

Get Ready for Work Exit Pack

Evaluation Report for

**Scottish Enterprise Edinburgh
and Lothian**

Frontline Consultants

January 2005

1 Introduction

Get Ready for Work (GRfW) is a national employability programme aimed at the NEET client group; ie 16-18 year olds who are not in employment, education or training. This is a difficult group to engage, and positive outcome rates of 40% are viewed as a strong performance. Scottish Enterprise Edinburgh and Lothian (SE E&L) has a track record of high-performing national training programmes, and continually seeks ways to improve outcome rates.

SE E&L secured GRfW innovation funding to develop and pilot an aftercare pack for GRfW clients, to:

- improve positive outcome rates and job sustainability
- provide ongoing support once they have left the programme
- encourage them to re-engage with Careers Scotland
- re-engage negative leavers and encourage them to return, if appropriate

Frontline Consultants were commissioned to research, develop, design and produce the pack for a pilot in West Lothian. They were also commissioned to undertake the initial evaluation of the pilot, six months after the pack was introduced.

The pack design was based on consultation with current and former clients and the prototype was tested with clients before production. Clients were fully involved in specifying the design and content, to ensure it was closely aligned to their needs and preferences and taking account of shelf life and costs.

The pack was initially designed to be sent to the client after leaving GRfW (regardless of whether they left for positive or negative reasons). Latterly it was also decided that the pack's content may be a useful learning tool during the programme, so a smaller second pilot was established where the pack was used throughout the programme and then sent to the client after they left the programme.

2 Our Approach

2.1 Evaluation model

Our approach to this evaluation was to use a holistic model of evaluation to capture the total impact made by the pack. The Kirkpatrick model of summative evaluation was used, to attempt to measure four levels of impact:

2.1.1 Reactions – how did clients react to the pack; did they like it?

This is a particularly important aspect in this project; the client group are unlikely to read beyond the first page if their first impressions are negative. Positive reactions are an essential precursor to achieving the three deeper levels of impact.

2.1.2 Learning – what additional knowledge or skills did the client acquire from the pack?

If the client reacted positively and explored the pack, it is important to know what they learned from it. The pack has been designed to fill reported gaps in their knowledge, therefore at this stage we were looking for an increase in perceived knowledge. However, if recipients report that they didn't learn anything new, but were inspired by the pack to take action (see behaviours below) then this would still be a positive finding.

2.1.3 Behaviour – have clients put their learning into practice?

A positive finding at the Learning level is only effective if the client then puts their learning into practice. Otherwise, the improved knowledge is interesting, but so what? The pack is a call to action, to inspire young people to gain and succeed in employment; for the pack to be a success it must empower young people to apply their knowledge. If positive results are identified at the next level, it will generally be as a result of changed behaviours.

2.1.4 Results – what outcomes have been achieved?

This final level measures whether the desired results have been delivered, and the extent to which the pack contributed to those results. The raw target data will supply the numerical results, but this must be combined with qualitative evaluation of the additional impact of the pack, over and above the impact of the GRfW programme itself.

This model was used so that we could develop a detailed understanding of the impact of the pack and, perhaps more importantly, the reasons for this impact. At the pilot stage this enables lessons to be learned and amendments made prior to major roll-out. In the future, the lessons could be applied to other projects involving similar client groups, thereby maximising the value of the investment made in the GRfW exit pack.

2.2 Method of working

The evaluation consisted of the following key stages:

2.2.1 Stakeholder interviews

Telephone interviews with and feedback from key stakeholders to explore their perceptions of how the pack works, its impact on the client group and suggestions for improvements. Stakeholders included:

- SE E&L Get Ready for Work team
- SE National Get Ready for Work team
- SE Marketing team
- Careers Advisors
- Other professionals who received the pack

A list of those consulted is shown at Appendix 1.

2.2.2 Training provider interviews

We also conducted interviews with training providers involved in the two pilots, to find out their experiences of using and distributing the pack, the feedback they have received from clients and their suggestions for further improvements. It is very important to compare the experiences of training providers in the two pilots, as their approach to using the pack has been different. This feedback will be triangulated with feedback from clients, to ascertain the most appropriate method of use.

2.2.3 Client interviews

We were given a sample of 43 clients from the West Lothian pilot and 4 from the Midlothian pilot. The sample included an even mix of negative and positive leavers.

Of this sample, we were able to speak with 23 clients from West Lothian and 1 client from Midlothian.

Telephone interviews were used, as they provide greater depth and richness of information than a survey questionnaire and ensure a suitable response rate; this is also a more suitable method for engaging clients with low levels of educational attainment, as they are easily put off by a questionnaire.

The lines of questioning differed slightly for clients from each of the two pilots, to reflect the differences in distribution/use. The interview prompts for each group are shown at Appendix 2.

2.2.4 Data interrogation

Alongside the interviews we analysed target data supplied by Scottish Enterprise. We synthesised the data to provide an overview of the hard results being achieved by the training providers involved in the pilot. It is probably too early to see marked changes in positive outcomes as a result of the pack, however the information was then triangulated with the softer feedback from the interview programme, to identify any early trends in impact of the pack.

3 Findings and Emerging Themes

This section outlines the findings of each stage of the evaluation, highlighting the key themes that emerged from the various groups that were consulted.

3.1 Stakeholders

Our stakeholder findings are segmented according the following groups:

- **'strategists'** – key decision makers relating to GRfW, such as SE National GRfW team and SE National branding specialists
- **'technicians'** – professional staff who are involved in local delivery who have received a copy of the pack, such as careers advisers and LEC staff
- **training providers** – staff from the training organisations involved in the exit pack pilots

There was a great deal of commonality in our findings within a particular segment, but less so between segments. We highlight the key themes from each segment's feedback below.

3.1.1 Strategists

Content

Stakeholders told us that the use and customisation of pre-existing content (from Careers Scotland) was a very positive aspect of the pack; it was seen as maximising the use of existing information and reinforcing messages that Careers Scotland is trying to promote. They reported that the pack provided lots of good information in an easy to use format and that the text was information-dense but word-'lite' – this was one of the key requirements specified by the client group.

The subject of aftercare is being considered at a national level for GRfW, and it was suggested that it may be desirable to integrate the content of the pack into the suite of aftercare, subject to branding and design changes described below.

Engagement with the client group

Whilst the individuals we spoke to recognised the value of the work that had gone into understanding the needs of the client group, they reported that the findings from the design phase of the pack didn't necessarily align with findings from SE National's engagement with customers in relation to branding. Given the breadth of the client groups engaged with SE, the brand must reflect the totality of customer groups and channels rather than specific client groups or products. Consequently there will be instances where the brand doesn't align closely with a particular segment of SE's market. Our discussions also revealed that brand compliance was essential. Therefore, whilst the young people's views were seen as helpful feedback, there was little scope to reflect their feedback in the design of the pack where this conflicted with the brand guidelines. The pack did include some of the design devices from the brand guidelines, such as the swathe and logo on the box and the correct typeface; the client group had confirmed the acceptability and appeal of these during the design testing phase. However, there was a mismatch

between the expressed preferences of the client group and the brand guidelines when it came to designing the interior of the pack.

Branding

SE National staff expressed concern with the brand compliance of the pack, and stated that substantial redesign would be required if the pack were to be rolled-out beyond pilot phase. Whilst the people we spoke to recognised the importance of taking clients' views into account, they confirmed that the SE brand guidelines provide limited flexibility to meet this particular client group's needs. They reported that any design for this client group needs to be aligned with other products within the national programmes portfolio, to ensure a holistic approach to marketing to the client group.

The team did confirm that the approach to GRfW marketing materials was currently being refreshed, to allow a little more flexibility to be 'youth friendly'. This refreshment was being undertaken through a process of consultation. However, they do not anticipate sufficient latitude to retain the current design.

We also received positive feedback on the design of the pack. Notwithstanding the brand guidelines, it was reported that the pack did appear to be designed to appeal to the client group.

3.1.2 Technicians

The responses from professionals who had received the pack were generally very positive, with the product being viewed as an excellent tool for supplementing the GRfW provision. The key themes emerging from the discussions were as follows:

Content

The people we spoke to thought the use and customisation of pre-existing information (eg from Careers Scotland) was excellent, as it didn't reinvent the wheel and it reinforced the messages that Careers Scotland was trying to convey to the client group. They reported that it was easy to use and covered all the important topics that the client group might need to consider.

The information density was again highlighted as a positive feature, providing lots of information in a small number of words. This is seen as particularly important for this client group, where attention spans can be short and literacy levels low. One careers adviser shared the pack with colleagues from Adult Basic Education, who reported that the content would be useful for their purposes too.

Look and feel

Most comments on the look and feel of the pack were very positive, particularly around the use of colour and visuals. They reported that it 'looked the part' and was appealing to young people. They were particularly pleased that clients had been involved in the design of the pack.

Adult Basic Education also reported that the colours used in the pack were helpful for people with poor literacy levels, as there is evidence that they are easier to read than black text on white background, and the colour added interest and held the attention.

Some people wondered if the pack was too bulky and large, but recognised the need for the pack to be physically robust and the impact that a smaller size would have had on design and content.

Delivery mechanism

A small number of people that we spoke to were concerned that the process of sending out the pack after the client had left GRfW did not make best use of the content. They preferred the idea of introducing it during the programme and using it as support material (as in the Midlothian pilot). The content was seen as so valuable that it should be used as collateral throughout the GRfW experience.

3.1.3 Training Providers

We spoke to 3 of the 4 training providers involved in the West Lothian pilot:

- BLES
- Livingston Training Centre
- West Lothian College

We also approached the fourth provider, Oatridge College, but the relevant staff were unavailable for comment.

We also spoke to Midlothian Training Services (MTS) – the training provider running the Midlothian pilot.

The key themes emerging from these discussions are detailed below:

West Lothian

Three of the four West Lothian providers had been involved in the development and design of the pack, and therefore had a deep understanding of the purpose and content of the pack. They had been involved in planning the distribution method and had provided advice to the consulting team throughout the project. Our conversations with them were designed to ascertain how the pack was working in practice. Overall the feedback was very positive, with the following themes emerging:

- **Positive feedback from positive leavers** – positive leavers had been in touch to say how useful they had found the pack, as it helped them understand some of the issues associated with starting in their first job; for example, annual leave entitlements, minimum wage information. One training provider did make the point that the client's positive feeling about the pack may be associated with the client having a good experience on the programme and securing a positive outcome.
- **Distribution difficulties** – one provider reported that the distribution system was cumbersome and that they would prefer to give it to the client as they left, rather than posting it out. Other providers reported the process as reasonably straightforward and simple. Posting the pack to the client's home was one of the requests made during the focus groups, as young people reported an unwillingness to carry the pack with them and they also wanted to receive it at home to stimulate a discussion with their parent(s). All training providers also highlighted the challenge of

distributing the pack to clients who change their address and do not leave a forwarding address. Whilst this is not the case for the majority of clients, there is a significant minority in this situation and this may require a different approach. Whilst the providers recognised the challenge, alternative suggestions were not provided.

- **'Trailing' the pack** – two of the training providers suggested there may be added value in introducing the pack to the client at an earlier stage, eg induction and during the programme. There was a concern that young people may not realise the current and potential value of the pack unless they had been introduced to the concept in advance, and therefore may not derive maximum benefit from the pack. This is the approach being piloted in Midlothian.
- **Postage** – postage costs have turned out to be slightly higher than originally anticipated. Whilst the numbers involved in the pilot are small, this will need to be considered if the pack is to be rolled out to a larger audience.

Overall, training providers felt the pack was a useful supplement to the GRfW programme and that the development process – involving clients in determining the design and content – was very positive.

Midlothian

The pilot in Midlothian used a different approach, with the pack being used during job search sessions of the programme prior to sending it out when the client left. The purpose of integrating the pack into the job search sessions was to familiarise the clients with the pack so that they were more keen to look at it when they received it later.

MTS reported that the pack was a useful tool for the job search sessions for a number of reasons:

- provided useful numbers, which MTS contacted to obtain further information from some of the agencies listed in the pack
- encouraged a more structured approach to planning the job search sessions
- encouraged use of different approaches and materials – eg the Steps to Success materials from Careers Scotland, which provide information in manageable 'chunks'
- provided a structure for helping clients to think about themselves, their preferences and skills in the context of job search

MTS pointed out that the clients are not avid readers and therefore there was a better chance of them using the pack at a later date if they had already been introduced to it and experienced its value.

Overall, MTS found the pack very useful, and found it easy to build the job search sessions around the pack. The content was viewed as useful, and the fact that it followed a logical sequence was seen as a positive feature.

3.2 Clients

It is important to note that clients in the GRfW group are not the most verbally effusive. This means that the information they provided during their interviews tended towards the short and sharp. However, their responses gave us clear indications of their views and experience of the pack.

3.2.1 West Lothian Pilot

Of the 43 clients in the sample, we spoke to 22, of which:

- 16 were interviewed
- 3 couldn't remember the pack and did not wish to be interviewed
- 3 received the pack but didn't look at it, and therefore did not wish to be interviewed

Of the remaining clients in the sample:

- 1 was in hospital
- 20 numbers were no longer in use

The profile of the interviewees was as follows:

- 8 completers with a positive outcome (FE or job)
- 2 completers with no positive outcome yet
- 6 negative leavers, of which 1 was dismissed and the rest left of their own accord

This is a satisfactory response rate on which to base our conclusions as they relate to the sample. However the overall size of the sample is small, therefore the extent to which the findings could be extrapolated is limited. We would advise further evaluation in another 3-4 months in order to increase the sample size, and therefore the reliability of the conclusions.

The following themes emerged from the interviews:

Completers with a positive outcome

Perhaps inevitably, the positive completers were the most effusive about the pack. This may in part be due to their positive experience of GRfW and the fact that they achieved a positive outcome.

All stated that they thought it looked really good and they wanted to look at it straight away. Views were divided about the usefulness of receiving a pen. All had kept the pack and continued to refer to it.

Over half of the people we spoke to had shown the pack to their mum (and some to their dad too) and discussed it with them. This is a very important finding, especially where the young person comes from a workless household or still needs extra support to make the transition to work. 1 person had lent the pack to a colleague.

The most useful parts of the pack were cited as:

- the phone numbers (eg Careers Scotland)
- applying for work
- interviews
- checklists

Respondents told us that the pack was easy to navigate and “quick to get to the right pages”. They reported that it was concise, easy to read and appealing to look at.

Importantly not all of these completers had secured jobs when they received the pack. 5 of them stated that the pack helped them get their job, through the following:

- helping them think about how to find a job and how to prepare for interview
- building their confidence
- encouraging them to get back in touch with Careers Scotland, who then helped them get a job

Completers without a positive outcome

Of the 2 clients in this category, only 1 had looked at the pack. The other client stated that he intended to look at it, but hadn't got round to it yet.

Both were happy with the pack being sent to their home, and the client who had looked at it had discussed it with his mum, the importance of which should not be underestimated. He liked how the pack looked and was pleased to receive a pen.

The client who had looked at the pack stated that it was useful and he felt it would help him get a job. He was also engaged with Careers Scotland for help and advice. He had used the checklists and the advice on finding a job. He said he couldn't think of anything to improve the pack.

Negative leavers

Of the 6 negative leavers, 2 had since secured a job. 1 of them reported that the pack had been helpful in getting a job, particularly around preparing for interview.

The leaver who had been dismissed was annoyed at receiving the pack, because “I was asked to leave for something I didn't do” and didn't want to receive communication from the training provider. All the other negative leavers were positive about receiving the pack. Most of them mentioned that it was helpful to receive a pen.

4 of the 6 negative leavers showed their pack to their mum and discussed it. They were happy with the pack being sent to their home.

They reported that the most useful parts of the pack were the sections on finding a job and preparing for interview. They perceived interviews as being the trickiest part of the process.

2 negative leavers had re-engaged with Careers Scotland as a result of the pack, and 1 said the pack made him reconsider returning to GRfW although “I'm not sure why”.

The people we spoke to liked the way the pack looked and the subjects it covered. The only suggested improvement was the inclusion of recruitment agency contact numbers. Whilst this is a good idea in principle, it is probably not feasible for reasons of shelf-life and cost (rolling out to other areas would require different numbers, meaning each region would require a bespoke print run, adding substantially to the costs). An alternative solution might be to include numbers on the Careers Scotland website where they could be geographically tailored and updated as necessary.

3.2.2 Midlothian Pilot

Of the 4 clients in the sample, we were only able to interview 1. Of the remaining 3 clients:

- 1 number was not in use
- 2 did not wish to be interviewed

Obviously, this is a very small sample, and cannot be used to draw any meaningful conclusions. We would recommend repeating the evaluation in 3-4 months to increase the sample size. We would also advocate speaking to young people in training during the next wave of the evaluation, to gauge their views of using the pack in the classroom environment.

Notwithstanding the comments above regarding sample size and reliability, the interview revealed the following useful themes:

The client we spoke to was a negative leaver who had left the programme of his own accord. He remembered using the pack during GRfW sessions on job search, and reported that it had been a helpful tool during those sessions, helping him define his skills and think systematically about looking for a job.

He had kept all of the pack, and reported that he liked the way the pack looked. He had found the job search information the most useful, and particularly the advice on CVs. Since leaving, he has referred to this part of the pack to assist in his job search.

The client has been looking for work for 3 months now and stated that he feels 'a bit' confident that he will be able to get a job soon. However, he was unsure whether the pack would improve his chances of success.

We asked him for suggestions for improving the pack, but he didn't think it required any improvement.

He had not made contact with any of the agencies or numbers provided in the pack, but did ask us to arrange for Careers Scotland to contact him so that he could re-engage with their service.

3.3 **Data interrogation**

Performance data relating to each training provider were supplied for interrogation. The data measured the numbers of:

- leavers
- jobs
- clients in training

The data were provided for the period June to October for years 2003, 2004 and 2005. This enabled a comparison to be made between performance in past and current years, during the period that the pack has been used.

The numbers were further analysed, to show:

- total number of jobs in the period June – October in each year
- jobs as % of leavers per month (averaged over the period)

The tables below show the findings of this analysis:

Jobs in period Jun - Oct

	2003	2004	2005
BLES	11	7	18
LTC	10	22	17
Oatridge	n/a	0	4
MTS	5	30	20

Jobs as % of leavers (average per month for period Jun - Oct)

	2003	2004	2005
BLES	52	19	83
LTC	24	39	56
Oatridge	0	0	40
MTS	15	45	72

The tables show that all training providers have shown an improved rate of jobs as a percentage of leavers in the 2005 period against performance in 2003 and 2004. However, it is difficult to tell whether this improvement can be solely attributed to the GRfW exit pack; SE E&L has a strong focus on continuous performance improvement and supporting training providers to improve their positive outcome rates, therefore this may be the major cause of the performance improvement, with the pack being a secondary causal factor. Our difficulties in speaking to many of the leavers mean that we have only limited data on which to base any conclusions. However, the trends we observe among course completers who then secured a job after leaving suggest that the pack does play a role in improving job outcomes.

4 Conclusions

Our conclusions are presented below. The early indications on impact are positive. However, it is important to reiterate the importance of continued evaluation over the coming 3-6 months. The sample sizes are small and more data will be needed to enable firm conclusions to be drawn. Alongside continued evaluation, we would recommend extending the Midlothian pilot to 2 or 3 more training providers, so that accurate comparisons can be made between the Midlothian and West Lothian models of use.

4.1 Impact on clients

Despite the sample of clients being small, it would appear that the pack has had a positive impact on some clients; supporting them in their job search activities and boosting their confidence. It is interesting to note that the greatest impact appears to have been on course completers rather than negative leavers, and this is likely to be because the negative leavers have a negative association with GRfW and are therefore not as interested in the pack as those who have completed the course (regardless of whether or not they have already secured a job).

The key areas of impact appear to be in:

- supporting and enhancing job search activity
- building confidence
- signposting to other support, eg Careers Scotland

We also observe an improvement in positive outcome rates in the training providers involved in the pilot. Whilst these may be, in large part, due to performance improvements and management by SE E&L, the client feedback suggests that the pack may also be a contributory factor.

When thinking about how to use the pack in future, it is important to consider how to engage negative leavers with the pack more effectively. The suggestions about distribution and point of use below may resolve this issue.

4.2 Distribution/point of use

There are clearly some difficulties with distributing the pack at the end of the programme, especially when clients have changed address and/or failed to provide a forwarding address. Given the clients' keenness to have the pack sent to their home (feedback from the focus groups), and the extent to which receiving the pack has led clients to discuss it with their parents, this is a difficult issue to resolve. The benefits of sending it to the majority of clients' homes *may* outweigh the lost opportunity with a small minority, however the clients who change address are perhaps the most chaotic; therefore they may be the ones most in need of the pack. When considering a solution to this conundrum, it is important to remember that the clients who participated in the focus groups told us they were likely to throw the pack away if they were given it to take away with them.

There is also a perception that ‘saving’ the pack until the client has left the programme may present a lost opportunity in two ways:

- familiarity with the pack before leaving may encourage clients to read and use it when it arrives at their home
- use of the content during the programme may reinforce the learning for the client and improve their outcomes

At this stage, it may be valuable to extend the Midlothian model to another 2 or 3 providers, so that the value of using the pack during the programme can be further explored.

In addition, we advise that the West Lothian providers start to ‘trail’ the pack during induction and at exit, to promote its value and encourage the client to appreciate the value of the pack.

4.3 Look and feel

The clients and training providers provided extremely positive feedback about the look and feel of the pack. This was cited by clients as one of the principal reasons why they read, used and kept the pack.

The key areas of positive feedback were:

- ease of use and navigation
- concise but lots of good information
- looks bright, interesting and ‘cool’
- use of colour makes it appealing and interesting

Importantly, Adult Basic Education reported that the format, content and use of colour would also be highly applicable to their client group.

However, these positive comments need to be viewed in the context of the stakeholder perspectives on brand compliance. The current pack is non-compliant with SE brand guidelines and would require extensive redesign in order to be approved for network-wide roll out. The initial design phase for the pack included focus groups with the client group, who at the time reported very clearly what design devices would act as a ‘turn off’, including some of the current SE brand and design devices. Any redesign, to align with brand and design guidelines, would therefore need further testing with the client group, to establish if this continued to be the case.

Whilst we recognise that SE needs to preserve its brand integrity, the feedback from clients during the initial focus groups indicated that a pack which follows the brand guidelines may not be embraced by the client group. The evaluation indicates that the design of the pack was well-received by the client group. However, given that there was no comparator group (who received a pack which was SE brand compliant), it is not possible to confirm whether the design was the tipping point which made the client engage with the pack; for instance, we know from the evaluation that the very act of sending the pack to the client was also a very positive feature, building self esteem and interest.

SE are interested in the pack, in principle if not in current format, and anticipate a potential role for it in the aftercare strategy that is currently being developed. Given the comments above, it will be very important to rigorously test any redesigned pack, to ensure that it remains engaging to the client group. If the redesign results in a pack which clients do not engage with, there is a debate to be had about whether such a pack would be a worthwhile investment of public money.

There may be the option to explore working with Careers Scotland more closely to enable the pack to be delivered under their auspices; this may provide greater design and branding latitude.

4.4 Content

The content was viewed positively by all stakeholders and the vast majority of clients. The use of existing materials was seen as very positive in three ways:

- didn't reinvent the wheel
- reinforced messages from Careers Scotland
- potential vehicle for providing standardised GRfW materials to the client group (and to providers as a learning resource)

We therefore propose that the content remains unchanged at this stage. However, it may be appropriate to consider other packaging options for this content, for those negative leavers who have not responded well to the pack.

4.5 Summary

In summary, the pack appears to be delivering positive impact, although the extent of this will need to be confirmed following further evaluation of a larger sample. Training providers find the pack a useful tool for their clients, and it can be helpful in structuring and delivering elements of the GRfW programme. Similarly the majority of clients were pleased to receive the pack and found it helpful – particularly the completers group.

The key challenges going forward will be:

- engaging negative leavers more effectively
- considering how to use the pack during the programme to improve usage and impact
- reconciling the SE branding compliance issues with the stated preferences of the client group (and the risk to impact of failing to reflect these preferences)

Stakeholders providing feedback for the evaluation

Strategists

Marie Burns	Scottish Enterprise
Sandra McIntyre	Scottish Enterprise
Mark Newlands	Scottish Enterprise

Technicians

Cathy Bain	Careers Scotland – written comments
Dawn Bartwicki	Scottish Enterprise
Fiona Grubb	Careers Scotland – written comments
Susan McGonigle	Careers Scotland
Joy Mill	Scottish Enterprise
Helen Millen	Scottish Enterprise
Elsbeth Robertson	Careers Scotland
Martin Mowatt	Careers Scotland – written comments

Training Providers

Rhonda Brown	West Lothian College
Trevor Easton	Livingston Training Centre
John Ewart	BLES
Kay Sterricks	Midlothian Training Services

Appendix 2

Client interview prompts

INTERVIEW PROMPTS – WEST LOTHIAN PILOT

Name:
Reason for leaving GRfW (supplied by training provider):
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completer, no job yet• Completer, got a job• Completer into FE• Negative leaver, left of own accord• Negative leaver, dismissed
Date of leaving:
Length of time on GRfW:
Current status: employed/in training/looking for work/other

What did you think of the pack?

- how it looked
- pen
- book
- case

How did you feel about getting a pack when you left Get Ready for Work?

What did you think about it being sent to your house?

- did you show it to anyone else in the house?
- what did they think of it?
- did you talk about it?

Have you kept it?

- all of it?
- part of it? which part?
- if not why not? what would have made you keep it?

If they kept it:

- what do you like about it?
- what don't you like about it?
- what could we do to make it better?
- which sections did you look at?
- do you still use it?

How useful was the information in the pack?

- which bits were most useful?

Did it cover issues that interested you?

Did it tell you anything new, or was it stuff you already knew about?

Did you use any of the advice in the pack?

- eg how to look for a job?
- information about being at work?
- checklists

How did it help you?

Do you think you would have done the same if you hadn't had the pack?

Did you take up any of the contacts in the book?

Eg Careers Scotland

- Helplines

If negative leaver: did it encourage you to give Get Ready for Work another try?

- if not, why not?
- if yes, why?

Do you still look at the pack?

- which bits do you look at?

If working:

Do you think that getting the pack played a part in you getting your job?

- why?
- what did it do for you?

How helpful has it been since you started work? Have you referred to it at all?

- which parts?
- how did it help?

If not working:

How confident do you feel about getting a job?

Do you think the book will help you get a job?

- why?
- are you using any of the advice in the pack to help you find a job?
- are you in touch with Careers Scotland?
- if not, would you like us to get someone from Careers Scotland to call you?

Is there anything that you would have liked to know about jobs/work that wasn't in the book?

INTERVIEW PROMPTS – MIDLOTHIAN PILOT

Name:

Reason for leaving GRfW (supplied by training provider):

- Completer, no job yet
- Completer, got a job
- Completer into FE
- Negative leaver, left of own accord
- Negative leaver, dismissed

Date of leaving:

Length of time on GRfW:

Current status: employed/in training/looking for work/other

What did you think of the pack?

- how it looked
- pen
- book
- case

How did you feel about using the pack during the Get Ready for Work programme?

- was it helpful?
- what kind of information did you find most valuable?
- did it help you think about finding a job?
- how did you use it during the programme?

Have you kept it?

- all of it?
- part of it? which part?
- if not why not? what would have made you keep it?

If they kept it:

- what do you like about it?
- what don't you like about it?
- what could we do to make it better?
- which sections did you look at?
- do you still use it?

Did the pack cover issues that interested you?

Did it tell you anything new, or was it stuff you already knew about?

Did you use any of the advice in the pack?

- eg how to look for a job?
- information about being at work?
- checklists

How did it help you?

Do you think you would have done the same if you hadn't had the pack?

Did you take up any of the contacts in the book?

- Eg Careers Scotland
- Helplines

Do you still look at the pack?

- which bits do you look at?

If working:

Do you think that getting the pack played a part in you getting your job?

- why?
- what did it do for you?

How helpful has it been since you started work? Have you referred to it at all?

- which parts?
- how did it help?

If not working:

How confident do you feel about getting a job?

Do you think the book will help you get a job?

- why?
- are you using any of the advice in the pack to help you find a job?
- are you in touch with Careers Scotland?
- if not, would you like us to get someone from Careers Scotland to call you?

Is there anything that you would have liked to know about jobs/work that wasn't in the book?