

**1993/1994
REGIONAL FRAMEWORK
DOCUMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 1.0 | <i>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</i> | 1 |
| 2.0 | <i>INTRODUCTION</i> | 5 |
| 3.0 | <i>WORKER CLIENTS</i> | 8 |
| 3.1 | UI Claimants | 8 |
| 3.2 | Social Assistance Recipients | 13 |
| 3.3 | Aboriginal Persons | 17 |
| 3.4 | Designated Groups | 22 |
| 3.41 | General Overview | 22 |
| 3.42 | Women | 25 |
| 3.52 | Visible Minorities | 29 |
| 3.53 | Persons With Disabilities | 32 |
| 3.5 | Youth/Students | 37 |
| 4.0 | <i>EMPLOYERS</i> | 43 |
| 5.0 | <i>COMMUNITIES</i> | 50 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|------------|---|
| Appendix A | Economic and Labour Market Outlook and Environment for Program Planning for 1993/94 |
| Appendix B | Industrial Sector Analysis |
| Appendix C | BC Government 1993/94 Labour Market Priorities |
| Appendix D | Yukon Government 1993/94 Labour Market Priorities |
| Appendix E | The 1992 British Columbia Labour Market Demand & Training Needs Review |
| Appendix F | LPS Checklist for Implementing The Designated Group Policy |

1993/1994

**REGIONAL FRAMEWORK
DOCUMENT**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During 1993/94 the BC/Yukon Region will concentrate on three employment program and services delivery priorities:

1. UI Claimants
2. Designated Groups/Social Assistance Recipients (SARs)
3. Partnerships

These priorities will be addressed as follows:

1. UI Claimants As OUR Number One Priority Client

- improve management of all UI Developmental Uses (UIDU) funds
- increase relative proportion of funding directed to feepayers
- implement full year of Self Employment Assistance (SEA)
- implement new mobility option
- link worksharing with training
- focus on client selection and client needs assessment

2. Increase the Participation of Designated Groups/SARs in All Relevant Programs/Services

- maximize use of UIDU funds for Designated Groups particularly women and visible minorities
- strategic application of CRF to support Designated Groups/SARs, particularly people with disabilities, who are not UI eligible
- further development of the Pathways process at all levels
- delivery of Awareness training to staff

3. Promotion, Development and Support of Partnerships

With the Province/Territory

- negotiate new Labour Force Development Agreements (LFDAs)
- engage in more joint local planning for SAR clients
- implement labour force boards

With Employers

- promote a training culture through human resource planning on a sectoral and individual firm basis
- assist in adjustment and restructuring in key areas

With Community Futures Committees (CFCs)

- implement "second generation" programming

With BC Aboriginal Management Board (BCAMB) and local AMBs

- further develop the Pathways process

These three priority areas are not mutually exclusive or discrete - there are overlaps. For example, Designated Groups members who are UI recipients, or Pathways representing both a Designated Group strategy and an example of partnership. As a result, there is no specific hierarchy among the priorities. **With this in mind, individual offices will be expected to address these priorities in light of their particular labour market situations; therefore, it is clear that plans must in some way be responsive to Regional priorities.**

There are a number of operational challenges/issues associated with addressing these priorities. To date the Region does not have the means to properly manage UIDU funds. Addressing this issue by the new calendar year is critical to ensure confidence in the management of UIDU funds throughout 1993.

Increasing feepayer activity will occur at the expense of Project Based Training (PBT). A decrease in PBT activity will impact on our ability to serve Designated Group clients. Also, increased feepayer activity will result in a capacity issue for some training institutions.

With respect to SEA, the proposed allocation by the Canadian Labour Force Development Board (CLFDB) would result in a 40% reduction in current activity in Community Futures areas; therefore, the Region continues to negotiate this issue with NHQ.

In 1993/94, EIC will be required to set targets for Designated Group members participating in UIDU programming. Although targets will be set, current participation tracking systems will make "success" measurement difficult. Designated Group members who are UI eligible must be encouraged to self identify during the claim-taking process if they wish equitable access to UI sponsored training. The LFDS Committee is currently working on the self identification and target setting issues. Once these issues are addressed, the committee will develop solutions to the participant tracking problems.

It is anticipated that Consolidated Revenue Fund (CFR) will be drastically reduced. Therefore, many of EIC's "traditional" clients will no longer receive the service they had in the past. To ensure Designated Groups/SARs remain a priority, staff will find it necessary to say NO to many others. To meet the

needs of Designated Groups local offices may require the coordination of resources across CEC boundaries, and perhaps across a LMA basis. This need will increase as further decentralization from program centres occurs.

Pathways will be "front and centre" and will require clear articulation of the roles between the National AMB (NAMB), BCAMB and local AMBs. At present, local AMBs in BC do not believe they need to comply with NAMB policies. Pathways will require attention from CECs, CJS Operations and RHQ. The biggest challenge will be to effectively use UIDU funds.

There will be pressure from the Province to live up to commitments with respect to SAR participation in regular programming. Joint planning at the local level with Ministry of Social Services (MSS) staff will be critical to meet these obligations.

Other partnership initiatives will impact on local offices. Sectoral activities will impact on local planning and there will be a need to integrate national, regional and local efforts.

Adjustment issues pose a special challenge in that they are difficult to plan for, often cut across boundaries, and require integrated responses. These situations will be on the increase and may impact on our ability to meet other priorities. Therefore, contingency planning at the local level should receive emphasis.