter (27.8%) did not think that it should be the same and the remainder (16.5%) did not know or were unsure.

Employers in the public (64.6% for versus 21.8% against) and private (62.5% for versus 26.1% against) sectors were much more likely to favor the wage subsidy being the same for both large and small employers, while employers in the non-profit (48.6% for versus 30.9%) sector were less likely to favor it.

⁹ As there is no commonly accepted definition of “small” and “large” firms in Canada, respondents were asked to think of large firms as those employing more than 100 employees and small firms as those employing fewer than 20 employees.

Employers in Prince Edward Island (74.0%) and New Brunswick (70.6%) were more likely to say “yes” while employers in British Columbia (47.9%) and Nova Scotia (48.5%) were the least likely. Somewhat in contrast, employers in Quebec (38.9%) and Newfoundland (36.0%) were more likely to say “no” while employers in Prince Edward Island (12.0%) and Saskatchewan (17.1%) were the least likely.

Employers in the key informant interviews had mixed views.

- (a) Size has nothing to do with it — all depends on who the student is working for and the size of the immediate department/unit.
- (b) SCP should not support large private sector employers who can afford to hire without a wage subsidy.
- (c) Subsidy should be better for employers — like us — who hire more students.

HRDC staff were generally not supportive of changing the current arrangement.

The real question, they suggested, is what is the participant getting out of the work.

- (a) The concept makes sense, but it is difficult to administer. Perhaps just placing an emphasis on small employers would do. Keep the program simple. Be flexible.
- (b) Again, if you negotiate the rate this does not matter. Lots of flexibility — you negotiate the number of positions, the number of weeks and the rates.
- (c) Generally, bigger employers tend to give better work experience. On the other hand, more support for students in smaller organizations. But, have to be equitable — can’t favor one type of employer.
- (d) Discriminatory if the subsidy is different depending on the size of an employer.

Those who were in favor of different wage subsidies said that there should be a larger subsidy for small firms, but there needs to be a clear definition of small firms and what is an employee.

3.6.2 Flat Rate — Same Subsidy for All Sectors

Similarly, almost half (52.1%) of the employers surveyed felt that the wage subsidy should be the same for both private sector and non-profit employers.

More than a third (38.1%) did not think that it should be the same and the remainder (9.8%) did not know or were unsure.

Again, employers in the private (62.8% for versus 25.7% against) and public (59.0% for versus 29.8% against) sectors were much more likely to favor the wage subsidy being the same for all sectors. Employers in the non-profit sector were slightly against having the same rate (43.4% for versus 48.3%).

Employers in Saskatchewan (70.0%), Prince Edward Island (56.0%) and New Brunswick (55.9%) were more likely to say “yes” while employers in Manitoba (46.3%), British Columbia (46.9%) and Alberta (47.3%) were the least likely.

Somewhat in contrast, employers in Alberta (44.1%), Quebec (42.2%) and British Columbia (41.7%) were more likely to say “no” while employers in Saskatchewan (24.3%) and Newfoundland (32.0%) were the least likely.

Employers in the key informant interviews had mixed views regarding the possibility of the same subsidy for all sectors.

Some employers said “yes” (more equitable, doesn’t believe that private sector always has more resources to pay students), while some said “no” (certain areas need more, private sector has greater capacity to contribute more). More specifically they offered the following:

- (a) It is important to ensure that students get paid the same amount — shouldn’t penalize those working for non-profit organizations.
- (b) Public and private sector should be the same, university stole one of the candidates from these sectors because it could pay much more for a recruitment level position.
- (c) If it drops the rate of subsidization for non-profit -- no (quote from not-for-profit employer). But large employers should hire more students — they have an obligation. But not so for smaller employers. Real issue is who does the employing and what career opportunities are provided — not size of employer. Aren’t jobs with Microsoft important for students’ careers?
- (d) “No” to the same subsidy for the various size of private sector employers — smaller companies need more assistance because that is where things are happening (the larger ones are downsizing). Besides, it is harder for smaller companies to find the money but the commitment is often stronger and there is a wider opportunity for a real life work experience in a smaller company. Perhaps HRDC should look into a form of proportional subsidization based on number of employees.

One suggested that the subsidy should be based on need while another said that they could not comment on the other sectors, but they know that they could not have less than 100% subsidy for the non-profit sector.

HRDC staff also had mixed views on whether the wage subsidy should be a flat rate, i.e., the same for all sectors.

Those who were against it noted the not-for-profit employers need a higher subsidy for them to employ someone. Some argued against the private sector getting more. “There is an expectation that it should do more to create summer jobs for students.” One HRCC manager felt that the wage rate should be negotiable within the guidelines so that the money can be spread around. “Employers must demonstrate the need for the subsidy. If they do not need it (or as much) then we must have the option of not awarding it or of awarding a lesser rate.” Several suggested that it would be easier, but not fairer.

Those who were in favour felt that different rates were discriminatory (i.e., favouring one type of enterprise over another). Some suggested the need to revisit the private sector subsidy of \$2.50/hour (especially for small business). “It used to be equivalent to the adult minimum wage, but it is proportionately less now.” Two managers asked why the public sector should get more than the private sector. “Maybe these should be reversed. The public sector is already subsidized — school boards and hospitals receive subsidies.”

3.6.3 Raising or Lowering the Subsidy

Key informants were asked “Given limited funding, should the average subsidy per job be raised or lowered? by sector of employer?”

In general, employers felt that raising the wage subsidy would be unrealistic and that lowering it would eliminate the incentive for some.

Some typical comments to this effect follow:

- (a) If any lower it would not be worth my time.
- (b) Higher is unrealistic, but do not lower it.
- (c) Should stay the same. But if funding is increased, the subsidy should be raised.
- (d) Higher, but not if it means fewer jobs for students.
- (e) Hard to say — we get 100% subsidy. On a general level, it would be nice to raise it as this would probably result in more job opportunities for students during the summer months which, in turn, will result in students having a better chance to get a job in their field after graduation.
- (f) Raised and fewer jobs as opposed to lowered and more jobs because the former would reduce administrative costs (per job) and make the subsidy worthwhile. The opposite would erode the value of the subsidy.
- (g) Would like to see the whole program get more money as the demand from students is not being met.

HRDC staff felt that there was some room to reconsider the size of the wage subsidy, particularly at the sector level.

HRDC staff suggested the following:

- (a) We need a subsidy which is sufficient to create the incentive. In this regard, there is a need to re-examine the various subsidies, particularly for the private sector. Suggest 50% of the adult minimum wage.
- (b) Don't know that it could be lowered much more and still generate applications — not-for-profits are strapped for cash. We have already lowered it through negotiated rates. It should not be higher.
- (c) Could possibly raise the subsidy in small communities, but not in large ones. Provide for local flexibility, but it is not necessary to change the level of subsidy.
- (d) The subsidy for the public sector should be reduced. It should be increased for the private sector in areas where the number of job opportunities is low. Not-for-profit is OK.

3.6.4 Other Alternatives

During the course of the key informant interviews, HRDC staff suggested some alternatives to the current program's design.

- (a) Some abuse is occurring (some individuals lie about their intention to return to school so that they can become eligible for employment insurance). Implement a tuition voucher system like SWASP. Market the program to students rather than employers. This should make the program more career-oriented.
- (b) As more and more students go on to the semester system, perhaps SCP should be available on a "year round" basis because there is nothing for a student who is available in March. Similarly, as the labour force becomes more part-time, perhaps SCP, which funds full-time jobs, sets unrealistic expectations for youth — maybe full-time is a false expectation. Maybe we should think about the part-time dimension a little more.
- (c) The fact that there are both federal and provincial government programs is confusing. It is really a provincial matter. Possible co-delivery with the province — "one stop shopping."

3.7 Provincial Summary

The provincial data in the previous sections have been analyzed according to the main issues to try to ascertain how they compared to the "national" measures and to each other. **Table 32** represents the result of that analysis. "High" mean that, in general, the province's measures were relatively better than the "national." "Low" means the opposite. The absence of either means that the province was about the same.

Care must be taken in reviewing these data. To illustrate, Saskatchewan's low reported incrementality may be due to its sector mix. It made the lowest use of the non-profit sector (where reported incrementality is highest), the highest use of the public sector (which has low reported incrementality) and high use of the private sector (where reported incrementality is lowest).

Similarly, these rankings may be heavily influenced by the nature of the labour market and the quality of the jobs that it can offer more than by the performance of HRDC staff. This may account for much of the difference between Ontario and Newfoundland. For example:

- *Ontario* enjoys high incrementality and career development and the most satisfied participants. Its employers, however, while highly satisfied with their participants' performance, are among the least satisfied with program service.
- *Nova Scotia* also enjoys highly satisfied participants and employers.
- *Newfoundland* reports high incrementality but low career development. Both its participants and employers are relatively dissatisfied, but they see a high continuing need for the program.
- *Saskatchewan*, by way of contrast, has both low reported incrementality and low career development.
- *Prince Edward Island* enjoys the most satisfied employers with respect to program. Its participants report high career development and high satisfaction. Both employers and participants see a high continuing need for the program.
- *New Brunswick's* participants report high career development, but are relatively dissatisfied with the program. By way of contrast, its employers are relatively satisfied with the performance of their students.
- *British Columbia* reports high incrementality, but low continuing need.

The other provinces have no clear message worth commenting on.

Table 32: Provincial Summary by Issue

	Incrementality	Career Development	Program Service	Participant Satisfaction	Employer Satisfaction	Continuing Need
Newfoundland	High	Low		Low	Low	High
Nova Scotia				High	Low	
New Brunswick		High		Low	High	
Prince Edward Island		High	High	High		High
Quebec	Low	High				
Ontario	High	High	Low	High	High	
Manitoba				Low		
Saskatchewan	Low	Low				
Alberta	Low		Low			
British Columbia	High		Low			Low

4.0 Conclusions

4.1 Work Experience

4.1.1 Career Development

SCP provides slightly more “career opportunity” and financial support than “work experience”.

Just over half (54.6%) of participants felt strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job was related to their career choice compared to 29.3% who felt that it did not (a rating of 1 or 2).

Still, 89.4% of participants felt strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job increased their understanding of what is expected in a work situation compared to only 2.4% who felt that it did not (a rating of 1 or 2).

For 38.3% of the participants, their summer job confirmed their career choices.

Both participants and employers felt strongly that SCP participants gained new skills.

The majority of participants (80.3%) felt strongly (a rating 4 or 5) that they gained new skills on their summer job compared to just 9.6% who felt the opposite (a rating of 1 or 2). Employers felt somewhat more strongly about this than did participants — 88.7% gave a rating of 4 or 5 compared to just 2.0% who gave a rating of 1 or 2.

4.1.2 Incrementality

While the information collected suggests that the program has resulted in the creation of many new jobs, incrementality can be weakened — for a number of reasons — both with respect to the job created and with respect to the job opportunity.

More than two-thirds (69.0%) of the employers surveyed stated that they would not have hired a student this summer had the wage subsidy not been available.

The majority (56.9%) of participants felt that their summer job was incremental while one in five (20.3%) did not (22.8% were not sure or did not know).

More than a third (36.1%) of employers said that the work done by their SCP student would have been postponed or not done had they not been able to hire the student.

As many as a third (33.3%) of SCP participants may have displaced other workers who would have replaced permanent workers who are on “normal” leave (e.g., pregnancy leave, sick leave, summer vacation).

Excluding employers who would not have hired a student if the wage subsidy had not been available (69.0%), almost two-fifths (37.2%) of the remainder said that they would not have paid the same wages to their student if they had not received any assistance from the SCP (presumably they would have paid less). This compares with almost three-fifths (57.3%) who would have paid the same wages.

More than a third (37.2%) of employers hired more than one student through SCP.

While almost all HRDC staff felt that the jobs were incremental in the not-for-profit sector, several of the staff suggested that “we may have created a dependency.” This can occur in all sectors, but it may impact the not-for-profit and public sectors more because the subsidies are relatively high and uninterrupted funding may deter them from searching for alternative sources of funding (e.g., charity drives, grants).

4.1.3 Future Job Opportunities

The majority (71.3%) of participants feel that their summer job will help them get full-time work in their chosen field compared to 19.7% who do not think it will help (9.0% are unsure or don't know).

Almost all (95.2%) employers feel that the summer employment experience of the SCP student will improve his/her chances of finding a full-time job after completing school. The remainder were split between don't know (2.6%) and no (2.2%).

Almost two-thirds (63.0%) of the employers surveyed said that their organization intended to re-hire their SCP student at a later date.

Almost four fifths (80.8%) of the employers who will be offering a job will be offering a job for the summer of 1997. Of the remaining 12.6%, 15.6% said they were considering a full-time job after graduation while 10.5% were considering a full-time job right away. The remaining 72.2% were considering a part-time job during the coming school year.

4.1.4 Sector

Encouraging private sector participation this year may have weakened the overall work experience — both career development and incrementality — of the program.

Participants in the non-profit sector felt most strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job was related to their career choice (65.9%). This compares with ratings of 58.6% for the public sector and 40.5% for the private sector.

Participants in the non-profit sector felt most strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that they gained new skills from their summer job (87.8%). This compares with ratings of 81.4% for the public sector and 74.6% for the private sector.

More than four-fifths (81.9%) of surveyed employers in the not-for-profit sector stated that they would not have hired a student this summer had the wage subsidy not been available. This is more prevalent than in the public (64.3%) and private (50.0%) sectors.

The private sector tends to pay somewhat better than the other two sectors: 31.6% of private sector employers paid \$8.00 or more per hour to their SCP student. This compares to 26.2% in the non-profit sector and 19.3% in the public sector.

The non-profit sector (78.6%) employed proportionately more post-secondary students than did the private (69.7%) and public (67.1%) sectors.

However, it should be noted that, although the experience gained by SCP participants in the private sector may not have been as career-oriented as jobs in the other two sectors, as the largest employer in the country, it may be better positioned to offer jobs in the future.

4.1.5 Education

Post-secondary students had a more favorable perception of the program's benefits to them than high school students.

Post-secondary students felt most strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job was related to their career choice (ratings ranging between 54.0% and 59.3%) compared to high schools students (28.7%). This may be due, in part, to post-secondary students having a clearer set of career expectations.

Similarly, post-secondary students were more likely to feel strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job increased their understanding of what is expected in a work situation (ratings around 90%) compared to high school students (rating of 32.7%).

Post-secondary students felt more strongly (a rating of 4 or 5) that their summer job gave them new skills (ratings around 80%) compared to high school students (rating of 36.1%).

Post-secondary students (59.6%) were more likely to think that their job was incremental than high school students (48.8%).

4.2 Program Efficiency

4.2.1 Timeliness

Employers and staff commented on the lateness of the Ministerial Announcement. They suggest that a "regular" announcement — taking place no later than a week or two before spring break every year — would go a long way towards helping businesses and students plan. Other HRDC programs are not hindered by this.

Since 1986 the time period between the announcement date and the application deadline has dropped from about 13 weeks to just 4 in 1996 (which is somewhat better than the 3 weeks

available in 1993). In reality, however, employers do not have all 4 weeks as HRCC staff need part of it to prepare application packages, etc.

The timeliness of the approval process caused employers the most concern with the administration of the program.

Reducing the amount of time taken to approve applications was the number one suggestion from employers about how to improve the program. More than a fifth (21.5%) stated this concern and another 6.0% said that businesses should be allowed to apply earlier.

While most key informant employers said they were informed soon enough to recruit participants as planned, many experienced delays which caused them difficulty finding students (either losing the best candidate for the job or having to replace a post-secondary student with a high school student). They also noted that some students had to accept other, perhaps less career-related, jobs because they could not wait for the HRDC decision — they needed enough “employment” to finance their return to school. HRDC staff felt that lateness diminished the quality of the service they provided to employers.

4.2.2 Marketing

Very few new employers enter the SCP program as most HRDC staff do not formally market the program.

Almost half (45.7%) the employers heard about the SCP because they had participated in the program in previous years. Another fifth (18.2%) learned about the program through the HRCC office.

However, staff report that program awareness among potential new employers could be improved.

More than four-fifths (86.1%) of employers surveyed were very satisfied with the ease of the application process (versus only 3.3% who were very dissatisfied).

4.2.3 Recruitment

About two-fifths (40.4%) of the employers used the HRCCs for Students to hire a student and a few of them (2.8%) felt that the HRCC's screening of the students could be improved.

By way of contrast, only 12.6% of participants reported that they heard about their job from a posting at (6.9%) or a referral from (5.7%) an HRCC for Students.

Participants were highly aware of the program (78.0%) and the federal government's subsidization of their job (85.3%).

4.2.4 Employer Costs

Employers do not incur any significant administrative costs as a consequence of the current wage subsidy process.

Many employers in the key informant interviews said that they only incur the normal costs of employing an employee and applying for and administering the program. They said that the latter were minimal. HRDC staff concurred.

Most employers (79.5%) were very satisfied (rating of 4 or 5) with the current method of paying the wage subsidy to employers.

4.2.5 Monitoring

The regions displayed divergent views on monitoring ranging from 10% to 100%.

Some monitor “high risk” employers — those for which there is some concern (for whom some complaint may have been received) — and also new employers to ensure that they do not make mistakes.

4.2.6 Roles and Responsibilities

While both employers and HRDC staff noted that the roles and responsibilities of the various HRDC players were clearly understood, HRDC staff expressed some concerns about the role of the Members of Parliament.

The program has been operating since 1985 and both employers and HRDC staff have come to know it well.

HRDC staff suggested that MPs be better briefed on their review role.

In general, neither employers nor HRDC staff felt that the SCP constituted a partnership between the government and employers. Similarly, neither side really saw an extended “leadership role” for employers.

4.2.7 Alternatives

In general, both employers and HRDC staff held mixed views about the need to change the wage subsidy.

More than half (55.7%) of the employers surveyed felt that the wage subsidy should remain as it is, which is the same for both large and small employers. Similarly, almost half (52.1%) of the employers surveyed felt that the wage subsidy should change and become the same for both private sector and non-profit employers. And, in general, employers felt that raising the wage subsidy would be unrealistic and that lowering it would eliminate the incentive for some.

HRDC staff felt that there was some room to reconsider the size of the wage subsidy, particularly at the private sector level.

4.3 Profiles

4.3.1 Employers

More than half (51.6%) of the employers using the SCP came from the non-profit sector. Another third (31.0%) came from the private sector while the remaining fifth (17.4%) came from the public sector.

This is very similar to the participant survey — Private (29.6%), Public (21.2%), Not-for-profit (44.3%), and Don't know (4.9%) — especially if adjusted for the other and don't know categories.

Employers surveyed were generally small — 36.0% had four or fewer employees, while another 28.4% had five to ten employees.

Almost one-fifth (20.1%) of the employers in the survey did not hire any students in the summer of 1995.

Almost two-thirds (62.7%) of the employers surveyed hired just one student under the SCP this summer. Another fifth (21.3%) hired two students under the program while a tenth (10.5%) hired three or four. Of the remaining 5.4%, almost half (2.5%) employed five or six students.

As mentioned above, 62.7% of all employers surveyed hired only one SCP student. In 82.6% of these cases, it is the only student they hired. This means that 51.8% of all surveyed employers hired no additional student.

The private sector (76.9%) had proportionately more “one-SCP student” employers than either the public (56.6%) or the non-profit sectors (56.3%).

More than four-fifths (85.5%) of the employers provided their SCP student with some training — mostly on-the-job training/coaching/mentoring (49.5%).

Employers in the survey report hiring a total of 4,128 students, almost half (47.6%) of whom were subsidized by SCP.

4.3.2 Participants

Almost two-thirds (65.9%) of the participants are female compared to one-third (34.1%) male.

The dominance of females among SCP participants is associated with the bulk of the employment being in the not-for-profit (which employs 73.1% females) and public (which employs 80.7%

females) sectors. By way of contrast, the private sector tends to be more balanced (52.8% males versus 47.8% females).

A little more than two-fifths (41.2%) of the participants are between 15 and 19 years of age, almost half (46.6%) are 20 to 24 years of age, while the remaining 12.0% are more than 24 years of age.

Some 71.0% of participants reported attending a post-secondary institution in September 1995 compared to 25.6% who attended high school. About 3.3% of the participants did neither.

Some 92.4% of SCP participants will be returning to school in September 1996. Of the 7.3% not returning, almost half (48.4%) will be looking for work instead.

Almost one-third (31.0%) of those going to a post-secondary institution will complete their current degree or diploma in one year, while most of the rest expect to take two (24.7%) or three (22.1%) years. About one in five (21.5%) expect to take four years or more.

Some 4.2% of participants have disabilities. About 6.4% are aboriginal and, 6.7% are members of a visible minority.

4.4 Program Satisfaction

The vast majority (90.7%) of SCP students strongly liked or liked their summer job.

An insignificant number of students strongly disliked or disliked their summer job, while a small percentage (less than 9%) had mixed feelings.

The majority of participants (75.9%) felt strongly (a rating 4 or 5) that their employer acted as a mentor or coach.

Almost all employers (94.9%) were fully satisfied with the overall performance of their SCP student.

Only a small fraction (less than 3%) were not.

Similarly, almost all (93.5%) employers felt that the work provided by their SCP student to the organization added value. Only a fraction (1.6%) did not.

4.5 Continuing Need

Almost every participant thought that a government program that tries to prepare students for full-time jobs through summer work experience was a good idea.

Almost every employer (98.6%) would be interested in applying should the SCP, or a similar program, be available next summer.