

Employer



**The Vocational and  
Rehabilitation  
Research Institute**  
3304-33rd Street NW  
Calgary, AB T2L 2A6  
Phone: (403) 284-1121  
Fax: (403) 284-1146  
www.vri.org  
vri@telus.net

## **Workforce Profile and Employer Perspectives**

### **Report from Survey of Rehabilitation Service Providers in Alberta**

**Prepared by  
The Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute**

**For**



**April 2005**

An accredited organization

A non-profit registered charity  
#11928 6912 RR0001

Meeting the needs of  
persons with disabilities  
and the community at  
large since 1969



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	i
PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	1
Survey tool development.....	1
Sampling and data collection strategies.....	2
Data quality and confidence in results.....	2
Analysis and interpretation of the data.....	4
Response Rates.....	5
PART TWO: SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS.....	5
Operating Model.....	5
Services Provided.....	6
Regional Distribution.....	7
Distribution by Population of Location.....	8
PART THREE: PROVINCIAL WORKFORCE DATA.....	9
Total Number of Employees.....	9
Regional Distribution.....	10
Gender Distribution.....	11
Age Distribution.....	11
Distribution by Position.....	12
Distribution by Job Status/Hours of Work.....	13
Distribution by Highest Level of Education.....	14
Summary.....	14
PART FOUR: REGIONAL DIFFERENCES.....	16
Total Number of Employees.....	16
Gender Distribution.....	17
Age Distribution.....	18
Distribution by Position.....	19
Distribution by Job Status/Hours of Work.....	21
Distribution by Highest Level of Education.....	23
Summary.....	25
PART FIVE: DIFFERENCES BY AGE GROUP.....	27
Gender Distribution.....	27
Distribution by Position.....	28
Distribution by Job Status/ Hours of Work.....	30
Distribution by Highest Level of Education.....	31
Summary.....	33
PART SIX: EMPLOYERS' PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES.....	34
Workforce Challenges, Issues and Trends.....	34
Recruitment and Retention Issues and Strategies.....	38
Staff Development and Training.....	42
Human Resource Practices for the Future.....	43
Summary.....	46
PART SEVEN: CONCLUSION.....	48
REFERENCES.....	49
APPENDICES	
A: Service Provider Survey instrument	

B: Calculation of regional and overall weighted totals

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The vision of Workforce 2010 is to have a responsive and sustainable workforce to support persons with disabilities in Alberta. As part of the Workforce 2010 initiative, the Alberta Association of Rehabilitation Centres (AARC) commissioned The Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute (VRRI) to undertake multiple intelligence gathering strategies, including a survey of community-based rehabilitation employers providing services to persons with developmental disabilities in Alberta.

### Methodology

Sample and data collection The survey instrument, developed by VRRI in consultation with the Workforce 2010 Steering Committee, was mailed to all community-based agencies funded by Person with Developmental Disabilities (PDD) to provide services to adults with developmental disabilities in Alberta, based on a sampling frame provided by PDD regional boards. Of the 176 agencies in the sample, 28 also received funding from Family Supports to Children with Disabilities (FSCD; previously known as Alberta Children and Family Services). Data collection occurred from October 19, 2004 to January 14, 2005.

Data quality and limitations Based on the overall response rate (43.2%) and the variability in service providers, it appears that the sample is representative, and findings may be generalized to PDD-funded service providers across the province. However, potential self-selection bias due to unknown factors may be present. As well, generalizability is limited for questions with large amounts of missing data. Data on FSCD-funded employees is only generalizable to those working in PDD-funded agencies.

Respondents provided “best guesses” rather than accurate numbers for some questions, and there is a potential inflation in the number of employees reported due to overlap in staffing across agencies. For these reasons, statistical tests of significance were not conducted, and percentage distributions rather than actual numbers should be used for interpreting the data.

The results should be treated as exploratory, recognizing that this is the first survey of its kind for the rehabilitation field in Alberta. The data is sufficiently valid to paint a broad picture of the current and future trends in the industry’s workforce—an area which has hitherto relied mostly on anecdotal information.

### Sample Demographics

76 respondents (43.2%) returned the survey, providing information for 70 unique organizations representing 83 service locations. Regional response rates were as follows: Calgary (46.5%), Central (40.5%), Edmonton (39.0%), Northeast (46.2%), Northwest (50.0%) and South (42.9%).

- The sample employs 7,446 employees and provides services to 4,877 adults and 761 children with disabilities (numbers potentially inflated due to overlap across agencies).
- 69 organizations provided information about their operating model, distributed as follows: not-for-profit societies (81.2%), not-for-profit businesses (8.7%) and for-profit organizations (10.1%); 92.8% were not unionized and 7.2% were fully or partially unionized.
- 69 organizations (98.6%) receive PDD funding to provide services to adults with developmental disabilities; of these, 48 serve only adults and 21 serve adults and children.
- 22 organizations (31.4%) receive FSCD funding to provide services to children with developmental disabilities; of these, 21 serve adults and children, and one serves only children.
- Services are located in all PDD regions and in all FSCD regions (except Métis Settlements), and are distributed across diverse settings: 37.3% are located in places with over 100,000 people, 15.7% in places with 50,001 to 100,000 people, 17.6% in places with 10,001 to 50,000 people and 31.4% in areas with 10,000 people or less.

## Provincial Workforce

Respondents were requested to provide demographic information on their current PDD-funded and/or FSCD-funded workforce, defined as “everyone in your organization who is funded by PDD and/or FSCD to provide services to persons with disabilities.” The definition included all direct service workers, administrative support, supervisory and managerial staff; full-time, part-time, temporary, variable, relief and casual staff; and, people employed or contracted for services such as supportive room-mates or neighbours, support home providers, contract job coaches and others providing proprietor-based services.

### Total employees

- The sample reported a total of 7,446 employees, of which 72.7% (5,413) are funded by PDD only, 8.4% (623) by FSCD only and 7.0% (526) by both PDD and FSCD. Thus, the data is based on 5,939 PDD-funded employees and 1,149 FSCD-funded employees. However, because of potential inflation in these numbers due to overlap in staffing across agencies, it may be more accurate to think of these in terms of the number of *positions* rather than actual number of *people* providing services.
- Population estimates based on data extrapolation suggest there could be as many as 13,600 PDD-funded and 2,630 FSCD-funded positions in community-based PDD-funded services in Alberta.

### Regional distribution

- PDD-funded employees: Calgary, 23.6%; Central, 22.3%; Edmonton, 25.7%; Northeast, 5.3%; Northwest, 4.6%; South, 8.4%; and, 10.1% in organizations across multiple regions. This distribution is slightly different from the regional distribution of individuals receiving services. Part of the discrepancy could be due to the amalgamation of data from organizations serving multiple regions.
- FSCD-funded employees: Calgary, 7.6%; Central, 45.3%; East Central, 0.6%; North Central, 3.6%; Edmonton, 16.4%; Northeast, 0.8%; Northwest, 4.6%; Southeast, 2.7%, Southwest, 1.0%; and, 17.5% in organizations across multiple regions.

### Gender distribution

- PDD-funded employees: Females, 82.6%; males, 16.5%. (n=5,888; missing=0.9%)
- FSCD-funded employees: Females, 81.9%; males, 18.1%. (n=1,149; missing=0%)

### Age distribution

- The largest proportion of workers are 26-35 years old. FSCD-funded employees appear to be slightly younger than PDD-funded employees, with a greater proportion 25 years or younger (FSCD, 25.1%; PDD, 16.1%) and a lower proportion 36-55 years old (FSCD, 35.3%; PDD, 44.2%).
- PDD-funded employees: Under 18 years, 0.1%; 18-25 years 16.0%; 26-35 years, 26.8%; 36-45 years, 24.4%, 46-55 years, 19.8%; over 55 years, 8.7%. (n=5,690; missing=4.2%)
- FSCD-funded employees: Under 18 years, 0.8%; 18-25 years 24.3%; 26-35 years, 28.1%; 36-45 years, 18.6%, 46-55 years, 16.7%; over 55 years, 11.4%. (n=1,149; missing=0%)
- There is some evidence of a bimodal distribution in the PDD-funded workforce, with people aged 36-45 years relatively fewer than those younger than 35 or older than 45. This could have implications with respect to leadership development and succession planning.

### Distribution by position

- The predominant employees are direct service workers. Compared to PDD-funded employees, there is a higher proportion of FSCD-funded administrative support workers and professional support staff.
- PDD-funded employees: Administrative support, 4.1%; direct service workers, 79.9%; front-line supervisors/coordinators/program managers, 10.1%; professional support, 0.9%; senior management, 2.2%. (n=5,773; missing=2.8%)

- FSCD-funded employees: Administrative support, 6.1%; direct service workers, 77.6%; front-line supervisors/coordinators/program managers, 9.5%; professional support, 1.9%; senior management, 1.9%. (n=1,114; missing=3.0%)

#### Distribution by job status/hours of work

- Permanent workers are predominant, however, compared to PDD-funded employees, there is a higher proportion of FSCD-funded variable/casual/on-call workers and fewer permanent workers.
- PDD-funded employees: Permanent full-time, 52.9%; permanent part-time, 28.7%; term full-time, 1.0%; term part-time, 0.7%; variable/casual/on-call, 15.1%. (n=5,839; missing=1.7%)
- FSCD-funded employees: Permanent full-time, 41.8%; permanent part-time, 30.4%; term full-time, 0.2%; term part-time, 0%; variable/casual/on-call, 24.3%. (n=1,110; missing=3.4%)

#### Distribution by highest education level attained

- Data for this variable was missing for a large portion of employees (PDD, 31.5%; FSCD, 58.2%). The largest proportion of people are those whose highest education level is a high school diploma, followed by those with a college diploma.
- PDD-funded employees: Less than high school, 1.7%; high school diploma, 26.0%; some college or university, 12.9%; college diploma, 15.4%; university degree (Bachelor's), 11.2%; post-graduate training, 1.3%. (n=4,067; missing=31.5%)
- FSCD-funded employees: Less than high school, 0.4%; high school diploma, 19.0%; some college or university, 6.1%; college diploma, 8.4%; university degree (Bachelor's), 6.1%; post-graduate training, 1.9%. (n=1,100; missing=58.2%)

### **Regional Differences**

Regional differences were analyzed for both PDD and FSCD sub-samples, with FSCD regions collapsed into their nearest PDD equivalents. Percentages were calculated out of valid numbers (i.e., not including missing cases); overall totals may differ from provincial information in previous section. The FSCD-funded samples from Northeast (12), Northwest (54) and South (40) are too low for meaningful interpretations; their results are not reported here but are in the main survey report for those who are interested.

#### Gender distribution

- PDD-funded employees (n=5,888; missing=0.9%)
  - The overall workforce is about 83% female and 17% male.
  - Calgary (21.3%), South (17.9%), Northeast (17.1%) and organizations serving multiple regions (17.1%) have higher proportions of males. Central (12.5%), Edmonton (14.6%) and Northwest (14.7%) have fewer males.
- FSCD-funded employees (n=1,149; missing=0%)
  - The overall workforce is 82% female and 18% male.
  - Organizations serving multiple regions have the largest proportion of males (36.7%); Edmonton (10.8%) has the lowest; Calgary (13.4%) and Central (13.5%) have similar gender distributions.

#### Age distribution

- PDD-funded employees (n=5,690; missing=4.2%)
  - Overall, the highest percentage of workers are 26-35 years (27.9%), followed by those 36-45 years (25.5%) and 46-55 years (20.7%).
  - Central region appears to have a slightly older workforce, with the highest proportion aged 36-45 years (26.0%), and a higher than average proportion aged over 55 (Central, 11.8%; overall, 9.1%). South also has a slightly higher percentage of workers aged 36-45 years (27.0%)

compared to those 26-35 years (24.5%). Northwest has a fairly obvious bimodal distribution, with the highest proportion aged 36-45 years (32.0%), followed by those 18-25 years (22.3%).

- FSCD-funded employees (n=1,149; missing=0%)
  - The highest percentage of workers are 26-35 years (28.1%), followed by 18-25 years (24.3%).
  - Edmonton appears to have the youngest workforce with 50.0% aged 25 years or younger (cf. 25.1% overall), and a lower proportion aged over 45 years (Edmonton, 16.9%; overall 28.1%). In contrast, Central has the lowest proportion 25 years or younger (17.2%) and a much higher proportion over 45 years (30.2%). Organizations serving multiple regions show a bimodal distribution, peaking at 26-35 years (32.8%) and at over 55 years (19.9%).

#### Distribution by position

- PDD-funded employees (n=5,773; missing=2.8%)
  - Overall, the highest percentage are in direct service positions (82.2%), followed by front-line supervisors/coordinators/program managers (10.4%), administrative staff (4.2%) and senior management (2.3%). There are no notable differences across regions in this trend.
- FSCD-funded employees (n=1,114; missing=3.0%)
  - Overall, direct service workers form 80.1% of the sample, followed by front-line supervisors, coordinators or program managers (9.6%) and administrative staff (6.3%).
  - Calgary has the highest proportion of direct service staff (92.8%) and a lower proportion of administrative support (2.1%) and front-line supervision staff (3.1%). In contrast, Central has a much higher proportion of front-line supervision staff (12.2%). Edmonton has a higher proportion of administrative support staff (Edmonton, 8.8%; overall 6.3%) than front-line supervisory staff (Edmonton, 6.1%; overall 9.6%), as do organizations serving multiple regions (13.3% administrative support staff compared to 8.6% front-line supervision staff).

#### Distribution by job status/hours of work

- PDD-funded employees (n=5,778; missing=2.7%)
  - The largest proportion in all regions are permanent, full-time workers (54.3% overall, ranging from 48.3% in Calgary to 69.1% in Northwest), followed by permanent, part-time workers (29.5% overall) and people who are employed on variable/casual/on-call terms (14.5% overall).
  - In Northeast and in organizations serving multiple regions, the proportions of variable/casual/on-call workers exceed permanent, part-time workers by a small margin. Both these geographic categories have the lowest proportions of permanent, part-time workers (Northeast, 19.1%; organizations serving multiple regions, 20.8%; overall, 29.5%), while Calgary (35.1%) has the highest, followed by Central (34.4%).
  - There is great variation across regions in the proportions of variable/casual/on-call workers, ranging from 24.3% in organizations serving multiple regions and 20.9% in Northeast to 2.9% in Northwest. We are not sure if this finding is an artifact of the small sample size (4-6 respondents each), or whether it is indeed reflective of regional practices.
- FSCD-funded employees (n=1,110; missing=3.4%)
  - Overall, the majority are employed on a permanent, full-time basis (43.2%), followed by those employed on a permanent, part-time basis (31.4%).
  - However, the largest proportion of workers in Calgary (83.5%) are employed on a permanent, part-time basis, while the largest proportion in Edmonton (77.7%) are variable/casual/on-call.

#### Distribution by highest level of education attained

- In both sub-samples, the largest proportions of workers hold a high school diploma (PDD, 37.9%; FSCD, 45.7%), followed by those with a college diploma (PDD, 22.67%; FSCD, 20.2%).
- PDD-funded employees (n=4,067; missing=31.5%)



- Exceptions to the general overall pattern include: organizations serving multiple regions, where university graduates constitute the largest category (34.3%); Edmonton, where the largest category is of those holding college diplomas (32.9%); and, Calgary, where the second largest category is not those with college diplomas, but with Bachelor's degrees (21.0%).
- Calgary (25.0%) and Edmonton (19.8%) have the highest proportion of degree.
- FSCD-funded employees (n=481; missing=58.1%): Regional numbers too small to interpret.

### **Differences by Age Groups**

The survey requested information on age-level differences in employee demographic characteristics in order to help understand how the workforce in PDD-funded services might change over time. Unfortunately there was a large number of missing cases; of those who did respond, many provided best estimates rather than accurate numbers. Thus, the results are not generalizable; however, they do paint a rough picture of age-level differences at least for the sample reported.

#### Gender distribution

- PDD-funded employees (n=4,688; missing=21.1%)
  - The gender difference is greatest for those 36-45 years (14.7% male; 85.3% female) and lowest for those 46-55 years (19.8% male; 81.1% female). The greatest proportion of men in the sample are 26-35 years (25.6%), followed by those who are 46-55 years (24.0%); the greatest proportion of women are 26-35 years (28.0%), followed by those who are 36-45 years (25.9%).
- FSCD-funded employees (n=649; missing=43.5%)
  - The gender difference is greatest for people under 26 (9.0% male, 91.0% female), and lowest for those over 55 (20.3% male, 79.7% female). The highest proportion of men are 26-35 years (25.6%) followed by those who are 46-55 years. The highest proportion of women are also 26-35 years (27.9%), followed by those who are under 26 years (23.2%).

#### Distribution by position

- PDD-funded employees (n=4,466; missing=21.1%)
  - Direct service workers are the predominant group, ranging from 76.1% of workers 36-45 years to 93.8% of those less than 26 years. Almost half the direct service workers (48.8%) are less than 36 years old; however, 80.3% of people over 55 years are also direct service workers.
  - Over half the front-line supervisors/coordinators/ program managers (59.5%) are 36-55 years old, and range from 3.7% of workers under 26 years to 15.3% of workers 36-45 years.
  - The distribution of senior managers rises steadily with age, ranging from less than 1% of those under 36 years to 5.2% of those over 55 years.
  - Administrative support staff range from 2.0% of those under 26 years to 6.3% of those 46-55 years and 6.0% of those over 55. There is no age-related trend in professional support staff.
- FSCD-funded employees (n=611; missing=53.2%)
  - Direct service workers range from 78.4% of people 26-35 years to 94.7% of those under 26 years; half these workers (50.8%) are under 36 years.
  - The bulk of front-line supervisors/coordinators/program managers (69.2%) are 26-45 years old, ranging from 6.2% of those who are under 26 or over 55 years, to 15.0% of those 36-45 years.
  - All senior managers reported are 36-55 years.
  - People in administrative support positions range from 0.8% of those under 26 years to 10.8% of those over 55 years; people providing professional supports are concentrated in the 26-35 years category (50.0%), followed by those who are 46-55 years (21.4%).

#### Distribution by job status/hours of work

- PDD-funded employees (n=4,187; missing=29.5%)
  - Over half the workers in the sample are employed on a permanent, full-time basis, and range from 47.3% of those under 26 years to 61.2% of those 36-45 years. These are followed by permanent, part-time workers, who constitute 30.6% of workers aged under 26.
  - Variable/casual/on-call workers range from 11.5% of people aged 36-45 years to 21.2% of those under 26 years. Over half the people in these positions (58.0%) are under 36.
- FSCD-funded employees (n=610; missing=53.1%)
  - Permanent, full-time workers range from 22.0% of those under 26 to 59.4% of those over 55. In contrast, permanent, part-time workers are 44.9% of the sample under 26, compared to only 23.4% of those over 55. The number of permanent, part-time people steadily decreases with age.
  - People employed on a variable/casual/on-call basis are most likely to be under 26 years old, where they form 33.1% of the people in that age group.

#### Distribution by highest level of education attained

- PDD-funded employees (n=3,104; missing=47.7%)
  - People with a high school diploma range from 31.4% of those who are 26 to 35 years to 55.0% of those who are over 55.
  - There is an inverse relationship between age and the proportion of people who have some college or university training, ranging from 23.6% of those under 26 years to 10.5% of those over 55.
  - A quarter of the sample (25.4%) holds a college diploma, constituting from 15.3% of the workforce over 55 years to 28.7% of the workforce 26-35 years.
  - People holding a Bachelor's degree (without any higher academic training) range from 9.2% of those over 55 years to 16.4% of people aged 26-35 years.
  - There is a direct relationship between age and the proportion of people with post-graduate training, ranging from none under 26 years to 3.9% of those over 55 years.
- FSCD-funded employees (n=144; missing=87.5%): Sample too small to interpret.

#### **Employers' Perspectives and Practices**

The survey gathered information on employers' perspectives on workforce challenges and trends, recruitment and retention, staff development and training, and exemplary human resource practices for the current and future needs of the rehabilitation field.

Workforce challenges, issues and trends Two issues raised most frequently were (i) lack of adequate funding and (ii) acute shortage of qualified workers. Both are crucial given the recent trends that are expected to continue for the foreseeable future.

Demographic trends observed in the workforce include (i) an increasingly culturally diverse workforce, (ii) more male applicants, (iii) more older applicants, and (iv) more people with lower academic qualifications. While some of these trends are positive (e.g., attracting individuals who are currently not well represented in the rehabilitation workforce), they also bring with them some challenges (e.g., communication barriers, and lack of formal knowledge and experience in rehabilitation services).

Demographic trends observed and expected in individuals receiving services include (i) an increase in older people, people with complex needs, FAS and dual diagnosis, (ii) a greater diversity in disabilities and ethnic backgrounds, (iii) a greater involvement from families in service planning, (iv) higher expectations for quality standards, and (v) more families and individuals becoming increasingly vocal in advocating for quality standards and government accountability.

In response to these expectations, employers feel that direct service staff will need to be more educated, specialized, and have a diverse range of skills such as communication, conflict management, advocacy,

partnership-building and knowledge of community resources. The role of direct service staff will need to evolve into that of facilitator, connector and ambassador. As well, post-secondary institutions will need to prepare students better than they are currently doing for the changing realities of rehabilitation services.

**Staff recruitment and retention** Employers overwhelmingly attributed the recruitment and retention challenges faced by the field to inadequate compensation for the skills, responsibilities and demands of the work—especially for direct service positions which were seen as being the most stressful. The perspective of the field as a devalued service, coupled with the failure to recognize rehabilitation work as a profession contribute to the recruitment crisis especially during the current labour shortage. More people were seen as leaving their jobs for other industries (e.g., education, nursing, other health services and the oil and gas sector) rather than for work in other agencies within the field.

Solutions to these problems include (i) increased compensation, (ii) more job flexibility, (iii) better promotion of the field as a valued service to society, (iv) development of a professional association, and (v) creation of learning and advancement opportunities so that people perceive the work as a career rather than just a job. As the primary funder, PDD was seen as playing a central role in providing the support and resources to enable these strategies to occur.

**Staff development and training** Employers identified a broad range of areas where staff training is required, including basic skills training, specific medical disorders, community inclusion, relationship building and leadership development. People agreed that staff coming into the field need to be better trained and ongoing staff development opportunities need to be improved. Inadequate funding, lack of time, shortage of relief staff and high turnover were all seen as barriers to effective staff development.

Employers are finding creative ways to overcome these barriers through partnerships, job shadowing opportunities and drawing on in-house expertise. Most employers are raising their own funds to achieve staff training goals, but there is a recognition that these resources can only go so far.

**Human resource practices for the future** To provide effective services in the near future, employers felt that improvements were needed in a range of areas including (i) adequate compensation, (ii) training and advancement opportunities, (iii) flexibility both within the agency and between PDD and service providers, (iv) resources (such as, access to technology, administrative supports, research and information on best practices and professional expertise in human resources), and (v) an improved image and profile in the community at large.

Only a few service providers felt that their organizations were well prepared to provide effective services in the future. The majority felt they had a lot of the necessary pre-requisites, but that lack of funding remained a critical barrier preventing them from being truly effective. In addition to funding, people felt they could be effective employers and service providers if there was improved and transparent relationship with PDD, with PDD focusing on its role of ensuring stability and consistency for the field rather than on micro-managing agencies.

People emphasized that the issues voiced in this survey were not new, and that many employers had demonstrated their creativity in meeting these challenges despite lack of adequate government resources. There was a strong consensus that the growing labour shortage in the province had made human resource issues more acute than ever before. Increased funding, resources and flexibility from the government were critical if the rehabilitation field was to be competitive over the next 5 to 10 years. Without this support, most employers felt that many community-based services would not be equipped to handle what may soon become insurmountable challenges.

## **Conclusion**

The information gathered through this survey paints the first ever demographic picture of the workforce in community-based PDD-funded services across Alberta. Despite some quantitative limitations, the survey provides the first critical step toward a broad understanding of the workforce distribution, and toward effective human resource planning and policy development. Supplementing the quantitative data are the rich perspectives, insights and practices of service providers who face and overcome human resource challenges in the rehabilitation field on a daily basis; challenges that are expected to become even more urgent in the current climate of Alberta's increasing labour shortage.

The comprehensive series of activities being undertaken by Workforce 2010 should enable service providers to become better equipped with the necessary intelligence and tools to position themselves as competitive employers. It is clear, however, that the human resource challenges confronting the rehabilitation field are not unique to the industry, but shared, to varying degrees, by all human services in Alberta. Service providers have identified a number of solutions to current and imminent challenges, and many are implementing a variety of “best practices” to remain valued employers. However, despite their dedication and efforts, only a few feel adequately prepared to provide quality services in the future.

Effective and long-term solutions will require solid commitment and partnerships among all rehabilitation stakeholders, and with all other human services and the community at large. As repeatedly urged by the respondents to this survey, no amount of information or employer creativity will be sufficient unless coupled with adequate compensation formulae, increased resources and flexibility, and a consolidated effort to change the devalued perception of the field—which includes establishing a professional designation for rehabilitation work. More than ever before, PDD Provincial and Regional Boards, AARC, individual service providers, family members and self-advocates will have to work together in partnership to achieve the vision set forth by Workforce 2010.

## WORKFORCE PROFILE, ISSUES AND EXEMPLARY PRACTICES

### PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

#### INTRODUCTION

The vision of Workforce 2010 is to have a responsive and sustainable workforce to support persons with disabilities in Alberta. As part of the multiple strategies used to gather the necessary intelligence for the Workforce 2010 initiative in 2004, the Alberta Association of Rehabilitation Centres (AARC) commissioned The Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute (VRRI) to undertake a survey of community-based rehabilitation employers providing services to persons with developmental disabilities in Alberta.

This document reports the findings of the survey. It includes:

- a description of the research methodology, with a discussion of data quality and confidence in the results;
- demographic information about the survey sample;
- a profile of the provincial workforce based on the quantitative data;
- regional differences in workforce profiles;
- differences in workforce profiles by age categories; and,
- employers' perspectives of workplace trends, issues and exemplary practices.

#### METHODOLOGY

##### Survey tool development

The survey instrument (See Appendix A) was developed by the VRRI in close consultation with members of the Workforce 2010 Steering Committee.

Initially, two options of the instrument were presented by the VRRI to the Committee: a short version and a long version. Both instruments requested information on: general organizational data, location and the types of services provided; demographic profile of the organization's current workforce funded by Persons with Developmental Disabilities (PDD) or Family Supports to Children with Disabilities (FSCD)<sup>1</sup>; and employers' perspectives on workforce challenges, trends and exemplary practices. In addition, employers were asked to indicate if they would like to participate in a second, more in-depth survey to provide individual-level data on their workforce so that an accurate trends analysis could be performed.

The long version, in addition to the items identified above, included a section where the respondent was requested to provide the workforce demographic information broken down by age categories. The intent of this section was that, in case employers were reluctant or unable to provide individual-level data in the second, more in-depth round of the survey, at the very least, we would have some breakdown by age categories and thus could obtain some idea of expected changes in workforce demographics over time.

Both instruments were reviewed by the Steering Committee and service provider representatives from three different regions. The decision was made to go with the longer version, despite some reservation that the length of the form may be daunting for some respondents. Revisions were made to this version based on feedback from the Committee

---

<sup>1</sup> This program was previously called Alberta Children's Services, commonly known as Children and Family Services (CFS). In the survey instrument, the program was referred to with the latter name.

members and service provider representatives, and the revised draft was re-circulated for final review and approval by AARC.

The survey package contained the survey instrument, a cover letter from the co-chairs of Workforce 2010 and a postage-paid return envelope addressed to the VRRRI that respondents could use to return their completed surveys.

### **Sampling and data collection strategies**

Sampling: The population for the survey consisted of all community-based agencies funded by PDD to provide services to adults with developmental disabilities in Alberta. The sampling frame consisted of 100% of the population, and was compiled by AARC from lists supplied to them by PDD regional boards. After correcting for (i) duplicate entries, (ii) agencies no longer receiving PDD funding, and (iii) organizations for whom PDD funding/services were a negligible portion of their primary mandate (e.g., college program), 176 agencies were listed in the final sampling frame. Of these, 28 were identified as also receiving funding from FSCD to provide services to children with developmental disabilities.

In addition to this primary sampling frame, some regions chose to distribute the survey to family members who received funding to hire staff privately. Only 12 family members responded to the survey, and since the proportion of the workforce employed through such private arrangements is negligible, these 12 cases are not included in any of the calculations.

Data collection: The mailing list of agencies was supplied by AARC to VRRRI, and was used to mail the survey by post on October 19, 2004. As well, an electronic copy of the survey was emailed to those service providers who made this request.

The original response deadline for the survey was November 19, 2004. Respondents had the option of responding by mail, fax or email. An email reminder was sent to all service providers in early November. As well, all service providers in the sampling frame who also provided services to children with disabilities were reminded by telephone, in order to maximize the response rate from this small sub-set of the sample. When the reminder was sent out, we discovered that some service providers had not received the survey during the original mailout. VRRRI sent electronic copies of the survey to these agencies, and extended the response deadline for all service providers to December 3, 2004, notifying all by email of this change.

By December 3, 2004, the overall response rate was less than 30% and even lower in some of the regions<sup>2</sup>, making it difficult to generalize the data province-wide. AARC, who had been receiving regular status updates of response rates, was alerted to this problem, and a number of strategies were implemented to improve the response rate: (i) the response deadline was further extended to end of December; (ii) regional representatives from the Workforce 2010 Advisory Committee were requested to encourage service providers in their regions who had not yet responded to do so, and (iii) AARC increased communication about the survey via existing channels (e.g., network groups, newsletter, etc.). To accommodate agencies during the Christmas holidays, VRRRI accepted completed surveys until January 14, 2005. By this time, 76 service providers and 12 family members had returned the survey by fax, email or post.

### **Data quality and confidence in results**

Representativeness and generalizability: The overall response rate of 43.2% (see calculation details reported in the "Response Rate" section below) is an acceptable response rate for mail-in surveys (Miller, 1991), although, it is lower than what one may expect given the intense

---

<sup>2</sup> Since the sampling frame was based on the population of PDD-funded service providers, unless indicated otherwise, the term "region" is used in this document to refer to the six PDD regions across the province.

follow-up activities and deadline extensions that were implemented. At the regional level, too, response rates are acceptable though not as high as hoped for, varying from 39.0% to 50.0%.

There is no apparent indication of response bias based on examining the variability in the demographics of the service providers (location, organizational size, types of services, etc.). Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the sample is representative of the population, and that the findings may be generalized to PDD-funded service providers across the province.

However, since the sample is self-selected (i.e., only those who chose to respond to the survey did so), potential response bias, based on unknown factors influencing self-selection, should not be ruled out. In addition, the reader should note that whenever a relatively large proportion of respondents fail to provide data for a particular question, generalizability becomes limited. This is true, for example, in Part C of the survey where as few as 49 out of the 69 PDD-funded agencies (71%) provided data for one of the sections; the missing data in this section is even higher for FSCD-funded agencies, e.g., only 2 out of 22 FSCD-funded agencies provided information on education level broken down by age categories. Finally, since the sampling frame consisted of organizations receiving PDD funding to provide services to adults with developmental disabilities, the results are not generalizable to all organizations providing services to children, even though some of the latter organization were included in the sample.

Validity and reliability: The most basic and necessary kind of measurement validity is face validity, which is a judgement of whether the indicator actually measures what it says it measures (Neuman, 1994). Face validity is not an issue with the qualitative portion of the survey, since this part asks simply for respondents' perceptions or opinions. However, it is more of a concern for the quantitative data, which is the more critical portion of the survey.

Judging from comments that some employers made, either verbally to us or in written statements in the qualitative section of the survey, it is apparent that the quantitative information requested in the survey is both time-consuming and tedious for already over-burdened service providers to gather and report. In some cases, respondents have provided their "best guesses" rather than accurate information, and we suspect this may be true for a number of respondents, although it is not possible to estimate how many.

As well, there is the issue of a potential inflation in the number of employees reported, due to overlap in staffing across agencies. This is because staff, especially in direct support and/or part-time positions, often work for, and would therefore be reported by, more than one agency. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the overlap could be anywhere from 30% to 60%. However, the exact degree of overlap cannot be calculated with the information currently available since there is no single data source, identifying each unique PDD-funded employee, against which the results from this survey can be compared.

In light of these limitations, our judgement is that the results of this survey should be treated as exploratory, recognizing the fact that this is the first survey of its kind for the rehabilitation field in Alberta. The data and its presentation are sufficiently valid given the scope of this project to paint a broad picture of the current and future trends in the rehabilitation industry's workforce—an area which has hitherto relied mostly on anecdotal information. Follow-up surveys should ensure that respondents are provided with adequate time and the proper tools to submit accurate and verifiable individual-level information on each employee; this should result in more solid findings in which we can place greater confidence.

In the meantime, we have used statistical tools to enable the reader to make reasonable interpretations from the findings (see next section for details).

## Analysis and interpretation of the data

Qualitative data: Qualitative data were entered into and analyzed using QSR NUD\*IST software program. Respondents' perspectives were thematically categorized for each question, and recurring themes were identified. The most dominant themes are presented in this report, together with illustrative direct quotes, wherever appropriate.

Quantitative data: Quantitative data were entered into and analyzed using SPSS software. The number of unique cases entered (N) was 70 organizations. Data was checked to ensure there were no internal discrepancies in the numbers, or that these discrepancies were clarified and corrected by contacting the respondent for verification. Whenever cases have data missing (i.e., not reported) for a particular variable, we have indicated this in the tables, together with the number of valid cases (i.e., those that did report). A large number of missing cases results in lower level of confidence when extrapolating the findings from the sample to the population.

We have chosen to restrict the reporting primarily to descriptive statistics, i.e., frequency counts and percentages. We had originally intended to conduct inferential statistical tests of significance (e.g.,  $\chi^2$  or *t*-tests) for between-group comparisons (e.g., across regions). However, given the limitations in the data (i.e., some respondents providing estimates rather than accurate numbers, and the issue of inflation in the number of employees), our opinion is that such tests would be statistically meaningless, and add an unwarranted sense of confidence and security in the data.

Interpreting the number of employees reported: To deal with the issue of inflation in the number of employees reported, we have assumed that although actual *numbers* of employees are inflated, the *percentage distribution* is a sufficiently reasonable estimate of the spread of employees across categories (regions, age, gender, etc.).<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, the reader is advised to pay attention to the reported *percentages* across categories rather than making interpretations based on the numbers or frequency counts reported.

Calculation of population estimates:<sup>4</sup> Since the purpose of the survey is to estimate the workforce profile of the entire population of PDD-funded service providers based on the data obtained from the sample, we have calculated *population estimates* using a weighting ratio derived from the overall and regional response rates. The weighting ratio assumes that the sample is representative of the population; we see no apparent bias in the sample distribution to indicate otherwise. By using regionally-specific weighting ratios when calculating population estimates for different regions, we inject a higher degree of accuracy in the estimate than we would if only a single weighting ratio based on the overall response rate had been used. It is important to note that the population estimate cannot account for inaccuracies in the original data, i.e., because the number of employees reported by the sample is inflated, the population mean will also be inflated. The reader is advised once again, to focus on the percentage distributions rather than the frequency counts.

The above statistical tools should be sufficient to enable the reader to make reasonable interpretations based on the survey results.

---

<sup>3</sup> This assumption probably does not hold for categories such as "positions" and "job status/hours of work" since front-line direct service workers and/or people working part-time are more likely to hold multiple jobs across agencies. However, focusing on percentage distributions is still better than interpreting frequency counts.

<sup>4</sup> See computation details in Appendix B, or contact VRRRI for more information.



## RESPONSE RATES

Of 176 valid surveys sent, 76 were returned, resulting in a response rate of 43.2%. These 76 respondents provided information for 70 unique organizations representing 83 service locations (i.e., including branch offices). Five organizations reported data for one or more additional branch offices not listed in the original sampling frame. These five and one other organization reported data for all their offices on one survey form, thus, a total of 70 cases were entered into the software for statistical analysis. Table 1 reports the overall response rate and the breakdown by PDD region, with the numbers adjusted for duplicate or invalid entries in the sampling frame.

Table 1: Overall response rate and regional breakdown

PDD region	No of entries in sampling frame <sup>1</sup>	Surveys returned	Response Rate
Calgary	43	20	46.5%
Central	37	15	40.5%
Edmonton	41	16	39.0%
Northeast	13	6	46.2%
Northwest	14	7	50.0%
South	28	12	42.9%
TOTAL	176	76	43.2%

Note 1: Adjusted for duplicate or invalid entries in original sampling frame.

## PART TWO: SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

A total of 76 respondents returned the survey, providing information for 70 unique organizations representing 83 service locations. Unless indicated otherwise, all data are analyzed based on a statistical "N" of 70 cases.

Organizations responding to this survey reported that they employed 7,446 employees and provided services to 4,877 adults and 761 children with disabilities. As noted previously, these reported numbers are undoubtedly inflated due to overlap in staff and individuals receiving services across agencies. For example, PDD's database identifies 8,812 individuals currently receiving services (see report on current and future consumer profile prepared for this project by VRRRI). Given that about 43% of PDD-funded service providers are represented in the survey sample, it is reasonable to expect that they serve approximately a proportionate number of individuals, i.e., 43% of 8,817, or about 3,600 to 4,000 individuals, rather than the 4,877 reported by survey respondents (a potential overlap of 25% to 30%).

## OPERATING MODEL

Sixty-nine organizations provided information about their operating model. Of these, 56 (81.2%) identified themselves as not-for-profit societies, 6 (8.7%) as not-for-profit businesses, and 7 (10.1%) as for-profit organizations; 64 (92.8%) were not unionized and 5 (7.2%) were either fully or partially unionized (Table 2).

**Table 2: Operating model and unionization status of respondents**

	Frequency	%
<b>Operating model</b>		
Not-for-profit society	56	81.2
Not-for-profit business	6	8.7
For-profit organization	7	10.1
TOTAL	69	100
<b>Unionization status</b>		
not unionized	64	92.8
unionized	5	7.2
TOTAL	69	100
Valid/Missing cases	69/1	

## SERVICES PROVIDED

Of the 70 organizations in the sample, 69 (98.6%) received PDD funding to provide services to adults with developmental disabilities; of these, 48 served only adults and 21 served adults and children. Table 3a lists the types of PDD-funded services provided to adults with developmental disabilities and the number of organizations in the sample offering those services.

**Table 3a: Types of PDD-funded services offered by respondents**

PDD-funded services	Frequency	% <sup>1</sup>
Overnight residences	43	62.3
Support homes	31	44.9
Supported independent living	41	59.4
Respite care	30	43.5
Employment preparation	42	60.9
Employment placement	38	55.1
Community access	63	91.3
Education services	15	21.7
Intake planning	13	18.8
Specialized supports - behavioural	16	23.2
Specialized supports - multidisciplinary	6	8.7
Other	9	13.0

Note 1: Multiple responses possible; % calculated out of 69. No missing cases.

Twenty-two (31.4%) organizations received FSCD funding to provide services to children with developmental disabilities; of these, 21 served adults and children, and one served only children.<sup>5</sup> Table 3b lists the types of FSCD-funded services provided and the number of organizations in the sample offering those services.

**Table 3b: Types of FSCD-funded services offered by respondents**

<sup>5</sup> One would expect that this one organization should not have been listed in the original sampling frame of PDD-funded organizations since it does not serve adults. Through our conversation with the Executive Director, we learned that the organization does typically get funding from PDD, but it just so happened that they did not have any PDD-funded individuals receiving services at the time of this survey. We have, therefore, chosen to include this organization in the sample instead of eliminating it.

<b>FSCD-funded services</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>% <sup>1</sup></b>
In-home respite	18	81.8
Child care support	8	36.4
Out of home care	10	45.5
Out of home respite	16	72.7
Homemaker service	2	9.1
Multi-disciplinary supports	3	13.6
Other	9	40.9

Note 1: Multiple responses possible; % calculated out of 22. No missing cases.

## REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Respondents were distributed across all regions, except FSCD Métis Settlements from which no surveys were received. Table 4a (PDD-funded services) and Table 4b (FSCD-funded services) provide the regional breakdown of the sample, together with the reported numbers of individuals served, for adults and children respectively. Note that the total number of individuals reported may be inflated due to overlap between agencies.

Table 4a: Regional distribution of PDD-funded respondents (including branch offices)

<b>PDD region</b>	<b>Services for adults</b>		<b>Individuals served <sup>1</sup></b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Calgary	21	25.3	1,754	36.0
Central	16	19.3	727	14.9
Edmonton	15	18.1	1,304	26.7
Northeast	10	12.0	406	8.3
Northwest	9	10.8	306	6.3
South	12	14.5	380	7.8
TOTAL	83	100	4,877	100
Valid/Missing cases	69/0		62/7	

Note 1: Actual numbers may be inflated due to possible overlap between agencies.

Table 4b: Regional distribution of FSCD-funded respondents (including branch offices)

<b>FSCD region</b>	<b>Services for children</b>		<b>Individuals served <sup>1</sup></b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Calgary	6	20.7	277	36.4
Central	5	17.2	160	21.0
East Central	2	6.9	0	0
North Central	4	13.8	15	2.0
Edmonton	4	13.8	212	27.9
Métis	0	0	0	0
Northeast	3	10.3	42	5.5
Northwest	2	6.9	42	5.5
Southeast	2	6.9	0	0
Southwest	1	3.5	13	1.7

TOTAL	29	100	761	100
Valid/Missing cases	22/0		18/4	
Note 1: Actual numbers may be inflated due to possible overlap between agencies.				

## DISTRIBUTION BY POPULATION OF LOCATION

Services were distributed across a diverse range of settings, with over a third of the sample (37.3%) reporting from locations with over 100,000 people, and just under a third (31.4%) located in areas with population base of 10,000 people or less (Table 5).

Table 5: Population of location of respondents (including branch offices)

Population of location	Frequency	% <sup>1</sup>
5,000 or less	10	12.1
5,001-10,000	16	19.3
10,001-25,000	8	9.6
25,001-50,000	5	6.0
50,001-100,000	13	15.7
Over 100,000	31	37.3
TOTAL	83	100
Valid/Missing cases	70/0	
Note 1: Multiple responses possible; % calculated out of 83.		

In summary, sample demographics confirm that the survey respondents represent the distribution of services across Alberta, from all regions (except FSCD Métis Settlements), rural and urban locations, service types and operating models.

## PART THREE: PROVINCIAL WORKFORCE DATA

Respondents were requested to provide demographic information on their current PDD-funded and/or FSCD-funded workforce as accurately as possible. For the purposes of the survey, **current workforce** was defined as “everyone in your organization who is funded by PDD and/or FSCD to provide services to persons with disabilities.” This definition included:

- all direct service (front-line) workers and administrative support, supervisory and managerial staff
- all full-time, part-time, temporary, variable, relief and casual staff
- all people employed or contracted for services such as supportive room-mate/neighbours, support home providers, contract job coaches and others providing proprietor-based services.

Respondents were instructed to count the actual number of *people* (not full-time equivalents); for support-home models where more than one person may be involved in providing service (e.g., a husband/wife team), respondents were instructed to count this as *one* unit.

### Interpreting the results

Due to the potential inflation in the numbers of employees reported (see “Analysis and interpretation of data” section for details), the reader is reminded to pay attention to the reported *percentages* across categories rather than making interpretations based on frequency counts, for both the sample results and the population estimates. It is probably more accurate to think of the data in terms of the number of *positions* rather than the number of *people* providing services.

### TOTAL NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

Based on the above definition of the current workforce, the sample reported a total of 7,446 employees, of which 11.9% (884) were funded by sources other than PDD or FSCD and 88.1% (6,562) were funded by either PDD and/or FSCD as follows: 72.7% (5,413) funded by PDD only, 8.4% (623) by FSCD only and 7.0% (526) by both PDD and FSCD (Table 6). Thus, the data contains information on 5,939 PDD-funded employees and 1,149 FSCD-funded employees. In addition, 16 respondents reported employing a total of 54 persons with developmental disabilities in their workforce.

Table 6: Total number of employees, by funding source

Funding source	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%
PDD only	5,413	12,395	72.7
FSCD only	623	1,425	8.4
PDD and FSCD	526	1,205	7.1
Other sources	884	2,025	11.9
TOTAL	7,446	17,050	100
Valid/Missing cases	70/0		

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio 2.29. Numbers rounded off.

Population estimates based on the survey results suggest that there could be as many as 15,000 employees funded by PDD and/or FSCD, and an additional 2,000 employees funded by

other sources, in community-based PDD-funded services in Alberta. Within the former, there could be as many as 13,600 PDD-funded workers and 2,630 FSCD-funded workers in total.

## REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Table 7a shows the regional breakdown of the total PDD-funded workforce (i.e., those funded by PDD only and those funded by both PDD *and* FSCD). The number of unique organizations reporting from each region is also listed (i.e., not including branch offices); agencies receiving funding from and providing services in more than one region are listed under “Multiple regions”.

Table 7a: Regional distribution of PDD-funded employees

PDD region	Services		Sample data		Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	
	N	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%
Calgary	19	27.5	1,562	26.3	3,200	23.6
Central	13	18.8	1,266	21.3	3,025	22.3
Edmonton	12	17.4	1,196	20.1	3,490	25.7
Northeast	6	8.7	392	6.6	715	5.3
Northwest	4	5.8	278	4.7	625	4.6
South	11	15.9	481	8.1	1,135	8.4
Multiple regions	4	5.8	764	12.9	1,375	10.1
TOTAL	69	100	5,939	100	13,600	100
Valid/Missing cases	69/0		69/0			

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.

Population estimates suggest that 23.6% of the PDD-funded employees are located in the Calgary region, 22.3% in Central region, 25.7% in Edmonton, 8.4% in South, 5.3% in Northeast, 4.6% in Northwest and 10.1% in organizations spread across multiple regions. This distribution is slightly different from what one might expect from the regional distribution of individuals receiving PDD-funded services (see consumer profile report prepared by VRRRI). According to PDD’s consumer database, 27.7% of individuals are in the Calgary region, 20.7% in Central, 29.5% in Edmonton, 11.9% in South, 6.0% in Northeast and 4.2% in the Northwest. Part of the discrepancy could be due to the fact that data from organizations serving multiple regions had to be amalgamated rather than being allocated to the respective regions.

Table 7b shows the regional breakdown of the total FSCD-funded workforce (i.e., those funded by FSCD only and those funded by both PDD *and* FSCD) within PDD-funded services. The number of unique organizations reporting from each region is also listed (i.e., not including branch offices); agencies receiving funding from and providing services in more than one region are listed under “Multiple regions”. Population estimates suggest that Central region has the largest proportion (45.3%) of FSCD-funded workers in PDD-funded services in the province, followed by 16.4% in Edmonton; 17.5% of the workers are located in PDD-funded services located in multiple regions.

Table 7b: Regional distribution of FSCD-funded employees within PDD-funded services

FSCD region	Services		Sample data		Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	
	N	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%
Calgary	4	18.2	97	8.4	200	7.6
Central	4	18.2	497	43.2	1,190	45.3
East Central	1	4.5	6	0.5	15	0.6
North Central	3	13.6	39	3.4	95	3.6
Edmonton	2	9.1	148	12.9	430	16.4
Northeast	2	9.1	12	1.0	22	0.8
Northwest	2	9.1	54	4.7	122	4.6
Southeast	1	4.5	30	2.6	70	2.7
Southwest	1	4.5	10	0.9	24	1.0
Multiple regions	2	9.1	256	22.3	460	17.5
TOTAL	22	100	1,149	100	2,630	100
Valid/Missing cases	22/0		22/0			

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.

## GENDER DISTRIBUTION

Table 8 shows the gender distribution of the total PDD-funded workforce and the FSCD-funded workforce in PDD-funded services. Sample distribution and population estimates show that 82.6% of the PDD-funded employees and 81.9% of FSCD-funded employees are women. Although the gender difference is comparable between PDD and FSCD-funded employees, when workers who are only PDD-funded are compared to those who are only FSCD-funded, the gender difference becomes slightly more evident: 16.9% of the former are men compared to 21.4% of the latter (data not in table). We are not sure of the reason for this difference, however, it is positive to find more male staff considering that the proportion of male individuals receiving services is higher than females, and particularly so in children with developmental disabilities.

Table 8: Gender distribution of employees, by funding source

Gender	PDD-funded employees			FSCD-funded employees		
	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%
Males	979	2,240	16.5	208	480	18.1
Females	4,909	11,240	82.6	941	2,150	81.9
Missing data	51	120	0.9	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,939	13,600	100	1,149	2,630	100
Valid/Missing cases	68/1			22/0		

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio 2.29. Numbers rounded off.

## AGE DISTRIBUTION

Table 9 shows the age distribution of the PDD-funded workforce and the FSCD-funded workforce in PDD-funded services. The FSCD-funded workforce appears to be slightly younger than the PDD-funded workforce, with a greater proportion 25 years or younger (25.1% compared to 16.1%) and a lower proportion 36 to 55 years old (35.3% compared to 44.2%). For both sub-samples, the largest proportion of workers is 26 to 35 years old (26.8% for PDD; 28.1% for FSCD).

Table 9: Age distribution of employees, by funding source

Age	PDD-funded employees			FSCD-funded employees		
	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%
Under 18 years	7	20	0.1	8	20	0.8
18 – 25 years	952	2,180	16.0	278	640	24.3
26 – 35 years	1,588	3,640	26.8	323	740	28.1
36 – 45 years	1,450	3,320	24.4	216	490	18.6
46 – 55 years	1,176	2,690	19.8	194	440	16.7
Over 55 years	517	1,180	8.7	130	300	11.4
Missing data	249	570	4.2	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,939	13,600	100	1,149	2,630	100
Valid/Missing cases	66/3			22/0		

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio 2.29. Numbers rounded off.

Service providers have suspected that the workforce has a bimodal age distribution, i.e., there is a large number of workers in the lowest and in the older age categories, compared to a lower number in the middle age groups. The data above supports this suspicion to some degree: For both sub-samples, there are a large proportion of workers 35 years or younger (42.9% for PDD; 53.2% for FSCD), and a large proportion of workers over 45 (28.5% for PDD; 28.1% for FSCD), compared to those 36 to 45 years old (24.4% for PDD; 18.6% for FSCD).

This bimodal distribution could have implications for leadership development and succession planning in organizations. Those who are over 45 years old are most likely to be in leadership positions and also most likely to be thinking of retiring or decreasing their work hours over the next 10 to 20 years. They will be turning to those currently 36 to 45 years old to take over these leadership positions. Given that there are relatively fewer people in the latter category and that not all of them will have leadership aspirations or capabilities, organizations may be faced with the challenge of filling leadership position in the next 10 years or so. This concern was expressed by a number of respondents in the qualitative section of the survey.

## DISTRIBUTION BY POSITION

Table 10 shows the distribution by position of employees in PDD-funded services. Not surprisingly, the largest proportion of workers in both sub-samples are direct service workers (79.9% for PDD; 77.6% for FSCD), followed by front-line supervisors, coordinators and program managers (10.1% for PDD; 9.5% for FSCD)<sup>6</sup>. Compared to PDD-funded employees, there is a

<sup>6</sup> Since direct service workers are more likely than those in other positions to be employed by multiple agencies, the frequency and percentage distributions for this group could be more inflated than for others.



higher proportion of FSCD-funded administrative support workers (6.1% for FSCD; 4.1% for PDD) and double the proportion of professional supports (1.9% for FSCD; 0.9% for PDD).

Table 10: Distribution of employees by position and funding source

Position	PDD-funded employees			FSCD-funded employees		
	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%
Administrative support	245	560	4.1	70	160	6.1
Direct service worker	4,746	10,870	79.9	892	2,040	77.6
Front-line supervisor, coordinator	599	1,370	10.1	107	250	9.5
Professional support	52	120	0.9	24	50	1.9
Senior management	131	300	2.2	21	50	1.9
Missing data	166	380	2.8	35	80	3.0
TOTAL	5,939	13,600	100	1,149	2,630	100
Valid/Missing cases	67/2			21/1		

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio 2.29. Numbers rounded off.

## DISTRIBUTION BY JOB STATUS/HOURS OF WORK

Table 11 shows the distribution of employees in PDD-funded services by job status/hours of work. Overall trends across PDD-funded and FSCD-funded employees are similar, with the exception that there is a significantly higher proportion of FSCD-funded than PDD-funded variable, casual and on-call workers (24.3% for FSCD; 15.1% for PDD).

Table 11: Distribution of employees by job status/hours of work, and funding source

Job status/hours of work	PDD-funded employees			FSCD-funded employees		
	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%
Permanent, full-time	3,137	7,190	52.9	479	1,100	41.8
Permanent, part-time	1,705	3,900	28.7	349	800	30.4
Term, full-time	62	140	1.0	2	5	0.2
Term, part-time	38	90	0.7	0	0	0
Variable, casual, on-call	897	2,050	15.1	280	640	24.3
Missing data	100	230	1.7	39	90	3.4
TOTAL	5,939	13,600	100	1,149	2,630	100
Valid/Missing cases	68/1			21/1		

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio 2.29. Numbers rounded off.

The largest proportion of workers in both sub-samples is employed on a permanent, full-time basis, i.e., at least 35 hours/week (52.9% for PDD; 41.8% for FSCD), followed by those who are permanent, part-time (28.7% for PDD; 30.4% for FSCD). The reader should note, however, that a number of respondents stated that many of their employees held multiple positions, e.g., a permanent, full-time staff person who also does relief work for the same agency. Thus, providing the break-down requested in the survey was either too time-consuming or impossible

for them to do. Employers often reported individuals in whatever “primary” category they felt was most appropriate, e.g., some respondents reported their variable staff in the “part-time” category.

## DISTRIBUTION BY HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Table 12 shows the distribution of employees in PDD-funded services by the highest level of education attained (not including in-service or basic skills training). A large proportion of respondents did not provide data for this variable (31.5% for PDD; 58.2% for FSCD); thus, Table 12 also reports the “Valid total” and Valid %” taking into account only those employees for whom data is available. The largest single group of employees consists of those with a high school diploma (37.9% for PDD; 45.5% for FSCD), followed by those with a college diploma (22.6% for PDD; 20.0% for FSCD). Less than a fifth of the employees for whom data is reported hold a university degree at the Bachelor’s or higher level (18.1% for PDD; 19.0% for FSCD).

Table 12: Distribution of employees by highest education level, and funding source

Highest education level	PDD-funded employees				FSCD-funded employees			
	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%	Valid %	Sample frequency <sup>1</sup>	Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	%	Valid %
Less than high school	100	230	1.7	2.5	4	10	0.4	0.9
High school diploma	1,542	3,530	26.0	37.9	220	500	19.0	45.5
Some college/university	770	1,760	12.9	18.9	69	160	6.1	14.5
College diploma	919	2,100	15.4	22.6	97	220	8.4	20.0
University degree (Bachelor’s)	662	1,520	11.2	16.3	69	160	6.1	14.5
Post-graduate training (partial or Master’s, Ph.D.)	74	170	1.3	1.8	22	50	1.9	4.5
Valid total	4,067	9,310	n/a	100	481	1,100	n/a	100
Missing data	1,872	4,290	31.5		668	1,530	58.2	
TOTAL	5,939	13,600	100		1,149	2,630	100	
Valid/Missing cases	59/10				18/4			

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio 2.29. Numbers rounded off.

## SUMMARY

**Definition and data quality:** Respondents were requested to provide information on their current workforce funded by PDD and/or FSCD, defined as including: direct service workers, administrative support, professional support, supervisory and managerial staff; variable, relief and casual staff; and people contracted for services, e.g., support home providers, job coaches and others providing proprietor-based services. Based on the sample data, population estimates were calculated using a weighting ratio derived from adjusted overall and regionally-specific response rates. Because of the complexity of the data requested, a number of respondents provided best estimates rather than accurate numbers. As well, employees working for multiple agencies were reported multiple times, thus inflating the total numbers of people reported. Since it is not possible to estimate the error introduced in the data due to these processes, the reader is advised to pay attention to percentage distributions rather than frequency counts.

**Total workforce and regional distribution:** Respondents employed 7,446 workers of whom 6,562 were funded by PDD and/or FSCD. The sample contained data on 5,939 PDD-funded

employees and 1,149 FSCD-funded employees working in diverse PDD-funded services across the province. Extrapolating the sample data suggests there could be as many as 13,600 PDD-funded positions and just over 2,600 FSCD-funded positions in the entire population of community-based PDD-funded services across Alberta. Of these, 23.5% of PDD-funded workers are located in the Calgary region, 22.1% in Central region, 25.7% in Edmonton, 8.4% in South, 5.3% in Northeast, 4.6% in Northwest and 10.2% in organizations across multiple regions. FSCD-funded workers in PDD-funded services are located mostly in the Central region (45.2%), followed by 16.3% in Edmonton, with relatively few elsewhere.

Gender distribution: The vast majority of workers are female, forming just over four-fifths of PDD-funded and FSCD-funded sub-samples. When workers who are only PDD-funded are compared to those who are only FSCD-funded, there is a slightly higher proportion of men in the latter (21.4%) than the former (16.9%). The reason for this is not clear, however, it is a positive sign considering that the proportion of males receiving services is higher than females.

Age distribution: The largest proportion of workers is 26 to 35 years old (26.8% for PDD; 28.1% for FSCD). The FSCD-funded workforce appears to be slightly younger than the PDD-funded workforce, with a greater proportion of workers 25 years or younger (25.1% for FSCD; 16.1% for PDD) and a lower proportion 36-55 years old (35.3% for FSCD; 44.2% for PDD). Service providers have suspected that the workforce has a bimodal distribution, with a “peak” of workers in the youngest and in the oldest categories; the survey data validates this suspicion with the finding that people aged 36 to 45 years old are relatively fewer than those younger than 35 or older than 45. The bimodal distribution could have potential implications for organizations with respect to leadership development and succession planning.

Distribution by position and job status/hours of work: The largest proportion of workers are direct service workers (79.9% for PDD; 77.6% for FSCD), and people employed on a permanent, full-time basis (52.9% for PDD; 30.4% for FSCD). Compared to the PDD-funded workforce, there is a higher proportion of FSCD-funded administrative supports (6.1% for FSCD; 4.1% for PDD), variable, casual and on-call workers (24.3% for FSCD; 15.1% for PDD), and double the proportion of professional supports (1.9% for FSCD; 0.9% for PDD).

Distribution by highest education level attained: Data for this variable was not available for a large portion of employees (31.5% for PDD; 58.2% for FSCD). Considering only those employees for whom the data was provided, the largest proportion consisted of people whose highest education level was a high school diploma (37.9% for PDD; 45.5% for FSCD), followed by those with a college diploma (22.6% for PDD; 20.0% for FSCD).

## PART FOUR: REGIONAL DIFFERENCES

This section compares regional differences in the demographic characteristics of the workforce in PDD-funded services. For ease of presentation, PDD-funded workers and FSCD-funded workers are reported in separate tables. As well, FSCD regions are collapsed into their PDD equivalents (i.e., Central, East Central and North Central are combined into “Central”; Southwest and Southeast are combined into “South”). Although the PDD and FSCD regional boundaries do not entirely coincide, presenting the data in this way will make regional comparisons easier.

### TOTAL NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

Tables 7a and 7b in the previous section outlined the regional breakdown of the PDD-funded and FSCD-funded workforce respectively, together with the number of unique organizations reporting from each region. For ease of reference, the data is repeated here below in Tables 13a and 13c, with the FSCD regions collapsed into their closest PDD counterparts.

Table 13a: Regional distribution of PDD-funded employees (same as Table 7a)

PDD region	Services		Sample data		Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	
	N	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%
Calgary	19	27.5	1,562	26.3	3,200	23.6
Central	13	18.8	1,266	21.3	3,025	22.3
Edmonton	12	17.4	1,196	20.1	3,490	25.7
Northeast	6	8.7	392	6.6	715	5.3
Northwest	4	5.8	278	4.7	625	4.6
South	11	15.9	481	8.1	1,135	8.4
Multiple regions	4	5.8	764	12.9	1,375	10.1
TOTAL	69	100	5,939	100	13,600	100
Valid/Missing cases	69/0		69/0			

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.

Table 13b: Regional distribution of FSCD-funded employees within PDD-funded services (Table 7b with FSCD regions collapsed into PDD regional equivalents)

PDD Region	Services		Sample data		Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	
	N	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%
Calgary	4	18.2	97	8.4	200	7.6
Central	8	36.3	542	47.1	1,295	49.2
Edmonton	2	9.1	148	12.9	430	16.3
Northeast	2	9.1	12	1.0	22	0.8
Northwest	2	9.1	54	4.7	122	4.6
South	2	9.1	40	3.5	94	3.6
Multiple regions	2	9.1	256	22.3	460	17.5
TOTAL	22	100	1,149	100	2,630	100
Valid/Missing cases	22/0		22/0			

PDD Region	Services		Sample data		Population estimate <sup>2</sup>	
	N	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%	Frequency <sup>1</sup>	%
Calgary	4	18.2	97	8.4	200	7.6

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratio regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.

As previously noted, population estimates suggest that 23.6% of the PDD-funded employees are located in the Calgary region, 22.3% in Central region, 25.7% in Edmonton, 8.4% in South, 5.3% in Northeast, 4.6% in Northwest and 10.1% in organizations spread across multiple regions. Central region has the largest proportion (49.2%) of FSCD-funded workers in PDD-funded services in the province, followed by 16.3% in Edmonton, while 17.5% of the workers are located in PDD-funded services located in multiple regions.

## GENDER DISTRIBUTION

Tables 14a and 14b present the gender breakdown by region for the PDD-funded and the FSCD-funded workforce respectively. Percentages for each of the categories are calculated out of valid totals (i.e., not including missing cases); table totals may differ slightly from provincial information in previous sections. In total, the PDD-funded workforce (Table 14a) is about 83% female and 17% male. Calgary has the highest proportion of males at 21.3%, while Central (12.5%), Edmonton (14.6%) and Northwest (14.7%) have lower proportions of males.

Table 14a: Gender breakdown of PDD-funded workers by region.

Gender	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Males</b>	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>14.6%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>16.6%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	322	158	174	67	41	86	131	979
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	660	380	510	125	90	205	235	2,240
<b>Females</b>	<b>78.7%</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>85.4%</b>	<b>82.9%</b>	<b>85.3%</b>	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>82.9%</b>	<b>83.4%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1,189	1,108	1,022	325	237	395	633	4,909
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	2,440	2,645	2,980	590	535	930	1,140	11,240
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1,511	1,266	1,196	392	278	481	764	5,888
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	3,100	3,025	3,490	715	625	1,135	1,375	13,480
Valid/Missing cases	18/1	13/0	12/0	6/0	4/0	11/0	4/0	68/1

Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.  
Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.

Table 14b: Gender breakdown of FSCD-funded workers, by region.

Gender	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Males</b>	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	<b>18.1%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	13	73	16	2	4	6	94	208
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	30	175	45	4	9	14	169	480
<b>Females</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>86.5%</b>	<b>89.2%</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>92.6%</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>81.9%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	84	469	132	10	50	34	162	941
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	170	1,120	385	18	113	80	291	2,150

<b>Valid total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	97	542	148	12	54	40	256	1,149
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	200	1,295	430	22	122	94	460	2,630
Valid/Missing cases	4/0	8/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	22/0
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.								
Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								

The FSCD-funded workforce (Table 14b) is about 82% female and 18% male. Compared to other regions, organizations providing services across multiple regions have the largest proportion of male employees (36.7%), while Northwest (7.4%) and Edmonton (10.8%) have the lowest. However, the number of workers in some regions, specifically Northwest, Northeast and South are too low to produce meaningful percentages.

## AGE DISTRIBUTION

Overall, the highest percentage of PDD-funded workers (Table 15a) are aged 26 to 35 years (27.9%), followed by those 36 to 45 years old (25.5%) and 46 to 55 years old (20.7%). Compared to other regions, Central appears to have a slightly older workforce, with the highest proportion of its workforce in the 36 to 45 years category (26.0%); it also has a higher than average percentage of workers aged over 55 years (11.8% compared to 9.1%). South also has a slightly higher percentage of workers aged 36 to 45 years old (27.0%) compared to those 26 to 35 years old (24.5%). Northwest has a fairly obvious bimodal distribution, with the highest proportion of its workers aged 36 to 45 years old (32.0%), followed by those who are 18 to 25 years old (22.3%).

Table 15a: Age breakdown of PDD-funded workers by region

Age	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Under 18 years</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	7
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	0	0	0	2	7	5	2	20
<b>18 – 25 years</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	177	232	205	69	62	72	135	952
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	360	550	600	125	140	170	245	2,180
<b>26 – 35 years</b>	<b>30.6%</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	<b>32.3%</b>	<b>28.1%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>28.5%</b>	<b>27.9%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	402	301	386	110	53	118	218	1,588
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	825	720	1,130	200	120	280	390	3,640
<b>36 – 45 years</b>	<b>25.3%</b>	<b>26.0%</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>26.5%</b>	<b>32.0%</b>	<b>27.0%</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>25.5%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	332	329	286	104	89	130	180	1,450
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	680	785	835	190	200	305	325	3,320
<b>46 – 55 years</b>	<b>22.0%</b>	<b>20.1%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	<b>16.5%</b>	<b>22.7%</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>20.7%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	289	254	246	71	46	109	161	1,176
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	590	610	720	130	105	260	290	2,690
<b>Over 55 years</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	113	150	73	37	25	50	69	517
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	230	360	215	70	55	120	125	1,180
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1,313	1,266	1,196	392	278	481	764	5,690
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	2,690	3,025	3,490	715	625	1,135	1,375	13,030
Valid/Missing cases	16/3	13/0	12/0	6/0	4/0	11/0	4/0	66/3
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies. Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								

The highest proportion of employees in the FSCD-funded workforce (Table 15b) is 26 to 35 years old (28.1%), followed by those who are 18 to 25 years old (24.3%). Compared to other regions, Edmonton, South and Northwest appear to have the youngest FSCD-funded workforce on average, with 50.0% of the workers in Edmonton, 42.5% of those in the South and 41.7% of those in the Northwest aged 25 years and younger (compared to 25.1% for the overall sample). Correspondingly, these regions have a lower proportion of their workforce aged over 45 years old (16.9% for Edmonton, 14.9% for Northwest and 17.5% for South, compared to 28.1% for the overall sample). The FSCD-workforce in agencies located across multiple regions shows a distinct bimodal distribution with its first peak in the 26 to 35 years category (32.8%) and the second one in the over 55 years category (19.9%).

Table 15b: Age breakdown of FSCD-funded workers by region

Age	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Under 18 years</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	2	0	4	0	2	0	0	8
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	5	0	10	0	5	0	0	20
<b>18 – 25 years</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>17.2%</b>	<b>47.3%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>24.3%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	26	93	70	3	20	17	49	278
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	55	220	205	5	45	40	90	640
<b>26 – 35 years</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>20.3%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>29.6%</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>32.8%</b>	<b>28.1%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	23	154	30	3	16	13	84	323
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	50	370	90	5	35	30	150	740
<b>36 – 45 years</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>18.6%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	20	131	19	3	8	3	32	216
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	40	310	55	5	20	7	55	490
<b>46 – 55 years</b>	<b>22.7%</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	22	101	18	2	7	4	40	194
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	45	240	50	5	15	10	70	440
<b>Over 55 years</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>19.9%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	4	63	7	1	1	3	51	130
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	10	150	20	2	2	7	95	300
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	97	542	148	12	54	40	256	1,149
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	200	1,295	430	22	122	94	460	2,630
Valid/Missing cases	4/0	8/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	22/0
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies. Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								

## DISTRIBUTION BY POSITION

Tables 16a and 16b present the regional breakdown by position for the PDD-funded and the FSCD-funded workforce, respectively.

As expected, the highest percentage of PDD-funded workers are in direct service positions (82.2%), ranging from 80.6% of the workforce in Calgary to 85.0% in Edmonton. In all regions, the next largest proportion of workers are front-line supervisors, coordinators or program managers (10.4% overall, ranging from 9.0% in Edmonton to 12.6% in Northwest), followed by administrative staff (4.2% overall, ranging from 2.6% in Northwest to 6.2% in South) and senior management (2.3% overall, ranging from 1.6% in services across multiple regions to 3.3% in Northeast). There are no anomalies across regions with respect to these trends.

Similarly, for FSCD-funded staff working in PDD-funded organizations, direct service workers constitute 80.1% of the sample, ranging from 71.1% in services across multiple regions to 92.8% in Calgary. The only notable difference across regions for this workforce is the higher proportion of administrative support staff compared to front-line supervisory staff in Edmonton and in services across multiple regions.

Table 16a: Breakdown by position of PDD-funded workers, by region

Position	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Admin support</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	81	46	37	19	7	30	25	245
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	165	110	110	35	15	70	45	560
<b>Direct service</b>	<b>80.6%</b>	<b>80.8%</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>81.9%</b>	<b>82.9%</b>	<b>81.3%</b>	<b>83.6%</b>	<b>82.2%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1,259	896	1,017	321	223	391	639	4,746
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	2,580	2,140	2,970	590	500	920	1,150	10,870
<b>Front-line supervisor, coordinator</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>12.6%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	150	137	108	39	34	44	87	599
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	310	330	315	70	75	105	155	1,370
<b>Professional support</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	32	9	8	0	0	2	1	52
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	65	20	25	0	0	5	2	120
<b>Senior management</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	40	21	26	13	5	14	12	131
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	80	50	75	25	10	35	20	300
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1,562	1,109	1,196	392	269	481	764	5,773
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	3,200	2,650	3,490	715	600	1,135	1,375	13,220
Valid/Missing cases	19/0	12/1	12/0	6/0	3/1	11/0	4/0	67/2
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.								
Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								



Table 16b: Breakdown by position of FSCD-funded workers, by region

Position	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Admin support</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>6.3%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	2	18	13	0	1	2	34	70
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	5	45	40	0	2	5	60	160
<b>Direct service</b>	<b>92.8%</b>	<b>81.1%</b>	<b>80.4%</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>90.7%</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>71.1%</b>	<b>80.1%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	90	411	119	10	49	31	182	892
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	185	982	350	18	110	73	330	2,043
<b>Front-line supervisor, coordinator</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	3	62	9	1	4	6	22	107
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	5	150	25	2	10	14	40	245
<b>Professional support</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	0	12	1	0	0	0	11	24
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	0	30	3	0	0	0	20	55
<b>Senior management</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	2	4	6	1	0	1	7	21
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	5	10	15	2	0	2	15	50
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	97	507	148	12	54	40	256	1,114
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	200	1,218	430	22	122	94	460	2,550
Valid/Missing cases	4/0	7/1	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	21/1
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies. Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								

## DISTRIBUTION BY JOB STATUS/HOURS OF WORK

Tables 17a and 17b present the regional breakdown by job status/hours of work for the PDD-funded and the FSCD-funded workforce, respectively. The largest proportion of workers are employed on a permanent full-time basis in all regions (54.3% overall, ranging from 48.3% in Calgary to 69.1% in Northwest), followed by those employed on a permanent, part-time basis (29.5% overall) and people who are on variable/casual/on-call terms (14.5% overall). The only exceptions to the latter trend are services in Northeast and those serving multiple regions, where the proportion of variable/casual/on-call workers exceeds permanent, part-time workers by a small margin. Northwest, interestingly, has less than 3% of its workforce employed on variable/casual/on-call terms, compared to the overall average of 14.5%. This could be an anomaly of the 4 agencies that constitute the sample from Northwest, or it could be that the regional service providers prefer to employ people on a permanent, part-time basis rather than on variable/casual/on-call basis.

Table 17a: Breakdown by job status/hours of work of PDD-funded workers, by region

Job status/ Hours of work	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Permanent, full-time</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	<b>57.9%</b>	<b>56.6%</b>	<b>69.1%</b>	<b>53.6%</b>	<b>54.3%</b>	<b>54.3%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	755	602	693	222	192	258	415	3,137
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	1,550	1,440	2,025	405	430	610	750	7,180
<b>Permanent, part-time</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>27.6%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>28.1%</b>	<b>28.1%</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>29.5%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	549	380	330	75	78	135	158	1,705
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	1,125	910	960	135	175	320	285	3,900
<b>Term, full-time</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	25	14	7	4	0	8	4	62
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	50	35	20	7	0	20	7	140
<b>Term, part-time</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	21	1	5	9	0	2	0	38
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	45	2	15	15	0	5	0	90
<b>Variable, casual, on-call</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>20.9%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>24.3%</b>	<b>14.5%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	212	108	161	82	8	78	186	835
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	435	260	470	150	20	185	335	1,910
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1,562	1,105	1,196	392	278	481	764	5,778
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	3,200	2,640	3,490	715	625	1,135	1,375	13,230
Valid/Missing cases	19/0	12/1	12/0	6/0	4/0	11/0	4/0	68/1
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies. Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								

Overall, the majority of the FSCD-funded workforce in PDD-funded agencies is employed on a permanent, full-time basis (43.2%), followed by those employed on a permanent, part-time basis (31.4%). However, there are some notable regional exceptions contrary to the overall trend. Calgary, Northwest and South have the majority of their FSCD-funded sample working on a permanent, part-time basis (83.5% for Calgary, 74.1% for Northwest and 65.0% for South), while just over three-quarters of Edmonton's FSCD-funded workforce (77.7%) is reported as being variable/casual/on-call. The reader should recall, though, that this survey was not based on the population of all FSCD-funded workers in the province, but only those that are employed in PDD-funded services, where, relatively speaking, FSCD-funded workers would probably form a secondary workforce compared to PDD-funded workers. Certainly, the picture would be different if the survey population consisted of all FSCD-funded agencies.

Table 17b: Breakdown by job status/ hours of work of FSCD-funded workers, by region

Job status/ Hours of work	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Permanent, full-time</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>48.5%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>25.9%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>64.5%</b>	<b>43.2%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	15	244	22	11	14	8	165	479
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	30	585	65	20	32	20	300	1,100
<b>Permanent, part-time</b>	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>31.4%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	81	190	11	0	40	26	1	349
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	165	455	30	0	90	60	2	800
<b>Term, full-time</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
<b>Term, part-time</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Variable, casual, on-call</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>77.7%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>35.2%</b>	<b>25.2%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1	67	115	1	0	6	90	280
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	2	160	335	2	0	15	160	640
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	97	503	148	12	54	40	256	1,110
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	200	1,200	430	22	122	94	460	2,540
Valid/Missing cases	4/0	7/1	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	21/1
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.								
Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								

## DISTRIBUTION BY HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Tables 18a and 18b present the regional breakdown by highest level of education attained for the PDD-funded and the FSCD-funded workforce, respectively. Both sub-samples show similar overall trends, with the largest proportion of workers holding a high school diploma (37.9% for PDD, 45.7% for FSCD), followed by those with a college diploma (22.67% for PDD, 20.2% for FSCD). Notable exceptions to this overall pattern in the PDD-funded sample include agencies serving multiple regions (where university graduates constitute the largest category at 34.3%), Edmonton (where the largest category is of those holding college diplomas at 32.9%), and Calgary (where the second largest category is not those with college diplomas, but with university degrees, at 21.0% for those with a Bachelor's degree). Not surprisingly for large urban centres, Calgary and Edmonton have the highest proportion of degree holders compared to other regions, at 25.0% and 19.8% respectively.

In the FSCD-funded sample, the regional numbers of valid cases are too small to make any reasonable interpretations of regional differences.

Table 18a: Breakdown by highest education level of PDD-funded workers, by region

Highest education level	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Less than high school</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	29	10	28	3	11	19	0	100
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	60	25	80	5	25	45	0	230
<b>High school diploma</b>	<b>34.7%</b>	<b>42.8%</b>	<b>28.5%</b>	<b>64.8%</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>46.8%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>	<b>37.9%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	301	297	288	254	81	225	96	1,542
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	615	710	840	465	180	530	170	3,530
<b>Some college or university</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>26.1%</b>	<b>16.0%</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>25.9%</b>	<b>18.9%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	164	181	162	57	14	64	128	770
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	335	430	475	105	30	150	230	1,760
<b>College diploma</b>	<b>18.0%</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>26.0%</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>22.6%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	156	129	332	61	15	125	101	919
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	320	310	970	110	35	295	180	2,100
<b>University degree (B.Sc., B.A.)</b>	<b>21.0%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>16.3%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	182	65	184	15	7	42	167	662
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	375	155	535	30	15	100	300	1,520
<b>Post-graduate training</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	35	12	16	2	0	6	3	74
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	70	30	45	4	0	15	5	170
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	867	694	1,010	392	128	481	495	4,067
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	1,780	1,660	2,950	715	290	1,135	890	9,310
Valid/Missing cases	14/5	11/2	11/1	6/0	3/1	11/0	2/2	58/11
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies.								
Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								

Table 18b: Breakdown by highest education level of FSCD-funded workers, by region

Highest education level	Calgary	Central	Edmonton	Northeast	Northwest	South	Multiple	Valid Total
<b>Less than high school</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	4
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	0	0	6	0	5	0	0	10
<b>High school diploma</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>38.0%</b>	<b>28.8%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>52.3%</b>	<b>45.7%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1	35	15	8	21	6	134	220
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	2	85	45	15	50	15	240	500
<b>Some college or university</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>21.7%</b>	<b>36.5%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	2	20	19	3	0	20	5	69
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	4	50	55	5	0	50	10	160
<b>College diploma</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>19.5%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	0	29	6	1	1	10	50	97
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	0	70	20	2	2	25	90	220
<b>University degree (B.Sc., B.A.)</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1	7	9	0	0	3	49	69
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	2	20	30	0	0	5	90	160
<b>Post-graduate training</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	1	1	1	0	0	1	18	22
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	2	2	3	0	0	2	35	50
<b>Valid total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
- Frequency <sup>1</sup>	5	92	52	12	24	40	256	481
- Pop. Estimate <sup>2</sup>	10	220	150	22	55	95	460	1,100
Valid/Missing cases	3/1	6/2	1/1	2/0	1/1	2/0	2/0	17/5
Note 1: Actual numbers inflated due to overlap between agencies. Note 2: Weighting ratios regionally-specific. Numbers rounded off.								

## SUMMARY

Regional differences in the demographic characteristics of the workforce were analyzed by collapsing FSCD regions into their PDD equivalents, and visually examining the distributions for the two FSCD and PDD sub-samples. Statistical tests of significance across regions were not conducted due to potential inflation in the numbers reported, however, regional differences, wherever they were present, were quite notable.

**Overall distribution:** Population estimates suggest that 23.6% of the PDD-funded employees are located in the Calgary region, 22.3% in Central region, 25.7% in Edmonton, 8.4% in South, 5.3% in Northeast, 4.6% in Northwest and 10.1% in organizations spread across multiple regions. Central region has the largest proportion (49.2%) of FSCD-funded workers in PDD-

funded services in the province, followed by 16.3% in Edmonton, while 17.5% of the workers are located in PDD-funded services located in multiple regions.

Gender distribution: The overall PDD-funded workforce is about 83% female and 17% male. Calgary has the highest proportion of males at 21.3%, while Central (12.5%), Edmonton (14.6%) and Northwest (14.7%) have lower proportions of males. Organizations providing services across multiple regions have the largest proportion of FSCD-funded male employees (36.7%), while Northwest (7.4%) and Edmonton (10.8%) have the lowest. However, the number of workers in Northwest, Northeast and South are too low to interpret meaningfully.

Age distribution: Overall, the highest percentage of PDD-funded workers are aged 26 to 35 years (27.9%), followed by those 36 to 45 years old (25.5%) and 46 to 55 years old (20.7%). Central region appears to have a slightly older workforce, with the highest proportion of its workforce in the 36 to 45 years category (26.0%), and a higher than average percentage of workers aged over 55 years (11.8% for Central, compared to 9.1% province-wide). South also has a slightly higher percentage of workers aged 36 to 45 years old (27.0%) compared to those 26 to 35 years old (24.5%). Northwest has a fairly obvious bimodal distribution, with the highest proportion of its workers aged 36 to 45 years old (32.0%), followed by those who are 18 to 25 years old (22.3%).

The highest proportion of employees in the FSCD-funded workforce is 26 to 35 years old (28.1%), followed by those who are 18 to 25 years old (24.3%). Edmonton, South and Northwest appear to have the youngest FSCD-funded workforce on average, with 50.0% of the workers in Edmonton, 42.5% of those in the South and 41.7% of those in the Northwest aged 25 years and younger (compared to 25.1% for the overall sample). These regions also have a lower proportion of their workforce aged over 45 years old (16.9% for Edmonton, 14.9% for Northwest and 17.5% for South, compared to 28.1% for the overall sample). The FSCD-workforce in agencies located across multiple regions shows a distinct bimodal distribution, peaking in the 26 to 35 years category (32.8%) and in the over 55 years category (19.9%).

Distribution by position: The highest percentage of PDD-funded workers are in direct service positions (82.2%), followed by front-line supervisors, coordinators or program managers (10.4%), administrative staff (4.2%) and then senior management (2.3%). There are no anomalies across regions with respect to this trend. Similarly, for FSCD-funded staff working in PDD-funded organizations, direct service workers form 80.1% of the sample. The only notable difference across regions is the higher proportion of FSCD-funded administrative support staff compared to front-line supervisory staff in Edmonton and in services across multiple regions.

Distribution by job status/hours of work: The largest proportion of PDD-funded workers are employed on a permanent full-time basis in all regions (54.3% overall, ranging from 48.3% in Calgary to 69.1% in Northwest), followed by those employed on a permanent, part-time basis (29.5% overall) and people who are on variable/casual/on-call terms (14.5% overall). The only exceptions to the latter trend are services in Northeast and those serving multiple regions, where the proportion of variable/casual/on-call workers exceed permanent, part-time workers by a small margin. Northwest has less than 3% of its workforce employed on variable/casual/on-call terms, compared to the overall average of 14.5%. We are not sure if this finding is an artifact of the small sample size (4 respondents), or whether it is indeed reflective of regional practices.

Overall, the majority of the FSCD-funded workforce in PDD-funded agencies is employed on a permanent, full-time basis (43.2%), followed by those employed on a permanent, part-time basis (31.4%). However, Calgary, Northwest and South have the majority of their FSCD-funded sample working on a permanent, part-time basis (83.5% for Calgary, 74.1% for Northwest and

65.0% for South), while 77.7% of Edmonton's FSCD-funded workforce is reported as variable/casual/on-call.

Distribution by highest level of education attained: In both sub-samples, the largest proportion of workers holds a high school diploma (37.9% for PDD, 45.7% for FSCD), followed by those with a college diploma (22.67% for PDD, 20.2% for FSCD). Exceptions to this pattern in the PDD-funded sample include agencies serving multiple regions (where university graduates constitute the largest category at 34.3%), Edmonton (where the largest category is of those holding college diplomas at 32.9%), and Calgary (where the second largest category is not those with college diplomas, but with university degrees, at 21.0% for those with a Bachelor's degree). Calgary and Edmonton have the highest proportion of degree holders compared to other regions, at 25.0% and 19.8% respectively. In the FSCD-funded sample, the regional numbers of valid cases are too small to make any reasonable interpretations of regional differences.

## PART FIVE: DIFFERENCES BY AGE GROUP

In this section, we report age-level differences in the demographic characteristics of the workforce in PDD-funded services; PDD-funded staff and FSCD-funded staff are reported in separate tables.

This analysis is in response to one of the tasks of the survey, which was to produce data to help us understand how the workforce in PDD-funded services might change over time. Ideally, in order to do this analysis properly, demographic information (age, gender, position, education level, etc.) needs to be provided separately for each employee. However, only 9 respondents said they were able to provide individual-level information on employees.

The next best scenario is to obtain demographic data aggregated by age categories (e.g., the total number of employees aged 26 to 35 years old, with a high school diploma), which is what we attempted to do via Part C of the survey. Of the 69 PDD-funded agencies in the sample, only 49 to 58 were able to provide the breakdown by age categories, depending on the demographic variable in question; the missing data was even higher for FSCD-funded agencies, e.g., only 2 out of 22 agencies provided information on education level broken down by age. As well, most people stated that the data provided were best estimates rather than accurate numbers.

Thus, given the significantly high number of missing cases, and the lack of certainty in the numbers, we have chosen not to calculate population estimates for any of the data reported in this section. Instead, we have provided both cell and row percentages in order to make sense of the sample distributions. The cell percentages demonstrate the differences *across age groups* for a given variable category (e.g., "males"); the row percentages demonstrate the differences *across a variable* (e.g., males compared to females) in a given age group. While this analysis may be useful to understand the distribution of employees reported in the sample, the results should *not* be used to make broad generalizations to all PDD-funded services.

### GENDER DISTRIBUTION

Tables 19a and 19b present the gender breakdown by age for the PDD-funded and the FSCD-funded workforce respectively. Percentages for each category are calculated out of valid totals (i.e., excluding missing cases), thus table totals may differ from information in previous sections<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> Because of relatively few numbers in the "Under 18" category, we combined it with the "18 to 25 years" category, and reported data for "Under 26 years" category for all the tables below.

Gender breakdown by age was reported by 57 agencies for 4,688 (78.9%) of the total 5,939 PDD-funded workers in the sample. In all age categories, women outnumber men at least four to one. This difference is greatest in the 36 to 45 year age group (14.7% male, 85.3% female) and lowest in the 46 to 55 year age group (19.8% male, 80.2% female). The greatest proportion of men in the sample are 26 to 35 years old (25.6%), followed by those who are 46 to 55 years old (24.0%); the greatest proportion of women are 26 to 35 years old (28.0%), followed by those who are 36 to 45 years old (25.9%).

Table 19a: Gender breakdown of PDD-funded workers by age

Gender	Under 26 years		26 to 35 years		36 to 45 years		46 to 55 years		Over 55 years		Valid Total	
	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %
<b>Males (%)</b>	17.1	15.8	25.6	15.2	22.7	14.7	24.0	19.8	10.6	18.9	100	16.4
- Frequency	132		197		175		185		82		771	
<b>Females (%)</b>	18.0	84.2	28.0	84.8	25.9	85.3	19.1	80.2	9.0	81.1	100	83.6
- Frequency	705		1,096		1,014		750		352		3,917	
<b>Valid total (%)</b>	17.9	100	27.6	100	25.4	100	19.9	100	9.3	100	100	100
- Frequency	837		1,293		1,189		935		434		4,688	

Valid/Missing cases: 57/12. High number of missing cases; findings may not be generalizable.

Gender breakdown by age was reported by only 10 FSCD-funded agencies, providing data for 649 (56.5%) of 1,149 workers. As with the PDD-funded workforce, women outnumber men by at least four to one in all categories. The difference is greatest for people under 26 years old (9.0% male, 91.0% female), and lowest for those over 55 years old (20.3% male, 79.7% female). The highest proportion of men are 26 to 35 years old (25.6%) followed by those who are 46 to 55 years old (24.0%). The highest proportion of women are also 26 to 35 years old (27.9%), followed by those who are under 26 years (23.2%).

Table 19b: Gender breakdown of FSCD-funded workers by age

Gender	Under 26 years		26 to 35 years		36 to 45 years		46 to 55 years		Over 55 years		Valid Total	
	Row%	Col%	Row%	Col%	Row%	Col%	Row%	Col%	Row%	Col%	Row%	Col%
<b>Males (%)</b>	15.1	9.0	25.6	12.3	18.6	11.2	24.4	18.4	16.3	20.3	100	13.3
- Frequency	13		22		16		21		14		86	
<b>Females (%)</b>	23.3	91.0	27.9	87.7	22.6	8.8	16.5	81.6	9.8	79.7	100	86.7
- Frequency	131		157		127		93		55		563	
<b>Valid total (%)</b>	22.2	100	27.6	100	22.0	100	17.6	100	10.6	100	100	100
- Frequency	144		179		143		114		69		649	

Valid/Missing cases: 10/12. High number of missing cases; findings may not be generalizable.

## DISTRIBUTION BY POSITION

Data on position broken down by age categories was provided by 54 agencies for 4,466 PDD-funded workers (75.2%), and 7 agencies for 611 FSCD-funded workers (53.2%). Direct service workers are the predominant group in all age categories in the PDD-funded workforce, ranging from 76.1% of the workers aged 36 to 45 years to 93.8% of those less than 26 years old. Almost half of all direct service workers (48.8%) are less than 36 years old; however, there is a



surprisingly high proportion (80.3%) of people over 55 years who are also direct service workers. Over half of all front-line supervisors, coordinators and program managers (59.5%) are aged between 36 to 55 years, ranging from 3.7% of workers under 26 years old to 15.3% of workers aged 36 to 45 years old. Not surprisingly, the distribution of people in senior management positions rises steadily with age, ranging from less than 1% of those under 36 years old to 5.2% of those over 55 years. People in administrative support positions range from 2.0% of those under 26 years old to 6.3% of those aged 46 to 55 years and 6.0% of those over 55 years. There does not appear to be any notable age-related trend in people providing professional supports, however, like the rest of the workers, the bulk of them (73.1%) are aged 26 to 45 years old.

Table 20a: Breakdown by position of PDD-funded workers across age categories

Position	Under 26 years		26 to 35 years		36 to 45 years		46 to 55 years		Over 55 years		Valid Total	
	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col%
<b>Administrative support (%)</b> - Frequency	8.1	2.0	19.7	3.1	32.3	5.5	28.3	6.3	11.6	6.0	100	4.4
	16		39		64		56		23		198	
<b>Direct service worker (%)</b> - Frequency	20.2	93.8	28.6	84.5	24.2	76.1	18.6	76.8	8.3	80.3	100	82.1
	740		1,049		887		683		306		3,665	
<b>Front-line supervisor, coordinator (%)</b> - Frequency	6.1	3.7	28.3	10.9	37.3	15.3	22.2	11.9	6.1	7.6	100	10.7
	29		135		178		106		29		477	
<b>Professional support (%)</b> - Frequency	15.4	0.5	23.1	0.5	23.1	0.5	26.9	0.8	11.5	0.8	100	0.6
	4		6		6		7		3		26	
<b>Senior management (%)</b> - Frequency	0	0	12.0	1.0	31.0	2.7	37.0	4.2	20.0	5.2	100	2.2
	0		12		31		37		20		100	
<b>Valid total (%)</b> - Frequency	17.7	100	27.8	100	26.1	100	19.9	100	8.5	100	100	100
	789		1,241		1,166		889		381		4,466	

Valid/Missing cases: 54/15. High number of missing cases; findings may not be generalizable.

Table 20b: Breakdown of FSCD-funded workers by position across age categories

Position	Under 26 years		26 to 35 years		36 to 45 years		46 to 55 years		Over 55 years		Valid Total	
	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col%
<b>Administrative support (%)</b> - Frequency	4.8	0.8	23.8	3.0	19.0	2.9	19.0	3.8	33.3	10.8	100	3.4
	1		5		4		4		7		21	
<b>Direct service worker (%)</b> - Frequency	24.9	94.7	25.9	78.4	21.9	79.3	16.8	80.2	10.5	81.5	100	82.8
	126		131		111		85		53		506	
<b>Front-line supervisor, coordinator (%)</b> - Frequency	6.2	3.0	36.9	14.4	32.3	15.0	18.5	11.3	6.2	6.2	100	10.6
	4		24		21		12		4		65	
<b>Professional support (%)</b> - Frequency	14.3	1.5	50.0	4.2	7.1	0.7	21.4	2.8	7.1	1.5	100	2.3
	2		7		1		3		1		14	
<b>Senior management (%)</b> - Frequency	0	0	0	0	60.0	2.1	40.0	1.9	0	0	100	0.8
	0		0		3		2		0		5	

<b>Valid total (%)</b>	<b>21.8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
- Frequency	133		167		140		106		65		611	
Valid/Missing cases: 7/15. High number of missing cases; findings may not be generalizable.												

In the sample of FSCD-funded workers, direct service workers range from 78.4% of people aged 26 to 35 years old to 94.7% of those under 26 years old. Like the PDD-funded workers, about half the FSCD-funded direct service workers (50.8%) are under 36 years old. The bulk of front-line supervisors, coordinators and program managers (69.2%) are 26 to 45 years old, ranging from 6.2% of those who are under 26 or over 55 years old, to 15.0% of those 36 to 45 years old. FSCD-funded senior managers in this sample are all 36 to 55 years old, however, data on only 5 people is reported in this category. People in administrative support positions range from 0.8% of those under 26 years old to 10.8% of those over 55 years old, while people providing professional supports are concentrated in the 26 to 35 years category (50.0%), followed by those in the 46 to 55 years category (21.4%).

## DISTRIBUTION BY JOB STATUS/HOURS OF WORK

Tables 21a and 21b present the breakdown by job status/hours of work across age categories for the PDD-funded and the FSCD-funded workforce respectively. Data was provided for 4,187 (70.1%) PDD-funded and 610 (53.1%) FSCD-funded workers.

Over half the PDD-funded workers in the sample are employed on a permanent, full-time basis, and range from 47.3% of those who are under 26 years old to 61.2% of those who are 36 to 45 years old. These are followed by permanent, part-time workers, who constitute 27.4% of the total sample, and 30.6% of workers aged under 26 years. Variable, casual and on-call workers are 14.9% of the total sample, ranging from 11.5% of those aged 36 to 45 years to 21.2% of people under 26 years old. Not surprisingly, over half the variable, casual, on-call workers (58.0%) are under 36 years old.

Table 21a: Breakdown of PDD-funded workers by job status/hours of work across age

Job status/hours of work	Under 26 years		26 to 35 years		36 to 45 years		46 to 55 years		Over 55 years		Valid Total	
	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %
<b>Permanent, full-time (%)</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>27.4</b>	<b>54.1</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>61.2</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>58.4</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>56.3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>55.7</b>
- Frequency	359		639		657		478		200		2,333	
<b>Permanent, part-time (%)</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>30.6</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>27.4</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27.4</b>
- Frequency	232		321		268		224		101		1,146	
<b>Term, full-time (%)</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>27.8</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>38.9</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1.3</b>
- Frequency	3		8		15		21		7		54	
<b>Term, part-time (%)</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>36.7</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0.7</b>
- Frequency	5		11		10		4		0		30	
<b>Variable, casual, on-call (%)</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14.9</b>
- Frequency	160		202		123		92		47		624	
<b>Valid total (%)</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
- Frequency	759		1,181		1,073		819		355		4,187	
Valid/Missing cases: 52/17. High number of missing cases; findings may not be generalizable.												

Table 21b: Breakdown of FSCD-funded workers by job status/hours of work across age

Job status/hours of work	Under 26 years		26 to 35 years		36 to 45 years		46 to 55 years		Over 55 years		Valid Total	
	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %
<b>Permanent, full-time (%)</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>48.6</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>54.3</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>59.4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>46.2</b>
- Frequency	28		89		70		57		38		282	
<b>Permanent, part-time (%)</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>44.9</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>24.9</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34.9</b>
- Frequency	57		56		53		32		15		213	
<b>Term, full-time (%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0.3</b>
- Frequency	0		1		1		0		0		2	
<b>Term, part-time (%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>
- Frequency	0		0		0		0		0		0	
<b>Variable, casual, on-call (%)</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>33.1</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>18.5</b>
- Frequency	42		24		20		16		11		113	
<b>Valid total (%)</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
- Frequency	127		170		144		105		64		610	

Valid/Missing cases: 7/17. High number of missing cases; findings may not be generalizable.

Permanent, full-time FSCD-funded workers range from 22.0% of those who are under 26 years old to 59.4% of those over 55. In contrast, permanent, part-time workers are the dominant category in the under 26 year age group, where they constitute 44.9% of the sample, compared to only 23.4% of those who are over 55. There is a clear, inverse relationship between age and the number of people who are on permanent, part-time status, i.e., the number steadily decreases with age. People employed on a variable, casual, on-call basis constitute 18.5% of the total sample. They are most likely to be under 26 years old, where they form 33.1% of the people in that age group, but are otherwise spread relatively equally across all other age groups.

## DISTRIBUTION BY HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Tables 22a and 22b present the breakdown by highest education level across age categories for the PDD-funded and the FSCD-funded workforce respectively. Data was provided for only 3,104 (52.3%) of PDD-funded workers and 144 (12.5%) of FSCD-funded workers.

People with a high school diploma as their highest level of education form the largest group of PDD-funded workers, at 36.8% of the overall sample; they range from 31.4% of those who are 26 to 35 years to 55.0% of those who are over 55. A quarter of the overall sample (25.4%) holds a college diploma, constituting from 15.3% of the workforce over 55 years to 28.7% of the workforce 26 to 35 years. There is an inverse relationship between age and the proportion of people who have some college or university training, ranging from 23.6% of those under 26 to 10.5% of people over 55 with these credentials. People holding a Bachelor's degree constitute 14.9% of the overall sample and range from 9.2% of those over 55 to 16.4% of people aged 26 to 35. Finally, there is a direct relationship between age and the proportion of people with post-graduate training, ranging from none under 26 years (0%) to 3.9% of those over 55 years.

The FSCD-funded sample (Table 22b) is too small to draw any meaningful conclusions.

Table 22a: Breakdown of PDD-funded workers by highest education level across age

Highest education level	Under 26 years		26 to 35 years		36 to 45 years		46 to 55 years		Over 55 years		Valid Total	
	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %
<b>Less than high school (%)</b> - Frequency	19.4	2.8	16.7	1.3	16.7	1.5	27.8	3.2	19.4	6.1	100	2.3
	14		12		12		20		14		72	
<b>High school diploma (%)</b> - Frequency	16.9	38.0	26.0	31.4	25.2	36.3	20.8	37.7	11.0	55.0	100	36.8
	193		297		288		237		126		1,141	
<b>Some college/university (%)</b> - Frequency	20.4	23.6	34.4	21.4	22.7	16.8	18.4	17.2	4.1	10.5	100	18.9
	120		202		133		108		24		587	
<b>College diploma (%)</b> - Frequency	14.3	22.2	34.4	28.7	28.3	28.1	18.5	23.2	4.4	15.3	100	25.4
	113		271		223		146		35		788	
<b>University degree (Bachelor's) (%)</b> - Frequency	14.7	13.4	33.5	16.4	26.3	15.4	21.0	15.4	4.5	9.2	100	14.9
	68		155		122		97		21		463	
<b>Post-grad. Training (partial or Master's, Ph.D.) (%)</b> - Frequency	0	0	15.1	0.8	28.3	1.9	39.6	3.3	17.0	3.9	100	1.7
	0		8		15		21		9		53	
<b>Valid total (%)</b> - Frequency	16.4	100	30.4	100	25.5	100	20.3	100	7.4	100	100	100
	508		945		793		629		229		3,104	

Valid/Missing cases: 49/20. High number of missing cases; findings may not be generalizable.

Table 22b: Breakdown of FSCD-funded workers by highest education level across age

Highest education level	Under 26 years		26 to 35 years		36 to 45 years		46 to 55 years		Over 55 years		Valid Total	
	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %	Row %	Col %
<b>Less than high school (%)</b> - Frequency	50.0	4.7	0	0	50.0	5.4	0	0	0	0	100	2.8
	2		0		2		0		0		4	
<b>High school diploma (%)</b> - Frequency	27.3	34.9	20.0	35.5	23.6	35.1	12.7	31.8	16.4	81.8	100	38.2
	15		11		13		7		9		55	
<b>Some college/university (%)</b> - Frequency	44.4	37.2	30.6	35.5	16.7	16.2	8.3	13.6	0	0	100	25.0
	16		11		6		3		0		36	
<b>College diploma (%)</b> - Frequency	13.3	9.3	26.7	25.8	36.7	29.7	20.0	27.3	3.3	9.1	100	20.8
	4		8		11		6		1		30	
<b>University degree (Bachelor's) (%)</b> - Frequency	37.5	14.0	6.3	3.2	25.0	10.8	25.0	18.2	6.3	9.1	100	11.1
	6		1		4		4		1		16	
<b>Post-grad. training (partial or Master's, Ph.D.) (%)</b> - Frequency	0	0	0	0	33.3	2.7	66.7	9.1	0	0	100	2.1
	0		0		1		2		0		3	
<b>Valid total (%)</b> - Frequency	29.9	100	21.5	100	25.7	100	15.3	100	7.6	100	100	100
	43		31		37		22		11		144	

Valid/Missing cases: 2/20. High number of missing cases; findings may not be generalizable.

## SUMMARY

Age-level differences in the demographic characteristics of PDD-funded and FSCD-funded staff were requested in order to help understand how the workforce in PDD-funded services might change over time. Unfortunately a large number of respondents were unable to provide the information requested, and many of those who did, stated that the data provided were best estimates rather than accurate numbers. Due to the significantly high number of missing cases, and lack of reliability in the data, the results are not generalizable; however, they are useful in that they, at least, paint a rough picture of age-level differences for the sample reported.

Gender distribution: Gender breakdown by age was reported for 4,688 (78.9%) of the total 5,939 PDD-funded workers in the sample. The gender difference is greatest in the 36 to 45 year age group (14.7% male, 85.3% female) and lowest in the 46 to 55 year age group (19.8% male, 81.1% female). The greatest proportion of men in the sample are 26 to 35 years old (25.6%), followed by those who are 46 to 55 years old (24.0%); the greatest proportion of women are 26 to 35 years old (28.0%), followed by those who are 36 to 45 years old (25.9%). For the FSCD-funded workforce, gender breakdown by age was reported for only 649 (56.5%) of 1,149 workers. The gender difference is greatest for people under 26 years (9.0% male, 91.0% female), and lowest for those over 55 years (20.3% male, 79.7% female). The highest proportion of men are aged 26 to 35 years old (25.6%) followed by those who are 46 to 55 years old. The highest proportion of women are also 26 to 35 years old (27.9%), followed by those who are under 26 years old (23.2%).

Distribution by position: Data was provided for 4,466 (75.2%) PDD-funded workers and 611 (53.2%) FSCD-funded workers. Direct service workers are the predominant group, ranging from 76.1% of PDD-funded workers aged 36 to 45 years to 93.8% of those less than 26 years old. Almost half the direct service workers (48.8%) are less than 36 years old; however, 80.3% of people over 55 years are also direct service workers. Over half the front-line supervisors, coordinators and program managers (59.5%) are aged between 36 to 55 years, ranging from 3.7% of workers under 26 years old to 15.3% of workers aged 36 to 45 years old. The distribution of senior managers rises steadily with age, ranging from less than 1% of those under 36 years old to 5.2% of those over 55 years old. People in administrative support positions range from 2.0% of those under 26 years old to 6.3% of those aged 46 to 55 years old and 6.0% of those over 55 years old. There is no age-related trend in people providing professional supports.

FSCD-funded direct service workers range from 78.4% of people aged 26 to 35 years old to 94.7% of those under 26 years old; about half these workers (50.8%) are under 36 years old. The bulk of front-line supervisors, coordinators and program managers (69.2%) are 26 to 45 years old, ranging from 6.2% of those who are under 26 or over 55 years old, to 15.0% of those 36 to 45 years old. All 5 senior managers reported in this sample are 36 to 55 years old. People in administrative support positions range from 0.8% of those under 26 years old to 10.8% of those over 55 years old, while people providing professional supports are concentrated in the 26 to 35 years category (50.0%), followed by those in the 46 to 55 years category (21.4%).

Distribution by job status/hours of work: Data was provided for 4,187 (70.1%) PDD-funded and 610 (53.1%) FSCD-funded workers. Over half the PDD-funded workers in the sample are employed on a permanent, full-time basis, and range from 47.3% of those who are under 26 years old to 61.2% of those who are 36 to 45 years old. These are followed by permanent, part-time workers, who constitute 27.4% of the total sample, and are 30.6% of workers aged under 26 years. Variable, casual and on-call workers are 14.9% of the total sample, ranging from 11.5% of those aged 36 to 45 years to 21.2% of people under 26 years old. Over half the variable, casual, on-call workers (58.0%) are under 36 years old.

FSCD-funded permanent, full-time workers range from 22.0% of those who are under 26 years old to 59.4% of those over 55. In contrast, permanent, part-time workers constitute 44.9% of the sample under 26 year, compared to only 23.4% of those who are over 55. The number of people on permanent, part-time status steadily decreases with age. People employed on a variable, casual, on-call basis constitute 18.5% of the total sample, and are most likely to be under 26 years old, where they form 33.1% of the people in that age group.

Distribution by highest level of education attained: Data was provided for only 3,104 (52.3%) PDD-funded workers and 144 (12.5%) FSCD-funded workers. People with a high school diploma form the largest single group of PDD-funded workers, at 36.8% of the overall sample; they range from 31.4% of those who are 26 to 35 years old to 55.0% of those who are over 55 years old. There is an inverse relationship between age and the proportion of people who have some college or university training, ranging from 23.6% of those under 26 to 10.5% of people over 55 years with these credentials. A quarter of the overall sample (25.4%) holds a college diploma, constituting from 15.3% of the workforce over 55 years old to 28.7% of the workforce 26 to 35 years old. People holding a Bachelor's degree constitute 14.9% of the overall sample and range from 9.2% of those over 55 years old to 16.4% of people aged 26 to 35 years old. Finally, there is a direct relationship between age and the proportion of people with post-graduate training, ranging from none under 26 years old (0%) to 3.9% of those over 55 years old. The FSCD-funded sample is too small to draw any meaningful conclusions.

## **PART SIX: EMPLOYERS' PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES**

The qualitative section of the Workforce 2010 Employer Survey obtained employers' perspectives of the demographic trends in the workforce and in the individuals receiving services, human resource issues and challenges, and the best practices in the field.

Common themes in the responses include the need for increased and improved funding models to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population, as well as to support the need for continual staff development and training. Respondents also indicated the desire to professionalize the rehabilitation field in order to attract and retain the most qualified and educated employees and to compete with other industries. The following are some of the highlights of employers' perspectives and insights, organized according to the series of questions asked in the survey form.

### **WORKFORCE CHALLENGES, ISSUES AND TRENDS**

#### **Most critical challenges and issues**

The top three critical challenges stated by respondents are: (i) inadequate compensation, (ii) lack of qualified staff and (iii) lack of support from PDD. To some extent, these are all seen as being inter-related.

Most employers believe that the problem of inadequate compensation, i.e., low wages, lack of pension plans and inadequate benefit packages, is one of the biggest human resource challenges they expect to face in the near future. Respondents feel that the compensation is not sufficient for the level of education and the responsibility that accompanies the various positions. They also feel that low wages both signal and enable the devaluing of jobs in this field by the government and the public at large, and that inadequate compensation is a primary cause for the relatively high staff turnover in the field.

Another concern expressed by employers is the lack of qualified staff to recruit from in the field. High staff turnover means that recruitment is a constant activity in most organizations. Finding

staff with the right amount of education and experience to fill the vacancies is problematic, particularly in rural areas. Employers believe that poor wages and the low profile of the rehabilitation field contribute to the shortage of qualified staff. They also feel that compromises made when hiring to accommodate these shortcomings often result in a young and unskilled workforce. Unfortunately, because of the labour shortage, employers are forced to pay under-qualified staff similar compensation to those with more qualifications. This, in turn, deters those with qualifications from entering the field and reduces the perceived need to attain qualification.

The final concern expressed by respondents in this section has to do with what they see as a lack of support from PDD, especially in promoting the field. People feel that PDD is not doing enough to raise the profile of the rehabilitation field or to advocate for increased recognition for the hard work underlying the provision of services to persons with disabilities. This lack of promotion and recognition was linked to the lack of professional designation in the field.

### **Observations of workforce demographic trends since 2000**

Demographic trends observed in the past five years include: (i) an increasingly culturally diverse workforce, (ii) more male applicants, (iii) more older applicants, and (iv) more people with lower academic qualifications.

Employers report that, since 2000, the workforce has become increasingly diverse. Cultural diversity is especially prevalent, and welcomed. Many agencies have seen an increase in applicants with their primary languages other than English. Some employers noted that this has created extreme communication barriers, leading to increased challenges for the agency in providing training and support.

*More applicants with ESL, some have extreme communication barriers. This presents challenges since at least 75% of our persons with disabilities have significant communication barriers. This has presented many challenges since when communication breaks down issues/concerns increase.*

Another trend reported by employers is the greater number of male applicants in the past few years; however, the general consensus is that the men are less qualified. The gender gap in frontline positions is seen as particularly acute, with most agencies reporting a gender ratio of 95% women to 5% men. One of the reasons reported for the lack of men in frontline positions is that it is difficult to provide for a family on the wages given to these positions.

Most of the women in the field are reported to be between the ages of 20 and 50. Respondents feel that younger female workers may have more education coming into the field than in previous years, but that they rarely remain in the field very long. An important trend noted by several agencies is women returning to the workforce after having children. Related to this is the observation made by some respondents that the average age of applicants is higher than in the past, but that the older workers have lower formal education.

*One positive change is home makers whose children have left home and are looking at re-entering the workforce. No rehab education but a wealth of knowledge and experiences- excellent employees.*

Several agencies reported that more people without post-secondary qualifications are applying for positions. Because of the labour shortage, employers feel pressured to hire people just out of high school or with fewer qualifications. They also noted that there is a trend for practicum students to move into higher management level positions quicker than is warranted by their skill levels. Respondents felt that all of these have the potential to diminish the value of education as a requirement for working in this field.

*We are needing to promote frontline employees to supervisory positions before they have had a solid level of experience. Qualified supervisors are hard to find. Cannot attract from other industries due to salary.*

## Expected workforce trends in the next 5-10 years

Overwhelmingly, the response was that the trend of high turnover will continue if the pay and benefits remain the same. Several employers feel that the aging workforce is a concern as many of their key staff will be retiring within the next ten years. Some agencies predicted continued cultural diversity in the next ten years, while others noted that they expect that women will continue to make up the majority of the workforce. A number of respondents stated that they expect to see an increased need for applicants with related educational backgrounds, especially those working with persons with disabilities who have high behavioural needs and require specific personal care skills. Rural respondents believe that recruiting difficulties will increase due to competition from other industries.

*With the economy going the way it is predicted, we will still be dealing with a crisis. There is a shortage of expert employees. Until rehab employers are able to offer respectable market salaries and demand higher education there will continue to be a shortage of staff in this challenging occupation.*

*Interest in the field of rehabilitation will not improve. It is simple economics. The "brightest and best", even people committed to helping others will know they first need to care for themselves.*

## Observations about demographic trends in individuals receiving services

*No distinct demographic trends, although it appears that people are having more crises/less adequate supports in areas outside of employment or community access service, which impact their success with job placements for example not enough residential support; inadequate transportation; and less relative income support. People seem to be in more stress due to poverty and of course there are more people slipping through the cracks or not getting adequate service.*

Many respondents reported noticing an increase in people with Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS), which some tied to more aboriginal individuals coming into services. Also noted was an increase in the need for services for older individuals, individuals with autism, complex behavioural needs and with dual diagnosis. Other trends mentioned included a reduction in individuals with Down Syndrome and Cerebral Palsy, more expectant mothers with developmental disabilities, and more males with disabilities. There has also been an increase in the cultural diversity of individuals, resulting in an increase in service challenges due to language barriers. Another area where people felt attention was needed is in transition services for individuals coming into the system from high school or those who are moving into retirement.

## Demographic trends expected in individuals receiving services in the next 5-10 years

The majority of respondents indicated that the main trend they expect in the next few years is an increase in the number of individuals with complex needs, such as complex behavioural needs and supports, high medical needs, FAS, and dual diagnosis. Some also indicated that this increase in complex behavioural problems would require that workers be equipped with the skills to handle such challenges. Another expected demographic trend expressed by the respondents is the increased number of older persons requiring age-appropriate services in response to their support needs.

Other expected trends reported include a continued focus on inclusion, with community partnerships and culturally sensitive supports being emphasized; more persons with disabilities coming into services who have problems with drugs or criminal activity; and an increase in aboriginal and immigrant persons with disabilities.



## **Expectations that individuals and families will have of service providers over the next 5-10 years<sup>8</sup>**

The overwhelming response was that families will expect at least the same level of individualized services with current funding, with an emphasis on educational and employment support services. A number of respondents also predicted that families will continue to become more involved and will hold the government accountable for the quality of services their family member receives, while expecting agencies to fundraise to provide adequate services. Similarly, people also expected that self-advocates will be more vocal in advocating for quality services and independent living support for themselves. Finally, respondents predicted increased accountability for staff and a decrease in abuse concerns.

## **Skills and qualifications that the future workforce will need to have to provide effective supports and services**

*There will be a greater need for personal care, i.e., medical and physical care. As services become more individualized, staff will need to be very flexible and adaptive to situations. Training may be general but skills need to be linked to the needs of those served. People skills will be very important as we try to connect individuals with their community. People skills also important in the development of Person Centered Planning.*

Respondents indicated that rehabilitation workers will need to have the ability to work in partnership with families and people of diverse backgrounds. They felt that the future workforce will need to have a higher level of education overall, and more specialized skills, e.g., a minimum of a rehabilitation diploma, LPN training, sign language, personal care, job coaching, counselling, and behavioural support. They also felt that staff would need to have good administrative, communication, conflict management, advocacy and writing skills, with the ability to cope with stress. Knowledge of community resources and supports was also seen as key.

People felt that the role of frontline staff would evolve over the next 5-10 years to resemble that of a facilitator, connector and an ambassador. Some respondents highlighted the fact that the role of frontline staff has become less structured and is expected to become increasingly so in the future as staff facilitate the inclusion of individuals into specific community environments.

*The roles will probably include more facilitation rather than "hands-on". Communities are very accepting of person with developmental disabilities, however, when the "extraordinary" occurs or the "unexpected", they search for someone else to manage that. As long as communities are fast paced, growing rapidly, this will not change. More accountability requires more paperwork and substantiation. We see this as being more rather than less.*

A number of respondents indicated that they expect the role of frontline staff to expand to include more administrative duties. This role would include having more input in risk management plans, critical incidence reports, and other forms of documentation. A draw back of this, which was mentioned by one respondent, was that it could take the staff's time and focus away from direct service and increasingly into the realm of paper work.

## **Are post-secondary rehabilitation programs preparing students adequately with the skills and competencies for the workforce?**

Overwhelmingly, respondents were dissatisfied with the preparation of students for the rehabilitation workforce. Post-secondary institutions were criticized for focusing on behaviour modification programs, not preparing graduates for the basic skills needed in frontline work, and

---

<sup>8</sup> Focus groups with families were held in February 2005 to identify their expectations of services and staff; findings from this data collection will be reported in a separate document to AARC at the end of April 2005.

for lacking a real understanding and practical experience in how to support people to integrate into the community. Respondents also felt that not enough emphasis was placed on teaching supervisory and management skills.

People felt that, even if post-secondary institutions were to properly prepare students for work in the rehabilitation field, low wages were a deterrent to working in this profession. One suggestion, for increasing the profile of the rehabilitation field and to bring in qualified workers, was to implement co-op terms. This kind of training and mentorship could facilitate loyalty to an agency while at the same time increasing their profile at college and university programs.

### **Potential solution to alleviate the human resource challenges facing rehabilitation services**

The overwhelming response was that higher wages are needed, and that problems in recruitment and retention of staff will not be resolved without wages first being addressed. Other suggestions include offering standardized pay according to education and expertise and having better benefits, including a retirement package, family-related sick leave and incentives to support students undertaking a diploma or university program. Also recommended were strategies that include increasing the number of full-time positions and decreasing part-time positions, while encouraging some form of professional designation. It was also stated that partnerships with other professions and businesses in the community could be developed, as well as the creation of more post-secondary programs in community rehabilitation services.

*Look at other jobs that have the same challenges—shift work, part-time/casual in nursing: what attracts people to the helping field? Good hourly pay, benefits, pensions and the knowledge that they won't hire just anybody; you have to be qualified and you are paid for your qualifications.*

## **RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ISSUES AND STRATEGIES**

### **Reason why fewer people are choosing rehabilitation as a career**

One of the main reasons why employers believe fewer people are choosing a career in the rehabilitation field is the high stress level and resulting burnout that accompanies the job. This was seen to be especially true when dealing with individuals with behavioural problems where the work environment is seen as being dangerous. In addition, the irregular hours and shift work were also seen as making this field less attractive, especially for employees who have families.

Respondents again expressed their concern that inadequate compensation was one of the main reasons why individuals are not attracted to the rehabilitation field. Employers attribute these problems to lack of funding from PDD, citing it as the reason for the inability of the rehabilitation industry to compete with other sectors, some of which require a similar level of education, for example nursing.

People felt that the issue of poor compensation is compounded by the fact that opportunities for advancement in the field are limited.

*Funding to agencies serving people with developmental disabilities is not adequate, as compared with unionized government employees doing the same thing. The rehab field is demanding and should be compensated accordingly. People will not make a career out of a job that does not compensate for a demanding responsibility.*

The failure to recognize the rehabilitation field as a profession is also seen as a major deterrent for prospective employees. Many respondents stated that if the industry had some sort of professional designation, they believe more people would be attracted to the rehabilitation field.

## **Proposed strategies to attract more people to choose rehabilitation as a life-long career**

The key strategy, seen by employers as a prerequisite to all others, was to increase overall compensation, and implement a wage differential to attract people to fill unpopular shifts. Other strategies suggested were: recognizing the rehabilitation field as a professional career with a professional designation; raising the public profile of the field through advertising and social marketing campaigns emphasizing the supportive aspect of the industry; collaborating with post-secondary institutions to market the field to students as early as those yet in high school; and, enabling potential recruits to engage in career planning by offering a ladder of continuous learning and advancement opportunities, e.g., through further education courses. Employers also suggested that funding needs to be increased in order to offer better technical and administrative supports for employees. The belief is that the role of PDD is key since many of these suggestions cannot be met with the current funding structure or resources available from the government.

## **Areas and positions especially difficult to recruit and retain workers for**

Respondents, especially those in rural areas, reported that it is especially difficult to find workers in general and that all positions were difficult to fill. However, among all respondents, frontline positions were overwhelmingly seen as being the most difficult to recruit and retain workers for. Of these, supervisory positions and team leader positions were seen as especially difficult to fill due to the fact that the required education level and increased responsibility of the position were not matched by the accompanying compensation. Notable difficulties also existed in retaining workers, especially those with families, for overnight and weekend shifts.

Other positions failing to attract workers are those requiring specialized skills (e.g., dealing with individuals with behavioural problems and difficult or dangerous situations), extensive personal care, or higher levels of education (e.g., psychologists, psychiatrists, and doctors).

## **Strategies used to overcome hiring and retention difficulties for difficult to fill positions**

The most commonly reported strategy used to overcome hiring and retention issues in the most difficult positions was to offer increased levels of compensation. This included increases in wages and benefits packages, other forms of job incentives and security and progressively increasing vacation time tied to length of time served. Another common strategy stated was to increase the amount of training offered, e.g., in-house training, training staff to train others, and supporting future educational training and opportunities. This training was ongoing and aimed both at developing the skills of the staff as well as increasing feelings of team membership. Also mentioned was the idea of increased flexibility, allowing staff to modify their work hours and job description.

Other strategies discussed revolved around building feelings of belonging to a supportive team and included a focus on improving the work environment. Respondents indicated that providing a supportive and positive work place was one way they retained their current staff. This was done by providing different activities for the staff to participate in, distributing service awards and staff surveys, and increasing opportunities for staff to participate on various committees. All of these were aimed at, and resulted in, improving the communication between frontline staff and management.

Respondents also offered a variety of innovative and creative ways to increase staff retention. These included developing partnerships with other businesses and agencies to do things such

as establish bursaries or share staff. Some offered bonuses and incentives while others targeted certain communities for recruitment such as students and immigrant populations. In addition, many agencies made use of word of mouth and personal referrals. Respondents also noted that they have revisited the agency's staffing models and policies in order to accommodate the staff. One such revision was the focus on training less educated individuals who had an aptitude for the job rather than hiring based solely on educational requirements.

### **Recommended strategies to retain people in frontline positions**

Providing strong support and guidance to staff was the most recommended strategy to retain frontline workers. Work related support and guidance from supervisors, forming a supportive staff network and providing staff with the necessary training to increase confidence and independence, were all seen as crucial, especially during a crisis situation. However, support also included moral support such as listening to staff's concerns as well as recognising their contributions. Moral support identified by respondents includes practices such as allowing time off for family events, hosting staff appreciation activities and providing various forms of staff recognition.

*Continue to treat employees with honesty & dignity. Provide opportunities to learn. Listen. Provide quality in-service training. Provide excellent supervisory support (i.e., training and team building), conflict resolution, values, attitudes, and provide incentives (e.g., flex time).*

Similarly to staff recruitment, increasing benefits and wages were stated as a strategy for staff retention. Providing incremental wage increases was thought to provide incentives for staff which in turn increased their commitment to the job. Respondents also noted the importance of providing staff with the opportunity to advance based on educational attainment, once again enhancing their job commitment as well as loyalty to the organization.

Strategies to improve the staff's passion for their jobs, such as providing different challenges, were also mentioned. Respondents also noted the importance of matching staff to the individuals that they were most suited to and have the desire to work with, as well as fully informing individuals of the challenges of working with persons with disabilities and behavioural problems prior to hiring them. In addition, creating awareness among frontline staff of the importance of their job was recommended to increase staff retention.

*Hire and try to retain individuals who have a passion for their work and individuals who have a unique understanding of the barriers that persons with developmental disabilities face (e.g., those who have family members with disabilities and those who have overcome significant barriers themselves).*

### **Main reasons given for leaving current positions**

Many respondents indicated that those leaving gave dissatisfaction with their level of compensation as a reason for leaving. They were thus moving on to better paying jobs with better benefits. Others also mentioned that they were not happy with their current working conditions. This included concerns with personal safety, staff burnout, the inability or lack of desire to deal with the behavioural issues of the persons with disabilities, and frustration with the lack of opportunity to advance or change in the agency. Inadequate hours or issues with how the profession was viewed by others were also listed as reasons given for leaving.

A variety of life changes were also given as reasons for employees leaving. These include furthering education, moving, health problems, marriage and other family responsibilities. Some of those who were moving were doing so due to a spouse, usually a husband, relocating.

Some respondents noted that some of their employees either did not give a reason for leaving, or that they staff turnover was so high they could not give an adequate response to the question.

### **Where are the people leaving their job going?**

About 16 of the respondents reported that their employees left their positions to return to school. Many mentioned that they went on to further their education, implying that they would be continuing along the same track or going into a field that is similar, e.g., the education sector. About 20 of the respondents noted that individuals leaving their agency indicated they were going to other agencies within the rehabilitation field. This includes casual workers getting full-time positions, those moving on to administrative positions in other agencies, or going to better opportunities or higher salaries in different agencies.

Many respondents noted, however, that the number of individuals leaving for jobs in the same industry was far less than those leaving for jobs in other industries. Of these respondents, some stated that wages and opportunities for career advancement were large influences on those leaving the industry. Commonly mentioned industries that attracted those from rehabilitation include similar fields such as education, nursing, and other human services. Others also indicated that individuals were leaving to work on the oilfields in northern communities.

### **Demographic patterns of those leaving**

A number of respondents indicated that there was no set demographic pattern to those leaving the agency, and that turnover was across the board. Of those who were able to report demographic patterns, most stated that turnover was predominant in their younger staff. Some of the young people were those with little education who were “testing” the profession or continuing with their education, while others who were educated were leaving for jobs more suited to their field of training. Many people reported that individuals often use frontline rehabilitation jobs to gain experience to get jobs in other related fields.

With respect to gender differences noted by some respondents, women were generally seen to leave for family-related reasons such as raising a family, relocating with their spouse, or for career opportunities. Men, in contrast, were seen to leave for financial reasons, i.e., for better paying jobs.

### **Demographic groups targeted for recruitment or retention**

While some respondents indicated that they do not target any one demographic group, either because they cannot afford to be selective in their need for employees, or that they focus on skill rather than demographic characteristics. Some stated that their goal is to match employee characteristics as closely as possible to those of the individuals requiring service. Others indicated that they rely, in part, on personal referrals and word of mouth advertising rather than targeting specific groups.

A sizable number of respondents mentioned that they target males, due to their shortage in the profession, but were quick to add that this is with limited success. Some target young people in order to get them interested in the field, while others choose to target middle aged and older individuals because they are seen as having a wide range of life experiences that would add to their ability to perform the job. Two respondents mentioned that location is an important factor when recruiting, one indicating that they focus on smaller communities while the other stated that they try to recruit locally as much as possible.

Many respondents reported that they often target specific cultural groups for recruitment, especially new immigrants and aboriginals. However, they note that they sometimes have to address cultural and language barriers with people from some of these groups. Respondents also target college and university students through job fairs, advertising and focusing on practicum students.

## **STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING**

### **Critical areas where workforce training is required**

The most often listed area where additional training is required is in dealing with complex behaviours, specifically, behaviour management and non-violent crisis intervention. Another important focus was the medical area, such as abuse protocol, medical administration, first aid and CPR. In addition, respondents felt that training is needed on specific medical disorders and disabilities, e.g., FAS, dual diagnosis and different types of seizures. Closely linked to the idea of medical training is the provision of personal care to adults which, according to the respondents, is an area where staff require additional training.

Community inclusion, access and development were also highlighted by a number of respondents as areas where staff need additional training. Teaching skills that can be used in the community, such as friendship building and social interaction, is an important part of frontline staff's job description. Respondents felt that in order to fulfill this role, more training was required. Specifically, staff needed to know how to develop connections and networks for persons with disabilities, as well as how to create opportunities for them in society. Also, agencies noted that their person centered philosophy necessitates that they also train their staff likewise, informing them of what it means to be person centered, and how that relates to community inclusion.

It was also noted that staff needed training in leadership areas, e.g., supervision, case load management, conflict resolution, mediation, creative thinking and decision making skills. Effective communication and interpersonal skills—with individuals, family members and other staff—as well as team building skills were also mentioned.

Skills aimed at applying more professional standards to the rehabilitation field were also listed in the responses. These included administrative skills, such as report preparation and documentation, as well as programming skills. For example, some emphasized the need for improvements in risk management plans, and in the knowledge and application of many of the agencies' policy and procedures.

### **Challenges and issues faced in providing staff with development and training**

The majority of respondents stated that the biggest challenge to providing staff with development and training is lack of resources. This included, but was not limited to, funding. Lack of funds limited the number of trainers that agencies could employ or invite, restricted the amount of travel or training registration costs that could be reimbursed, and needed to be factored in when considering the cost of providing relief coverage while staff were away on training.

Another valuable resource which respondents reported as limiting their ability to provide staff development and training was lack of time. It was reported that the work schedule of full time staff made it difficult for them to attend courses. This was especially true for those with families and other responsibilities outside of the agency.

Respondents also stated that the lack of relief staff to cover shifts was a barrier to providing regular staff with development and training opportunities. In addition, the availability of well-trained reliable and qualified trainers posed a problem. Finally, some respondents mentioned that staff development and training is a challenge given the high turnover rate in the field, since staff often leave before the material learned in training can be implemented effectively.

### **Strategies implemented to overcome staff development and training challenges**

One of the strategies mentioned as a solution to the challenges of staff development and training was to access community resources. For example, at least one agency reported that they look to external funders (outside of PDD) for support, for example through bursaries. Another approach mentioned was to seek out free or low cost courses offered by others in the community, while others indicated that they chose to partner with other agencies to offer training and development courses. This was done by either combining resources so that both agencies offered the course, or sending a small number of staff to a course being offered by another agency or educational institution.

*Creative methods for non-profit groups to access affordable training and development might include tapping the expertise and potential of current employees. A database of educational and professional qualifications of employees would be a valuable tool when looking for "in-house" personnel to deliver and develop training. Cross-agency cooperation and collaboration in this regard would be an exciting way to enhance training and development opportunities. Involvement of front-line staff in the development and delivery of training may be one way of enhancing current front-line jobs.*

Many respondents indicated that their agencies often make use of their own resources by offering some type of in-house training. For some, this means paying for some staff to get trained, who in turn train other staff in their agency. For others, this involves conducting regular training sessions offered at staff or team meetings. Another solution was to become flexible in order to accommodate those requiring training. One respondent indicated that they offer multiple sessions at times intended to accommodate the schedules of the staff, and to get around the problem of lack of relief staff to fill shifts. Other creative strategies proposed to overcome training problems included: offering wage incentives to motivate employees to attend training and development sessions; offering shadow shifts for orientation rather than send staff to structured training sessions; and, offering a "self-funded program" where, once again, there is a monetary incentive to complete all required training, and consequently receive higher wages. The following suggestion was also given to combat the shortage of staff and need for creativity.

## **HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES FOR THE FUTURE**

### **Organizational characteristics or practices employers will have to implement to provide effective rehabilitation services**

One of the major responses to the question of providing effective rehabilitation services was that employers needed to address the issue of compensation. As with previous responses, many respondents indicated that in order to be effective, agencies needed to offer their employees more compensation. One respondent stated that in a staff survey conducted in their agency, the two top issues raised were benefits and wages. Incentives include, but are not limited to, increases in pay scale. In addition to wages, respondents mentioned the need for incentives such as sick and maternity leave, educational incentives, job recognition, and better and more progressive job opportunities for advancement. One respondent also stated that having more

input in the organization, for example being stakeholders in the agency, would also be an incentive that could help the rehabilitation field be more effective in the future.

Closely tied to the idea of increased incentives was the belief that agencies would need to be more flexible in the way they deal with their employees, e.g., offer a flexible work schedule, including shifts and work hours; being more accommodating to employees with families by offering some form of child care provision; offering stress day in recognition of the high stress level of the job. This flexibility and creativity in dealing with employees were seen as crucial in order to continue to be an effective service.

Another important aspect in remaining effective was the continual commitment to staff development. Some respondents indicated that they believed the application of strict standards, such as CET certification and AARC standards, is vital in delivering effective services. Keeping educational requirements at a high level was also stated as a means to increase effectiveness. Others stated that continual planned training and staff development, both at an in-house organizational level and at the broader community level, are also an important part of effective staff development. It was also stated that there should be a focus on instilling good leadership and supervisory skills through training. One respondent suggested the development of internal staff associations; others stated the need for increase opportunity for growth and advancement.

Becoming a more staff oriented field was also indicated when respondents stated that in addition to staff recognition, getting to know the employees on a more personal level was also a challenge faced by agencies. Also, the need for staff to have a good sense of the organizational structure and goals was seen as important, preferably done through a thorough orientation, with a focus on continual development.

A number of administrative improvements were also seen as important to effective service provision. These include better technological communication within agencies, effective delegation of paper work tasks to administrative staff so that frontline workers can focus on direct service delivery, and improved (not just more) documentation so that people could learn from prior experiences and history.

Developing a better profile and relationship in the community were also seen as important aspects of effective service delivery. As mentioned above, some respondents indicated the need to increase community awareness and respect for the field on a whole. This would include partnering with educational institutions and community organizations, as well as promoting the field as a long term career option rather than a part-time job.

### **How able do you feel your organization is to implement the above practices?**

Roughly 20% of the respondents stated that they believed their organization is well prepared to implement the necessary strategies to continually provide effective services. Of these respondents, some indicated that they had the necessary funds to offer continual training, to hire effective staff and offer competitive wages and benefits in order to maintain high standards of service delivery. While some stated that they have sufficient qualified staff to be effective, others indicated that their commitment to community involvement and liaising with community organizations and educational institutions made them prepared for future challenges. One agency stressed that their organization's policies and procedures made them capable of implementing these strategies.

The majority of respondents indicated that they were "on their way to being prepared", or otherwise capable, however, funding remained a barrier. Thus, for most respondents, the capabilities are there, providing that increased funding is in place.



*Our organization is a leader in the field. Adequate funding must be in place to provide adequate wages. Our organization currently operates some commercial ventures (bottle depot, recycling program) to supplement our services to persons with disabilities. The fact is that if a service costs an "X" amount of dollars to deliver, funds to deliver that service should match.*

*The biggest challenge is the funding. I feel our organization is very capable of being flexible and creative but because funding is always short, it restricts our ability to always do so.*

Just over 15% of the respondents believed their agencies were not capable of implementing the strategies needed for effective service delivery. Again, funding was the main reason cited for this challenge. These respondents felt that financial constraints handicapped them to the point where they were not as effective as they could otherwise be. Lack of funding prevented them from obtaining resources such as qualified staff, adequate training and development, and administrative systems that were needed to be effective. Some indicated the need to improve community outreach and involvement as one hindrance. Another stated that relationships with the family members needed to be improved before they could be effective. Other agencies felt that they were just too small to have an impact on the delivery of services in the field, while another felt that the nature of the field at present required an overhaul to be effective.

### **Helpful supports in order to implement the practices needed to become or remain a valued employer**

As with the ability to provide effective services, the majority of respondents indicated that increased funding was necessary to become or remain a valued employer. Funding was needed to provide competitive wages and benefits to attract the best qualified individuals to the field. It was also stated that funds need to be consistent and permanent rather than being awarded based on contract. In addition, people felt that funds were needed to provide effective technological support, continual training and educational opportunities, and access to outside support and consultations.

Another major suggestion was the need for improved and increased relationships between service providers and PDD. People felt that PDD did not demonstrate adequate support or understanding of the issues faced by community service providers. They also felt that PDD did not appreciate the depth of commitment that agencies had made to serve the rehabilitation community. Respondents stated the need for PDD to recognize and respect each agency's ability and expertise at managing its own internal affairs; they wanted PDD to restrict its role to that of providing overarching guidelines to ensure stability and consistency in the field, rather than engaging in micro-managing. People also mentioned the need for greater transparency between the government board, staff and community service providers.

Better communication and cooperation among service providers, as well as between PDD and the agencies, were also identified as important elements of being a valued employer. This includes being fully aware of policies and guideline changes from the government, access to up-to-date knowledge about best practices, and effective sharing of information, research and resources among different agencies.

Additional resources that were identified as important for agencies to be seen as valued employers include professional support staff (e.g., counsellors and social workers), access to other community resources, improved technology, and access to human resource advice such as expertise in recruiting, training and staff retention.

Improving the status of rehabilitation services and the status of people with developmental disabilities were also seen as vital in order for employers and the field at large to be seen as valued components of society.

## **Innovative strategies or practices that are currently being implemented**

The majority of strategies that were reported focus on improving the working environment. These included providing team building opportunities (in the traditional work environment but also in social and leisure settings), conflict resolution strategies, and improved communications at all levels. Increasing opportunities for staff input is seen as a vital component of improving the work environment. Service providers are achieving this in a number of ways, e.g., involving stakeholders in strategic planning and decision making processes; giving staff a voice in determining the policies and procedures of the agency; encouraging feedback on the organization from staff; allowing staff to share their expertise and skills through specialized programming; and encouraging staff to serve on an human resources committee in an advocacy role, etc.

Others indicated that creativity and flexibility in work arrangements are important, e.g., being flexible in scheduling shifts and work hours, and encouraging creativity in service provision. Also important were recognizing work-life balance, e.g., liberal benefit packages, extended sick leave, long vacation periods, “well-in” days in honor of good attendance, and additional hours for family time or to deal with personal or family matters.

One agency stated that its commitment to a holistic approach, not only in dealing with its staff, but also its persons with disabilities and the community at large, was an innovative practice. This involves its relationships with the community as well as with specific agencies in the community, especially those that provide services to people with developmental disabilities.

Life-long learning and progressive practices for career advancement were also mentioned as strategies being implemented by some employers. Among these include providing staff with bursaries to further their education while maintaining their job position, grooming staff for senior management positions highlighting the need to have career goals match the desires and needs of the specific employees. One agency stated that they offer a number of small contracts to staff to allow them the opportunity to work with a larger number of persons with disabilities, while another stated that its holistic approach to service provision provided staff with numerous growth and learning opportunities.

Strong relationship with the community were also seen as important. Organizations who focused on developing external ties felt that these practices were essential to enhance partnerships, inclusion and the profile of the field in the community.

## **FINAL WORDS**

The main messages that people emphasized were the need for improved funding and for establishing a professional designation for the field. People reiterated the importance of PDD really listening to the concerns and recommendations put forward in this survey, and for working in partnership with community service providers to develop a comprehensive response.

*I sincerely hope that the message is received that people are tired of efforts that ignore the real problem faced by the field (i.e., funding, attitudes that de-value, cast aspersions, etc.). I find being asked about how we can be more creative is insulting. We need more funding for compensation of staff, more resources for training, and much more positive attitude for supports to the disabled from the provincial government.*

It was clear that, as one respondent stated, the issues presented were not new to the rehabilitation field or community service providers on the whole. In addition to increased funding, it is critical that agencies are given the resources and the flexibility to enable them to develop creative and innovative ways of facing the challenges.

## SUMMARY

Workforce challenges, issues and trends Two issues raised most frequently were (i) lack of adequate funding and (ii) acute shortage of qualified workers. Both are crucial given the recent trends that are expected to continue for the foreseeable future.

Demographic trends observed in the workforce include (i) an increasingly culturally diverse workforce, (ii) more male applicants, (iii) more older applicants, and (iv) more people with lower academic qualifications. While some of these trends are positive (e.g., attracting individuals who are currently not well represented in the rehabilitation workforce), they also bring with them some challenges (e.g., communication barriers, and lack of formal knowledge and experience in rehabilitation services).

Demographic trends observed and expected in individuals receiving services include (i) an increase in older people, people with complex needs, FAS and dual diagnosis, (ii) a greater diversity in disabilities and ethnic backgrounds, (iii) a greater involvement from families in service planning, (iv) higher expectations for quality standards, and (v) more families and individuals becoming increasingly vocal in advocating for quality standards and government accountability.

In response to these expectations, employers feel that direct service staff will need to be more educated, specialized, and have a diverse range of skills such as communication, conflict management, advocacy, partnering and knowledge of community resources. The role of direct service staff will need to evolve into that of facilitator, connector and ambassador. As well, post-secondary institutions will need to prepare students better than they are currently doing for the changing realities of rehabilitation services.

Staff recruitment and retention: Employers overwhelmingly attributed the recruitment and retention challenges faced by the field to inadequate compensation for the skills, responsibilities and demands of the work—especially for direct service positions which were seen as being the most stressful. The perspective of the field as a devalued service, coupled with the failure to recognize rehabilitation work as a profession contribute to the recruitment crisis especially during the current labour shortage. More people were seen as leaving their jobs for other industries (e.g., education, nursing, other health services and the oil and gas sector) rather than for work in other agencies within the field.

Solutions to these problems include (i) increased compensation, (ii) more job flexibility, (iii) better promotion of the field as a valued service to society, (iv) development of a professional association, and (v) creation of learning and advancement opportunities so that people perceive the work as a career rather than just a job. As the primary funder, PDD was seen as playing a central role in providing the support and resources to enable these strategies to occur.

Staff development and training: Employers identified a broad range of areas where staff training is required, including basic skills training, specific medical disorders, community inclusion, relationship building and leadership development. People agreed that staff coming into the field need to be better trained and that there is a need to improve ongoing staff development opportunities for those already employed. Lack of funding, time and relief staff, together with high turnover, were all seen as barriers to effective staff development.

Employers are finding creative ways to overcome these barriers through partnerships, job shadowing opportunities and drawing on in-house expertise. Most employers are raising their own funds to achieve staff training goals, but there is a recognition that these resources can only go so far.

Human resource practices for the future: To provide effective services in the near future, employers felt that improvements were needed in a range of areas including (i) adequate compensation, (ii) training and advancement opportunities, (iii) flexibility both within the agency and between PDD and service providers, (iv) resources (such as access to technology, administrative supports, research and information on best practices and professional expertise in human resources), and (v) an improved image and profile in the community at large.

Only a few service providers felt that their organizations were well prepared to provide effective services in the future. The majority felt they had a lot of the necessary pre-requisites, but that lack of funding remained a critical barrier preventing them from being truly effective. In addition to funding, people felt they could be effective employers and service providers if there was improved and transparent relationship with PDD, with PDD focusing on its role of ensuring stability and consistency for the field rather than micro-managing agencies.

People emphasized that the issues voiced in this survey were not new, and that many employers had demonstrated their creativity in meeting these challenges despite lack of adequate government resources. There was a strong consensus that the growing labour shortage in the province had made human resource issues more acute. Increased funding, resources and flexibility from the government were critical if the rehabilitation field was to be competitive over the next 5 to 10 years. Without this support, most people felt that many individual agencies would not be equipped to handle what may soon becoming insurmountable challenges.

## **PART SEVEN: CONCLUSION**

The information gathered through the Workforce 2010 employer survey paints the first ever demographic picture of the workforce in community-based PDD-funded services across Alberta. Despite limitations such as estimations and potential inflation in the numbers reported, the survey provides the first critical step toward a broad understanding of the workforce distribution, and toward effective human resource planning and policy development. Supplementing the quantitative data are the rich perspectives, insights and practices of service providers who face and overcome human resource challenges in the rehabilitation field on a daily basis.

As noted here and in information reported elsewhere (see, for example, *Facts for a Solid Foundation*, VRRRI, 2004), these challenges are expected to become even more urgent in the current climate of Alberta's increasing labour shortage. The comprehensive series of activities being undertaken by the Workforce 2010 initiative should enable service providers to become better equipped with the necessary intelligence and tools to position themselves as competitive employers.

It is clear, however, that information and tools on their own will not be sufficient; nor will it be prudent for service providers to try to achieve success by relying solely on their own resources and creativity. The human resource challenges that confront the rehabilitation field are not unique to the industry, but shared, to varying degrees, by all human services in Alberta. Service providers have identified a number of solutions to current and imminent challenges, and many are implementing a variety of "best practices" to remain valued employers. However, despite their dedication and efforts, only a few feel adequately prepared to provide quality services in the future.

Effective and long-term solutions will require solid commitment and partnerships—among service providers, within the rehabilitation field and with other human services and the community at large; among service providers, individuals and families; and especially among service providers, government funders and policy makers. As repeatedly urged by the

respondents to this survey, no amount of information or creativity will be sufficient unless coupled with adequate compensation formulae, increased resources and flexibility, and a consolidated effort to change the devalued perception of the field—which includes establishing a professional designation for rehabilitation work. More than ever before, PDD Provincial and Regional Boards, AARC, individual service providers, family members and self-advocates will have to work together in partnership to achieve the vision set forth by Workforce 2010.

## REFERENCES

- Miller, D.C. (1991). *Handbook of research design and social measurement* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Neuman, W. L. (1994). *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- The Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute. (2004). *Facts for a solid foundation: Essential intelligence for planning the future workforce*. (Prepared for Workforce 2010). Calgary, AB: The Author.

# **APPENDIX A**

Workforce 2010 Employer Survey Form

## APPENDIX B

### Calculation of regional and overall weighted totals

The table below was used to determine the weighting ratios for each region, based on surveys sent and received. Note that this table differs from Table 1 (Response Rates) because, in the table below: (i) the count is based on unique organizations and does not include branch locations, and (ii) organizations reporting data for multiple regions have been separated out from those reporting data for only one region. This table is for illustration purposes to show how the weighting ratio was arrived at. It does not represent and should *not* be used for reporting regional response rates.

Table Appendix B: Calculation of regional and overall weighted totals

<b>PDD region</b>	<b>Unique entries in sampling frame</b>	<b>Unique entries received</b>	<b>Effective response rate ( R )%</b>	<b>Weighting ratio ( 100/R )</b>
Calgary	39	19	48.7	2.05
Central	31	13	41.9	2.39
Edmonton	35	12	34.3	2.92
South	26	11	42.3	2.36
Northeast	11	6	54.5	1.83
Northwest	9	4	44.4	2.25
Multiple regions	9	5	55.6	1.80
TOTAL	160	70	43.7	2.29