Council Direction:
Not Applicable.

Information:
According to a 2009 Ontario Works client Satisfaction Survey, 96% of respondents reported that they were ‘somewhat’ or ‘very’ satisfied with the level of service they received from staff. In addition, results comparing 2008 with 2009 show that many areas of service delivery improved significantly, with the greatest improvements in telephone service, in-office service and mail service. The report respecting the Ontario Works – Client Satisfaction Survey is attached as Appendix A to Report CS11009.

Client Satisfaction Survey
To support continuous quality improvement and program planning, Ontario Works (OW) conducted a participant satisfaction survey in 2009. On behalf of Hamilton’s Ontario Works teams, the survey was conducted by the Department’s Social Development Team.

The main goal of the survey was to gather information about OW participant perception of the level of service they received from staff.

The full report (Appendix A to Report CS11009) summarizes the key findings from the survey across all OW offices.
2009 Survey Results
Anyone over the age of 15 who visited a Hamilton OW office or the Career Development Centre between Monday November 23 and Friday December 11, 2009 was given the opportunity to participate. A total of 137 usable surveys were returned for analysis.

Only one area of concern identified in 2008 remained in 2009 (ie: respondents are still reporting low rates of agreement with the statement that they were informed of language interpretation services available to them.) While management has begun work on putting recommendations into action that will address this concern, the process has been somewhat extended as staff make sure work is done in alignment with the French Language Services processes being implemented across all City departments.

Next Steps:
Recommendations are:

- that staff and management continue to monitor the impact of caseload pressures on the quality of participant service and take action to mitigate any negative effects wherever possible;

- that the request from participants to have information regarding their upcoming benefits made available on the Interactive Voice Response system be forwarded to the province;

- that consideration be given to provide surveys at out-of-office service provision locations (ie: home visits, neighbourhood hubs, etc.);

- that a simple, ongoing feedback form be developed for regular use and available in multiple languages to facilitate feedback from individuals with lower literacy skills or English as a second language;

- that privacy lock-boxes be provided for questionnaires returned by participants; and,

- that survey results be communicated to internal and external stakeholders.

The survey will once again be undertaken in 2011 for a review of the services offered in 2010. Staff will continue to identify ways to monitor participant satisfaction and improve the delivery of service.

In addition to this survey, the Ontario Works Program also has other methods of gathering feedback and monitoring satisfaction with service.
• Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program Operational Advisory Committee and the Annual Town Hall;

• Logging and actioning of queries and complaints received from the Councillors’ office and other areas;

• Distribution of the Customer Service Card, which communicates how to provide feedback; and,

• Internal review process if an applicant or recipient disagrees with a decision made by OW staff.

Customer Service excellence is a key focus area of the departmental and divisional business plans.
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Executive Summary

In 2006, the City of Hamilton (City) identified three customer service goals for its Ontario Works (OW) clients. OW staff are committed to providing service to clients in a timely, respectful and knowledgeable manner.

Staff are also very interested in providing opportunities for clients to give feedback and input about the services they receive. One way this has been achieved in Hamilton is through the implementation of a client survey. This report marks the second implementation of the City’s OW Client Survey. Similar to 2008, this survey asked OW clients in Hamilton about the level of service they received from OW staff, what they felt worked well and what they would like to see changed. A total of 137 useable surveys were completed and analyzed.

In general, respondents felt extremely positive about the service they received. Based on criteria developed by the project’s advisory group, over 96% of respondents reported that they were ‘somewhat’ or ‘very’ satisfied with the level of service they received from staff. In addition, results comparing 2008 with 2009 show that many areas of service delivery improved significantly with the greatest improvements in telephone service, in office service and mail service. Only one area of concern identified in 2008 remained in 2009. Respondents are still reporting low rates of agreement with the statement that they were informed of language interpretation services available to them. While this area remains a concern, the results overall are very positive despite significant caseload increases over the period reviewed.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

In 2006, the City developed three OW customer service goals which were shared with the community through the OW Customer Service Cards (see Appendix A). OW staff are committed to providing service to clients in a timely, respectful and knowledgeable manner. These goals align with the Community Service Department’s values of integrity, respect, courage and empathy and reflect the City’s commitment to providing high quality OW services to citizens in need.

OW staff are committed to providing opportunities for recipients to give feedback about and input into OW services. One way in which this initiative has been accomplished is through the implementation of a client survey. The survey provides an opportunity for individuals to comment on their experience of Hamilton’s OW customer service as well as to offer ideas for service improvements.

An Advisory Group composed of OW staff and managers, other City staff and client representatives developed the questionnaire used in this survey (see Appendix B). The concept of timely service was defined as providing a rapid response and not making a person wait for service or answers. Respectful service was thought to be demonstrated through a respectful attitude towards individuals including listening, partnering, and considering challenges that may face a person (e.g., accessibility of the service, hours, available childcare). Knowledgeable staff was equated to the quality of the service; quality service being appropriate and comprehensive service. OW staff carry out a variety of necessary functions, not all of which may be looked upon favourably by the recipient of the service; however, all staff strive to maintain the goals of client service.

The specific objectives of the survey were to:

- gather information about respondents’ perceptions of the client service they received from OW staff;
- which processes/procedures work well for clients;
- which processes/procedures cause frustration for clients; and,
- suggestions/recommendations that clients have for service delivery enhancements.

The survey was not intended to gather feedback from clients about individual staff performance, specific service elements or client needs.

2009 marks the second iteration of the OW Client Service survey. Since the 2008 survey was conducted, there have been various changes in both the internal and external OW environment in Hamilton. A review was conducted over 2008 and 2009 which resulted in a clearer and more streamlined client service path being implemented in the spring of 2009. However, the downturn in the global and local economy has resulted in a surge in OW applications and, in turn, increased the size of the OW caseload. The internal pressures created by the increased
caseload may have offset some of the positive gains made through the changes resulting from the internal review.

This document was prepared for the Employment and Income Support and Benefit Eligibility Divisions of the City of Hamilton and reports on the results of the 2009 OW Client Service Survey. The report summarizes the key findings from the project across all OW offices, beginning with an overview of the OW program followed by the survey methodology, a discussion of the results and concluding with a comparison of the 2008 and 2009 survey results and recommendations for program planning.

1.1 Ontario Works
The Province of Ontario has two social assistance programs, OW and the Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP). The mandate of the OW program is:

To provide employment assistance and temporary financial assistance to people in financial need. OW:

- recognizes individual responsibility and promotes self-reliance through employment;
- provides temporary financial assistance to those most in need while they meet obligations to become and stay employed;
- effectively serves people needing assistance; and,
- is accountable to the taxpayers of Ontario.

OW is delivered at the municipal level through 47 Consolidated Municipal Service Managers in Central and Southern Ontario (District Social Services Administration Boards in Northern Ontario) and 109 First Nations delivery agents. To be eligible for assistance, an applicant must be a resident of Ontario, in immediate financial need and willing to participate in employment assistance activities. The amount of money that an individual receives from OW varies depending upon housing costs and family size. Participants may also be eligible for drug and dental coverage, eyeglasses, hearing aids and community and employment start-up benefits.

Individuals in receipt of OW benefits are required to participate in employment related activities as a condition of ongoing eligibility for financial assistance. OW provides practical assistance to finding and securing employment with the goal of supporting people in finding jobs and becoming self-reliant.

For residents of the City of Hamilton, OW is delivered by the City of Hamilton. The program is delivered by three Divisions within the Community Services Department at the City: Benefit Eligibility, Employment and Income Support and Social Housing and Homelessness. Residents can access services at three local OW offices:

- 250 Main Street East serving central Hamilton;
- 1550 Upper James Street serving the mountain area; and,
- 2255 Barton Street East serving the east end of the city.
Employment services can also be accessed at the Career Development Centre located at 181 Main Street West.

### 1.2 Ontario Works in Hamilton

All calls for applications are handled through a central intake number. An Intake Clerk obtains preliminary information and conducts a quick calculation to determine initial eligibility via the Service Delivery Model Technology (SDMT) computer system. Applicants are scheduled for a face to face appointment with an OW Case Manager within four working days. Where an emergency is identified (i.e., family violence, fire, pending eviction), the application is expedited and the appointment is arranged with an OW Team Lead. At the application interview, OW Case Managers or Team Leads complete a full application for assistance.

If language is a barrier, applicants may contact an interpreter service to assist them in applying for assistance. The OW Program currently has agreements with two community organizations to provide interpreter service: Settlement and Integration Service Organization (SISO) and Centre de Santé Communautaire Hamilton/Niagara.

Once it is determined that an applicant is eligible for OW benefits, regular meetings are set with a Case Manager to support the ongoing monitoring of financial eligibility and employment activities through a participation agreement. At these meetings, the Case Manager will review eligibility, as well as review and re-negotiate Participation Agreements and make appropriate referrals to in-house employment supports or community resources.

Case Managers may complete applications, Participation Agreement updates or Form 1 updates through home visits. There has also been a move towards providing service to OW participants in neighbourhood hubs and community agencies. OW Case Management services are now being provided from two CityHousing sites – the Congress and Oriole neighbourhoods. To expand customer service to newcomers, OW applications and updates are also being completed at SISO and Centre de Santé.

In-house employment support services are provided by Employment Development Counsellors and include employment assessments and counselling, workshops, referrals, employment placement, community placement and skills training. Resource centres located on site also provide participants access to telephones, faxes, computers and job banks. Services at the resource centres are also available to ODSP applicants, spouses and dependents, along with the general public.

OW participants are encouraged to pursue financial independence, thereby reducing their dependence on OW. The Family Support Unit assists OW recipients in obtaining financial resources if a support obligation exists under any of several governmental acts.

The Consolidated Verification Process (CVP) serves as an audit on all OW cases to ensure correct legislative decisions are administered and the appropriate financial assistance is issued. The process supports the ongoing monitoring of eligibility. Through the use of third party information, a financial review of the case is completed annually. This review is to ensure the case has previously received and is currently receiving the correct amount of entitlement.
During the CVP interview, there may be occasions where sources of undeclared income are discovered. This finding may result in a determination of ineligibility. Ineligibility decisions may result in an overpayment or referral to the Eligibility Review Unit for further investigation. There may also be situations where a referral to the Family Support Unit is warranted.

As directed by legislation, the City provides an eligibility review function. A case review determines whether a participant is reporting accurate information or is attempting to receive benefits for which they are not entitled. This process ensures that eligibility integrity is maintained. Cases are prepared for referral to the Police Department when intent to defraud has been confirmed and documented. Overpayment Recovery Officers are responsible for pursuing the collection of overpayments on inactive cases and negotiating payment schedules.

OW legislation protects the right of a participant to appeal decisions through an independent party. All requests for appeal in the City are reviewed by Case Presenting Officers. Where resolution cannot be achieved, Case Presenting Officers prepare detailed submissions for presentation at the Social Benefits Tribunal.

2.0 2009 ONTARIO WORKS CLIENT SERVICE SURVEY METHODOLOGY

2.1 Ethics
The guidelines outlined by the Tri-Council Policy Statement on Research Ethics involving Human Participants (CIHR, NSERC and SSHRC, 1998) are followed in carrying out any research at the City. In addition, research which involves OW participants adheres to all provincial and municipal directives related to social assistance programming.

Information required for informed consent has been incorporated into the introduction to the survey questionnaire. Completion of the questionnaire is taken as consent to participate. Names and signatures are not collected in order to enable participants to provide their feedback anonymously.

All data are maintained in a secure and confidential manner. Hardcopy materials are locked in filing cabinets within a key card access facility. Electronic materials are stored on secure networks and password protected.

2.2 Data Sources
Information about client service, satisfaction and ideas for improvements to the OW program was collected using a self-report questionnaire. The questionnaire was based on the version used for the 2008 iteration of the survey with the following changes/additions:

- All questions were worded in the positive in an effort to increase the “legibility” of the questionnaire for individuals with lower literacy levels or for whom English was not their first language.
Three questions were removed from the questionnaire – two due to difficulty with interpretation of the results in 2008, and one being reworded and included in the demographic section.

Some wording changes were made on the introductory page and to the IVR question introduction.

Questions were added about out of office services.

Questions about citizenship and English as a Second Language were added to the demographic section.

2.3 Procedure
The methodology for the survey was reviewed, as had been recommended after the 2008 iteration of the survey. However, after careful deliberation about alternate methods of delivery with consideration to the population that would be reached, supports and resources required and cost, the decision was made by the Advisory Group to use the same methodology.

Front desk staff at each of the three OW offices and the Career Development Centre offered each person arriving at the office the opportunity to complete a questionnaire. Most respondents completed the questionnaire while at the office, but pre-paid return envelopes were provided to anyone who wished to complete the survey at home. Employment Clerks were on hand at three of the offices to assist if clients had questions when completing the survey. Clients arriving at the 250 Main office who agreed to participate in the survey were directed to contact the Program Analyst for assistance if they had questions.

Completed questionnaires were deposited in boxes at the front desk of each office and were collected by Social Development Team staff for data entry and analysis. While unlikely, it is possible that a participant could have completed more than one questionnaire within the survey time period. In such cases, it is likely that the participant would be referring to different service experiences.

2.4 Participants
Anyone over 15 years of age who visited a Hamilton OW office or the Career Development Centre for any reason between Monday, November 23 and Friday, December 11, 2009 was eligible to participate in the survey. Recruitment at the 181 Main site ended on Friday, December 4. The survey included OW participants, ODSP recipients and dependants, community members and individuals applying for OW benefits.

Individuals arriving for an OW application appointment were not directly solicited to participate in the survey but could respond if they wished. It was felt that this request might cause additional burden on individuals who may already be experiencing significant stress. Posters describing the survey were posted in each office in the reception area so that clients were made aware of the survey.
2.5 Analysis

Each completed questionnaire was coded and entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The statistical software SPSS (version 17) was used for quantitative data analyses. The questionnaire also contained a number of open-ended questions and these were analyzed into thematic categories using standard qualitative research methodology.

All percentages presented in this report are valid percentages, rounded to the nearest single decimal point. Calculating a valid percentage means removing missing and uncodeable data from the percentage calculation. Consequently, the denominator varies by question. The exact number of respondents removed from each frequency can be found in Appendix C, Table 6. Due to rounding, summing the percentages of all responses to a particular question may produce a number slightly above or below 100%. In addition, some questions allowed respondents to select multiple answers; therefore, the sum of the percentages for these responses will be greater than 100%.

Frequencies for the questions related to satisfaction with service were analyzed in two ways. The percentages are presented by response option as well as by the categories of “satisfied” (including ‘very satisfied’ and ‘somewhat satisfied’), and “not satisfied” (including ‘not very satisfied’ and ‘not satisfied at all’). Given the subject matter of the questionnaire, the second analysis was included as it was felt that respondents might under-select “very satisfied”, feeling that this choice would indicate there was no room for improvement in the program.

Given that there was significant variation in the number of questionnaires received from each location, it was deemed impractical and unnecessary to produce frequencies broken down by office location or to compare results by office.

2.6 Data Quality

2.6.1 Rejected Questionnaires

In addition to the 137 questionnaires analyzed for this report, 7 other questionnaires were received (see Table 1). These questionnaires were removed from the analysis due to being more than 75% incomplete. Overall, 93.1% of the returned questionnaires were useable.

Table 1. 2009 OW Client Service Survey, Returned Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Returned Questionnaires (n=144)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useable (n=137)</td>
<td>% of Useable Total</td>
<td>Rejected (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Main</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2255 Barton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550 Upper James</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 Main</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.6.2 Response Rate

The three OW office were provided with 40 questionnaires each to hand out to clients during the survey period. The Career Development Centre received 110 questionnaires. The number of questionnaires provided to each office was based on the number of questionnaires received from each office during the 2008 client survey and the original goal of completing the survey during a two week time period.

For the 2008 survey, it was possible to provide an approximated response rate based on estimates of the number of individuals coming into OW offices during the survey time period. Subsequent to the 2008 survey, a new application for tracking appointments has been introduced and at this time, data could not be generated to the level of detail required for this analysis.¹

In lieu of an actual response rate, an analysis was conducted to examine the rate at which questionnaires were handed out and returned by office. As can be seen in Table 2, there was a great disparity between offices in terms of the proportion of questionnaires which were handed out to clients. However, if the questionnaires were handed out, there was generally a strong likelihood that they would be returned. The one exception to this is the 250 Main office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Handed Out (% of provided)</th>
<th>Returned (% of handed out)</th>
<th>Useable (% of returned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250 Main</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 (100.0%)</td>
<td>10 (25.0%)</td>
<td>10 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2255 Barton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25 (62.5%)</td>
<td>19 (76.0%)</td>
<td>19 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550 Upper James</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15 (37.5%)</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
<td>8 (72.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 Main</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110 (100.0%)</td>
<td>104 (94.5%)</td>
<td>102 (98.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.3 Response Bias

The majority of survey respondents reported themselves as men, between 25 and 54 and single living with or without children (see Table 3). Most were Canadian citizens who spoke English as their first language and who did not report themselves as requiring any type of accommodation for a disability.

---

¹ Without having service level information available, it is not possible to remove individuals coming in for application appointments from the estimate. It is also not possible to remove individuals attending the office only to pick up or drop off information. The intention to remove this second group from the base estimate stemmed from the hypothesis that individuals who had not intended to spend any amount of time at the office would be much less likely to choose to complete a 10 minute survey questionnaire.
It was not possible to complete an accurate response bias analysis. As the sample may include community members entering the Career Development Centre, individuals applying for OW and ODSP recipients and beneficiaries, there is no one source of demographic information for all of these individuals. A best estimate source is the SDMT reports generated for the December 2009 OW caseload. Compared to these data, the respondent profile fairly approximates the overall OW caseload.

Without being able to comment on the potential extent of response bias, it is recommended that the results be interpreted with caution when applied to the entire OW recipient population. However, as many of the survey questions showed a strong result in one direction, it is less likely that the results are skewed to only reflect a segment of the population.

Table 3. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Respondent Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Survey Respondents (n=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/uncodeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group (years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or younger</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-54</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/uncodeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, living alone</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, living with children</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner, no children</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner and children</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/uncodeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  a</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/uncodeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 2009 ONTARIO WORKS CLIENT SERVICE SURVEY RESULTS

3.1 Telephone Client Service

Almost three-quarters of respondents (n=102, 74.5%) indicated that they had contacted OW by telephone within the last three months. Depending on the nature of their call, they may have spoken with Intake Unit staff, Team Control Clerks, Case Managers, Employment Development Counsellors, specialty staff (e.g., Special Supports, Family Support), Program Managers or reception staff.

Internal business processes related to phone service include the standards that:

- staff introduce themselves when answering the telephone;
- voicemail messages must indicate whether the staff person is in or out of the office and who to contact for immediate assistance;
- the voicemail system must allow for clients to press ‘0’ and be redirected to someone in the office; and,
- all efforts must be made to return messages left by clients within one business day.

---

Survey Respondents (n=137)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian citizen</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other categories (^b)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/uncodable</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disability Supports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/uncodable</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^a\) Respondents listed their first language as Arabic (n=5), Portuguese (n=2), French (n=1) and Nuer (n=1). Two individuals reported two first languages and one individual did not indicate their first language. \(^b\) Other categories included “Visitor/applicant for permanent residence”, “Registered (status) Indian”; “Convention refugee”; “Convention refugee – RAP/AAP”, “Refugee claimant”, “Minister’s/temporary resident permit”, “Deportee – actionable”, “Deportee – inactionable”, “Student visa”, and “Visitor/tourist/temporary resident visitor”
3.1.1 **Reason for Telephone Contact**

Participants were asked why they had contacted OW by telephone (see Figure 1). Respondents were able to select more than one reason. The most frequently reported reason for contacting OW was to ask a question (n=42, 41.2%). Scheduling an appointment (n=35, 34.3%) and providing or requesting information (n=33, 32.4%) were the second and third most frequently reported reasons respectively.

**Figure 1. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Reason for Telephone Contact (n=102)**
3.1.2 **Timeliness of Telephone Service**

Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statements to assess the timeliness of telephone service:

- Someone answered my call promptly.
- After I left a message, I was called back within 24 hours (or on Monday if on a weekend).
- I was given the option to press ‘0’ to speak with someone if it was an emergency.

The results are displayed in Figure 2. Over three quarters of respondents (78.6%) agreed that someone had answered their call promptly. A similar percentage (77.7%) agreed that they had received a call back from OW staff within one business day. A larger percentage (88.8%) reported that they were given the option to zero out to an in-office staff person.

**Figure 2. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Timeliness of Telephone Service**

[Timeliness of Service Received chart]

- 78.6% of respondents agreed that someone answered their call promptly.
- 77.7% agreed that they received a callback within 24 hours.
- 88.8% reported being given the option to press ‘0’.
3.1.3 Respectfulness of Telephone Service

Participants were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statements to assess the respectfulness of telephone service:

- The staff answering the phone introduced themselves.
- The staff answering the phone were polite.
- The message indicated whether the worker/staff was out of the office and what to do.

Over 90% of respondents agreed that staff introduced themselves when answering the telephone (92.9%), were polite (92.1%) and agreed that if they had reached voicemail, the message told them whether the staff person was out of the office and provided options to follow-up for immediate service (94.1%; see Figure 3).

Figure 3. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Respectfulness of Telephone Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Percentage Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff introduced themselves</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were polite</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicemail indicated if staff unavailable</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.4 **Quality of Telephone Service**

Participants were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statements to assess the quality of telephone service:

- The staff answering the phone were helpful.
- I was directed to the right person.
- The message was understandable and clear to follow.

The results are displayed in Figure 4. The majority of respondents (88.9%) agreed that staff answering their calls had been helpful, with 89.9% reporting that they had been directed to the correct person. For those individuals who had reached voicemail, 98.1% agreed that the message was understandable and provided clear instructions to follow.

**Figure 4. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Quality of Telephone Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Percentage Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff were helpful</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information was accurate</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicemail left clear directions</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.5 **Satisfaction with Telephone Service**

With regard to the most recent telephone contact with OW, when asked, “How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion,” the majority of respondents were somewhat or very satisfied (90.0%; see Figure 5).

*Figure 5. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Satisfaction with Telephone Service*
3.2 In-Office Client Service

The majority of respondents (n=121, 88.3%) indicated that they had been in an OW office within the last three months. A service that is currently provided at all offices is child-minding; however, the hours this service is available vary somewhat by office. The offices are all located on bus routes; however, some amenities (e.g., free parking access) are not available at all offices. Each office is open to the public from 8:30 to 4:30 Monday to Friday.

3.2.1 Reason for Visit to Office

Figure 6 shows the results of asking why respondents had come in to an OW office. Multiple reasons could be selected. The most frequent reason for coming in to an office was to attend an in-person appointment (n=94, 77.7%), although almost a quarter of respondents (n=29, 24.09%) had come in to an office to provide or request information.

Figure 6. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Reason for In-Office Contact (n=121)
3.2.2 *Timeliness of In-Office Service*

The following questions were asked to assess the timeliness of in-office service:

- I waited in line less than 10 minutes before I could talk to someone.
- Getting to the office during open hours was easy for me.

Most respondents (81.5%) agreed that they received prompt service and that the office hours were reasonable for them (92.9%, see Figure 7).

**Figure 7. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Timeliness of In-Office Service**

```plaintext
Timeliness of Service Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not wait more than 10 minutes</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get to office during open hours</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
3.2.3 Respectfulness of In-Office Service

Both the staff and the office environment were thought to contribute to a sense of respectfulness towards clients. A number of questions were posed to assess respondents’ perceptions of the respectfulness of the in-office service. They asked whether:

- The office location was easy to get to by public transit, car, or on foot.
- Child-minding services were available.
- The waiting area was clean.
- The staff at reception were polite.
- There was enough seating for the number of people in the waiting area.

The results are illustrated in Figure 8. Respondents indicated a high rate of agreement with all of these statements; the office location being easy to get to (95.9%), the waiting area being clean (98.4%), reception staff being polite (99.2%), and having enough seating available in the waiting area (96.9%). While the majority of respondents indicated that child-minding services were not relevant to them (see Appendix C, Table 6), 94.4% agreed that they were available.

Figure 8. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Respectfulness of In-Office Service
3.2.4 Quality of In-Office Service

The quality of in-office service was assessed by examining respondents’ perceptions of the help received from reception staff, information being available and receiving guidance on how to access the service if they required the assistance of an interpreter. Individuals were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statements:

- The staff at reception were helpful.
- There was information posted in the waiting area.
- I was informed of language interpretation services available to me.

A high proportion of respondents (99.2%) agreed that reception staff were helpful and 98.4% agreed that there was information posted in the waiting area. The majority indicated that language interpretation services were not relevant to them (see Appendix C, Table 6), but for those answering this question, 62.5% agreed that they were informed of services available to them. The results are illustrated in Figure 9.

Figure 9. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Quality of In-Office Service
3.2.5 Satisfaction with In-Office Service

With regard to the most recent in-office contact, when asked, “How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion,” the majority of respondents were somewhat or very satisfied (98.4%; see Figure 10).

![Figure 10. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Satisfaction with In-Office Service](image)

3.3 In-Person Client Service

Similar to in-office contact, most respondents (n=113, 82.5%) indicated that they had received in-person service in the last three months. Individuals meet with OW staff for many reasons and some of these meetings may not be considered “positive” (for example a fraud investigation meeting with an Eligibility Review Officer.) Regardless, all OW staff strive to ensure that participants receive good client service.

3.3.1 Reason for In-Person Contact

When asked why they had met in-person with OW staff, the largest number of individuals reported that it was to attend a Participation Agreement update appointment (n=47, 41.6%). Approximately one-third of respondents indicated that they had attended an employment supports appointment (n=36, 31.9%) and about one in five had attended an application appointment (n=21, 18.6%).
Figure 11. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Reason for In-Person Contact (n=272)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update Participation Agreement</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Support appointment</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for Ontario Works benefits</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments and Agreements appointment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Review appointment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly financial review appointment (Consolidated Verification Process)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Supports appointment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and Responsibilities Review appointment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support appointment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about appealing a decision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpayment Recovery appointment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Timeliness of In-Person Service

The timeliness of in-person service was assessed using respondents’ agreement with two statements:

- I was able to book an appointment at a time that suited me.
- Staff were able to meet with me at the time we scheduled.

The majority of individuals agreed that they had been able to book an appointment at a time that suited them (91.1%) and that the staff person had met with them at the agreed upon time (90.6%). These results are illustrated in Figure 12.

Figure 12. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Timeliness of In-Person Service
3.3.3  Respectfulness of In-Person Service

To assess respondents’ perceptions of the respectfulness of service received during in-person meetings, they were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statements:

- Staff took some time to get to know me.
- I was asked what my needs were.
- Staff listened to me.
- Staff were sensitive to my feelings and concerns.
- Staff treated me with respect.
- Staff worked together with me in making decisions and plans.

The results can be seen in Figure 13. Most respondents agreed that staff took some time to get to know them (83.5%), asked what their needs were (86.2%), listened to them (94.1%) and were sensitive to their feelings and concerns (90.7%). The majority agreed that they were treated with respect (95.7%) and that staff worked in partnership with them to make decisions and plans (93.5%).

Figure 13. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Respectfulness of In-Person Service
3.3.4 Quality of In-Person Service

In-person contact is a key component of the service provided by staff in OW. An enormous amount of information is shared with clients and the resources available within the City are constantly changing. Staff work very hard to stay abreast of all of the types of information that they need in order to best serve their clients.

Individuals were asked to express their agreement with the following statements related to the quality of in-person service:

- Staff seemed to be well informed about policies and requirements.
- Staff explained information and/or requirements to me clearly.
- Staff told me about programs offered by the City and/or the community.

Almost all respondents (97.4%) agreed that staff seemed well informed about policies and requirements. They also explained information and requirements clearly (97.4%) and referred clients to programs and services offered within the City or the community (91.0%). The results are displayed in Figure 14.

**Figure 14. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Quality of In-Person Service**
3.3.5 **Satisfaction with In-Person Service**

Overall, respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the client service received during in-person contacts. With regard to the most recent in-person contact with OW, when asked, “How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion,” the majority of respondents were somewhat or very satisfied (97.5%; see Figure 15).

![Figure 15. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Satisfaction with In-Person Service](image)

3.4 **Out of Office Service**

Less than one-third of individuals surveyed (n=44, 32.1%) indicated that they had received out of office service within the past three months. Other respondents appeared to try to use the sections to share their opinions about this type of service even if they had not received the service. For example, individuals would indicate that they had not received a home visit but answer one or two of the questions in the section; these answers were removed from the analysis. One respondent even wrote “answered these questions as to opinions” on their questionnaire.

3.4.1 **Home Visit Service**

As stated in section 1.2 of this report, Case Managers may complete applications, Participation Agreement updates or Form 1 updates through home visits. Individuals responding to the survey were asked four questions about their experience of home visit service:

- Receiving a home visit made it possible for me to apply for Ontario Works.
- I see home visits as a way for Ontario Works to provide good service to clients.
- I felt comfortable having an Ontario Works staff person visit my home.
- I think that more Ontario Works services should be available through home visits.
The results are shown in Figure 16. The majority of respondents felt that receiving service in their home made it possible for them to apply to OW (75.0%), saw it as a good way to provide service to clients (77.8%) and thought that services provided in this way should be increased (77.8%). However, over one-quarter of individuals reported not feeling comfortable having an OW staff person visit their home.

**Figure 16. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Home Visit Service Experience**

![Home Visit Service](image)

Respondents were asked to indicate how satisfied they had been with the home visit service they received. As can be seen in Figure 17, 100.0% of individuals were somewhat or very satisfied. This is an extremely encouraging result but needs to be interpreted very cautiously as there were so few individuals responding to this question.

**Figure 17. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Satisfaction with Home Visit Service**

![Satisfaction with Home Visit Service](image)
3.4.2 Neighbourhood Location Service

Case Management services are also provided at Congress Court and in the Oriole neighbourhood. Respondents were asked the following questions about service received at a neighbourhood location:

- Meeting with staff at a neighbourhood location made it possible for me to apply for Ontario Works.
- I see serving clients at neighbourhood locations as a way for Ontario Works to provide good service to clients.
- I felt comfortable meeting with an Ontario Works staff person in my neighbourhood.
- I think that more Ontario Works services should be available at neighbourhood locations.

The results are shown in Figure 18. The majority of respondents felt that receiving service at a neighbourhood location made it possible for them to apply to OW (88.2%), saw it as a good way to provide service to clients (89.7%) and thought that services provided in this way should be increased (90.5%). As well, most individuals (88.6%) reported that they were comfortable meeting with an OW staff person in their neighbourhood.

Figure 18. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Neighbourhood Service Experience

[Figure showing percentage agreement with survey questions]
Respondents were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the service received at a neighbourhood location. The results are shown in Figure 19. The majority of individuals (95.3%) reported being somewhat or very satisfied.

**Figure 19. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Satisfaction with Neighbourhood Service**

![Satisfaction with Neighbourhood Service](image)

**3.4.3 Community Agency Service**

OW applications and Participation Agreement updates can also be completed at two community agencies: SISO and Centre de Santé. Individuals were asked four questions about their experience of service at a community agency location:

- Meeting with staff at a community agency made it possible for me to apply for Ontario Works.
- I see serving clients at community agencies as a way for Ontario Works to provide good service to clients.
- I felt comfortable meeting with an Ontario Works staff person at a community agency.
- I think that more Ontario Works services should be available at community agencies.

As can be seen in Figure 20, the majority of respondents felt that receiving service at a community agency made it possible for them to apply to OW (93.8%), saw it as a good way to provide service to clients (91.7%), were comfortable meeting at a community agency (86.5%) and thought that services provided in this way should be increased (88.6%).
Respondents were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the service received at a community agency. Figure 21 shows that most individuals (97.0%) reported being somewhat or very satisfied with the service they received.
3.5 **Interactive Voice Response System**

The Province maintains a service called the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) System which OW recipients can access through the telephone to find out the status of their most recent benefit cheque. The City provides information about the service to all clients and was interested in finding out about the usage and utility of this system to OW recipients in Hamilton.

The following statements were included on the survey questionnaire:

- I was able to access the IVR system to find out about my cheque.
- I was able to follow the IVR automated instructions.
- The IVR system provides the information that I want to know.

In addition, respondents were asked their opinion about whether they felt it would be helpful if the IVR system told them about upcoming cheques, not only past cheques.

The majority of individuals reported that they had not tried to access the IVR system within the last three months (see Appendix C, Table 6). Those who had used the service reported that they were able to access the system (95.3%) and follow the instructions (92.1%). They also indicated that the information provided by the IVR system was useful to them (90.3%). Nine out of 10 respondents agreed that it would be helpful if the IVR system reported information about upcoming cheques in addition to past cheques (90.0%). The results are shown in Figure 22.

*Figure 22. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Interactive Voice Response System*
3.6 Letter Mail Service

Recipients of OW benefits receive many letters from the program. These include letters
notifying of upcoming appointments, requests for documentation and information and
notifications of suspension or termination of benefits.

Many of these letters are generated automatically by the Provincial SDMT system and the City
does not have control over the content of these letters. Many clients have reported that the
wording of the letters is confusing and there is a lack of complete information. Hamilton has
taken steps to ensure that citizens in receipt of OW receive letters which fully outline the
clients’ responsibilities and who to contact to get more information. OW staff are able to
suppress many of the automatically generated letters and are then able to substitute other letters
developed in-house. The in-house letters contain attachments and specific contact information.
This year the City has been able to exercise control over a greater proportion of the letter mail
correspondence than ever before.

Respondents were asked if they agree with the following statements about letter mail:

- When I received the letter I had at least 5 days to act before the deadline.
- There were attachments to the letter that clearly outlined the information I needed to
  provide or what I needed to do.
- The letter told me who to contact for help or for more information.

Figure 23 illustrates the responses. Most respondents (86.4%) agreed that when they received
the letter they had at least 5 days to respond. The majority (91.3%) agreed that there were
attachments to the letter which clearly outlined what they needed to do or provide and most
individuals (90.8%) agreed that there was detailed instructions about who to contact for more
information.

Figure 23. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Letter Mail Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received letter at least 5 days before deadline</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were informative attachments</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact information was included</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 What is Working

All respondents were asked to provide their opinions regarding what part of the service they thought was the best and what they thought was working well.

In response to the question, “What part of the service was the best?” 66 individuals provided responses. Many of the responses contained multiple themes. A few respondents provided answers that were uncodeable or difficult to interpret (e.g., everything).

Predominantly respondents commented on the staff being the best part of the service. Individuals shared comments such as:

- Reception people are always polite and helpful. Most workers are respectful and do their best to help.
- My first worker was extremely sympathetic, helpful, great at communicating to me what I needed to do, and very supportive.

In addition, a number of other themes emerged from the comments and they included:

- practical assistance given (e.g., money, computer availability)
- program content (e.g., networking sessions)
- response time (e.g., short wait time for appointment, prompt in-office service)
- information provided (e.g., availability, amount)
- meeting in-person

The following quotes illustrate some of the themes summarized above:

- I appreciate how helpful OW workers are with me regarding schooling options and my community start-up.
- I like that they are able to communicate with me and give me all the necessary information and enough time to do it.
- Getting an appointment right away.
- All the brochures and information that was available in the waiting area.

In answer to the question, “What do you think we do well?” 63 respondents provided opinions. Again many responses contained multiple themes. A few respondents provided answers that were uncodeable or difficult to interpret (e.g., everything, yes).
There were many things that respondents felt OW staff do well, a number of which relate to the customer service goals of OW. Individuals mentioned characteristics related to staff attitudes as well as to activities such as:

- respect
- practical assistance
- communicating
- explaining information fully and clearly
- flexibility
- compassion

One respondent’s comment encapsulated these themes eloquently:

You are there to ask advice to, to be supportive and informative. When I got a part-time job, although the hours were low, you were happy and just as excited as me about it. That means a lot.

### 3.8 What is Not Working

OW staff realize that there are aspects of the OW program which can cause frustration for clients. Some of these factors are system-based and not within the control of the City to change. However, in other areas we may have the ability to locally make changes. Therefore, through this survey, the City has solicited the input of clients in order to help prioritize issues to address.

Respondents were asked, “What part of the service was the worst (e.g., it might have been the hardest to understand or the most frustrating)?” Fifty-three individuals responded to this question. A number of them reported that there had been nothing negative about their experience or provided answers that were unable to be coded. A few people suggested possible areas for improvement. These suggestions can be found in the next section of the report.

The themes that emerged as causing frustration for respondents can be grouped into the following categories:

- response time (e.g., having to wait to meet with worker past appointment time, waiting for cheque)

  The most frustrating [part] is not getting information on time through mail.

- communication problems (e.g., trying to contact worker, finding out about services from newspaper rather than from worker)
Calling OW and not getting a hold of a live person (leaving messages is frustrating when you have no phone).

- systemic issues (e.g., amount of money received, amount of information required)
  
  Paper work

- processes (e.g., deadlines for information requirements, frequent change of Case Manager)
  
  Sometimes it is hard to make deadlines for things, circumstances are not always within our control, and there is often no leeway on these matters.

- being suspended
  
  Sometimes the disqualifying forms come sent out for little things that a phone call could handle.

- when mistakes are made
  
  Getting letter telling me to come in at a specific time only to be told I was here at the wrong time but letter specifically said another (earlier time).

- access to location
  
  My home is closer to the downtown office. It is frustrating having to travel down to the Barton office and the Upper James office.

- staff attitude
  
  Like talking to a prison guard.

3.9 Suggestions for Improvements

Respondents were asked what they felt could be improved about the service and were also provided space to make additional comments. Forty-nine people provided suggestions for improvements and 16 individuals made additional comments.

The suggestions for improvements have been grouped into the same contact categories used on the questionnaire and the remaining suggestions have been grouped together under a category called “additional suggestions.” There were no specific suggestions made for improvements to out of office, IVR or letter mail services so these sections have not been included below.

Telephone Service

- answer phones more regularly
• return messages more promptly

In-Office Service

• less waiting time in line
• connect clients with office closest to their homes

In-Person Service

• provide more information about community resources, schooling, employment opportunities
• provide thorough information to clients
• provide consistent information to clients
• be on time for appointments
• be more sensitive to peoples’ diversity

Additional Suggestions

• more money – living wage recognizing increases in cost of living
• do not deduct money made from working – provide a grace period
• provide more social interaction opportunities facilitated by staff
• work with local community to provide discounted attraction tickets, low priced overnight outings for families
• train staff about how to work with people with disabilities e.g., speak more slowly for the hard of hearing
• provide a locked box at reception desk to deposit questionnaires to increase perception of confidentiality and security of responses to survey

In the additional comments section a number of respondents took the opportunity to thank staff. One individual shared the following sentiment:

I applaud the workers and staff that deal with so many people on a daily basis and I appreciate the help that I receive everyday.
4.0 2009 ONTARIO WORKS CLIENT SERVICE SURVEY FINDINGS SUMMARY

4.1 2009 Survey Findings

About one-fifth of respondents had attended an application appointment within the last three months; therefore, responses reflected a combination of “new” and “old” OW participants. There was minimal representation from individuals for whom English was a second language and non-Canadian citizens.

Overall, respondents provided very positive feedback about their experience of client service from Hamilton OW staff. In deciding how to interpret the 2008 survey results the Advisory Group set the following evaluation criteria which were also used to assess the 2009 survey results:

- 90% or higher agreement rating – good work is being done
- 81–89% agreement rate – we are meeting our target to provide good client service
- 75 – 80% agreement rate – this area could use some work
- 75% or lower agreement rate – we need to focus on improving this area

Table 4 outlines how many questions fell into each of the categories for the eight contact types. The feedback about home visits was excluded as such a small proportion of individuals indicated that they had received this type of service in the past three months (n=12). It was considered to be too presumptuous to make recommendations for program changes based on this sample size.

Table 4. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Evaluation of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Type</th>
<th># Questions Achieving Agreement Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Service</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Office Service</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person Service</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visit Service</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Location Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agency Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Voice Response System a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Mail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Did not include question which solicited feedback about receiving information about upcoming cheques*
The one item falling into the category of “concerning” was the percentage agreement with the statement “I was informed of language interpretation services available to me.” The two items that could use improvement were having calls answered promptly and receiving a call back within 24 hours. Overall, the two weakest areas were telephone and home visit services.

Satisfaction ratings across the six types of service which included the “Overall Satisfaction” question (IVR and letter mail service did not include this question) were averaged resulting in an overall satisfaction rating. The majority of respondents (96.4%) were either somewhat or very satisfied with the service they received overall.

Over half of respondents (56.9%) provided written comments to the open-ended questions. While this number is lower than last year, it is still encouraging to have such clear willingness to provide feedback to inform the program. The majority of respondents, 89.7%, indicated that they were comfortable having their comments shared anonymously as part of this report. Individuals provided comments which highlighted both positive components of the program and areas that could use improvement.

### 4.2 Comparison with 2008 Survey Results

The total number of respondents was smaller in 2009 than in 2008; however, the breakdown of questionnaires received by each office location remains relatively stable except for the Upper James office.

Table 5 shows a comparison of the 2009 and 2008 results indicating the statistical significance\(^2\) of the difference seen in the agreement frequencies between the two years. As indicated in section 2.2 of the report, three questions were removed from the 2008 version of the questionnaire for use in 2009, the sections on “out of office service” were added, and two questions were added to the IVR section. As there were no comparison data, these questions are not included in the analysis below.

---

\(^2\) Statistical significance was calculated using Z-score analysis which is widely used in survey research. However, it must be noted that the survey sample was self-selected rather than randomly selected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage Agreement by Survey Year</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone answered my call promptly.</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I left a message, I was called back within 24 hours (or on Monday if on a weekend).</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was given the option to press ‘0’ to speak with someone if it was an emergency.</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone introduced themselves.</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone were polite.</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message indicated whether the worker/staff was out of the office and what to do.</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone were helpful.</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was directed to the right person.</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message was understandable and clear to follow.</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Office Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I waited in line less than 10 minutes before I could talk to someone.</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to the office during open hours was easy for me.</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The office location was easy to get to by public transit, car, or on foot.</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-minding services were available.</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The waiting area was clean.</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff at reception were polite.</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was enough seating for the number of people in the waiting area.</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff at reception were helpful.</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was information posted in the waiting area.</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was informed of language interpretation services available to me.</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Comparison of 2008 and 2009 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage Agreement by Survey Year</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to book an appointment at a time that suited me.</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were able to meet with me at the time we scheduled.</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff took some time to get to know me.</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was asked what my needs were.</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff listened to me.</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were sensitive to my feelings and concerns.</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff treated me with respect.</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff worked together with me in making decisions and plans.</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff seemed to be well informed about policies and requirements.</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff explained information and/or requirements to me clearly.</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff told me about programs offered by the City and/or the community.</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Voice Response Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to access the IVR system</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to follow the IVR automated instructions</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letter Mail Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I received the letter I had at least 5 days to act before the deadline.</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were attachments to the letter that clearly outlined the information I needed to provide or what I needed to do.</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The letter told me who to contact for help or for more information.</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is hoped that each iteration of the client survey would find respondent agreement remaining constant, at a minimum, but ideally increase each year. As can be seen in Table 5, 13 items increased significantly year over year. The greatest improvements were seen in the following five items:

**Telephone Service**

- “I was given the option to press ‘0’ to speak with someone if it was an emergency” increased by 14.5%
- “The staff answering the phone introduced themselves” increased by 18.6%

**In-Office Service**

- “Child-minding services were available” increased by 15.7%
- “The staff at reception were polite” increased by 17.8%

**Letter Mail**

- “When I received the letter I had at least 5 days to act before the deadline” increased by 32.2%

The above noted improvements may be a result of action taken on the following recommendations made in the 2008 Client Survey Report:

- that management consider a refresher/reminder for OW staff that they should identify themselves when answering the telephone
- that telephony be reviewed to ensure that clients are able to zero out to a live person, also including this feature on Team Control Clerks’ lines
- that due dates have appropriate flexibility to allow time to respond to requests for documentation as outlined in letters

Only one area of concern from 2008 remains concerning in 2009. Respondents are still reporting low rates of agreement with the statement that they were informed of language interpretation services available to them. The following recommendations were made in the 2008 report:

- that signage be posted and pamphlets or wallet cards be available in all offices detailing where applicants/participants can access the assistance of interpreters. The signage should be visible to visitors in at least the top 10 languages in Hamilton. A short phrase such as “Ontario Works service is provided in English only. If you need the help of an interpreter please contact…” could be utilized.
- that an information memo be sent to all staff reminding them that the City line, 546-CITY, provides information in multiple languages
While management has begun work on putting these recommendations into action, the process has been somewhat extended as staff make sure work is done in alignment with the French Language Services processes being implemented across all City departments.

Two areas which continue to need improvement in 2009 as in 2008 are having telephones answered promptly, and messages being returned within one business day. As mentioned in the Introduction to this report, there has been a significant increase in the OW caseload over the last year due to the downturn in the local economy. This increase may be affecting staff’s ability to answer calls and return messages in a timely manner.

The City has taken action to mitigate the effects of the caseload increase on client service by instituting a contingency plan which includes the hiring of Case Aides to assist with various administrative tasks, thus enabling Case Managers to focus on interactions with clients. In addition, the City is implementing a review of all call centre processes in an effort to increase efficiencies. It is anticipated that the 2010 client survey would show improvements in these two areas.

### 5.0 2009 ONTARIO WORKS CLIENT SERVICE SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS

OW management and staff have taken steps toward action on all of the recommendations made in the 2008 Client Survey Report. In addition to following through on those recommendations, the following additional overall recommendations have been developed based on the 2009 survey results:

- that staff and management continue to monitor the impact of caseload pressures on the quality of client service and take action to mitigate these effects wherever possible;
- that the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disability client service standards be implemented within OW;
- that the desire of participants to have information about upcoming cheques available on the IVR system be forwarded to the province;
- that consideration be given to soliciting respondents for the survey at out of office service provision locations;
- that a simple, ongoing feedback form be developed for regular use available in multiple languages to facilitate feedback from individuals with lower literacy skills or English as a second language;
- that lock-boxes be provided for questionnaires returned by clients; and,
- Survey results should be communicated to internal and external stakeholders.
With regards to a 2010 iteration of the client survey, the City will have to decide how to proceed based on the current environment. However, before proceeding, it is recommended that both the questionnaire and the methodology be reviewed with the goals of increasing the number of respondents, improving the ability to draw conclusions about the representativeness of the survey sample, and the opportunities for more detailed analyses (e.g., by office location or reason for contact).
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APPENDIX A: ONTARIO WORKS CUSTOMER SERVICE CARD

How can we serve you better?

Ontario Works staff are knowledgeable about the OW program and resources in our community. We strive to provide excellent customer service. You can expect to be treated in a timely, respectful and knowledgeable manner.

If you are not, then we encourage you to let us know by following one of the options below.

1. Contact your Case Manager

Contact your Case Manager if:
• You need a decision to be explained
• You have not received a letter explaining a decision concerning your assistance
• You are unable to provide outstanding information you have been asked for

Your Case Manager will do his or her best to help you with any questions.

2. Contact the Program Manager

In some cases, you may not be satisfied with how your concern has been handled. In this case, you may contact the Program Manager by phoning 905-546-4800. Ask to speak with your Case Manager’s Program Manager.

If you would rather write a letter to your Case Manager or Program Manager include the following information:
• Your Name, Address, Member ID and the name of your Case Manager
• The reason for your complaint and
• Provide any copies of documentation to support your complaint

If you are not sure about where to address your letter, call us at 905-546-4800 for help.

By the way, we would also like to know when we are doing something well and welcome your comments!

INTENSITY RESPECT COURAGE EMPATHY

Hamilton Community Services
APPENDIX B: 2009 ONTARIO WORKS CLIENT SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Ontario Works
Client Service Survey

We are asking for your feedback to help us improve our services. You do not have to fill out this survey but your answers will help us serve you better.

Please note that your answers
- will be kept confidential to the best of our ability
- will be added together with everyone else’s answers in a report
- will not affect your Ontario Works (OW) eligibility
- will help contribute to improved client service

What you need to know about this survey
- you may answer all of the questions or you may decide to skip some
- you will need about 10 minutes to answer this survey
- please do not put your name or any other identifying information on the questionnaire
- please do not refer to staff by name in your answers
- we will be asking for your permission to include your written comments, anonymously, in the final report. We are NOT asking you to provide your name, and you are completely free to agree or refuse, it is YOUR choice. Even if you agree, please note that we will remove any sections of comments related to specific people, places or times.

The questionnaire is available in English only. We would encourage you to get help from a friend, family member or interpreter to complete the survey if you need assistance in another language.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey please call Sarah Wallace, Program Analyst, at 905-546-2424 extension 6084 or email her at Sarah.Wallace@hamilton.ca.
Questionnaire Instructions

Part I

This part of the questionnaire is divided into eight short sections (A – E) based on the different ways people come into contact with Ontario Works staff. The questions ask about the contact you had in the last three (3) months and the client service you received.

You will be asked to skip sections if you did not receive that type of service in the last three months.

Part II

In the second part of the survey we would like to ask a few basic questions about you.

Part III

In the last part of the survey we would like to give you the opportunity to share your ideas for service improvements with us. Please think about all of the experiences you have had with Ontario Works in the last three (3) months.
Section A. Please think back to the last time you called Ontario Works.
☐ I did not call Ontario Works in the last three (3) months. (☞ please go to Section B)

1. What was the reason for your call?
   ☐ ask a question
   ☐ provide or request information
   ☐ schedule an appointment
   ☐ talk about appealing a decision
   ☐ other: _______________________

2. Please fill in one circle to show your agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone answered my call promptly.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone introduced themselves.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone were polite.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone were helpful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was directed to the right person.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message indicated whether the worker/staff was out of the office and what to do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message was understandable and clear to follow.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was given the option to press ‘0’ to speak with someone if it was an emergency.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I left a message, I was called back within 24 hours (or on Monday if on a weekend).</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion?
   ☐ very satisfied
   ☐ somewhat satisfied
   ☐ somewhat dissatisfied
   ☐ not at all satisfied
Section B. Please think back to the last time you came into an Ontario Works office.

○ Before today, I have not been into an Ontario Works office in the last three (3) months. (☞ please go to Section C)

4. Why did you come into the office?
   ○ provide or request information
   ○ attend an appointment
   ○ other ______________________________

5. Please fill in one circle to show your agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
<th>Does not apply to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting to the office during open hours was easy for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The office location was easy to get to by public transit, car, or on foot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I waited in line less than 10 minutes before I could talk to someone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff at reception were polite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff at reception were helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was enough seating for the number of people in the waiting area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The waiting area was clean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was information posted in the waiting area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-minding services were available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was informed of language interpretation services available to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How satisfied are you with the client service you received on that occasion overall?

○ very satisfied
○ somewhat satisfied
○ somewhat dissatisfied
○ not at all satisfied
Section C. We would like you to think back to your last in-office meeting with an Ontario Works staff person.

☐ I did not have a meeting with an Ontario Works staff person in the last three (3) months. (☞ please go to Section D)

7. What was the reason for your meeting?

☐ to apply for Ontario Works benefits ☐ Overpayment Recovery appointment
☐ to update my Participation Agreement ☐ Family Support appointment
☐ Employment Support appointment ☐ Eligibility Review appointment
☐ Special Supports appointment ☐ other ____________________________
☐ Assignments and Agreements appointment
☐ Rights and Responsibilities Review appointment
☐ yearly financial review appointment (Consolidated Verification Process – CVP)
☐ to talk about appealing a decision that was made

8. Please fill in one circle to show your agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
<th>Does not apply to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was able to book an appointment at a time that suited me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were able to meet with me at the time we scheduled.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff took some time to get to know me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was asked what my needs were.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff listened to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were sensitive to my feelings and concerns.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff treated me with respect.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff seemed to be well informed about policies and requirements.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff explained information and/or requirements to me clearly.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree</td>
<td>I do not agree</td>
<td>Does not apply to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff worked together with me in making decisions and plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff told me about programs offered by the City and/or the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How satisfied are you with the client service you received on that occasion overall?

- very satisfied
- somewhat satisfied
- somewhat dissatisfied
- not at all satisfied
Section D. Please think back to the last time you received a home visit from an Ontario Works staff person.

☐ I have not received a home visit from Ontario Works staff in the last three (3) months. (*please go to Section E)

10. Please fill in one circle to show your agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
<th>Does not apply to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving a home visit made it possible for me to apply for Ontario Works.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see home visits as a way for Ontario Works to provide good service to clients.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable having an Ontario Works staff person visit my home.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that more Ontario Works services should be available through home visits.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How satisfied are you with the client service you received on that occasion overall?

☐ very satisfied
☐ somewhat satisfied
☐ somewhat dissatisfied
☐ not at all satisfied
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Section E. Please think back to the last time you met with Ontario Works staff person at a **neighbourhood location**.

- I have not met with an Ontario Works staff at a neighbourhood location in the last three (3) months. (**please go to Section F**)

12. Please fill in one circle to show your agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
<th>Does not apply to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with staff at a neighbourhood location made it possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for me to apply for Ontario Works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see serving clients at neighbourhood locations as a way for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Works to provide good service to clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable meeting with an Ontario Works staff person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that more Ontario Works services should be available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at neighbourhood locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **How satisfied are you with the client service you received on that occasion overall?**

- very satisfied
- somewhat satisfied
- somewhat dissatisfied
- not at all satisfied
**Section F. Please think back to the last time you met with Ontario Works staff at a community agency.**

☐ I have not met with an Ontario Works staff at a community agency in the last three (3) months. (please go to Section G)

14. Please fill in one circle to show your agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
<th>Does not apply to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with staff at a community agency made it possible for me to apply for Ontario Works.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see serving clients at community agencies as a way for Ontario Works to provide good service to clients.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable meeting with an Ontario Works staff person at a community agency.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that more Ontario Works services should be available at community agencies.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How satisfied are you with the client service you received on that occasion overall?

☐ very satisfied  ☐ somewhat dissatisfied
☐ somewhat satisfied ☐ not at all satisfied
Section G. Please think back to the last time you used the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system. The IVR system provides clients with access to personal case file information and general information about Ontario Works. It is reached by calling 1-800-808-2268 and entering a nine digit identification number and a 4 digit PIN number.

☐ I have not used the IVR system in the last three (3) months. (☞ please go to Section H)

16. Please fill in one circle to show your agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
<th>Does not apply to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was able to access the IVR system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to follow the IVR automated instructions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IVR system provides the information that I want to know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be helpful if the IVR system told me about upcoming cheques, not only past cheques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section H. Please think back to the last time you received a letter from Ontario Works.

☐ I have not received a letter in the last three (3) months. (⇒ please go to Part II)

17. Please fill in one circle to show your agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
<th>Does not apply to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I received the letter I had at least 5 days to act before the deadline.</td>
<td>○ 1</td>
<td>○ 0</td>
<td>○ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were attachments to the letter that clearly outlined the information I needed to provide or what I needed to do.</td>
<td>○ 1</td>
<td>○ 0</td>
<td>○ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The letter told me who to contact for help or for more information.</td>
<td>○ 1</td>
<td>○ 0</td>
<td>○ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II

1. **What is your age?**
   - 15 years or younger
   - 16 – 24 years old
   - 25 – 54 years old
   - 55 years or older

2. **What gender are you?**
   - female
   - male

3. **What is your family status?**
   - I am single and live alone
   - I am single and live with my children
   - I live with a spouse/partner/family member without children
   - I live with a spouse/partner/family member with children
   - other __________________________

4. **Is English the first language you spoke growing up?**
   - Yes
   - No ➔ Please indicate your first language: __________________________

5. **What is your citizenship status?**
   - Canadian citizen
   - Permanent resident
   - Visitor / applicant for permanent residence
   - Registered (status) Indian
   - Convention refugee
   - Convention refugee – RAP / AAP
   - Refugee claimant
   - Minister’s / Temporary resident permit
   - Deportee – actionable
   - Deportee – in actionable
   - Student visa
   - Visitor / tourist / temporary resident visitor

6. **If you have a disability, was service available in a way that supported you?**
   - Yes
   - No ➔ What would have helped you? __________________________
   (e.g., large print, TTY/TDD, accessible doors and elevators)
   - Does not apply to me
1. What part of the service was the best?

2. What part of the service was the worst (e.g., it might have been the hardest to understand or the most frustrating)?

3. What do you think we do well?

4. What do you think we could do to improve our service?

5. Is there anything else that you would like to share with us?

_Last year, individuals made excellent comments on their surveys but we did not include anyone's comments in the final report. This year, we are hoping that some people will be comfortable having their comments shared anonymously in the final report. We would remove any comments, or sections of comments, related to specific people, places or times._

6. Would you be willing to let us include some of your comments anonymously in the final report?  ○ Yes  ○ No

_Thank you for your help!_
## APPENDIX C: SURVEY RESPONSE RATES BY QUESTION

Table 6. 2009 Ontario Works Client Service Survey, Response Rates by Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Returned Questionnaires (n=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Reporting Not Applicable, Missing or Uncodeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the reason for your call?</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone answered my call promptly.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I left a message, I was called back within 24 hours (or on Monday if on a weekend).</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was given the option to press ‘0’ to speak with someone if it was an emergency.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone introduced themselves.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone were polite.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message indicated whether the worker/staff was out of the office and what to do.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff answering the phone were helpful.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was directed to the right person.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message was understandable and clear to follow.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion?</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Returned Questionnaires (n=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Office Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did you come into the office?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I waited in line less than 10 minutes before I could talk to someone.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to the office during open hours was easy for me.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The office location was easy to get to by public transit, car, or on foot.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-minding services were available.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The waiting area was clean.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff at reception were polite.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was enough seating for the number of people in the waiting area.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff at reception were helpful.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was information posted in the waiting area.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was informed of language interpretation services available to me.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion?</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Returned Questionnaires (n=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Reporting Not Applicable, Missing or Uncodeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the reason for your meeting?</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to book an appointment at a time that suited me.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were able to meet with me at the time we scheduled.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff took some time to get to know me.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was asked what my needs were.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff listened to me.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were sensitive to my feelings and concerns.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff treated me with respect.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff worked together with me in making decisions and plans.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff seemed to be well informed about policies and requirements.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff explained information and/or requirements to me clearly.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff told me about programs offered by the City and/or the community.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion?</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Returned Questionnaires (n=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Reporting Not Applicable, Missing or Uncodeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Visit Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving a home visit made it possible for me to apply for Ontario Works.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see home visits as a way for Ontario works to provide good service to clients</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable having an Ontario Works staff person visit my home</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that more Ontario works services should be available through home visits</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion?</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Location Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with staff at a neighbourhood location made it possible for me to apply for Ontario Works.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see serving clients at neighbourhood locations as a way for Ontario works to provide good service to clients</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable meeting with an Ontario Works staff person in my neighbourhood</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that more Ontario works services should be available at neighbourhood locations</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion?</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Returned Questionnaires (n=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Reporting Not Applicable, Missing or Uncodeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Agency Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with staff at a community agency made it possible for me to apply for Ontario Works</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see serving clients at community agencies as a way for Ontario works to provide good service to clients</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable meeting with an Ontario Works staff person at a community agency</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that more Ontario works services should be available at community agencies</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you overall with the client service you received on that occasion?</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Voice Response Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to access the IVR system</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to follow the IVR automated instructions</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IVR system provides the information that I want to know</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be helpful if the IVR system told me about upcoming cheques, not only past cheques</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letter Mail Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I received the letter I had at least 5 days to act before the deadline.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were attachments to the letter that clearly outlined the information I needed to provide or what I needed to do.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The letter told me who to contact for help or for more information.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>