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# Study Background

**The State of Connecticut Department of Rehabilitation Services, Bureau of Education and Services for the Blind (BESB), commissioned the Center for Public Policy and Social Research (CPPSR) at Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) to conduct a customer satisfaction survey of their service recipients for fiscal year 2018. This work represents a continuation of research conducted by the Center for Survey Research and Analysis (CSRA) at the University of Connecticut (UConn) from fiscal years 2003 through 2008. The purpose of this survey is to evaluate the services that clients received from the Vocational Rehabilitation Division at BESB.**

**From September 18 through October 10, 2018, CPPSR completed 33 interviews with BESB service recipients. “Complete” interviews are defined as instances when a respondent followed the interview to its entirety. Both the sample and the instrument were provided by BESB. Each client was called a minimum of seven times. A maximum of eleven attempts were made per individual.**

**CPPSR is utilizing CSRA’s data to draw longitudinal comparisons. For reasons not detailed in their report, CSRA states that results from fiscal year 2005 cannot be compared with data from other years; thus, data from 2005 does not appear in this analysis. Mirroring previous reports, references to each year (e.g., 2013, 2012, etc.) refers to the “fiscal year.”**

# Notable Findings for Fiscal Year 2018

**Overall**

**BESB continues to receive high marks for their Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) services and counselors; however, client satisfaction has dropped from recent years. About four-fifths of the clients surveyed (81%, down 15 percentage points) reported that they would recommend BESB VR services to a friend. Although still very high, this percentage is the lowest reported figure in the history of survey (previously 89%, recorded in 2008). Reported satisfaction regarding overall experiences with BESB services, as rated on a scale from 1- to 10-point scale, also declined this year.**

**Satisfaction rates of clients’ overall experiences with BESB services were not able to match the all-time highs witnessed last year, decreasing in all areas surveyed in 2018. It is possible that 2017 represents a historical outlier, a point that can be more concretely assessed in the future. For this reason, 2018 data is best contextualized by comparing findings to the survey’s historical averages. Generally, this year’s satisfaction levels fell relatively close to the average rating of each surveyed element of BESB services.**

**The most significant decline in satisfaction was seen in clients’ overall satisfaction with BESB services (7.55, down 1.23 points), falling from the record high set in 2017. The second largest drop in satisfaction came from the extent to which clients felt Vocational Rehabilitation Services met their needs (7.30, down 1 point from 2017), followed by the extent to which services met clients’ expectations (7.50, down 1.04 from last year).**

**Last fiscal year, all but one of the dimensions of counselors improved, with that one dimension maintaining the same rating as the year prior. In 2018, universally, ratings of counselors were unable to sustain last year’s outstanding findings. Two dimensions of counselors that saw particularly notable drops in mean rating were identifying career goals (setting an all-time low of 6.86, down 2.1 in mean rating from 2017) and understanding Vocational Rehabilitation rights and responsibilities (6.97, down 1.7 in mean rating). It should be noted that, despite these drops in rating, the average client satisfaction level across all dimensions of counselors measured in 2018 was still respectable (7.38).**

**Since survey reporting began in 2003, Low Vision and Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment have been the most widely used BESB services, with each respectively averaging around a three-in-four utilization rate. Low Vision continues to take the top spot as the most highly utilized service (82%, down 2 percentage points). Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services took the second spot, with utilization rates matching last year’s finding (71%). On the other end of the usage spectrum, utilization of Skills Training Services declined dramatically (12%, down 33 percentage points from 2017). This represents the lowest utilization rate in the history of the survey for this service (previously 23%, recorded in 2009).**

**Overall, of the eight services offered to VR clients, two of them experienced an increase in use, five reported declines in utilization rates, and one remained at the same level of use this fiscal year. Of the two services that saw an increase in use, Higher Education Training experienced the largest jump in utilization rate. Almost a quarter of all VR clients (24%, up 20 percentage points from last year) reported using this service. This percentage is the third highest recorded utilization rate for this service in the survey’s history. Reader Services also enjoyed a notable uptick in use (21%, up 11 percentage points), representing the highest reported figure since 2011.**

**The remaining five services all experienced a decline in use this year, with Skills Training seeing a record low downturn (12%, down 33%). Another record low was observed in the percentage of clients utilizing Small Business Services (3%, down 11%). Prior to 2018, the lowest recorded use for this service was 7%, reported in the 2007 survey. Finally, Personal Care Attendant Services (3%, down 5 percentage points) Transportation Services (21%, down 4 percentage points), and Low Vision Services (82%, down 2 percentage points) experienced marginal declines.**

**This year, the sample size for the survey, as based on the number of clients who achieved employment outcomes during state fiscal year 2018 was at 60, compared to 116 for the same time period in 2017. It should be noted that it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions with a population of this size. Given this small population, no shifts in figures from 2017 to 2018 were deemed to be statistically significant.**

**Services**

**To measure the satisfaction of services received, clients were asked to rate each service on a 1- to 10-point scale. A rating of “10” meant the client was “very satisfied” and a rating of “1” meant the client was “very dissatisfied.” The mean scores for these ratings are reported below. Clients who rated the services on the high (8-10) and low (1-3) end of the scale were asked a follow-up question about the reason for their rating.**

**Compared to 2017 findings, four services experienced an increase in mean satisfaction, while the remaining four services saw declines. Personal Care Attendant Services recorded the most sizable increase in satisfaction rating (10.0, up 3.0 in mean rating), tying the all-time high observed in both 2007 and 2016. Small Business Services notched the second-highest increase in mean satisfaction rating among all services this year (10.0, up 1.29 in mean rating), hitting an all-time high. Reader Services reported a notable uptick in rating (8.71, up .71 in mean rating). Finally, Low Vision Services experienced a slight increase in rating (8.75, up .09 in mean rating); this mean rating is the best this service has seen since 2013.**

**The four remaining services experienced a decline in mean satisfaction rating. Transportation Services saw the most sizable decline (7.57, down 2.10 in mean rating). This mean satisfaction rating represents the service’s lowest level since 2016 (6.80), while also falling below the historical average for this service (7.92). Higher Education Services also saw a drop in mean satisfaction rating (8.50, down 1.07 in mean rating), the lowest recorded average since 2012 (5.0). However, reports of satisfaction for this service still sit well above the historical average (7.52). Skills Training Services experienced a noticeable decline in client satisfaction (7.75, down 0.80 in mean rating). This is the lowest reported satisfaction in the history of the survey (previously 7.89, reported in 2006) and is below the historical average (8.42). Finally, Rehabilitation Equipment Services also experienced a decline (8.42, down 0.24 in mean rating).**

**Clients were asked to rate their overall experiences with BESB services on a 1- to 10-point scale, in addition to their individualized plan for employment (IPE), timeframe of delivery of service, and the extent to which the services provided met their expectations. They were also asked, based on their personal experience, if they would recommend BESB to a friend.**

**Reported satisfaction of clients’ overall experiences with BESB services decreased in all areas surveyed in 2018. With that said, last year’s report characterized 2017 as a “remarkable year for satisfaction with BESB services on a broad spectrum.” It is possible that 2017 represents a historical outlier. For this reason, 2018 data is best contextualized by comparing findings to the survey’s historical averages. Generally, this year’s satisfaction levels fell relatively close to the average rating of each surveyed element of BESB services. This suggests that, when viewed longitudinally, this year’s findings are on par with historical common values.**

**The most significant decline in satisfaction was seen in clients’ overall satisfaction with BESB services (7.55, down 1.23 points), falling from the record high set in 2017. The second largest drop in satisfaction came from the extent to which clients felt Vocational Rehabilitation Services met their needs (7.30, down 1 point from 2017). Client satisfaction with the extent to which services met their expectations decreased as well (7.50, down 1.04 from last year), the lowest measurement since 2014 (7.46). Finally, the extent to which BESB services met clients’ IPE also dropped (7.63, down 0.43 points from 2017). This element of BESB services stands at its lowest point since 2011 (7.25). In totality, measurements of clients’ overall experience with BESB services could not sustain the record highs set last year. While satisfaction ratings dipped, no aspect of clients’ overall experience with BESB services dropped to an all-time low.**

**Counselors**

**Satisfaction ratings of counselors decreased in all areas surveyed this fiscal year. Like measurements of BESB services, these findings must be historically contextualized. In 2017, ratings of counselors increased in all but one area, with numerous dimensions surveyed hitting record highs. These all-time highs were not sustained in 2018, again pointing to the possibility that 2017 represents a historical anomaly. With that said, looking longitudinally, there were notable drops in satisfaction this year. This is evidenced by the observation of record low ratings associated with some dimensions of counselors.**

**This fiscal year, the largest decline in counselor rating came in the area of identifying career goals (6.86, down 2.1 points). This is an all-time low rating in the history of the survey, which was previously held by the rating reported in 2011 (7.35). This finding is also well below the historical average (7.77). The second largest decline came from counselors’ effectiveness in helping clients understand their VR rights and responsibilities (6.97, down 1.7 points from 2017). This score is similarly below the historical average (8.19) and represents the lowest rating in the survey’s history (previously 7.64, set in 2008). Also exhibiting notable declines in ratings were satisfaction levels with referrals from counselors (7.77, down 1.45 in mean rating), counselors’ ability to help clients understand the process for complaint resolution (6.67, down 1.25 in mean rating), counselors’ effectiveness in helping the client develop their IPE (7.41, down 1.03 in mean rating), counselors’ professionalism and knowledge (7.87, down 0.98 points, and 7.69, down 0.94 points, respectively), counselors’ ability to recognizing clients’ special needs (7.53, down 0.85 points), and counselors’ ability to provide information in a format that clients could use (7.75, down 0.76 points).**

**Regional Trends**

**Since 2016, CCSU has performed a regional analysis on nine dimensions of BESB counselors. In 2018, the Northwestern region showed the highest levels of satisfaction, offering top ratings in five dimensions of counselors (understanding VR rights and responsibilities, recognizing special needs in regard to employment, providing information in the format clients use, helping develop clients’ IPE, and knowledge). Further, the Northwest region tied the South Central region for the top place in another dimension of counselors (helping clients identify career goals). This is a notable reversal from the previous two years, both of which showed the Northwest region to have some of the lowest client satisfaction rates. The second-best performing region in 2018 was South Central, which held the top ranking in two dimensions of counselors (satisfaction of referrals and professionalism) and tied with the Northwestern region in another dimension. This finding is consistent with last year’s analysis, which also placed South Central second overall. Finally, the North Central region held the top ranking in one dimension of counselors measured this year (helping clients understand the process for formal complaint resolution).**

**On the other end of the spectrum, statistically-speaking, the Eastern region had the lowest rates of satisfaction. However, low sample size obscures the utility of this finding. A more accurate interpretation of this year’s data points to a relatively even distribution of low satisfaction rates across the regions.**

**The Eastern region recorded the lowest rates of satisfaction in three dimensions of counselors (identifying career goals, helping clients understand their VR rights and responsibilities, and knowledge). On face, this may seem like a notable reversal from last year; a year in which the Eastern region took the top spot in two dimensions of counselors. However, sample size comes into play here. Across numerous dimensions of counselors, the number of clients reporting from the Eastern region stood at either zero or one. For this reason, all regional trends should be interpreted with caution, as the low sample size for the Eastern region influences rankings across the board. For example, although the Northwestern, North Central, and Southwestern regions each ranked in last place in two dimensions of counselors (the South Central region was the only region to not come in last in any dimension), this was usually due to the fact that no clients from the Eastern region responded to that question. Overall, when taking sample size from the Eastern region into consideration, no clear regional patterns associated with low satisfaction emerged.**

# BESB Services Ratings

**Frequency of BESB Services**

**Clients were asked to identify the types of services that they received from BESB. For 2018, of the eight services offered, two of them experienced an increase in use, five reported a decrease, and one remained at the same level of use.**

**Since reporting began in 2003, Low Vision and Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment have been the most widely-used BESB services, with each service respectively averaging an over 75% utilization rate. This trend continued in 2018, with Low Vision Services retaining its top position as the most widely used service. The service reported a slight decrease in usage from the last two years (82%, down two percentage points from 2017), which is the fourth-best utilization percentage in the history of this survey. The utilization of Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services remained the same from last year (71%).**

**Of the two services that saw an increase in use, Higher Education Training experienced the largest increase. A little less than a quarter of all VR clients (24%, up 20 percentage points from last year) reported using this service. This percentage is the third highest recorded utilization rate in the survey’s history, matching the percentage from 2015. Reader Services also enjoyed an uptick in use (21%, up 11 percentage points), representing the highest reported figure since 2011. These were the only two services that saw an increase in use.**

**The remaining five services all experienced a decline in use this year, with Skills Training seeing a record low downturn (12%, down 33%). Another record low was observed in the percentage of clients utilizing Small Business Services (3%, down 11%). Prior to 2018, the lowest recorded use for this service was 7%, reported in the 2007 survey. Personal Care Attendant Services (3%, down 5 percentage points), Transportation Services (21%, down 4 percentage points), and Low Vision Services (82%, down 2 percentage points) experienced marginal declines.**

**Frequency of Services Received**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low Vision 2018** | **82%** |
| **Low Vision 2017** | **84%** |
| **Low Vision 2016** | **84%** |
| **Low Vision 2015** | **89%** |
| **Low Vision 2014** | **80%** |
| **Low Vision 2013** | **78%** |
| **Low Vision 2012** | **79%** |
| **Low Vision 2011** | **80%** |
| **Low Vision 2010** | **76%** |
| **Low Vision 2009** | **81%** |
| **Low Vision 2008** | **75%** |
| **Low Vision 2007** | **78%** |
| **Low Vision 2006** | **76%** |
| **Low Vision 2004** | **81%** |
| **Low Vision 2003** | **87%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rehab Equipment 2018** | **71%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2017** | **71%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2016** | **83%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2015** | **76%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2014** | **86%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2013** | **76%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2012** | **79%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2011** | **88%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2010** | **88%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2009** | **67%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2008** | **73%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2007** | **81%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2006** | **75%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2004** | **71%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2003** | **71%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Skills Training 2018** | **12%** |
| **Skills Training 2017** | **45%** |
| **Skills Training 2016** | **44%** |
| **Skills Training 2015** | **40%** |
| **Skills Training 2014** | **31%** |
| **Skills Training 2013** | **48%** |
| **Skills Training 2012** | **37%** |
| **Skills Training 2011** | **35%** |
| **Skills Training 2010** | **47%** |
| **Skills Training 2009** | **23%** |
| **Skills Training 2008** | **32%** |
| **Skills Training 2007** | **27%** |
| **Skills Training 2006** | **32%** |
| **Skills Training 2004** | **29%** |
| **Skills Training 2003** | **31%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reader 2018** | **21%** |
| **Reader 2017** | **10%** |
| **Reader 2016** | **20%** |
| **Reader 2015** | **14%** |
| **Reader 2014** | **12%** |
| **Reader 2013** | **13%** |
| **Reader 2012** | **8%** |
| **Reader 2011** | **30%** |
| **Reader 2010** | **22%** |
| **Reader 2009** | **13.50%** |
| **Reader 2008** | **15%** |
| **Reader 2007** | **18%** |
| **Reader 2006** | **32%** |
| **Reader 2004** | **29%** |
| **Reader 2003** | **31%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Higher Education Training 2018** | **24%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2017** | **4%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2016** | **27%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2015** | **24%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2014** | **20%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2014** | **20%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2013** | **22%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2012** | **11%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2011** | **26%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2010** | **20%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2009** | **17%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2008** | **14%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2007** | **21%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2006** | **20%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2004** | **11%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2003** | **14%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Transportation 2018** | **21%** |
| **Transportation 2017** | **25%** |
| **Transportation 2016** | **16%** |
| **Transportation 2015** | **21%** |
| **Transportation 2014** | **8%** |
| **Transportation 2013** | **15%** |
| **Transportation 2012** | **13%** |
| **Transportation 2011** | **26%** |
| **Transportation 2010** | **24.50%** |
| **Transportation 2009** | **17%** |
| **Transportation 2008** | **14%** |
| **Transportation 2007** | **14%** |
| **Transportation 2006** | **14%** |
| **Transportation 2004** | **16%** |
| **Transportation 2003** | **14%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Small Business 2018** | **3%** |
| **Small Business 2017** | **14%** |
| **Small Business 2016** | **11%** |
| **Small Business 2015** | **22%** |
| **Small Business 2014** | **12%** |
| **Small Business 2013** | **11%** |
| **Small Business 2012** | **11%** |
| **Small Business 2011** | **8%** |
| **Small Business 2010** | **16%** |
| **Small Business 2009** | **11.50%** |
| **Small Business 2008** | **11%** |
| **Small Business 2007** | **7%** |
| **Small Business 2006** | **14%** |
| **Small Business 2004** | **10%** |
| **Small Business 2003** | **9%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2018** | **3%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2017** | **8%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2016** | **2%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2015** | **4%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2014** | **4%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2013** | **4%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2012** | **3%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2011** | **8%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2010** | **2%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2009** | **6%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2008** | **5%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2007** | **2%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2006** | **7%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2004** | **11%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2003** | **12%** |

**Mean Satisfaction Service Ratings**

**To measure the satisfaction of services received, clients were asked to rate each service on a 1- to 10-point scale. A rating of “10” meant the client was “very satisfied” and a rating of “1” meant the client was “very dissatisfied.” The mean scores for these ratings are reported below. Clients who rated the services on the high (8-10) and low (1-3) end of the scale were asked a follow-up question about the reason for their rating.**

**Compared with 2017 findings, four services experienced an increase in mean satisfaction rating, whereas the remaining four saw declines. Personal Care Attendant Services saw the most dramatic increase in satisfaction rating (10.0, up 3.0 in mean rating), tying with 2007 and 2016 for an all-time high. Last year, this service reported the third lowest satisfaction rating in the history of the survey. Small Business Services saw the second highest increase in mean satisfaction rating among all services this year (10.0, up 1.29 in mean rating), which is another all-time high. Reader Services reported a notable uptick in rating (8.71, up .71 in mean rating), with 2018 representing the sixth-highest mean in the history of the survey. Finally, Low Vision Services also enjoyed a slight uptick in rating (8.75, up .09 in mean rating); this mean rating is the best this service has seen since 2013.**

**The four remaining services experienced a decline in mean satisfaction rating. Transportation Services satisfaction ratings decreased the most (7.57, down 2.10 in mean rating). The 2018 mean satisfaction rating represents its lowest level since 2016 (6.80), while also falling below the historical average for this service (7.92). Higher Education Services also saw a drop in mean satisfaction rating (7.43, down 1.07 in mean rating). This is the lowest reported mean satisfaction rating since 2012 (5.0). However, the 2018 mean satisfaction rating observed for this service is still well above the historical average (7.52). The mean satisfaction rating for Skills Training Services also dropped noticeably (7.75, down 0.80 in mean rating). This is the lowest reported satisfaction in the survey’s history (which was previously 7.89, reported in 2006) and is below the historical average (8.42). Finally, Rehabilitation Equipment Services experienced a relatively small decline (8.42, down 0.24 in mean rating). While only a slight decrease, this puts the mean satisfaction rating for the service slightly below the historical average (8.58) and is the lowest reported rating since 2011 (7.55).**

**It is important to note the issue of sample size when reviewing these figures. Historically, Small Business and Personal Care Attendant Services have received particularly small response rates – a trend that continued in 2018. This year, only one client offered a satisfaction rating for Small Business Services (an all-time low), and only one offered a rating for Personal Care Attendant Services. Additionally, Skills Training Services attracted very few respondents; only four respondents offered a satisfaction rating of this service in 2018. Given the comparatively small sample sizes for 2018, especially for these three services, one should not place too much significance on the changes in satisfaction from year to year.**

**Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Transportation 2018** | **7.57** |
| **Transportation 2017** | **9.67** |
| **Transportation 2016** | **6.80** |
| **Transportation 2015** | **8.67** |
| **Transportation 2014** | **7.25** |
| **Transportation 2013** | **7.71** |
| **Transportation 2012** | **6.00** |
| **Transportation 2011** | **6.75** |
| **Transportation 2010** | **7.58** |
| **Transportation 2009** | **8.13** |
| **Transportation 2008** | **9.00** |
| **Transportation 2007** | **8.38** |
| **Transportation 2006** | **8.92** |
| **Transportation 2004** | **8.27** |
| **Transportation 2003** | **8.09** |
|  |  |
| **Reader 2018** | **8.71** |
| **Reader 2017** | **8.00** |
| **Reader 2016** | **8.25** |
| **Reader 2015** | **9.27** |
| **Reader 2014** | **8.67** |
| **Reader 2013** | **7.00** |
| **Reader 2012** | **7.40** |
| **Reader 2011** | **7.52** |
| **Reader 2010** | **8.36** |
| **Reader 2009** | **9.57** |
| **Reader 2008** | **9.00** |
| **Reader 2007** | **9.40** |
| **Reader 2006** | **8.44** |
| **Reader 2004** | **8.58** |
| **Reader 2003** | **8.89** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rehab Equipment 2018** | **8.42** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2017** | **8.66** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2016** | **8.70** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2015** | **8.47** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2014** | **8.60** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2013** | **8.80** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2012** | **8.90** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2011** | **7.55** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2010** | **8.88** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2009** | **8.80** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2008** | **8.62** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2007** | **8.43** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2006** | **8.38** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2004** | **8.76** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2003** | **8.68** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Higher Education Training 2018** | **7.43** |
| **Higher Education Training 2017** | **8.50** |
| **Higher Education Training 2016** | **7.79** |
| **Higher Education Training 2015** | **8.18** |
| **Higher Education Training 2014** | **8.70** |
| **Higher Education Training 2013** | **7.80** |
| **Higher Education Training 2012** | **5.00** |
| **Higher Education Training 2011** | **5.00** |
| **Higher Education Training 2010** | **4.20** |
| **Higher Education Training 2009** | **8.33** |
| **Higher Education Training 2008** | **8.62** |
| **Higher Education Training 2007** | **7.79** |
| **Higher Education Training 2006** | **8.47** |
| **Higher Education Training 2004** | **8.07** |
| **Higher Education Training 2003** | **8.86** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low Vision 2018** | **8.75** |
| **Low Vision 2017** | **8.66** |
| **Low Vision 2016** | **8.00** |
| **Low Vision 2015** | **8.62** |
| **Low Vision 2014** | **7.89** |
| **Low Vision 2013** | **8.79** |
| **Low Vision 2012** | **8.75** |
| **Low Vision 2011** | **7.72** |
| **Low Vision 2010** | **8.25** |
| **Low Vision 2009** | **7.79** |
| **Low Vision 2008** | **8.47** |
| **Low Vision 2007** | **8.87** |
| **Low Vision 2006** | **8.65** |
| **Low Vision 2004** | **8.95** |
| **Low Vision 2003** | **8.89** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Skills Training 2018** | **7.75** |
| **Skills Training 2017** | **8.55** |
| **Skills Training 2016** | **8.16** |
| **Skills Training 2015** | **8.79** |
| **Skills Training 2014** | **8.67** |
| **Skills Training 2013** | **9.09** |
| **Skills Training 2012** | **8.69** |
| **Skills Training 2011** | **7.96** |
| **Skills Training 2010** | **8.87** |
| **Skills Training 2009** | **7.92** |
| **Skills Training 2008** | **8.47** |
| **Skills Training 2007** | **8.50** |
| **Skills Training 2006** | **7.89** |
| **Skills Training 2004** | **8.41** |
| **Skills Training 2003** | **8.62** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2018** | **10.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2017** | **7.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2016** | **10.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2015** | **9.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2014** | **9.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2013** | **8.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2012** | **6.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2011** | **4.25** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2010** | **8.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2009** | **9.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2008** | **7.80** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2007** | **10.00** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2006** | **9.33** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2004** | **8.87** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2003** | **8.45** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Small Business 2018** | **10.00** |
| **Small Business 2017** | **8.71** |
| **Small Business 2016** | **7.00** |
| **Small Business 2015** | **8.38** |
| **Small Business 2014** | **7.14** |
| **Small Business 2013** | **6.75** |
| **Small Business 2012** | **7.43** |
| **Small Business 2011** | **3.57** |
| **Small Business 2010** | **7.33** |
| **Small Business 2009** | **8.17** |
| **Small Business 2008** | **7.78** |
| **Small Business 2007** | **8.33** |
| **Small Business 2006** | **7.75** |
| **Small Business 2004** | **6.71** |
| **Small Business 2003** | **7.00** |

**Low Vision Services**

**Most of the clients surveyed (82%) reported that they had received Low Vision Services. Client satisfaction with these services was very high, with nine out of ten respondents (90%) indicating a high level of satisfaction. This represents an increase of 9% in highly satisfied ratings over the past year and is the second highest reported satisfaction rating historically, the highest being 91% in 2015. Neutral ratings dropped by 11% from 2017 to 5% in 2018, the lowest figure since 2015 (2%). Low satisfaction ratings matched neutral ratings at 5%, an increase of 2 percentage points from last year. Overall, client satisfaction with Low Vision Services has improved since 2017.**

**When asked to indicate the main reason for their satisfaction, most respondents (61%, up from 26% in 2017) felt that the products or services met their needs or expectations. A little more than a quarter of respondents stated their satisfaction was due to the knowledge and/or care exhibited by the service provider (28%, a decline from 55% in 2017). There was also a decline in the number of respondents who cited the timeliness of the service as the main reason for their satisfaction (5.5%, down from 13% in 2017).**

**Fourteen respondents chose to elaborate on their satisfaction with Low Vision Services in open-ended responses. The main theme expressed in these comments was consistent with the most commonly cited reason for satisfaction — the services and/or products they received fulfilled their needs and met their expectations. A few clients noted that the quality of the glasses they received was very high and that it was made affordable for them. In general, there was a consensus that the services and/or products they received were consistent, helpful, of the highest quality, and satisfied their needs. Respondents also noted that their service providers were highly skilled, professional, competent, interested, and attentive.**

**Only one respondent reported dissatisfaction with Low Vision Services, citing the poor quality of the product, as well as noting a lack of coordination and resources. This is the same number as in the 2017 survey, wherein the respondent stated that they were not able to receive needed equipment in a timely manner due to limited operating hours of the service facility. No respondents in 2018 mentioned this as a major factor in their dissatisfaction with Low Vision Services.**

**How satisfied were you with Low Vision Services?**

**2003 n=142, 2004 n=114, 2006 n=64, 2007 n=69, 2008 n=71, 2009 n=34, 2010 n=32, 2011 n=54, 2012 n=40, 2013 n=34, 2014 n=51, 2015 n=42, 2016 n=41, 2017 n=38, 2018 n=34**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **17%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **4%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **2%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **23%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **30%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **8%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **90%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **81%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **76%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **91%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **82%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **85%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **87%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **61%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **81%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **85%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **88%** |

**Rehabilitation Technology and Adaptive Equipment Services**

**Client satisfaction with Rehabilitation Technology and Adaptive Equipment Services enjoyed a sizable jump from last fiscal year. This year, more than eight in ten clients (84%, up 7 percentage points) offered a highly satisfied rating of the service — the highest percentage since 2013. The percentage of clients offering a dissatisfied rating increased slightly, rising from 6% in 2017 to 8% in 2018. Reports of neutral satisfaction experienced a noticeable decline (8%, a drop of 9 percentage points from 2017).**

**Most satisfied clients (85%, up from 58% in 2017) stated the products and/or services met their needs and/or expectations. One client (5%, down from 17% in 2017) attributed their satisfaction to the knowledge and/or care exhibited by the service provider, and another (5%) cited the timeliness of the services. Compared with 2017, more clients attributed their satisfaction to their needs and/or expectations being met than to other factors such as effective coordination or good follow-up (which were selected by 13% and 8% of respondents in 2017, respectively).**

**The two respondents (100%) who reported dissatisfaction with these services both stated they did not feel the product or service met their needs and/or expectations. One area of concern was not receiving what was wanted or prescribed.**

**How satisfied were you with Rehabilitation Technology and Adaptive Equipment Services?**

**2003 n=113, 2004 n=114, 2006 n=60, 2007 n=72, 2008 n=69, 2009 n= 35, 2010 n=42, 2011 n =65, 2012 n=50, 2013 n=36, 2014 n=49, 2015 n=55, 2016 n=47, 2017 n=35, 2018 n=24**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **2%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **23%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **27%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **16%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **84%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **83%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **82%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **81%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **86%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **86%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **66%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **86%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **80%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **84%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **79%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **73%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **83%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **80%** |

**Skills Training Services**

**Client satisfaction ratings of Skills Training Services dropped significantly in 2018. Half (50%) of all clients noted that they were highly satisfied with the service — an all-time low (down 28 percentage points from 2017). The percentage of respondents who were dissatisfied with these services dropped to zero (down 4 percentage points). The percentage of neutral ratings rose 32 percentage points (50%). It should be noted that there were only four respondents who had received Skills Training Services in this year’s survey (down from 25 in 2017), and so these numbers should be taken with a grain of salt.**

**All (100%) of the clients expressing satisfaction with Skills Training Services stated the main reason for their satisfaction was that the products and/or services met their needs and/or expectations. This is a change from 2017, where the majority of satisfied clients (53%) cited the knowledge and/or care of their service provider, and one-quarter (27%) noted their fulfilled needs and/or expectations.**

**Respondents who offered further elaboration on their reasons for satisfaction noted that they received helpful training in using a cane and stated they were grateful for not having to pay for the devices they received through skills training. Others said that they reached their intended VR goal — finding employment — through Skills Training Services. This corresponds with the reasons given in 2017, with clients in both years focusing on the quality and helpfulness of their instructors as well as aid in finding employment. No reasons were given for dissatisfaction as there were no respondents that reported dissatisfaction with Skills Training Services.**

**How satisfied were you with Skills Training Services?**

**2003 n=50, 2004 n=41, 2006 n=27, 2007 n=24, 2008 n=30, 2009 n=13, 2010 n=23, 2011 n=28, 2012 n=23, 2013 n=22, 2014 n=15, 2015 n=29, 2016 n=25, 2017 n=25, 2018 n=4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **4%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **50%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **23%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **25%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **18%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **78%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **76%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **86%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **80%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **82%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **79%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **83%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **61%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **80%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **63%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **76%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **78%** |

**Higher Education Training Services**

**Satisfaction rates associated with Higher Education Training Services declined in 2018. Slightly more than two in five (43%, down 57 percentage points) reported high levels of satisfaction, a rate that has not been that low since 2011. Dissatisfied ratings stayed at zero (0%, zero percentage point change), indicating a sizable gravitation towards neutral satisfaction ratings. Neutral ratings reached an all-time high (57%, up 57 percentage points).**

**A few survey questions were added in 2011 regarding Higher Education Training to better understand the population of clients utilizing this service. In 2017, only two clients could be reached to whom these questions were applicable, but in 2018 seven clients could be reached, creating a more reliable sample. This means that comparisons between figures from 2017 and 2018 should be made with caution. In 2018, 71% of those surveyed reported attending a traditional college (defined as offering college degrees) whereas the remaining 29% attended a vocational program. In 2017, these figures were 100% and 0%, respectively, indicating a slight decline in clients attending college degree–granting institutions and increase in clients attending vocational programs. Full-time status among clients also declined to 71% (down from 100% in 2017), while part-time status rose to 29% (up from 0%). Graduation rates remained strong from last year with 86% (down from 100%) of clients stating that they graduated from the program they attended. Only one client (14%, up from 0%) stated they did not graduate. Overall, recent data suggest that the average BESB client utilizing Higher Education Training Services attends a traditional college, is a full-time student, and graduates from their program.**

**Two-thirds of satisfied respondents (66.6%) cited products and/or services that met their needs and/or expectations as the primary reason for their satisfaction. The other third (33.3%) noted the care and/or knowledge of their provider. When asked to elaborate upon their satisfaction, clients were appreciative of being able to receive the books they needed for class.**

**How satisfied were you with Higher Education Training Services?**

**2003 n=22, 2004 n=15, 2006 n=17, 2007 n=19, 2008 n=13, 2009 n=10, 2010 n=10, 2011 n=35, 2012=7, 2013 n=10, 2014 n=10, 2015 n=17, 2016 n=14, 2017 n=2, 2018 n=7**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **48%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **40%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **0%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **57%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **21%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **43%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **6%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **50%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **26%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **24%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **23%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **43%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **76%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **80%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **70%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **43%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **10%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **78%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **92%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **73%** |

**Reader Services**

**At 71%, clients reporting high satisfaction with Reader Services dropped slightly (71%, down 9 percentage points). While this is a decrease from recent years, reports of dissatisfaction also decreased to 0%, a sharp decline from last year’s figure (20%). The remaining clients evaluating reader services offered a neutral rating (29%, up 29 percentage points).**

**Two-thirds (66.66%) attributed their high levels of satisfaction to their needs and/or expectations being met. Slightly less than one-in-five (16.66%) stated that they were satisfied because their provider was knowledgeable and/or caring; an identical percentage (16.66%) enjoyed the timeliness of the services. When asked to expand on their thoughts, clients noted the reliability of their readers. This is similar to the foremost sentiment expressed in the 2017 survey; those respondents noted the accuracy and patience of their readers, as well as good follow-up service.**

**How satisfied were you with Reader Services?**

**2003 n=22, 2004 n=15, 2006 n=9, 2007 n=15, 2008 n=14, 2009 n=7, 2010 n=11, 2011 n=23, 2012 n=5, 2013 n=6, 2014 n=6, 2015 n=11, 2016 n=12, 2017 n=5, 2018 n=7**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **20%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **8.5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **17%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **20%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **22%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **7%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **29%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **8.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **4%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **29%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **27%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **10%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **80%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **83%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **91%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **83%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **78%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **73%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **79%** |

**Transportation Services for Training Programs or Employment**

**As noted in 2017, client ratings of Transportation Services have historically been subject to sizable swings from year to year. In 2017, this swing favored towards greater satisfaction, with 92% indicating a high level of satisfaction. In 2018, the service was unable to sustain this upward trend. Only 72% of clients reported high levels of satisfaction. Neutral ratings increased (14%, up 6 percentage points), as did reports of dissatisfaction (14%, up 14 percentage points).**

**Of those reporting high levels of satisfaction, two in five (40%) said that the service met their needs and/or expectations. One in five (20%) cited the exceptional care of the service provider. When asked to elaborate, respondents reported being pleased with help learning to use the public transit system. The punctuality of transportation services was also a point that clients elaborated upon.**

**The one client (100%) that reported dissatisfaction with Transportation Services stated that the product and/or service did not meet their needs and/or expectations. The respondent felt as though the BESB lacked resources in this service area.**

**How satisfied were you with Transportation Services for Training Programs or Employment?**

**2003 n=23, 2004 n=22, 2006 n=12, 2007 n=13, 2008 n=13, 2009 n=8, 2010 n=12, 2011 n =21, 2012 n=8, 2013 n=7, 2014 n=4, 2015 n=15, 2016 n=10, 2017 n=12, 2018 n=7**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **14%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **20%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **13%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **25%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **14%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **25%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **19%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **4%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **7%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **25%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **37.50%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **24%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **42%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **37.50%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **31%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **35%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **92%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **80%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **37.50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **52%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **62.50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **69%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **92%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **61%** |

**Personal Care Attendant Services**

**Personal Care Attendant (PCA) Services received a notable uptick in high satisfaction ratings in 2018 (100%, up fifty percentage points). With that said, longitudinal satisfaction trends associated with this service should be interpreted with caution — especially in 2018. The low number of respondents utilizing PCA Services is a continuing trend, as it has not surpassed ten since 2004.**

**The respondent (100%) who received PCA Services specified that satisfaction stemmed primarily from provider knowledge and/or care, describing providers as professional, considerate, and helpful. This corresponds with reasons given for satisfaction in 2017.**

**How satisfied were you with Personal Care Attendant Services?**

**2003 n=23, 2004 n=22, 2006 n=6, 2007 n=2, 2008 n=5, 2009 n=3, 2010 n=1, 2011 n=8, 2012 n=2, 2013 n=2, 2014 n=2, 2015 n=3, 2016 n=1, 2017 n=4, 2018 n=1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **25%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **50%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **25%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **5%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **25%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **50%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **25%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **40%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **7%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **15%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **87%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **80%** |

**Small Business Ventures Services**

**Only one respondent participating in the 2018 survey (equating to 3% of all survey participants) received Small Business Ventures Services, which is an all-time low. In consideration of that, the following observations should be taken cautiously. The respondent was highly satisfied with the service. This 100% satisfaction rating is a historical high point, surpassing the 86% satisfaction rating from 2017. As there was only one respondent for this question, there were no neutral or negative responses. The client stated that their satisfaction was due to the knowledge and/or care of their provider. In qualitative feedback, the client further elaborated that they worked with a counselor who was very caring, knowledgeable, and diligent.**

**How satisfied were you with Small Business Ventures Services?**

**2003 n=15, 2004 n=14, 2006 n=12, 2007 n=6, 2008 n=10, 2009 n=6, 2010 n=9, 2011 n=8, 2012 n=7, 2013 n=4, 2014 n=7, 2015 n=16, 2016 n=6, 2017 n=7, 2018 n=1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **14%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **20%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **50%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **21%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **13%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **67%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **31%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **29%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **57%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **25%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **40%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **34%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **86%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **33%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **69%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **43%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **25%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **56%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **53%** |

# BESB Counselor Ratings

**Mean Counselor Ratings**

**Satisfaction ratings for counselors decreased in all areas surveyed this fiscal year. Like measurements of BESB services, these findings must be historically contextualized. In 2017, ratings of counselors increased in all but one area, with numerous dimensions surveyed reaching record highs. These all-time highs were not sustained in 2018, again suggesting that 2017 represents a historical anomaly. With that said, considered longitudinally, there were notable drops in satisfaction this year. This is evidenced by the observation of record low ratings associated with some aspects of counselors.**

**In this fiscal year, the largest decline for counselor ratings came from services related to identifying career goals (6.86, down 2.1 points). This rating marks the lowest seen in the survey’s history, dropping below 2011 (7.35), and is below the historical average (7.77). Ratings for counselors aiding client comprehension of VR rights and responsibilities saw the second largest decline (6.97, down 1.7 points from 2017). This score likewise is below the historical average (8.19) and represents the lowest rating in the survey’s history (previously 7.64, set in 2008). Also exhibiting notable declines in ratings were satisfaction levels with the following aspects of service: referrals from counselors (7.77, down 1.45 in mean rating), counselors’ ability to help clients understand the process for complaint resolution (6.67, down 1.25 in mean rating), counselors’ effectiveness in developing a client’s IPE (7.41, down 1.03 in mean rating), counselors’ professionalism and knowledge (7.87, down 0.98 points, and 7.69, down 0.94 points, respectively), recognition of clients’ special needs (7.53, down 0.85 points), and finally, the provision of information in a useful format (7.75, down 0.76 points). Note that despite these declines in rating, the average client satisfaction level across all dimensions of counselors remains at a respectable level (7.38).**

**In 2018, counselor ratings in every area fell into the neutral satisfaction range, spanning from 7.87 (professionalism of counselor) to 6.67 (understanding the process for complaint resolution). Clients were most satisfied with the professionalism of their counselors, the referrals they provided, and their ability to provide information in the format the clients use. They were least satisfied with the counselors’ ability to explain the complaint resolution process, their help to identify career goals, and in aiding comprehension of Vocational Rehabilitation rights.**

**Since 2016, CCSU has performed a regional analysis on nine dimensions of BESB counselors. In 2018, the Northwestern region showed the highest levels of satisfaction, offering top ratings in five dimensions of counselors (understanding VR rights and responsibilities, recognizing special needs in regard to employment, providing information in the format clients use, helping develop clients’ IPE, and knowledge). Further, the Northwest region tied the South Central region for the top place in helping clients identify career goals. This is a notable reversal from the previous two years, both of which showed the Northwest region to have some of the lowest client satisfaction rates. The second-best performing region in 2018 was South Central, which held the top ranking in two dimensions of counselors (satisfaction of referrals and professionalism) and tied with the Northwestern region in another dimension. This finding is consistent with last year’s analysis, which also placed South Central second overall. Finally, the North Central region held the top ranking in one dimension of counselors measured this year: helping clients understand the process for formal complaint resolution.**

**The Eastern region had the lowest rates of satisfaction this year. However, low sample size obscures the utility of this finding. A more accurate interpretation of this year’s data points to a relatively even distribution of low satisfaction rates across the regions.**

**The Eastern region had the lowest satisfaction rates in three dimensions of counselors (identifying career goals, helping clients understand their VR rights and responsibilities, and knowledge). This may seem like a notable reversal from last year, when the Eastern region took the top spot in two dimensions of counselors. However, sample size affects results. Across numerous dimensions of counselors, the number of clients reporting from the Eastern region stood at either zero or one. For this reason, all regional trends should be interpreted with caution, as the low sample size for the Eastern region influences rankings across the board. For example, although the Northwestern, North Central, and Southwestern regions each ranked in last place in two dimensions of counselors (the South Central region was the only region to not come in last in any dimension), this was usually due to the fact that no clients from the Eastern region responded to that question. Overall, when taking sample size from the Eastern region into consideration, no clear regional patterns associated with low satisfaction emerged.**

**Mean Counselor Ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2018** | **7.87** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2017** | **8.85** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2016** | **8.55** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2015** | **9.06** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2014** | **9.06** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2013** | **8.79** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2012** | **9.0** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2011** | **8.63** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2010** | **9.16** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2009** | **9.12** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2008** | **8.68** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2007** | **8.83** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2006** | **9.19** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2004** | **9.13** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2003** | **9.01** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2018** | **7.69** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2017** | **8.63** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2016** | **8.43** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2015** | **8.91** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2014** | **8.28** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2013** | **8.67** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2012** | **8.54** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2011** | **8.23** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2010** | **8.88** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2009** | **8.86** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2008** | **8.36** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2007** | **8.51** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2006** | **8.84** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2004** | **8.90** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2003** | **8.68** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2018** | **7.77** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2017** | **9.22** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2016** | **8.54** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2015** | **8.45** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2014** | **8.20** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2013** | **8.40** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2012** | **8.69** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2011** | **8.16** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2010** | **8.49** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2009** | **8.34** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2008** | **8.20** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2007** | **8.80** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2006** | **8.42** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2004** | **8.67** |
| **Satisfaction of Referral 2003** | **8.50** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2018** | **7.75** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2017** | **8.51** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2016** | **8.51** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2015** | **8.75** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2014** | **9.36** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2013** | **8.09** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2012** | **7.70** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2011** | **7.70** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2010** | **8.86** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2009** | **8.03** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2008** | **8.06** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2007** | **8.78** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2006** | **8.57** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2004** | **8.53** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2003** | **8.30** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2018** | **6.97** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2017** | **8.67** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2016** | **8.15** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2015** | **8.46** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2014** | **8.47** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2013** | **8.47** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2012** | **8.71** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2011** | **7.80** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2010** | **8.42** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2009** | **8.39** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2008** | **7.64** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2007** | **8.30** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2006** | **8.09** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2004** | **8.20** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2003** | **8.07** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Develop your IPE 2018** | **7.41** |
| **Develop your IPE 2017** | **8.44** |
| **Develop your IPE 2016** | **8.04** |
| **Develop your IPE 2015** | **7.70** |
| **Develop your IPE 2014** | **7.84** |
| **Develop your IPE 2013** | **8.23** |
| **Develop your IPE 2012** | **8.08** |
| **Develop your IPE 2011** | **7.70** |
| **Develop your IPE 2010** | **8.05** |
| **Develop your IPE 2009** | **7.83** |
| **Develop your IPE 2008** | **7.62** |
| **Develop your IPE 2007** | **8.06** |
| **Develop your IPE 2006** | **7.87** |
| **Develop your IPE 2004** | **7.90** |
| **Develop your IPE 2003** | **7.80** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recognize your special needs 2018** | **7.53** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2017** | **8.38** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2016** | **7.82** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2015** | **8.62** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2014** | **7.84** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2013** | **8.22** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2012** | **8.60** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2011** | **8.05** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2010** | **8.49** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2009** | **7.22** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2008** | **7.56** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2007** | **8.12** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2006** | **8.03** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2004** | **8.05** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2003** | **7.84** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Identify your career goals 2018** | **6.86** |
| **Identify your career goals 2017** | **8.96** |
| **Identify your career goals 2016** | **7.45** |
| **Identify your career goals 2015** | **8.06** |
| **Identify your career goals 2014** | **8.05** |
| **Identify your career goals 2013** | **7.78** |
| **Identify your career goals 2012** | **8.36** |
| **Identify your career goals 2011** | **7.35** |
| **Identify your career goals 2010** | **7.94** |
| **Identify your career goals 2009** | **7.47** |
| **Identify your career goals 2008** | **7.43** |
| **Identify your career goals 2007** | **7.71** |
| **Identify your career goals 2006** | **7.75** |
| **Identify your career goals 2004** | **7.88** |
| **Identify your career goals 2003** | **7.47** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2018** | **6.67** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2017** | **7.92** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2016** | **6.71** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2015** | **7.45** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2014** | **8.85** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2013** | **7.71** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2012** | **7.76** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2011** | **7.62** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2010** | **7.64** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2009** | **7.82** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2008** | **7.12** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2007** | **7.83** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2006** | **7.51** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2004** | **7.95** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2003** | **7.52** |

**Assistance with an Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE)**

**Slightly less than half of all clients (49%, down 17 percentage points) expressed high levels of satisfaction with their counselors’ ability to develop an IPE. Dissatisfied ratings increased slightly (9%, up 5 percentage points), while neutral satisfaction rates more than doubled from last year (30%, up 16 percentage points). Finally, the percentage of clients who were unable or unwilling to answer the question declined (12%, down 4 percentage points).**

**The main reason for client satisfaction with this service continues to be the perception that the provider was knowledgeable and/or caring, with well over half (59%) of satisfied clients citing this as their primary reason. This was followed by the clients stating that their needs and/or expectations were met (23%), that the follow-up after the service was good (6%), and that the service was timely (6%). Additionally, 6% of clients asked to give a main reason as to why they were satisfied stated they didn’t know or refused to answer. In qualitative follow-up questions, satisfied clients said their counselors were always there to help and that they were able to answer any questions they had. Clients also noted that counselors gave effective and timely advice, provided helpful opportunities, and understood specific needs.**

**Clients expressing dissatisfaction were equally split between three reasons. One-third (33.33%) felt that their needs and/or expectations were not met, one-third (33.33%) cited that the quality of the service was poor, and the remainder (33.33%) noted that their needs were ignored. When asked to further elaborate, dissatisfied clients cited a lack of communication and slow return phone calls.**

**Clients living in the Northwestern region offered the highest ratings on their counselors’ ability to develop an IPE (8.50, 1.09 above the overall mean and a decrease of 0.05 points from 2017). Clients in the North Central region (7.45, 0.04 points above the overall mean and a decrease of 0.37 points from 2017) also reported mean satisfaction ratings above the overall mean, although ratings in that region decreased slightly from 2017’s reported rating. Clients from the Southwestern (6.80, 0.61 below the overall mean and a decrease of 1.20 points from 2017) and South Central (7.75, 0.34 points above the overall mean and a decrease of 1.34 points from 2017) regions reported mean satisfaction ratings more than one point below the previous year’s ratings. Lack of respondents from the Eastern region for this question prevented a mean satisfaction rating for that region, which had the highest rating in 2017 at 9.6.**

**…helping you to develop your Individualized Plan for Employment, or IPE?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=85, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=45, 2011 =74, 2012 n=63, 2013 n=43, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=66, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=33**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **13%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **6%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **30%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **33%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **14%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **49%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **66%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **54%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **62%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **59%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **61%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **47%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **46%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **52%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **44%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **42%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **12%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **16%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **18%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **18%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **16%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **9%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **18%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **33%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **28%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **21%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **21%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **38%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **38%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **8.25** | **9.6** | **--** |
| **North Central** | **7.29** | **7.82** | **7.45** |
| **Northwestern** | **6.57** | **8.55** | **8.50** |
| **South Central** | **9.4** | **9.14** | **7.75** |
| **Southwestern** | **8.4** | **8.0** | **6.80** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.04** | **8.44** | **7.41** |

**Identifying Career Goals**

**Slightly under half (45%) of the clients surveyed in 2018 reported high satisfaction with their counselor’s ability to help them identify career goals, a slight drop from 2017 (down 4 percentage points). The number of individuals who expressed dissatisfaction with their counselor’s ability to help identify career goals reached an all-time high (18%, up 18 percentage points), with neutral ratings also increasing from 2017 (22%, up 15 percentage points). Notably, a much more sizable percentage of clients were able and/or willing to offer an opinion compared to last fiscal year. In 2017, more than two-in-five clients (44%) were unable or unwilling to answer the question — a record high. This year, that percentage declined sharply (15%, down 29 percentage points). Part of the uptick in dissatisfaction seen in 2018 can be attributed to the substantial decline in refusals to answer.**

**Just shy of half (47%) of all highly satisfied clients cited that their counselor was knowledgeable and/or caring, while an identical percentage felt that the service met their needs and/or expectations. The remainder (6%) felt that the service was timely. In qualitative responses, satisfied clients elaborated that they felt their counselors did a good job in keeping them up to date on career opportunities and gave valuable advice. Clients also felt that their counselors were efficient and timely.**

**Clients expressing dissatisfaction were equally split between three reasons. One-third (33.33%) felt that the service did not meet their needs and/or expectations, one-third (33.33%) cited a lack of follow-up (33.33%), and the remainder (33.33%) felt their needs were ignored. When asked to elaborate, dissatisfied clients said that their counselors didn’t search for jobs that matched their professional interests.**

**Interestingly, the Southwestern region showed a significant drop in mean satisfaction rating of VR counselors’ ability to help identify career goals (6.80 mean rating, 0.06 lower the overall mean and 3.2 less than the previous year). This region had the highest mean satisfaction ratings in both 2016 and 2017. The lowest mean rating occurred in the Eastern region (3.0 mean rating, 3.86 below the overall mean), which was a 6.5-point drop in mean satisfaction from 2017. The other three regions, including South Central (8.33 mean rating, 1.47 above the overall mean), Northwestern (8.33 mean rating, 1.47 above the overall mean), and North Central (6.45, 0.41 below the overall mean) all experienced drops in mean satisfaction rating as well, although these declines were less drastic than those experienced in the Southwestern and Eastern regions.**

**…helping you identify your career goals?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=85, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=41, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=58, 2013 n=42, 2014 n=49, 2015 n=63, 2016 n=49, 2017 n=41, 2018 n=33**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **18%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **9%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **7%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **24%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **7%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **27%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **13%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **45%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **49%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **51%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **53%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **46%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **54%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **44%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **48%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **51%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **42%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **36%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **15%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **44%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **23%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **22%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **33%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **27%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **19%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **40%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **42%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **6.5** | **9.5** | **3.0** |
| **North Central** | **7.08** | **8.55** | **6.45** |
| **Northwestern** | **6.0** | **9.0** | **8.33** |
| **South Central** | **8.0** | **9.33** | **8.33** |
| **Southwestern** | **9.6** | **10.0** | **6.80** |
| **Overall Mean** | **7.45** | **8.96** | **6.86** |

**Recognizing Special Needs in Regard to Employment**

**Clients’ satisfaction with their counselors’ ability to recognize special needs in regard to employment enjoyed a sizable rebound from last year (67%, up 10 percentage points). Dissatisfied ratings climbed (15%, up 13 percentage points), while neutral ratings decreased (9%, down 7 percentage points). Similar to the last aspect of counselors that was surveyed (identifying career goals), a growing percentage of clients were able/willing to answer the question. In 2017, one-quarter of all clients (25%) were unable or unwilling to answer the question. This year, that percentage declined sharply to less than one in ten (9%, down 16 percentage points).**

**Half (50%) of the clients who were very satisfied with their counselor’s ability to recognize their special needs related to employment attributed their satisfaction to the knowledge and/or care exhibited by the provider. Slightly more than one quarter (27.5%) said that the service met their needs and/or expectations (27.5%). The remaining clients said that the service was timely (9%), or refused to give a main reason for their satisfaction (9%). Themes that emerged from qualitative feedback were that counselors were timely, knowledgeable, considerate, and helpful, which clients found invaluable to their employment situation. Overall, satisfied clients felt that their counselors were both perceptive to and efficient in meeting their special employment needs.**

**Clients who expressed dissatisfaction felt that the service did not meet their needs and/or expectations (40%), that their needs were ignored (40%), or that the quality of the service was poor (20%). Those who elaborated mentioned a lack of communication with counselors. Some clients noted very limited communication with their counselor and that they were unable to get in touch, while others stated that counselors didn’t tailor services to their personal situations.**

**Overall mean satisfaction with counselors’ ability to recognize special needs decreased in 2018, with the largest declines occurring in the North Central (7.0, down 1.15) and Southwestern (7.09, down 0.91) regions. The Northwestern and South Central regions showed slight increases in mean satisfaction ratings (9.0, up 0.25, and 8.75, up 0.50, respectively). As was the case in 2016 and 2017, clients across regions rated counselors similarly on this dimension comparative to other dimensions. The North Central and Southwestern regions’ mean satisfaction ratings were below the overall mean (7.53) while the Northwestern and South Central regions’ ratings were above it. There were no respondents from the Eastern region for this question, so there was no way to determine a mean satisfaction rating for that region. The rating for that region was 8.8 in 2017.**

**…recognizing your special needs in regards to employment?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=85, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=35, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=62, 2013 n=42, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=65, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=33**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **15%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **13%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **6%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **21%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **13%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **66%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **54%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **41%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **53%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **61%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **53%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **42%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **42%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **9%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **25%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **7%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **18%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **12%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **31%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **19%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **30%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **25%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **41%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **39%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **7.67** | **8.8** | **--** |
| **North Central** | **7.42** | **8.15** | **7.0** |
| **Northwestern** | **7.38** | **8.75** | **9.0** |
| **South Central** | **9.0** | **8.25** | **8.75** |
| **Southwestern** | **7.43** | **8.0** | **7.09** |
| **Overall Mean** | **7.82** | **8.38** | **7.53** |

**Understanding Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Rights and Responsibilities**

**More than half of clients (52%, down 20 percentage points from 2017) were highly satisfied with their counselors’ ability to help them understand their vocational rehabilitation (VR) rights and responsibilities. About one in five clients gave neutral ratings (21%, up 11 percentage points), and a little less than a quarter (24%, up 20 percentage points) were dissatisfied. A small number of clients (3%, down 11 percentage points) didn’t know how to answer or refused to answer.**

**Of clients reporting high levels of satisfaction, three of five (60%) cited the knowledge and/or concern of the provider as the primary reason for their high satisfaction. Others felt that the product or service met their needs and expectations (35%) or appreciated the timeliness of service (5%). In qualitative commentary, satisfied clients praised the knowledge, efficiency, and helpfulness of their counselors and stated that the explanations they received were thorough and clear. Clients noted that their counselors verified their understanding and answered any questions the client had.**

**Clients who were dissatisfied felt that the services did not meet their needs and/or expectations (25%), the quality of services was poor (25%), their needs were ignored (25%), or the service was not timely (12.5%). One client gave an alternate reason (12.5%). In qualitative responses, clients felt explanations of their VR rights and responsibilities were incomplete and the services were not timely. A common theme in these responses was that clients thought the legal complexity in the process was not adequately explained.**

**Regionally, clients living in the Northwestern region showed the most satisfaction with their counselors’ help in understanding their VR rights and responsibilities (9.0, 2.03 above the overall mean and 0.29 greater than 2017). The Northwestern region was the only region to experience a gain in satisfaction levels. The Eastern region suffered the greatest decrease (5.0, 1.97 below the overall mean and 5.0 lower than 2017). This region had a perfect 10 in mean satisfaction last year. The South Central (7.50, 0.53 points above the overall mean and 1.06 lower than 2017), North Central (6.67, 0.3 points below than the overall mean and 1.89 lower than 2017), and Southwestern (6.55, 0.42 points above the overall mean and 0.78 lower than 2017) regions underwent declines in mean satisfaction as well.**

**…help you understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights and responsibilities?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=85, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=47, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=62, 2013 n=44, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=69, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=33**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **24%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **6%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **21%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **23%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **14%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **52%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **66%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **47%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **61%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **44%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **53%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **9%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **17%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **23%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **12%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **11%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **31%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **23%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **11%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **12%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **37%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **37%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **8.33** | **10.0** | **5.0** |
| **North Central** | **7.82** | **8.56** | **6.67** |
| **Northwestern** | **7.57** | **8.71** | **9.0** |
| **South Central** | **8.75** | **8.56** | **7.50** |
| **Southwestern** | **8.12** | **7.33** | **6.55** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.15** | **8.67** | **6.97** |

**Understanding the Process for Formal Complaint Resolution**

**In 2018, more than three of five clients (64%, down ten percentage points) did not provide a numerical rating for their satisfaction with their counselors’ explanations of the formal complaint resolution process: they instead didn’t know how to answer, refused to answer, or stated the subject was not applicable. Of those who did give a rating of satisfaction, most were highly satisfied (21%, up 5 percentage points). The remaining clients gave neutral ratings (3%, down 5 percentage points) or were dissatisfied (12%, up ten percentage points from 2017).**

**Although there was an increase in dissatisfied clients, there was also an increase in satisfaction among clients in this area. The increase in dissatisfaction can be contributed to the decreases in those who did not give a numerical rating and those who gave a neutral rating. Although the number of clients who didn’t know/refused to answer has gone down from 2017, it is still the second-highest figure in the survey’s history. However, the percentage of clients who chose this response has always been higher on average than in other questions, and it is possible, based on qualitative feedback received in the past, that clients are generally not aware of the formal complaint resolution process. The 2017 assessment suggested that clients generally need additional education in this area, and the 2018 survey seems to show some improvement in this area from 2017.**

**More than two in five (43%) of highly satisfied clients cited knowledge and/or concern exhibited by the caregiver as the main reason for their high satisfaction. One-third of clients noted that the product or service met their needs and/or expectations (29%), gave an alternative reason (14%) or didn’t know/refused to answer (14%). In qualitative feedback, clients again stressed the importance of counselors who understood the processes and procedures and explained these clearly to the client.**

**Two in five (40%) dissatisfied clients stated that the service did not meet their needs and/or expectations, while an identical percentage (40%) volunteered an alternate reason for their satisfaction. The remaining clients (20%) felt that their needs were ignored. In qualitative follow-up responses, clients noted a lack of detail in information given in this area or that the formal complaint resolution process was never discussed at all. Generally, clients were dissatisfied about the lack of information on the process given by counselors.**

**The North Central region showed the highest mean satisfaction rating (9.0, 2.33 above the overall mean and up 2.6 from 2017). The Southwestern (6.75, 0.08 above the overall mean and down 3.25 from 2017) and South Central (6.50, 0.17 below the overall mean and down 0.50 from 2017) regions showed some decline in satisfaction from last year. The other two regions exhibited significant drops in mean satisfaction. The Eastern region dropped from a perfect 10.0 in 2017 to 3.0 in 2018 (3.67 below the overall mean), and the Northwestern region dropped from 7.5 in 2017 to 1.0 in 2018 (5.67 below the overall mean).**

**…help you understand the process for formal complaint resolution?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=46, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=62, 2013 n=23, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=66, 2016 n=55, 2017 n=36, 2018 n=34**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **14%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **13%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **9%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **3%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **6%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **21%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **14%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **21%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **16%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **33%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **35%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **42%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **30%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **38%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **37%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **41%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **34%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **56%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **45%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **41%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **42%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2018** | **64%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2017** | **74%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2016** | **42%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2015** | **26%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2014** | **58%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2013** | **31%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2012** | **60%** |
| **DK/Ref /NA 2011** | **39%** |
| **DK/Ref/ NA 2010** | **40%** |
| **DK/Ref/ NA 2009** | **36%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2008** | **38%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2007** | **20%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2006** | **29%** |
| **DK/Ref /NA 2004** | **43%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2003** | **35%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **10.0** | **10.0** | **3.0** |
| **North Central** | **6.15** | **7.4** | **9.0** |
| **Northwestern** | **5.0** | **7.5** | **1.0** |
| **South Central** | **8.0** | **7.0** | **6.50** |
| **Southwestern** | **5.4** | **10.0** | **6.75** |
| **Overall Mean** | **6.71** | **7.92** | **6.67** |

**Information Provided in the Format You Use**

**Most clients surveyed in 2018 appeared satisfied with their counselors’ ability to provide information in the format that they use. Slightly more than half (52%, down 5 percentage points from 2017) of respondents expressed high satisfaction in this area, while smaller numbers gave neutral ratings (9%, down one percentage point from 2017) or were dissatisfied (12%, up 8 percentage points from 2017). Slightly more than a quarter of clients didn’t know how to answer or refused to (27%, down two percentage points).**

**Almost half (47%) of the highly satisfied clients attributed their satisfaction to the fact that the product or service met their needs and/or expectations. Others felt that the provider was knowledgeable and/or caring (35%), that access to the service was coordinated effectively (6%), gave an alternate reason (6%), or couldn’t give an answer (6%). In qualitative follow-up comments, respondents noted that they appreciated the wide range of alternative formats available to them, and that service providers were helpful in relaying these options and helping clients with the process of obtaining them. Clients with a wide range of needs noted their counselors’ skill in helping them obtain information in the formats they use.**

**Three-quarters of dissatisfied clients (75%) felt that the product or service did not meet their needs and/or expectations, while the remaining quarter (25%) felt that their needs were ignored. When asked to elaborate, clients stated that they were never given the devices or technology they needed to read information in the format they use. Others mentioned that they were never told about these services at all.**

**As in 2017, clients residing in the Northwestern region were most satisfied with their counselors’ ability to provide information in the format that they use, unanimously giving this dimension a perfect 10 rating (2.25 above overall mean). Clients in the South Central region also rated this dimension highly (8.00, 0.25 above overall mean and 0.29 down from 2017). Client satisfaction in the Southwestern (7.11, 0.64 below overall mean and 2.72 down from 2017) and North Central (7.25, 0.50 below the overall mean and 0.88 down from 2017) regions showed slight decline from 2017; however, they still reflect a high degree of client satisfaction. There were no respondents from the Eastern region for this question, so there was no way to determine a mean satisfaction rating for that region. The rating for that region was 8.75 in 2017.**

**…providing any information in the format you use?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=46, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=63, 2013 n=35, 2014 n=46, 2015 n=71, 2016 n=55, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=33**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **1%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **6%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **14.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **12%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **52%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **76%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **69%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **55%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **66%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **49%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **59%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **57%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **27%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **29%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **14.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **10%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **22%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **25%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **17%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **21%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **33%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **19%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **18%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **17%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **30%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **25%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **9.25** | **8.75** | **--** |
| **North Central** | **7.94** | **8.13** | **7.25** |
| **Northwestern** | **8.29** | **10.0** | **10.0** |
| **South Central** | **8.5** | **8.29** | **8.00** |
| **Southwestern** | **9.83** | **9.83** | **7.11** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.15** | **8.51** | **7.75** |

**Referrals Provided by Counselors**

**In 2018, slightly less than half of clients (46%, down 25 percentage points from 2017) were highly satisfied with referrals provided by their counselors. The number of clients who gave neutral ratings (12%, up 8 percentage points) or were dissatisfied (9%, up 9 percentage points) increased from last year. A third of respondents (33%, up 8 percentage points from last year) didn’t know how to answer or felt the question did not apply. The decrease in high satisfaction from 2017 can be partially explained by the increases in neutral and didn’t know/does not apply responses.**

**Half (50%) of the clients who were highly satisfied with the referrals provided by their counselors attributed their satisfaction to the fact that the service met their needs and/or expectations. Others stated that their provider was knowledgeable and/or caring (38%) or that the service was timely (6%). In qualitative elaboration, clients felt that the referrals they received were helpful and addressed their needs. Clients also stated the services were timely, and counselors answered any questions clients had about the process.**

**Two-thirds of dissatisfied clients stated that the service did not meet their needs and/or expectations (66.7%), while the other third felt that the quality of the product was poor (33.3%). Qualitative follow-up responses show dissatisfied clients felt they were not offered referrals when they should have been.**

**Unlike last year, clients in the South Central region showed the most satisfaction with referrals provided by their counselor (8.25, 0.48 above the overall mean and 1.32 lower than in 2017). Previously, this spot belonged to the Southwestern region (7.86, 0.09 above the overall mean), which had a perfect 10.0 mean rating in 2017. The North Central (8.13, 0.36 above the overall mean and 0.67 lower than in 2017) and Northwestern (6.0, 1.77 below the overall mean and 2.0 lower than in 2017) showed declines in mean satisfaction as well.**

**...any referral provided by your counselor?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=46, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=63, 2013 n=45, 2014 n=49, 2015 n=68, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=33**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **6%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **4%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **10%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **46%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **66%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **73%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **65%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **63%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **62%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **63%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **70%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **66%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2018** | **33%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2017** | **25%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2016** | **18%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2015** | **15%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2014** | **15%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2014** | **18%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2013** | **11%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2012** | **19%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2011** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2010** | **19%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2009** | **15%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2008** | **14%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2007** | **16%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2006** | **8%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2004** | **18%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2003** | **18%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **8.33** | **9.5** | **--** |
| **North Central** | **7.4** | **8.8** | **8.13** |
| **Northwestern** | **8.17** | **8.0** | **6.0** |
| **South Central** | **9.33** | **9.57** | **8.25** |
| **Southwestern** | **9.43** | **10.0** | **7.86** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.54** | **9.22** | **7.77** |

**Knowledge of Counselors**

**As in 2016 and 2017, mean client satisfaction with knowledge demonstrated by counselors declined in 2018. Still, two-thirds (67%) of BESB clients indicated that they were highly satisfied with the knowledge of their counselor. Smaller percentages of clients gave neutral ratings (15%, down 1 percentage point) or stated they were dissatisfied (15%, up eleven percentage points). Overall, while satisfaction is at an all-time low in this area, the majority of clients are still highly satisfied with the knowledge of their counselors.**

**In qualitative responses regarding the knowledge of counselors, satisfied clients felt that their counselors were well educated, informed, considerate, and generally helpful. Satisfied clients liked that their counselors would answer any questions they had in a timely manner and would research answers to questions they couldn’t immediately answer. Dissatisfied clients felt that the communication they received from their counselors was poor, with some clients saying that they had no contact with their counselors at all.**

**In 2018, most of the BESB regions reported high levels of satisfaction with their counselors’ knowledge levels. Clients in the Northwestern region had an increase in mean satisfaction rating from last year (9.50, 1.81 above the overall mean and 0.95 higher than in 2017). Clients in the North Central (8.08, 0.39 above overall mean and 0.36 lower than in 2017) and South Central (8.25, 0.56 above the overall mean and 0.30 lower than in 2017) regions experienced slight declines in mean satisfaction. The Southwestern region (6.82, 0.87 below the overall mean and 1.85 lower than in 2017) had a more moderate decrease in satisfaction, and the Eastern region appeared to have a steep decline in satisfaction (3.0, 4.69 below the overall mean and 5.0 lower than in 2017). However, it should be noted that only one respondent from the Eastern region could be reached to gauge their satisfaction on this topic. Therefore, the mean satisfaction rating from that region and the overall mean satisfaction rating should both be interpreted with caution. Overall, the mean satisfaction with BESB counselors’ knowledge remained high in 2018.**

**How would you rate the knowledge of your counselor?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=45, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=61, 2013 n=44, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=69, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=33**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **15%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **1%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **4%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **8%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **12%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **83%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **80%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **79%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **76%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **80%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **79%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **73%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **77%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **79%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **79%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **76%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **8%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **9.0** | **8.0** | **3.0** |
| **North Central** | **7.47** | **8.44** | **8.08** |
| **Northwestern** | **8.0** | **8.55** | **9.50** |
| **South Central** | **9.24** | **8.55** | **8.25** |
| **Southwestern** | **8.88** | **8.67** | **6.82** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.43** | **8.63** | **7.69** |

**Professionalism of Counselors**

**Almost three-quarters of respondents (72%, down two percentage points from 2017) stated they were highly satisfied with their counselors’ professionalism. One-eighth of clients (12.5%, down 3.5 percentage points) gave neutral ratings, and another eighth (12.5%, up 6.5 percentage points) felt dissatisfied. Despite this increase in dissatisfaction, most clients are still highly satisfied with BESB counselors’ professionalism.**

**In qualitative follow-up commentary, most clients noted that their counselors were timely, polite, and followed a good code of conduct. Overall, satisfied clients felt that their counselors were generally very professional and that they respected confidentiality. The few dissatisfied clients stated the opposite, citing counselor inexperience, unprofessionalism, and lengthy follow-up time.**

**Regionally, mean satisfaction declined slightly from 2017 in almost all regions while still staying relatively high. The Northwestern region (8.75, 0.88 above the overall mean and 0.42 higher than in 2017) was the only area where mean satisfaction increased. The North Central (7.45, 0.42 below the overall mean and 1.05 lower than in 2017), South Central (9.0, 1.13 above the overall mean and 0.78 lower than in 2017), and Southwestern (7.55, 0.32 below the overall mean and 1.12 lower than in 2017) regions all experienced small declines in satisfaction. The Eastern region (8.0, 0.13 below the overall mean and 1.50 lower than in 2017) showed the highest decrease in satisfaction from last year, but it should again be noted that only one client residing in this region could be reached for a response in this area, and so this figure should be interpreted cautiously.**

**How would you rate the professionalism of your counselor?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=45, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=61, 2013 n=44, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=69, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=48, 2018 n=32**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **12.5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **5.5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **3%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **12.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **3%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **7%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **3%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **9%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **12%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **86%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **89%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **84%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **84%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **85%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **82.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **84%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **81%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **78%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **79%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **86%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **85%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **74%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **7%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **11%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **9.25** | **9.50** | **8.0** |
| **North Central** | **7.58** | **8.50** | **7.45** |
| **Northwestern** | **9.38** | **8.33** | **8.75** |
| **South Central** | **9.41** | **9.78** | **9.0** |
| **Southwestern** | **7.88** | **8.67** | **7.55** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.55** | **8.85** | **7.87** |

**Experience Working with Counselors**

**Almost four out of five (79%, down 13 percentage points from 2017) rated their experience in working with BESB counselors as positive. Slightly over one out of five (21%, up 15 percentage points) respondents rated their experience as negative. Clients were somewhat polarized in 2018, as none of them gave neutral ratings in this area (0%, down two percentage points). More than three out of five clients (61%) rated their experience as very positive while relatively few clients (12%) rated their experience as very negative, showing the majority of BESB clients are still highly satisfied working with their counselors. The fact that the results found in this area in 2018 are more like the figures found in 2016 than those found in 2017 again seem to point to the all-time highs of 2017 being a historical anomaly.**

**Those reporting positive experiences were satisfied with their counselor’s professionalism, knowledge, positivity, and their overall ability to help their clients achieve their career and life goals. Some clients stated that they liked their counselor’s willingness to help and their timeliness in doing so. Dissatisfied clients felt that their counselors didn’t communicate enough with them or felt that the help counselors offered wasn’t useful. Some clients stated that they rarely hear from their counselor or don’t hear from their counselor at all.**

**Clients in the Northwestern (100%, up 8.33 percentage points from 2017) and South Central (100%, same as in 2017) regions rated their experiences as 100% positive. Respondents residing in the North Central (75%, down 9.21 percentage points) and Southwestern (73%, down 27 percentage points) regions experienced declines in satisfaction. The Eastern region (0%, down 100 percentage points) experienced a seemingly massive decrease in positive experiences with counselors, but it should again be noted that only one respondent could be reached from this region to answer this question, and so this new percentage is not very telling, especially given that the rating in both 2016 and 2017 for this region was 100%.**

**Experience working with the counselor**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=45, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=60, 2013 n=45, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=68, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=33**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Positive Rating 2017** | **79%** |
| **Positive Rating 2017** | **92%** |
| **Positive Rating 2016** | **84%** |
| **Positive Rating 2015** | **90%** |
| **Positive Rating 2014** | **88%** |
| **Positive Rating 2013** | **90%** |
| **Positive Rating 2012** | **88%** |
| **Positive Rating 2011** | **86%** |
| **Positive Rating 2010** | **96%** |
| **Positive Rating 2009** | **88%** |
| **Positive Rating 2008** | **86%** |
| **Positive Rating 2007** | **87%** |
| **Positive Rating 2006** | **92%** |
| **Positive Rating 2004** | **92%** |
| **Positive Rating 2003** | **85%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Neutral Rating 2018** | **0%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2017** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2016** | **0%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2015** | **6%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2014** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2013** | **0%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2012** | **4%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2011** | **4%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2009** | **4%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2008** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2007** | **3%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2006** | **1%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2004** | **1%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2003** | **4%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Negative Rating 2017** | **21%** |
| **Negative Rating 2017** | **6%** |
| **Negative Rating 2016** | **16%** |
| **Negative Rating 2015** | **4%** |
| **Negative Rating 2014** | **6%** |
| **Negative Rating 2013** | **6%** |
| **Negative Rating 2012** | **8%** |
| **Negative Rating 2011** | **10%** |
| **Negative Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **Negative Rating 2009** | **4%** |
| **Negative Rating 2008** | **11%** |
| **Negative Rating 2007** | **6%** |
| **Negative Rating 2006** | **6%** |
| **Negative Rating 2004** | **4%** |
| **Negative Rating 2003** | **4%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **7%** |

**Regional Data, Percentage Issuing Positive Rating**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **100%** | **100%** | **0%** |
| **North Central** | **74%** | **84.21%** | **75%** |
| **Northwestern** | **75%** | **91.67%** | **100%** |
| **South Central** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** |
| **Southwestern** | **75%** | **100%** | **73%** |

**Explanation of Delays**

**Almost half (49%, down 25 percentage points from 2017) of all clients stated that their counselor explained the delays encountered in providing services on time. At the same time, the number of clients who said that their counselor did not explain delays also decreased (16%, down 8 percentage points). This can be explained by the large number of clients—more than one-third—who stated the question was not applicable to them (35%). This means that of the clients the question applied to, the vast majority had counselors who explained delays.**

**Regionally, clients residing in the North Central (80%, up from 58.33% in 2017) and Northwestern (100%, up from 70% in 2017) regions were the most satisfied with their counselors’ explanation of delays. Clients from the South Central (75%, down from 100% in 2017) and Southwestern (75%, up from 50% in 2017) regions were also mostly satisfied. The Eastern region shows a satisfaction rating of 0%, but this is because only one respondent could be reached from this region and felt the question was not applicable to them. In 2017, this region had a satisfaction rating of 100%. Overall, mean satisfaction with the explanation of delays increased across most regions.**

**Did your counselor explain to you the delays encountered in providing the Services on time?**

**2003 n=108, 2004 n=111, 2006 n=60, 2007 n=78, 2008 n=81, 2009 n=50, 2010 n=45, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=45, 2013 n=35, 2014 n=38, 2015 n=54, 2016 n=40, 2017 n=34, 2018 n=31**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes 2018** | **49%** |
| **Yes 2017** | **74%** |
| **Yes 2016** | **65%** |
| **Yes 2015** | **78%** |
| **Yes 2014** | **81%** |
| **Yes 2013** | **74%** |
| **Yes 2012** | **78%** |
| **Yes 2011** | **74%** |
| **Yes 2010** | **86%** |
| **Yes 2009** | **91%** |
| **Yes 2008** | **75%** |
| **Yes 2007** | **74%** |
| **Yes 2006** | **85%** |
| **Yes 2004** | **75%** |
| **Yes 2003** | **75%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No 2018** | **16%** |
| **No 2017** | **24%** |
| **No 2016** | **25%** |
| **No 2015** | **20%** |
| **No 2014** | **16%** |
| **No 2013** | **20%** |
| **No 2012** | **18%** |
| **No 2011** | **11%** |
| **No 2010** | **8%** |
| **No 2009** | **6%** |
| **No 2008** | **21%** |
| **No 2007** | **19%** |
| **No 2006** | **12%** |
| **No 2004** | **16%** |
| **No 2003** | **18%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **10%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **9%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **7%** |

**Regional Data, Percentage Reporting “yes” (explanation of delay received)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **50%** | **100%** | **0%** |
| **North Central** | **69.2%** | **58.33%** | **80%** |
| **Northwestern** | **50%** | **70%** | **100%** |
| **South Central** | **91%** | **100%** | **75%** |
| **Southwestern** | **66.7%** | **50%** | **75%** |

**Satisfaction with Services Arranged**

**Three-quarters of BESB clients (75%, down 9 percentage points from 2017) were highly satisfied with services arranged by counselors. Specifically, more than half of all clients (52%) were “very satisfied” while almost a quarter (23%) were “somewhat satisfied.” A small number of clients gave neutral ratings (3%, down 3 percentage points) while about one in five (19%, up 9 percentage points) were dissatisfied. Of those who were dissatisfied, only a small number (6%) were very dissatisfied; the rest (13%) were only “somewhat dissatisfied.”**

**As in 2017, mean client satisfaction with the services arranged by counselors was mixed across regions, with the highest levels occurring in the South Central (100%, up from 88.89% in 2017) and North Central (82.0%, down from 90.0% in 2017) regions. Satisfaction ratings from clients residing in the Northwestern region (75%, up from 66.67% in 2017) increased, while ratings in the Southwestern region (64%, down from 66.67% declined slightly). No clients from the Eastern region could be reached to respond in this area. In 2016 and 2017, a 100% mean satisfaction rating was reported for that region.**

**Overall, how satisfied were you with the Services your counselor arranged for you?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=51, 2010 n=44, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=61, 2013 n=43, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=18, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49; 2018 n=31**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Satisfied Rating 2018** | **75%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2017** | **84%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2016** | **82.5%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2015** | **95%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2014** | **84%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2013** | **82%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2012** | **93%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2011** | **85%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2010** | **98%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2009** | **79%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2008** | **87%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2007** | **83%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2006** | **85%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2004** | **85%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2003** | **83%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Neutral Rating 2018** | **3%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2017** | **6%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2016** | **3.5%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2015** | **3%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2014** | **0%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2013** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2012** | **0%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2011** | **5%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2009** | **6%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2008** | **1%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2007** | **0%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2006** | **6%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2004** | **3%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2003** | **2%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2018** | **19%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2017** | **10%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2016** | **10.5%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2015** | **2%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2014** | **6%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2013** | **9%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2012** | **7%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2011** | **6%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2010** | **0%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2009** | **4%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2008** | **9%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2007** | **10%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2006** | **7%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2004** | **6%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2003** | **7%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **3.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **10%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **7%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **11%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **7%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **9%** |

**Regional Data, Percentage Issuing Satisfied Rating**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **100%** | **100%** | **--** |
| **North Central** | **72.2%** | **90.0%** | **82.0%** |
| **Northwestern** | **62.5%** | **66.67%** | **75%** |
| **South Central** | **100%** | **88.89%** | **100%** |
| **Southwestern** | **100%** | **66.67%** | **64.0%** |

# 

# Overall Satisfaction with BESB Services

**Finally, clients were asked to rate their overall experiences with BESB services on a 1- to 10-point scale, in addition to their IPE, timeframe of delivery of service, and the extent to which the services provided met their needs and/or expectations. They were also asked, based on their personal experience, if they would recommend BESB to others.**

**While reported satisfaction with BESB services decreased in all areas surveyed in 2018, the mean ratings remained at a very respectable level. In all areas, the context for the decline in satisfaction is somewhat similar. The most significant decline in satisfaction was in overall satisfaction (7.55, down 1.23 points), falling from a record high in 2017 to a rating only 0.01 points above the all-time low (7.54 in 2011). However, this score is not significantly lower than the historical average (8.25). The second largest drop in satisfaction came from the extent to which clients felt Vocational Rehabilitation Services met their needs (7.30, down one point from 2017). Similar to overall satisfaction, this is the second-lowest rating in the survey’s history and the lowest rating since 2011 (7.18). The 2018 rating is, again, not much lower than the mean rating for all years combined (7.87).**

**Client satisfaction with the extent to which services met their expectations (7.50, down 1.04 from last year) decreased as well, bringing it to its lowest point since 2014 (7.46) and below the historical mean of 7.9. Finally, the lowest decrease came from client satisfaction in how BESB services met their IPE (7.63, down 0.43 points from 2017). This rating is also at its lowest point since 2011 (7.25) but is only slightly below the historical average (7.88). In conclusion, 2018 saw a decline across the board for overall satisfaction with BESB services, with a drop of a little less than a point in average rating across all dimensions (7.50, down from 8.42 in 2017). Last year’s rating was the highest average rating in the survey’s history. Individual satisfaction ratings are at their lowest points in several years, but none of them are at all-time lows.**

**BESB Vocational Rehabilitation Services Mean Ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall satisfaction 2018** | **7.55** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2017** | **8.78** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2016** | **8.35** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2015** | **8.33** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2014** | **7.96** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2013** | **8.44** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2012** | **8.40** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2011** | **7.54** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2010** | **8.60** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2009** | **8.28** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2008** | **8.02** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2007** | **8.39** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2006** | **8.12** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2004** | **8.54** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2003** | **8.48** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Services met expectations 2018** | **7.50** |
| **Services met expectations 2017** | **8.54** |
| **Services met expectations 2016** | **7.57** |
| **Services met expectations 2015** | **8.03** |
| **Services met expectations 2014** | **7.46** |
| **Services met expectations 2013** | **7.79** |
| **Services met expectations 2012** | **7.93** |
| **Services met expectations 2011** | **8.20** |
| **Services met expectations 2010** | **8.04** |
| **Services met expectations 2009** | **8.30** |
| **Services met expectations 2008** | **7.80** |
| **Services met expectations 2007** | **7.72** |
| **Services met expectations 2006** | **7.59** |
| **Services met expectations 2004** | **8.14** |
| **Services met expectations 2003** | **7.96** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Services met your IPE 2018** | **7.63** |
| **Services met your IPE 2017** | **8.06** |
| **Services met your IPE 2016** | **7.86** |
| **Services met your IPE 2015** | **8.19** |
| **Services met your IPE 2014** | **7.89** |
| **Services met your IPE 2013** | **8.31** |
| **Services met your IPE 2012** | **7.93** |
| **Services met your IPE 2011** | **7.25** |
| **Services met your IPE 2010** | **8.33** |
| **Services met your IPE 2009** | **7.83** |
| **Services met your IPE 2008** | **7.69** |
| **Services met your IPE 2007** | **8.23** |
| **Services met your IPE 2006** | **7.39** |
| **Services met your IPE 2004** | **7.89** |
| **Services met your IPE 2003** | **7.69** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Services met needs 2018** | **7.30** |
| **Services met needs 2017** | **8.30** |
| **Services met needs 2016** | **8.19** |
| **Services met needs 2015** | **7.92** |
| **Services met needs 2014** | **8.16** |
| **Services met needs 2013** | **8.35** |
| **Services met needs 2012** | **8.16** |
| **Services met needs 2011** | **7.18** |
| **Services met needs 2010** | **8.04** |
| **Services met needs 2009** | **7.73** |
| **Services met needs 2008** | **7.58** |
| **Services met needs 2007** | **8.06** |
| **Services met needs 2006** | **7.46** |
| **Services met needs 2004** | **7.91** |
| **Services met needs 2003** | **7.78** |

**Extent that Services Met IPE**

**Half of all clients surveyed in 2018 (50%, down 3 percentage points from 2017) were highly satisfied with the extent to which services met their individualized plan of employment (IPE). Neutral ratings increased to almost one-quarter of all respondents (22%, up 16 percentage points), while dissatisfied ratings saw a marginal increase (12%, up four percentage points). Don’t know/refusal to answer responses dropped significantly (16%, down 17 percentage points).**

**Regionally, satisfaction ratings regarding the extent to which services met the client’s IPE varied, but increased from last year in most regions. Specifically, mean satisfaction increased in the North Central (7.64, 0.01 above the overall mean and 0.06 higher than in 2017), Southwestern (6.63, 1.00 below the overall mean and 1.13 higher than in 2017), and Northwestern (9.0, 1.37 above the overall mean and 1.3 higher than in 2017) regions. Satisfaction only declined in the South Central region (8.0, 0.37 above the overall mean and 1.5 lower than in 2017). No respondents could be reached from the Eastern region to respond in this area (in 2017, the rating was 10.0, which was 1.91 above that year’s overall mean).**

**To what extent have the Services you received met your Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE)?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, n=52, 2010 n=45, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=60, 2013 n=40, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=67, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49; 2018 n=32**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **13%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **15%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **7%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **6%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **4%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **12.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **23%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **11%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **9%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **53%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **56%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **62.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **48%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **47%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **56%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **46%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **47%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **56%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **44%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **45%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **39%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **16%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **33%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **9%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **22%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **30%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **20%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **33%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **11%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **33%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **28%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **21%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **24%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **35%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **45%** |

**Regional Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Eastern** | **8.25** | **10.0** | **--** |
| **North Central** | **7.82** | **7.58** | **7.64** |
| **Northwestern** | **6.43** | **7.7** | **9.0** |
| **South Central** | **9.12** | **9.5** | **8.0** |
| **Southwestern** | **6.14** | **5.5** | **6.63** |
| **Overall Mean** | **7.86** | **8.09** | **7.63** |

**Extent Vocational Rehabilitation Services Met Needs**

**More than half of BESB clients (56%, down 22 percentage points from 2017) were highly satisfied with the extent to which Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Services met their needs in 2018. Ratings of neutrality (22%, up ten percentage points) and dissatisfaction (19%, up 15 percentage points) increased, although ratings of high satisfaction are still at a respectable level in this area.**

**To what extent did Vocational Rehabilitation Services meet your needs?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=52, 2010 n=44, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=61, 2013 n=40, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=66, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=31**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **19%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **17%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **9%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **14%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **17.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **16.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **23%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **25%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **20%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **56%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **78%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **66%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **70%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **57%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **55%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **54%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **61%** |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **7%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **10%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **7.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **16.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **13%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **20%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **17%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **20%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **10%** |

**Timeframe for Delivery of Services**

**Almost three-quarters (71%, down 9 percentage points from 2017) of BESB clients were highly satisfied with the overall timeframe for delivery of services in 2018. Specifically, more than three out of five clients (61%) stated they were “very satisfied” with the timeframe for delivery while one in ten (10%) were “somewhat satisfied.” A small number of clients (6.5%, up 2.5 percentage points) gave a rating of neutrality. Slightly less than a quarter (22.5%, up 6.5 percentage points) stated they were dissatisfied in this area.**

**How satisfied were you with the overall timeframe for delivery of Services?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=51, 2010 n=45, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=61, 2013 n=43, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=68, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=31**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Satisfied Rating 2018** | **71%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2017** | **80%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2016** | **71%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2015** | **80%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2014** | **76%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2013** | **79%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2012** | **86%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2011** | **80%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2010** | **93%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2009** | **84%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2008** | **74%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2007** | **80%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2006** | **80%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2004** | **82%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2003** | **82%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Neutral Rating 2018** | **6.5%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2017** | **4%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2016** | **9%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2015** | **4%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2014** | **4%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2013** | **7%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2012** | **3%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2011** | **4%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2009** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2008** | **1%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2007** | **2%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2006** | **4%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2004** | **0%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2003** | **1%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2018** | **22.5%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2017** | **16%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2016** | **20%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2015** | **14%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2014** | **16%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2013** | **14%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2012** | **9%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2011** | **15%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2010** | **5%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2009** | **8%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2008** | **18%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2007** | **15%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2006** | **17%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2004** | **14%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2003** | **14%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **3%** |

**Overall Satisfaction with Vocational Rehabilitation Services**

**More than three in five clients (65%, down 17 percentage points from 2017) rated their overall satisfaction with BESB services as very high. Although this is a decline from an all-time high in 2017, this figure is well above the all-time low (55.5%, found in 2011) and shows that the majority of BESB clients are still highly satisfied with BESB services. Additionally, 16% (up 14 percentage points from 2017) stated they were dissatisfied and 19% (up 3 points from 2017) gave ratings of neutrality. As in 2017, no clients were unable or unwilling to answer the question.**

**What is your overall satisfaction with the Services provided by the Vocational Rehabilitation Division of BESB?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, 2008 n=95, 2009 n=51, 2010 n=46, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=61, 2013 n=43, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=68, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=31**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **16%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **8%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **19%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **4%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **4%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **24%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **26%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **24.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **23%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **12%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **17%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **26%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **18%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **21%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **65%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **82%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **75%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **75%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **55.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **69%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **73%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **71%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **73%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **7%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **15%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **7%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **2%** |

**Extent Services Met Expectations**

**In 2018, more than three out of five (65%, down 9 percentage points from 2017) of clients were highly satisfied with the extent to which BESB Services met their expectations. About one-sixth (16%, down 6 percentage points) of clients gave a neutral rating and the same amount (16%, up 14 percentage points) were dissatisfied. BESB clients, as a whole, are still highly satisfied with the extent to which services met their expectations.**

**As a follow-up question, clients were also asked which service provided by BESB fell short of their expectations. A third of respondents (33%, down 5 percentage points from 2017) refused to answer or didn’t know how to. Of those who did respond, about a sixth chose Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment (17%, up 2 percentage points). The same number chose Skills Training (17%, up 2 percentage points) and Transportation (17%, up 8.5 percentage points). Smaller groups of clients felt that Personal Care Attendant (7%), Low Vision Services (3%), Higher Education Training (3%), and Small Business Venture Services (3%) fell short of their expectations. These figures are similar to those found in 2017, with the exception of the percentage of clients who felt that Transportation Services fell short of their expectations, which increased moderately.**

**Additionally, clients were asked which service provided by BESB exceeded their expectations. About a quarter (26%) of clients didn’t know/refused to answer. Those who did answer largely felt that Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment (42%) exceeded their expectations the most. Other clients chose Low Vision Services (9.5%), Personal Care Attendant (9.5%), Skills Training (6.5%), and Higher Education Training (6.5%) Services.**

**When asked to elaborate, clients who felt a service fell short of their expectations gave varying reasons for why. In general, most felt that they did not receive the services they felt they needed, whether it be technology, transportation, or skills training. Others noted a lack of communication with their counselors in arranging necessary services.**

**In qualitative follow-up responses, many clients who felt that a particular service exceeded their expectations remarked that the equipment and/or services provided were of high quality. Others mentioned the timeliness of the services, saying they were invaluable in their pursuit of occupational and/or educational goals.**

**To what extent have the Services met your expectations?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, n=2008 = 95, 2009 n=51, 2010 n=46, 2011 n=74, 2012 n=61, 2013 n=43, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=67, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=31**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2018** | **16%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2017** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2016** | **11%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2015** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2014** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2013** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2012** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2011** | **19%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2010** | **2%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2009** | **6%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2008** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2007** | **9%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2006** | **7%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2004** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2003** | **6%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **16%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2017** | **22%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2016** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2015** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2014** | **26%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2013** | **26%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2012** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **24.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **38%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **10%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2008** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2007** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2006** | **31%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2004** | **26%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2003** | **25%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2018** | **65%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2017** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2016** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2015** | **75%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2014** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2013** | **65%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2012** | **69%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **55.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **68%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2008** | **64%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2007** | **69%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2006** | **58%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2004** | **67%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2003** | **65%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **16%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **4%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **4%** |

**Recommending BESB Vocational Rehabilitation Services**

**Slightly more than four-fifths of the clients surveyed (81%, down 15 percentage points from 2017) reported that they would recommend BESB VR services to a friend. The proportion of clients who would not recommend BESB services to a friend increased (19%, up 15 percentage points). No clients were unable or unwilling to answer this question (0%, the same percentage as in 2017). Overall, most BESB clients are willing to recommend VR services to a friend.**

**Based on your experience, would you recommend BESB Vocational Rehabilitation Services to a friend?**

**2003 n=163, 2004 n=141, 2006 n=84, 2007 n=90, n=2008=95, 2009 n=51, 2010 n=49, 2011 n=73, 2012 n=61, 2013 n=45, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=70, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=32**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes 2018** | **81%** |
| **Yes 2017** | **96%** |
| **Yes 2016** | **98%** |
| **Yes 2015** | **96%** |
| **Yes 2014** | **90%** |
| **Yes 2013** | **91%** |
| **Yes 2012** | **94%** |
| **Yes 2011** | **92%** |
| **Yes 2010** | **94%** |
| **Yes 2009** | **90%** |
| **Yes 2008** | **89%** |
| **Yes 2007** | **92%** |
| **Yes 2006** | **92%** |
| **Yes 2004** | **93%** |
| **Yes 2003** | **90%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No 2018** | **19%** |
| **No 2017** | **4%** |
| **No 2016** | **0%** |
| **No 2015** | **4%** |
| **No 2014** | **8%** |
| **No 2013** | **9%** |
| **No 2012** | **3%** |
| **No 2011** | **7%** |
| **No 2010** | **4%** |
| **No 2009** | **4%** |
| **No 2008** | **9%** |
| **No 2007** | **7%** |
| **No 2006** | **7%** |
| **No 2004** | **5%** |
| **No 2003** | **8%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DK/Ref 2018** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2017** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2016** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2015** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2014** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2013** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2012** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2011** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2010** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2009** | **6%** |
| **DK/Ref 2008** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2007** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2006** | **1%** |
| **DK/Ref 2004** | **2%** |
| **DK/Ref 2003** | **2%** |

# Methodology

**The Vocational Rehabilitation Division at the Bureau of Education and Services for the Blind (BESB) commissioned the Center for Public Policy and Social Research (CPPSR) at Central Connecticut State University to conduct an annual customer satisfaction survey for clients who received services during the 2018 fiscal year.**

**This survey represents a continuation of the research previously conducted at the University of Connecticut from 2003 through 2008. For 2018, 33 complete interviews were conducted from September 18t through October 10. Complete interviews are defined as instances when a respondent followed the interview to its entirety. The instrument, as well as the list of clients from which this survey data is drawn, was provided by BESB.**

**Out of the sample of 60 clients who received services from BESB during the 2018 fiscal year, ten individuals refused to respond to the survey. Sixteen clients did not answer the phone following numerous attempts to reach them. CPPSR called each client a minimum of eight times, though in most cases, attempted contact reached upwards of 11 calls. Three clients were deemed to be unreachable, while the remaining client started the survey but terminated participation mid-way through. Privacy devices were not a major hindrance to reaching clients in 2018; instead, clients appeared to use voicemail to screen calls at higher rates than in the past. After six attempts at reaching a client, CPPSR left a message requesting a return call.**

**CPPSR noted no statistically significant changes in responses from 2017 to 2018. Out of respondents who CPPSR was able to reach, this survey has a 9.0% margin of error at the 90% confidence interval. This means that statistical anomalies outside of the +/-9.0% margin of error will only exist approximately ten percent of the time.**

# Annotated Questionnaire

**Connecticut Bureau of Education and Services for the Blind  
Vocational Rehabilitation Division**

**Annotated Questionnaire:  
Fiscal Year 2018**

**Conducted by:**

****

**Issued December 2018**

**Hello. May I speak with <FNAME> <LNAME>, please? My name is <FNAME>. I am calling on behalf of the Vocational Rehabilitation Division at the Connecticut Bureau of Education and Services for the Blind (BESB). We are conducting a survey evaluating the Services you received and need your opinions. The results of the study will be kept confidential and will only be used in an effort to improve the program. For questions dealing with employment and career issues, please keep in mind that for many BESB clients, homemaker is considered as employment.**

**Q1a. Have you received Low Vision Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **82%** |
| **No** | **15%** |
| **Don't know** | **3%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **34** |

**Q1b. Did you see an eye doctor referred to you by BESB as part of the Low Vision Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **62%** |
| **No** | **29%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **9%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **34** |

**Q1c. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied", how satisfied were you with these Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **5%** |
| **4-7** | **5%** |
| **8-10** | **90%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **20** |

**Q1d. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product did not meet my needs/expectations** | **--** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **100%** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Wanted different product** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **1** |

**Q1e. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **61%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **28%** |
| **The service was timely** | **5.5%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **Other** | **5.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **18** |

**Q2a. Have you received Rehabilitation Technology and Adaptive Equipment Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **71%** |
| **No** | **29%** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **34** |

**Q2b. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means “Very Dissatisfied” and 10 means “Very Satisfied”, how satisfied were you with these Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **8%** |
| **4-7** | **8%** |
| **8-10** | **84%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **24** |

**Q2c. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **100%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Wanted different product** | **--** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **2** |

**Q2d. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **85%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **5%** |
| **The service was timely** | **5%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **Other** | **5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **20** |

**Q3a. Have you received Skills Training Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **12%** |
| **No** | **88%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **33** |

**Q3b. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied", how satisfied were you with these Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **--** |
| **4-7** | **50%** |
| **8-10** | **50%** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **4** |

**Q3c. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **--** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **0** |

**Q3d. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **100%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **--** |
| **The service was timely** | **--** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

**Q4a. Have you received Higher Education Training Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **24%** |
| **No** | **76%** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **33** |

**Q4b. What type of higher education training did you receive? Was it a traditional college that offered a college degree, or was it a vocational training program that provided a certificate?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Traditional College** | **71%** |
| **Vocational Program** | **29%** |
| **Don't Know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **7** |

**Q4c. Did you participate as a full-time or part-time student?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Full-Time** | **71%** |
| **Part-Time** | **29%** |
| **Don't Know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **7** |

**Q4d. Did you graduate?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **86%** |
| **No** | **14%** |
| **Don't Know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **7** |

**Q4e. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied", how satisfied were you with these Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **--** |
| **4-7** | **57%** |
| **8-10** | **43%** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **7** |

**Q4f. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **--** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **0** |

**Q4g. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **66.6%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **33.3%** |
| **The service was timely** | **--** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other (specify)** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

**Q5a. Have you received Reader Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **21%** |
| **No** | **79%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **33** |

**Q5b. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied", how satisfied were you with these Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **--** |
| **4-7** | **29%** |
| **8-10** | **71%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **7** |

**Q5c. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **--** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **0** |

**Q5d. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **66.66%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **16.66%** |
| **The service was timely** | **16.66%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **6** |

**Q6a. Have you received Transportation Services for Training Programs or Employment?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **21%** |
| **No** | **79%** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **33** |

**Q6b. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied", how satisfied were you with these Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **14%** |
| **4-7** | **14%** |
| **8-10** | **72%** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **7** |

**Q6c. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **100%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **1** |

**Q6d. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **40%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **20%** |
| **The service was timely** | **--** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **Other** | **40%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **5** |

**Q7a. Have you received Personal Care Attendant Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **3%** |
| **No** | **97%** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **33** |

**Q7b. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied", how satisfied were you with these Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **--** |
| **4-7** | **--** |
| **8-10** | **100%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **1** |

**Q7c. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **--** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **0** |

**Q7d. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **--** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **100%** |
| **The service was timely** | **--** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **1** |

**Q8a. Have you received Small Business Ventures Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **3%** |
| **No** | **97%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **33** |

**Q8b. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied", how satisfied were you with these Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **--** |
| **4-7** | **--** |
| **8-10** | **100%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **1** |

**Q8c. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **--** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Business plan request was reduced or denied** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **0** |

**Q8d. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **--** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **100%** |
| **The service was timely** | **--** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **1** |

**IQ9. Now I would like you to rate your counselor on the following subjects using a 1 to 10 scale where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied." Again, please keep in mind that for many BESB clients, homemaker is considered as employment. First...**

**Q9a. Helping you to develop your Individualized Plan for Employment also known as an IPE?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **9%** |
| **4-7** | **30%** |
| **8-10** | **49%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **12%** |
| **Total respondents** | **33** |

**Q9b. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **33.33%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **33.33%** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **33.33%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

**Q9c. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **23%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **59%** |
| **The service was timely** | **6%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **6%** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **6%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **17** |

**Q10a. Help you identify your career goals whether they are to find a job, stay in your current job or as a homemaker and the Services you need to achieve that goal?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **18%** |
| **4-7** | **22%** |
| **8-10** | **45%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **15%** |
| **Total respondents** | **33** |

**Q10b. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **33.33%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **33.33%** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **33.33%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don't know/refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **6** |

**Q10c. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **47%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **47%** |
| **The service was timely** | **6%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **15** |

**Q11a. Recognize your special needs in regards to employment?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **15%** |
| **4-7** | **9%** |
| **8-10** | **67%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **9%** |
| **Total respondents** | **33** |

**Q11b. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **40%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **20%** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **40%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don’t know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **5** |

**Q11c. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **27.5%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **50%** |
| **The service was timely** | **9%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **4.5%** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **9%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **22** |

**Q12a. Help you understand your Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Rights and Responsibilities?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **24%** |
| **4-7** | **21%** |
| **8-10** | **52%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **3%** |
| **Total respondents** | **33** |

**Q12b. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **25%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **25%** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **25%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **12.5%** |
| **Other** | **12.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **8** |

**Q12c. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **35%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **60%** |
| **The service was timely** | **5%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don’t know/refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **20** |

**Q13a. Help you understand the process for formal complaint resolution (PROBE: review process)?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **12%** |
| **4-7** | **3%** |
| **8-10** | **21%** |
| **Don’t Know/Not applicable/Refused** | **64%** |
| **Total respondents** | **34** |

**Q13b. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **40%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **20%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **40%** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **5** |

**Q13c. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **29%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **43%** |
| **The service was timely** | **--** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **--** |
| **Other** | **14%** |
| **Don’t know/refused** | **14%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **7** |

**Q14a. Provide any information in the format you use, for example Braille, Large Print, Audiotape, or other Language?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **12%** |
| **4-7** | **9%** |
| **8-10** | **52%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **27%** |
| **Total respondents** | **33** |

**Q14b. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **75%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **--** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **25%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **4** |

**Q14c. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **47%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **35%** |
| **The service was timely** | **--** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **6%** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **6%** |
| **Don’t know** | **6%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **17** |

**Q15a. How satisfied were you with any referral provided by your counselor such as referral for mobility, low vision, etc.?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **9%** |
| **4-7** | **12%** |
| **8-10** | **46%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused/Not Applicable** | **33%** |
| **Total respondents** | **33** |

**Q15b. We are interested in improving the Services that are offered. You mentioned that overall you were not very satisfied. What was the main reason you were not satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product/service did not meet my needs/expectations** | **66.7%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **33.3%** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **--** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **--** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **--** |
| **The service was not timely** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

**Q15c. What was the main reason you were satisfied with the Services you received?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **50%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **38%** |
| **The service was timely** | **6%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **--** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **6%** |
| **All of the above** | **--** |
| **Other** | **--** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **16** |

**Q16a. The knowledge of your Counselor?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **15%** |
| **4-7** | **15%** |
| **8-10** | **67%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **3%** |
| **Total respondents** | **33** |

**Q16b. The professionalism of your Counselor?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **12.5%** |
| **4-7** | **12.5%** |
| **8-10** | **72%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **3%** |
| **Total respondents** | **32** |

**Q17. Overall, would you say that working with your Counselor has been very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very Positive** | **61%** |
| **Somewhat Positive** | **18%** |
| **Neutral** | **--** |
| **Somewhat Negative** | **9%** |
| **Very negative** | **12%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **33** |

**Q18. Considering the Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE) you developed with your Counselor, to what extent have the Services you received met your PLAN? 1 now means, "Falls short of your PLAN" and 10 means "Follow exactly your PLAN."**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **12%** |
| **4-7** | **22%** |
| **8-10** | **50%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **16%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **32** |

**Q19. Using the same scale, to what extent did Vocational Rehabilitation Services meet your needs? 1 now means "Did not meet my needs" and 10 means “Perfectly met my needs."**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **19%** |
| **4-7** | **22%** |
| **8-10** | **56%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **3%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **31** |

**Q20. How satisfied were you with the overall timeframe for delivery of Services?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very Satisfied** | **61%** |
| **Somewhat Satisfied** | **10%** |
| **Neutral (vol.)** | **6.5%** |
| **Somewhat Dissatisfied** | **6.5%** |
| **Very Dissatisfied** | **16%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **31** |

**Q21. If applicable, did your Counselor explain to you the delays encountered in providing the Services on time?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **49%** |
| **No** | **16%** |
| **Not Applicable (volunteered)** | **35%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **31** |

**Q22. Overall, how satisfied were you with the Services your counselor arranged for you?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very Satisfied** | **52%** |
| **Somewhat Satisfied** | **23%** |
| **Neutral (vol.)** | **3%** |
| **Somewhat Dissatisfied** | **13%** |
| **Very Dissatisfied** | **6%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **3%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **31** |

**Q23. Utilizing a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 means "Very Satisfied", what is your overall satisfaction with the Services provided by the Vocational Rehabilitation Division of the Connecticut Board of Education and Services for the Blind?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **16%** |
| **4-7** | **19%** |
| **8-10** | **65%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **31** |

**Q24a. To what extent have the Services met your expectations? 1 now means "Falls short of my expectations" and 10 means "Exceeds my expectations.”**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **16%** |
| **4-7** | **16%** |
| **8-10** | **65%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **3%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **31** |

**Q24b. What ONE service falls short of your expectations?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low Vision** | **3%** |
| **Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment** | **17%** |
| **Skills Training** | **17%** |
| **Higher Education Training** | **3%** |
| **Reader** | **--** |
| **Transportation** | **17%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant** | **7%** |
| **Small Business Venture** | **3%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **33%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **30** |

**Q24c. What ONE service exceeds your expectations?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low Vision** | **9.5%** |
| **Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment** | **42%** |
| **Skills Training** | **6.5%** |
| **Higher Education Training** | **6.5%** |
| **Reader** | **--** |
| **Transportation** | **--** |
| **Personal Care Attendant** | **9.5%** |
| **Small Business Venture** | **--** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **26%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **31** |

**Q25. Based on your experience, would you recommend BESB Vocational Rehabilitation Services to a friend?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **81%** |
| **No** | **19%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **--** |
| **Total Respondents** | **32** |

**Q26. Finally, when you were working with your BESB Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, what town did you live in? (towns were correlated to BESB VR regions)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Eastern** | **12.5%** |
| **North Central** | **34.5%** |
| **Northwest** | **37.5%** |
| **South Central** | **12.5%** |
| **Southwest** | **3.0%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **32** |

**Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today.**