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# Study Background

**The State of Connecticut Department of Aging and Disability 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 2020. 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 Program at BESB.**

**From November 1, 2019, through November 1, 2020, CPPSR completed 40 interviews with BESB service recipients. “Complete” interviews are defined as instances when a respondent followed the interview to its entirety. Both the client sample and the questionnaire instrument were provided by BESB. Each client was called a minimum of seven times. A maximum of 11 attempts was 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.”**

**Executive Summary for Fiscal Year 2020**

# A. Overall

**BESB continues to receive high marks for their Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) services and counselors. Slightly less than nine in ten clients surveyed (87.5%, down 5.5 percentage points from last fiscal year) reported that they would recommend BESB VR services to a friend. Reported satisfaction regarding overall experiences with BESB services, as rated on a scale from 1 to 10 points, remains strong.**

**Of the eight areas surveyed in 2020, reported overall satisfaction with BESB services decreased slightly across seven areas, while the final area remained unchanged. This contrasts with the pattern reported in 2019 in which satisfaction increased across all services. The largest decrease in mean satisfaction occurred in Small Business Venture Services (6.20, down 2.30 points), followed by Skills Training Services (7.75, down 1.50 points) and Reader Services (9.00, down 1.00 point). All other declines in mean ratings were less than one point. Satisfaction levels with Higher Education Training (8.00, zero percentage point change) remained unchanged from last fiscal year.**

**Mean satisfaction with BESB counselors increased in five areas in 2020, while the remaining four areas surveyed decreased in rating. This represents another shift from the pattern observed in 2019, a year in which satisfaction ratings for counselors increased across all areas. Notably, many of these increases came from record-lows found in 2018. The most substantial increase in satisfaction seen in 2020 pertained to counselors’ ability to help clients understand the complaint resolution process (7.61, up 0.61 points). The greatest decrease was seen in counselors’ ability to help clients identify their career goals (8.06, down 0.72 points). Overall, BESB clients remain very satisfied with the services their counselors provide.**

**Clients were asked to identify the types of services that they received from BESB. Of the eight services offered, half showed an increase in participant use in 2020, while the remaining half experienced declines. This varies slightly from the pattern found in 2019, a year in which six areas of service experienced an uptick in use. In 2020, Low Vision Services (90% use) and Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services (65% use) continue to be the most widely used services among BESB clients. Use of Low Vision Services experienced an increase of one percentage point, reaching an all-time high. While remaining one of the most widely used services, Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment hit an all-time low in utilization rate this year (down 16.5 percentage points from 2019). This sizable decline may be attributed to guidelines regarding home visitations due to COVID-19, a pandemic which heavily impacted how services could be delivered this fiscal year.**

**Of all service categories, Small Business Venture Services experienced the greatest increase in utilization from last year (12.5%, up 5.5 percentage points). This service continues to climb from the all-time low found in 2018 (3%). Reader Services (5%, up 1 percentage point) and Personal Care Attendant Services (7.5%, up 0.5 percentage point) also experienced increases in utilization. Historically, these three services have shown low usage rates compared to other categories.**

**Excluding Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services, Higher Education Training services (7.5%, down 14.5 percentage points) experienced the greatest decrease in utilization rate in 2020, followed by Transportation Services (12.5%, down 13.5 percentage points) and Skills Training Services (20%, down 10 percentage points). Despite these decreases in use, none are at an all-time low utilization rate.**

**This fiscal year, the BESB Vocational Rehabilitation Program had 77 clients who achieved employment outcomes, a decline of 25 individuals from 2019. This decline is likely due, in part, to the decrease in employment opportunities due to COVID-19. It should be noted that it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions with a population of this size.**

**It is important to recognize the extraordinary circumstances that were at play during the time that data was collected for this report. COVID-19 spread rapidly throughout the United States starting in March 2020. In an effort to slow the spread of the virus, Governor Ned Lamont ordered all nonessential businesses in Connecticut to close on March 23, 2020. As part of a four-phase plan to reopen the state, Governor Lamont started lifting certain restrictions on May 20, 2020. At the time of authorship, Connecticut is in Phase 2.1 of its reopening, meaning that the pandemic impacted three of the four fiscal quarters discussed in this report.**

**The pandemic has had a profound impact on BESB’s VR Program—as well as the clients it serves. Without warning, life changed dramatically for VR clients. Readers are encouraged to interpret the findings discussed in this report within the context of the global pandemic.**

# B. Services

**Satisfaction with the services received was measured on a 10-point rating scale. A rating of “10” meant the client was “very satisfied” and a rating of “1” meant the client was “very dissatisfied.” Clients who rated services on the high (8-10) or low (1-3) end of the scale were asked a follow-up question about the reason for their rating.**

**Mean satisfaction with seven of eight services surveyed in 2020 decreased compared to 2019. One service did not change in mean satisfaction: Higher Education Training Services (8.00). The lowest mean satisfaction rating was found in Transportation Services (5.80, down 0.91 in mean rating). It is worth noting that the delivery of Transportation Services was heavily impacted due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The highest mean satisfaction rating found in 2020 was observed in Personal Care Attendant Services (9.67, down 0.33 in mean rating). It is important to note that, due to small sample sizes, interpretation of trends associated with services should be made with caution.**

**This year’s largest decrease in mean satisfaction rating was seen in Small Business Venture Services (6.20, down 2.30 in mean rating). It is the second-lowest mean rating that this service has experienced in the history of the survey. The second-largest decrease was observed in Skills Training services (7.75, down 1.50 in mean rating). This drop in mean satisfaction comes after its all-time high notched last year. The remaining decreases in mean satisfaction ratings declined by one point or less: Reader Services (9.00, down 1.00 in mean rating), Low Vision Services (7.86, down 0.64 in mean rating), Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services (7.88, down 0.53 in mean rating), and Personal Care Attendant Services (9.67, down 0.33 in mean rating).**

**Clients were also asked to rate their overall satisfaction with BESB services on a 1- to 10-point scale, as well as satisfaction with their Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE), timeframe of delivery of service, and the extent to which the services provided met their needs and/or expectations. Clients’ overall satisfaction with BESB services decreased in all areas surveyed in 2020. This contrasts the trend in 2019, wherein all survey areas increased in mean satisfaction ratings. The overall mean satisfaction with BESB services is 7.88 (down 0.34 in mean rating from 2019). The largest overall mean satisfaction decrease this year occurred in the extent to which clients felt services met their needs (7.58, down 0.54 in mean rating). The second-largest decrease was in the extent to which services met client expectations (7.58, down 0.50 in mean rating). The only service with an overall mean satisfaction above the historical average for this survey—and considered in the highly satisfied range—is with the extent to which services met clients’ IPE (8.08, down 0.19 in mean rating).**

**C. Counselors**

**In 2020, client satisfaction with counselors increased in five of the nine areas surveyed. Notably, most mean satisfaction ratings were close to or above their respective historical means. Two aspects tied at 8.67 for the highest mean satisfaction with counselors this year: counselor professionalism and ability to provide information in a usable format. The lowest mean satisfaction rating was found in the explanation of the complaint resolution process (7.61). In 2020, this is the only mean rating below the threshold of 8.00—reflecting a high level of client satisfaction across all dimensions of counselors surveyed.**

**Despite its neutral rating, counselors’ ability to help clients understand the complaint resolution process had the most significant gain from last year (7.61, up 0.61 points from 2019). After hitting an all-time low in 2018 (6.67), this dimension of counselors has shown notable improvement. The second-largest increase in mean satisfaction was with counselors’ ability to provide information in a format clients could use (8.67, up 0.57 points). This mean rating continues a two-year trend of increasing client satisfaction. Other increases in mean satisfaction were found in counselors’ ability to explain Vocational Rehabilitation rights and responsibilities (8.30, up 0.42 points), knowledge of counselors (8.45, up 0.12 points), and satisfaction with counselors’ referrals (8.03, up 0.03 points).**

**The largest decrease in mean satisfaction was in counselors’ ability to help clients identify their career goals (8.06, down 0.72 points). Although it is a decrease from the previous year, it is still above its historical mean (7.84). The second-largest decrease was in counselors’ professionalism (8.67, down 0.52 points). It should be noted that this drop in satisfaction with counselor professionalism comes after an all-time high observed in 2019 (9.19). The remaining two aspects experiencing a drop in mean satisfaction were in counselors’ ability to help develop an IPE (8.11, down 0.35 points) and counselors’ ability to recognize clients’ special needs (8.62, down 0.03 points).**

**Generally, BESB clients are highly satisfied with their counselors, with values ranging from 7.67 to 8.67 across all categories surveyed (8.28 average). This reflects virtually no change in overall mean rating, on average across all dimensions of counselors surveyed, from last year (8.27)—a year in which there was a larger variation in average ratings (means spanned from 7.0 to 9.19). Overall, clients surveyed in 2020 were most satisfied with counselors’ ability to provide information in the format they could use, their professionalism, and their recognition of clients’ special needs. Clients were least satisfied with their counselors’ ability to explain the process for complaint resolution, counselor referrals, and counselors’ help in identifying client career goals.**

**D. Regional Trends**

**Since 2016, CCSU has performed a regional analysis on nine dimensions of satisfaction with counselors. In 2020, the Northwestern region showed the highest mean levels of satisfaction across all categories (8.80), followed by the Southwest (8.51), North Central (8.23), South Central (8.19), and Eastern (7.83) regions. When interpreting these results, it is important to note that the sample size in each region varies considerably. Specifically, an average of 15 respondents could be reached from the North Central region across all categories, while an average sample size of only two was achieved in the Eastern region. Similarly, an average sample size of three was captured in the Northwest. Due to this variation in sample size, regional differences should be interpreted cautiously, particularly for the Eastern and Northwestern regions.**

**The relative satisfaction rating of each region experienced slight shifts in 2020. This year, the Northwest region held top satisfaction ratings in six of nine categories assessed, with two of those being tied for top place with other regions. Notably, the Northwest region saw a sizable satisfaction increase in the extent to which counselors provided information in a format that clients could use—improving from a mean of 5.0 to a perfect ten. This may show that the low rating found in 2019 was an anomaly. The Southwest region showcased similarly high ratings, ranging from a low of 7.86 to a high of 10. The Southwest region achieved top ratings across three categories, including tying with the Northwest in the category of providing information to clients in a format they can use.**

**The South-Central region, which had the highest overall mean satisfaction rating in 2019, dipped to the second-lowest rated region this year. Despite this finding, the region had the highest satisfaction rating in two of the nine areas surveyed. While the Eastern region had the lowest mean satisfaction ratings in 2020, this region improved significantly in client satisfaction across all categories.**

# BESB Services Ratings

**Frequency of BESB Services**

**Clients were asked to identify the types of services that they received from BESB. Of the eight services offered, half showed an increase in the proportion of participant utilization in 2020, and half experienced declines. This is a slight change from 2019 in which six areas of service use increased and two decreased from its previous year.**

**Low Vision Services and Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services continue to be the most widely used among BESB clients, with 90% and 65%, respectively, reporting use in 2020. Low Vision Services showed a 1% increase in percentage of use from last year while Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services showed a decrease of 16.5%. Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services reached an all-time low rate of utilization while Low Vision Services reached an all-time high.**

**Skills Training Services (20%, down 10 percentage points), Higher Education Training Services (7.5%, down 14.5 points), and Transportation Services (12.5%, down 13.5 points) all experienced decreases in 2020, although none of these utilization rates are at an all-time low. On the other hand, Reader Services (5%, up 1 percentage point), Personal Care Attendant Services (7.5% up 0.5 points), and Small Business Venture Services (12.5%, up 5.5 points) all experienced increased use in 2020. These three services have shown low utilization rates throughout the history of the survey.**

**Frequency of Services Received**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low Vision 2020** | **90%** |
| **Low Vision 2019** | **89%** |
| **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 2020** | **65%** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2019** | **81.5%** |
| **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 2020** | **20%** |
| **Skills Training 2019** | **30%** |
| **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%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Higher Education Training 2020** | **7.5%** |
| **Higher Education Training 2019** | **22%** |
| **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 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%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reader 2020** | **5%** |
| **Reader 2019** | **4%** |
| **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** | **13.5%** |
| **Reader 2008** | **15%** |
| **Reader 2007** | **18%** |
| **Reader 2006** | **32%** |
| **Reader 2004** | **29%** |
| **Reader 2003** | **31%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Transportation 2020** | **12.5%** |
| **Transportation 2019** | **26%** |
| **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** | **24.5%** |
| **Transportation 2009** | **17%** |
| **Transportation 2008** | **14%** |
| **Transportation 2007** | **14%** |
| **Transportation 2006** | **14%** |
| **Transportation 2004** | **16%** |
| **Transportation 2003** | **14%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2020** | **7.5%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2019** | **7%** |
| **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%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Small Business 2020** | **12.5%** |
| **Small Business 2019** | **7%** |
| **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** | **11.5%** |
| **Small Business 2008** | **11%** |
| **Small Business 2007** | **7%** |
| **Small Business 2006** | **14%** |
| **Small Business 2004** | **10%** |
| **Small Business 2003** | **9%** |

**Mean Satisfaction Service Ratings**

**To measure satisfaction with 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” indicated the client was “very dissatisfied.” Clients who rated services on the high (8-10) or low (1-3) end of the scale were asked a follow-up question about the reason for their rating.**

**Compared with 2019 findings, seven services showed a decrease in mean satisfaction ratings whereas one service remained the same in 2020. The decreases in mean satisfaction ratings were generally small, and only one service, Transportation Services, showed a historically low rating (5.80, down 0.91 in mean rating). It should be noted that Transportation Services were significantly impacted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, so this figure should be compared to previous ratings with caution.**

**The largest decrease in mean satisfaction rating for this year’s survey was seen in Small Business Venture services (6.20, down 2.30 in mean rating), followed by Skills Training services (7.75, down 1.50 in mean rating). Mean ratings for other services decreased by one or fewer points. This includes Reader Services (9.00, down 1.00 in mean rating), Low Vision Services (7.86, down 0.64 in mean rating), Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment Services (7.88, down 0.53 in mean rating), and Personal Care Attendant Services (9.67, down 0.33 in mean rating). Higher Education Training Services (8.00) showed no increase or decrease in mean rating from 2019.**

**It is important to note the issue of sample size when reviewing these figures. Historically, Small Business Venture and Personal Care Attendant Services have received especially low response rates, and this continued to be the case for these services and others in 2020. Small Business Venture Services and Transportation Services had five respondents each, while Higher Education Training Services and Personal Care Attendant Services both had three respondents. Only two respondents who utilized Reader Services could be reached this year. Given the comparatively small sample sizes, especially for these services, one should not place too much significance on how satisfaction rates in 2020 compare to ratings in previous years.**

**Mean Satisfaction Ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low Vision 2020** | **7.86** |
| **Low Vision 2019** | **8.50** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rehab Equipment 2020** | **7.88** |
| **Rehab Equipment 2019** | **8.41** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Skills Training 2020** | **7.75** |
| **Skills Training 2019** | **9.25** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Higher Education Training 2020** | **8.00** |
| **Higher Education Training 2019** | **8.00** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reader 2020** | **9.00** |
| **Reader 2019** | **10.00** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Transportation 2020** | **5.80** |
| **Transportation 2019** | **6.71** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2020** | **9.67** |
| **Personal Care Attendant 2019** | **10.00** |
| **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 2020** | **6.20** |
| **Small Business 2019** | **8.50** |
| **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**

**Nine in ten clients surveyed (90%) in 2020 reported receiving Low Vision Services. Most clients remain very satisfied with these services, with two-thirds of respondents (66%) indicating a high level of satisfaction (i.e., a rating between 8 and 10). However, this figure is nine percentage points below that reported for 2019, and below the historical average of 79%. Meanwhile, neutral ratings increased 12 points to 31% in 2020, far above the historical average of 15.5%. Only 3% of clients reported low satisfaction (i.e., a rating between 1 and 3) in 2020, a decrease of three points from last year’s survey. Overall, most clients were highly satisfied with Low Vision Services in 2020, despite an increase in neutral responses.**

**When asked to identify the main reason for their satisfaction, the majority of respondents stated that the products or services met their needs or expectations (38%, the same as in 2019), or they were satisfied with the knowledge and care of their service provider (43%, up from 38% in 2019). Other clients cited the timeliness of services (5%, down from 8% in 2019), effective coordination of access to services (5%, down from 8% in 2019), or another reason, which was provided in a follow-up response.**

**Twenty respondents elaborated on their satisfaction with Low Vision Services in open-ended responses. The main sentiment expressed by clients was consistent with the most commonly cited reasons for satisfaction—the services and/or products they received fulfilled their needs/met their expectations, and their service providers were knowledgeable and/or caring. Several clients were very happy with the referrals for technology and medical services. Others felt that BESB counselors “went out of the way” for them and were very personable and detail-oriented. Overall, clients felt that the services and/or products clients received were helpful, supportive, and consistent.**

**Only one respondent reported dissatisfaction with Low Vision Services in 2020. The respondent stated that the services received were not timely. The client did not elaborate on the specific reason for their dissatisfaction in this area.**

**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, 2019 n=32, 2020 n=29**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **3%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **6%** |
| **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 2020** | **31%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **19%** |
| **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 2020** | **66%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **75%** |
| **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**

**Most BESB clients (65%) reported receiving Rehabilitation Technology and Adaptive Equipment Services in 2020, and client satisfaction with this service remains high. More than two-thirds of the respondents in 2020 offered a highly satisfied rating of the service (69%, down 4 percentage points from 2019). However, it is the second time in history wherein the percentage of very satisfied clients falls below 70%. Reports of neutral satisfaction decreased slightly (19%, down 4 points from 2019), while the proportion of clients who reported dissatisfaction increased (12%, up 8 points from 2019).**

**The majority of satisfied clients (69%, up from 56% in 2019) stated that the main reason for their satisfaction was the products and/or services met their needs and/or expectations. A smaller proportion (16%, down from 28% in 2019) cited the knowledge and/or care of the service provider. Three other reasons were cited by 5% of survey respondents each: the timeliness of services, offered a different response in qualitative follow-up, or could not give a main reason for their satisfaction. Clients elaborated in follow-up responses that the technology they received made their lives easier, with one client calling the equipment they received “life changing.” Participants also stated that counselors were helpful and efficient in obtaining technology and explaining how to use equipment.**

**Four respondents reported dissatisfaction with these services. Two stated they wanted a different product while one cited a lack of follow-up from BESB and another that their needs were ignored. In qualitative responses, two clients stated that the software and equipment they received didn’t work correctly. Another client experienced delays when receiving software for job-training programs.**

**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, 2019 n=44, 2020 n=26**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **12%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **4%** |
| **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 2020** | **19%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **23%** |
| **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 2020** | **69%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **73%** |
| **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**

**About 20% of BESB clients (eight respondents) reported receiving Skills Training Services in 2020. It should be noted that due few respondents in this area, the trends in this section should be interpreted with caution. Client satisfaction ratings for Skills Training Services remained very high in the past year, with about three-quarters (74%, down from 87.5% in 2019) reporting high satisfaction, which is in line with the historical average of 75%. The percentage of neutral ratings increased by 0.5 percentage points to 13%, and the percentage of dissatisfied ratings increased 13 percentage points to 13%. It is the first time in the past two years that the percentage of respondents expressing low satisfaction has been above 0%.**

**Half of the clients satisfied with Skills Training Services (50%, down from 62.5% in 2019) cited the main reason for their satisfaction as the products and/or services meeting their needs and/or expectations. The other half (50%, up from 37.5% in 2019) cited the knowledge and/or care of the service provider. In follow-up responses, clients explained that providers offered friendly, comprehensive, and easy-to-understand services. Respondents also felt that orientation and interview training met their expectations. Skills Training Services were described as effective in getting the client the skills they needed. These reasons are similar to those found in previous surveys, with clients focusing on the quality and helpfulness of the training provided.**

**One respondent was dissatisfied with Skills Training Services, citing the main reason for their dissatisfaction as their needs being ignored. The client elaborated that a follow-up phone call was never received.**

**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, 2019 n=38, 2020 n=8**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **13%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **13%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **12.5%** |
| **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 2020** | **74%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **87.5%** |
| **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**

**Only 7.5% of BESB clients (three respondents) reported receiving Higher Education Training Services in the 2020 survey. This area has historically seen few respondents, but the especially low percentage in this year should be noted when interpreting the following percentages. Satisfaction rates associated with this service decreased from last year, with one of three clients (33.3%, down from 83% in 2019) reporting high satisfaction. The remaining two clients gave neutral responses (66.7%, up from 0% in 2019), meaning no clients gave a rating of dissatisfaction (0%, down from 17% in 2019).**

**Several survey questions were added in 2011 to better understand the population of clients utilizing Higher Education Training Services. All respondents in 2020 attended a traditional college (defined as an institution offering college degrees). This is a small change from last year, when 83% of clients attended a traditional college and 17% of clients reported attending a vocational program. This is a continuation of an increase in clients attending traditional colleges that was seen in the last two surveys. Two-thirds of respondents participated as full-time students (down from 100% in 2019), and the remaining one-third attended as a part-time student. Graduation rates decreased from 2019, with one client stating that they graduated (33.3%, down from 86% in 2019), and the other two clients reporting that they did not graduate. This is far below the percentages reported in previous surveys and is likely the result of the low number of respondents in this area, as mentioned previously. 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.**

**When asked about the main reason for their satisfaction, all three clients stated that the products and/or services met their needs and/or expectations. This is a change from last year, when 60% gave this reason, and the remaining 40% cited the care and/or knowledge of providers. When asked to further elaborate on their satisfaction, clients stated that the services were reliable and helpful and that their counselor was available to them. One client noted that their schooling was paid for and met their expectations, although they felt that they did not receive support services for school.**

**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 n=7, 2013 n=10, 2014 n=10, 2015 n=17, 2016 n=14, 2017 n=2, 2018 n=7, 2019 n=12, 2020 n=3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **17%** |
| **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 2020** | **66.6%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **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 2020** | **33.3%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **83%** |
| **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**

**Very few BESB clients have historically utilized Reader Services. This remained true in 2020 with only 5% of respondents receiving these services (up from 4% in 2019). This is only two respondents (the same number of respondents reached in 2019), meaning the following percentages should be interpreted carefully. The few clients who reported using Reader Services were highly satisfied in 2020. It is the second year in a row wherein 100% of respondents are highly satisfied. Additionally, it is the third year with zero participants offering dissatisfied ratings.**

**The one client who elaborated on their satisfaction stated that Reader Services allowed them to perform tasks they previously had trouble with. The other satisfied respondent did not give a qualitative response. Respondents in recent years have also noted that their readers are accurate, patient, and provide good follow-up.**

**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, 2019 n=2, 2020 n=2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **100%** |
| **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**

**One-eighth (12.5%) of clients surveyed in 2020 received Transportation Services for Training Programs or Employment. The following results should be interpreted with caution considering only five clients who received these services could be reached this year. The percentage of clients who were highly satisfied with Transportation Services has been slowly declining over the past few surveys. High satisfaction ratings reached 72% in 2018, followed by a decline to 43% in 2019, and a further decline to 20% this year. While this value is the lowest in the history of the survey, only one client gave this service a dissatisfied rating in 2020. Neutral ratings reached an all-time high of 60% (up 3 percentage points from 2019).**

**Of those clients reporting a high level of satisfaction, 100% (up from 67% in 2019) stated the main reason for their satisfaction was that Transportation Services met their needs and/or expectations. Clients in previous years have also noted the effective coordination of these services. When asked to elaborate, one respondent noted the drivers BESB arranged for clients were very accommodating, timely, and skilled. In previous years, respondents have noted the helpfulness of Transportation Services in obtaining employment and travelling in harsh weather.**

**The one dissatisfied respondent noted that the services they received were not timely. The client elaborated in a follow-up response that they felt Transportation Services were not punctual or dependable.**

**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, 2019 n=14, 2020 n=5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **20%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **60%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **57%** |
| **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** | **37.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2011** | **24%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2010** | **42%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2009** | **37.5%** |
| **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 2020** | **20%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **43%** |
| **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** | **37.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2011** | **52%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2010** | **50%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2009** | **62.5%** |
| **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**

**Satisfaction with Personal Care Attendant (PCA) Services remained very high for the 7.5% of BESB clients who reported using this service in 2020 (100%, no change from 2018 and 2019). Very few clients have reported utilizing this service historically, and in this year’s survey, only three clients reported using PCA services. This number has not surpassed five since 2011. Satisfaction trends associated with this service should be interpreted cautiously.**

**Three respondents elaborated on their high satisfaction with PCA Services. One client talked about how the services helped them stay organized. Another noted the timeliness of the services. The third client stated that while there was always room for improvement, they were very satisfied with their experiences in obtaining PCA Services. This feedback is consistent with similar reasons given in previous surveys.**

**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, 2019 n=4, 2020 n=3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **0%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **100%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **100%** |
| **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**

**Five respondents (12.5%) in 2020 reported receiving Small Business Ventures Services from BESB. In consideration of this small sample size, the following observations should be taken with caution. Two of five clients (40%, down from 100% in 2019) reported high satisfaction with this service. Another two gave ratings of neutrality (40%), and one client reported dissatisfaction (20%). While this ends a trend of very high satisfaction ratings beginning in 2017, it is far from the lowest point of satisfaction in the past.**

**All satisfied clients stated the main reason for their satisfaction was the services meeting their needs and/or expectations. Previously, clients have also noted the knowledge and/or care of their provider and the effective coordination of services. Qualitative feedback indicated that the services helped clients reach their small business goals and enabled them to be independent.**

**The one dissatisfied client stated that the poor quality of the service was the main reason for their dissatisfaction. They explained in a follow-up response that they found BESB unhelpful in following up on an issue.**

**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, 2019 n=4, 2020 n=5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **20%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **40%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **40%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **100%** |
| **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**

**Average satisfaction ratings for counselors increased in five areas surveyed in 2020 while ratings decreased in the remaining four areas. In 2019, counselor ratings increased across all areas, rising from record lows seen in 2018. This rise in satisfaction has continued in most areas in 2020, with most ratings in line with or above their historical averages.**

**In 2020, the most significant increase in mean counselor ratings was seen in their ability to** **help clients understand the complaint resolution process (7.61, up 0.61 points from 2019).** **This is slightly above the historical average in this area (7.57). Satisfaction in counselors’ ability to provide information in a usable format increased by a similar amount** **(8.67, up 0.57 points), which is also above the historical mean in that section (8.37). Mean satisfaction ratings also increased regarding counselors’ ability to help clients understand their** **Vocational Rehabilitation rights (8.30, up 0.42 points), the knowledge of counselors (8.45, up 0.12 points), and satisfaction with counselors’ referrals (8.03, up 0.03 points). These ratings are all close to or above the historical averages in their areas (8.18, 8.54, and 8.40, respectively).**

**The decreases in mean satisfaction ratings seen in 2020 are all less than one point. The greatest decrease in mean satisfaction was seen in** **counselors’ ability to help clients identify their career goals (8.06, down 0.72 points). This rating is well above the historical mean of 7.84 in this area. A similar decrease occurred in** **counselor professionalism (8.67, down 0.52 points). Small decreases in satisfaction were seen** **in counselors’ ability to help develop an individualized plan for employment or IPE (8.11, down 0.35 points) and to recognize clients’ special needs (8.62, down 0.03 points).**

**Overall, client satisfaction with counselors remains high, with values ranging from 7.61 to 8.67 (8.28 average). Compared with 2019, in which ratings ranged from** **7.0 to 9.19 across categories (8.27 average), the 2020 survey shows an increase in the average rating across categories and an increase in the lowest rating. In 2020, BESB clients were most satisfied with** **counselors’ ability to provide information in the format they use, their professionalism, and their recognition of clients’ special needs. Clients were least satisfied with their counselors’ ability to explain the process for complaint resolution, counselor referrals, and counselors’ help in identifying client career goals.**

**Since 2016, CCSU has performed a regional analysis on the nine dimensions of satisfaction with counselors. In 2020, the Northwestern region showed the highest mean levels of satisfaction across all categories (8.80), followed by the Southwest (8.51), North Central (8.23), South Central (8.19), and Eastern (7.83) regions. When interpreting these ratings, it is important to note that the sample size in each region varies considerably. Specifically, an average of 15 respondents could be reached from the North Central region across all categories, while an average sample size of only two was achieved in the Eastern region, which reported the lowest overall mean satisfaction rating. Similarly, an average sample size of three was captured in the Northwest. Due to this variation in sample size, regional differences should be interpreted cautiously, particularly for the Eastern and Northwestern regions.**

**Compared to 2019, the relative satisfaction ratings of each region changed slightly in 2020. The Northwest region held top satisfaction ratings in six of the nine categories assessed in 2020, with two of those being ties for top place with other regions. Mean ratings in this region varied from 7.67 to a perfect 10. Notably, the Northwest region increased mean satisfaction in the area of providing information in a usable format from 5 to 10, returning to the very high level of satisfaction found in 2018. This may show that the low rating found in 2019 was an anomaly. The Southwest region showed similarly high ratings, ranging from a low of 7.86 to a high of 10. The Southwest achieved top ratings across three categories, including tying with the Northwest in the category of providing information in a usable format.**

**The South Central region, which had the highest overall mean satisfaction rating in 2019, had the second lowest overall rating in 2020. Still, the region had the highest satisfaction rating in two of the nine areas surveyed. The Eastern region generally had the lowest mean satisfaction ratings in 2020, as in previous years, although the region improved significantly in satisfaction across all categories. Mean satisfaction ratings in this region varied from 6.5 to a high of 10. This is noteworthy, as even the lowest rating of 6.5 is higher than the overall mean found in 2019 (5.56) and much higher than the lowest rating found in that year (3.0).**

**Mean Counselor Ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Develop your IPE 2020** | **8.11** |
| **Develop your IPE 2019** | **8.46** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Identify your career goals 2020** | **8.06** |
| **Identify your career goals 2019** | **8.78** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recognize your special needs 2020** | **8.62** |
| **Recognize your special needs 2019** | **8.65** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2020** | **8.30** |
| **Understand your Vocational Rehabilitation Rights 2019** | **7.88** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2020** | **7.61** |
| **Understand the process for complaint resolution 2019** | **7.00** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2020** | **8.67** |
| **Provide information in the format you use 2019** | **8.10** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2020** | **8.03** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2019** | **8.00** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2018** | **7.77** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2017** | **9.22** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2016** | **8.54** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2015** | **8.45** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2014** | **8.20** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2013** | **8.40** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2012** | **8.69** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2011** | **8.16** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2010** | **8.49** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2009** | **8.34** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2008** | **8.20** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2007** | **8.80** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2006** | **8.42** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2004** | **8.67** |
| **Satisfaction with Referral 2003** | **8.50** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2020** | **8.45** |
| **Knowledge of Counselor 2019** | **8.33** |
| **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** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2020** | **8.67** |
| **Professionalism of Counselor 2019** | **9.19** |
| **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** | **9.00** |
| **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** |

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

**In 2020, there were 40 respondents who rated the assistance they received with an IPE. Most respondents (65%) were highly satisfied with their counselor’s assistance with their IPE. However, this is a decrease of about eight participants in high satisfaction compared with 2019, which has the highest all-time percentage of highly satisfied participants. Of the 40 participants, 20% gave neutral ratings, an increase of about three participants compared with 2019. Highly unsatisfied ratings were at 10%. This is a comparable number to 2019 and continues a trend of small increases in proportion of highly unsatisfied participants since 2017. Two participants did not know or refused to answer the question.**

**Half of the four participants who were unsatisfied with their counselor’s assistance on an IPE attributed it to their needs being ignored. One participant noted that there was no follow-up. Three participants explained that their counselor did not communicate with them properly. Just under half of 30 participants (47%) attributed their satisfaction with their counselor being knowledgeable or caring. The next highest attribute (30%) was the service meeting needs or expectations. Many participants described good relationships with their counselor when prompted to elaborate further on why they were satisfied. For example, participants said that their counselor “always kept in touch”, was “always there when needed”, and “very supportive”.**

**Regionally, satisfaction with the extent to which services met the client’s IPE continued to increase in most regions in 2020. Mean satisfaction ratings increased in the Eastern (8.33, up 3.33 points from 2019 and 0.22 above the overall mean), North Central (8.00, up 0.44 points and 0.11 below the overall mean), and Northwestern (9.00, up 0.50 points and 0.89 above the overall mean) regions, while ratings in the South Central (8.00, down 2.0 points and 0.11 below the overall mean) and Southwestern (7.86, down 1.47 points and 0.25 below the overall mean) regions decreased. It should be noted that, as in previous years, few respondents could be reached in the Eastern region, so its overall mean should be interpreted with caution.**

**…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 n=74, 2012 n=63, 2013 n=43, 2014 n=50, 2015 n=66, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=33, 2019 n=48, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **7%** |
| **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 2020** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **11%** |
| **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 2020** | **65%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **71%** |
| **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%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Don’t Know (DK)/Refused (Ref) 2020** | **5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **11%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **8.25** | **9.6** | **—** | **5.00** | **8.33** |
| **North Central** | **7.29** | **7.82** | **7.45** | **7.56** | **8.00** |
| **Northwestern** | **6.57** | **8.55** | **8.50** | **8.50** | **9.00** |
| **South Central** | **9.4** | **9.14** | **7.75** | **10.0** | **8.00** |
| **Southwestern** | **8.4** | **8.0** | **6.80** | **9.33** | **7.86** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.04** | **8.44** | **7.41** | **8.46** | **8.11** |

**Identifying Career Goals**

**Forty BESB clients provided their level of satisfaction with counselor assistance in identifying career goals. Over half (57.5%) expressed high satisfaction with their counselor. This is a large decrease from 2019, wherein 76% of survey respondents were highly satisfied with the help given by their counselor in identifying career goals. It is important to note that 2019 seems to be an outlier. Between 2006 and 2020, high satisfaction responses typically range between 44% and 58%, excluding 2019. About 22% of survey respondents expressed neutral satisfaction, which marks a steady increase since 2017. Low satisfaction is at 5%, which is comparable to 2019. It also maintains a recovery from a 2018 spike in dissatisfaction. Six participants refused to answer or chose “Don’t Know”.**

**The two clients who were unsatisfied with their counselor’s assistance in identifying career goals explained that their needs were ignored, or their expectation of the services were never met. Just over half of 25 respondents (52%) credited their satisfaction to their counselor’s knowledge and caring personality, consistent with 2019. For example, clients said that their counselor “had more [knowledge] than just the book” and “really listened and observed what [client] needed.” The second largest attribute (36%) was the service meeting their expectations.**

**The overall mean satisfaction rating across all regions was 8.06 in 2020, a decrease from the mean of 8.78 in 2019 but well above the historically low mean of 6.86 found in 2018. The Eastern region (6.50, up 1.50 from 2019 and 1.56 below the overall mean) showed a sizeable increase in mean satisfaction from last year. The North Central (8.19, down 0.45 points and 0.13 above the overall mean), Northwestern (7.67, down 1.33 points and 0.39 below the overall mean), South Central (8.57, down 1.14 points and 0.51 points above the overall mean), and Southwestern (7.86, down 1.14 points and 0.20 below the overall mean) regions all showed slight decreases in mean satisfaction from the previous survey.**

**…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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **4%** |
| **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 2020** | **22.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **15%** |
| **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 2020** | **57.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **76%** |
| **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 2020** | **15%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **5%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **6.5** | **9.5** | **3.0** | **5.0** | **6.50** |
| **North Central** | **7.08** | **8.55** | **6.45** | **8.64** | **8.19** |
| **Northwestern** | **6.0** | **9.0** | **8.33** | **9.0** | **7.67** |
| **South Central** | **8.0** | **9.33** | **8.33** | **9.71** | **8.57** |
| **Southwestern** | **9.6** | **10.0** | **6.80** | **9.0** | **7.86** |
| **Overall Mean** | **7.45** | **8.96** | **6.86** | **8.78** | **8.06** |

**Recognizing Special Needs in Regard to Employment**

**The majority (72.5%) of 40 BESB survey respondents are highly satisfied with their counselor’s ability to recognize their special needs regarding employment. This is the third highest proportion of very satisfied participants in the last ten years. About 18% of the sample recorded neutral satisfaction ratings with their counselor’s ability to recognize their special needs regarding employment. This is about three less participants expressing neutral ratings compared to 2019 and five more than 2018. Participants who were unsatisfied made up 5% of the sample, which is similar to 4% in 2019 and a 10 percentage-point decrease from 2018. Two participants from the sample were unable or unwilling to answer the question.**

**Two participants identified a lack of communication or help looking for a job/career as the main reason for their low satisfaction. Limited communication has been cited as a reason for dissatisfaction in 2018. About one-third (35.5%) of 31 respondents attributed their satisfaction to the service meeting their needs and expectations. Another large attribution (29%) was the care or knowledge exhibited by the counselor. This is a change from last year, in which 60% of the sample identified their counselor’s care or knowledge as the main reason for their satisfaction. Qualitative responses provided further context to counselor’s care and knowledge. For example, participants said that their counselor “listened to what [they] wanted”, “recommended good technology to assist”, and “knew how to ask the right questions.”**

**On a regional level, the overall mean satisfaction for counselors’ ability to recognize clients’ special needs regarding employment showed a very slight decrease from 8.65 to 8.62 from 2019 to 2020. Mean satisfaction ratings increased in the Eastern (8.33, up 3.33 points and 0.29 below the overall mean) and Southwestern (9.17, up 0.74 points and 0.55 points above the overall mean) regions. Overall, mean satisfaction decreased in the North Central (8.72, down 1.03 points and 0.10 above the overall mean), Northwestern (8.25, down 1.75 points and 0.37 below the overall mean), and South Central (8.25, down 1.50 points and 0.37 below the overall mean) regions.**

**…recognizing your special needs in regard 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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **4%** |
| **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 2020** | **17.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **19%** |
| **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 2020** | **72.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **74%** |
| **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 2020** | **5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **3%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **7.67** | **8.8** | **—** | **5.0** | **8.33** |
| **North Central** | **7.42** | **8.15** | **7.0** | **9.75** | **8.72** |
| **Northwestern** | **7.38** | **8.75** | **9.0** | **10.0** | **8.25** |
| **South Central** | **9.0** | **8.25** | **8.75** | **9.75** | **8.25** |
| **Southwestern** | **7.43** | **8.0** | **7.09** | **8.43** | **9.17** |
| **Overall Mean** | **7.82** | **8.38** | **7.53** | **8.65** | **8.62** |

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

**In 2020, almost three-quarters (70%) of 40 participants were highly satisfied with their counselor helping them understand Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Rights and Responsibilities. There is only one other year in which 70% or more of a sample were highly satisfied with their counselor’s assistance in helping to understand their VR and Rights and Responsibilities. Neutral ratings have increased from 2019 by 5 percentage points (20%), though the number of participants expressing neutral satisfaction remains similar at about eight. Dissatisfaction decreased by 4.5 percentage points to 2.5% from 2019 and 21.5% from 2018. Those who refused to answer or did not know made up 7.5% of the sample.**

**One client provided further clarification as to why they were unsatisfied. This client felt their needs were ignored. The top attribution for satisfaction with counselor’s help in understanding VR Rights and Responsibilities was the same as 2019. Of 29 respondents, 49% said that the primary reason for their satisfaction is their knowledgeable and caring provider. In qualitative responses, participants said that their counselor was “informative”, “very knowledgeable”, and “explained everything thoroughly”. The second largest attribution was the service meeting their needs/expectation (21%). Participants who were unable or unwilling to respond made up 24% of the sample.**

**Regionally, overall mean satisfaction increased to 8.30 for counselors’ ability in helping clients understand their VR rights and responsibilities in 2020, an increase of 0.42 points. Specifically, the North Central (8.38, up 1.16 points and 0.08 above the overall mean) and South Central (8.50, 0.50 points up and 0.20 above the overall mean) regions showed increases in mean satisfaction, while the Eastern (7.00, down 1.0 points and 1.30 below the overall mean), Northwestern (8.25, down 0.08 points and 0.05 below the overall mean), and Southwestern (8.29, down 0.14 points and 0.01 below the overall mean) regions showed small decreases in mean satisfaction ratings.**

**…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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **2.5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **7%** |
| **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 2020** | **20%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **15%** |
| **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 2020** | **70%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **67%** |
| **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 2020** | **7.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **11%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **8.33** | **10.0** | **5.0** | **8.0** | **7.00** |
| **North Central** | **7.82** | **8.56** | **6.67** | **7.22** | **8.38** |
| **Northwestern** | **7.57** | **8.71** | **9.0** | **8.33** | **8.25** |
| **South Central** | **8.75** | **8.56** | **7.50** | **8.0** | **8.50** |
| **Southwestern** | **8.12** | **7.33** | **6.55** | **8.43** | **8.29** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.15** | **8.67** | **6.97** | **7.88** | **8.30** |

**Understanding the Process for Formal Complaint Resolution**

**The proportion of high satisfaction with counselor’s explanations of the formal complaint resolution process has been steadily increasing since 2017. Just over half (52.5%) of 40 participants were highly satisfied compared with 16% of 36 participants in 2017. The proportion of survey respondents reporting high satisfaction in 2020 is at its highest since 2007. Three clients (7.5%) expressed neutral satisfaction in 2020. Neutral satisfaction has decreased from 2019 by 11.5 percentage points. Dissatisfaction ratings in 2020 increased by three percentage points from 2019 to 10% of the sample. From 2015-2020, there have been four years wherein the percentage of participants who were dissatisfied has been 10% or above. Almost a third of survey respondents (30%) said they did not know, refused, or the question did not apply to them. The percentage of sample participants who chose this answer has been declining from its highest point in 2017.**

**Three of four participants who were dissatisfied with their counselor’s explanations of the formal complaint resolution process attributed it to their needs being ignored. Compared to 2019, who also had four dissatisfied participants, this attribute increased by one participant. Qualitative data highlights an important theme among participants dissatisfaction. All four clients in 2020 explained that the formal complaint process was never described to them.**

**Of the 20 satisfied clients, 35% attributed their satisfaction to their knowledgeable and caring counselor and 25% to the service meeting their needs or expectation. These top two reasons are similar to last year’s satisfied participants (38% and 25%, respectively). Qualitative data particularly highlighted the knowledge of counselors in explaining the process for complaint resolution. For example, some participants said their counselor was “very detail-oriented”, “informative”, and “broke it down into everyday language.” Five participants chose not to answer or did not know.**

**On a regional scale, mean satisfaction ratings regarding counselors’ ability to help clients understand the process for formal complaint resolution increased overall in 2020. Increases in mean satisfaction occurred in the Eastern (7.00, up 2.0 points and 0.61 below the overall mean) and Southwestern (8.20, up 0.40 points and 0.59 above the overall mean) regions. The other regions all showed decreases from the perfect 10 ratings they received in 2019. This includes the North Central (7.27, down 2.73 points and 0.34 below the overall mean), Northwestern (9.33, down 0.67 points and 1.72 points above the overall mean), and South Central (7.14, down 2.86 points and 0.47 below the overall mean) regions. Of note are the ratings in the Northwestern and Eastern regions, which continue to show ratings well above their historically low ratings seen in 2018 (1.0 and 3.0, respectively).**

**…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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **7%** |
| **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 2020** | **7.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **19%** |
| **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 2020** | **52.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **26%** |
| **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 2020** | **30%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2019** | **48%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **10.0** | **10.0** | **3.0** | **5.0** | **7.00** |
| **North Central** | **6.15** | **7.4** | **9.0** | **10.0** | **7.27** |
| **Northwestern** | **5.0** | **7.5** | **1.0** | **10.0** | **9.33** |
| **South Central** | **8.0** | **7.0** | **6.50** | **10.0** | **7.14** |
| **Southwestern** | **5.4** | **10.0** | **6.75** | **7.8** | **8.20** |
| **Overall Mean** | **6.71** | **7.92** | **6.67** | **7.0** | **7.61** |

**Information Provided in the Format You Use**

**BESB clients who were highly satisfied with their counselors’ ability to provide information in the format they wanted to use reached 57.5%. This marks the second straight year the proportion of sample clients satisfied with the service has increased since the decline from its highest all-time point in 2015. The proportion of participants expressing neutral satisfaction (12.5%) has increased for the third straight year. Two participants (5%) were dissatisfied with the service, a decrease of six percentage points from 2019. A quarter (25%) of participants were unable or unwilling to respond.**

**Two respondents described their low satisfaction as resulting from information not being provided consistently in the format they needed. A total of 27 survey participants identified their main reason for being satisfied. The two highest attributes were the service meeting needs or expectations (26%) and the counselor was knowledgeable or caring (22%). Those who did not identify reason made up 18.5% of the sample. An important theme among satisfied participants is that their counselor explained the available reading formats. One participant summed this up by saying “their counselor explained everything well and gave [client] access to what [they] needed.”**

**Regionally, mean satisfaction with counselors’ ability to provide information in a usable format for clients is at an all-time high in 2020. Perfect ratings were seen in the Eastern (10.0, up 1.0 points and 1.33 above the overall mean), Northwestern (10.0, up 5.0 points and 1.33 above the overall mean), and Southwestern (10.0, up 0.83 points and 1.33 above the overall mean) regions. Mean satisfaction also increased in the North Central region (8.19, up 0.94 points and 0.48 below the overall mean). Ratings decreased slightly in the South Central region (8.63, down 1.04 points and 0.04 below the overall mean).**

**…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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **11%** |
| **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 2020** | **12.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **7%** |
| **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 2020** | **57.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **56%** |
| **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 2020** | **25%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **26%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **9.25** | **8.75** | **—** | **9.0** | **10.0** |
| **North Central** | **7.94** | **8.13** | **7.25** | **7.25** | **8.19** |
| **Northwestern** | **8.29** | **10.0** | **10.0** | **5.00** | **10.0** |
| **South Central** | **8.5** | **8.29** | **8.00** | **9.67** | **8.63** |
| **Southwestern** | **9.83** | **9.83** | **7.11** | **9.17** | **10.0** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.15** | **8.51** | **7.75** | **8.10** | **8.67** |

**Referrals Provided by Counselors**

**In 2020, just over half (52.5%) of 40 clients expressed high satisfaction with referrals provided by their counselors. This is a 10.5 percentage decrease from 63% in 2019. The proportion of sample respondents reporting high satisfaction in 2020 is the second all-time lowest. However, it is important to note that there was a relatively high proportion of sample respondents (27.5%) who chose don’t know, refused, or not applicable compared with previous years. Neutral satisfaction ratings have increased by 8.5 percentage points (12.5%) since 2019 whereas dissatisfaction ratings have decreased by 10.5 points (7.5%).**

**Two participants elaborated on the main reason for their low satisfaction: untimely service of referrals while another said referrals were never provided to them. The latter reason was also mentioned in the 2019 report. The top two attributes of satisfied participants were needs or expectations of services have been met (32%) and the knowledge or care of their counselor (23%). Analysis of qualitative responses revealed that some participants felt that their counselor provided the referral in a timely manner and the referred doctors or services were good. Participants who were unable or unwilling to participate made up 23% of the 22 respondents. The proportion of unable and unwilling participants in 2020 increased by 17.5% since 2019.**

**Regionally, overall mean satisfaction with referrals provided by counselors continued to increase in 2020. Specifically, mean satisfaction increased greatly in the Eastern (7.33, up 4.33 points and 0.70 below the overall mean) region, recovering from an all-time low seen last year. Ratings also increased in the North Central (8.00, up 0.89 points and 0.03 below the overall mean) and Southwestern (8.67, up 0.67 points and 0.64 above the overall mean) regions. Mean satisfaction decreased from their all-time highs in the Northwestern (8.67, down 1.08 points and 0.64 above the overall mean) and South Central (7.57, down 2.43 points and 0.46 below the overall mean) regions.**

**...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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **7.5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **18%** |
| **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 2020** | **12.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **4%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2018** | **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 2020** | **52.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **63%** |
| **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 2020** | **27.5%** |
| **DK/Ref/NA 2019** | **15%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **8.33** | **9.5** | **—** | **3.0** | **7.33** |
| **North Central** | **7.4** | **8.8** | **8.13** | **7.11** | **8.00** |
| **Northwestern** | **8.17** | **8.0** | **6.0** | **9.75** | **8.67** |
| **South Central** | **9.33** | **9.57** | **8.25** | **10.0** | **7.57** |
| **Southwestern** | **9.43** | **10.0** | **7.86** | **8.0** | **8.67** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.54** | **9.22** | **7.77** | **8.0** | **8.03** |

**Knowledge of Counselors**

**Forty clients provided their satisfaction levels regarding their counselor’s knowledge. Almost three quarters (72%) of the sample were highly satisfied. This is an 8-percentage point decrease from 2019. Despite the decrease, the proportion of satisfied clients has remained relatively stable between 70% and 80% over the years. There have been only two years where the proportion of participants expressing high satisfaction has been below 70% or above 80%. Neutral satisfaction among participants increased about 5.5 percentage points to 20.5% in 2020 compared to 2019. The proportion of clients with neutral ratings is at its all-time highest. Dissatisfaction with counselor’s knowledge made up 5% of the sample. This continues the recovery from 15% in 2018. One participant (2.5%) was unable to respond.**

**Satisfied clients provided a few reasons for their satisfaction with their counselor’s knowledge. The main theme was their counselor’s ability to answer questions or find someone who did know the answer. A smaller theme is their counselor’s special knowledge on certain topics or experience. A small group of clients who were dissatisfied with their counselor’s knowledge expressed a few reasons that can be categorized as poor communication and relationships.**

**On a regional level, most areas continued to report a high level of satisfaction with counselors’ knowledge in 2020. Mean satisfaction increased greatly in the Eastern (8.00, up 4.0 points and 0.45 below the overall mean) and North Central (8.59, up 1.23 points and 0.14 above the overall mean) regions. Satisfaction ratings decreased in the remaining areas, including the Northwestern (9.00, down 0.25 points and 0.55 above the overall mean), South Central (8.14, down 1.86 points and 0.31 below the overall mean), and Southwestern (8.29, down 0.71 points and 0.16 below the overall mean) regions.**

**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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **7%** |
| **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 2020** | **20.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **15%** |
| **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 2020** | **72%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **78%** |
| **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 2020** | **2.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **0%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **9.0** | **8.0** | **3.0** | **4.0** | **8.00** |
| **North Central** | **7.47** | **8.44** | **8.08** | **7.36** | **8.59** |
| **Northwestern** | **8.0** | **8.55** | **9.50** | **9.25** | **9.00** |
| **South Central** | **9.24** | **8.55** | **8.25** | **10.0** | **8.14** |
| **Southwestern** | **8.88** | **8.67** | **6.82** | **9.0** | **8.29** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.43** | **8.63** | **7.69** | **8.33** | **8.45** |

**Professionalism of Counselors**

**The majority of 40 survey respondents (75%) were highly satisfied with their counselor’s professionalism. The proportion of participants with neutral satisfaction increased to 22.5% compared to 18.5% in 2019. This marks the third year of an increase in the proportion of neutrally satisfied participants. Zero clients (0%) expressed dissatisfied ratings for the second year in a row. One client (2.5%) was unable to respond to the question.**

**In follow-up conversations, most clients who responded were satisfied with their counselors’ professionalism. They used descriptive words like “respectful”, “honest”, “nice”, “caring”, and “on time”. Few unsatisfied participants responded to the follow-up question. However, there was mention of dissatisfaction because client’s questions were largely unanswered.**

**Clients remain highly satisfied with counselors’ professionalism across every region in 2020. Satisfaction increased substantially in the Eastern region (8.00, up 2.00 points and 0.67 below the overall mean). Mean satisfaction also increased in the North Central region (8.72, up 0.08 points and 0.05 above the overall mean). Satisfaction ratings decreased in the Northwestern (9.00, down 1.0 point and 0.33 above the overall mean), South Central (8.88, down 1.22 points and 0.21 above the overall mean), and Southwestern (8.29, down 1.28 points and 0.38 below the overall mean) regions.**

**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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **0%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **22.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **18.5%** |
| **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 2020** | **75%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **81.5%** |
| **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 2020** | **2.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **0%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **9.25** | **9.50** | **8.0** | **6.0** | **8.00** |
| **North Central** | **7.58** | **8.50** | **7.45** | **8.64** | **8.72** |
| **Northwestern** | **9.38** | **8.33** | **8.75** | **10.0** | **9.00** |
| **South Central** | **9.41** | **9.78** | **9.0** | **10.0** | **8.88** |
| **Southwestern** | **7.88** | **8.67** | **7.55** | **9.57** | **8.29** |
| **Overall Mean** | **8.55** | **8.85** | **7.87** | **9.19** | **8.67** |

**Experience Working with Counselors**

**All 40 participants were willing to rate their experiences working with their counselor. The overall rating was positive (85%). The proportion of sample respondents expressing positive experiences is the same as 2019, which maintains the recovery from the all-time lowest proportion of positive ratings in 2018. A minority of participants (5%) reported neutral experiences. It is the second time this proportion has been above 4% in all evaluation years. The remaining 10% of participants reported negative experiences. Compared to 2018 (the highest all-time proportion of negative ratings), the proportion of participants with negative experiences in 2020 is smaller by 11 percentage points.**

**Many clients gave descriptive words about their counselor to explain their positive experiences. For example, participants said their counselor was “caring,” “realistic,” “optimistic,” “understanding,” and “helpful.” Some participants attributed a good relationship with their counselor as the reason for their positive experiences. A few clients who had negative experiences provided different responses. For example, one client said their needs were not understood while another said their counselor could have been better.**

**Regionally, three geographical territories improved in the percentage of clients that rated their experience working with their VR counselor as positive (Eastern, North Central, and Southwestern). One region remained unchanged (Northwestern), and only one declined in satisfaction (South Central). Every client in the Northwestern (100%, zero percentage point change from 2018) and Eastern (100%, up 100 percentage points) regions rated their experience working with their VR counselor as positive. Nine in ten clients in the North Central region (90%, up 15 percentage points) offered a positive rating. Satisfaction levels also grew in the Southwestern region (86%, up 13 percentage points). The South Central region was the only geographical area to experience a dip in counselor ratings (75%, down 25 percentage points). It should be noted that the Eastern region has historically had a low response rate for this question—a trend that continued in 2019 (n=2).**

**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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Positive Rating 2020** | **85%** |
| **Positive Rating 2019** | **85%** |
| **Positive Rating 2018** | **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 2020** | **5%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2019** | **4%** |
| **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 2020** | **10%** |
| **Negative Rating 2019** | **7%** |
| **Negative Rating 2018** | **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 2020** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **100%** | **100%** | **0%** | **100%** |  |
| **North Central** | **74%** | **84.21%** | **75%** | **90%** |  |
| **Northwestern** | **75%** | **91.67%** | **100%** | **100%** |  |
| **South Central** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** | **75%** |  |
| **Southwestern** | **75%** | **100%** | **73%** | **86%** |  |

**Explanation of Delays**

**Less than half (45%) of 40 participants said their counselor gave an explanation about the delays encountered in providing services on time. This is the all-time lowest proportion of participants stating that delays have been explained. A quarter of participants (25%) said that the delays in providing service on time were not explained to them by their counselor. This is the first time the proportion of participants has increased since 2016, which was also at 25%. There were 11 participants (27.5%) who identified the question as not applicable, and one (2.5%) who was unable or unwilling to respond.**

**The North Central area had the highest percentage (71%, down 7 percentage points from 2019) of clients reporting that the delay in service delivery was explained to them. This percentage is at its the overall historical average of 71.3%. Additionally, it is the second year of a decrease in proportion of clients reporting they were given an explanation. The second largest proportion in 2020 is a tie between the Northwestern (66.67%, down 33.33 points from 2019) and Southwestern (66.67%, down 8.33 points from 2019) regions. Representation from the Eastern (two participants) and South Central (four participants) is low. Therefore, these trends should be taken with caution. One participant from the East (50%, no data from 2019) and one from the South Central (25%, down 42 percentage points from 2019) regions reported that an explanation of delays in service delivery was given. Overall, North Central and Southwestern regions had modest declines from the previous year compared with the Northwestern and South Central areas.**

**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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes 2020** | **45%** |
| **Yes 2019** | **52%** |
| **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 2020** | **25%** |
| **No 2019** | **15%** |
| **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 2020** | **2.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **0%** |
| **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%** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **50%** | **100%** | **0%** | **—** | **50%** |
| **North Central** | **69.2%** | **58.33%** | **80%** | **78%** | **71%** |
| **Northwestern** | **50%** | **70%** | **100%** | **100%** | **66.67%** |
| **South Central** | **91%** | **100%** | **75%** | **67%** | **25%** |
| **Southwestern** | **66.7%** | **50%** | **75%** | **75%** | **66.67%** |

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

**Satisfaction with Services Arranged**

**Overall, most clients (84.5%) were satisfied with the services arranged by their counselors. The proportion of satisfied participants is almost 10 percentage points higher than the all-time low in 2018. The majority of satisfied participants (61.5%) were very satisfied. This is a 16.5 percentage point drop in very satisfied participants compared to 2019. Neutral satisfaction remains low (2.5%). However, it is an increase from 2019 wherein zero participants expressed neutral satisfaction. Dissatisfied clients made up 10.5% of the sample. The number of participants expressing dissatisfaction increased by about two participants from 2019. The proportion of dissatisfied participants remains about 18 percentage points below the all-time high in 2018. Only one of the dissatisfied clients in 2020 was very dissatisfied. Of the 40 respondents, 2.5% were unable or unwilling to respond.**

**The percentage of clients satisfied with services arranged decreased in four territories: Eastern (66.67, down 33.33 points), Northwestern (75%, down 25 points), Southwestern (83.3%, down 16.7 points), and South Central (87.5%, down 12.5 points). All four regional decreases come after 100% positive satisfaction ratings in the previous year. The proportion of clients satisfied with services arranged increased in the North Central area (94%, up 12 points).**

**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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Satisfied Rating 2020** | **84.5%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2019** | **89%** |
| **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 2020** | **2.5%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020** | **10.5%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2019** | **4%** |
| **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 2020** | **2.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **4%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **100%** | **100%** | **—** | **100%** | **66.67%** |
| **North Central** | **72.2%** | **90.0%** | **82.0%** | **82%** | **94%** |
| **Northwestern** | **62.5%** | **66.67%** | **75%** | **100%** | **75%** |
| **South Central** | **100%** | **88.89%** | **100%** | **100%** | **87.5%** |
| **Southwestern** | **100%** | **66.67%** | **64.0%** | **100%** | **83.3%** |

# Overall Satisfaction with BESB Services

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

**Clients’ overall satisfaction with BESB services decreased in all areas surveyed in 2020. This contrasts the trend in 2019, wherein all survey areas increased in mean satisfaction ratings. The largest mean satisfaction decrease in 2020 occurred in the extent to which clients felt services meet their needs (7.58, down 0.54 points). The second largest decrease was in services meeting client expectations (7.58, down 0.50 points). The overall mean satisfaction with BESB services is at 7.88 (down 0.34 points). It is the fourth time in history the overall mean satisfaction rating is below 8.00, or very satisfied. The only service with a mean satisfaction above the historical average and considered in the highly satisfied range is with services meeting client IPE’s (8.08, down 0.19). Most survey respondents (87.50%) stated they would recommend BESB VR services to a friend. The remaining 12.5% of clients would not recommend BESB VR services to a friend.**

**There is an average satisfaction rating of 7.78 across all areas of surveyed. This is a neutral rating, although it is on the higher end of the scale. The average this year is down 0.39 points compared with 2019.**

**BESB Vocational Rehabilitation Services Mean Ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall satisfaction 2020** | **7.88** |
| **Overall satisfaction 2019** | **8.22** |
| **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 2020** | **7.58** |
| **Services met expectations 2019** | **8.08** |
| **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 2020** | **8.08** |
| **Services met your IPE 2019** | **8.27** |
| **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 2020** | **7.58** |
| **Services met needs 2019** | **8.12** |
| **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**

**Clients who were highly satisfied with the extent to which services met their IPE made up just over half (55%) of all 40 participants. This is a significant drop of 19 percentage points compared to 2019. However, the proportion of clients satisfied with the extent to which services met their IPE in 2019 is the all-time highest point and an outlier in the data. The proportion of highly satisfied clients in 2020 is three percentage points above its historical mean of 53%. Those expressing neutral satisfaction remained at the same proportion as 2019 (15%). Low satisfaction rose 8 percentage points to 15% in 2020. It is tied with 2011 for the all-time highest proportion of dissatisfied participants. A total of six participants (15%) were unable or unwilling to respond.**

**Regional average satisfaction ratings regarding the extent to which services met client’s IPE varied. Interpretations of Eastern region trends should be taken with caution given a low sample size (n=3) in 2020. Satisfaction ratings increased in the Eastern (6.33, 1.33 below the overall mean and 1.33 higher than 2019) and North Central (8.00, 0.34 points above the overall mean and 0.40 higher than 2019) regions. Three areas experienced decreases: Northwestern (8.33, 0.67 above the overall mean and 1.67 lower than 2019), South Central (8.57, 0.91 above the overall mean and 0.68 lower than 2019), and Southwestern (6.29, 1.37 below the overall mean and 1.85 lower than 2019).**

**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, 2009 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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **15%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **7%** |
| **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 2020** | **15%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **15%** |
| **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 2020** | **55%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **74%** |
| **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 2020** | **15%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **4%** |
| **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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Eastern** | **8.25** | **10.0** | **—** | **5.0** | **6.33** |
| **North Central** | **7.82** | **7.58** | **7.64** | **7.60** | **8.00** |
| **Northwestern** | **6.43** | **7.7** | **9.0** | **10.0** | **8.33** |
| **South Central** | **9.12** | **9.5** | **8.0** | **9.25** | **8.57** |
| **Southwestern** | **6.14** | **5.5** | **6.63** | **8.14** | **6.29** |
| **Overall Mean** | **7.86** | **8.09** | **7.63** | **8.27** | **7.66** |

**Extent Vocational Rehabilitation Services Met Needs**

**A total of 23 clients (57.5%) are highly satisfied with the extent to which VR services met their needs. The proportion of highly satisfied participants dropped by 16.5 percentage points from 2019. The proportion of BESB clients with neutral satisfaction regarding VR services meeting their needs is at its all-time highest point (30%). This is a 19-percentage point difference from 2019. Low satisfied participants made up 10% of the sample. It is the second year in a row in which the proportion has decreased, although it is a very small number (down 1 point from 2019). The remaining one participant (2.5%) was unable or unwilling to answer.**

**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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **10%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **11%** |
| **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 2020** | **30%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **11%** |
| **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 2020** | **57.5%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **74%** |
| **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 2020** | **2.5%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **4%** |
| **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**

**Satisfaction with the timeframe for delivery of services is split between high and low rates of satisfaction. There were zero participants expressing neutral satisfaction (0%). The majority of clients were highly satisfied with the timeframe for delivery of services (74%). This is an 11-percentage point drop from 2019. Since 2015, each year has alternated between a percentage of highly satisfied participants in the seventies and eighties. Low satisfaction increased 16 percentage points from 2019 to 23% in 2020. It is the highest all-time proportion of low satisfied respondents. A small number of clients (3%) were unable or unwilling to respond.**

**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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Satisfied Rating 2020** | **74%** |
| **Satisfied Rating 2019** | **85%** |
| **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 2020** | **0%** |
| **Neutral Rating 2019** | **4%** |
| **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 2020** | **23%** |
| **Dissatisfied Rating 2019** | **7%** |
| **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 2020** | **3%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **4%** |
| **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**

**All participants were able to provide their overall satisfaction levels with VR services. Overall satisfaction with VR services experienced a decrease from 2019. A total of 24 clients (60%) in 2020 were highly satisfied, which is the second all-time lowest proportion of clients expressing high satisfaction. There were 14 participants (35%) who were neutrally satisfied. The proportion of neutrally satisfied participants has been increasing since 2017. On the other hand, low satisfaction has been decreasing since 2018. In 2020, there were two participants (5%) who were overall dissatisfied with VR services.**

**What is your overall satisfaction with the Services provided by the Vocational Rehabilitation Program 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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **8%** |
| **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 2020** | **35%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **22%** |
| **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 2020** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **70%** |
| **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 2020** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 2020, all 40 participants responded with their satisfaction levels regarding service expectations. The majority of survey respondents (60%) were satisfied with the extent to which services met expectations. This is a 10-percentage point decrease from 2019. Neutral satisfaction has increased for the second year in a row. About a quarter of participants (27.5%) in 2020 were neutrally satisfied with services meeting their expectations. The remaining 12.5% of the sample gave low satisfaction ratings, an increase of 4.5 percentages points from 2019.**

**Clients were asked which service provided by the BESB fell short of their expectations. Over half of 40 respondents (57.5%, up 2.5 percentage points from 2019) were unable or unwilling to respond. Most participants who responded chose Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment (12.5%, down 9.5 points from 2019) as the service that fell short of their expectations. This is a similar trend to 2019, wherein Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment was the top service that fell short of expectations. Other services that fell short of client expectations were Low vision (7.5%, up 3.5 points), Higher Education (7.5%), Skills Training (5%, up 5 points), Transportation (5%, down 10 points), and Small Business Venture Services (2.5%, down 1.5 points).**

**Survey respondents elaborated on their reasons for services fallings short of expectations. A few participants identified general reasons whereas others were specific to the service. For example, the delivery of Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment was described as untimely and its equipment provided little functionality. Clients who were unsatisfied with Low Vision services provided two different reasons: the referred doctor did not treat them well, and the visits did not provide new information to the patient. One client explained that Transportation Services were unreliable.**

**Participants were also given the chance to identify what BESB services exceeded expectations. More clients were willing to disclose the services that exceeded their expectations rather than those that fell short. Of 38 participants, Low Vision (22.5%, up 4.5 points) and Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment (20%, down 21 points) were identified as the top services that exceeded expectations. Other services were Higher Education (5%, up 1 point), Skills Training (2.5%, down 4.5 points), and Personal Care Attendant (2.5%, down 4.5 points) services. A total of 17 participants (42.5%) were unable to respond.**

**In qualitative follow-ups, participants generally recognized their counselors as the reason why their expectations with services were exceeded. Others described equipment or technology, such a magnifiers, that have been helpful in their lives.**

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

**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=67, 2016 n=56, 2017 n=49, 2018 n=31, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3 Rating 2020** | **12.5%** |
| **1-3 Rating 2019** | **8%** |
| **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 2020** | **27.5%** |
| **4-7 Rating 2019** | **22%** |
| **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 2020** | **60%** |
| **8-10 Rating 2019** | **70%** |
| **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 2020** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **0%** |
| **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**

**The percentage of clients who would recommend BESB VR services (87.50%) is below the historical average of 91.7%. It is a 5.5 percentage point decrease from 2019 and the third time in history wherein the proportion of clients who would recommend BESB services has fallen below 90%. The percentage of clients who would not recommend BESB VR services has increased 5.5 percentage points from 2019 to 12.5% in 2020. It is the second highest proportion of those who would not recommend BESB services and 5.6% above the historical average of 6.9%. Overall, most survey respondents would recommend BESB 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, 2008 n=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, 2019 n=54, 2020 n=40**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes 2020** | **87.5%** |
| **Yes 2019** | **93%** |
| **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 2020** | **12.5%** |
| **No 2019** | **7%** |
| **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 2020** | **0%** |
| **DK/Ref 2019** | **0%** |
| **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 Program 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 2020 fiscal year.**

**This survey represents a continuation of the research previously conducted at the University of Connecticut from 2003 through 2008. For 2020, 40 complete interviews were conducted from November 1, 2019, through November 1, 2020. Complete interviews are defined as instances when a respondent followed the interview to its entirety. The survey instrument, as well as the list of clients from which this survey data is drawn, was provided by BESB.**

**Out of the sample of 77 clients who received services from BESB during the 2020 fiscal year, nine individuals refused to respond to the survey. Twenty-two clients did not answer the phone following numerous attempts to reach them. CPPSR called each client a minimum of seven times, though in most cases, attempted contact reached upwards of 11 calls. Six clients were deemed to be unreachable. Privacy devices were not a major hindrance to reaching clients in 2020; instead, clients appeared to use voicemail to screen calls at higher rates than in the past. After two attempts at reaching a client, CPPSR left a message requesting a return call.**

**CPPSR noted no statistically significant changes in responses from 2019 to 2020. Out of respondents who CPPSR was able to reach, this survey has a 9.0% margin of error at the 95% confidence interval. This means that statistical anomalies outside of the +/-9.0% margin of error will only exist approximately five percent of the time.**

**Annotated Questionnaire**

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

**Annotated Questionnaire:  
Fiscal Year 2020**

** Conducted by:**

**Issued December 2020**

**Hello. May I speak with <FNAME> <LNAME>, please? My name is <FNAME>. I am calling on behalf of the Vocational Rehabilitation Program 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** | **90%** |
| **No** | **10%** |
| **Don't know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **74%** |
| **No** | **26%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **39** |

**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** | **3%** |
| **4-7** | **31%** |
| **8-10** | **66%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **29** |

**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** | **—** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **—** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **—** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **100%** |
| **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** | **38%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **43%** |
| **The service was timely** | **5%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **—** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **5%** |
| **Other** | **9%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **21** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **65%** |
| **No** | **35%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **12%** |
| **4-7** | **19%** |
| **8-10** | **69%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **26** |

**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** | **—** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **—** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **25%** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **25%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **—** |
| **Wanted different product** | **50%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Other** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **4** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **69%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **16%** |
| **The service was timely** | **5%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **—** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **—** |
| **Other** | **5%** |
| **Don’t know** | **5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **19** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **20%** |
| **No** | **77.5%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **2.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **13%** |
| **4-7** | **13%** |
| **8-10** | **74%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **8** |

**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** | **100%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **—** |
| **Other** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **1** |

**Q3d. 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** | **50%** |
| **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** | **6** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **7.5%** |
| **No** | **92.5%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **100%** |
| **Vocational Program** | **—** |
| **Don't Know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Full-Time** | **66.7%** |
| **Part-Time** | **33.3%** |
| **Don't Know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

**Q4d. Did you graduate?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **33.3%** |
| **No** | **66.7%** |
| **Don't Know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **4** |

**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** | **66.7%** |
| **8-10** | **33.3%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

**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** | **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 (specify)** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **5%** |
| **No** | **95%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **—** |
| **8-10** | **100%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **2** |

**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** | **50%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **50%** |
| **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** | **2** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **12.5%** |
| **No** | **87.5%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **20%** |
| **4-7** | **60%** |
| **8-10** | **20%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **5** |

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

**Q6d. 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** | **—** |
| **Other** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **1** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **7.5%** |
| **No** | **92.5%** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **3** |

**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** | **—** |
| **The service was timely** | **33.3%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **—** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **33.3%** |
| **All of the above** | **—** |
| **Other** | **33.3%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **3** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **12.5%** |
| **No** | **87.5%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **20%** |
| **4-7** | **40%** |
| **8-10** | **40%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **5** |

**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** | **100%** |
| **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** | **1** |

**Q8d. 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** |

**Q9. 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** | **10%** |
| **4-7** | **20%** |
| **8-10** | **65%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **5%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **—** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **—** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **25%** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **50%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **—** |
| **Other** | **25%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **4** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **30%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **47%** |
| **The service was timely** | **3%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **10%** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **3%** |
| **All of the above** | **—** |
| **Other** | **7%** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **30** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **5%** |
| **4-7** | **22.5%** |
| **8-10** | **57.5%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **15%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **50%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **—** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **—** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **50%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **—** |
| **Other** | **—** |
| **Don't know/refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **2** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **36%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **52%** |
| **The service was timely** | **—** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **4%** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **—** |
| **All of the above** | **—** |
| **Other** | **8%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **25** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **5%** |
| **4-7** | **17.5%** |
| **8-10** | **72.5%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **5%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **—** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **—** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **—** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **50%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **—** |
| **Other** | **50%** |
| **Don’t know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **2** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **35.5%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **29%** |
| **The service was timely** | **—** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **6.5%** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **—** |
| **All of the above** | **—** |
| **Other** | **6.5%** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **22.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **31** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **2.5%** |
| **4-7** | **20%** |
| **8-10** | **70%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **7.5%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **21%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **49%** |
| **The service was timely** | **—** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **3%** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **—** |
| **All of the above** | **—** |
| **Other** | **3%** |
| **Don’t know/refused** | **24%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **29** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **10%** |
| **4-7** | **7.5%** |
| **8-10** | **52.5%** |
| **Don’t Know/Not applicable/Refused** | **30%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **—** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **25%** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **—** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **75%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **—** |
| **All of the above** | **—** |
| **Other** | **—** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **4** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **25%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **35%** |
| **The service was timely** | **—** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **—** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **5%** |
| **Other** | **10%** |
| **Don’t know/refused** | **25%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **20** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **5%** |
| **4-7** | **12.5%** |
| **8-10** | **57.5%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **25%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **—** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **—** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **—** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **50%** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **—** |
| **Other** | **50%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **2** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Products/service met my needs/expectations** | **26%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **22%** |
| **The service was timely** | **7.5%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **7.5%** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **11%** |
| **All of the above** | **—** |
| **Other** | **7.5%** |
| **Don’t know** | **18.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **27** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **7.5%** |
| **4-7** | **12.5%** |
| **8-10** | **52.5%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused/Not Applicable** | **27.5%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **33.3%** |
| **The quality of the product was poor** | **—** |
| **There was no follow-up** | **33.3%** |
| **My needs were ignored** | **—** |
| **Lack of transportation** | **—** |
| **The service was not timely** | **33.3%** |
| **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** | **32%** |
| **The provider was knowledgeable/caring** | **23%** |
| **The service was timely** | **13%** |
| **Follow-up after the service was good** | **—** |
| **Access to the service was coordinated effectively** | **9%** |
| **All of the above** | **—** |
| **Other** | **—** |
| **Don’t know/Refused** | **23%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **22** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **5%** |
| **4-7** | **20.5%** |
| **8-10** | **72%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **2.5%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **—** |
| **4-7** | **22.5%** |
| **8-10** | **75%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **2.5%** |
| **Total respondents** | **40** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very Positive** | **65%** |
| **Somewhat Positive** | **20%** |
| **Neutral** | **5%** |
| **Somewhat Negative** | **10%** |
| **Very negative** | **—** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **15%** |
| **4-7** | **15%** |
| **8-10** | **55%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **15%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **10%** |
| **4-7** | **30%** |
| **8-10** | **57.5%** |
| **Don't know/Refused** | **2.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very Satisfied** | **41%** |
| **Somewhat Satisfied** | **33%** |
| **Neutral (vol.)** | **—** |
| **Somewhat Dissatisfied** | **13%** |
| **Very Dissatisfied** | **10%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **3%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **45%** |
| **No** | **25%** |
| **Not Applicable (volunteered)** | **27.5%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **2.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very Satisfied** | **61.5%** |
| **Somewhat Satisfied** | **23%** |
| **Neutral (vol.)** | **2.5%** |
| **Somewhat Dissatisfied** | **8%** |
| **Very Dissatisfied** | **2.5%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **2.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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 Program of the Connecticut Board of Education and Services for the Blind?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1-3** | **5%** |
| **4-7** | **35%** |
| **8-10** | **60%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **12.5%** |
| **4-7** | **27.5%** |
| **8-10** | **60%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low Vision** | **7.5%** |
| **Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment** | **12.5%** |
| **Skills Training** | **5.0%** |
| **Higher Education Training** | **7.5%** |
| **Reader** | **—** |
| **Transportation** | **5%** |
| **Personal Care Attendant** | **—** |
| **Small Business Venture** | **2.5%** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **57.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low Vision** | **24%** |
| **Rehabilitation and Adaptive Equipment** | **21%** |
| **Skills Training** | **2.5%** |
| **Higher Education Training** | **5%** |
| **Reader** | **—** |
| **Transportation** | **—** |
| **Personal Care Attendant** | **2.5%** |
| **Small Business Venture** | **—** |
| **Don’t Know/Refused** | **45%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **38** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **87.5%** |
| **No** | **12.5%** |
| **Don’t Know** | **—** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

**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** | **7.5%** |
| **North Central** | **45%** |
| **Northwest** | **10%** |
| **South Central** | **20%** |
| **Southwest** | **17.5%** |
| **Total Respondents** | **40** |

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