

Reasons for Decision:

Order # AP1819-0042

On <date removed>, the appellant appealed the decision of the Director, Employment and Income Assistance, to close their file due to non-compliance with work expectations. The decision letter was dated <date removed>.

In their appeal, <name removed> stated their file was closed because they were late on two occasions for a program they were required to attend.

The Department stated the appellant's file was closed on <date removed>, due to work expectations not being met. The Department asserted the appellant failed to attend the Opportunities for Independence program, contrary to the commitment in the action plan they signed on <date removed>.

The Department met with the appellant on <date removed>, and offered them an opportunity to comply with work expectations by attending Jobs on Market. The appellant was provided a bus pass and a food voucher to attend a workshop from <dates removed>.

The Department reported the appellant was late for the workshop four days out of five, and claimed they lost their bus pass.

The Department referred the appellant to the Social Skills Reintegration Program, and advised them that failure to attend daily and participate fully would result in the closure of their file. The appellant attended the orientation and one day of the program, at which time staff of the program advised the Department that the appellant was rude to staff, made no effort to participate in the program and fell asleep in the afternoon. The Department closed the appellant's file due to non-compliance with work expectations.

The Department stated the appellant reapplied for assistance on <date removed>. The appellant advised the Department at that time they had not looked for work since their file closure as they did not have transportation. The appellant was denied assistance at Intake based on their previous non-compliance, and their lack of effort in searching for work since file closure.

The Department told the Board the usual practice when applicants are denied at Intake is to refer them to Jobs on Market. The Department determined that was not a viable option for the appellant, based on their history. The appellant was offered a single grant to their first pay day, should they find a job. The Department has had no

contact with the appellant since.

The Department stated its position is that the appellant was aware of their work expectations, and the consequences of not complying with them. The Department denied the appellant assistance based on a pattern of behaviour in several programs.

The appellant told the Board they do not remember most of the events described in the Department's report. The appellant stated the Social Skills Reintegration Program was a five-week commitment and they did not have any means of getting to the program. In response to a question from the Board, the appellant stated they did not contact their worker about the length of the program or their transportation difficulties.

The Department clarified that the Social Skills Reintegration Program does not have a set duration. The appellant was issued a bus pass for the first week, and would have been issued a pass for each succeeding week based on their attendance.

In response to a question from the Board, the appellant stated they had worked when they lived in Sprague, but could not find work in Winnipeg.

The Board asked the appellant why they were late four days out of five at the Essential Skills Manitoba workshop. The appellant asserted they were only late two days, because they had to walk.

In response to a question from the Board, the appellant stated they saw some value for new workers in the Department's programs, but less value for experienced workers. The appellant asserted they wanted to find work, but it was difficult in Winnipeg.

After careful consideration of the written and verbal evidence submitted to it, the Board determined the Department assessed the appellant's application correctly based on the information it had before it, in accordance with the legislation and regulations. The Board confirmed the Director's decision to deny <name removed>'s application for assistance.

DISCLAIMER

These are electronic copies of the Reasons for Decision issued by the Social Services Appeal Board. These written reasons have been edited to protect the personal information of individuals by removing personal identifiers.