

WHSCC

Client Satisfaction Survey 2006

Executive Summary

**Prepared by Omnifacts Bristol Research
December 2006**

Table of Contents

A. Executive Summary	2
1.0 Safety	2
2.0 Service	3
2.1 Awareness Index	3
2.2 Satisfaction Index	4
2.3 Satisfaction with Case Managers	5
2.4 Time to Receive First Benefit Payment	5
3.0 Improving Satisfaction	6
3.1 Understanding the Dissatisfied Injured Worker	6
3.2 Understanding the Expectations of Registered Employer	6
4.0 Return to Work	7
5.0 Efficiency	9
B. Client Satisfaction Indices and Trends	10
1.0 Client Satisfaction Index	10
2.0 Performance Index	12
3.0 Case Management Index	15
4.0 Awareness Index	16
5.0 Trends	19
5.1 Overall Familiarity with WHSCC Programs and Services	19
5.2 Satisfaction with Contacts with the WHSCC	19
5.3 Information about WHSCC Programs and Services	20
5.4 Quality of the Information Provided by the WHSCC	20
5.5 WHSCC Online	21
5.6 Health and Safety Policies and Procedures in the Workplace	22

A. Executive Summary

This is the eighth year of the WHSCC Satisfaction Survey. To provide a clearer understanding of how the WHSCC is doing with respect to its strategic goals, the executive summary presents key findings according to four of these goals; safety, service, return-to-work and efficiency.

1.0 Safety

A very high proportion of registered employers, non-registered employers, injured workers, as well as the general workers population agreed that the programs and services of the WHSCC promote the prevention of workplace accidents.

Tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with the following statements: Summary Results: % indicating 'Completely Agree or Mostly Agree'				
	2006			
	Injured Workers	General Workers	Registered Employers	Non-registered Employers
Total (N)	801	382	267	200
The programs and services of the WHSCC promote the prevention of workplace accidents	83%	90%	84%	89%

More workers received health and safety training in 2006. This has been recorded among the injured workers population, the general workers population and the non-registered employers. It is among registered employers that we find the highest proportion (82%), and it has remained constant since last year.

Does your workplace provide workers with training on how to safely perform their job? Summary Results: % indicating 'Yes'		
	2005	2006
Injured workers	61%	71%
General workers population	65%	75%
Registered employers	83%	82%
Non-registered employers	49%	72%

Non-registered businesses were more aware of the inspection services and accident prevention services provided by the WHSCC in 2006 than ever before.

Executive Summary

Among registered employers, the awareness level has been very high for the last two to three years.

WHSCC provides accident prevention services							
	5-year average	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured Workers	51%	50%	43%	53%	54%	55%	54%
General Workers	59%	50%	59%	64%	60%	61%	55%
Registered Employers	80%	74%	78%	77%	85%	86%	88%
Non-registered Employers	61%	51%	61%	69%	63%	63%	73%

WHSCC conducts OHS inspections							
	5-year average	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured Workers	62%	61%	57%	63%	64%	63%	66%
General Workers	68%	65%	67%	71%	70%	66%	68%
Registered Employers	82%	83%	82%	78%	80%	85%	84%
Non-registered Employers	66%	58%	69%	70%	68%	64%	77%

2.0 Service

2.1 Awareness Index

On average, awareness of the WHSCC and its programs and services among all client groups as expressed by the Awareness Index was good at 75%, and has been stable since 2003.

Awareness was highest among registered employers, and especially so among larger companies. It reached 77% among non-registered employers in 2006, back to the peak level recorded in 2004. It has been stable among injured workers since 2003 at 71%. On the other hand, it has been steadily declining among the general workers population from 75% in 2003 to 69% in 2006.

Awareness Index	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured Workers	68%	66%	65%	70%	72%	72%	71%
General Worker Population	61%	65%	72%	75%	75%	71%	69%
Registered Employers	78%	78%	80%	81%	87%	84%	82%
Non-registered Employers	62%	61%	71%	77%	74%	69%	77%
Average All Client Groups	67%	68%	72%	76%	77%	74%	75%

Awareness of the WHSCC as an organization was rather low (approximately 40% of the general workers population and injured workers prior to their most recent claim). However, when probed on specific services, respondents stated much higher awareness levels, reaching 79% for wage loss replacement benefits among the general workers population. This may reflect the fact that the WHSCC's services were better known than the organization itself.

Executive Summary

This section examines the link between satisfaction and familiarity with the WHSCC. The figure below illustrates that those who were more familiar with the WHSCC before their accident, were more likely to have a satisfactory experience when dealing with the WHSCC¹.

2.2 Satisfaction Index

Satisfaction with the WHSCC among injured workers and registered employers as expressed by the Client Satisfaction Index has been at approximately the same levels since 2000.

Client Satisfaction Index (Weighted)							
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured Workers	82%	83%	81%	81%	87%	82%	81%
Registered Employers	86%	86%	85%	86%	85%	84%	84%

Generally speaking, registered employers were very satisfied with the performance of the WHSCC, even more so than the injured workers group, with notably smaller percentages classified as *not at all satisfied* and *less than average satisfaction*.

A new Performance Index was developed to help better understand trends identified through regression analysis in 2006. The primary difference between the performance index and the traditional weighted satisfaction index is that:

- The traditional weighted satisfaction index will incorporate attribute satisfaction even if the attribute is deemed 'not at all important' (though it will carry less weight).
- The PI only uses attributes that are rated critically important in the overall satisfaction score.²

2006 Performance Index Categorized (% in each Category)		
	Injured Workers	Registered Employers
Not At All Satisfied	8%	1%
Less than Average Satisfaction	18%	7%
Average Satisfaction	27%	43%
Mostly Satisfied	23%	19%
Fully Satisfied	24%	30%
Total	100%	100%

¹ "Fully Satisfied" is the strongest satisfaction category of PI.

² More information on the Performance Index can be found in "Indices and Trends" section.

In 2006, stakeholders had a more positive perception of the satisfaction of injured workers and registered employers, and this better reflected the actual levels of satisfaction from these groups.

2.3 Satisfaction with Case Managers

A decline was recorded in the satisfaction levels of injured workers with case managers between 2004 and 2006. However, satisfaction as expressed by the Case Management Index remained high at 80%.

Case Management Index	
Injured workers – 2006	80%
Injured workers – 2005	81%
Injured workers – 2004	85%

The mere presence of a case manager did not impact satisfaction levels, however, for injured workers who were assigned a case manager, satisfaction with the case manager drove overall satisfaction with the WHSCC.

Of all service attributes, regression analysis demonstrated that the strongest driver of overall satisfaction with case managers was “My case manager treats me with respect”.

Other key drivers were “My case manager cares about my needs” and “My case manager keeps me up-to-date”. In 2006, one-third of injured workers reported that their case manager did not keep them up to date. A strategy to improve overall satisfaction could focus on ensuring that case managers improve this particular aspect of service.

Injured workers with long-term disability/pension were notably less satisfied with all service attributes as compared to other injured workers. Nevertheless, 74% of them were satisfied with the quality of service they received from the WHSCC.

2.4 Time to Receive First Benefit Payment

Injured workers were satisfied with the amount of time it took to receive their first benefits:

Satisfaction with Time Required to Receive First Benefits (Those completely or mostly satisfied)							
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured workers	70%	71%	71%	78%	78%	83%	80%

3.0 Improving Satisfaction

3.1 Understanding the Dissatisfied Injured Worker

Demographically, the *dissatisfied* injured workers group (as defined by the Performance Index³) was quite different from those workers who were satisfied, as well as the population of injured workers as a whole. They were more likely to be older males on long-term disability, with a lower income, and still receiving wage loss benefits. It was also found that the *dissatisfied* injured workers group were more likely to have filed an appeal and/or have their employment terminated.

Nearly all aspects of service were perceived to be critically important by most injured workers. For the *satisfied* injured workers group, all aspects of service was noted to be fairly equal in importance. However, for the *dissatisfied* injured workers group there was some variance. The most important service attributes for dissatisfied workers (rated as critically important by 90% or more) included:

- Amount of benefits received;
- Fairness in handling claim;
- Accuracy of the information received;
- Willingness to listen; and
- Understanding of your needs.

For the dissatisfied injured workers group, some of the more notable areas of dissatisfaction included:

- Feeling that WHSCC was helpful in working with their employer to assist in return to work and in general (in helping injured workers recover from their workplace injuries);
- Agreeing that the WHSCC is effectively run; and
- Agreeing that the compensation provided to injured workers is reasonable.

When asked what the WHSCC could do to improve service, injured workers who were dissatisfied were much more likely to suggest the improvement of communication, as well as the WHSCC being more willing to listen to them.

3.2 Understanding the Expectations of Registered Employer

The following trends were identified during the analysis of satisfaction of registered employers:

- Information is important - having reviewed the WHSCC guide or having received any information from the WHSCC on services and programs offered to employers was linked to higher satisfaction.
- Higher satisfaction levels were correlated with more positive perceptions of the WHSCC on the following attributes:

³ More information on the Performance Index can be found in "Indices and Trends" section.

Executive Summary

- Helping injured workers recover from their work place injuries;
 - Helping employers to meet their legislated obligations under the *Workers' Compensation Act* and the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*; and
 - Programs and services promoting the prevention of workplace accidents.
- Contact with WHSCC staff in of itself does not appear to be linked to satisfaction.

4.0 Return to Work

Awareness of the WHSCC return to work services has significantly increased among non-registered employers in 2006. It has been very high among registered employers since 2004. Awareness is lower among injured workers and the general population. A slight decrease in awareness was recorded among the general workers population in 2006.

WHSCC provides return to work services	5-year average	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured Workers	54%	43%	46%	55%	62%	64%	63%
General Workers	60%	53%	63%	62%	62%	62%	56%
Registered Employers	80%	73%	78%	79%	84%	87%	85%
Non-registered Employers	60%	46%	60%	68%	66%	58%	79%

The proportion of registered employers who said the WHSCC programs and services allowed injured workers to return to work was very high at 96%. It was also very high among injured workers although a slight decrease was recorded in 2006.

WHSCC programs and services allow injured workers to return to work*?				
	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured workers	94%	87%	95%	91%
Registered employers	90%	85%	94%	96%

* Excluding those who responded, "don't know".

The self-reported proportion of injured workers returning to work after their injury has declined to 73% in 2006 from 80% in 2003. It was near the lowest level recorded in 2001 (72%). The proportion of injured workers who agreed that the WHSCC was helpful in assisting their return to work has also declined since 2004.

Executive Summary

Return to Work							
Injured Workers	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
% Returning to work after most recent injury	79%	72%	82%	80%	75%	75%	73%
% Who agreed that WHSCC was helpful in working with the accident employer in assisting in return to work*	65%	76%	80%	78%	86%	82%	79%
* Excluding those who responded "don't know"							

Regression analysis showed the perception of how helpful the WHSCC was in assisting return to work, was strongly linked to overall satisfaction.

Nearly all injured workers and registered employers agreed that WHSCC programs and services allow injured workers to return to work:

WHSCC Programs and Services Allow Injured Workers' Return to Work*?				
	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured workers	94%	87%	95%	91%
Registered employers	90%	85%	94%	96%
* Excluding those who responded "don't know"				

Employers were asked whether the programs and services offered by the WHSCC were helpful in enabling them to meet their legislated obligations. The gap that existed at one time between registered employers and non-registered employers has narrowed in such a way that the groups shared in 2006 a similar opinion about this statement.

WHSCC Helpfulness in Enabling Registered Employers to Meet Their Legislated Obligations							
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Registered employers	86%	81%	-	77%	80%	89%	85%
Non-registered employers	68%	67%	66%	72%	69%	71%	81%

54% of injured workers reported their employer did not offer to modify their job to enable them to return to work while taking part in rehabilitation. 45% of injured workers were not even aware that employers were required to offer such changes by the Human Rights Legislation.

5.0 Efficiency

WHSCC's overall effectiveness was one of the questions that surveyed groups were less likely to agree with. No major trend can be reported as the perception has slightly improved among non-registered employers, slightly declined among injured workers and remained stable among the two other groups.

Tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree that the WHSCC is effectively run: Summary Results: % indicating 'Completely Agree or Mostly Agree'		
	2005	2006
Registered employers	70%	68%
Non-registered employers	51%	56%
Injured workers	74%	70%
General workers population	62%	59%

Satisfaction with the amount of benefits provided to workers was fairly high for both injured workers and registered employers, but declined slightly in 2006. On the other hand, the stakeholders' perception of the satisfaction of injured workers and registered employers with the amount of benefits has significantly increased in 2006, but was still lower than the actual levels of satisfaction.

Satisfaction with amount of benefits (Those completely or mostly satisfied)	2005	2006
Injured workers	70%	66%
Registered employers	77%	73%
Stakeholders' perception of injured workers' satisfaction	33%	48%
Stakeholders' perception of registered employers' satisfaction	56%	70%

Registered employers were more satisfied with assessment rates in 2006 than they have been since 2000.

Satisfaction with assessment rates (Those completely or mostly satisfied)	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Registered employers	71%	68%	65%	62%	64%	65%	73%

B. Client Satisfaction Indices and Trends

1.0 Client Satisfaction Index

Methodology

The Client Satisfaction Index (CSI) was calculated for injured workers by obtaining the average level of satisfaction (1 - Completely Dissatisfied, 2 - Mostly Dissatisfied, 3 - Mostly Satisfied, 4 - Completely Satisfied) from each of the following:

- Level of understanding;
- Fairness;
- Effective problem solving;
- Accuracy of information;
- Amount of benefits;
- Level of communication;
- Timeliness of handling of claims;
- Willingness to listen;
- Promptness of service;
- Respect;
- Competence; and
- Professionalism.

The index is weighted, taking into account the rated level of importance injured workers placed on each service attribute.

The same method was used to calculate the CSI for registered employers with the exclusion of fairness, amount of benefits, and timeliness of handling claims.

Findings

Satisfaction levels were high, all exceeding 80% although the slight decline that was initially observed in 2005 continued in 2006, bringing satisfaction back to levels similar to 2002. However, the satisfaction levels in 2006 were not out of scope from those observed between 2000 and 2004.

Client Satisfaction Index (Weighted)							
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured Workers	82%	83%	81%	81%	87%	82%	81%
Registered Employers	86%	86%	85%	86%	85%	84%	84%

Injured Workers Satisfied with WHSCC Service (by Attribute*)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Demonstrates Competence	87	91	90	88	92	89	88%
Demonstrates Professionalism	89	92	91	91	91	91	90%
Shows Respect	90	90	89	88	91	90	88%
Provides Accurate Information	85	90	87	89	90	89	86%
Handles Claims in Fair Manner	84	85	86	87	89	89	85%
Promptness in Providing Service	85	86	85	86	89	88	88%
Willingness to Listen	85	89	86	85	88	86	86%
Understands Your Needs	82	85	86	85	87	88	83%
Handles Claims in Timely Manner	77	85	81	82	88	84	85%
Effectively Handles Your Problems	83	87	82	84	87	86	82%
Keeping You Informed and Up to Date	85	88	81	81	85	82	83%
Provides an Appropriate Amount of Benefits	79	76	75	77	83	81	78%
*NOTE: Don't know and refusals excluded							

Registered Employers Satisfied with WHSCC Service (by Attribute)							
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Demonstrates Professionalism	99	98	96	97	98	96	97%
Willingness to Listen	91	97	93	95	97	94	95%
Provides Accurate Information	97	97	97	96	97	96	98%
Shows Respect	98	98	95	96	97	95	97%
Demonstrates Competence	98	96	95	96	96	95	97%
Effectively Handles Your Problems	93	97	92	92	96	92	97%
Understands Your Needs	92	94	93	94	96	92	92%
Promptness in Providing Service	95	97	95	92	95	96	97%
Keeping You Informed and Up to Date	91	93	91	93	95	92	95%

2.0 Performance Index

A new Satisfaction Index was created in 2006 to measure critical expectations and performance.

Looking at attribute satisfaction ratings without the context of attribute importance can often lead to misinterpretation of satisfaction results.

Should a high attribute satisfaction score for a respondent who doesn't rate that attribute as critical, be as meaningful as a high attribute satisfaction score for a respondent who does indicate the attribute to be critical?

Based on a series of attributes where the respondent was to first indicate its importance, and then rate WHSCC performance on each, a Performance Index (PI) was created that measures a respondent-level satisfaction score of WHSCC that is based on satisfaction in context of critical expectations. More specifically, a respondent's PI score will only be based on satisfaction ratings of attributes that they have noted as "critically important."

The Performance Index (PI) creates a respondent-level satisfaction score of WHSCC that is based on satisfaction in context of critical expectations. More specifically, a respondent's PI score will only be based on satisfaction ratings of attributes that they have rated as 'critically important'.

Each respondent receives a PI score that ranges from “0” to “3”, where “0” means Extremely Poor Satisfaction (not satisfying expectations in any way) and a “3” means Excellent Satisfaction (completely satisfying expectations). From this, mean summary statistics can be presented on overall IW performance as well as any key group of respondents.

This index has then been categorized into five segments of performance to more easily understand how well WHSCC is doing overall. These categories were created by partitioning the 0 to 3 scale as follows:

- 0 to 0.99 Not at All Satisfied;
- 1 to 1.99 Less than Average Satisfaction;
- 2 to 2.49 Average Satisfaction;
- 2.5 to 2.99 Mostly Satisfied; and
- 3 Fully Satisfied.

Mean Index Results

This index can be expressed on a continuous scale from “0” to “3”, where “0” means *Extremely Poor Satisfaction* (not satisfying expectations in any way) and a “3” means *Excellent Satisfaction* (completely satisfying expectations).

As the PI is created at the respondent level, the index can be used across any group or segment of respondents. As well, an index has been created for injured workers and registered employers. The table below provides a summary of mean PI for 2005 and 2006 for each surveyed group.

Mean PI by Client Group 2005 and 2006				
PI Mean Values (Range 0 - 3)				
	Injured Workers		Registered Employers	
	2005	2006	2005	2006
Mean	2.28	2.23	2.35	2.42

For the most part, the Injured Workers’ and Registered Employers’ PI values were unchanged this year. Slight changes can be observed between 2006 and 2005 but they are not statistically significant.

Making the Index More Meaningful

Comparing the mean PI scores across groups can be insightful. This index has been categorized into five segments of performance to more easily understand how well WHSCC is doing overall, across certain segments, and for various aspects of its service delivery. The table below provides an overview for 2005 and 2006.

**Performance Index Categorized
(% in each category)
2005 and 2006**

	Injured Workers	Injured Workers	Registered Employers	Registered Employers
	2005	2006	2005	2006
Not at All Satisfied	5%	8%	2%	1%
Less than Average Satisfaction	19%	18%	8%	7%
Average Satisfaction	29%	27%	43%	43%
Mostly Satisfied	21%	23%	17%	19%
Fully Satisfied	26%	24%	30%	30%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Viewed in this way, the categorized Injured Workers' PI suggests that injured workers' satisfaction was stable as the distribution was not statistically different from 2005 to 2006. Similarly for the Registered Employers' Index, the distribution was not statistically different from 2005 to 2006.

Selected Results by PI Categorized — Injured Workers 2006

The tables that follow show the relationship between PI satisfaction levels and the different aspects of service provided by the WHSCC. More specifically they illustrate that:

- Satisfaction with the WHSCC was clearly linked to the awareness levels beforehand;
- The frequency of contact did not correlate with satisfaction, but the experience clearly did;
- There was no correlation between satisfaction and whether or not an injured worker was assigned a case manager; however, for those who had a case manager, the level of service they provided was directly linked to the overall satisfaction with the WHSCC; and
- Employers' satisfaction was clearly linked to how helpful the WHSCC was in working with the employer in assisting the post-injury return to work.

3.0 Case Management Index

The Case Management Index was developed to better understand injured workers' satisfaction with case management services. The Case Management Index is an average of injured workers' agreement (1 - Completely disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Agree, 4 - Completely Agree) with the following case management statements:

- My case manager knows all about my case;
- When I leave a telephone message, my case manager usually returns my call promptly, within one working day;
- My case manager has provided me with a clear understanding of my benefits;
- My case manager cares about my needs;
- My case manager keeps me up to date;
- My case manager provides me with accurate information;
- My case manager treats me with respect;
- My case manager demonstrates a willingness to listen; and
- My case manager demonstrates professionalism.

Findings

Injured workers were satisfied with WHSCC programs and services. In fact, their satisfaction level far exceeded what stakeholders thought it was. This implies that communications efforts could significantly improve the stakeholders' perception of the WHSCC. Additional information can be found in the section on stakeholders and their perception of the satisfaction of injured workers and employers.

Case Management Index	
Injured workers – 2006	80%
Injured workers – 2005	81%
Injured workers – 2004	85%

As can be seen in the table below, the satisfaction level of injured workers with their case manager has steadily increased on all aspects from 2003 to 2005.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
My case manager knows all about my case	82%	81%	82%	79%	82%	88%	87%
When I leave a telephone message, my case manager usually returns my call promptly, within one working day	73%	80%	74%	70%	74%	82%	80%
My case manager has provided me with a clear understanding of my benefits	82%	75%	76%	69%	77%	79%	80%
My case manager cares about my needs	82%	75%	72%	75%	76%	80%	79%
My case manager keeps me informed and up to date	73%	70%	71%	67%	72%	75%	71%
My case manager provides me with accurate information	-	-	-	-	80%	86%	82%
My case manager treats me with respect	-	-	-	-	86%	87%	87%
My case manager demonstrates a willingness to listen	-	-	-	-	83%	86%	85%
My case manager demonstrates professionalism	-	-	-	-	86%	89%	89%
Don't know and refusals have been excluded							

Note: The above table presents for each statement, the proportion of injured workers who *completely agreed* or *mostly agreed*. The slight decline in satisfaction showed in the Case Management Index reflects the fact that in 2006 a higher proportion of injured workers *mostly agreed* with the statements as compared to 2004 where more injured workers *completely agreed* with the same statements.

4.0 Awareness Index

Methodology

The Awareness Index was calculated to reflect each client group's overall awareness of the WHSCC programs and services. It was an arithmetic average of the clients' awareness to specific programs and services including:

- Providing injured workers with money for lost employment wages;
- Paying injured workers for approved prescription drugs and physiotherapy costs;
- Providing injured workers with return to work services such as job search techniques and skills development;
- Providing accident prevention services;
- Providing injured workers with rehabilitation services such as physiotherapy and occupational therapy services; and
- Providing occupational health and safety inspections.

Findings

Awareness was significantly higher among non-registered employers in 2006 compared to 2005, but similar to the levels recorded in 2003 and 2004.

Registered employers still showed the highest level of awareness of the WHSCC programs and services.

Across all groups, awareness has been stable since 2003. The table below provides the Awareness Index for each client group and an average Awareness Index for all four groups combined.

Awareness Index	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured Workers	68%	66%	65%	70%	72%	72%	71%
General Worker Population	61%	65%	72%	75%	75%	71%	69%
Registered Employers	78%	78%	80%	81%	87%	84%	82%
Non-registered Businesses	62%	61%	71%	77%	74%	69%	77%
Average All Client Groups	67%	68%	72%	76%	77%	74%	75%

The table below shows that, in 2006, non-registered employers recorded higher awareness of all the surveyed programs and services, while awareness levels remained stable since last year for all other groups.

	Five-year Average (2001-2005)	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
WHSCC provides money for lost wages							
Injured Workers	81%	82%	75%	80%	81%	85%	87%
General Workers	78%	64%	76%	85%	84%	82%	79%
Registered Employers	92%	86%	94%	93%	93%	96%	92%
Non-registered Employers	73%	56%	75%	83%	81%	72%	83%
WHSCC provides rehabilitation services							
Injured Workers	73%	64%	70%	76%	74%	83%	80%
General Workers	75%	70%	77%	77%	73%	77%	74%
Registered Employers	91%	86%	89%	92%	92%	95%	95%
Non-registered Employers	74%	63%	75%	80%	78%	73%	85%
WHSCC provides return to work services							
Injured Workers	54%	43%	46%	55%	62%	64%	63%
General Workers	60%	53%	63%	62%	62%	62%	56%
Registered Employers	80%	73%	78%	79%	84%	87%	85%
Non-registered Employers	60%	46%	60%	68%	66%	58%	79%
WHSCC provides accident prevention services							
Injured Workers	51%	50%	43%	53%	54%	55%	54%
General Workers	59%	50%	59%	64%	60%	61%	55%
Registered Employers	80%	74%	78%	77%	85%	86%	88%
Non-registered Employers	61%	51%	61%	69%	63%	63%	73%
WHSCC pays for prescription drugs							
Injured Workers	59%	55%	51%	62%	60%	66%	63%
General Workers	60%	56%	55%	69%	62%	59%	58%
Registered Employers	79%	75%	74%	79%	84%	83%	76%
Non-registered Employers	59%	47%	62%	69%	62%	56%	65%
WHSCC conducts OHS inspections							
Injured Workers	62%	61%	57%	63%	64%	63%	66%
General Workers	68%	65%	67%	71%	70%	66%	68%
Registered Employers	82%	83%	82%	78%	80%	85%	84%
Non-registered Employers	66%	58%	69%	70%	68%	64%	77%

5.0 Trends

5.1 Overall Familiarity with WHSCC Programs and Services

As illustrated in previous tables, the familiarity of non-registered employers with the WHSCC programs and services has steadily increased since the beginning of the survey in 2000.

Other groups only recorded small variations. The overall familiarity of clients with the WHSCC programs and services appeared to be fairly constant.

Overall Familiarity with WHSCC Programs and Services				
	Injured Workers	General Workers	Registered Employers	Non-registered Employers
2000-2004 average	37%	37%	67%	36%
2004	42%	40%	70%	44%
2005	44%	40%	66%	42%
2006	42%	37%	67%	47%

5.2 Satisfaction with Contacts with the WHSCC

Again, only small variations were recorded from 2002 to 2006 as shown in the table below. The satisfaction of clients with their personal contacts with the WHSCC was consistently very high.

Satisfaction with Personal Meeting or Telephone Conversation with the WHSCC					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Amount of Time					
Injured Workers	90%	90%	88%	87%	88%
Registered Employers	94%	98%	98%	95%	97%
Politeness					
Injured Workers	91%	92%	90%	91%	94%
Registered Employers	99%	98%	99%	99%	98%
Answers to Questions					
Injured Workers	85%	88%	86%	86%	86%
Registered Employers	91%	94%	96%	96%	96%
Reaching the Person You Wanted to Speak with					
Injured Workers	83%	83%	84%	81%	82%
Registered Employers	90%	91%	93%	91%	90%

5.3 Information about WHSCC Programs and Services

The survey asked whether individuals received information from the WHSCC during the past 12 months. For injured workers, the question was whether they had received information on the WHSCC prior to filing their most recent claim.

The proportion of registered employers who received information from the WHSCC declined by 10% in 2006, following five years of steady increase since 2000. The proportion of registered employers who had received information from the WHSCC was more than twice as high as the proportion found in all other groups.

Information about WHSCC Programs and Services							
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured workers	36%	28%	24%	31%	35%	30%	31%
General worker population	24%	23%	32%	35%	33%	29%	32%
Registered employers	66%	62%	70%	76%	76%	80%	70%

5.4 Quality of the Information Provided by the WHSCC

Satisfaction was very high related to the quality of information provided by the WHSCC.

Quality of the Information Provided by WHSCC							
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Complete and Accurate							
Injured Workers	85%	92%	87%	94%	93%	93%	90%
Registered Employers	93%	91%	90%	87%	93%	93%	93%
Easy to Understand							
Injured Workers	84%	92%	88%	94%	93%	93%	94%
Registered Employers	92%	93%	91%	89%	95%	91%	94%
Timely / Easy to Obtain							
Injured Workers	81%	84%	87%	93%	94%	92%	91%
Registered Employers	95%	92%	91%	86%	93%	91%	88%
Note: Question was only asked of Injured Workers and Registered Employers who reported receiving information about WHSCC Programs and Services							

5.5 WHSCC Online

Internet penetration steadily increased in all four client groups. In 2006, it was close to reaching 100% among registered employers.

Access to Internet at Home, Work or Elsewhere				
	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured workers	62%	61%	75%	75%
General worker population	83%	83%	88%	91%
Registered employers	93%	91%	94%	94%
Non-registered employers	78%	81%	88%	89%

Registered employers reported the highest awareness related to the WHSCC Website information. This was consistent with registered employers who reported the highest proportion of online access.

Awareness of WHSCC Website information								
	Information on Programs and Services				Information on Policies			
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured workers	37%	44%	43%	46%	33%	41%	35%	33%
General worker population	52%	57%	58%	56%	44%	54%	42%	46%
Registered employers	62%	79%	74%	72%	55%	75%	63%	62%
Non-registered employers	45%	51%	48%	57%	39%	48%	39%	50%

There was a very slight increase in the online access to information on the WHSCC website. Registered employers were the most likely to access WHSCC information online.

Accessing Information on the WHSCC Website*								
	Information on Programs and Services				Information on Policies			
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2003	2004	2005	2006
Injured workers	28%	18%	20%	21%	27%	18%	20%	20%
General worker population	18%	12%	13%	16%	20%	14%	10%	13%
Registered employers	31%	40%	40%	39%	31%	41%	26%	27%
Non-registered employers	17%	17%	21%	22%	14%	16%	18%	19%

* % among clients that are aware the information was available on the Internet

5.6 Health and Safety Policies and Procedures in the Workplace

The survey asked whether workplaces had a health and safety policy or related procedures in place.

A steady decline was observed in the number of injured workers who reported having such policies and procedures starting from 85% in 2000 down to 63% in 2006. The same trend was observed among registered employers on health and safety procedures.

A decline was also recorded among non-registered employers.

Policies and Procedures in the Workplace						
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Health and Safety Policies						
Injured workers	85%	81%	78%	70%	67%	63%
General worker population	69%	78%	77%	77%	72%	70%
Registered employers	64%	68%	69%	69%	69%	60%
Non-registered employers	47%	34%	45%	34%	30%	42%
Health and Safety Procedures						
Injured workers	75%	71%	74%	67%	68%	68%
General worker population	61%	73%	74%	72%	70%	73%
Registered employers	61%	59%	68%	57%	57%	53%
Non-registered employers	28%	22%	30%	30%	27%	35%