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# Background and Methodology

Using Section 188 Disability Reference Guide as a blueprint for improving access and equal opportunity to the MO workforce development system and Career Centers, surveys were conducted to consider how to incorporate universal strategies proven to be successful for people with disabilities and all customers accessing the workforce system.

The MO State WIB determined concentration area(s) and goals were based on evidence of need.

The LEAD Center collaborated with MO workforce to develop the survey for job seekers. The MO workforce IT department disseminated the surveys to customers statewide that accessed the Career Centers over the past 6 months.

**Notable limitations:**

* The survey responses represent the experience of job seekers in 39 MO Job Centers. However, six centers, each with over 30 respondents, account for half of all respondents while 15 centers had five or fewer respondents. Because we present the data in aggregate with each response having the same weight, the results are influenced more heavily by the centers with a large number of respondents than those with a small number.

**Overview of document:**

This document presents results for each survey question for all respondents and a comparison between respondents who disclosed a disability to Job Center staff and those who did not.

Table 13 provides a summary of responses by Job Center.

A copy of the survey is provided in the appendix.

We present Chi square statistics to evaluate how likely it is that the difference between the groups arose by chance.[[1]](#footnote-1) Any results that are statistically significant are noted in the text so it is not necessary for the reader to under the chi square statistic.

# Total Number of Respondents

670 seekers logged on to answer the survey. However, not all answered each question. For example, 670 responded to the first question “how times did you visit a MO job Center in the last 6 months,” while 507 provided the name of the Center, 665 responded to whether the staff were welcoming, and 564 responded to the question of whether it was easy to access information. As a result of this variation, we provide the number of responses included in each table.

# Number of Visits to a Missouri Job Center in the last 6 months

Job Seekers who disclosed a disability were statistically more likely to visit a job center more than 1-2 times.

Table : Number of visits to MO Job Center in last 6 months,  
by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of visits in last 6 months | All | Did not Disclose Disability | Disclosed Disability |
| 1-2 times | 48% | 50% | 29% |
| 3-4 times | 28% | 28% | 36% |
| 6 or more | 24% | 23% | 35% |
| N respondents | 666 | 611 | 55 |
| Pearson chi2(2) = 8.8925 Pr = 0.012 | | | |

# Which Job Center did you access?

The survey responses represent the experience of job seekers in 39 MO Job Centers. However, six centers account for over half of respondents. 24 centers had fewer than 10 respondents There is no correlation between the job center and whether the respondent disclosed.

Table : Number of respondents by Job Center

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Center Name | Total Respondents | Disclosed Disability | |
| Number | Percent |
| Springfield Job Center | 61 | 4 | 7% |
| Kansas City – FEC Job Center | 46 | 5 | 11% |
| Independence Job Center | 45 | 4 | 9% |
| Kansas City - Northland Job Center | 41 | 3 | 7% |
| St. Charles County Job Center | 34 | 2 | 6% |
| St. Louis City – SLATE Job Center | 31 | 2 | 6% |
| Arnold Job Center | 30 | 0 | 0% |
| Joplin Job Center | 28 | 2 | 7% |
| Sedalia Job Center | 16 | 0 | 0% |
| St. Joseph Job Center | 16 | 1 | 6% |
| Columbia Job Center | 14 | 2 | 14% |
| Park Hills Job Center | 14 | 1 | 7% |
| St. Louis County – Florissant Job Center | 14 | 0 | 0% |
| Jefferson City Job Center | 11 | 3 | 27% |
| Linn Creek Job Center | 10 | 1 | 10% |
| Clinton Job Center | 9 | 2 | 22% |
| Cape Girardeau Job Center | 8 | 1 | 13% |
| Lebanon Job Center | 8 | 2 | 25% |
| Rolla Job Center | 7 | 0 | 0% |
| Sikeston Job Center | 7 | 0 | 0% |
| Chillicothe Job Center | 6 | 0 | 0% |
| Nevada Job Center | 6 | 2 | 33% |
| Poplar Bluff Job Center | 6 | 0 | 0% |
| Kirksville Job Center | 5 | 0 | 0% |
| Branson Job Center | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| Kennett Job Center | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| Maryville Job Center | 4 | 1 | 25% |
| St. Louis County – North Oaks Job Center | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| Hannibal Job Center | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| Pulaski County Job Center | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| Belton-WCMCAA | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| Mexico Missouri Job Center | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| Monett Limited | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| FEC (Richmond) Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| Neosho Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| Platte County Resource Center | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| Potosi Missouri Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| Washington Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| West Plains Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 507 | 38 | 7% |
| Pearson chi2(38) = 32.3970 Pr = 0.726 | | | |

# How did you learn about the Job Center?

Respondents were most likely to report that they found the Job Center on their own (57%). There is no statistical difference between those who did and did not disclose disability.

Table : Source of Information about Job Center,  
by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Did not disclose disability | Disclosed Disability |
| Found on my own | 57% | 57% | 58% |
| Referred by Community Service Provider | 6% | 6% | 13% |
| Referred by Friend | 11% | 11% | 13% |
| Other | 26% | 26% | 18% |
| N respondents | 511 | 471 | 40 |
| Pearson chi2(3)= 4.1756 Pr = 0.243 | | | |

Among the jobseeker that said they were “referred by a community service provider,” 15 cited “unemployment office” as the CSP. Eleven respondents identified actual CSPs.

Respondents that disclosed their disability mentioned:

* Jenna Hall
* Michelle Reinmiller
* The Whole Person

Respondents that did not disclose a disability mentioned:

* 4 kidz only inc.
* BJC Behavioral Health
* Criminal Justice Ministry
* Family Enrichment Center-Salvation Army
* Gamm Inc.
* Metro Business College
* Salvation army counselor
* St. Patrick Center

Jobseekers who responded “other” source of information were asked to specify in text how they learned about the job center. Most responded that they were required to register at the Job Center as a precondition for receiving unemployment benefits.

Table : Explanation for “Other” response to

“How did you learn about the MO Job Center?”\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category of response | Number of respondents |
| Unemployment | 50 |
| Past Use | 13 |
| Letter | 10 |
| Former Employer | 7 |
| Other Job Center | 7 |
| Internet Search | 6 |
| Became Unemployed | 6 |
| Family | 4 |
| Employment services/Dept of Labor | 4 |
| Just Knew | 3 |
| Other government agency | 3 |
| Email | 2 |
| Live nearby | 1 |
| TV | 1 |
| Workplace Visit | 1 |

\* Text responses categorized by LEAD staff

# Did you find the staff welcoming?

Overwhelmingly, respondents found the staff welcoming. However, job seekers who disclosed a disability were twice as likely to find the staff not welcoming (13%) compared with jobseekers who did not disclose (6%). Despite the small numbers, this difference is statistically significant

Table : Staff welcoming, by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Did not disclose a disability | Disclosed a disability |
| No | 5% | 13% | 6% |
| Yes | 95% | 87% | 94% |
| N respondents | 663 | 609 | 54 |
| Pearson chi2(1) = 5.3236 Pr = .021 | | | |

Among the 39 people who report that the staff was not welcoming, 25 said the staff was uncaring, condescending, or rude. The respondents used words such as "better than you attitude," "condescending," "acts like she is better than everyone," "acted like I was bothering them, "acted like I did not exist," and "rude."

Four people complained that they needed to wait for services and two reported that the staff was unresponsive to their needs. Others reported confusion, an altercation, personal dislike, and that the staff was “a hot mess.”

# Did you find the setting welcoming?

Overall, 94% of respondents found the setting welcoming. Those who disclosed a disability were more likely to find the setting unwelcoming than those who did not disclose (13% compared with 5%). It is important to note that this is statistically significant but represents the opinion of only seven of 39 respondents who disclosed a disability and responded to the setting questions.

Table : Setting welcoming, by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Did not disclose a disability | Disclosed a disability |
| No | 6% | 5% | 13% |
| Yes | 94% | 95% | 87% |
| N respondents | 594 | 546 | 48 |
| Pearson chi2(1) = 5.3236 Pr =0.021 | | | |

Among people who reported that the setting was not welcoming, seven said it felt institutional using words such as “clinical,” “austere,” feeling of being processed rather than helped,” “not warm and welcoming,” or “institutional.” Four reported that the setting was dirty. Two commented that the service focused on lower level jobs rather professional jobs or jobs that maintained their current salary. Six complained that the staff was uncaring, condescending, or rude.

Others reported that it was “a crazy layout,” “loud,” “long wait,” “no help available,” or in an “unsafe neighborhood.”

# Was the Center easy to access by car or public transportation?

Overall 94% of respondents said the Job Center was easy to access by car or public transportation. People who disclosed a disability were twice as likely to find that the Center was not easy to access.

Table : Ease of access to Center by car or public transportation,  
by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Did not disclose a disability | Disclosed a disability |
| No | 6% | 6% | 13% |
| Yes | 94% | 94% | 87% |
| N respondents | 576 | 529 | 47 |
| Pearson chi2(1) = 3.7083 Pr = 0.054 | | | |

Among the respondents who reported the Center was not easy to access, 17 cited insufficient parking; five said it was far from their home, four reported it was difficult to find, two said it was that it difficult to access because of its proximity to a major highway, two cited signage, and one said it was difficult to access via public transportation.

# Was the building physically easy to access and was it easy to move around inside the building?

Only 12 respondents (2%) said the building was not physically accessible or that it was not easy to move around.

Four people who reported difficulty identified access issues such as no automatic door, no place to sit, confusing layout, and that it was a “hassle” that they had to be admitted at the entrance and walked in by a staff member.

The others cited problems not related to the accessibility of the building interior such as “the job fair was packed,” the Center was difficult to find, or parking was inconvenient or not well marked.

Table : Access and move around inside building  
by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Did not disclose a disability | Disclosed a disability |
| No | 2% | 2% | 4% |
| Yes | 98% | 98% | 96% |
| N respondents | 573 | 528 | 45 |
| Pearson chi2(1) = 1.3156 Pr =0.251 | | | |

# Was it easy to find the information you were looking for?

66 respondents (12%) of all respondents had difficulty finding the information they were looking for. Jobseekers who disclosed a disability were more than twice as likely as those who did not disclose to report difficulty.

Table : Easy to find information, by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Did not disclose a disability | Disclosed a disability |
| No | 12% | 11% | 24% |
| Yes | 88% | 89% | 76% |
| N respondents | 563 | 517 | 46 |
| Pearson chi2(1) = 7.1930 Pr =0.007 | | | |

As shown in Table 10, among those who reported difficulty finding the information, one-quarter said that the staff was not helpful and/or that you need to help yourself. Another large group had some type of issue with the computers.

Table : Reasons for difficulty finding information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Computer Issues--Any | 14 |
| Difficult to use | 5 |
| Confusing | 4 |
| Don’t know how to use | 2 |
| Don’t work properly | 2 |
| Too busy/occupied | 1 |
| Staff was no help/not much help was available/Need to help yourself | 17 |
| Type of jobs available did not suit needs | 5 |
| Needed service was not available | 4 |
| Personnel didn't know how to address question/inadequate explanations | 4 |
| Did not want help but was required to get it | 2 |
| No feedback from jobs | 2 |
| Long wait for services | 2 |
| Other | 4 |

Several people who disclosed a disability cited disability-related barriers to finding information such as:

* I was unable to get any information with respect to additional benefits available to me, i.e. Food stamps, etc.
* “Couldn't find how to write a resume, what to say to potential employees about disability.”
* My agent (counselor) ignored my plea for help.
* I am looking for part-time only and within an easy driving distance from my home. That seems to be almost impossible.

# Number of negative responses

We considered the possibility that respondents were just angry with their experience and had negative responses to all five questions. However, this was not the case. Most of those who had negative responses complained about only one or two characteristics of the Job Center.

Table : Number of negative responses, by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Negative Responses | All | Did not Disclose Disability | Disclosed Disability |
| 0 | 441 | 415 | 26 |
| 1 | 69 | 59 | 10 |
| 2 | 31 | 26 | 5 |
| 3 | 10 | 9 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 554 | 510 | 44 |

# Did you ask for / receive an accommodation?

Among the 52 people who disclosed a disability, 10 (19%) requested an accommodation. Half (5 of 10) did not receive the accommodation. When asked to explain their “no” answer, the jobseekers provided the following responses:

* No one can help me with the computer.
* Wasn't able to find part-time, everything offered was full-time.
* The person I spoke with did not have any information with respect to ongoing support. Somewhat disconcerting given I have been paying taxes since I was 12.
* I did not receive my accommodation

# Overall experience

Survey respondents were asked to rate their overall experience on a scale of 1 to 10 with 10.

On average, people who disclosed a disability rated their overall experience lower than those who did not disclose (7.3 compared with 8.3). This difference is statistically significant.

Table : Overall rating of Job Center, by disability disclosure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disability | N respondents | Overall Experience rating on a 1-10 scale | |
| Mean | Std. Err. |
| Did not disclose a disability | 614 | 8.28 | 0.08 |
| Disclosed a disability | 55 | 7.33 | 0.36 |
| Total | 669 | 8.20 | 0.08 |
| Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0010 | |  |  |

Table : Number of respondents with negative comments and overall rating, by Job Center

|  |  | Any Negative Comments | | Category of Negative Comment | | | | | Overall rating |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Center | N respondents | N | Percent | Staff | Setting | Trans-portation | Infor-mation | Inside |
| Nevada Job Center | 6 | 3 | 50% | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.5 |
| St. Louis City – SLATE Job Center | 31 | 11 | 38% | 3 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 8.0 |
| Jefferson City Job Center | 11 | 4 | 36% | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8.0 |
| Hannibal Job Center | 3 | 1 | 33% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7.0 |
| St. Louis County – North Oaks Job Center | 4 | 1 | 33% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7.8 |
| Pulaski County Job Center | 3 | 1 | 33% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8.3 |
| Kansas City - Northland Job Center | 41 | 12 | 32% | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 7.9 |
| Linn Creek Job Center | 10 | 3 | 30% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7.7 |
| Independence Job Center | 45 | 12 | 27% | 5 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 7.6 |
| St. Charles County Job Center | 34 | 8 | 25% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 8.2 |
| Cape Girardeau Job Center | 8 | 2 | 25% | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9.1 |
| St. Louis County – Florissant Job Center | 14 | 3 | 23% | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8.1 |
| Park Hills Job Center | 14 | 3 | 23% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9.0 |
| Poplar Bluff Job Center | 6 | 1 | 20% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7.8 |
| St. Joseph Job Center | 16 | 3 | 20% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8.4 |
| Sedalia Job Center | 16 | 3 | 20% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 8.6 |
| Arnold Job Center | 30 | 5 | 19% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 7.9 |
| Joplin Job Center | 28 | 5 | 19% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8.1 |
| Chillicothe Job Center | 6 | 1 | 17% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.7 |
| Kansas City – FEC Job Center | 46 | 7 | 16% | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 8.3 |
| Springfield Job Center | 61 | 9 | 15% | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 8.5 |
| Columbia Job Center | 14 | 2 | 14% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7.6 |
| Rolla Job Center | 7 | 1 | 14% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8.7 |
| Lebanon Job Center | 8 | 1 | 13% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8.3 |
| Washington Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.0 |
| Kirksville Job Center | 5 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.4 |
| Platte County Resource Center | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.0 |
| Kennett Job Center | 4 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.5 |
| Sikeston Job Center | 7 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.7 |
| Maryville Job Center | 4 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.0 |
| Monett Limited | 2 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.0 |
| Branson Job Center | 5 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.2 |
| Belton-WCMCAA | 2 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.5 |
| Mexico Missouri Job Center | 2 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.5 |
| Clinton Job Center | 9 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 |
| FEC (Richmond) Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.0 |
| Neosho Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.0 |
| Potosi Missouri Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.0 |
| West Plains Job Center | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.0 |

1. Although we report the percentage in each group, the chi square statistic is based on the underlying frequency of each response [↑](#footnote-ref-1)