

## **2006/7 Follow-Up Survey of FÁS Participants**

**Roshin Sen  
Planning & Research  
FÁS  
27-33 Upper Baggot Street  
Dublin 4**

**November 2007**

## 2006/7 Follow-Up Survey of FÁS Participants

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
Executive Summary	3
I Introduction	6
II Customer Satisfaction/Feedback	7
III Background Status of Participants	13
IV Post-Programme Outcomes	18
V Comparisons with Previous Surveys	36
VI People with Disabilities in Specialist Training	40

## Executive Summary

This report presents the findings from two surveys carried out by the ESRI on behalf of FÁS. The first was a sample survey of persons who completed or dropped out of FÁS training and employment programmes, undertaken between November 2006 and April 2007 in respect of persons who had left their FÁS programme in the period June to September 2005. A total of 1,261 participants responded to the survey. These responses were 'weighted-up' to represent the 19,023 persons who, in fact, exited FÁS programmes between June and September 2005. The main results are presented in this report. The second survey is of participants who completed or dropped out of FÁS Specialist Training Programmes for people with disabilities. The fieldwork was carried out between January and June 2007 in respect of March to September 2005 leavers.

Some of the main findings from the first survey are:

**Employment Outcomes:** 45% of participants obtained employment after their programme. The placement rate into employment was 57% for training programme participants, and 33% for employment programme participants. Traineeship and Linked Work Experience had the highest placement rate into employment (78% and 71% respectively). Sixty-seven percent of participants on Specific Skills Training obtained a job after the programme.

**Current Situation of Participants:** At the time of the survey, 39% of persons were in employment, 26% were on a further FÁS programme or other education/training, 8% were engaged in home duties and 21% were unemployed. The employment rate (at the time of the survey) for training programme participants was 48%, and was 31% for employment programmes. The unemployment rate was 22% for training programmes participants and 19% for those who had participated in employment programmes. Excluding those who returned to FÁS employment programmes, the progression for employment programme participants to employment was 44% and 27% were unemployed at the time of the survey.

**Live Register:** Thirty-five percent of participants were on the Live Register before entering their FÁS programme. In terms of outcomes, out of every hundred persons who were on the Live Register before entering their FÁS programme, 31 were unemployed at the time of the survey. Thirty-seven were employed at the time of the survey, 17 were on an employment scheme and 8 were in further training or education.

**Social Welfare:** Thirty-nine percent of training programme participants stated that they were not in receipt of benefits in the month before their programme started. This is a decline from 50% in the previous survey.

**Usefulness of Programme:** Overall, more than half of participants (56%) rated their programme as 'very useful' and a further 31% rated it as 'quite useful'. As in previous years, improving confidence, helping to identify job opportunities, and providing new job skills were all rated positively by more than four out of five participants. For the first time since the start of these surveys, employment

programmes received equal or higher ratings than training programmes across the range of benefits.

**Certification:** More than three-quarters (78%) of all training programme participants received certification from their programme. When participants who did not complete their programme are excluded, the percentage receiving certification rose to 89%.

**Non-Completion:** One in four participants (24%) did not complete their programme, which is a considerable increase from the previous survey (where one in six did not complete).

**Education Background:** There was a wide spread of educational attainment on FÁS programmes. More than half of all participants had not obtained the Leaving Certificate (56%). This was higher for employment programmes where 69% of participants had not completed second level. In contrast to this, some training programmes had a significant minority with third level qualifications.

**Social Welfare Benefits<sup>1</sup>:** Three-quarters of participants were receiving social welfare benefits before starting their programme (Unemployment Allowance and Unemployment Benefit 32%, Lone Parents Allowance 18% and a Disability Payment 12%). There has been a continuation in the trend of less participants receiving Unemployment Allowance and more participants receiving alternative payments. One in four participants stated that they were long-term unemployed prior to commencing their programme.

**Looked for Work:** Half of all participants (49%) who had not obtained employment after their FÁS programme said that they had not looked for work. Of these, a half (49%) said that they had not looked for work because they were on a FÁS programme. Focussing on participants who were unemployed at the time of the survey, 96% stated that they were looking for work. Seventy percent of respondents on home duties at the time of the survey also stated that they were looking for work.

**Net Hourly Pay in First Job:** The average hourly take-home pay of persons in their first job after a FÁS course/scheme was €10.48. This represents a 12% increase from the previous survey in 2004, and a 5% increase above inflation over the period. Men, on average, earned €10.60 compared to women at €10.41. The average rate earned by training programme participants was €9.96 compared to €11.33 earned by employment programme participants.

**Use of FÁS Skills:** 68% of all job-obtainers stated that they used their FÁS-imparted skills either 'all of the time', 'most of the time' or 'sometimes' in their first job. This was higher for employment programme participants (74%) than training programme participants (65%). Over a half of all participants (55%) stated that they would not have got their job without FÁS. Again, this was higher for employment programme participants (63%) than training programme participants (50%).

**National Employment Action Plan:** Thirty-six percent of NEAP clients were employed at the time of the survey (compared to 39% of all participants and 39% of

---

<sup>1</sup> The change in the names of Unemployment Allowance/Benefit to Jobseekers' Allowance/Benefit had not occurred during the reference period of this survey.

NEAP clients in the previous survey), 21% were in FÁS or education/training, 34% were unemployed and 9% were on home duties.

**Non-Irish Nationals:** Nine percent of respondents were non-Irish nationals. Forty-six percent were employed at the time of the survey, 18% were in education/training, 10% were on an employment programme and 9% were on home duties. Eighteen percent were unemployed.

**Longer-term trends:** Up until the year 2000, the trends in outcomes for all programmes had been positive – the percentage in employment was increasing and the percentage in unemployment was decreasing. From 2001 to 2003, this trend reversed and across all programmes there was a decline in employment and a rise in unemployment. In the last two surveys (2004 and 2006/7), there have been no clear trends across programmes. The percentage in employment in Specific Skills Training has improved from 2003 levels, but the percentage in unemployment has worsened. The reverse is true for Community Training Centres and Community Employment – the percentage in employment has dropped compared to 2003 but so has the percentage in unemployment. Instead, there has been movement into education, training or employment programmes.

In terms of Specialist Training Programmes for people with disabilities, some of the main findings are:

**Current Situation of Participants:** 28% of people with disabilities in specialist training were employed at the time of the survey. Sixteen percent were in a FÁS programme, 10% were in other education/ training and 6% continued at a centre. Three out of ten participants were unemployed and 9% were on home duties/other<sup>2</sup>.

**Satisfaction with Training:** More than four-fifths of people with disabilities in specialist training were either ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with the content of their course, their instructor, the availability of equipment, and access to and the general condition of the building in which the training took place.

**Comparison with Mainline Training:** The employment outcomes at the time of the survey are lower for Specialist Training Programmes than mainline training (28% compared to 39%), but they are very similar compared to the outcomes for people in receipt of a disability payment on mainline training (29%). In terms of satisfaction with the programme and the perceived benefits of the programme, the results for Specialist Training Programmes and mainline training are broadly similar.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be highlighted that this question changed in this year’s survey, which may impact on comparisons with previous years – in particular with regard to the distribution between unemployed and “at home”.

## I Introduction

This report presents the results of two surveys of FÁS participants. The first sample survey covered non-sponsored FÁS participants who completed or dropped-out of their programme in the period June – September 2005. The second survey covered participants of the FÁS Specialist Training Programme for people with disabilities. The methodology and findings of the second survey are presented separately in Section VI of this report. Sections I to V relate to the first survey.

The survey was conducted by the ESRI on behalf of FÁS from November 2006 to April 2007. The questionnaire used was broadly similar to the questionnaires used in previous surveys, with some additions and alterations. A mixture of postal, telephone, and personal interviewing was used. The total population of participants who exited during the June to September 2005 period was 19,023. Useable responses from the sample amounted to 1,261 – a response rate of 65%, which is an improvement from the last survey. The survey responses were re-weighted to provide estimates of the true population of 19,023 and all the results in this report are presented on a grossed-up basis. The population and response numbers for each programme are presented in Table 1.

It may be noted that for each programme a minimum of 50 responses were obtained. This is satisfactory for providing an overall result indicator by programme. However, care must be taken in considering cross-classifications of smaller programmes, as sampling errors could be significant.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Bridging	2,778	208
Community Training Centres	1,002	144
Linked Work Experience	104	67
Local Training Initiative	1,291	70
Return to Work	337	61
Specific Skills Training	2,765	285
Traineeship	948	132
<i>Total Training</i>	9,225	967
Community Employment	9,142	244
Job Initiative Scheme	656	50
<i>Total Employment</i>	9,798	294
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,023</b>	<b>1,261</b>

## II Customer Satisfaction and Feedback

### *Usefulness of Programme*

All respondents were asked to provide an overall assessment of the usefulness of their programme. Table 2 presents the results for each programme. Overall, 56% of respondents rated their programme as ‘very useful’ and a further 31% as ‘quite useful’. The remaining 13% gave a more negative rating. Particularly positive ratings were given by participants on Linked Worked Experience (100% rated positively) and Local Training Initiative (92% rated positively). Participants on the Local Training Initiative (67%) and Traineeship (61%) were the most likely to rate their programme as ‘very useful’. Conversely, participants on Community Training Centres (15%), Community Employment (14%) and Bridging (14%) gave the highest percentage of negative ratings. Community Employment participants also gave one of the highest positive ratings (60% stated it was ‘very useful’), therefore the programme experienced mixed results. Negative ratings have decreased noticeably from the previous survey, when some programmes were rated poorly by almost a quarter of participants.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Very Useful</b>	<b>Quite Useful</b>	<b>Not so Useful</b>	<b>No Use</b>
Bridging	47	39	9	5
Community Training Centres	46	40	10	5
Linked Work Experience	50	50	0	0
Local Training Initiative	67	24	5	4
Return to Work	52	38	5	5
Specific Skills Training	50	36	9	4
Traineeship	61	26	10	3
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>4</i>
Community Employment	60	26	9	5
Job Initiative Scheme	56	33	8	3
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>5</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>

### *Non-completion of Programme*

One in four participants did not complete their programme (Table 3), which is a considerable increase from the previous survey (where one in six did not complete their programme). The rate of non-completion was particularly high for the Job Initiative Scheme (45%) and Community Training Centres (35%).

Respondents were asked to give their reason for not completing their programme. One in four clients (26%) dropped out in order to take a job. This reason was most prevalent for participants in Community Training Centres (39%) and on Specific Skills Training (38%). More than one in ten participants (12%) did not complete their programme for health reasons. This reason was given most often by participants on Bridging programmes (30%) and Traineeship (27%). Almost one in ten participants (9%) felt that the course that they were in was not suited to their needs. This occurred most often with participants in Bridging courses (22%) and also in Traineeship (18%). Caring responsibilities, be they for children or others, were given as a reason for non-completion by 4% of clients, mostly in Bridging (13%) and Community Training Centres (9%). Six percent of participants left to go into other training. This occurred most often with participants in Local Training Initiatives (16%). Three percent of participants moved into another FÁS training programme. This reason was given by one in ten (9%) of Traineeship participants who did not complete their programme.

The other reasons given for non-completion include moving away, not being able to finish the course as it was too difficult, personal reasons (family member became ill) and being asked to leave the course. It should be noted that all of the figures in this section refer only to the minority of participants who did not complete their programme. The absolute numbers involved are very small in some cases and the results should be treated with caution.

<b>Participants who did not Complete their Programme</b>								
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Did not complete</b>	<b>Reason (%)</b>						
		<b>To take Job</b>	<b>Health</b>	<b>Course was not Suitable</b>	<b>Caring Responsibilities</b>	<b>Other Training (not FÁS)</b>	<b>Other Training (FÁS)</b>	<b>Other</b>
Bridging	13	22	30	22	13	4	0	22
CTC	35	39	4	13	9	4	4	36
LWE	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
LTI	23	32	5	5	0	16	5	37
Return to Work	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
SST	14	38	8	15	4	8	4	27
Traineeship	19	18	27	18	0	9	9	19
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>26</i>
CE	29	22	11	7	4	5	3	52
JIS	45	32	16	0	0	0	5	47
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>49</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>44</b>

### *Certification*

More than three-quarters (78%) of all training programme participants and 40% of all employment programme participants received certification (Table 4), which is similar to previous surveys. One of the reasons for failing to obtain certification is programme non-completion. The certification rates are higher, therefore, when looking only at participants who completed their programme (the second column in the table) – 89% of training programme participants and 48% of employment programme participants. The lowest proportion of clients receiving certification was found on Community Employment (48%), Linked Work Experience (57%) and the Job Initiative Scheme (58%). The low rates of certification achieved by participants on Community Employment and the Job Initiative Scheme may not be so surprising, given that they are employment rather than training programmes.

When asked whether the certification was useful in applying for jobs, 63% of participants stated that it was useful. The proportion stating that it was useful was highest for Traineeship (77%), Linked Work Experience (67%), and Local Training Initiative (65%).

<b>Table 4</b>			
<b>Certification of Programme Participants (%)</b>			
<b>% Receiving Certification</b>			
<b>Programme</b>	<b>All Participants</b>	<b>Participants who completed Programme</b>	<b>% of Cert. Recipients Stating Cert. Useful</b>
Bridging	82	90	59
Community Training Workshops	66	84	58
Linked Work Experience	57	57	67
Local Training Initiative	72	86	65
Return to Work	82	90	56
Specific Skills Training	82	92	64
Traineeship	78	92	77
<i>Total Training</i>	78	89	63
Community Employment	40	48	64
Social Economy Programme	41	58	58
<i>Total Employment</i>	40	48	64
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>63</b>

### *Benefits of FÁS Programme*

Table 5 indicates the percentage of respondents who stated that their FÁS programme helped them ‘a lot’ or ‘a little’ in a number of different respects. The results are very similar to the previous year’s results. For the first time since the start of these surveys, employment programmes were rated more highly than training programmes across every category.

The highest scoring benefit was ‘improved confidence’, which was scored positively by 90% of respondents. Particularly high ratings on this factor were given by Linked Work Experience (100%), Job Initiative Scheme (97%) and Local Training Initiatives (93%).

The second highest ranking area was ‘new job skills’, which 86% of respondents rated positively. Participants on the Traineeship programme rated this aspect particularly highly (97%). Employment programmes and training programmes fared equally well in this respect (86%).

Helping to identify new job opportunities was rated positively by 83% of respondents. Return to Work (91%) and Traineeship (90%) were rated positively by the highest proportion of participants for this aspect of training. Employment programmes were rated slightly more positively than training programmes in this regard – 84% compared to 81%.

More than three out of four respondents (77%) said that they improved their interview skills. The Return to Work (86%) programme and Local Training Initiatives (85%) were rated particularly positively in this respect. Training programmes were rated the same as employment programmes in this aspect – 76% rated positively compared to 77% of employment programme participants.

Fifty-nine percent of participants stated that their programme helped them to get a job, up seven percentage points from the previous survey. Highest scoring programmes were Traineeship (76%), Linked Work Experience (71%) and Job Initiative Scheme (70%). Lowest scores were achieved by Bridging (45%) and Return to Work (47%).

Forty-four percent of respondents stated that their programme helped them with their literacy and numerical skills. The highest percentages scoring these aspects were in Community Training Centres, Local Training Initiatives, Job Initiative Scheme and Linked Work Experience where more than half of respondents stated that their programme helped them ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’ in improving their literacy and/or numerical skills.

Finally, one in ten respondents stated that their programme helped them to set up their own business.

**Table 5**

**Benefits of FÁS programmes (% Helped 'a little' or 'a lot')**

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Improved Confidence</b>	<b>Identify Job Opportunities</b>	<b>Improved Interview Skills</b>	<b>Helped get a Job</b>	<b>Helped set up Own Business</b>	<b>New Job Skills</b>	<b>Literacy</b>	<b>Numerical Skills</b>
Bridging	86	78	74	45	11	82	45	44
Community Training Centres	89	78	72	53	8	87	66	55
Local Training Initiatives	93	84	85	60	10	86	53	36
Linked Work Experience	100	86	83	71	0	86	50	43
Return to Work	91	91	86	47	18	76	44	31
Specific Skills Training	87	81	71	64	13	88	31	37
Traineeship	88	90	80	76	13	97	39	22
<i>Total Training</i>	88	81	76	58	11	86	44	39
Community Employment	91	84	78	60	11	86	49	44
Job Initiative Scheme	97	84	70	70	21	86	53	47
<i>Total Employment</i>	92	84	77	61	12	86	49	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>42</b>

Table 5a presents the percentage of participants on FÁS courses who expressed satisfaction with the content of the course, the equipment available on the course and the instructor/trainer.

Satisfaction with the content of the course was high, with 83% of respondents expressing satisfaction in this regard. Participants on Traineeship were particularly satisfied (90%).

Seventy-eight percent of participants were satisfied with the equipment available on their programme, a decrease of seven percentage points from the previous survey. Community Training Centre participants were the most satisfied (91%), while participants on Traineeship were the least satisfied (64%).

Eighty-three percent of participants were satisfied with the instructor or trainer on their programme. Satisfaction ratings were particularly high for participants on Return to Work (91%), Community Training Centres (91%) and Job Initiative Scheme (90%).

<b>Table 5a</b>			
<b>Satisfaction with FÁS programmes (% 'Satisfied' or 'Very Satisfied')</b>			
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Content of course</b>	<b>Equipment</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
Bridging	83	77	82
Community Training Centres	86	91	91
Linked Work Experience	83	83	83
Local Training Initiative	81	83	86
Return to Work	86	82	91
Specific Skills Training	83	78	81
Traineeship	90	64	85
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>84</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>84</i>
Community Employment	82	78	82
Job Initiative Scheme	89	88	90
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>82</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>83</b>

Table 5b displays the satisfaction of employment programme participants with the training opportunities that arose during their programme. It was a positive finding that three-quarters of employment programme participants were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with the level of training opportunities afforded to them by their programme.

<b>Table 5b</b>	
<b>Training Opportunities</b>	
<b>Programme</b>	<b>% Satisfied</b>
Community Employment	76
Job Initiative Scheme	80
<b>Total Employment Programmes</b>	<b>76</b>

### III Background Status of Participants

#### *Education Background*

Table 6 presents a profile of the highest level of education achieved by the survey participants. Five categories are presented. Overall, 26% had completed primary education only, 30% Junior Certificate (or equivalent), 31% Leaving Certificate and 13% some form of third-level education. As would be expected, these percentages varied greatly between programmes. For instance, 37% of participants on employment programmes had primary level education only, compared to 14% of training programme participants.

The level of training programme participants with third-level education has dropped by eight percentage points from the previous survey. Programmes with a relatively high proportion of third-level participants were Specific Skills Training (24%), Local Training Initiatives (23%) and Traineeship (20%). The high level of third-level educated participants on Local Training Initiatives is particularly worth highlighting, as the programme is aimed specifically at persons who are socially excluded or persons who would be perceived to have difficulties integrating into the labour market – this would tend not to equate with third-level qualifications<sup>3</sup>.

Fifty-six percent of participants had completed less than Leaving Certificate level of education. This was sizeably higher for participants on employment programmes (69%) compared to training programmes (42%). Of all training programmes, Community Training Centres had the highest level of participants with less than Leaving Certificate level of education (70%), as would be expected given that the programme is aimed at early school leavers. Perhaps it is surprising that 30% of Community Training Centre participants had Leaving Certificate level of education.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Junior Certificate</b>	<b>Leaving Certificate</b>	<b>Certificate/Diploma</b>	<b>Degree/Masters</b>
Bridging	14	30	43	8	6
Community Training	29	41	30	0	0
Linked Work Experience	0	33	67	0	0
Local Training Initiative	17	21	39	11	12
Return to Work	26	30	30	9	4
Specific Skills Training	9	25	42	13	11
Traineeship	5	19	56	10	10
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>8</i>
CE	37	32	21	8	3
Job Initiative Scheme	43	40	10	3	5
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>

<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, 40% of third-level participants on Local Training Initiatives were not in receipt of benefits prior to commencing their programme.

*Prior Status of Participants*

Table 7 shows the employment status of participants in the month prior to starting their programme. The largest group (45%) were unemployed, with the remainder being either employed (19%), on home duties/other (22%) or in education/training (13%). These results are almost identical to the previous survey.

<b>Table 7</b>		
<b>Employment Status of All Participants in the Month Prior to starting Programme</b>		
Working-full-time	8	Employed – 19%
Working-part-time	8	
Self-Employed	2	
On CE/Job Scheme	5	Education and Training – 13%
Other FÁS course or scheme	2	
At School/College	7	Unemployed – 45%
Unemployed	45	
Home Duties	16	
Other	6	Other – 22%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	

Participants who were working prior to starting their FÁS programme were asked why they left their job to take up the programme. Table 7a below presents their responses. A quarter of persons who were employed previously did not reply, or stated that they did not know why they left. One in four participants (24%) left their job and started their FÁS programme to retrain or gain a new skill, and almost one in four (23%) to improve their job prospects. Just over one in five participants (22%) left their job because it was part-time. Nine percent left their job because they did not like it. The remainder gave a variety of reasons, such as becoming ill or disabled, being made redundant or moving to a new location.

<b>Table 7a</b>	
<b>Reason Participant Left Job to Start FÁS Programme</b>	
<b>Reason</b>	<b>% of Respondents</b>
Learn new skill/retraining	24
Improve job prospects	23
Part-time job	22
Did not like job	10
Other	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 8 presents the same type of information as Table 7 but for each programme. A number of features arise from this table. Firstly, with regard to participants who were unemployed prior to starting their programme, the highest percentages of unemployed respondents were found in Bridging (54%). Linked Work Experience (29%) and Traineeship (28%) had the highest proportion of clients who were employed in the month prior to the programme, compared to 23% for all training programmes.

Almost a half of participants on the Job Initiative Scheme (JIS) were on an employment programme prior to their current programme. This is a large increase from the previous year, when 25% of clients on JIS were in a scheme previous to commencing their programme.

Unsurprisingly, a large proportion of the participants on Return to Work (40%) were on home duties prior to their programme. One in five Traineeship participants were also on home duties before their training programme.

Community Training Centres had the highest percentage of clients who came from school or college (35%), followed by Linked Work Experience (29%) and Local Training Initiatives (29%).

Almost a half of participants (47%) on Community Employment had been unemployed prior to commencing their programme. One in five were on home duties and 16% had been employed. Five percent had been on another employment programme.

<b>Table 8</b>							
<b>Employment situation before FÁS programme</b>							
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Working</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>	<b>CE/Job Scheme</b>	<b>Other FÁS Course</b>	<b>At School/ College</b>	<b>Home Duties</b>	<b>Other</b>
Bridging	18	54	1	2	2	16	7
CTC	14	34	5	5	35	5	3
LWE	29	29	0	0	29	14	0
LTI	25	28		1	29	15	2
Return to Work	5	40	5	0	5	40	5
SST	27	45	2	4	7	9	5
Traineeship	28	36	0	2	13	20	2
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>5</i>
CE	16	47	5	1	4	20	8
JIS	10	31	48	0	2	10	
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>

### Social Welfare

Respondents were asked to indicate which, if any, Social Welfare benefits they were in receipt of immediately before commencing their FÁS programme. Table 9 shows that three-quarters of respondents were in receipt of some benefit during this time. Twelve percent were in receipt of Unemployment Assistance (UA), 20% were in receipt of Unemployment Benefit (UB) and 3% were in receipt of credits<sup>4</sup>. These three categories together make up persons on the Live Register. In other words, 35% of respondents were on the Live Register in the month before their FÁS programme. The proportion in receipt of a disability payment (Disability Allowance, Disability Benefit, Blind Person's Allowance, or Invalidity Pension) remained the same as in the previous survey (12%). The proportion in receipt of Lone Parent's Allowance increased to 18% this year. Seven percent of respondents were in receipt of some other benefit, such as Carer's Allowance, Widow's Pension and Farm Assist.

A greater proportion of employment programme participants were in receipt of a benefit than training programme participants – 88% compared to 61% of training programme participants. However, for the first time since the start of the surveys, a smaller proportion of employment programme participants were on the Live Register compared to training programme participants (33% compared to 37%). Employment programme participants were more likely to be in receipt of a disability payment or lone parent's allowance.

The percentage of participants not in receipt of benefits (25%) showed a significant decrease from the previous survey (32%), bringing the proportion back closer to 2002 levels.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>UA</b>	<b>UB</b>	<b>Credits</b>	<b>LPA</b>	<b>Disability*</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Supp Welf</b>	<b>Live Reg.</b>	<b>% None</b>
Bridging	16	27	4	6	9	6	4	48	28
CTW	3	10	1	10	3	6	3	15	63
LWE	0	14		14	14	0		14	57
LTI	4	12	4	12	4	15	4	19	46
Return to Work	5	29	0	14	14	5	0	33	33
SST	15	26	4	7	7	5	1	45	35
Traineeship	10	21	2	14	3	2	2	32	48
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>39</i>
CE	12	18	2	27	19	9	1	33	11
JIS	19	26		21	7	0	2	44	26
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>12</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>

\* This includes those in receipt of Disability Allowance + disregard, Disability Benefit, Blind Persons Pension and Invalidity Pension

<sup>4</sup> While UA, UB and DB all changed names last year, during the reference period of this survey the names of these benefits had not changed.

### *Long-term Unemployed*

Table 10 shows the percentage of unemployed respondents who were long-term unemployed. Just over a half of unemployed respondents (54%) were long-term unemployed, which is the same as the previous survey. The highest proportion of long-term unemployed participants were found in Return to Work (75%), followed by the employment programmes (68%). It must be noted that these responses were based on the respondent's perceptions and refer to self-defined unemployment status.

<b>Long-Term Unemployment prior to FÁS Programme (%)</b>	
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Long-Term Unemployed % of Unemployed</b>
Bridging	40
Community Training Centres	42
Linked Work Experience	0
Local Training Initiative	60
Return to Work	75
Specific Skills Training	30
Traineeship	30
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>38</i>
Community Employment	69
Job Initiative Scheme	57
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>68</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>

#### IV Post-Programme Outcomes

A major purpose of the follow-up survey was to find out what happens to persons after they leave their FÁS programme and, in particular, whether they gain employment. This section examines the first job obtained afterwards (if any) and employment status at the time of the survey.

##### *First Job after Programme*

Table 11 shows that 45% of participants obtained a job after leaving FÁS. The percentage was much higher for training (57%) than employment (33%) programme participants. Placement into employment was particularly high for Traineeship (78%) and Linked Work Experience (71%). One in three Community Employment leavers (33%) obtained a job after completion. Eighty-three percent of all the jobs were obtained within three months of completion and 92% within a year.

Two-thirds of the jobs obtained were full-time, and almost a half (49%) were both full-time and permanent. Permanent jobs, whether full or part-time, made up 72% of jobs (up nine percentage points from the previous survey). More than half of participants on Return to Work and Community Employment were employed in part-time jobs. Three out of four jobs obtained by training programme participants were full-time, compared to slightly less than half (48%) of employment programme participants' jobs.

<b>First Job after FAS Programme (All Participants)</b>							
<b>Programme</b>	<b>% Total</b>	<b>% Jobs within 3 Months</b>	<b>% Jobs within 1 year later</b>	<b>% Full Time</b>		<b>% Part Time</b>	
				<b>Perm.</b>	<b>Temp.</b>	<b>Perm.</b>	<b>Temp.</b>
Bridging	47	77	100	52	22	17	9
Community Training Centres	55	83	97	63	20	11	6
Local Training Initiatives	46	82	95	50	17	17	17
Linked Work Experience	71	100	100	56	26	10	8
Return to Work	36	67	89	43	0	43	14
Specific Skills Training	67	80	97	63	14	12	10
Traineeship	78	77	94	53	15	21	11
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>9</i>
Community Employment	33	82	98	33	14	39	15
Job Initiative Scheme	34	100	100	46	31	23	0
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>98</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>14</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>

### *Looked for Work*

Participants who had not obtained a job since their FÁS programme were asked whether they had at all looked for work. The responses are shown in Table 12 below. Of the 55% of participants who had not obtained a job, almost a half said that they had not looked for work (27% in total).

Employment programme participants who had not obtained employment were more likely not to have looked for work than training programme participants (57% compared to 36%).

<b>Table 12</b>						
<b>Since FÁS, did not look for work (% of those who did not obtain employment)</b>						
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Did not look for job</b>	<b>Reason did not look for a job (%)</b>				
		<b>On FÁS programme</b>	<b>Non-FÁS Ed/Training</b>	<b>Home Duties</b>	<b>Ill/Disabled</b>	<b>Other</b>
Bridging	33	11	21	30	24	14
Community Training Centres	37	28	9	50	4	9
Linked Work Experience	61	41	41	12	6	0
Local Training Initiative	52	16	28	30	7	19
Return to Work	34	25	7	18	18	33
Specific Skills Training	27	20	28	35	0	18
Traineeship	29	0	25	37	15	23
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>17</i>
Community Employment	56	64	4	6	21	6
Job Initiative Scheme	79	87	0	0	5	8
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>

Respondents were asked why they had not looked for work. A half (52%) stated that they had not looked for work because they were on a FÁS programme. This was the case for two-thirds of employment programme participants and one in six training programme participants. The most common reason for not looking for work given by training programme participants was that they were on home duties (33%) and therefore had exited the labour force, followed by progression into non-FÁS training/education (22%). Almost one in five FÁS participants (18%) said that they had not looked for work because they were ill or disabled.

It should be highlighted that these results refer to a minority of FÁS participants – those who did not obtain employment and subsequently did not look for work i.e. 27% of all participants. Therefore, the absolute numbers involved for some programmes is quite small and the results should be treated with caution.

Table 12a looks at respondents who were unemployed or on home duties/other at the time of the survey and whether they were looking for work.

Almost all of the respondents who were unemployed at the time of the survey stated that they were looking for work (96%). All employment programme participants who were unemployed at the time of the survey said that they were looking for work. The results are not given for each programme as the numbers involved are too small.

Seven out of ten persons on home duties stated that they were looking for work at the time of the survey. Looking at persons on home duties and not looking for work (30%), the most common reason given was being ill or disabled (46%), followed by caring responsibilities (33%). Being ill or disabled was the reason given by 71% of employment programme participants who were on home duties or “other” at the time of the survey, while caring responsibilities accounted for 47% of training programme participants not looking for work.

<b>Table 12a</b>				
<b>Currently Not Working &amp; Looking for Work (%)</b>				
	<b>% Unemployed</b>	<b>Of unemployed, % looking for work</b>	<b>% On Home Duties or Other</b>	<b>Of Home Duties/Other, % Looking for Work</b>
Training Programmes	22	92	13	55
Employment Programmes	19	100	15	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>71</b>

Table 12b below shows whether the respondent looked for work since their FÁS programme, broken down by the respondent’s previous situation. This question was asked to respondents who said that they had not obtained a job since their programme.

More than half of respondents who were previously employed (53%) or unemployed (60%) had looked for work since their FÁS programme. Persons who were previously on an employment programme were the least likely to have looked for work since their programme (30%), as the majority went on to another employment programme.

<b>Table 12b</b>					
<b>Looked for Work by Previous Employment Situation (%)</b>					
<b>Previous Situation</b>	<b>Looked for Work (% Yes)</b>	<b>Reason did not look for work (%)</b>			
		<b>On CE or Job Scheme</b>	<b>Home Duties</b>	<b>Ill/Disabled</b>	<b>Other</b>
Employed	53	31	26	18	25
FÁS/Education	37	41	3	0	56
CE/Job Scheme	30	74	0	13	13
Unemployed	60	54	8	17	21
Home Duties	45	34	24	27	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>

### *Use of Skills*

Table 13 indicates to what extent participants who obtained work used the skills gained in FÁS in their first job. Overall, 35% said that they used them ‘all the time’, while another 16% said ‘a lot’ and 17% ‘sometimes’. This leaves the remaining 32% who said ‘a little’ or ‘never’. Participants on employment programmes were more likely than training programme participants to say that they used the skills gained at least sometimes (74% compared to 65%). The most positive ratings were given by Local Training Initiative and Job Initiative Scheme, where more than half of participants stated that they used the skills acquired in their FÁS programme ‘all the time’. The most negative rating was given by Bridging with a high ‘never’ scoring of 26%; this was followed by Traineeship (23%).

The last column of Table 13 presents respondents’ answers to the question ‘do you think that you would have been able to get this job without your FÁS course/scheme?’ Overall, 55% of respondents did not feel that they could have got the job without FÁS. This figure was highest for Job Initiative (86%), followed by Local Training Initiative (73%), Traineeship (63%) and Community Employment (62%). It was low for Bridging/Foundation programmes (33%).

<b>Programme</b>	<b>All the time</b>	<b>A Lot</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>A Little</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>Job without FÁS % (No)</b>
Bridging	16	15	23	20	26	33
Community Training Centres	22	17	22	22	17	44
Linked Work Experience	33	17	17	17	17	50
Local Training Initiative	59	5	14	8	14	73
Return to Work	11	22	22	22	22	56
Specific Skills Training	31	18	19	15	17	52
Traineeship	38	13	15	13	23	63
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>50</i>
Community Employment	43	16	14	11	15	62
Job Initiative Scheme	53	27	13	7	0	86
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>63</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>55</b>

### *Comparison of Skill*

For those who had a job both before and after their FÁS programme, a comparison of the skill level is given in Table 14. Three out of five respondents noted an increase in skills, and most of the remainder stated it was the same. Fourteen percent stated a decrease in skill. It should be noted however that programme totals ('n' amounts) are small in some instances and this should be borne in mind when interpreting the findings.

<b>Table 14</b>				
<b>Comparison of Level of Skill in First Job with Job before FÁS Programme (%)</b>				
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Greater</b>	<b>Same</b>	<b>Less</b>	<b>Balance</b>
Bridging	39	41	20	19
Community Training Centres	63	31	6	56
Linked Work Experience	67	33	0	67
Local Training Initiative	76	24	0	76
Return to Work	60	40	0	60
Specific Skills Training	58	27	15	44
Traineeship	56	31	14	42
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>42</i>
Community Employment	64	20	16	48
Job Initiative Scheme	87	13	0	87
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>52</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>46</b>

### *Occupational Classification of First Job*

Table 15 presents the occupational classification of first job. The distribution of occupations is very similar to previous years. The most common occupational category was Security & Personal Services (28%), followed by Clerical (22%). Other significant occupational groups overall were Sales (13%) and Professional/Technical (11%). A significant minority of Community Employment participants found their first job in Security & Personal Services (37%). The most common occupation for leavers of Specific Skills Training was Clerical (25%), followed by Professional/Technical (17%). Again, the cell counts in this table are quite low, so caution must be taken in drawing conclusions from these results.

<b>Table 15</b>										
<b>Occupational Classification of First Job (%)</b>										
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Agriculture</b>	<b>Managers, Executives</b>	<b>Professional Technical</b>	<b>Clerical</b>	<b>Skilled Workers</b>	<b>Production Operatives</b>	<b>Transport, Communication</b>	<b>Sales</b>	<b>Security, Personal Services</b>	<b>Labourers, Other</b>
Bridging	0	4	7	28	10	12	2	16	19	2
Community Training Centres	0	0	0	15	26	6	3	18	26	6
Local Training Initiatives	0	0	0	25	25	0	0	25	25	0
Linked Work Experience	0	3	10	16	6	0	0	26	35	3
Return to Work	10	10	10	30	10	0	0	20	10	0
Specific Skills Training	1	4	17	25	10	6	4	14	16	3
Traineeship	2	2	9	22	4	4	2	15	39	0
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>2</i>
Community Employment	1	7	13	18	5	0	7	7	37	5
Job Initiative Scheme	0	7	13	33	7	13	7	0	13	7
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>5</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4</b>

### *Hourly Pay*

Respondents who had obtained employment were asked to indicate their net weekly (take-home) pay and the average number of hours worked in the first job. From this, net hourly wage rates were calculated. These are presented in Tables 16a and 17. The survey also asked for gross earnings (Table 16b). Net earnings are discussed below for purposes of comparison with earlier years' surveys.

Overall, the average net hourly wage was €10.48. This represents a 12% increase from the previous survey in 2004, and a 5% increase above inflation over the period. This was higher for persons completing employment programmes (€11.33) than training programmes (€9.96). Females, on average, took home €10.41 per hour compared to males at €10.60 – an average difference of 19 cents per hour.

The number of respondents for this question was quite low, as responses were given by a subset of those who obtained a job. This means that the individual programme results must be treated with caution.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male – Female</b>
Bridging	10.20	10.04	10.33	-0.29
Community Training Centres	8.49	9.08	7.92	1.16
Local Training Initiatives	9.14	7.95	9.51	-1.56
Linked Work Experience	8.83	9.23	8.71	0.52
Return to Work	9.75	9.01	10.14	-1.13
Specific Skills Training	10.55	11.44	9.84	1.60
Traineeship	9.86	9.89	9.85	0.04
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>9.96</i>	<i>10.29</i>	<i>9.74</i>	<i>0.55</i>
Community Employment	11.30	11.33	11.29	0.04
Job Initiative Scheme	11.75	11.59	11.86	-0.27
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>11.33</i>	<i>11.36</i>	<i>11.32</i>	<i>0.04</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>10.48</b>	<b>10.60</b>	<b>10.41</b>	<b>0.21</b>

Table 16b below presents gross wages. The average gross hourly wage was €11.80. This was higher for employment programme participants than training programme participants - €12.34 compared to €11.46. Women earned on average €1.15 less than men an hour – €11.33 compared to €12.48.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Balance</b>
Bridging	11.16	11.82	10.34	1.48
Community Training Centres	8.74	9.65	8.25	1.40
Local Training Initiatives	11.00	8.03	11.83	-3.80
Linked Work Experience	10.46	11.14	10.02	1.12
Return to Work	11.47	13.29	10.78	2.51
Specific Skills Training	12.26	13.09	11.47	1.62
Traineeship	11.66	13.17	10.95	2.22
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>11.46</i>	<i>12.22</i>	<i>10.87</i>	<i>1.35</i>
Community Employment	12.18	12.66	11.91	0.75
Job Initiative Scheme	13.67	15.24	12.58	2.66
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>12.34</i>	<i>12.95</i>	<i>11.97</i>	<i>0.98</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.80</b>	<b>12.48</b>	<b>11.33</b>	<b>1.15</b>

Note: The 'gross earnings' category was not completed for all those in a first job after their FÁS programme

The range of take-home pay is presented in Table 17. Five percent of respondents fell into the under €6 category, and a further 6% in the €6 – €6.99 category. Just over one in three participants (35%) had an hourly take-home pay between €7 and €9.99 and 38% had earnings between €10 and €13 an hour. Almost one in five participants (18%) enjoyed net earnings of €13 or more an hour.

Median net hourly income increased from €8.75 in the previous survey to €10.00 an hour this year. This means that half of participants on FÁS programmes earned less than €10 an hour and the other half earned more €10 an hour in their first job.

<b>Wage Range</b>	<b>Training</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Total</b>
Under €6.00	7	2	5
€6.00 - €6.99	7	4	6
€7.00 - €7.99	11	4	9
€8.00 - €8.99	18	10	15
€9.00 - €9.99	9	14	11
€10.00 - €10.99	19	17	18
€11.00 - €11.99	7	12	9
€12.00 - €12.99	8	15	11
€13.00 and over	15	23	18

### *Current status*

Table 18 summarises the employment status of respondents at the time of interview. Overall, the total employment rate remained similar to the previous three surveys at 39%, of which 62% was made up of full-time employment. Employment from training programmes decreased to 2003 levels of 48%. Similarly, full-time employment from training programmes remained at 34% and part-time employment stayed at 12%. Employment from employment programmes was similar to the previous survey, increasing by one percentage point to 31%.

Unemployment levels remained the same as in the previous survey at 21%. For the first time, unemployment rates were higher for training programme participants (22%) than employment programme participants (19%).

Looking at the details in Table 18, the best employment performance was achieved by Traineeship (72%) and Local Training Initiatives (62%). Specific Skills Training participants had an employment rate of 59%. Part-time employment is more prevalent for some programmes – for example, more than half of Return to Work and Community Employment participants were part-time employees.

In relation to foundation-type training programmes, 38% of Bridging programme participants were in employment at the time of the survey, a drop from 50% in the previous survey and 16% moved into further education and training. Overall, 54% of Bridging clients experienced some form of positive outcome (down from 68% in the previous survey), which made it the programme with the lowest level of positive outcomes.

The biggest employment programme, Community Employment, achieved a 30% employment rate. A further 29% continued in employment schemes (up five percentage points from the previous survey). Seven percent were on home duties and 20% were unemployed. Job Initiative Scheme had a 36% employment rate, and a full half of participants stayed on a FÁS scheme.

The trend of a sizeable proportion of participants, particularly on training programmes, that move into non-FÁS education or training lessened this year. Nine percent of training programme participants progressed to non-FÁS education or other training, which is a decline from the 11% found in the previous survey. The programmes where this occurred most were Local Training Initiatives (14%) and Linked Work Experience (13%). Three percent of participants on employment programmes progressed to non-FÁS education or other training. The extent to which participants progressed to further education and training is examined in more detail in Table 18a.

<b>Table 18</b>												
<b>Current Employment Status of Participants</b>												
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Employed</b>				<b>FÁS/Education</b>				<b>Unempl.</b>	<b>Home Duties</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Employed FÁS Educ.</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Full-Time</b>	<b>Part-Time</b>	<b>Self-Empl.</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CE/Job Scheme</b>	<b>FÁS Training</b>	<b>Education /other training</b>				
Bridging	38	25	11	2	16	3	4	9	28	9	9	54
Community Training Centres	41	34	6	1	18	5	7	6	31	9	2	59
Local Training Initiatives	62	43	18	1	25	7	4	14	10	2	2	86
Linked Work Experience	39	29	4	6	29	11	5	13	14	16	1	69
Return to Work	34	14	18	2	23	9	5	8	21	19	4	56
Specific Skills Training	58	43	13	3	10	2	1	7	23	6	3	68
Traineeship	72	46	22	4	9	1		9	10	7	1	81
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>64</i>
Community Employment	30	12	17	1	35	29	3	3	20	7	8	65
Job Initiative Scheme	36	26	6	4	50	50	0	0	7	2	4	87
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>66</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>65</b>

Almost one in three participants of FÁS programmes (30%) participated in further education or training subsequent to their FÁS programme. The results for participation in further education or training are displayed in Table 18a below. This includes short- and long-term programmes, as well as full- and part-time programmes. The rate of participation was particularly high among Local Training Initiative participants (44%) and Linked Work Experience (43%). It was lowest in Return to Work (22%).

A new question was added this year, asking participants whether their further training/education was related to their FÁS training. As these responses relate only to those persons who participated in further education and training, the absolute number of responses is quite low in some cases and the results should be interpreted with caution. Almost two-thirds of participants stated that their further education/training was at least somewhat related to their FÁS programme. This was highest in Job Initiative Scheme, where all participants stated that their further education/training was related to their FÁS programme. It was also high among Return to Work (71%). It was lowest among Linked Work Experience (50%) and Traineeship (51%).

Combining these responses, we can see that almost one in five participants in FÁS programmes participate in further training/education that is related to their FÁS programme. This can be perceived in a positive sense as progression; however, it could also be interpreted in a more negative sense that the FÁS programme is not fully meeting training needs. The survey results do not inform us which of these explanations is the more valid. This could be an issue for further probing.

<b>Table 18a</b>						
<b>Further Training/Education after FÁS Programme</b>						
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Participated in Further Training/Ed (%)</b>	<b>Training/Ed Related to FÁS Programme (%)</b>				<b>Participated in related training/ed (%)</b>
		<b>Very related</b>	<b>Fairly related</b>	<b>Somewhat related</b>	<b>Not at all related</b>	
Bridging	36	37	15	16	32	25
CTCs	34	29	10	17	44	19
Linked Work Experience	43	25	14	11	50	22
LTI	44	36	19	9	35	29
Return to Work	22	18	21	33	29	16
SST	26	29	16	18	36	17
Traineeship	32	33	6	13	49	16
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>21</i>
CE	26	35	15	7	42	15
Job Initiative Scheme	29	50	50	0	0	29
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>16</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>18</b>

The next tables present various additional analyses of the current employment status data. Table 19 compares the current employment position in relation to the prior employment status of the participants. Perhaps of most interest are those who were unemployed prior to participation. One in three (34%) of these were now employed, 18% were on a job scheme, 7% were on a FÁS training programme or other training/education, 8% were on home duties/other and a further 33% were unemployed at the time of the survey.

In relation to persons previously on home duties, 29% were in employment and a further 7% in FÁS/education. This is a reduction from the previous year, when 40% found employment.

<b>Table 19</b>					
<b>Current Employment Situation by Prior Employment Status</b>					
<b>Present Situation (%)</b>					
<b>Previous Situation</b>	<b>Employed</b>	<b>FÁS/ Education</b>	<b>CE/ Job Scheme</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>	<b>Home Duties/ Other</b>
Employed	67	11	5	9	8
FÁS/Education	49	20	11	18	2
CE/Job Scheme	24	12	41	15	9
Unemployed	34	7	18	33	8
Home Duties	29	7	17	9	38
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>

Participants who were employed at the time of the survey were asked whether they had previously worked with their employer before their FÁS programme, for work experience during their FÁS programme or on a part-time basis during their FÁS programme. One in four (24%) participants stated that they had previously worked with their current employer. This was similar for both training (23%) and employment (25%) programmes. Ten percent of participants stated that they had worked with their current employer before their FÁS programme. Eighteen percent stated that they had worked for their current employer via work experience (FÁS or non-FÁS organised) and ten percent stated that they had worked with their current employer on a part-time basis during their FÁS programme.

The programmes with the highest level of previous work with their employer were Linked Work Experience (40%) and Traineeship (30%). In both of these programmes, the most common form of previous work was through work experience. The lowest level of previous exposure to their current employer was found in Return to Work, where none of the participants had previously worked for their current employer.

<b>Table 19a</b>				
<b>Currently Employed – Previously Worked with Same Employer (%)</b>				
	<b>Before FÁS</b>	<b>Work Experience</b>	<b>Part-Time During FÁS Programme</b>	<b>Any One of These</b>
Bridging	12	10	4	19
CTCs	6	15	9	18
Linked Work Experience	25	40	25	40
LTI	5	8	8	14
Return to Work	0	0	0	0
SST	12	20	7	28
Traineeship	11	22	5	30
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>23</i>
CE	11	23	16	25
Job Initiative Scheme	7	18	10	29
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>25</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24</b>

Table 20 contrasts the current employment status with different previous durations of unemployment and Live Register status. The analysis is presented for training and employment programmes separately. Forty-two percent of those previously on the Live Register who attended training courses were in employment (down from 55% in the previous survey), a further 12% were in FÁS programme or in education and 4% were on a job scheme. One in three (34%) were unemployed (up from one in five in the previous survey). For Live Registrants on employment programmes, 32% had moved to being employed (up five percentage points from the previous survey), a further 30% were on a job scheme, 2% were in FÁS/education and 27% were unemployed. Thus, overall, out of every 100 Live Registrants that started FÁS programmes, 31 were unemployed at the time of the survey. This is a five percentage point decrease from the previous survey.

<b>Table 20</b>					
<b>Current Employment Situation by Unemployment Duration and Live Register Status</b>					
<b>Present Situation (%)</b>					
<b>Training Programmes</b>	<b>Employed</b>	<b>FÁS/ Education</b>	<b>CE/Job Scheme</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>	<b>Home Duties/Other</b>
LTU	26	8	9	46	11
STU	48	13	4	29	7
Not-Unemployed	54	13	3	14	17
Live Register	42	12	4	34	8
<b>Employment Programmes</b>					
LTU	26	4	35	27	8
STU	38	7	23	26	6
Not Unemployed	31	6	30	13	21
Live Register	32	2	30	27	9
<b>All Programmes</b>					
LTU	26	5	26	33	9
STU	44	11	11	28	7
Not Unemployed	43	9	16	14	19
Live Register	37	8	17	31	8

In relation to the duration of unemployment, the figures show, as expected, that long-term unemployed persons fare worse than short-term unemployed or not unemployed persons. Nevertheless, the figures for the long-term unemployed show that a quarter were in employment at the time of the survey (26%) and a further 5% were in FÁS/education. One-quarter of participants (26%) who were long-term unemployed were on a scheme at the time of the survey. One in three were unemployed. Participants who were short-term unemployed prior to their FÁS programme were as likely to be employed as participants who were not unemployed prior to their FÁS programme.

The data is split between males and females in Table 21. Overall, 35% of male participants were in employment compared to 42% of their female counterparts. However, more males were in further FÁS/education programmes and fewer on home duties/other. One in four males were unemployed compared to 17% of females. Males and females benefited equally in terms of employment outcomes from training programmes. Females did better, however, on employment programmes.

<b>Table 21</b>								
<b>Current Employment Status of Male and Female Participants</b>								
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Male</b>				<b>Female</b>			
	<b>Employed</b>	<b>FÁS/ Educ.</b>	<b>Unemp.</b>	<b>Home Duties/ Other</b>	<b>Employed</b>	<b>FÁS/ Educ.</b>	<b>Unemp.</b>	<b>Home Duties/ Other</b>
Bridging	37	13	39	11	38	19	19	23
CTW	43	17	33	7	40	20	26	14
LWE	50	50		0	60	20	20	0
LTI	41	23	32	5	39	32	7	22
Return to Work	38	13	38	13	29	29	14	29
SST	60	11	25	5	56	10	20	14
Traineeship	68	16	16	0	73	7	9	11
<i>Total Training</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>18</i>
CE	20	44	21	15	38	28	18	16
JIS	40	55		5	33	46	13	8
<i>Total Employment</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>16</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>

### Client groups

Table 22 displays the employment situation of early school leavers, those in receipt of a disability payment, those in receipt of Lone Parent’s Allowance (LPA), persons who are referred to FÁS under the National Employment Action Plan (NEAP) process, and non-Irish nationals.

<b>Table 22</b>					
<b>Current Employment Situation (%)</b>					
<b>All Programmes</b>	<b>Employed</b>	<b>FÁS/Ed Training</b>	<b>CE</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>	<b>Home Duties</b>
Early School Leavers	39	12	4	39	7
In receipt of a disability payment	29	10	24	18	19
In receipt of LPA	40	6	19	14	22
NEAP	36	8	13	34	9
Non-Irish Nationals	46	18	10	18	9
<b>All Respondents</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>

The results for each of the client groups are discussed below. The main statistically significant differences in the responses to the survey for each of the client groups are also highlighted.

#### *Early school leavers<sup>5</sup>*

The employment rate for early school leavers was the same as the overall employment rate for all FÁS participants (39%). A significantly higher level of early school leavers were employed on a full-time basis – 32% compared to 23% of non-early school leavers. A higher proportion of early school leavers progressed to further education – 12% of early school leavers were in FÁS or other education/training compared to 9% of overall participants. Interestingly, early school leavers were less likely to progress to further education/training that was related to their FÁS programme - 56% participated in further education/training that was “not at all” related to their FÁS programme compared to 37% of non-early school leavers.

A small proportion of early school leavers moved to employment programmes (4% compared to 17% overall), which is understandable given the criteria necessary to enter employment programmes. The main negative finding for early school leavers compared to the overall results was the relatively high level of unemployment - 39% were unemployed, compared to 21% overall. This is somewhat, though by no means entirely, explained by the comparatively small proportion moving to home duties or other (7% compared to 14% overall).

In general, early school leavers were less satisfied with their FÁS programme than other participants. For the majority of the questions relating to the benefits of FÁS programmes (namely, improved confidence, helped to identify jobs, helped get a job, helped me to set up my own business, and gave new jobs skills), most early school leavers stated that their programme helped them “a little” rather than “a lot”. The only aspect that early school leavers rated significantly higher (as in the previous

<sup>5</sup> Early school leavers are defined as persons aged under 21 with below Leaving Certificate level education.

survey) was “helped me improve my reading and writing skills”, which 65% stated their programme did help them “a little” or “a lot” compared to 45% of others.

Early school leavers were more likely not to complete their course (62% completed compared to 75%). One in seven early school leavers who did not complete their course left to take up non-FÁS training or education (compared to one in twenty non-early school leavers).

#### *Disability payment*

The employment rate at the time of the survey for respondents in receipt of a disability payment (which was almost half the average rate) has improved from the previous survey – 29% were employed compared to 21% in the previous survey. Almost one in four respondents (24%) were on a job scheme. One in ten respondents were in FÁS training or other education/training. Less than one in five (18%) were unemployed and a further fifth of respondents (19%) were on home duties.

Respondents in receipt of a disability payment were significantly less likely to have completed their programme (58% compared to 78% of others). Of those who did complete their programme, more than half (53%) did not receive a certificate compared to 40% of others. Furthermore, slightly less than a half (49%) of respondents in receipt of a disability payment found their certificate useful compared to 65% of others.

Respondents in receipt of a disability payment were significantly less likely to have obtained a job since their programme was completed (30% compared to 47% of others). Of those who had not obtained a job, 32% stated that they had looked for work compared to 55% of those not in receipt of a disability payment. Thirteen percent of persons in receipt of a disability payment stated that they had not looked for work because they were ill or disabled (compared to 2%) of others.

#### *Lone Parent's Allowance*

The employment rate for respondents in receipt of lone parent's allowance was in line with the average – 40% compared to 39% overall. A significantly higher proportion were employed on a part-time basis (26% compared to 11% of others). Fourteen percent of respondents in receipt of lone parent's allowance were unemployed, which is significantly lower than the 21% rate overall. This can be attributed to the higher proportion on home duties/other (22% compared to 14% overall). Six percent were in training or education, compared to 9% of others.

There were many significant differences in the responses from persons in receipt of lone parent's allowance compared to others. Respondents in receipt of lone parent's allowance rated many aspects of their programme more positively than others. For example, 97% of respondents in receipt of lone parent's allowance stated that their participation in their programme improved their confidence (compared to 87% of others); 90% stated that the programme helped them to identify jobs (compared to 81% of others); 87% said that it helped them to present themselves at interviews (compared to 74% of others); and 92% said that the programme gave them new job skills (compared to 84% of others). Equally, the opportunities for training that arose during their work experience was rated significantly more positively, as was the

instructor/trainer of the programme (90% compared to 82% of others) and the availability of equipment/facilities on the course.

More than one in four respondents (27%) in receipt of lone parent's allowance stated that they received a childcare allowance while attending their programme, compared to one in ten of others. Forty-one percent of those in receipt of the childcare allowance stated that it was a deciding factor in their participation on the programme (compared to 33% of others).

Furthermore, more than half of respondents in receipt of lone parent's allowance (52%) who obtained employment stated that they used the skills gained in the course all the time (compared to 32% of others). Finally, 63% stated that they would not have obtained their job without the FÁS programme, compared to 53% of others.

#### *NEAP clients*

Thirty-six percent of NEAP clients were in employment at the time of the survey. Eight percent were in FÁS or other education/training and 13% were in an employment programme. One in three (34%) were unemployed and 9% were on home duties/other. The rate of unemployment was significantly higher than for other clients.

NEAP clients reported significantly less benefits than other clients with regards to their FÁS programme. While 67% of non-NEAP clients reported that their confidence improved "a lot", the same was stated by 57% of NEAP clients. This was reported across many aspects: helped identify jobs (46% said helped "a lot" compared to 57% of others), taught how to present self at interviews, helped get a job, gave new job skills, and improved reading/writing skills (60% said "not at all" compared to 52% of others).

NEAP clients were also significantly less likely to state that the certificate they received was useful to them or that they used the skills gained from their FÁS programme (47% stated that their certificate was not useful compared to 34% of non-NEAP clients).

#### *Foreign nationals*

This year, respondents were asked what their nationality was, in order to determine whether there are significant differences in feedback and outcomes for non-Irish nationals. Nine percent of respondents were non-Irish nationals. Of these, a half were non-EU and a third were from the UK.

In terms of the employment situation of foreign nationals at the time of the survey, 46% were in employment, which is higher than the Irish employment rate of 39%. Eighteen percent of foreign nationals were in FÁS or other education/training (compared to 8% of Irish nationals) and 10% were on an employment programme (compared to 18% of Irish nationals). The unemployment rate was broadly similar – 18% compared to 21% overall. A lower proportion of foreign nationals were on home duties at the time of the survey – 9% compared to 15% of Irish nationals.

There were few significant differences in the responses to the other survey questions by foreign nationals. A higher proportion of foreign nationals received certification

from their FÁS programme (70% compared to 56% of Irish nationals); however, this can be attributed to the greater levels of participation in training rather than employment programmes. Two-thirds of the foreign nationals in the sample participated in training programmes compared to less than half (47%) of the Irish nationals. Foreign nationals also participated in further education/training after their FÁS programme more than their Irish counterparts – 53% compared to 27%.

Foreign nationals rated their programme significantly higher than Irish nationals in terms of helping to improve their reading and writing skills (31% said that it helped them “a lot” compared to 23% of Irish nationals). A breakdown of nationalities revealed that this was attributed to non-EU nationals from non-English speaking countries (i.e. excluding the U.S., Canada, Australia and South Africa) and nationals from the new EU-25 countries.

Foreign nationals also stated that they received the FÁS childcare allowance more so than Irish nationals (26% compared to 11% of Irish nationals). While 43% of Irish nationals stated that this allowance was a deciding factor in attending their programme, the same was stated by 12% of foreign nationals.

## **V Comparisons with Previous Surveys**

This final section presents some comparisons between the results from the current survey and those of earlier surveys. It should be noted that due to the change in when the fieldwork took place since 2002 care must be taken in making direct comparisons in some instances. Table 23 compares the results of the questions on the benefits received by participants from FÁS programmes. The programmes that are compared are Specific Skills Training, Community Employment and then a summary of all the programmes together. It is important to emphasise that the summary of all programmes reflects a varied mix of programmes over the years, and is therefore not strictly comparable.

In relation to Specific Skills Training (SST), there was a noticeable improvement in this year's survey in the proportion of participants who stated that the programme "helped them to get a job". There was a six percentage point decline in the proportion that stated that the programme gave them "new job skills" down from 94% to 88%. Eighty-one percent of SST participants felt that their course helped them to identify job opportunities, similar to the 82% found in the previous survey.

In relation to Community Employment (CE) the results showed that high scores were maintained in the area of giving people new job skills (82%). The trend in CE outstripping SSTs in identifying job opportunities over the last few years continued, with positive ratings from 84% of participants this year.

Overall the results of the later surveys show considerably more people reporting benefits than in the first few years of the survey.

<b>Table 23</b>				
<b>Comparison with previous surveys of Benefits of FÁS Programmes</b>				
<b>% Helped 'A Lot' or 'A Little'</b>				
	<b>Year</b>	<b>Specific Skills Training</b>	<b>Community Employment</b>	<b>All Programmes</b>
<b>Improved Confidence</b>	1990	85	60	74
	1992	89	72	81
	1994	83	57	76
	1996	85	70	75
	1997	87	75	78
	1998	86	86	86
	1999	86	86	86
	2000	88	86	86
	2001	90	89	89
	2002	87	90	89
	2003	89	92	91
	2004	89	94	92
		<b>2006/7</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Identify Job Opportunities</b>	1990	79	52	67
	1992	80	54	72
	1994	81	41	65
	1996	81	62	67
	1997	85	62	67
	1998	86	71	74
	1999	90	77	79
	2000	88	81	82
	2001	80	79	80
	2002	78	82	81
	2003	76	82	81
	2004	82	84	83
		<b>2006/7</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Helped Get a Job</b>	1990	61	17	40
	1992	56	19	44
	1994	52	17	38
	1996	66	30	45
	1997	78	34	45
	1998	75	44	50
	1999	78	47	54
	2000	78	54	59
	2001	71	51	60
	2002	54	48	51
	2003	51	56	54
	2004	58	49	52
		<b>2006/7</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>New Job Skills</b>	1990	87	35	58
	1992	92	50	79
	1994	89	37	68
	1996	90	62	72
	1997	93	63	70
	1998	89	76	78
	1999	96	75	79
	2000	91	77	80
	2001	91	82	84
	2002	92	82	84
	2003	91	83	85
	2004	94	82	86
		<b>2006/7</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>86</b>

Table 24 displays the employment status of the participants from 1994 to the current survey – whether they were working, unemployed, in FÁS/education or involved in home duties/other – in respect of four of the principal FÁS programmes (Specific Skills Training, Community Training Centres, Community Youth Training Programmes – now merged into Local Training Initiatives – and Community Employment).

Overall, the results from 1996 to 2000 were the most positive in terms of employment outcomes for all of the above programmes. Unemployment was the lowest in 2000 and 2001, and education/training/job scheme was at its highest in 2002. The downward trend in employment (and the corresponding increase in unemployment) that was evident in the survey results from 2000 to 2003 has halted. However, there are no clear trends evident across programmes from the most recent two surveys.

Community Youth Training Programmes no longer exist, having merged into Local Training Initiatives; therefore, information on Local Training Initiatives has been presented instead this year. Due to the change in the composition of the programme, changes in trends for this programme are not discussed; however the figures are displayed in Table 24 on the next page.

Employment outcomes across the other three programmes – Specific Skills Training, Community Training Centres and Community Employment – are very similar to the previous survey. For SST, this represents an improvement from 2002 and 2003 results; however, for CTCs and CE, the employment outcomes were at an all-time low in the previous survey and this report finds no particular improvement.

Unemployment rates have increased this year for Specific Skills Training (up from 19% to 23%) and for Community Training Centres (from 24% to 31%) but they have declined for Community Employment (from 23% to 20%). Unemployment is now at an all-time high for SST.

In terms of participants moving into education/training or a scheme, SST experienced a decrease this year (from 16% to 10%), as did CTCs (from 25% to 18%). Both programmes have reverted to pre-2002 levels (when both programmes experienced a surge in participants moving into further education/training). The proportion of CE participants moving into education/training or a job scheme increased this year to 36% (from 30% in the previous survey). This is a high level for CE.

Finally, in terms of participants on home duties at the time of the survey, the levels remained approximately the same over the past few years of surveys.

**Table 24**

**Employment Status - Comparison with Previous Years**

	At Work (%)								Unemployed (%)								Education/Training/Job Scheme						Home Duties/Other (%)									
	96	98	00	01	02	03	04	06	96	98	00	01	02	03	04	06	96	98	00	01	02	03	04	06	96	98	00	01	02	03	04	06
<b>SST</b>	75	72	75	64	54	54	59	58	15	14	8	17	19	19	19	23	7	9	8	7	15	18	16	10	3	6	8	11	10	10	6	9
<b>CTC</b>	37	38	56	43	45	43	40	41	45	41	21	25	20	35	24	31	10	14	15	17	27	13	25	18	7	7	8	14	9	9	11	11
<b>CE</b>	36	31	44	38	30	37	29	30	27	21	17	21	19	24	23	20	30	41	25	26	38	24	30	36	7	7	10	14	14	15	17	15
<b>LTI* (formerly CYTP)</b>	54	57	64	61	53	52	50	62	24	17	10	20	27	20	16	10	19	20	20	10	19	15	19	25	2	6	6	8	2	13	21	4

\*Community Youth Training Programmes (CYTP) merged with Local Training Initiatives in 2005. The results presented are for CYTP until 2004. The 2006 results are for Local Training Initiatives.

## VI People with Disabilities in Specialist Training

This section examines the training outcomes for people with disabilities who have left specialist training provision. The fieldwork for this follow-up survey of March – September 2005 leavers was carried out in January – June 2007 by the ESRI. The survey was conducted by face-to-face personal interviews. Similar surveys which monitor training outcomes within specialist training have been conducted in previous years. Participants who drop out of training prior to completion are included in the population frame. A response rate of 60% was achieved, resulting in 255 responses from an eligible population of 425. In some instances, therefore, the base totals ('n' amounts) are very small – this should be borne in mind when interpreting the survey findings.

The questionnaire used for this survey was changed substantially this year, bringing the questions in line with the main Follow-Up Survey while retaining the questions that were specific to specialist training. The results are differentiated by whether the training programme was an Introductory Skills Training or a Specific Skills Training course, with sections on customer satisfaction, the background status of participants and post-programme outcomes. The respondents are split almost equally between Introductory and Specific Skills Training. The tables also present the results from mainline FÁS training programmes where possible, in order to allow a comparison of results.

### Customer Satisfaction/Feedback

#### *Usefulness of Programme*

Respondents were asked how useful they found their programme. Overall, a half of respondents (49%) found their programme 'very useful' and a third (35%) found it 'quite useful'. One in ten found it 'not so useful' and 6% stated that it was 'no use at all'. The results for participants on Specific Skills Training were more positive than those from Introductory Skills Training courses – 53% found it 'very useful' compared to 43%. Similarly, while 7% of Specific Skills Training participants on Specialist Training Programmes found their course 'not so useful', this percentage doubled for participants on Introductory Skills Training (14%). The results are presented in Table 24 below.

Overall, the results were broadly similar to participants on mainline FÁS programmes.

<b>Usefulness of Programme (%)</b>				
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Very Useful</b>	<b>Quite Useful</b>	<b>Not so Useful</b>	<b>No Use</b>
Introductory Skills Training	43	37	14	7
Specific Skills Training	53	34	7	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	52	35	9	4

### *Non-completion*

The percentage of participants who did not complete their specialist training was very similar to those on mainline FÁS training programmes – 19% compared to 17%. The reasons given for not completing were quite different, however, and are displayed in Table 25 below. Four of ten participants on specialist training programmes did not complete their programme because of health reasons, compared to one in seven participants on mainline programmes. Furthermore, 4% of participants did not complete their programme to take up a job, compared to 31% of participants in mainline training.

<b>Participants who did not Complete their Programme</b>							
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Did not Complete</b>	<b>Reason (%)</b>					
		<b>To take Job</b>	<b>Health</b>	<b>Course was not Suitable</b>	<b>Other Training (not FÁS)</b>	<b>Other Training (FÁS)</b>	<b>Other</b>
Introductory	20	5	40	25	-	-	30
Specific	19	4	42	8	4	8	33
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>32</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>29</i>

### *Certification*

Three out of four participants on specialist training received a certificate. Looking only at participants who completed the programme, this figure increases to 91%. A higher proportion of participants on Specific Skills Training received a certificate compared to participants on Introductory Skills Training. Table 26 below presents the results.

A half of respondents who received a certificate stated that it was not useful to them in applying for jobs. Interestingly, receiving a FETAC certificate (80% of recipients) did not make a difference in rating the usefulness of the certificate.

<b>Certification of Programme Participants (%)</b>			
<b>% Receiving Certification</b>			
<b>Programme</b>	<b>All Participants</b>	<b>Participants who completed Programme</b>	<b>% of Cert. Recipients Stating Cert. Useful</b>
Introductory Skills Training	71	87	45
Specific Skills Training	78	93	58
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>50</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>63</i>

### *Benefits of FÁS Programme*

Participants were asked whether participation in their specialist training programme helped them in a number of different areas. The results are shown in Table 27 below. Nine out of ten participants stated that participation helped to improve their confidence ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’. Almost nine of ten participants (87%) stated that they learned new job skills. Three out of four participants (77%) stated that their

programme helped them to identify job opportunities. Four out of five participants (82%) felt that the programme helped to improve their interview skills. Less than half stated that their programme helped them to get a job (44%) and one in ten said it helped them to set up their own business. Approximately a half said that their course helped them with their literacy (54%) or numerical skills (47%).

These results were broadly similar for both Specific and Introductory Skills Training courses. Specific Skills Training rated higher in relation to aspects that were job-related such as identifying job opportunities (81% compared to 70%), helped to get a job (50% compared to 42%) and new job skills (89% compared to 82%).

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Improved Confidence</b>	<b>Identify Job Opportunities</b>	<b>Improved Interview Skills</b>	<b>Helped get a Job</b>	<b>Helped set up Own Business</b>	<b>New Job Skills</b>	<b>Literacy</b>	<b>Numerical Skills</b>
Introductory	87	70	80	42	14	82	52	40
Specific	90	81	82	50	11	89	52	49
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>47</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	88	81	76	58	11	86	44	39

#### *Satisfaction with Programme*

Participants were asked to rate on a five point scale how satisfied they were with various aspects of their programme. Table 28 presents the percentage of respondents who were either 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with a particular aspect. Eighty-five percent of participants were satisfied with the content of their course. Nine out of ten participants were satisfied with the equipment available on their course. Eighty-seven percent were satisfied with their instructor. The results were very similar for participants on both Introductory and Specific Skills Training courses.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Content of course</b>	<b>Equipment</b>	<b>Instructor</b>	<b>Prepared me for work</b>	<b>Opportunities for training during work</b>
Introductory	81	92	86	63	76
Specific	85	90	86	90	82
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>79</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	84	79	84	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>

Respondents were also asked to rate how satisfied they were that their course had prepared them for work. A significant difference emerged between Introductory and Specific Skills Training, as would be expected – 90% of participants on Specific Skills Training were satisfied that their course prepared them for work, compared to 63% of participants on Introductory Skills Training courses. Four out of five participants were satisfied with the training opportunities that arose during their work placements.

A final two questions were asked in relation to customer feedback regarding satisfaction with buildings. Ninety-three percent of respondents were satisfied with general access to the building where their course was held and 92% were satisfied with the physical condition of the building.

<b>Table 28b</b>		
<b>Satisfaction with Buildings (% 'Satisfied' or 'Very Satisfied')</b>		
<b>Programme</b>	<b>General Access</b>	<b>Physical Condition</b>
Introductory	93	90
Specific	93	93
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>

## **Background Status of Participants**

### *Education Background*

Table 29 below displays the educational background of participants on specialist training programmes. Some 5% of participants had gone to a special school for people with disabilities. Approximately a third (35%) had completed the Leaving Certificate and a half (49%) had not obtained the Leaving Certificate. One in ten participants had some form of third level qualification.

<b>Table 29</b>						
<b>Educational Qualification-Highest Educational Level Achieved</b>						
<b>(% participants)</b>						
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Junior Certificate</b>	<b>Special School</b>	<b>Leaving Certificate</b>	<b>Certificate/Diploma</b>	<b>Degree/Masters</b>
Introductory Skills Training	22	35	5	30	9	0
Specific Skills Training	12	31	4	38	10	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>8</i>

### *Prior Status*

Table 30 displays the background status of participants one month before commencing training. A half of participants (48%) were unemployed one month prior to starting at the training centre. Some 5% of participants were on another specialist training programme. One in ten were on a FÁS course or on an employment programme. Ten percent were employed and 13% were in school or college.

<b>Employment situation before FÁS programme (%)</b>								
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Working</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>	<b>CE/ Scheme</b>	<b>Centre</b>	<b>FÁS Course</b>	<b>School/ College</b>	<b>Home Duties</b>	<b>Other</b>
Introductory	12	51	1	3	6	13	9	6
Specific	7	46	2	6	10	14	3	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	22	43	2	<i>n/a</i>	3	12	14	5

## **Post-Programme Outcomes**

### *Current status*

Table 31 presents the economic status of respondents at the time of interview. The proportion of leavers who were in a job at the time of the survey stood at 28%. Sixteen percent of respondents were in FÁS training or an employment programme and one in ten had moved into non-FÁS training or education. Six percent of respondents were at a specialist training centre (including sheltered work) and 9% were on home duties/other. Three out of ten participants were unemployed at the time of the survey.

While the proportion in employment represents the lowest rates for Specialist Training Programmes in the past twelve years (although similar to the previous survey's rate of 29%), there has been an improvement in progression to non-FÁS training or education (up to 10% compared to 6% in the previous survey). There was an increase in the proportion of participants who stated that they were unemployed at the time of the survey (30% compared to 16% in the previous survey). This can be attributed to the decline in the percentage of respondents who stated they were "at home".

<b>Current Status of Participants (%)</b>						
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Working</b>	<b>At a centre (incl. Sheltered work)</b>	<b>FÁS</b>	<b>Other Training/Ed</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>	<b>Home Duties/ Other</b>
Introductory	25	9	19	9	33	6
Specific	30	3	16	13	26	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	48	<i>n/a</i>	7	9	22	13

### *Benefits and Allowances*

Respondents were asked what benefits, if any, there were in receipt of prior to starting their programme. One in five participants (21%) were not on any benefits. The majority were in receipt of some disability payment. The most common payment was Disability Allowance (32%), followed by Disability Benefit (25%) and Invalidity Pension (9%). Ten percent were on the Live Register and 2% in receipt of some other payment (e.g. supplementary welfare allowance). The results are displayed in Table 32 below.

<b>Social Welfare Benefits by Programme (% of Participants in receipt)</b>									
<b>Programme</b>	<b>UA</b>	<b>UB</b>	<b>DA</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>IP</b>	<b>LP</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Disability Payment</b>	<b>% None</b>
Introductory	6	7	34	21	8	0	1	63	23
Specific	2	4	31	27	10	5	3	69	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>21</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>22</i>	-	-	-	9	<i>11</i>	7	<i>39</i>

#### *Current status by previous status*

Table 33 displays the current situation of leavers compared to their situation prior to commencing at the training centre. The rows indicate the respondent's situation a month prior to starting at the training centre, while the columns indicate their situation at the time of the survey. It should be borne in mind that the numbers involved in some of the cells in the table are very low.

Two-fifths (39%) of the clients who were previously at a centre were employed at the time of the survey, and two-fifths were unemployed. Forty-three percent of respondents who were unemployed prior to attending the centre returned to unemployment – a fifth found work, a quarter were in FÁS or education/training. Almost a half of persons who were at home prior to training returned to home/other; however, almost a third went into employment (31%).

<b>Current Employment Situation by Prior Employment Status</b>					
<b>Present Situation (%)</b>					
<b>Previous Situation</b>	<b>Employed</b>	<b>Centre</b>	<b>FÁS/ Education</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>	<b>Home Duties/ Other</b>
Employed	50	8	29	13	0
Centre	39	8	15	39	0
FÁS/Education	32	4	35	25	5
Unemployed	20	8	26	43	3
Home Duties	31	3	15	8	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>

### **Leavers in a job**

#### *Use of Skills*

Fifty-nine percent of leavers in a job stated that they would not have their job without participating in the specialist training programme. This rate was higher for participants on Specific Skills Training (67%) compared to Introductory Skills Training (46%).

In terms of whether the skills gained from the training course were used in their first job, 23% said that they used their skills 'all the time', 28% said that they used them 'a lot' and 18% said they used them at least 'sometimes'. Thus, seven out of ten leavers in a job (69%) used their STP-imparted skills at least sometimes in their first job. In contrast to this, a fifth of respondents (22%) said that they never used their STP-imparted skills in their first job. The results are shown in Table 34 below.

<b>Use of Skills Acquired in Training in First Job</b>						
<b>Programme</b>	<b>All the time</b>	<b>A Lot</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>A Little</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>Job without Training? % (No)</b>
Introductory	27	19	22	5	27	46
Specific	21	31	14	14	19	67
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>59</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>50</i>

*Type of employment and contracts*

Thirty-seven percent of respondents obtained a job after their training programme. The level of employment progression was the same for both Introductory and Specific Skills Training courses. Seven out of ten participants (69%) obtained their job within three months of exiting their programme and nine of ten obtained their job within a year of exiting. Table 35 below displays the results.

In terms of the type of job obtained, the majority (61%) obtained part-time employment for their first job. The majority of leavers found permanent employment in their first jobs (57%).

A half of leavers in a job had a contract which they signed (48%). This figure was higher for participants on Specific Skills Training (56%) than Introductory Skills Training (41%) courses.

<b>First Job after FAS Programme (All Participants)</b>							
<b>Programme</b>	<b>% Total</b>	<b>% Jobs within 3 Months</b>	<b>% Jobs within 1 year later</b>	<b>% Full Time</b>		<b>% Part Time</b>	
				<b>Perm.</b>	<b>Temp.</b>	<b>Perm.</b>	<b>Temp.</b>
Introductory	37	75	88	27	11	22	41
Specific	36	62	91	34	10	34	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>34</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>9</i>

Just over a half of leavers in a job (54%) told their employer about their disability. Thirty percent did not. Ten percent stated that they did not have a disability and the remaining 6% were either self-employed or the employer already knew about their disability. The vast majority (88%) of respondents who had told their employer about their disability stated that it did not affect the way in which they were treated. Of the twelve percent who said that their treatment was affected, 17% said (or, 1% of all leavers) that disclosure of their disability had a negative impact on the way they were treated. It should be highlighted that the absolute numbers here are very small.

### Occupation/Industry

Table 36 displays the occupation of employment of leavers in a job. Almost a third (32%) of all workers were employed in clerical and secretarial positions and a fifth were (21%) were in personal and protective service positions. Thirteen percent were in sales and 11% in professional/technical occupations.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Agriculture</b>	<b>Managers, Executives</b>	<b>Professional Technical</b>	<b>Clerical</b>	<b>Skilled Workers</b>	<b>Production Operatives</b>	<b>Sales</b>	<b>Security, Personal Services</b>	<b>Labourers, Other</b>
Introductory	0	3	0	19	0	6	28	42	3
Specific	5	5	9	43	2	7	9	16	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>2</i>

### Employment by Gender

A greater percentage of women were in employment at the time of the survey than men (32% compared to 24%), as can be seen in Table 37 below. A greater percentage of men were in FÁS or other training/education, however – 32% compared to 20% of women.

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Male</b>					<b>Female</b>				
	<b>Employed</b>	<b>Centre</b>	<b>FÁS/Educ.</b>	<b>Unemp.</b>	<b>Home Duties/Other</b>	<b>Employed</b>	<b>Centre</b>	<b>FÁS/Educ.</b>	<b>Unemp.</b>	<b>Home Duties/Other</b>
Introductory	25	8	31	34	2	26	10	23	28	13
Specific	22	6	36	24	12	40	0	20	29	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>13</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>18</i>

### Salary

Table 38 presents the average hourly and weekly salaries of participants in their first job. In addition to the low rate of employment among participants, which reduces the number of responses, there were many missing cases in the responses to the questions on either the salary earned or the hours worked. Therefore, the results must be treated with caution as the number of responses is low. In comparison to the results from mainline training, the weekly earnings appear much lower. However, the hourly earnings show that much of the discrepancy is due to fewer hours worked by participants from specialist training programmes compared to mainline programmes.

<b>Average Hourly and Weekly Earnings, Net and Gross</b>				
	<b>Net Hourly</b>	<b>Gross Hourly</b>	<b>Net Weekly</b>	<b>Gross Weekly</b>
STP	€8.95	€9.30	€226.81	€228.02
Mainline	€9.96	€11.46	€336.37	€403.58

#### *Further Education/Training*

Just over a third of respondents (37%) had participated in further training or education after their Specialist Training Programme. This was higher for participants of Introductory Skills Training (44%) compared to Specific Skills Training (33%). Of those who attended further education/training, the majority participated in a course related to their training (64%). The last column of the table is the percentage of respondents who participated in further education/training that was at least somewhat related to their programme (24%). These results can be seen in Table 39 below.

<b>Further Training/Education after Programme</b>						
<b>Programme</b>	<b>Participated in Further Training/Ed (%)</b>	<b>Training/Ed Related to Programme (%)</b>				<b>Participated in related training/ed (%)</b>
		<b>Very related</b>	<b>Fairly related</b>	<b>Somewhat related</b>	<b>Not at all related</b>	
Introductory	44	20	18	22	40	26
Specific	33	29	27	12	32	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>24</b>
<i>Mainline</i>	33	33	15	16	37	21

#### *Awareness and usage of grants*

Participants were asked whether they were aware of a number of different grants aimed at people with disabilities, and if so, whether they had ever used them. The results are presented in Table 40 below. The highest level of awareness was found for Supported Employment, of which one-fifth of participants (22%) were aware. Of these, a third (35%) had partaken in a Supported Employment scheme. Just over one in ten participants were aware of the Wage Subsidy Scheme and the Workplace Equipment/Adaptation Grant. The latter grant was used by more participants than the former (17% compared to 9%). The other grants – Job Interview Interpreter Grants, Employee Retention Grant and Personal Reader Grant – had lower levels of awareness (less than 10%) and were not used by any of the applicants. The Job Interview Interpreter Grant and the Personal Reader Grants are aimed at people with specific disabilities; the grants are therefore not applicable to the majority of participants.

<b>Table 40</b>						
<b>Awareness and Usage of Grants</b>						
	<b>Aware(%)</b>			<b>Used (%)</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Supported Employment	22	77	2	35	57	8
Wage Subsidy Scheme	13	85	2	9	72	19
Workplace Equipment/Adaptation Grant	12	85	4	17	63	20
Job Interview Interpreter Grants	7	50	43	0	42	59
Employee Retention Grant	6	92	2	0	90	10
Personal Reader Grant	4	53	43	0	24	76