Arkansas Division of
Workforce Services

WORKFORCE INNOVATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT SYSTEMS EVALUATION, SKILLS GAP ANALYSIS AND CUSTOMER SERVICE ASSESSMENT

Prepared by:

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

JUNE 16, 2021

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HEALTH PROFESSIONS
100 Graduate Education Building, University of Arkansas

Dr. Brent Williams, Ph.D., Principal Investigator

Dr. Keith Vire, Ph.D., Project Director

Mervin Jebaraj, Director, Center for Business and Economic Research

David Sorto, Research Associate

Counselor Education Program
Department of Rehabilitation, Human Resources and Communication Disorders,
College of Education and Health Professions
100 Graduate Education Building
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701
479-575-8696

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....5

History of Workforce Services in Arkansas 14

Rationale for Systems Evaluation.....15

Project Objectives 19

Study Methodology.....20

Collaborative Partners 21

Co-Enrolled Customers 23

Referral Procedures 25

Skills Gap Analysis 26

Introduction 27

Background 28

Purpose 28

Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Area 28

Western Arkansas Planning and Development District.....29

Central Arkansas Planning and Development District.....29

Case Study Process 30

Results.....32

Skills Gap Identification.....32

Services to Address Skills Gaps.....33

Assessing the Effectiveness of Services.....35

Compliance Review.....36

Affiliate Center Specific Reviews……37

Comprehensive Center Specific Reviews……..39

Business and Customer Service Surveys……..43

Findings……164

Levels of Co-Enrollment in partner programs……165

Partner Programs and Agencies……165

Referral Procedures……..165

Training Services……166

Skills Gap Identification and Amelioration……167

Assessing the Effectiveness of Skills Gaps Interventions……167

Compliance Review……..170

Business Survey……171

Customer Survey……172

Recommendations:

Co-Enrollment……173

Partner Programs and Organizations……173

Business Survey……..174

Customer Survey……175

Compliance Review……176

Other Recommendations……176

Summary and Conclusions……177

Appendices……183

WIOA Systems Evaluation, Skills Gap Analysis, And Customer Service Assessment

Executive Summary:

In 2020, the leadership of the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services (ADWS), engaged two University of Arkansas departments, the Counselor Education Program and the Center for Business and Economic Research at the Walton College of Business to complete a comprehensive WIOA Systems Evaluation, Skills Gap Analysis, and a series of Customer Service Surveys.

Identification of Partner programs:

The evaluators interviewed leadership of WIOA workforce centers to identify partner programs and non-profits that collaborate with the Workforce Centers. For these partners, the evaluators documented and reported on the existence of the following:

- Memoranda of understanding between the workforce centers and partners;
- Written referral procedures;
- Documentation of training for partners regarding the services provided;
- Alternative print materials to assist in collaboration, or…
- An alternative method to refer customers between the partners effectively.

Services Provided to Targeted Populations:

The evaluators researched and identified entities in the assigned local areas that provide services to these specific targeted populations:

- Displaced Homemaker
- Low Income Individuals
- Limited English Proficiency
- Migrant Worker
- Disabled
- Veteran
- Older Worker
- Out of School Youth
- Foster Youth
- Basic Skill Deficient
- Ex-Offender
- Single Parent
- TANF Recipient
- SNAP Recipient
- SSDI Recipient
- UI Claimant
- Long-Term Unemployed

Co-Enrolled Participants:

For all programs identified as (WIOA), Wagner-Peyser Act Employment Service programs, and Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) programs, the evaluators were asked to identify, from a sampled participant list, whether customers were referred or co-enrolled in other programs.

Identifying and Closing Skills Gaps:

For the three assigned workforce areas, the evaluators were charged with developing case studies on effectiveness of identifying and closing Skills-Gaps. To develop these case studies, the evaluators interviewed workforce center staff for examples of skills-gap identification on either the occupation level, the demand level, or the skill-level. Employer interviews were completed to gauge interaction between employers and workforce center staff and to determine the services that were provided to address the skills-gap.

Compliance with Certification Policy:

As part of the study, the evaluators were tasked with reviewing a sample of six Arkansas Workforce Centers against the State's certification policy and applicable laws and regulations. The six centers, (four comprehensive and two affiliate centers) were located in different Local Workforce Development Areas.

Business Partner Survey:

The ADWS WIOA Business Survey, conducted by the Center for Business and Economic Research at the Walton College of Business explored how Arkansas businesses feel about their

experiences with the WIOA program. This survey included 845 individual businesses, and produced an overall response rate of 9.9%. Overall, 5 individual local workforce development areas had a response rate greater than 10% and 8 local workforce development areas had a response rate greater than 8%.

Customer Survey:

The ADWS WIOA Customer Survey, also conducted by the Center for Business and Economic Research at the Walton College of Business, explored how Arkansas job seekers feel about their experiences with the WIOA program. The Customer Survey contacted 60,668 individuals with valid emails as of October 9, 2020. The survey produced an overall response rate of 11.8%. All individual local workforce development areas had response rates of at least 10%.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations:

The findings and recommendations for this study are summarized below. The full text of the findings and recommendations are included on page 159 of this report.

Findings:

1. **Levels of Co-Enrollment in partner programs**: Results of customer reviews in the three selected workforce areas confirmed a range of 2.5% co-enrollment to a high of 16.6% for these individual partner providers, with an overall average rate for all reporting providers of 7.34%. This is not an optimum rate of co-enrollment. The evaluators find that the rates of co-enrollment in partner programs during the most recent reporting period is not acceptable.
2. **Partner Programs and Agencies:** The number of partners listed by the three selected

workforce areas were thirty-six in the Central Arkansas Planning and Development District, fifteen in the Northeast Arkansas Workforce DevelopmentCenter, and ten in the Western Arkansas Planning and Development District. The discrepancy in these numbers is significant, and it is the opinion of the evaluators that other potential partner programs are available in at least two of the three workforce areas.

3. **Referral Procedures**: Referral procedures are in place for the three assigned workforce areas. All three managers reported that referrals are also received via email and telephone as an alternative when necessary. Referral procedures and customer support are well laid out and well documented at all three selected workforce areas. The evaluators find that the three selected workforce areas are in substantial compliance with this requirement.
4. **Training Services:** The three selected areas provide training concerning available services as necessary. The evaluators find that the training opportunities are, in many cases, insufficient to meet the needs of the workforce customer base, and that, while the requirement to provide training is met at a minimal level in thethree selected workforce areas, more should be done to ensure understanding by all ADWS customers.
5. **Skills Gap Identification and Amelioration:** Strategies for identifying skills gaps clearly demonstrated significant differences among the centers. The evaluators find that, while two of the three selected centers are heavily engaged in identifying and addressing skills gaps in their regions, more work is clearly needed. The tools for identifying skills gaps are available in equal measure to all 28 workforce centers in Arkansas; however the quality of skills gap analysis is not equivalent across all centers.

6. **Assessing the Effectiveness of Skills Gaps Interventions:** All three of the selected workforce centers reported using "repeat/continued business with employers" as one measure of the effectiveness of services provided. Other measures are employed by each of the three workforce centers. It is the finding of the evaluators that standard protocols for measuring the effectiveness of ameliorating skills gaps should be developed and shared with all workforce areas.

7. **Compliance Review**: The evaluators reviewed a sample of six Arkansas Workforce Centers approved by Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board, against the State's certification policy and applicable laws and regulations. All six centers reviewed meet or exceed minimum requirements established by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for physical accessibility. Additional information is provided in the expanded findings section of this report, but no findings are reported.

8. **Business Survey:** The survey of business partners was conducted for this evaluation by the Center for Business and Economic Research at the University of Arkansas' Walton College of Business. Overall, the report finds that WIOA recipients display a moderate degree of satisfaction with the WIOA program and the ADWS. Some areas of concern were reported, however, and these findings are reported in the expanded findings section of the report.

9. **Customer Survey:** This survey showed a 62% overall satisfaction rate with WIOA programs and a 68% satisfaction rate with Workforce Center staff. The survey found that, "many" respondents reported "poor customer service", "a rude attitude",

“inattentive staff”, or “uninformed staff”. In spite of the high overall satisfaction rating with the program, the fact that “many” respondents cited these issues, the evaluators find that a critical need exists for additional training in customer service for all local workforce center staff. In addition, the evaluators find that the current phone system does not appear suited to surge demand of ADWS or WIOA services.

Recommendations:

These full text of these recommendations are included in the Findings and Recommendations section of this report on page 168 of this report.

1. **Co-Enrollment**: The evaluators recommend that Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board and area managers develop data collection methods to effectively track and monitor rates of co-enrollment. Only by having accurate and up- to-date information concerning co-enrollment can ADWS begin to encourage andpromote additional co-enrollment with WIOA partners.
2. **Partner Programs and Organizations:** WIOA places a strong emphasis on planning across multiple partner programs to ensure alignment in service delivery. Many organizations reported that while they are willing, they do not have data available to adequately partner with Workforce Centers. These organizations are willing and even eager to partner with ADWS centers, but don't have processes in place to collect data and provide support and assistance. It is recommended by the evaluators that Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board work with all workforce areas to identify and engage additional community partners, and to provide training and assistance to those partners in data collection techniques.
3. **Business Survey:** It is recommended by the evaluators that ADWS address each of the concerns expressed in the survey. These concerns are serious, and even though the overall results showed a "…moderate degree of satisfaction with WIOA programs…" the

concerns must be addressed. These concerns include: Less than half of WIOA recipients (42%) reported receiving the majority of services needed to address workforce needs; Many respondents described Workforce Center staff as "unresponsive" or "inattentive;" Many comments brought up the difficulty of posting job openings through the ADWS or the employers' website; Several comments noted a lack of interaction between workforce center staff and businesses. The evaluators recommend that additional training programs be established to improve staff/customer relationships.

4. **Customer Survey:** This survey showed a 62% overall satisfaction rate with WIOA programs and a 68% satisfaction rate with Workforce Center staff. Comments referring to "rude behavior" and "poor customer service" by staff, however, leads the evaluators to strongly recommend additional training in customer service for all local workforce center staff.

   In addition, the survey found that, "The current phone system does not appear suited to surge demand of ADWS or WIOA services." Because it is possible that the increased demand on the phone system due to the COVID pandemic is at least partially responsible for the problems reported by customers, the evaluators highly recommend that the phone system be evaluated immediately. If these problems continue post-COVID, the evaluators recommend that the system be upgraded as soon as it is feasible. This upgrade, installed across all workforce centers in the state will no doubt be expensive, but quality services are dependent upon an effective and reliable communication system.

5. **Compliance Review:** The evaluators make no recommendations for change in this area.

As previously stated, it is the opinion of the evaluators that the six centers reviewed for this study are in substantial compliance with all ADWS regulations, and that the managers take their regulatory responsibilities seriously.

6. **Other Recommendations**: It is highly recommended that ADWS establish methods for high performing centers and workforce areas to provide training for other centers.

History of Workforce Services in Arkansas:

The Arkansas Division of Workforce Services (ADWS) is the state agency responsible for providing job-related services to state residents, such as coordinating training andeducational opportunities, processing unemployment insurance claims, and connecting job seekers with employment opportunities in the state. ADWS was originally called the Arkansas Employment Security Division of the Arkansas Department of Labor (ADL) which was created by Act 391 of 1941. The division was established as part of New Deal legislation such as the Social Security Act of 1935 and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act of 1939. These laws created a national system of unemployment benefits and encouraged states to pass similar legislation.In response, Arkansas passed Act 391 in 1941, establishing AESD. The act noted that "economicinsecurity due to unemployment is a serious menace to the health, morals, and welfare of thepeople of this State." This legislation created a network of public employment offices to operate "in affiliation with a national system of employment services" as well as a fund for thedisbursement of benefits to be paid out during periods of unemployment. A board of review was created to hear claims and appeals for unemployment benefits. (Encyclopedia of Arkansas)

Since the 1940's additional legislation modified the definitions of unemployment and who

could receive benefits, as well as dealing with issues such as women in the workplace and work done on commission. Specific programs, especially those aimed at providing job training to youth, were developed. In 1973, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) was the first of several youth focused efforts to be established. This was followed in 1984 by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) which was subsequently repealed by the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). There were no major changes to Arkansas' workforce system, however, until Act 100 of 1991 changed it, raising it to a department-level agency, the Arkansas Employment Security Department (AESD). Act 551 of 2007 changed the name of the agency to the Arkansas Department of Workforce Services. In 2019, Act 910 changed the name of the agency to the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services and moved Adult Education programs, Arkansas Rehabilitation Services, and the Division of Services for the Blind under the DWS umbrella. The 2019 act placed ADWS under the auspices of the Department of Commerce.

Rationale for Systems Evaluation:

Under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), the Governor of each State must submit a state plan to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor that outlines a four-year strategy for the State's workforce development system. WIOA offers states two options for submitting this State Plan—they may submit a Unified State Plan or a Combined State Plan. A Unified State Plan includes the Adult Program, Dislocated Worker Program, Youth Program, Wagner-Peyser Act Program, Adult Education and Family Literacy Act Program, and Vocational Rehabilitation Program. A Combined State Plan includes the Adult, Dislocated Worker, Youth, Wagner-Peyser Act, Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and Vocational Rehabilitation

programs, as well as one or more optional Combined State Plan partner programs. In Arkansas, the most recent WIOA state plan, completed in July 2019, was a Combined State Plan, and included, in addition to the required components, the following Combined State Plan partner programs:

- Trade Adjustment Assistance Program for Workers

The Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) Program is a federal entitlement program that assists U.S. workers who have lost or may lose their jobs as a result of foreign trade. This program seeks to provide adversely affected workers with opportunities to obtain the skills, credentials, resources, and support necessary to become reemployed.

- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program provides grant funds to states and territories to provide families with financial assistance and related support services. State-administered programs may include childcare assistance, job preparation, and work assistance.

- Employment and Training Programs under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is part of the Nutrition Title of the Farm Bill. Under SNAP, Employment and Training (E&T) Programs were created to help food stamp recipients gain skills, training, or experience and increase their ability to obtain regular employment.

- Jobs for Veterans State Grants Program

The Jobs for Veterans State Grants (JVSG) program provides federal funding, through a

formula grant, to 54 State Workforce Agencies (SWAs) to hire dedicated staff to provide individualized career and training-related services to veterans and eligible persons with significant barriers to employment and to assist employers to fill their workforce needs with job-seeking veterans.

- Unemployment Insurance Program

The Federal-State Unemployment Insurance Program provides unemployment benefits to eligible workers who are unemployed through no fault of their own (as determined under State law), and meet other eligibility requirements of State law.

The State Plan, whether Combined or Unified, must include a Strategic Planning section that analyzes the State's current economic environment and identifies the State's overall vision for its workforce development system. The strategic planning requirements in the State Plan allow the State to develop data-driven goals for preparing an educated and skilled workforce and to identify strategies for aligning workforce development programs to support economic growth.

In addition to submitting a State Plan under WIOA, states have a responsibility, as outlined in Title 20, § 682.200(d), to use funds reserved by the Governor for statewide activities to conduct evaluations of activities under the WIOA title I core programs. These evaluations are required in order to, "…promote continuous improvement, research and test innovative services and strategies, and achieve high levels of performance and outcomes." (Legal Information Institute, Cornell Law). The State, in cooperation with local boards and State partner agencies has a responsibility to conduct these evaluations in order to, "…promote,

establish, implement, and utilize methods for continuously improving core program activities in order to achieve high level performance within, and high-level outcomes from, the workforce development system." (WIOA [H.R. 803])

To honor this commitment and in fulfillment of the federal mandate to meet the Arkansas' evaluative responsibilities, the leadership of the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services (ADWS), has engaged two University of Arkansas departments, the Counselor Education Program and the Center for Business and Economic Research at the Walton College of Business. The purposes of the project are to complete a comprehensive WIOA Systems Evaluation, Skills Gap Analysis, and a series of Customer Service Surveys. The evaluators worked in cooperation with ADWS in the design and implementation of all surveys, analysis, assessments, and evaluations in order to implement processes and procedures necessary to ensure that accurate and relevant data were collected and used for evaluation purposes.

The evaluation was completed under the leadership of the project's Principal Investigators, Dr. Brent Williams, Associate Professor, University of Arkansas Counselor Education and Supervision, and Mervin Jebaraj, Director, Center for Business and Economic Research at the University of Arkansas' Walton College of Business. Dr. Keith Vire, Adjunct Professor and Lecturer in the Counselor Education and Special Education programs at the University of Arkansas, served as the Project Director for the study. As Project Director, Dr. Vire provided daily direction and oversight for all aspects of the project in collaboration with the Principal Investigators and supported the Principal Investigators in provision of oversight for all budgetary expenses.

Project Objectives:

To accomplish the purposes of the evaluation, the following project objectives were approved by ADWS and adopted by the evaluators:

Objective 1: Create evaluation tool(s) to complete a local integration study encompassing a sample of Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Title I or Title III customers for three separate Local Workforce Development Areas.

Objective 1–a: Evaluate the level of Co-enrollment and Co-funding of required WIOA partners.

Objective 1–b: Evaluate the leveraging of Local Resources available in the Local Workforce Development Area.

Objective 2: In the Comprehensive Centers for the 3 Local Areas selected for sampling, the Evaluators will report case studies on effectiveness of identifying and closing Skill-Gaps.

Objective 2–a: Evaluators will interview workforce center staff to determine skills-gap identification on either the occupation level, based on demand, or the skill-level based on interaction with an employer.

Objective 2–b: Evaluators will determine through interviews with workforce center staff, the services thatwere provided to address the skills-gap.

Objective 2–c: Evaluators will provide an assessment of the effectiveness of the services provided in closing the skills-gap.

Objective 3: Review a sample of Arkansas Workforce Centers against the State's

certification policy and applicable laws and regulations. The original instructions given to the evaluators by ADWS called for four comprehensive centers and two affiliate centers to be reviewed. The centers that were eventually approved by ADWS and reviewed for this purpose included four affiliate and two comprehensive centers. The centers reviewed by the evaluators were the Comprehensive centers in Hot Springs and Conway, and the affiliate centers located in Arkadelphia, Russellville, Mena, and Searcy. This deviation from the original instructions is believed by the evaluators to be primarily due to the COVID pandemic and resulting increase in workload for all Workforce Center staff and leadership. Some ADWSoffices operated with a skeleton crew for many weeks during this difficult time, while the demands on the offices due to massive increases in unemployment claims increasedexponentially. The evaluators further determined that this change in methodology from theinitial plan has little if any impact on the final results and findings to be generated by the review.

Objective 4: Conduct a statewide customer service survey for business customers of WIOA Title I and Title III receiving services over the most recent 12 months available.

Study Methodology:

The methods used in this study related to objectives 1 through 3 were designed to gather accurate and appropriate data for a comprehensive evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation was to provide information required for planning and implementation of needed interventions and/or corrective actions.

The evaluators used these tactics to gather the data required to meet the ADWS objectives:

a) review of Local Workforce Development Center documents and materials; b) structured surveys and interviews with workforce center staff members; and c) a statewide customer service survey for business customers of WIOA Title I and Title III receiving services over the most recent 12 months. These methods were utilized to ensure effective and accurate data gatheringfrom appropriate agencies, organizations, individuals, and groups. In addition, the questions and study methods utilized were designed to be culturally sensitive and to accommodate responses by a variety of individuals. To effectively identify and assess the workforce needs of Arkansans, evaluators used creative approaches for reaching a variety of individuals and community members who have knowledge and experience with community workforce development.

Study methodology for the in-depth surveys conducted by the Center for Business and Economic Research at the Sam M. Walton College of Business (described in objective 4) is detailed in the Business and Customer Service survey section of this report.

Collaborative Partners

For each assigned local area, evaluators interviewed leadership to identify partner programs and non-profits that worked in collaboration with the Local Workforce Centers. For these partners, the evaluators documented the existence of memoranda of understanding betweenthe ADWS and partners, written referral procedures, documentation of training for partners regarding the services provided or alternative print materials to assist in collaboration or, an alternative method to refer customers between the partners effectively.

The evaluators researched and identified entities in the assigned local areas providing services to the following specific targeted populations:

- Displaced Homemaker
- Low Income
- Limited English Proficiency
- Migrant Worker
- Disabled
- Veteran
- Older Worker
- Out of School Youth
- Foster Youth
- Basic Skill Deficient
- Ex-Offender
- Single Parent
- TANF Recipient
- SNAP Recipient
- SSDI Recipient
- UI Claimant
- Long-Term Unemployed

A listing of these providers for each assigned area, are included in the Statewide Community Resources Portal, a site sponsored and maintained by the Arkansas Department of Education's Data Center. The portal can be accessed at https://adedata.arkansas.gov/scr.

It is critically important that the collected data are well maintained. Unmonitored and ill-maintained data tends to deteriorate very quickly. People move, they change jobs and email addresses, organizations change their mission and shift their focus. Failing to maintain the accuracy of the database will quickly render it much less usable, and workforce center staff

who depend on the information contained in the database will lose confidence in it. They may become frustrated and abandon the process which will lead to a loss in productivity and a greater use of workforce center staff timeand resources to accomplish day-to-day customer referrals and services. A well-maintained database on the other hand will help keep the database of WIOA community partners relevant,timely and valuable.

The evaluators strongly recommend that community partners be given the opportunity to update their organizational contact details of their own accord. This provides the partners with some incentive to ensure that the information included in the database is current and accurate, and it takes some of the manual work off of ADWS and ADE staff. In its simplest form, this might be the inclusion of a link in all outgoing email messages that directs the recipients to an online portal to update their contact details. Other methods might include the sending of a survey that has an incentive at the end of it to include contact details, or sending an email asking recipients to get in touch if any details have changed. Keeping the database up to date is an ongoing process, but if a system is initiated that triggers regular updates, it can become part of the normal business processes.

Co-Enrolled Customers

For all programs identified as Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), Wagner-Peyser Act Employment Service programs, and Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) programs, the evaluators identified whether customers were referred or co-enrolled in other programs. To accomplish this objective, the evaluators made an initial contact with managers of the three assigned workforce areas to obtain a list of partner programs meeting the stated criteria. The evaluators contacted partner programs from the list provided by the managers of

the three assigned workforce areas to determine the rate of co-enrollment in partner programs. Representatives of these partner programs were contacted and asked to provide information concerning their customer list. Individual customers were not contacted, and no personally identifiable information was requested or provided. Partner program representatives from each of the three workforce areas participated in the survey. A total of 12,539 customer files werereviewed by the partners contacted. Results of these customer reviews confirmed a range of 2.5%co-enrollment to a high of 16.6% for these individual partner providers, with an overall averagerate for all reporting providers of 7.34%. It should be noted that one adult education provider reported a 20% rate of co-enrollment. Because this particular provider reported an enrollmentof only ten customers, with two of those being co-enrolled in other programs, the result was considered an outlier and is not reported as the high enrollment for this study. These numbersare included in the totals.

When reporting the results, two provider representatives addressed the rates of co-enrollment. Both of these representatives described the results as “disappointing” and suggested that co-enrollment during the most recent program year was significantly hampered by the COVID Pandemic. These representatives expressed the opinion that co-enrollment in subsequent reporting periods would be significantly higher.

It is important to note that the rates of co-enrollment for these workforce centers are adversely affected by the inclusion of individuals who receive Employment Services in the total numbers. Employment Services are universal and therefore, serve very high numbers of individuals, many of whom do not have recognized barriers to employment. Co-enrollment

strategies are designed for targeted populations with significant barriers to employment which require more intensive interventions.

Referral Procedures

To evaluate the processes employed by the three assigned workforce areas to initiate and receive customer referrals, the evaluators conducted written surveys and telephone interviews with the managers and/or their Workforce Center staff members. Managers were initially contacted via email andwere asked to provide written responses to these questions:

1. Please identify some of the partner programs and non-profits that collaborate with the Workforce Centers in your area.
2. For these partners, are these items in place?
    a. Memoranda of understanding between the ADWS and partners
    b. Written referral procedures, for those partners
    c. Documentation of training for partners regarding the services provided, or,
        i. Print materials to assist in collaboration, or,
        ii. An alternate method to refer claimants between the partners effectively.

Managers in the three areas provided a list of partner agencies and programs. The number of partners listed were thirty-six in the Central Arkansas Planning and Development District, fifteen in the Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Center, and ten in the Western Arkansas Planning and Development District. A listing of these partner providers is included in Appendix I.

All three managers of the local areas assigned for this study reported that memoranda of

understanding are in place for WIOA partners, and all of these managers provided examples of these documents. An example of an existing MOU is included in Appendix II.

Referral procedures are in place for the three assigned workforce areas. Examples of referral forms and procedures are included in Appendix III. All three managers reported that referrals are also received via email and telephone as an alternative when necessary.

The three areas provide training concerning available services as necessary. The most common method reported was through information provided on the workforce development center's website, with follow-up through Workforce Center staff face-to-face contact and the provision of print materials to claimants. An example of a web based information page is included in Appendix IV.

For the assigned areas covered in this report, referral procedures and claimant support are well laid out and well documented. Procedures are in place and are available for review by potential claimants. During the interviews conducted with workforce center staff, one area manager said, "We have good procedures in place, and do our best to maintain a good and effective online presence, but in the end, a solid referral is sometimes dependent upon one staff person maintaining an old-fashioned rolodex."

Skills Gap Analysis

The evaluators, with the assistance of the managers and Workforce Center staff in the three assigned areas, developed case studies on effectiveness of identifying and closing Skills-Gaps. The Evaluators interviewed Workforce Center staff for examples of skills-gap identification using either the occupation, demand,or skill-level based on interaction with an employer and provided reports concerning the services that were provided to address the skills-gap. The

evaluators also assessed and provided reports on the effectiveness of the services in achieving the objective using surveys (See Appendix V) developed for the purpose, and on and interviews. A summary of the reviewand analysis of skills gap identification and amelioration follows:

Introduction:

In Arkansas, Comprehensive Workforce Centers have a clear mission: To provide employment related services that enhance the economic stability of Arkansas. To accomplish this mission, the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services (ADWS) has 28 Arkansas Workforce Centers located strategically throughout the state. At these workforce centers, ADWS employees strive tohelp employers and job seekers find the best resources and services to meet their needs. Theywork to provide universal access to an integrated array of services so that workers, job seekers,and businesses can access the services they need in one stop, and frequently under one roof. Although ADWS provides these services to employers and job seekers at all 28 local workforce centers, the fullmenu of services may vary from center to center, as each site can tailor the additional servicesit offers to meet the specific needs of employers and job seekers in their community.

Background:

A major component of each local workforce center involves identifying and closing skills gaps at the local level. A “skills gap” is defined as the difference between skills that employers want or need, and skills their workforce offer. Conducting this skills gap analysis helps identify the skills needed to meet business and industry goals. To accomplish the skills gap analysis, workforce center staffutilize the Labor Market Information (LMI) program administered by the U.S. Department of Labor through the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Workforce center staff

also have access to the web application called TORQ. This application provides occupational assessments to individuals to help determine skills gaps and match them with job openings. The TORQ algorithm gives job candidates insights into the career paths that their experience, education, and talents can makepossible. It is also designed to give employers an expanded talent pool to help them find a goodmatch.

These tools are available in equal measure to all 28 local workforce centers in Arkansas; however thequality of skills gap analysis is not equivalent across all workforce centers. The ability of centers to conduct a viable and quality analysis of skills gaps in their local areas is largely dependent upon the training and ability of the Workforce Center staff in those centers.

Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to provide an in-depth examination of the processes that are used to identify, analyze, and close skills gaps in economic regions served by three selected local workforce centers. The findings of the study will be used to develop recommendations of "best practices" for identifying and closing skills gaps. These recommendations may be used to develop training courses or modules which can be provided to other local workforce centers. In doing so, ADWS hopes to increase the quality of skills gap identification and analysis across the state. The three ADWS centers selected for the case study are described below:

Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Area:

The Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Area (NEAWDA) is made up of seven Northeast Arkansas counties: Clay, Craighead, Greene, Lawrence, Mississippi, Poinsett, and

Randolph. Offices are located in Jonesboro, Blytheville, and Paragould. The largest employers in Northeast Arkansas are the local school districts, higher education institutions such as Arkansas State University and Black River Technical College, and large retail stores including Wal-Mart. There are a number of healthcare and nursing home providers that employ more than 100 individuals. Manufacturing sites include Peco Foods, Pinnacle Frames, Bosch Tools, Pocahontas Aluminum, and Custom-Pak, Inc.

Western Arkansas Planning and Development District:

The Western Arkansas Planning and Development District, led by Program Manager, Dennis Williamson, serves the six counties of Crawford, Franklin, Logan, Polk, Scott and Sebastian from their office in Fort Smith. Education, food processing, health care and manufacturing are major industry sectors in the Western Arkansas development area. In addition to Sparks Health System, Mercy Hospital, Fort Smith Public Schools, and the University of Arkansas-Fort Smith, a number of manufacturing and logistics jobs are available in the region. These employers include OK Foods, Baldor Electric Company, and ArcBest Corporation.

Central Arkansas Planning and Development District:

The Central Arkansas Planning and Development District, from its office in Lonoke, serves these counties in Central Arkansas: Faulkner, Lonoke, Monroe, Prairie, Pulaski and Saline Counties. Combined federal, state and local governments make up the largest employer pool in Central Arkansas with over 71,000 employees. An additional 29,600 individuals are employedin various medical centers and hospitals, and 10,500 are employed in education (public school

systems and higher education institutions). Major manufacturing sites include Caterpillar, Remington Arms, Virco Manufacturing, Welspun, and LM Wind Power. Retail employers include Dillard's and Wal-Mart. In addition, a number of Information Technology, utility services and consultants, and banking companies are located in the region. Central Arkansas isthe most populous and arguably the most prosperous region in Arkansas.

Case Study Process:

As directed in the WIOA Systems Evaluation, Skills Gap Analysis, and Customer Service Assessment, an agreement between the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services (ADWS) and the evaluators from the Counselor Education program at the University of Arkansas, the case study consists of these metrics:

- Identification of three employers with whom the Workforce Board has interacted to explore workforce needs (skills gaps).
- Determination of appropriate skills gap Identification on at least one of these three levels for each employer:
    - Occupational
    - Demand
    - Skill
- Identification of services that were developed or provided to address the identified skills gap(s) based on the skills gap identification.
- Completion of interviews with employers as well as Workforce Center staff, to evaluate the degree to which skills gaps were correctly identified.

- Completion of interviews with employers to determine the success and/or effectiveness of the services provided to address skills gaps.

The Evaluators initiated the development of this case study with an initial introductory email to the managers at the three selected ADWS Workforce Centers. In this email, managers were asked to provide written answers to answer these questions:

1. How do you, in your local area, identify skills gaps on either or both of the following levels?

   a) The occupation level, based on demand;

   b) The skill-level based, on interaction with an employer.

2. What services did you provide to address the skills-gap?
3. How would you assess the effectiveness of the services provided in closing the skills-gap?

The information received in the responses to these questions was compiled and served as a basis for the subsequent collection and analysis of data. Interviews with ADWS mangers and selected Workforce Center staff were conducted to follow up on information received in the initial emailed information request. Results of these interviews were analyzed by the evaluators.

Additionally, interviews were conducted with selected employers to determine the degree to which the interventions initiated by workforce center staff were successful (See Appendix VI).

Results:

For the three assigned local workforce development areas, some common themes were clearly present in terms of identifying and addressing skills gaps. Reports from the three centers also reveal some unique and regionally specific methods. In addition, some best practices began toemerge as procedures are catalogued and compared.

Skills Gap Identification:

Strategies for identifying skills gaps clearly demonstrated significant differences the centers. One area manager reported that no outreach or investigation was done concerning occupational or skill level gaps, saying, "We are dependent solely on the employer telling us their needs." The manager indicated that Career Advisors are asked to assess claimants using O*NET and to discuss occupational skills with them.

The two remaining centers in the cohort reported significant activities related to identifying gaps in both occupational and skill levels. Both centers reported collecting data from www.discover.arkansas.gov as well as conducting in-person meetings with local industry and business leaders and consulting with the local and regional Chambers of Commerce and Chief Elected Officials. These two centers also reported regularly reviewing labor market information and attending industry specific meetings. At the occupational level, managers reported that WIOA and workforce center staff serve as members of the Workforce Development Committee through the Chamber of Commerce, where information is shared regarding local business needs and demand occupations.

At the skill level, these two centers reported "talking with employers one on one and

reviewing job orders that are repeatedly placed" as well as meeting with employer forums or lead employers in specific industry sectors to identify those positions that are regularly posted. One manager reported that, "DWS works with the employer to determine the skill set needed for posted job positions."

Services to Address Skills Gaps:

Services provided to address these skills gaps, once identified, also varies significantly. The Workforce Center that reported being "solely dependent upon employers to report their needs" to identify skills gaps was unable to identify significant strategies aimed at addressing skills gaps. This center reported that customers were assessed using Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) and ACT Work Ready. Upon completion of these assessments, the DWS Career Advisor, "…counsels customers on options such as basic skills development or training options."

The two remaining workforce centers in the assigned group report significant additional services to address identified gaps. One center manager said, "WIOA utilizes career services, occupational skills training, and supportive services to assist claimants who have an interest in a demand occupation obtain the skill set needed to become employed in a demand occupation and maintain employment."

At this local workforce center, claimants complete the ACT Work Keys curriculum and attempt to earn the Career Readiness Certificate (CRC) inorder to meet their employment goals and to help determine what areas need improvement. The Workforce Center, in collaboration with the employer, determines which level rating on the (CRC) is needed for the job posting. Applicants

who meet this level on the CRC can apply for this job and the employer has crucial information at the beginning of the interview process.If an applicant is not currently meeting a required level on the CRC, they are referred to the local Adult Education facility to improve their skill sets and retest for the CRC.

The manager also reported that services such as On the Job Training (OJT) and Work Experience are offered to claimants to assist in their career search. The manager said, "Work Experience benefits employers and claimants. The service is a planned, structured learning experience that takes place in a workplace for a limited period of time. It also leads to employers hiring customers who do not initially have the required skill set but gain the necessary skills and experience during the process."

Staff at the third Workforce Center reported using, "targeted recruiting to help employers build a pipeline…" to the training provided at the Workforce Center. This center also used online platforms and "…feet on the ground efforts," to create and expand work experience and OJT opportunities, and explore apprenticeship options. Workforce Center staff also worked with partner agenciesto locate additional funding to increase skill level training opportunities.

The area manager at this center also reported working to increase awareness of the Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC), and the Federal Bonding Program (FBP) to encourage training and hiring of "hard to place" individuals.

"We provide businesses with information on market conditions, short and long term industry trends and other Labor Market Information," the area manger reported. "We also provide customized services, such as assisting with job description and work titles, retention

best practices, etc."

Assessing the Effectiveness of Services:

All three of the selected local workforce centers reported using "repeat/continued business withemployers" as one measure of the effectiveness of services provided. One local workforce center reported as additional specific measures, annual WIOA performance ratings, employer feedback, and the success of claimants remaining employed. In addition to these performance measures, the two other members of the cohort reported a number of other measures of their effectiveness. These include: WIOA customers becoming more self-sufficient and no longer depending on public services; employers reporting that they benefit from an increasingly skilled workforce; unemployment Rates for each county as reviewed quarterly; customer surveys of the workforce centers; and effective recruiting and placement of qualified applicants.

Compliance Review

The evaluators reviewed a sample of six Arkansas Workforce Centers approved by ADWS leadership, against the State's certification policy and applicable laws and regulations. According to the State's regulations governing ADWS services, the WIOA One-Stop delivery system includes two different types of physical centers, Comprehensive and Affiliate, from which services and activities are provided. The regulations specify that ADWS, "…at a minimum, shall make each of the programs, services, and activities described in paragraph one (1) accessible at not less than one physical center in each local area of the State; and…may also make programs, services, and activities described in paragraph one (1) available…through a network of affiliated sites that can provide one or more of the programs, services, and activities

to individuals…" The Centers reviewed by the evaluators for this study included two comprehensive and four affiliate centers assigned by ADWS from four different Local Workforce Development Areas.

All six centers reviewed meet or exceed minimum requirements established by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for physical accessibility. External entrances into the facilities in which workforce services are housed are at least minimally accessible for individuals who have mobility impairments. Ramps and level entrances into the facilities are present at all locations reviewed. The evaluators were not tasked with making recommendations for accessibility measures beyond the minimum ADA requirements.

One of the system requirements for Workforce Center certification states that "Arkansas Workforce Center and American Job Center Brands [are] Used Appropriately". This is generally interpreted as requiring adequate and appropriate signage to make services available and recognizable for potential claimants. Of the six centers reviewed for compliance by the evaluators,five met the intent of this requirement. For maximum impact, signage should be visible at the street level as well as on the building itself. The local workforce centers in Hot Springs, Searcy, and Russellvillemeet both conditions with signage visible from the street and on the building. In Arkadelphia and Conway, signage is visible on the building, but is not easily seen from the street level. Whilethis meets minimum guidelines, it may not provide optimum guidance for claimants trying to findservices. The final local workforce center, located in Mena, does not have visible signage from the outside of the building. This center is located in a building on the campus of Rich Mountain Community College, which clearly offers benefits to potential claimants. The location, however, is notdesignated as a Workforce Center in any

visible manner.

Affiliate Center Specific Reviews:

The four Affiliate Centers reviewed (in Mena, Searcy, Arkadelphia, and Russellville) meet or exceed the one-stop guidelines listed under "Required Programs/Partners". Note that according to the regulations, Affiliate sites, "…provide one or more of the programs, services, and activities to individuals…" These sites are not required to provide access to all WIOA programs/partners. The Affiliate Centers reviewed for this study exceed this requirement through a combination of on-site as well as off-site or electronic connections. Those potential partners that are listed in the regulations as "Additional Partners/Not Mandated" are not included as on-site services by the Affiliate Centers. Three of the local workforce centers note that some of these services are provided "off-site in another manner."

All Affiliate Centers reviewed by the evaluators provide the vast majority of services listed in the "Basic Career Services" category. They self-report that they are somewhat lacking in the areas of recruitment of employees for local industry, and report that they are not able to provide adequate information to claimants regarding performance information and program cost information on eligible providers of training services in the local area. They also report aweakness in providing information, in formats that are usable by and understandable to one- stop center claimants, regarding how the local area is performing on the local performance accountability measures.

In the area of Individualized Career Services, the four Affiliate Centers vary significantly. This category includes services such as development of individualized employment plan (IEP), group

and individual counseling, and career/vocational planning, among the service options. The centers located in Searcy and Russellville reported that each service in this category was provided on-site, while the Mena and Arkadelphia centers listed only one and three of the twelve services respectively, as being available on-site.

In the business services category, the Searcy and Russellville centers provide both listed business services, “Establish and develop relationships and networks with large and small employers and their intermediaries” and “Develop, convene, or implement industry or sector partnerships.” The centers in Mena and Arkadelphia do not report providing the service listed as, “develop, convene, or implement industry or sector partnerships.”

In the “Other business services (non-mandatory)” category, described as “Customized screening and referral of qualified customers in training services to employers” the Affiliated Centers reviewed provided many of the services listed, although they each reported compliance with different standards. This is a non-mandatory category, so it is not surprising that these centers do not provide the full scope of available services. Examples of service categories provided are customized recruitment events and related services for employers, to include the support and provision of targeted job fairs, and the establishment and development of relationships and networks with large and small employers and their intermediaries. Weaknesses in this category are in the areas of customized assistance in the development of a registered apprenticeship program, and marketing of business services to appropriate area employers. Again, this is a non-mandatory category, so the fact that these Affiliate Centers provide so many of these services should be applauded.

Centers were asked, as part of the review, to meet with workforce center staff and to complete

a self-evaluation of each category of WIOA/ADWS regulations. This is the same self-evaluation that is used as part of the regular re-certification process for Workforce Centers. The criteria are:

Rank on a scale of 1 to 5, where the site believes it is in its path toward meeting, or exceeding, the stated standard.

5 = achieved the standard and excelling

4 = significantly meeting standard with some work yet to do 3 = have some of the elements in place, some of the time

2 = making progress but long way to go

1 = no progress yet

The Affiliate Centers generally rated their level of quality at the top of the scale, awarding their centers either a 5 or a 4 in almost all of the categories rated. Only one of the centers, (Arkadelphia) was more critical in the interpretation of their services. The report from that center indicated that the Workforce Center staff members refer claimants to partners for assessment, and are not able at this point to schedule joint assessments. Workforce center staff also report that they do not haveany on-site partners, so they are not able to deliver any services to claimants that would require partnering with other services and agencies. It is obvious that these center managers and workforce center staff take great pride in their work and that they strive to do their work well.

Comprehensive Center Specific Reviews:

The two Comprehensive Centers reviewed were located in Conway and Hot Springs. Six items are required items for all centers, including the Affiliate Centers. The compliance regulations specify that "…all centers must:

1. Be strategically located to maximize service to employers and employees.

2. Have enough traffic to warrant operations.

3. Provide on-site services (interpreter, documents, etc.) based on demographic need.

4. Have hours of operation that are based on claimant needs and are claimant driven.

5. Ensure that uniform procedures are in place to implement priority of service for veterans, individuals with disabilities, English-as-a-Second Language persons, and any other priority populations identified at the federal, state or local level for job placement.

6. Ensure that priority of service for job training opportunities for veterans, individuals with disabilities, English-as-a-Second Language persons, and any other priority populations identified at the federal level is clearly implemented for all U.S. DOL programs such as employment, training, and placement services."

In addition to these rules which are required of all centers, the regulations specify that, "Additionally, Comprehensive Centers must:

1. Be accessible to the general public during regular business days, as well as physically and programmatically accessible to individuals with disabilities.

2. Contain a portal site for electronic access.

3. Be a provider of basic and individualized career services, and training services.

4. Be a provider of business services.

5. Demonstrate representation of core mandated partners (WIOA Titles I-IV).

6. Provide additional related employment and training resources."

Both Comprehensive Centers wholly and unquestionably meet all twelve of these required items. In the "Required WIOA Program/Partner" area, the regulations list a total of fifteen service

partners with whom Comprehensive Centers must maintain cooperative working relationships. Centers are not required to have all of these partners housed on-site. Each Local workforce center has three partnership options—partners may be housed "on-site", "off-site through electronic connection", or "off-site basic career services made available in another manner". The Local workforce centersreviewed for this study maintained these required partnerships; one Center reported ten of the fifteen service partners were located on-site, and the other reported a total of eight on-sitepartners. Services in which contacts were maintained off-site through electronic connection only included Adult Education and Family Literacy, Title V Older Americans Act, and the Community Services Block Grant program. Services provided "off-site in another manner" included the Second Chance Act (provided in cooperation with the Department of Correction), and the Housing and Urban Development Employment and Training program (provided in cooperation with city officials).

Four additional WIOA services are listed in the ADWS regulations in the category of "Additional Partners, Not Mandated". These are, a) Ticket to Work, b) Small Business Administration, c) SNAP Employment and Training, and d) Orientation to Arkansas Workforce Centers. The Centers both provide three of the four "not mandated" partnerships. One Center provides the SNAP Employment and Training partnership on-site, with the Ticket to Work and Small Business Administration categories being provided off-site "in another manner". The other Center provided Ticket to Work, Small Business Administration, and SNAP Employment and training categories, off-site in another manner. The final category, Orientation to Arkansas Workforce Centers, was not fully provided by either Center. One local workforce center reported that the provision of orientation "depends on customer flow".

In terms of Career Services provided for job seekers, ADWS regulations list two categories of services. In the “Basic Career Services” category, which includes thirteen separate services ranging from “Initial Assessment of Skill Levels” to “Translation Services”, both reviewed Centers reported 100% compliance, with all services provided on-site. In the “Individualized Career Services” category, which includes twelve items such as the development of an Individualized Employment Plan (IEP), and individualized job counseling, both of the reviewed centers provided all services on-site.

ADWS regulations also address services to business provided by Comprehensive Centers. This section of the regulations consists of sixteen measures of services provided to business and industry, and includes items related to convening business sector partnerships and developing recruitment events for specific business and industry. Both of the reviewed Centers provide 100% of these services on-site.

The Comprehensive Centers, like the Affiliate Centers that were reviewed, were asked, as part of the review, to meet with workforce center staff and to complete a self-evaluation of each categoryof WIOA/ADWS regulations. This is the same self-evaluation that is used as part of the regular re-certification process for Workforce Centers. The criteria for the Comprehensive Centers areidentical to those used in the evaluation of Affiliate Centers:

Rank on a scale of 1 to 5, where the site believes it is in its path toward meeting, or exceeding, the stated standard.

5 = achieved the standard and excelling

4 = significantly meeting standard with some work yet to do

3 = have some of the elements in place, some of the time

2 = making progress but long way to go

1 = no progress yet

The Comprehensive Centers reviewed rated their level of quality at the top of the scale, awarding their centers either a 5 or a 4 in every category rated. Based on the evaluators' reviews of these centers, it is clear these center managers and workforce center staff take great pride in their work and that they do, indeed, provide an extremely high level of quality for the job seekers and the businesses they support.

It is the opinion of the evaluators that the six centers reviewed for this study are in substantial compliance with all ADWS regulations, and that the managers take their regulatory responsibilities seriously. The evaluators further believe that the review of these six centers provides a representative picture of ADWS centers across the state, and that ADWS and those who manage the Local Workforce Areas, as well as Arkansas' taxpaying citizens, should be confident in the work of the thirty-two workforce centers located throughout the state.

The evaluators are grateful to the managers and Workforce Center staff of the six reviewed centers for their willingness to participate in the initial surveys and to provide follow up information when requested. Survey results and reviewer notes of the policy and regulation interviews are included in Appendix VII.

Business and Customer Service Surveys

WIOA Customer and Business Service surveys were conducted for this evaluation by the Center for Business and Economic Research at the University of Arkansas' Walton College of Business. The survey summaries are included below. Listings of survey questionsfor each of

these surveys are included in Appendix VIII and Appendix IX.

ANALYSIS OF THE ADWS WIOA BUSINESS SURVEY

Produced for Arkansas Division of Workforce Services

Mervin Jebaraj, Director
David Sorto, Research Associate
Willard J. Walker Hall 546
Sam M. Walton College of Business
1 University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701-1201
(479) 575-4151
June 2021

Executive Summary

The Arkansas Department of Workforce Services (ADWS) provides assistance to businesses in meeting their workforce needs. Two primary funding sources for these services come from the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Title I and Wagner-Peyser Title III programs.

In 2020-21, the University of Arkansas began working with ADWS to review services provided under the WIOA program with the goal of understanding how the program meets the needs of Arkansas' labor market.

The ADWS WIOA Business Survey explores how Arkansas businesses feel about their experiences with the WIOA program. The data collected in this study will be used in several ways: as a review of outcomes associated with the WIOA program in Arkansas; to help inform future planning about the manner in which the program is directed and operated; and as a benchmark for review in future years.

The ADWS WIOA Business Survey conducted a survey of 845 individuals businesses with valid emails as of October 9, 2020. The survey focused on a distribution by local workforce development area for a more balanced sample and produced an overall response rate of 9.9%. Overall, 5 individual local workforce development areas had a response rate greater than 10% and 8 local workforce development areas had a response rate greater than 8%.

The survey captures information and perceptions that can be grouped into five key areas:

- Comprehension of Responsibilities in the WIOA Program;
- Recommendation of the WIOA program;

- Status of Services Received;
- Satisfaction with the WIOA Program;
- Satisfaction with ADWS Staff.

Overall, the report finds that WIOA recipients display a moderate degree of satisfaction with the WIOA program and the ADWS. WIOA recipients reported a 49% satisfaction rate of the WIOA program, and a 55% satisfaction rate of ADWS staff.74% of recipients understood their responsibilities when participating in the WIOA program, although only 42% reported that they received most, or all the services needed to address their workforce needs. Finally, 57% of respondents reported that they would positively recommend the WIOA program based on their experience.

The statistical summaries combined with aggregate comments from respondents highlight areas which can be addressed to improve the experience within the WIOA program and subsequent outcomes. Notable issues raised are:

- Less than half of WIOA recipients (42%) reported receiving the majority of services needed to address workforce needs. The result was reflected in the comment section as numerous respondents mentioned a lack of qualified candidates. ADWS leadership should review how services help the development of soft skills among potential job candidates. Comments highlighted aspects such as ensuring applicants are punctual to interviews and dressed professionally, and coaching to ensure applicants have productive mindsets when they are at work sites and are accountable for themselves.

- Many respondents described ADWS staff as “unresponsive” or “inattentive.” ADWS leadership should consider providing additional training to Workforce Center Staff about program offerings, stress management, and other aspects of customer service.
- Many comments brought up the difficulty of posting job openings through the ADWS or the online options made available to employers. In addition, employer/business accounts would be deactivated every few months which would require a tedious process to reactivate accounts in order to post job openings. ADWS leadership should review the current process of posting job openings and see if business accounts can be made permanent – likely the root problem of the difficulty of posting job openings through the ADWS.
- Lastly, several comments noted a lack of interaction between workforce center staff and businesses. ADWS leadership should ensure that offices have a more proactive relationship with regional employers to have the most accurate information about job openings, employer workforce needs, and feedback relevant to the WIOA program.

In conclusion, the report utilizes high-quality data from a statewide evaluation survey to obtain an empirical assessment of past WIOA recipients’ sentiments and outcomes of participating in the WIOA program. The data and report provide a few benefits to the Arkansas Division Workforce Services. The data can serve as a baseline assessment of the WIOA program in Arkansas. In addition, aggregate comments have provided detailed feedback and suggested areas of improvement. The aim of this report is to provide a critical assessment which can be utilized to improve the structure and operations of the WIOA program in Arkansas. The ultimate goal is to improve outcomes of

WIOA recipients, strength the Arkansas workforce, and to better address workforce needs of businesses in Arkansas.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 45

Table of Contents..... 49

List of Tables & Figure..... 51

Survey Design and Methodology..... 52

Survey Design 52

Survey Instrument..... 52

Consent 52

Self-Identification of WIOA Services Received – Survey Part I 52

WIOA Satisfaction and Feedback – Survey Part II 53

Demographics – Survey Part III 53

Survey Methodology..... 53

Population Sample Frame 54

Data Collection 54

Response Rates..... 55

Survey Respondents 55

Characteristics of Respondent Businesses 57

Survey Responses..... 60

Executive Summary 66

Findings and Recommendations, Customer Survey 68

Age Group 69

Racial/Ethnic Identity 69

Educational Attainment 70

ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 70

Results from Multivariate Risk Models of Key Measures 71

Conclusions 73

Table of Contents 77

List of Tables 79

List of Figures 83

Survey Design 84

Survey Instrument 84

Consent 84

Self-Identification of WIOA Services Received – Survey Part I 85

WIOA Satisfaction and Feedback – Survey Part II 85

Demographics – Survey Part III 85

Incentive Related Questions 85

Survey Methodology 86

Population Sample Frame 86

Data Collection 87

Incentives 87

Response Rates 87

Post-Survey Adjustment and Weighting 88

Pre-adjustment Demographics of Survey Respondents 90

Analysis of Survey Responses 94

Statewide Responses 94

Multivariate Risk Models of Key Measures 113

ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 120

Comments from WIOA Recipients 156

Survey Responses by Question 229

List of Tables & Figure

Table 1: ADWS WIOA Business Customer Survey - Response Rates 55
Table 2: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Service 58
Table 3: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Industry of Operations 58
Table 4: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Total Employees 59
Table 5: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Years of Operation 59
Table 6: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities 60
Table 7: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program 61
Table 8: Status of WIOA Services Rendered 61
Table 9: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program 62
Table 10: Satisfaction with the ADWS Staff 62

Figure 1: Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients 64

Survey Design and Methodology

Survey Design

The study used a survey of all WIOA business recipients forwarded by the ADWS. The list was partitioned to just include the businesses with available emails and then effectively partitioned again as several businesses had email addresses which bounced during mailing.

Survey Instrument

The ADWS WIOA was developed via a collaboration between the University of Arkansas and the ADWS. The survey utilized questions forwarded by the ADWS to assess satisfaction and feedback concerning the WIOA programs, ADWS staff and operations, and the match of workforce needs. In addition, sections were added to discern the specific WIOA programs utilized along with voluntary disclosure of business characteristics.

The survey was designed as a self-administered, interactive, web-based survey which would take less than 10 minutes on average to complete. The survey structure was comprised of five sections:

Consent

- At the beginning of the survey, all respondents were provided with an information page. The page served as an informed consent to participate.
- The consent form included information about where participants could seek assistance if they had any questions or concerns.

Self-Identification of WIOA Services Received – Survey Part I

- The section outlined specific programs under the WIOA and asked respondents to indicate which ones had been utilized by them.

WIOA Satisfaction and Feedback – Survey Part II

- Questions were asked to capture sentiments about the comprehension of responsibilities of participation in the program; if a business would recommend the program; if a business' workforce needs were met; satisfaction with services in the WIOA program; and satisfaction with ADWS staff.

Demographics – Survey Part III

- Questions were asked about the demographics of each participant, including: primary industry of operation, total number of employees, number of years in operation.

Respondents were required to complete the survey sections concerning self-identification of WIOA services received in addition to satisfaction and feedback. If a respondent did not consent to self-identify WIOA services received, or if none of the services were applicable, then the survey would not include these respondents. In addition, the satisfaction and feedback section also had a mandatory component so the survey would not include individuals who declined to complete this section. The conditions allow for the two sections to be full samples across their respective questions, the number of respondents in data tables will be consistent for these questions. For the full questionnaire administered to respondents please see the Methods Appendix.

Survey Methodology

The ADWS WIOA Customer Survey was administered as an online web survey and the survey was formatted so that it could be completed on mobile devices and tablets in addition to desktop or laptop computers.

Population Sample Frame

The eligible population for the survey included all ADWS WIOA recipients who were listed in a file provided on October 9, 2020. The Arkansas Division of Workforce Services provided the sample frame (approximately 1,554 businesses).

Using the sample frame, the sample was filtered to individuals with listed emails (933 businesses). Afterwards, the emails were systematically filtered for dummy email addresses (ex. email@gmail.com) and duplicates to arrive at a mailing list (907 businesses). The list were divided into their corresponding ADWS local workforce development area. Ultimately, the final mailing list was 845 businesses after accounting for bounced emails.

Data Collection

The overall data collection design protocol for recipients was:

- An email sent from the ADWS to each working email address, informing them of the survey and inviting them to participate upon their reception of a second email.
- A second email invitation, by ADWS local area, with the survey link was sent to participate in the web-based survey.
- A series of email reminders to participate in the web-based survey. Two email reminders went to 5 specific ADWS local areas, and four email reminders went to the other 5 specific ADWS local areas.

Response Rates

Response rates were monitored during data collection and were used to help target the individual ADWS local workforce development areas. The final response rates are presented below. Overall, 9.9% of the survey sample completed the survey, as 5 local workforce development areas had a response rate greater than 10% and 8 local workforce development areas had a response rate greater than 8%.

Table 1: ADWS WIOA Business Customer Survey - Response Rates

ADWS WIOA Business Survey – Response Rates		
ADWS Workforce Zone	Total Responses	Response Rate
Central	20	14.1%
City of Little Rock	7	5.7%
Eastern	2	6.7%
North Central	6	16.7%
Northeast	9	13.6%
Northwest	12	8.1%
Southeast	10	8.3%
Southwest	4	10.0%
West Central	7	8.0%
Western	7	13.2%
Total	84	9.9%

Survey Respondents

The first results presented describe the characteristics of the respondents of our survey. The report will provide population estimate of ADWS WIOA participants based on responses to the survey itself. Each section will display percentages of ADWS WIOA participants for each item in the survey and 95% confidence limits (CL). As our estimates for the entire population of ADWS WIOA recipients are based on a sample of the recipients, each statistic we report has some degree of sampling variation and the CL describes the degree of the sampling variation.

The 95% Confidence Limits (CL) presented in the tables can be utilized to determine if two different estimates reflect a statistically significant difference.

If the two CLs from two different subgroups overlap, then the difference between them is not statistically significant at the 95% level ($p<.05$). If the two CLs from two different subgroups do not overlap then the difference between them is statistically significant at the 95% level ($p<.05$). The method describe is an informal and conservative manner to compare differences among subgroups. A more formal test may be needed to identify significant differences among subgroups.[1] Overlapping CLs infer that the estimate of each CL is contained within the other CL's upper and lower bound. Consider the following example, an outcome of "Yes" with categories (subgroups) A, B, and C. A and B have CLs which overlap as their estimates are within each other's CLs (A; 50 is greater than 46 and less than 58; B: 52 is greater than 46 and less than 58) so the difference between A and B is not statistically significant – one cannot infer a difference in outcome between A and B. However, C does not overlap with A or B (65 is greater than 55, A; 65 is greater than 58, B) so the estimate for C is different from the estimates of A and B – one can infer a difference in outcome for C when compared to A and B.

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)			
Category	A	B	C
Yes	50 (45,55)	52 (46, 58)	65 (50, 80)

[1] STAT 100 - Statistical Concepts and Reasoning. *9.3 - Confidence Intervals for the Difference Between Two Population Proportions or Means*. Pennsylvania State University – Eberly College of Science. Accessed April 16, 2021. Web. https://online.stat.psu.edu/stat100/lesson/9/9.3.

Throughout the report, an empty table cell with the notation "*" denotes insufficient data in that specific category, usually 10 or fewer cases. The small number of respondents prevents detailed comparisons as there was insufficient data to calculate necessary statistics.

Characteristics of Respondent Businesses

Overall, approximately 86% of ADWS WIOA respondents reported receiving employment services – job searches or resumes, 30% received local workforce services (focused on training programs such as work experience, on the job training, or incumbent worker programs), 7% received adult education, 4% received rehabilitation services, and more than 2% received services for the blind (Table 2).

The industry distribution of respondents are as follows: 18% reported they were in Construction, 16% were in Health Care and Social Assistance, 10% were in Manufacturing, 10% were in Transportation and Warehousing, 8% were in Other services except Public Administration, 7% were in Accommodation and Food Services, 7% were in Educational Services, 5% were in Utilities, 4% were in Professional, Scientific and Technical Services, 4% were in Retail Trade, 2% were in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting, 2% were in Public Administration, 1% were in Administrative Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services, 1% were in Arts, Entertainment and Recreation, 1% were in Finance and Insurance, 1% were in Information, 1% were in Real Estate and Rental Leasing, 1% were Wholesale Trade, and 1% did not list their industry. In addition, there were no responses from businesses in the Management of Companies and Enterprises, or Mining, Quarrying and Oil and Gas Extraction industries (Table 3).

35% of ADWS WIOA respondents report having 1 to 9 employees, 35% reported having10 to 49 employees, 11% reported having 50 to 99 employees, 10% reported having 100 to 249 employees, 5% reported having 250 to 499 employees, 4% reported having 500+ employees, and 2% did not report their employee totals (Table 4). More than 70% of ADWS WIOA respondents reported being in operations for 11+ years, 18% had been in operations for 0-5 years, 10% had been in operations for 6-10 years, and 2% did not report their years of operation (Table 5).

Table 2: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Service

What program(s) provided a service to your organization? (Click all that apply)	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
Adult Education	7.1 (3.2 ,15.2)
Local Workforce Services Provider	29.8 (20.9 ,40.5)
Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	85.7 (76.3 ,91.8)
Rehabilitative Services	3.6 (1.1 ,10.7)
Services for the Blind	2.4 (0.6 ,9.2)

Table 3: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Industry of Operations

What is the primary industry of operation for your business?	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
Accommodation and Food Services	7.1 (3.2 ,15.2)
Administrative Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	1.2 (0.2 ,8.2)
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting	2.4 (0.6 ,9.2)
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.2 (0.2 ,8.2)
Construction	17.9 (11 ,27.7)
Educational Services	7.1 (3.2 ,15.2)
Finance and Insurance	1.2 (0.2 ,8.2)
Health Care and Social Assistance	15.5 (9.1 ,25)
Information	1.2 (0.2 ,8.2)
Management of Companies and Enterprises	*
Manufacturing	9.5 (4.8 ,18.1)
Mining, Quarrying and Oil and Gas Extraction	*
Other services except Public Administration	8.3 (4 ,16.6)

Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	3.6 (1.1 ,10.7)
Public Administration	2.4 (0.6 ,9.2)
Real Estate and Rental Leasing	1.2 (0.2 ,8.2)
Retail Trade	3.6 (1.1 ,10.7)
Transportation and Warehousing	9.5 (4.8 ,18.1)
Utilities	4.8 (1.8 ,12.2)
Wholesale Trade	1.2 (0.2 ,8.2)
N/A	1.2 (0.2 ,8.2)

Table 4: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Total Employees

What is the total number of employees at your business?	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
1 to 9	34.5 (25 ,45.4)
10 to 49	34.5 (25 ,45.4)
50 to 99	10.7 (5.6 ,19.5)
100 to 249	9.5 (4.8 ,18.1)
250 to 499	4.8 (1.8 ,12.2)
500+	3.6 (1.1 ,10.7)
N/A	2.4 (0.6 ,9.2)

Table 5: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Years of Operation

How many years has your business been in operation?	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
0-5 years	17.9 (11 ,27.7)
6-10 years	9.5 (4.8 ,18.1)
11+ years	70.2 (59.5 ,79.1)
N/A	2.4 (0.6 ,9.2)

Survey Responses

The tables below describe ADWS WIOA recipients' responses to the following survey questions on satisfaction:

Did you clearly understand your responsibilities to participate in the program?

Yes; No; Unsure

Overall, 74% of WIOA recipients reported that they understood their responsibilities to participate in the WIOA program. Approximately 16% of recipients reported that they were unsure of the responsibilities in the WIOA program, and 11% reported that they did not understand their responsibilities.

Table 6: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities

	Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)
No	10.7 (5.6 ,19.5)
Unsure	15.5 (9.1 ,25)
Yes	73.8 (63.2 ,82.2)

Would you recommend this program?

Would not Recommend; Would Possibly Recommend; Would Recommend; Would Strongly Recommend; Would Very Strongly Recommend

57% of WIOA recipients reported that they would recommend, strongly recommend, or very strongly recommend the program they had received. Approximately 30% of recipients reported that they would possibly recommend the WIOA program, and 13% of recipients reported that they would not recommend the WIOA program.

Table 7: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)	
Would not Recommend	13.1 (7.3 ,22.3)
Would Possibly Recommend	29.8 (20.9 ,40.5)
Would Recommend/Strongly/Very Strongly	57.1 (46.2 ,67.4)

Did you receive the services needed for you to address your workforce needs?

I don't know; Received None of the Services Needed; Received Some of the Services Needed; Received Most but Not All Services Needed; Received All Services Needed

42% of WIOA recipients reported that they received most or all of the services needed to address their workforce needs. Approximately 24% of recipients reported that they received some of the services needed to address their workforce needs, and another 24% of recipients reported that they received none of the services needed to address their workforce needs. Lastly, 11% of recipients did not know if they had received needed services.

Table 8: Status of WIOA Services Rendered

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)	
I Don't know	10.7 (5.6 ,19.5)
Received None of the Services Needed	23.8 (15.8 ,34.2)
Received Some of the Services Needed	23.8 (15.8 ,34.2)
Received Most/All Services Needed	41.7 (31.5 ,52.6)

Overall were you satisfied with the services in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Program?

Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied

49% of WIOA recipients reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the services in the

WIOA program. More than 33% of recipients reported that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the WIOA program. Approximately 11% of recipients reported that they were dissatisfied with the WIOA program, and an additional 7% of recipients reported that they were very dissatisfied with the WIOA program.

Table 9: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)	
Very Dissatisfied	7.1 (3.2 ,15.2)
Dissatisfied	10.7 (5.6 ,19.5)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	33.3 (24 ,44.2)
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	48.8 (38.2 ,59.5)

How satisfied were you with the professionalism and accessibility of staff?

Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied

55% of WIOA recipients reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with ADWS staff. 31% of recipients reported that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with ADWS staff. More than 7% of recipients reported that they were dissatisfied with ADWS staff, and an additional 7% of recipients reported that they were very dissatisfied with ADWS staff.

Table 10: Satisfaction with the ADWS Staff

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)	
Very Dissatisfied	7.1 (3.2 ,15.2)
Dissatisfied	7.1 (3.2 ,15.2)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	31 (21.9 ,41.8)
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	54.8 (43.9 ,65.2)

Comments from WIOA Recipients

As part of the evaluation of WIOA services, survey respondents were offered the opportunity to provide feedback comments. In total, 39 comments were provided and 38 of them were unique comments. See Figure 1 for details.

The largest category of comments were “Better Job Matching” at 23% of total comments. The comments raised issues of having no qualified candidates and applicants who showed up to interviews in non-professional attire. The next most common category was “Better Customer Service” at 18% of total comments. These comments raised issues of unresponsive or inattentive staff, better explanations of services, and need for more ADWS staff. In addition, 3% of comments were “Faster Response Time.”

The “Easier Access to Services” category comprised 13% of total comments. The comments raised issues of difficulties to post job openings and access to business accounts – accounts are deactivated every few months. The “Better Communication” category comprised 10% of total comments and expressed the need for more interactions between ADWS staff and businesses.

The “Nothing/No Changes” category accounted for 10% of total comments, and listed no definitive changes to the program. In addition, 3% of comments were “Not Applicable” as they were not relevant to the survey.

The “COVID Issues” category comprised 8% of total comments. The comments referenced the COVID pandemic as the cause of workforce issues. The “Better Services” category was 5% of total comments and mentioned the need for better operation of the program, or funds for longer

training programs.

The “Great Program” category also comprised 5% of total comments and reflected satisfaction in the WIOA program. In addition, “Good Customer Service” category was 3% of total comments and captured sentiments of good service from ADWS staff.

Figure 1: Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients

Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients		
Category	Total	Percent
Better Communication	4	10.3%
Better Customer Service	7	17.9%
Better Job Matching	9	23.1%
Better Services	2	5.1%
COVID Issues	3	7.7%
Easier Access to Services	5	12.8%
Faster Response Time	1	2.6%
Good Customer Service	1	2.6%
Great Program	2	5.1%
Not Applicable	1	2.6%
Nothing/No Changes	4	10.3%
Total	39	

ANALYSIS OF THE ADWS WIOA CUSTOMER SURVEY

Produced for Arkansas Division of Workforce Services

Mervin Jebaraj, Director
David Sorto, Research Associate
Willard J. Walker Hall 546
Sam M. Walton College of Business
1 University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701-1201
(479) 575-4151
June 2021

Executive Summary

The Arkansas Department of Workforce Services (ADWS) provides assistance to residents in acquiring and retaining employment. Two primary funding sources for these services come from the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Title I and Wagner-Peyser Title III programs.

In 2020-21, the University of Arkansas began working with the ADWS to review services provided under the WIOA program with the goal of understanding how the program meets the needs of Arkansas' labor market.

The ADWS WIOA Customer Survey explores how Arkansas job seekers feel about their experiences with the WIOA program. The data collected in this study will be used in several ways: as a review of outcomes associated with the WIOA program in Arkansas; to help inform future planning about the manner in which the program is directed and operated; and as a benchmark for review in future years.

The ADWS WIOA Customer Survey conducted a survey of 60,668 individuals with valid emails as of October 9, 2020. The survey focused on a distribution by local workforce development areas for a more balanced sample and produced an overall response rate of 11.8%. All individual local workforce development areas had response rates of at least 10%.

The survey captures information and perceptions that can be grouped into seven key areas:

- Comprehension of Responsibilities in the WIOA Program;
- Recommendation of the WIOA program;

- Status of Services Received;
- Satisfaction with the WIOA Program;
- Satisfaction in ADWS Staff;
- Attainment of Employment;
- Retention of New Employment (if applicable).

Overall, the report finds that WIOA recipients display a high degree of satisfaction with the WIOA program and the ADWS. WIOA recipients reported a 62% satisfaction rate of the WIOA program, and a 68% satisfaction rate of ADWS staff. Overall, 86% of respondents understood their responsibilities when participating in the WIOA program, although only 52% reported that they received most, or all of the services needed to achieve the goal outlined in their plan. Employment outcomes saw 49% of all respondents, who sought employment, find employment, and 87% of these individuals have a strong belief in being able to retain the new position over the next six months. Finally, 74% of respondents reported that they would positively recommend the WIOA program based on their experience.

A detailed review of available demographics among the survey questions, provides several distinct patterns. A general summary of findings and recommendations, along with additional details can be found on the following pages.

Findings and Recommendations, Customer Survey

Figure 2: Findings and Recommendations

Findings and Recommendations	
Findings	
1	62% satisfaction rate with the WIOA program.
2	68% satisfaction rate with ADWS staff.
3	86% of recipients understood their responsibilities.
4	52% of respondents reported that they received most, or all of the services needed to achieve the goal outlined in their plan.
5	49% of respondents, who sought employment, attained employment.
6	87% of respondents who found employment had a strong belief in being able to retain the new position over the next six months.
7	74% of respondents reported that they would positively recommend the WIOA program based on their experience.
8	Women generally showed more positive outcomes than men, notably in satisfaction with the WIOA program and employment attainment.
9	Younger workers (18-24) had the most positive outcomes.
10	Older workers (65+, 45-64) had the least positive outcomes.
11	African American individuals consistently reported the most positive or second-most positive outcomes.
12	White individuals consistently reported outcomes which corresponded to the middle of the pack.
13	Individuals with higher levels of education (Bachelor's, or a graduate or professional degree) reported the least positive outcomes in several areas.
14	Individuals with high school or GED education consistently reported the most positive outcomes.
15	Individuals with less than high school education reported the least positive outcome to employment attainment.
16	The Eastern and Southwest local workforce development areas generally reported the most positive outcomes.
17	The Central, City of Little Rock, and Northwest local workforce development areas generally reported the least positive outcomes.
Recommendations	
1	Satisfaction with the WIOA program and ADWS staff could be improved by ADWS leadership providing additional and routine training rooted in customer service and program offerings to office and/or customer facing employees.
2	Older recipients, 45-64 and 65+ years of age, reported less favorable outcomes. ADWS leadership should review if the current delivery of services meet the needs of these individuals.
3	The current delivery of services to individuals with high levels of educational attainment may be ill suited. Comments indicated that jobs are not matched to the backgrounds of these groups. ADWS leadership should review how services and job opportunities are provided to these groups.
4	The employment attainment rate suggests improvements can be made. ADWS leadership, specifically at local offices, should consider development or continued development of partnerships between local offices and employers in the area.

5	The rate at which respondents received needed services could be improved with better channels of communication and service. Comments highlighted a desire for more feedback from case managers and local offices. ADWS leadership should consider the current procedure for feedback from case managers and/or manners to improve accountability and feedback to WIOA program recipients.
6	Improvement to online resources for reporting and participating in the WIOA program and/or phone system technology could improve satisfaction and outcomes. Many comments noted the difficulty in aspects of the WIOA program – reporting, communication, etc. ADWS leadership should review if investment in more online offerings/reporting and/or phone system technology are warranted.

Age Group

Among the age group groups, the 18-24 age group reported the most positive outcomes while the 65+ age group displayed the least positive outcomes.

The 18-24 age group reported a greater comprehension of WIOA program responsibilities, higher rate of receiving needed services, greater satisfaction with the WIOA program and ADWS staff, along with higher employment attainment rate and stronger confidence in retaining their new employment.

The 65+ age group reported the least comprehension of WIOA program responsibilities, lowest rate of receiving needed services, the least satisfaction with the WIOA program and ADWS staff along with their lowest employment attainment rate and least confidence in retaining their new employment.

The 45-64 age group also reported significantly lower rates of receiving needed services, along with lower rates of employment attainment and weaker confidence in retaining employment when compared to the 25-44 age group.

Racial/Ethnic Identity

Survey responses related to racial/ethnic identity were a bit mixed. A few patterns emerged for the two largest racial identities in the survey – African American and white.

African American individuals consistently reported the most positive or second-most positive outcomes for comprehension of WIOA program responsibilities, recommendation of the program, rate at which needed services were received, satisfaction with the WIOA program and ADWS staff, along with employment attainment and confidence in employment retention.

White individuals consistently reported their outcomes to be in the middle of the pack. This was observed across all categories of the survey - comprehension of WIOA program responsibilities, recommendation of the program, satisfaction with the WIOA program and ADWS staff, along with employment attainment and confidence in retention. White individuals did report a higher rate of receiving needed services.

Educational Attainment

Individuals with a Bachelor's, or a graduate or professional degree consistently reported the least positive outcomes across the survey in categories such as recommendation of the program, rate at which needed services were received, satisfaction with the WIOA program and ADWS staff.

Individuals with high school diploma or GED or some college education consistently reported the most positive outcomes for comprehension of WIOA program responsibilities, recommendation of the program, rate at which needed services were received, satisfaction with the WIOA program and ADWS staff, along with employment attainment and confidence in employment retention.

Lastly, individuals with less than high school education reported the least positive outcome with regard to employment attainment but were consistently around the middle for all other categories.

ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

The Eastern and Southwest local workforce development areas generally reported the most positive outcomes across all survey questions compared to other local workforce development areas. On the other hand, the Central, City of Little Rock, and Northwest local workforce development areas generally reported the least positive outcomes across all survey questions over all the local workforce development areas.

Results from Multivariate Risk Models of Key Measures

Based on the results for the survey, with respect to age group, racial/ethnic identity, and educational attainment, statistically modeling was utilized to estimate the independent effects of each demographic category on the odds of having a specific experience/outcome. The multivariate model allows us to control for different demographic categories, many which overlap, and determine each categories' independent impact on the "risk" factor for the specific experiences of interest.[2]

The following key measures were examined while collectively accounting for gender, age, racial/ethnic, and educational attainment characteristics:

Satisfaction with the WIOA program

- Women were 14% more likely to be satisfied in the WIOA program than men.
- Individuals in the 18-24 age group were 43% more likely to be satisfied in the program than individuals between 25-64 years old.

[2] Pardoe, I., L. Simon & D. Young. *15.1 Logistic Regression*. Pennsylvania State University – Eberly College of Science. Accessed April 22, 2021. Web. https://online.stat.psu.edu/stat501/lesson/15/15.1.

- African American individuals were 50% more likely to report being satisfied in the WIOA program than white individuals.
- Individuals with some college education or an Associate's degree, a Bachelor's degree, or a graduate or professional degree were 15%, 32%, and 44% less likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied in the WIOA program than individuals with a high school diploma or GED, respectively.

Satisfaction in ADWS staff

- Individuals in the 18 -24 age group were 22% more likely to be satisfied in ADWS staff than individuals between 25-64 years old.
- Individuals who identified as Asian or African American were 115% and 53% more likely, respectively, to be satisfied in the ADWS staff than white individuals.
- Individuals who identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Other, or Two or more Races (Other) were 31% less likely to be satisfied in the ADWS staff than white individuals.
- Individuals with some college education or an Associate's degree, a Bachelor's degree or a graduate or professional degree were 12%, and 22% less likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied in ADWS staff than individuals with a high school diploma or GED, respectively.

Attaining Employment

- Women were 22% more likely to report finding employment than men.
- Individuals in the 18-24 age group were 87% more likely to find employment than individuals between 25-64 years old.
- Individuals in the 65+ age group were 48% less likely to find employment than individuals between 25-64 years old.
- Individuals who identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Native American) were 49% less likely to find employment than white individuals.
- Individuals with less than high school education were 35% less likely to report finding employment than individuals with a high school diploma or GED.
- Individuals with a Bachelor's degree or a higher degree were 20% less likely to report finding employment than individuals with a high school diploma or GED.

Conclusions

Reviewing the detailed demographics of the survey results highlights some areas of concern. The level of satisfaction with the WIOA program and ADWS staff had a position relationship with the strength of belief in retention of employment. Individuals will stronger belief in employment retention reported a higher satisfaction rate with both the WIOA program and ADWS staff. The employment attainment rate, 49%, suggest adjustments are warranted to improve outcomes among recipients. Older recipients, 45-64 and 65+ years old, displayed less positive outcomes in sentiments about the WIOA program, experiences during the WIOA program, and employment

outcomes. The observation is likely associated with larger societal issues or barriers which face these groups. Adjustments to the program to address these subgroups unique needs is warranted. In addition, the programs appear to be less satisfactory for individuals with higher levels of education – a Bachelor's or graduate/professional degree. The individuals with these characteristics generally reported less positive outcomes in sentiments about the WIOA program and experiences during the WIOA program. The program may require some modifying to meet the labor market preparations required for these individuals.

The statistical summaries combined with aggregate comments from respondents highlight areas which can be addressed to improve the experience within the WIOA program and subsequent outcomes. Notable issues raised are:

- Many respondents reported either "poor customer service", "a rude attitude", "inattentive staff", or "uninformed staff" when describing ADWS staff. ADWS leadership should consider providing additional training about program offerings, stress management, and other aspects of customer service as these would be a beneficial investment.
- Older recipients, 45-64, and specifically, 65+ years of age generally displayed less favorable outcomes and sentiments throughout the survey. ADWS leadership may consider having case managers receive additional training to provide better service to these recipients and their unique problems or barriers. The comments brought up issues with accessibility, both physical and technological, which likely impacts these groups.

- Individuals with higher levels of educational attainment – a Bachelor's, or a graduate or professional degree – consistently reported - less favorable outcomes and sentiments throughout the survey. Several comments mentioned a mismatch between jobs posting or recommendations and the background of recipients. A better job search process may be required for individuals with higher levels of education.
- Many comments suggested more partnerships between local offices and employers in the area. Continued developments of this nature could help produce better job searches and job matches for recipients.
- Additional online resources for reporting and participating in the WIOA program would also be beneficial. Numerous comments mentioned the hassle of going to local offices for aspects which could be done online (aspects of reporting). Further develop of online options could improve accessibility and reduce wait times at local offices. The user-friendly aspect of online options is also an important current and future consideration.
- Additional feedback from case managers was a common comment among respondents. The sentiment among respondents is that additional case manager feedback would help to improve outcomes by accountability and progress of the recipient.
- The current phone system does not appear suited to surge demand of ADWS or WIOA services. Improvements in the phone system technology, more staff, or moving more aspects online may help to resolve part of this issue.

In conclusion, the present report utilizes high-quality data from a statewide evaluation survey to obtain an empirical assessment of past WIOA recipients' sentiments and outcomes of

participating in the WIOA program. The data and report provide several benefits to the Arkansas Division Workforce Services. First, the report provides sentiments and outcomes with detailed summaries about gender identity, age group, racial/ethnic identity, educational attainment, ADWS location, and WIOA service. The data can serve as a baseline assessment of the WIOA program in Arkansas. In addition, aggregate comments have provided detailed feedback and suggested areas of improvement (as previous mentioned). The aim of this report is to provide a critical assessment which can be utilized to improve the structure and operations of the WIOA program in Arkansas. The ultimate goals is to improve outcomes of WIOA recipients, strength the Arkansas workforce, and to improve the well-being of residents.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 45

Table of Contents 49

List of Tables & Figure 51

Survey Design and Methodology 52

Survey Design 52

Survey Instrument 52

Consent 52

Self-Identification of WIOA Services Received – Survey Part I 52

WIOA Satisfaction and Feedback – Survey Part II 53

Demographics – Survey Part III 53

Survey Methodology 53

Population Sample Frame 54

Data Collection 54

Response Rates 55

Survey Respondents 55

Characteristics of Respondent Businesses 57

Survey Responses 60

Executive Summary 66

Findings and Recommendations, Customer Survey 68

Age Group 69

Racial/Ethnic Identity 69

Educational Attainment 70

ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 70

Results from Multivariate Risk Models of Key Measures 71

Conclusions 73

Table of Contents 77

List of Tables 79

List of Figures 83

Survey Design 84

Survey Instrument 84

Consent 84

Self-Identification of WIOA Services Received – Survey Part I 85

WIOA Satisfaction and Feedback – Survey Part II 85

Demographics – Survey Part III 85

Incentive Related Questions 85

Survey Methodology 86

Population Sample Frame 86

Data Collection 87

Incentives 87

Response Rates 87

Post-Survey Adjustment and Weighting 88

Pre-adjustment Demographics of Survey Respondents 90

Analysis of Survey Responses 94

Statewide Responses 94

Multivariate Risk Models of Key Measures 113

ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 120

Comments from WIOA Recipients 156

Survey Responses by Question 229

List of Tables

Table 1: ADWS WIOA Customer Survey - Response Rates 88
Table 2: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Service 91
Table 3: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Age Group 92
Table 4: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Gender Identity 92
Table 5: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity 92
Table 6: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Educational Attainment 92
Table 7: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by English Status 93
Table 8: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Marital Status 93

Table 9: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Attainment of Trade or Professional Certifications/Licenses 93
Table 10: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Gender Identity 95
Table 11: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Age Group 95
Table 12: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Racial/Ethnic Identity 95
Table 13: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Educational Attainment 95
Table 14: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 96
Table 15: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by WIOA Service 96
Table 16: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Gender Identity 97
Table 17: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Age Group 97
Table 18: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Racial/Ethnic Identity 98
Table 19: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Educational Attainment 98
Table 20: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 98
Table 21: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by WIOA Service 98
Table 22: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Gender Identity 100
Table 23: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Age Group 100
Table 24: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Racial/Ethnic Identity 100
Table 25: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Educational Attainment 101
Table 26: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 101
Table 27: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by WIOA Service 101
Table 28: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Gender Identity 103
Table 29: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Age Group 103
Table 30: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Racial/Ethnic Identity 103
Table 31: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Educational Attainment 103
Table 32: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 103
Table 33: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by WIOA Service 104
Table 34: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Gender Identity 105
Table 35: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Age Group 105
Table 36: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Gender Identity 105

Table 37: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Educational Attainment 105
Table 38: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 106
Table 39: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by WIOA Service 106
Table 40: Rate of Finding Employment -by Gender Identity 107
Table 41: Rate of Finding Employment -by Age Group 107
Table 42: Rate of Finding Employment -by Racial/Ethnic Identity 108
Table 43: Rate of Finding Employment -by Educational Attainment 108
Table 44: Rate of Finding Employment -by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 108
Table 45: Rate of Finding Employment -by WIOA Service 108
Table 46: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Gender Identity 110
Table 47: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Age Group 110
Table 48: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Racial/Ethnic Identity 110
Table 49: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Educational Attainment 110
Table 50: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 111
Table 51: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by WIOA Service 111
Table 52: WIOA Satisfaction - by Employment Attainment and Retention Confidence 111
Table 53: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Employment Attainment and Retention Confidence 112
Table 54: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 121
Table 55: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 121
Table 56: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 122
Table 57: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities – by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 124
Table 58: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 126
Table 59: Area's Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 126

Table 60: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program – by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 128
Table 61: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 129
Table 62: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 130
Table 63: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 131
Table 64: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 132
Table 65: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 134
Table 66: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 135
Table 67: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 136
Table 68: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 137
Table 69: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 139
Table 70: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 140
Table 71: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas..... 141
Table 72: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 142
Table 73: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 144
Table 74: Rate of Finding Employment -by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 145
Table 75: Rate of Finding Employment -by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas.. 146

Table 76: Rate of Finding Employment -by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 147
Table 77: Rate of Finding Employment -by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 149
Table 78: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 150
Table 79: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 151
Table 80: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 152
Table 81: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment – by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas 154

List of Figures

Figure 1: Findings and Recommendations 68
Figure 2: Multivariate Logistic Regression - Satisfaction with the WIOA Program 115
Figure 3: Multivariate Logistic Regression - Satisfaction in the ADWS Staff 117
Figure 4: Multivariate Logistic Regression - Likelihood of Finding Employment 119
Figure 5: Summary of Comment from WIOA Recipients 159
Figure 6: Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients - Central to Northeast Areas 161
Figure 7: Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients - Northwest to Western Areas 161

Survey Design and Methodology

Survey Design

The study used a survey of all WIOA recipient with available emails forwarded by the ADWS. The list was partitioned to the individual ADWS local workforce development areas and then effectively partitioned again to remove individuals with inactive email addresses during survey distribution.

Survey Instrument

The ADWS WIOA was developed via a collaboration between the University of Arkansas and the ADWS. The survey utilized questions forwarded by the ADWS to assess satisfaction and feedback concerning the WIOA programs, ADWS staff and operations, and employment outcomes. In addition, sections were added to discern the specific WIOA programs utilized along with voluntary disclosure of demographics.

The survey was designed as a self-administered, interactive, web-based survey which would take less than 10 minutes on average to complete. The survey structure was comprised of five sections:

Consent

- At the beginning of the survey, all respondents were provided with information about the survey and informed consent to participate.
- The consent form included information about where participants could seek assistance if they had any questions or concerns.

Self-Identification of WIOA Services Received – Survey Part I

- The section outlined specific programs under the WIOA and asked respondents to indicate which ones had been utilized by them.

WIOA Satisfaction and Feedback – Survey Part II

- Questions were asked to capture respondents' comprehension of responsibilities of participation in the program; if an individual would recommend their program; satisfaction with services in the WIOA program; satisfaction in ADWS staff; employment outcomes; and ability to maintain employment (if applicable).

Demographics – Survey Part III

- Questions were asked about the demographics of each participant, including: county of residence, race/ethnicity, age group, gender identity, educational level, English as a primary language, marital status, and obtainment of trade or professional certifications/licenses. These questions variables will be in the primary analysis.

Incentive Related Questions

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked if they wished to provide contact information to be included in a drawing of $25 gift cards. All data relating to incentives, including contact information for mailing purposes were collected in a separate survey instrument to ensure that contact information was not retained in the same database as survey data.

Respondents were required to complete the survey sections concerning self-identification of WIOA services received in addition to satisfaction and feedback. If a respondent did not consent

to self-identify WIOA services received, or if none of the services were not applicable, then the survey would not include these respondents. In addition, the satisfaction and feedback section also had a mandatory component so the survey would not include individuals who declined to complete this section. The conditions allow for the two sections to be full samples across their respective questions, the number of respondents in data tables will be consistent for these questions. For the full questionnaire administered to respondents please see the Methods Appendix.

Survey Methodology

The ADWS WIOA Customer Survey was administered as an online web survey; the survey was formatted so that it could be completed on mobile devices and tablets in addition to desktop or laptop computers.

Population Sample Frame

The eligible population for the survey included all ADWS WIOA recipients who were listed in a file provided on October 9, 2020. The Arkansas Division of Workforce Services provided the sample frame (approximately 94,837 individuals).

Using the sample frame, the sample was filtered to individuals with listed emails (73,743 individuals). Afterwards, the emails were systematically filtered for dummy email addresses (ex. email@gmail.com) and duplicates to arrive at a mailing list (65,628). The list were divided into their corresponding ADWS local workforce development areas. Ultimately, the final mailing list was 60,659 individuals after accounting for bounced emails.

Data Collection

The overall data collection design protocol for recipients was:

- An email sent from the ADWS to each working email address, informing them of the survey and inviting them to participate upon their reception of a second email.
- A second email invitation, by ADWS local area, with the survey link was sent to participate in the web-based survey.
- A series of email reminders to participate in the web-based survey. Two email reminders went to 7 specific ADWS local areas, and three email reminders went to 3 specific ADWS local areas.

Incentives

The first 30 participants who completed the survey and provided contact information received a $25 gift card, mailed in early December 2020. A random drawing for one of 20 gift cards also worth $25 each served as an additional incentive for everyone who completed the survey and provided contact information.

Response Rates

Response rates were monitored during data collection and were used to help target specific efforts. The final response rates is presented below. Overall, 11.8% of the survey sample completed the survey and all 10 ADWS local workforce development areas had responses rates greater than 10%.

Table 11: ADWS WIOA Customer Survey - Response Rates

ADWS WIOA Customer Survey – Response Rates		
ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas	Total Responses	Response Rate
Central	1270	12.1%
City of Little Rock	1328	13.6%
Eastern	166	11.2%
North Central	557	11.1%
Northeast	666	11.0%
Northwest	598	11.9%
Southeast	528	10.9%
Southwest	646	11.2%
West Central	1098	11.7%
Western	328	11.8%
Grand Total	7185	11.8%

Post-Survey Adjustment and Weighting

Statistical weighting was performed to ensure that the data based on this sample correctly represent the entire population of ADWS WIOA recipients. After surveying was finished, it was observed that female recipients responded at a much higher rate than male recipients.

After data collection was complete, using the population counts from the ADWS participant list, the characteristic of the respondents were weighted to match those of the population. The technique, known as post-stratification, helps reduce sampling error. The survey responses were weighted by gender identity to account for the overrepresentation of women.

The adjustment assumes there are not differences in the survey measures between responders and non-responders after controlling for the characteristics used in post-stratification. Under this assumption, the weighting adjustments allow analysts to make inferences regarding the entire populations. These estimates have an associated sampling error. This error is expressed as “95% confidence limits,” which indicate that over repeated sampling, an estimate within this interval

would occur 95 out of 100 times.

Survey Respondents

The first results presented describe the characteristics of the respondents of our survey. The report will provide population estimate of ADWS WIOA participants based on responses to the survey itself. Each section will display percentages of ADWS WIOA participants for each item in the survey and 95% confidence limits (CL). As our estimates for the entire population of ADWS WIOA recipients are based on a sample of the recipients, each statistic we report has some degree of sampling variation and the CL describes the degree of the sampling variation.

The 95% Confidence Limits (CL) presented in the tables can be utilized to determine if two different estimates reflect a statistically significant difference.

If the two CLs from two different subgroups overlap, then the difference between them is not statistically significant at the 95% level ($p<.05$). If the two CLs from two different subgroups do not overlap then the difference between them is statistically significant at the 95% level ($p<.05$). The method describe is an informal and conservative manner to compare differences among subgroups. A more formal test may be needed to identify significant differences among subgroups.[3]

Overlapping CLs infer that the estimate of each CL is contained within the other CL's upper and lower bound. Consider the following example, an outcome of "Yes" with categories (subgroups)

[3] STAT 100 - Statistical Concepts and Reasoning. *9.3 - Confidence Intervals for the Difference Between Two Population Proportions or Means*. Pennsylvania State University – Eberly College of Science. Accessed April 16, 2021. Web. https://online.stat.psu.edu/stat100/lesson/9/9.3.

A, B, and C. A and B have CLs which overlap as their estimates are within each other's CLs (A; 50 is greater than 46 and less than 58; B: 52 is greater than 46 and less than 58) so the difference between A and B is not statistically significant – one cannot infer a difference in outcome between A and B. However, C does not overlap with A or B (65 is greater than 55, A; 65 is greater than 58, B) so the estimate for C is different from the estimates of A and B – one can infer a difference in outcome for C when compared to A and B.

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)			
Category	A	B	C
Yes	50 (45,55)	52 (46, 58)	65 (50, 80)

Throughout the report, an empty table cell with the notation "*" denotes insufficient data in that specific category, usually 10 or fewer cases.

Pre-adjustment Demographics of Survey Respondents

Overall, over 77% of WIOA survey respondents reported receiving employment services – job search or resumes, 15% received dislocated worker services, 13% received adult (training/workforce) services, 5% received adult education, 2% received rehabilitation services, 1% received youth services and less than 1% received services for the blind (Table 2). The age distribution of recipients are as follows: 50% reported they were 25-44 years old, 34% were 45-64 years old, 11% were 18-24 years old, about 5% were 65+ year old, and 1% did not disclose their age (Table 3).

Gender identity was skewed towards women, as the percentage of female respondents was roughly 69%, while the percentage of male respondents was almost 30%. Over 1% of respondents did not disclose their gender and less than 1% of respondents reported other (Table 4). 57% of

ADWS WIOA respondents identify as white, 33% as African American or Black, 2% as Hispanic/Latino, 2% as two or more races, 1% as Asian, 1% as American Indian/Alaska Native, 1% as other, less than 1% as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and 3% did not disclose their race/ethnicity (Table 5).

Overall, 34% of ADWS WIOA respondents reported attaining some college education, and 30% had obtained a high school education. Approximately 14% of ADWS WIOA respondents had obtained a Bachelor's degree, 13% had obtained an Associate's degree, and over 6% had obtained a graduate or professional degree. Approximately 3% of respondents had less than a high school diploma, and less than 1% did not disclose their educational information (Table 6).

Approximately 99% of ADWS WIOA respondents reported English as their primary or first language (Table 7). Roughly 43% of ADWS WIOA respondents reported that they were single, 36% were married or remarried, roughly 14% were divorced, 4% were separated, and 3% were widowed (Table 8). 39% of ADWS WIOA respondents indicated that they had obtained trade/professional certifications or licenses (Table 9).

Table 12: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Service

What type of services did you receive from the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services? (Click all that apply)	
	Percentage (Confidence Limits)
Adult Education	5 (4.5, 5.5)
Adult (Training/Workforce) Services	13.3 (12.5, 14.1)
Dislocated Workers Services	14.8 (14, 15.7)
Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	77.1 (76.1, 78)
Rehabilitative Services	1.7 (1.4, 2.1)
Services for the Blind	0.3 (0.2, 0.4)

Youth Services	1.3 (1, 1.6)

Table 13: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Age Group

What age group do you belong to?	
	Percentage (Confidence Limits)
Age 18 - 24	10.5 (9.8 ,11.3)
Age 25 - 44	49.5 (48.4 ,50.7)
Age 45 - 64	34 (32.9 ,35.1)
Age 65+	5 (4.5 ,5.5)
Refuse to Disclose	1 (0.8 ,1.2)

Table 14: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Gender Identity

What gender do you identify as?	
	Percentage (Confidence Limits)
Female	68.5 (67.4 ,69.6)
Male	29.8 (28.8 ,30.9)
Other	0.3 (0.2 ,0.5)
Refuse to Disclose	1.4 (1.1 ,1.7)

Table 15: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity

What is the race/ethnicity that you identify as?	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
American Indian or Alaska Native (non-Hispanic or Latino)	0.9 (0.7 ,1.1)
Asian (non-Hispanic or Latino)	0.9 (0.7 ,1.2)
Black or African American (non-Hispanic or Latino)	33 (31.9 ,34.1)
Hispanic or Latino	2.4 (2.1 ,2.8)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic or Latino)	0.1 (0.1 ,0.3)
Other	0.9 (0.7 ,1.1)
Refuse to Disclose	2.9 (2.5 ,3.3)
Two or More Races (non-Hispanic or Latino)	1.9 (1.6 ,2.3)
White (non-Hispanic or Latino)	57 (55.8 ,58.1)

Table 16: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Educational Attainment

What is your highest attained level of education?	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
Associates Degree	13.5 (12.7 ,14.3)
Bachelor's Degree	13.3 (12.6 ,14.1)
Graduate or Professional Degree	6.3 (5.7 ,6.8)
High School or GED	29.6 (28.5 ,30.7)

Less than High School	2.7 (2.4 ,3.1)
Some College	34.4 (33.3 ,35.5)
Unknown	0.2 (0.1 ,0.3)

Table 17: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by English Status

Is English your primary/first language?	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
No	1.4 (1.1 ,1.7)
Yes	98.6 (98.3 ,98.9)

Table 18: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Marital Status

What is your marital status?	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
Divorced	14.2 (13.4 ,15)
Married/Remarried	36.1 (35 ,37.2)
Separated	3.8 (3.4 ,4.3)
Single	43.3 (42.2 ,44.5)
Widowed	2.6 (2.2 ,3)

Table 19: Distribution of WIOA Respondents by Attainment of Trade or Professional Certifications/Licenses

Do you hold any trade or professional certifications and/or licenses?	
	Percent (Confidence Limits)
No	61 (59.9 ,62.2)
Yes	39 (37.8 ,40.1)

Analysis of Survey Responses

Statewide Responses

The tables in this section describe ADWS WIOA recipients' responses to each of the listed survey questions:

Did you clearly understand your responsibilities to participate in the program?

Yes; No; Unsure

Over 86% of ADWS WIOA recipients reported that they understood their responsibilities when participating in the WIOA program. Other gender identities reported statistically significant lower rates of understanding their responsibilities in the WIOA program than both men and women (Table 10). The age groups had a few statistically significant differences. The youngest age group, 18-24, had the highest rate of comprehension of responsibilities, followed by both the 25-44 and 45-64 age groups, and then the 65+ age group (Table 11).

The racial/ethnic groups had many statistically significant differences. Individuals who identified as Pacific Islander reported the highest rate of comprehension of responsibilities in the WIOA program. African American individuals followed, then American Indian or Hispanic/Latino individuals, white individuals, and lastly individuals who identified as Asian, other, or two or more races (Table 12).

Individuals with a high school diploma or GED, or some college education reported the highest comprehension levels of responsibilities. Individuals with an Associate's, Bachelor's, or graduate or professional degree followed, and then individuals with less than high school education (Table 13)

The Eastern, Northeast, Northwest, and Western local workforce development areas reported higher levels of comprehension of responsibilities than the Central, City of Little Rock, North Central, and West areas (Table 14).

The summaries by WIOA services are listed in Table 15. No comparison is performed due to the overlapping nature of the services – individuals may have received more than one service.

Table 20: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Gender Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Yes	86.7 (85.7, 87.6)	86.8 (85.3, 88.1)	68.2 (46.6, 84)	70.4 (60.7, 78.6)	86.4 (85.6, 87.3)

Table 21: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Age Group

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Age	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Yes	88.2 (85.6, 90.4)	87 (85.7, 88.1)	86.1 (84.6, 87.5)	83.6 (79, 87.3)	72.7 (61, 81.9)

Table 22: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Racial/Ethnic Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Yes	89.1 (77.1, 95.2)	81 (68.6, 89.3)	89.7 (88.3, 90.9)	88.5 (82.9, 92.5)	93.3 (63.7, 99.1)	82.2 (70.2, 90.1)	68.7 (61.6, 75)	78.8 (70.6, 85.1)	85.9 (84.8, 87)

Table 23: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Educational Attainment

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
Education	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Yes	80.1 (73.7, 85.3)	87.4 (85.8, 88.8)	87.2 (85.8, 88.6)	86.2 (83.7, 88.4)	84.6 (82, 86.9)	85.2 (81.4, 88.4)	76.3 (45.2, 92.6)

Table 24: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)										
ADWS Work area	Central	City of Little Rock	Eastern	North Central	Northeast	Northwest	Southeast	Southwest	West Central	Western
Yes	86.3 (84.2, 88.2)	85.4 (83.2, 87.3)	88.2 (81.8, 92.6)	83.9 (80.3, 87)	88.5 (85.7, 90.8)	88.2 (85.2, 90.7)	86.8 (83.4, 89.6)	86.8 (83.7, 89.4)	85.7 (83.3, 87.9)	88.2 (83.8, 91.5)

Table 25: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by WIOA Service

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
WIOA Service	Adult Education	Adult (Training/ Workforce) Services	Dislocated Workers Services	Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	Rehabilitative Services	Services for the Blind	Youth Services
Yes	84.2 (79.6, 88)	85.6 (82.9, 87.9)	81.5 (78.8, 83.9)	87.7 (86.7, 88.6)	78.8 (69.7, 85.7)	78.5 (53.7, 92)	83.9 (73.9, 90.5)

Would you recommend this program?

Would not Recommend; Would Possibly Recommend; Would Recommend; Would Strongly Recommend; Would Very Strongly Recommend

Over 74% of ADWS WIOA recipients reported that they would recommend, strongly recommend, or very strongly recommend the program they had received. There was a statistical difference among gender identities, as women reported the highest recommendation rates, followed by men, and then other gender identities (Table 16). Several statistically significant differences existed among the age groups. The youngest age group, 18-24, had the highest rate of recommendations, followed by both the 25-44 and 45-64 age groups, and then the 65+ age group (Table 17).

African American individuals reported the highest recommendation rate of the WIOA program, followed by white individuals, individuals who identified as Asian, Hispanic/Latino, two or more

races, or other, and then American Indian or Pacific Islander individuals (Table 18)

The educational attainment groups also had several statistically significant differences. Individuals with high school diploma or GED reported the highest recommendation rates of the WIOA program, followed by individuals with an Associate's degree, some college education, or less than high school education. Individuals with a Bachelor's, or a graduate or professional degree reported the lowest recommendation rates (Table 19).

The Eastern and Southwest areas had the highest recommendation rates, and were followed by the Central, Northeast, Southeast, Western and West Central areas. Next were areas for the City of Little and Central and then the Northwest area (Table 20).

The summaries by WIOA services are listed in Table 21. No comparison is performed due to the overlapping nature of the services – individuals may have received more than one service.

Table 26: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Gender Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Would Recommend/ Strongly Recommend/ Very Strongly Recommend	77.3 (76.1, 78.4)	72.1 (70.1, 73.9)	63.6 (42.3, 80.7)	53.1 (43.2, 62.7)	74.4 (73.3, 75.5)

Table 27: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Age Group

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Age	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Would Recommend/ Strongly Recommend/ Very Strongly Recommend	80 (76.7, 82.9)	75.7 (74.1, 77.2)	72.2 (70.3, 74.1)	72.4 (67.2, 77.1)	45.7 (34.2, 57.6)

Table 28: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Racial/Ethnic Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
WR/ SR/ VSR	64.8 (51.5, 76.1)	72.9 (59.8, 82.9)	79.7 (77.9, 81.4)	70.9 (63.1, 77.7)	64.4 (30.4, 88.3)	69.1 (55.6, 80)	47.5 (40.4, 54.6)	71.6 (63, 78.8)	73.6 (72.1, 75)

Table 29: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Educational Attainment

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
Education	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
WR/ SR/ VSR	72.9 (65.6, 79.2)	77.7 (75.7, 79.6)	74.7 (72.8, 76.5)	75.7 (72.7, 78.5)	69.1 (65.8, 72.1)	67.5 (62.7, 72)	52.6 (25.6, 78.2)

Table 30: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)										
ADWS Work area	Central	City of Little Rock	Eastern	North Central	Northeast	Northwest	Southeast	Southwest	West Central	Western
WR/ SR/ VSR	72.7 (70, 75.3)	72.2 (69.5, 74.8)	82.5 (75.2, 88)	76.2 (72.1, 79.9)	76.1 (72.4, 79.4)	68.7 (64.5, 72.6)	76.2 (72.1, 79.9)	80 (76.4, 83.1)	75.2 (72.3, 77.9)	74 (68.5, 78.8)

Table 31: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by WIOA Service

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
WIOA Service	Adult Education	Adult (Training/ Workforce) Services	Dislocated Workers Services	Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	Rehabilitative Services	Services for the Blind	Youth Services
WR/ SR/ VSR	81.8 (77.1, 85.8)	75.5 (72.4, 78.4)	71.5 (68.5, 74.3)	74.4 (73.1, 75.6)	81.1 (72.5, 87.4)	67.2 (43.1, 84.7)	81.6 (70.3, 89.2)

Did you receive the services needed to achieve your goal as outlined in the plan you developed with your case manager?

I don't know; Received None of the Services Needed; Received Some of the Services Needed; Received Most but Not All Services Needed; Received All Services Needed

52% of WIOA recipients reported that they received most or all of the services needed to achieve outlined goals. There were no statistically significant differences between men and women, but statistically significant differences existed for other gender identities. Other gender identities reported they were less likely to have received needed services than both men and women (Table 22). The 18-24 age group reported they were more likely to have received needed services than all other defined age groups (25-44, 45-64, 65+) (Table 23).

Many statistically significant differences existed among the racial/ethnic groups. Pacific Islander individuals reported the highest rates of receiving needed services, followed by individuals who identified as African, white, American Indian or Hispanic/Latino, Asian or two or more races, and finally individuals who identified as other (Table 24).

Individuals with a high school diploma or GED or some college education reported the highest rates of receiving needed services, followed by individuals with an Associate's degree, a Bachelor's degree, or less than high school education. Individuals with a graduate or professional degree reported the lowest rates of receiving needed services (Table 25).

The ADWS local workforce development areas had numerous statistically significant differences. The Eastern area's recipients reported the highest rates of receiving needed services, followed

by the Southwest, Northeast, North Central, Western areas, Southeast, West Central, Northwest, and Central areas. The City of Little Rock area's recipients reported the lowest rates of receiving needed services (Table 26).

The summaries by WIOA services are listed in Table 27. No comparison is performed due to the overlapping nature of the services – individuals may have received more than one service.

Table 32: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Gender Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Received Most/All Services Needed	52.6 (51.2, 54)	52.8 (50.7, 54.9)	45.5 (26.5, 65.9)	27.6 (19.6, 37.2)	52.4 (51.1, 53.6)

Table 33: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Age Group

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Age	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 – 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Received Most/All Services Needed	58.8 (55, 62.6)	52.4 (50.7, 54.2)	50.9 (48.8, 53.1)	51.8 (46.2, 57.3)	35.1 (24.6, 47.2)

Table 34: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Racial/Ethnic Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Received Most/All Services Needed	50.9 (38, 63.7)	43.6 (31.4, 56.6)	54.7 (52.5, 56.8)	48.9 (41.1, 56.9)	64.4 (30.4, 88.3)	36.7 (25, 50.2)	28.8 (22.8, 35.6)	41.8 (33.3, 50.7)	53.2 (51.6, 54.9)

Table 35: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Educational Attainment

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
Education	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Received Most/All Services Needed	48.8 (41.3, 56.3)	54.1 (51.8, 56.3)	54 (51.9, 56.1)	52.1 (48.7, 55.4)	49.2 (45.8, 52.6)	44.7 (39.8, 49.7)	37.8 (15.5, 66.7)

Table 36: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)										
ADWS Work area	Central	City of Little Rock	Eastern	North Central	Northeast	Northwest	Southeast	Southwest	West Central	Western
Received Most/All Services Needed	49.5 (46.5, 52.4)	48.8 (46, 51.7)	62.2 (54, 69.7)	55.4 (51, 59.8)	55.9 (51.8, 59.9)	50.3 (46, 54.6)	52.3 (47.7, 56.9)	58 (53.9, 62)	52.2 (49, 55.4)	54.1 (48.2, 59.8)

Table 37: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by WIOA Service

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
WIOA Service	Adult Education	Adult (Training/ Workforce) Services	Dislocated Workers Services	Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	Rehabilitative Services	Services for the Blind	Youth Services
Received Most/All Services Needed	58.1 (52.6, 63.5)	55.3 (51.9, 58.7)	51.3 (48.1, 54.5)	51.9 (50.5, 53.3)	51.2 (41.8, 60.5)	40.8 (21.8, 63.1)	60.9 (49.6, 71.1)

Overall were you satisfied with the services in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Program?

Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied

62% of WIOA recipients reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the services in the WIOA program. There were several statistically significant differences among the gender identities. Women reported greater satisfaction with the WIOA program than both men and

other gender identities (Table 28). There were also several statistically significant differences among the age groups. The 18-24 age group reported the highest satisfaction rate with the WIOA program, followed by the 25-44 age group, and then collectively the 45-64 and 65+ age group (Table 29).

African American individuals reported the highest satisfaction rates in the WIOA program, followed by individuals who identified as Hispanic/Latino or Asian, then white individuals, followed by individuals who identified as American Indian, two or more races, other, and lastly Pacific Islander (Table 30).

Several statistically significant differences were present among the educational attainment groups. Individuals with a high school diploma or GED reported the highest satisfaction rates in the WIOA program, followed collectively by individuals with an Associate's degree, some college education, or less than high school education. Individuals with a bachelor's degree, or a graduate or professional degree reported the lowest rates of satisfaction with the WIOA program (Table 31).

The recipients in the Eastern and Southwest area reported the highest satisfaction rates with the WIOA program, followed by North Central, Southeast, Western areas, Northeast, West Central, and Northwest areas. The recipients in the Central and City of Little Rock areas reported the lowest satisfaction rates with the WIOA program (Table 32).

The summaries by WIOA services are listed in Table 33. No comparison is performed due to the overlapping nature of the services – individuals may have received more than one service.

Table 38: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Gender Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	64.7 (63.4, 66)	60.3 (58.2, 62.4)	59.1 (38.2, 77.2)	32.7 (24.1, 42.5)	62.2 (60.9, 63.4)

Table 39: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Age Group

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Age	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 – 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	71.6 (68, 75)	62.7 (61, 64.4)	60 (57.9, 62)	58.3 (52.8, 63.7)	36.9 (26.3, 49)

Table 40: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Racial/Ethnic Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	56.6 (43.5, 68.9)	66.3 (53.2, 77.3)	69.4 (67.4, 71.3)	67.3 (59.5, 74.3)	50 (21, 78.9)	50.2 (37.1, 63.2)	33.8 (27.4, 40.9)	55.8 (46.8, 64.4)	60.1 (58.4, 61.7)

Table 41: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Educational Attainment

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
Education	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	62 (54.5, 69)	66.7 (64.5, 68.8)	62.6 (60.6, 64.7)	62.9 (59.6, 66.1)	56 (52.6, 59.3)	51 (46.1, 56)	37.8 (15.5, 66.7)

Table 42: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)										
ADWS Work area	Central	City of Little Rock	Eastern	North Central	Northeast	Northwest	Southeast	Southwest	West Central	Western
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	58.6 (55.7, 61.5)	58.8 (55.9, 61.6)	72.3 (64.3, 79)	66.6 (62.2, 70.7)	63.2 (59.1, 67)	59 (54.7, 63.2)	65.4 (60.9, 69.7)	71.4 (67.5, 75)	60.6 (57.5, 63.7)	63.5 (57.8, 68.9)

Table 43: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by WIOA Service

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
WIOA Service	Adult Education	Adult (Training/ Workforce) Services	Dislocated Workers Services	Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	Rehabilitative Services	Services for the Blind	Youth Services
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	73.4 (68.2, 78.1)	67.1 (63.8, 70.3)	57.3 (54.1, 60.5)	62 (60.6, 63.4)	71.2 (62, 78.9)	78.5 (53.7, 92)	81 (70.5, 88.4)

How satisfied were you with the professionalism and accessibility of staff?

Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied

Approximately 68% of WIOA recipients reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied in ADWS staff. There were statistically significant differences among the gender identities. Women reported the highest rate of satisfaction in the ADWS staff, followed by men, and then other gender identities (Table 34). There were several statistically significant differences among the age groups. The 18-24 age group reported the highest rate of satisfaction in ADWS staff, followed by the 25-44, 45-64, and 65+ age groups (Table 35).

Several statistically significant differences were present among the racial/ethnic groups. Asian individuals reported the highest rates of satisfaction in ADWS staff, followed by individuals who identified as African American, Hispanic/Latino, white, American Indian, two or more races, other, and lastly Pacific Islander (Table 36).

Individuals with high school diploma or GED reported the highest rates of satisfaction in ADWS staff, followed by individuals with less than high school education or an Associate's degree, some college education, and then individuals with a Bachelor degree, or a graduate or professional degree (Table 37).

The Eastern area's recipients reported the highest rate of satisfaction in ADWS staff, followed by the Southwest, North Central, West Central, Western, Southeast, Northeast, Northwest, Central, and City of Little Rock areas (Table 38).

The summaries by WIOA services are listed Table 39. No comparison is performed due to the overlapping nature of the services – individuals may have received more than one service.

Table 44: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Gender Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	69.2 (67.9, 70.5)	67.1 (65.1, 69)	50 (30.2, 69.8)	41.8 (32.5, 51.8)	67.8 (66.6, 68.9)

Table 45: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Age Group

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Age	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	73 (69.5, 76.3)	67.8 (66.1, 69.5)	67.1 (65.1, 69.1)	65.9 (60.4, 70.9)	45 (33.6, 57)

Table 46: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Gender Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	61.3 (48, 73)	79.1 (67, 87.5)	74.5 (72.5, 76.3)	68.5 (60.7, 75.5)	50 (21, 78.9)	51.1 (38, 64.1)	36.9 (30.3, 44)	57.3 (48.3, 65.9)	66.4 (64.8, 67.9)

Table 47: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Educational Attainment

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
Education	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	68.8 (61.5, 75.3)	70.6 (68.5, 72.7)	67.2 (65.2, 69.2)	68.3 (65.1, 71.4)	64.9 (61.6, 68.1)	62.3 (57.4, 66.9)	47.4 (21.8, 74.4)

Table 48: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)										
ADWS Work area	Central	City of Little Rock	Eastern	North Central	Northeast	Northwest	Southeast	Southwest	West Central	Western
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	64.2 (61.3, 67)	64.2 (61.4, 67)	79.2 (71.3, 85.3)	72.4 (68.2, 76.3)	67.1 (63.1, 70.8)	64.9 (60.7, 68.9)	68.4 (64, 72.5)	75.2 (71.5, 78.7)	69.2 (66.2, 72.1)	69 (63.2, 74.2)

Table 49: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by WIOA Service

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
WIOA Service	Adult Education	Adult (Training/ Workforce) Services	Dislocated Workers Services	Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	Rehabilitative Services	Services for the Blind	Youth Services
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	78.1 (73.1, 82.4)	72.6 (69.4, 75.6)	61.7 (58.5, 64.8)	68 (66.7, 69.3)	69.2 (59.9, 77.2)	79 (56.5, 91.6)	81.9 (71.4, 89.1)

Were you able to find employment in your career field after you completed this program?

No, I Did Not Find Employment; Yes, I Found Employment, but Not in My Career Field; Yes, I Found Employment in My Career Field

Approximately 49% of WIOA recipients, who indicated that they had searched for employment, reported that they found employment – either not in their career field or in their career field. A statistically significant difference existed among gender identities. Individuals who identified as other gender(s) reported the highest rate of attaining employment, followed by women, and then men. There were several statistically significant differences among the age groups (Table 40). The 18-24 age group reported the highest rate of attaining employment, followed by the 25-44 age group, the 45-64 age group, and finally the 65+ age group (Table 41).

The racial/ethnic groups had many statistically significant differences. Individuals who identified as two or more races reported the highest rates of attaining employment, followed by individuals

who identified as Hispanic/Latino, African American, Asian, other, white, American Indian, and lastly Pacific Islander (Table 42).

Individuals with high school diploma or GED education reported the highest rates of attaining employment, followed by individuals with an Associate's degree, some college education, a Bachelor's degree, a graduate or professional degree, and lastly less than high school education (Table 43)

The ADWS local workforce development areas had many statistically significant differences. The Eastern area's recipients reported the highest rates of attaining employment, followed by the Southwest, North Central, Southeast, Northwest, Northeast, Central, West Central, Western, and lastly the City of Little Rock area (Table 44).

The summaries by WIOA services are listed in Table 45. No comparison is performed due to the overlapping nature of the services – individuals may have received more than one service.

Table 50: Rate of Finding Employment -by Gender Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Found Employment	51.8 (50.2, 53.5)	46.2 (43.7, 48.6)	60 (34.8, 80.8)	31.6 (20.9, 44.7)	48.8 (47.3 ,50.3)

Table 51: Rate of Finding Employment -by Age Group

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Age	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Found Employment	64.6 (60.3, 68.7)	52.9 (50.8, 55)	41 (38.5, 43.6)	30.8 (24.7, 37.6)	35.4 (22.8, 50.3)

Table 52: Rate of Finding Employment -by Racial/Ethnic Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Found Employ ment	34 (20, 51.4)	51.9 (35.5, 67.9)	52.1 (49.6, 54.6)	52.2 (42.8, 61.3)	23.6 (6.8, 56.8)	50.9 (34.5, 67)	33.1 (25.3, 41.9)	59.2 (48.9, 68.7)	47.4 (45.4, 49.4)

Table 53: Rate of Finding Employment -by Educational Attainment

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
Education	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Found Employment	40.4 (31.8, 49.6)	52.5 (49.7, 55.2)	48.8 (46.3, 51.4)	50.1 (46, 54.2)	45.5 (41.5, 49.5)	40.7 (35.2, 46.4)	55.2 (16.6, 88.4)

Table 54: Rate of Finding Employment -by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)										
ADWS Work area	Central	City of Little Rock	Eastern	North Central	Northeast	Northwest	Southeast	Southwest	West Central	Western
Found Employ ment	46.7 (43.2, 50.3)	45.8 (42.5, 49.2)	66.5 (57.1, 74.8)	53.1 (47.4, 58.7)	49.1 (44.1, 54.2)	50.1 (45, 55.3)	51.7 (46.2, 57.2)	53.7 (48.6, 58.7)	46.6 (42.7, 50.5)	46.2 (39.8, 52.7)

Table 55: Rate of Finding Employment -by WIOA Service

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
WIOA Service	Adult Education	Adult (Training/ Workforce) Services	Dislocated Workers Services	Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	Rehabilitative Services	Services for the Blind	Youth Services
Found Employment	57.6 (50.7, 64.1)	57.8 (53.7, 61.8)	42.5 (38.4, 46.6)	47.7 (46, 49.4)	45.3 (34.2, 56.8)	25 (10.1, 49.7)	60.9 (46.3, 73.7)

If you found employment, are you likely to keep this job over the next six months?

Yes; No; Unsure

Among the respondents who indicated that they had found employment, approximately 87% indicated that they believed that were likely to retain the position over the next six months. There was a statistically significant difference between men and women, as women reported a stronger belief that they would retain their new employment in the next six months than men. Other gender identities were excluded from analysis due to insufficient data. There were statistically significant differences among several age groups (Table 46). The 18-24 age group had the most confidence in retaining their new position over the next six months, followed by the 25-44 group, the 45-64 group, and finally the 65+ group (Table 47).

The racial/ethnic groups had many statistically significant differences. Individuals who identified as other had the most confidence in retaining their new position over the next six months, followed by African American and American Indian individuals, individuals who identified as Hispanic/Latino, white or two or more races, and finally Asian individuals (Table 48).

Interestingly, individuals with a Bachelor's degree reported a weaker belief, that was statistically significant, in retaining their new job over the next six months compared to individuals with a high school diploma or GED, some college education, an Associate's degree, or a graduate or professional degree (Table 49).

The ADWS local workforce development areas had many statistically significant differences. The Northeast's recipients reported the most confidence in retaining their new position over the next

six months, followed by the Southwest, City of Little Rock, Southeast, Eastern, Northwest, North Central, West Central, Central, and Western (Table 50).

The summaries by WIOA services are listed in Table 51. No comparison is performed due to the overlapping nature of the services – individuals may have received more than one service.

Table 56: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Gender Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Yes	87.8 (86.2, 89.3)	86 (83.2, 88.3)	*	38.9 (19.8, 62.2)	86.6 (85.1, 88)

Table 57: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Age Group

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)					
Age	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Yes	88.6 (84.5, 91.7)	88 (85.9, 89.7)	85.6 (82.6, 88.3)	71.2 (58.8, 81.1)	54.1 (30.7, 75.9)

Table 58: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Racial/Ethnic Identity

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Yes	87.7 (47.8, 98.2)	74.6 (48.1, 90.3)	89.6 (87.3, 91.5)	86.4 (74.9, 93.1)	*	92 (60.4, 98.9)	70.9 (55.9, 82.4)	83.6 (71.2, 91.4)	85.5 (83.3, 87.4)

Table 59: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Educational Attainment

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
Education	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Yes	85.8 (72, 93.4)	88.5 (85.8, 90.7)	86.9 (84.1, 89.2)	86.5 (82.2, 90)	81.9 (76.8, 86.1)	86.2 (78.6, 91.4)	*

Table 60: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)										
ADWS Work area	Central	City of Little Rock	Eastern	North Central	Northeast	Northwest	Southeast	Southwest	West Central	Western
Yes	84.2 (79.9, 87.7)	89 (85.6, 91.6)	88.5 (78.6, 94.2)	85.8 (79.5, 90.4)	91.1 (86.2, 94.4)	86 (80.2, 90.4)	88.6 (82.5, 92.8)	89.1 (84.4, 92.5)	85.7 (81.1, 89.3)	75.1 (65.6, 82.7)

Table 61: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by WIOA Service

Percentage of Respondents (Confidence Limits)							
WIOA Service	Adult Education	Adult (Training/ Workforce) Services	Dislocated Workers Services	Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	Rehabilitative Services	Services for the Blind	Youth Services
Yes	88.4 (80.8, 93.2)	90 (86.2, 92.8)	85.7 (80.6, 89.6)	86 (84.2, 87.6)	84.6 (68.6, 93.3)	*	93.9 (78.2, 98.5)

Do Employment Attainment & Retention Confidence have an Impact on Satisfaction with the WIOA Program?

Among recipients who found employment, a few statistically significant differences existed concerning satisfaction with the WIOA program which was based on an ordinal order of retention confidence. Individuals with strong retention confidence (will retain) reported the highest satisfaction rate in the WIOA program, followed by individuals with mixed retention confidence (unsure), and then individuals with weak retention confidence (will not retain).

Table 62: WIOA Satisfaction - by Employment Attainment and Retention Confidence

Overall were you satisfied with the services in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Program?			
	Found Employment and Will Retain it	Found Employment and Unsure if Will Retain it	Found Employment and Will not Retain It
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	84.8 (83.1, 86.4)	71 (64.2, 77)	58.7 (47.6, 68.9)

Do Employment Attainment & Retention Confidence have an Impact on Satisfaction in ADWS Staff?

Among recipients who found employment, a few statistically significant differences existed concerning satisfaction in ADWS staff which was based on an ordinal order of retention belief. Individuals with strong retention confidence (will retain) reported the highest satisfaction rate in ADWS staff, followed by individuals with mixed retention confidence (unsure), and then individuals with weak retention confidence (will not retain).

Table 63: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Employment Attainment and Retention Confidence

How satisfied were you with the professionalism and accessibility of staff?			
	Found Employment and Will Retain it	Found Employment and Unsure if Will Retain it	Found Employment and Will not Retain It
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	85.7 (84.1, 87.3)	77.1 (70.6, 82.5)	66.6 (55.6, 76.1)

Multivariate Risk Models of Key Measures

Specific demographic variables have independent correlations with key outcomes within the survey results. Multivariate logistic regression was utilized to estimate the independent effects of each demographic category on the odds of having a specific experience/outcome. The multivariate model allows us to control for different demographic categories, many which overlap, and determine each categories' independent impact on the "risk" factor for the specific experiences of interest.[4]

The effects presented in each table are odds ratios. The odds ratios are multiplicative, so a 1.0 odds ratios indicates there is no association, an odds ratio greater than 1.0 indicates the odds of an experience are increased, while less than 1.0 indicates the odds of an experience are reduced.[5]

The statistical significance of each odds ratio is estimated with a Wald chi-square statistic, presented in parentheses directly below the odds ratio. The standard 95% Confidence Level ($p<.05$) is utilized to determine and display the statistically significant demographics which have an impact on the odds of an experience. In addition, demographics with multiple categories – age, race/ethnic, and educational attainment – are compared against their counterparts in the model. A detail legend is presented below of the abbreviations utilized throughout the tables.

Age:

- 18 – 24: Individuals who are 18-24 years old;

[4] Pardoe, I., L. Simon & D. Young. *15.1 Logistic Regression*. Pennsylvania State University – Eberly College of Science. Accessed April 22, 2021. Web. https://online.stat.psu.edu/stat501/lesson/15/15.1.

[5] Ibid.

- 65+: Individuals who are 65+ years old.

Race:

- A: Asian (non-Hispanic)
- AA: Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
- H/L: Hispanic or Latino
- O: Other
- T: Two or More Races
- NA: “Native American” - American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- OR: Other - American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Other, or Two or more Races.

Educational Attainment:

- LHS: Less than High School
- C_AA: Some College or an Associate’s Degree
- BA: Bachelor’s Degree
- GP: Graduate or Professional Degree
- BA+: Bachelor’s Plus - Bachelor’s Degree, Graduate or Professional Degree

Figure 2 below presents the statistical analysis of the survey data about satisfaction (Satisfied or Very Satisfied) in the WIOA program. Key findings are:

- Women were 14% more likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied than men.

- Individuals in the 18-24 age group were 43% more likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied in the WIOA program than individuals between the ages of 25-64 (25-44, 46-64).
- Individuals who identified as African American or Black were 50% more likely to report being satisfied in the WIOA program than individuals who identified as white.
- With respect to educational attainment, individuals with a graduate or professional degree were less likely to report feeling satisfied or very satisfied in the WIOA program than all other educational attainment groups. Individuals with a Bachelor's degree were also less likely to report feeling satisfied or very satisfied in the WIOA program than individuals with individuals with lower levels of educational attainment. Individuals with some college education or an Associate's degree were less likely to report feeling satisfied or very satisfied in the WIOA program than individuals with a high school diploma or GED.
- Individuals with some college education or an Associate's degree, a Bachelor's degree, or a graduate or professional degree were 15%, 32%, and 44% less likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied in the WIOA program than individuals with a high school diploma or GED, respectively.

Figure 3: Multivariate Logistic Regression - Satisfaction with the WIOA Program

Multivariate Logistic Regression - Satisfaction with the WIOA Program	
	Satisfaction "Satisfied or Very Satisfied"
Female (Relative to Male)	1.18* (3.11)
18 - 24 Years Old (Relative to 25 - 64 Years Old)	1.43* (3.83) 65+
65+ Years Old (Relative to 25 - 64 Years Old)	1.02 (0.16) 18 - 24

Race/Ethnicity (Relative to White)	
Asian	1.5 (1.42) AA
African American	1.5* (6.85) A, H/L, OR
Hispanic/Latino	1.39 (1.85) AA, OR
Other[A]	0.81 (-1.59) AA, H/L
Educational Attainment (Relative to a High school diploma or GED)	
Less than High School	0.83 (-1.09) C_AA, BA, GP
Some College or Associate's Degree	0.85* (-2.49) LHS, BA, GP
Bachelor's Degree	0.68* (-4.39) LHS, C_AA, GP
Graduate Degree	0.56* (-5.04) LHS, C_AA, BA
Respondents	7185
2-Loglikelihood	-4759.46
Odds ratio with Z Statistics Shown in Parenthesis. *p<.05 two tailed tests	

Figure 3 below presents the statistical analysis of the survey data about satisfaction (Satisfied or Very Satisfied) in ADWS staff. Key findings are:

- Individuals in the 18 -24 age group reported that they were 22% more likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied in ADWS staff than individuals between 25-64 years old.
- Individuals who identified as Asian, or African American or Black were 115% and 53% more likely, respectively, to report being satisfied or very satisfied in the ADWS staff than individuals who identified as white.

- Individuals who identified among American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Other, or Two or more Races (Other) were 31% less likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied in the ADWS staff than individuals who identified as white.
- With respect to educational attainment, individuals with a Bachelor's degree or higher were less likely to report feeling satisfied or very satisfied in the WIOA program than all other educational attainment groups.
- Individuals with some college education or an Associate's degree, a Bachelor's degree or a graduate or professional degree were 12%, and 22% less likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied in ADWS staff than individuals with a high school diploma or GED, respectively.

Figure 4: Multivariate Logistic Regression - Satisfaction in the ADWS Staff

Multivariate Logistic Regression - Satisfaction in the ADWS Staff	
	Satisfaction "Satisfied or Very Satisfied"
Female (Relative to Male)	1.09 (1.54)
18 - 24 Years Old (Relative to 25 - 64 Years Old)	1.22* (2.13)
65+ Years Old (Relative to 25 - 64 Years Old)	1.04 (0.29)
Race/Ethnicity (Relative to White)	
Asian	2.15* (2.35) AA, H/L, OR
African American	1.53* (6.84) A, H/L, OR
Hispanic/Latino	1.15 (0.77) A, AA, OR
Other[A]	0.69* (-2.78)

	A, AA, H/L
Educational Attainment (Relative to a High school diploma or GED)	
Less than High School	0.94 (-0.37) BA+
Some College or Associate's Degree	0.88* (-2.02) BA+
Bachelor's Degree or Higher	0.78* (-3.07) LHS, BA+
Respondents	7185
2-Loglikelihood	-4535.39

Figure 4 below presents the statistical analysis of the survey data about finding employment (Found Employment, but not in My Career Field; Found Employment in My Career Field). Key findings are:

- Women were 22% more likely to report finding employment than men.
- Individuals in the 18-24 age group were 87% more likely to report finding employment than individuals between 25-64 years old.
- Individuals in the 65+ age group were 48% less likely to report finding employment than individuals between 25-64 years old.
- Individuals who identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Native American) were 49% less likely report finding employment than individuals who identified as white.
- With respect to educational attainment, individuals with less than high school education were less likely to report finding employment than individuals with all higher levels of education.

- Individuals with less than high school education were 40% less likely to report finding employment than individuals with a high school diploma or GED.
- Individuals with a Bachelor's degree or a higher degree were 20% less likely to report finding employment than individuals with a high school diploma or GED.

Figure 5: Multivariate Logistic Regression - Likelihood of Finding Employment

Multivariate Logistic Regression – Likelihood of Finding Employment	
	Found Employment "Found Employment, but not in My Career Field, or Found Employment in My Career Field"
Female (Relative to Male)	1.22* (3.22)
18 - 24 Years Old (Relative to 25 - 64 Years Old)	1.87* (6.15) 65+
65+ Years Old (Relative to 25 - 64 Years Old)	0.52* (-4.15) 18 - 24
Race/Ethnicity (Relative to White)	
Native American[B]	0.51* (-2.01) AA, H/L, O, T
Asian	1.34 (0.83) AA, H/L, O, T
African American	1.12 (1.66) NA, A, H/L, O, T
Hispanic/Latino	1.21 (0.95) A, AA, O, T
Other	1.16 (0.43) A, AA, O, T
Two or More Races	1.44 (1.65) NA, A, AA, H/L, O
Educational Attainment (Relative to a High school diploma or GED)	
Less than High School	0.6* (-2.5)

	C_AA, BA+
Some College or Associate's Degree	0.9 (-1.42) LHS, BA+
Bachelor's Degree or Higher	0.8* (-2.5) LHS, BA+
Respondents	4971
2-Loglikelihood	-3470.75
Odds ratio with Z Statistics Shown in Parenthesis. *p<.05 two tailed tests	

ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

The tables in this section describe ADWS WIOA recipients' responses from each local workforce development area to each of the listed survey questions:

Did you clearly understand your responsibilities to participate in the program?

Yes; No; Unsure

The proportion of ADWS WIOA recipients who reported that they understood their responsibilities when participating in the WIOA program ranged from 84% in the North Central area to 89% in the Northeast area. Only the West Central area showed a statistically significant difference between men and women, as women reported a higher rate of comprehending responsibilities. The City of Little Rock, Eastern, North Central, Northwest, and Southeast areas saw individuals who identified as other gender report a lower comprehension rate of responsibilities than both men and women (Table 54).

Table 64: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Yes - (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Central	85.5 (83, 87.7)	87.5 (83.8, 90.5)	*	73.7 (50.2, 88.6)	86.3 (84.2, 88.2)
City of Little Rock	85.2 (82.8, 87.4)	86.8 (83, 89.8)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	59.3 (40.3, 75.8)	85.4 (83.2, 87.3)
Eastern	89.4 (82.9, 93.6)	87.1 (70.2, 95.1)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	*	88.2 (81.8, 92.6)
North Central	85.8 (81.9, 88.9)	81.9 (75.1, 87.2)	75 (23.8, 96.7)	80 (30.9, 97.3)	83.9 (80.3, 87)
Northeast	88.1 (84.8, 90.8)	90 (85.1, 93.5)	*	44.4 (17.7, 74.9)	88.5 (85.7, 90.8)
Northwest	87.2 (83.5, 90.2)	89.3 (84.2, 92.8)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	87.5 (46.3, 98.3)	88.2 (85.2, 90.7)
Southeast	86.2 (82.4, 89.4)	87.7 (81.3, 92.1)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	*	86.8 (83.4, 89.6)
Southwest	86.8 (83.3, 89.6)	86.6 (80.9, 90.8)	*	90 (53.3, 98.6)	86.8 (83.7, 89.4)
West Central	88 (85.5, 90.2)	84.3 (80, 87.7)	*	55.6 (25.1, 82.3)	85.7 (83.3, 87.9)
Western	89.8 (84.8, 93.2)	86.8 (79.3, 91.9)	*	87.5 (46.3, 98.3)	88.2 (83.8, 91.5)

The 65+ age group reported the lowest or second lowest comprehension rate in all areas except the Northeast and Western areas. The 18-24 age group reported the highest comprehension rate in the Central, North Central, Northeast, Northwest, Southwest, and Western areas (Table 55). The rankings within each area are presented below:

- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+: Central;
- 18-24, 45-64, 25-44, 65+: North Central;
- 18-24, 65+, 45-64, 25-44: Northeast, Western;
- 18-24, 25-44, 65+, 45-64: Northwest, Southwest;

- 25-44, 45-64, 18-24, 65+: City of Little Rock, Southeast;
- 45-64, 25-44, 18-24, 65+: Eastern;
- 45-64, 25-44, 65+, 18-24: West Central.

Table 65: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Yes - (Confidence Limits)					
Age & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Central	87.7 (80.7, 92.4)	86.4 (83.2, 89.1)	86.3 (82.5, 89.3)	85.5 (74.8, 92.2)	77.6 (48, 92.8)
City of Little Rock	84.6 (77.1, 89.9)	87 (84.2, 89.4)	84.7 (80.7, 88)	76.4 (62.4, 86.3)	77.3 (48.2, 92.6)
Eastern	85.7 (68.8, 94.2)	88.9 (80, 94.1)	94.7 (80.8, 98.7)	50 (11, 89)	*
North Central	92.3 (81.9, 97)	82.7 (77.2, 87.1)	83.6 (77.1, 88.5)	79.2 (53.8, 92.6)	78.6 (27.5, 97.3)
Northeast	95.6 (89.8, 98.2)	86.9 (82.5, 90.3)	89.1 (83.8, 92.8)	90.2 (72.3, 97)	45.4 (14.3, 80.6)
Northwest	92.5 (80.4, 97.3)	90.3 (86, 93.4)	85.8 (80.5, 89.9)	86.8 (68.3, 95.2)	77.8 (41, 94.6)
Southeast	79.5 (67.5, 87.8)	89.4 (84.6, 92.8)	86.3 (79.9, 90.8)	79.5 (57.5, 91.7)	*
Southwest	96.7 (90.1, 98.9)	87.7 (83.6, 91)	82.2 (75.5, 87.3)	83.2 (64.1, 93.2)	*
West Central	79.5 (69, 87.1)	86.2 (82.5, 89.1)	87.6 (83.7, 90.6)	84.1 (72, 91.6)	56.5 (25, 83.5)
Western	97.2 (82.3, 99.6)	86.8 (79.6, 91.7)	88.2 (80, 93.3)	96.8 (80.3, 99.6)	58.8 (25.8, 85.4)

In all areas, except for the North Central and Western areas, African American individuals reported higher rates of understanding of responsibilities in the WIOA program than white individuals (Table 56). The rankings within each area are presented below:

- AA, H/L,W, T, A, O: Central;
- A, O, AA, AI, T, W, H/L: City of Little Rock;
- AA, W, T: Eastern;
- H/L, W, AA, T, AI: North Central;
- AA, W, A, T, O: Northeast;
- AA, H/L, W, AI: Northwest;

- AA, T, H/L, W: Southeast;
- AA, W, H/L, T, O, A: Southwest;
- H/L, AA, O, W, T, A: West Central;
- W, H/L, AA, A, T, AI: Western.

Table 66: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Yes - (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity & ADWS Area	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Central	*	72.4 (39.9, 91.2)	90.3 (86.8, 92.9)	87.9 (73.1, 95.1)	*	50.7 (20.2, 80.7)	72.8 (57.7, 84)	74 (51.4, 88.4)	86.1 (83.3, 88.6)
City of Little Rock	88 (45.5, 98.5)	95.3 (72.2, 99.4)	89.1 (86.6, 91.2)	75.5 (52, 89.8)	*	91.8 (71.9, 98)	70 (54.7, 81.8)	88 (70.6, 95.7)	80.6 (76.2, 84.3)
Eastern	*	*	88.8 (81.4, 93.5)	*	*	*	*	81.8 (31.2, 97.8)	86.6 (63.7, 96)
North Central	47.9 (7.7, 91)	*	84.4 (69.2, 92.8)	90.3 (53, 98.7)	*	*	56.4 (24, 84.1)	58.9 (32, 81.3)	85.1 (81.2, 88.3)
Northeast	*	76 (21.4, 97.4)	94.5 (90.1, 97)	*	*	31.5 (2.8, 88)	60.5 (34.8, 81.5)	59.7 (24.1, 87.3)	87.9 (84.4, 90.8)
Northwest	82.2 (47.8, 95.9)	*	93.2 (75.9, 98.4)	89.9 (71, 97)	*	*	82.9 (57.6, 94.6)	*	87.6 (84.2, 90.4)
Southeast	*	*	89.3 (85.2, 92.3)	85.7 (41.9, 98)	*	*	42.5 (17, 72.7)	88 (45.5, 98.5)	84.9 (78.2, 89.8)
Southwest	*	55.4 (19.9, 86.1)	89.7 (85.6, 92.7)	76 (48.2, 91.5)	*	56.8 (16.2, 89.9)	67.8 (46.5, 83.6)	73.7 (40.8, 91.9)	87.7 (82.6, 91.4)
West Central	*	78.1 (41.1, 94.8)	88.6 (81.3, 93.3)	96.5 (87, 99.1)	*	87.2 (59.1, 97)	58.6 (35.3, 78.7)	78.3 (53, 92)	85.5 (82.7, 87.9)
Western	79 (31.3, 96.9)	80 (32, 97.1)	86.9 (65.4, 95.9)	87.5 (59.3, 97.1)	*	*	77.3 (46.7, 93)	80 (30.9, 97.3)	89.5 (84.6, 93)

Across all areas, except for the Western area, the highest or second highest rate of understanding of responsibilities in the WIOA program were individuals with either high school or GED education, some college education, or an Associate's degree. For all areas, except the Northeast and Northwest areas, individuals with less than high school education reported the lowest or second lowest rates of understanding of responsibilities in the WIOA program. The rankings within each area are shown below:

- SC, HS, BD, AD, G/P, LHS: Central;
- HS, AD, G/P, SC, LHS, BD: City of Little Rock;
- AD, SC, HS, LHS: Eastern;
- BD, SC, HS, G/P, AD, LHS : North Central;
- AD, HS, LHS, SC, G/P, BD: Northeast;
- LHS, AD, HS, SC, BD, G/P: Northwest;
- SC, HS, BD, AD, LHS, G/P: Southeast;
- AD, HS, BD, SC, LHS, G/P: Southwest;
- G/P, SC, BD, AD, HS, LHS: West Central;
- G/P, BD, HS, SC, LHS, AD: Western.

Table 67: Summary of Understanding WIOA Responsibilities – by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Yes - (Confidence Limits)							
Education & ADWS Area	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Central	69.1 (47.9, 84.5)	86.3 (81.8, 89.8)	89.1 (85.8, 91.7)	84.2 (77, 89.4)	86.3 (80.4, 90.7)	83.2 (73.6, 89.8)	*
City of Little Rock	80.5 (63.6, 90.8)	90.6 (86.5, 93.5)	84.8 (81, 88)	85.9 (79.5, 90.5)	79.4 (73.2, 84.6)	85.5 (77.8, 90.9)	*
Eastern	66.7 (31, 89.9)	85.9 (74.2, 92.8)	89.4 (77.5, 95.4)	96.1 (76.6, 99.5)	*	*	*
North Central	65.8 (33.6, 87.9)	84.5 (78, 89.3)	85.8 (79.5, 90.4)	80.4 (70.4, 87.7)	86.1 (72.9, 93.5)	83.7 (62.2, 94.1)	68.5 (12, 97.2)

Northeast	89.4 (70.8, 96.7)	89.9 (85.5, 93.1)	88.4 (83, 92.3)	90.3 (80.2, 95.6)	80.4 (67.2, 89.2)	86.6 (67.8, 95.2)	*
Northwest	92 (72.3, 98.1)	89.5 (82.8, 93.8)	87.6 (82, 91.7)	91.8 (84.5, 95.9)	85.8 (76.6, 91.7)	82.3 (65.9, 91.8)	*
Southeast	81.4 (58.6, 93.1)	88 (81.9, 92.2)	89.4 (83.9, 93.2)	81.5 (67.8, 90.2)	84.1 (72.6, 91.3)	80.5 (56.9, 92.8)	*
Southwest	84.8 (59.8, 95.5)	88 (82.6, 92)	85.7 (80.2, 89.8)	91.4 (82.3, 96.1)	86 (73.6, 93.1)	82.7 (65.3, 92.4)	59.4 (11.1, 94.4)
West Central	80 (63.5, 90.2)	84.3 (79.6, 88.1)	87.3 (82.9, 90.7)	84.4 (76.6, 89.9)	86.8 (80.1, 91.4)	88.6 (77.2, 94.7)	*
Western	86.4 (40.8, 98.3)	87 (76.9, 93.1)	87 (79.3, 92.2)	86.3 (71.5, 94)	93.1 (79.7, 97.9)	95.5 (73.3, 99.4)	*

Would you recommend this program?

Would not Recommend; Would Possibly Recommend; Would Recommend; Would Strongly Recommend; Would Very Strongly Recommend

The proportion of ADWS WIOA recipients who reported that they would recommend, strongly recommend, or very strongly recommend the program they had received ranged from 69% in the Northwest area to 83% in the Eastern area. The North Central, Northwest, Southwest, West Central, and Western areas showed a statistically significant difference between men and women, as women reported a higher recommendation rate than men. In addition, all areas, except for the Northeast, West Central, and Western areas, saw individuals who identified as other gender report a lower recommendation rate than both men and women (Table 58).

Table 68: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Would Recommend/Strongly Recommend/Very Strongly Recommend - (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Central	73.6 (70.6, 76.4)	72.5 (67.8, 76.7)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	52.6 (31.1, 73.2)	72.7 (70, 75.3)
City of Little Rock	74.3 (71.3, 77)	70.9 (66.1, 75.3)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	51.9 (33.6, 69.6)	72.2 (69.5, 74.8)
Eastern	85.6 (78.5, 90.6)	77.4 (59.6, 88.8)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	*	82.5 (75.2, 88)
North Central	81.2 (77, 84.7)	71.6 (64, 78.2)	50 (12.3, 87.7)	40 (10, 80)	76.2 (72.1, 79.9)
Northeast	78 (73.9, 81.5)	75.1 (68.7, 80.6)	*	33.3 (11.1, 66.7)	76.1 (72.4, 79.4)
Northwest	74.4 (69.8, 78.5)	64.4 (57.6, 70.6)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	50 (20, 80)	68.7 (64.5, 72.6)
Southeast	77 (72.5, 81)	75.3 (67.7, 81.7)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	*	76.2 (72.1, 79.9)
Southwest	83.4 (79.7, 86.6)	76.9 (70.3, 82.4)	66.7 (15.3, 95.7)	60 (29.7, 84.2)	80 (76.4, 83.1)
West Central	78.6 (75.5, 81.4)	72 (67, 76.5)	*	55.6 (25.1, 82.3)	75.2 (72.3, 77.9)
Western	79 (72.9, 84.1)	70.2 (61.2, 77.9)	*	62.5 (28.5, 87.5)	74 (68.5, 78.8)

All areas, except for the Eastern, Northeast, and Southeast areas, saw the 18-24 age group report the highest rate of recommendations of the WIOA program. The Central, Eastern, North Central, Northwest, Southwest, and West Central areas saw the 65+ age group report the lowest rate of recommendations of the WIOA program (Table 59). The rankings within each area are presented below:

- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+: Central, Northwest, Southwest, and West Central;
- 18-24, 65+, 25-44, 45-64: City of Little Rock;
- 45-64, 18-24, 25-44, 65+: Eastern;

- 18-24, 45-64, 25-44, 65+: North Central;
- 65+, 18-24, 25-44, 45-64: Northeast;
- 25-44, 46-64, 65+, 18-24: Southeast;
- 18-24, 65+, 45-64, 25-44: Western.

Table 69: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Would Recommend/Strongly Recommend/Very Strongly Recommend - (Confidence Limits)					
Age & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Central	79.8 (71.5, 86.2)	73 (69, 76.6)	71.7 (67, 75.9)	71 (58.9, 80.7)	38.3 (15.8, 67.2)
City of Little Rock	75.5 (66.5, 82.7)	73.6 (70, 76.9)	70 (65, 74.5)	74.5 (61.3, 84.4)	37.5 (17.4, 63.1)
Eastern	83.8 (67.1, 92.9)	81.6 (70.9, 88.9)	87.5 (69.9, 95.5)	50 (11, 89)	*
North Central	90.7 (79.9, 96)	74.3 (68.3, 79.5)	75.2 (67.8, 81.3)	69.8 (42.3, 87.9)	78.6 (27.5, 97.3)
Northeast	83.6 (73.4, 90.4)	75.7 (70.5, 80.3)	73.1 (66, 79.2)	88 (70.6, 95.7)	18.2 (2.5, 65.6)
Northwest	78.6 (63.6, 88.5)	72.7 (66.5, 78.2)	64.7 (58, 70.9)	60.8 (42.4, 76.5)	48.6 (18.4, 79.9)
Southeast	60.9 (47.5, 72.9)	81.3 (75.8, 85.8)	74.9 (67.2, 81.3)	65.6 (44, 82.3)	*
Southwest	91.9 (81, 96.8)	81.5 (76.5, 85.6)	74.8 (67.6, 80.9)	74 (55.8, 86.6)	69.2 (30.3, 92.1)
West Central	77.3 (67.3, 84.9)	76.9 (72.7, 80.7)	73.9 (69, 78.2)	72.2 (58.7, 82.6)	50.6 (20.8, 79.9)
Western	82.1 (59.7, 93.4)	73.3 (64.8, 80.4)	74.3 (65.2, 81.7)	79.5 (52.8, 93)	38.1 (12.5, 72.7)

In all areas, except for the North Central and Western areas, African American individuals reported higher recommendation rates of the WIOA program than white individuals (Table 60). The rankings within each area are shown below:

- T, AA, PI, W, H/L, A, O: Central
- AA, T, O, W, A, H/L, AI: City of Little Rock
- AA, T, W: Eastern
- W, AA, T, A, AI: North Central
- AI, A, W, T: Northeast
- AA, O, A, H/L, W, AI, T: Northwest

- T, AA, W, AI, H/L, O: Southeast
- AA, AI, W, A, O, H/L, T: Southwest
- A, H/L, W, AA, O, T, AI: West Central
- AA, W, H/L, O, AI: Western

Table 70: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program – by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Would Recommend/Strongly Recommend/Very Strongly Recommend - (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity & ADWS Area	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Central	*	66.4 (34.3, 88.2)	78.7 (74.1, 82.7)	68.4 (47.6, 83.8)	74.5 (24.1, 96.4)	58.7 (25.7, 85.4)	52.3 (37.5, 66.8)	80.7 (59.5, 92.3)	71.1 (67.5, 74.5)
City of Little Rock	38 (9.1, 79)	55.1 (27.8, 79.7)	78 (74.7, 81)	45.7 (26.4, 66.4)	*	75.4 (53.2, 89.2)	39.9 (26.4, 55.1)	76.5 (59.3, 87.9)	68.3 (63.2, 72.9)
Eastern	*	*	85.5 (77.6, 90.9)	*	*	*	51.8 (8.8, 92.3)	81.8 (31.2, 97.8)	73.3 (50.2, 88.2)
North Central	47.9 (7.7, 91)	60 (20, 90)	76 (58.6, 87.7)	*	*	*	69.2 (35.5, 90.2)	74 (45, 90.8)	76.2 (71.8, 80.2)
Northeast	*	76 (21.4, 97.4)	83.3 (76.4, 88.4)	*	*	*	31.8 (13.3, 58.5)	40.3 (12.7, 75.9)	75.5 (71, 79.6)
Northwest	64.5 (33.5, 86.8)	73.1 (32.1, 94)	93.2 (75.9, 98.4)	70.8 (49.6, 85.7)	*	79.3 (31.1, 97)	37 (18.5, 60.3)	53.1 (22.3, 81.7)	69.3 (64.7, 73.6)
Southeast	72.8 (30.1, 94.3)	*	77.4 (72.1, 81.8)	57.1 (23, 85.6)	*	50 (5.9, 94.1)	57.5 (25.4, 84.3)	88 (45.5, 98.5)	76.4 (68.8, 82.6)
Southwest	81.7 (34, 97.5)	76.8 (28, 96.6)	85.4 (80.8, 89)	63 (33.3, 85.3)	*	70.4 (20.5, 95.7)	58.5 (38.2, 76.3)	61.1 (31.5, 84.2)	78.1 (71.9, 83.2)
West Central	67.5 (39.8, 86.7)	93.1 (63, 99.1)	75.3 (67, 82.1)	76.6 (60.2, 87.6)	*	75.2 (43.3, 92.4)	52.3 (30.3, 73.5)	68 (44.5, 84.9)	75.8 (72.5, 78.9)
Western	40.3 (12.7, 75.9)	*	77.5 (59.2, 89.1)	75 (47.8, 90.8)	*	60.6 (13.7, 93.7)	31.8 (11.7, 62.2)	*	75.5 (69.1, 81)

When considering educational attainment, the Central, City of Little Rock, and Northeast areas saw individuals with high school/GED education report the highest recommendation rates. In addition, the Eastern, North Central, and Southeast areas saw individuals with some college education report the highest recommendation rates. The Central, North Central, Southeast, and West Central areas saw individual with a graduate or professional degree report the lowest recommendation rates, while the City of Little Rock, Northwest, Southwest, and Western areas saw individuals with a Bachelor's degree reported the lowest recommendation rates. The rankings within each area are shown below:

- HS, AD, SC, BD, LHS, G/P: Central
- HS, LHS, SC, AD, G/P, BD: City of Little Rock
- SC, AD, BD, HS, LHS: Eastern
- SC, LHS, HS, AD, BD, G/P: North Central
- HS, AD, SC, BD, G/P, LHS: Northeast
- LHS, AD, HS, SC, G/P, BD: Northwest
- SC, BD, LHS, HS, AD, G/P: Southeast
- LHS, AD, SC, HS, G/P, BD: Southwest
- AD, HS, LHS, SC, BD, G/P: West Central
- G/P, HS, SC, AD, LHS, BD: Western

Table 71: Recommendation Rate of the WIOA Program - by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Would Recommend/Strongly Recommend/Very Strongly Recommend - (Confidence Limits)							
Education & ADWS Area	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Central	68.5 (46.1, 84.7)	77.8 (72.7, 82.2)	71.5 (66.8, 75.8)	74.9 (67.5, 81.2)	70.9 (63.5, 77.3)	60.4 (49.5, 70.4)	*
City of Little Rock	73.4 (53, 87.1)	77.7 (72.3, 82.3)	72.8 (68.1, 77)	70.9 (63.1, 77.6)	65.9 (59, 72.2)	69.6 (60.5, 77.3)	*

Eastern	58.7 (25.7, 85.4)	77 (64, 86.3)	89.4 (77.5, 95.4)	87.5 (59.9, 97)	87 (42.2, 98.4)	*	*
North Central	77.2 (42.1, 94)	76.4 (69.3, 82.3)	81.3 (74.4, 86.8)	72.9 (61.4, 82)	72.4 (58.5, 83)	67.4 (46.1, 83.3)	*
Northeast	59.8 (36.6, 79.3)	81.4 (75.5, 86.1)	74.9 (68.3, 80.6)	75.5 (64.6, 83.9)	67.3 (53.7, 78.6)	66 (45.4, 81.9)	*
Northwest	78.7 (50, 93.1)	74 (65.3, 81.1)	68.8 (61.6, 75.3)	74.9 (64.7, 82.9)	57.3 (46.3, 67.7)	64.2 (46.9, 78.5)	*
Southeast	76 (49, 91.2)	73.5 (65.7, 80.1)	81.7 (75, 87)	72.8 (60.6, 82.4)	77.9 (65.6, 86.7)	49.6 (26.3, 73)	*
Southwest	84.8 (59.8, 95.5)	80 (73.4, 85.3)	80.5 (74.3, 85.5)	80.9 (69.8, 88.5)	76.5 (63.2, 86)	80 (62.6, 90.5)	59.4 (11.1, 94.4)
West Central	74.1 (56.9, 86)	78.5 (73.4, 83)	72.3 (67, 77)	82.1 (74.5, 87.9)	72 (63.5, 79.2)	68.1 (54.6, 79.1)	*
Western	70.4 (20.5, 95.7)	77.2 (65.8, 85.6)	73.9 (65, 81.3)	72.9 (57.6, 84.2)	67.1 (50.7, 80.1)	81.2 (52.3, 94.4)	*

Did you receive the services needed to achieve your goal as outlined in the plan you developed with your case manager?

I don't know; Received None of the Services Needed; Received Some of the Services Needed; Received Most but Not All Services Needed; Received All Services Needed

The proportion of ADWS WIOA recipients who reported that they received most or all of the services needed to achieve outlined goals ranged from 49% in the City of Little Rock area to 62% in the Eastern area. There was not a statistically significant difference between men and women, across all areas, with respect to the rates at which they received needed services. A few statistically significant differences were present concerning other gender identities. In the Eastern area, women received needed services at a higher rate than other gender identities, and

both men and women received needed services at a higher rate than other gender identities in the Southwest area. In addition, other gender identities received needed services at a higher rate than both men and women in the North Central area.

Table 72: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Received Most/All Services Needed - (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Central	48.1 (44.8, 51.5)	51.7 (46.7, 56.6)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	21.1 (8.1, 44.6)	49.5 (46.5, 52.4)
City of Little Rock	49.5 (46.3, 52.7)	48.9 (43.9, 54)	*	33.3 (18.3, 52.7)	48.8 (46, 51.7)
Eastern	65.2 (56.7, 72.8)	58.1 (40.4, 73.9)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	*	62.2 (54, 69.7)
North Central	55.7 (50.8, 60.6)	55.5 (47.6, 63.1)	75 (23.8, 96.7)	20 (2.7, 69.1)	55.4 (51, 59.8)
Northeast	55.1 (50.5, 59.6)	57.7 (50.8, 64.4)	*	11.1 (1.5, 50)	55.9 (51.8, 59.9)
Northwest	49.9 (44.9, 54.9)	51.2 (44.4, 58)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	25 (6.3, 62.3)	50.3 (46, 54.6)
Southeast	52.4 (47.3, 57.4)	52.7 (44.6, 60.7)	*	50 (5.9, 94.1)	52.3 (47.7, 56.9)
Southwest	60.2 (55.6, 64.6)	56.5 (49.2, 63.4)	33.3 (4.3, 84.7)	40 (15.8, 70.3)	58 (53.9, 62)
West Central	53.2 (49.6, 56.8)	51.9 (46.6, 57.1)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	11.1 (1.5, 50)	52.2 (49, 55.4)
Western	53.2 (46.3, 59.9)	55.3 (46.1, 64.1)	*	50 (20, 80)	54.1 (48.2, 59.8)

The Central, City of Little Rock, North Central, Northeast, Northwest, and West Central areas saw the 18-24 group report the highest rate of receiving needed services (Table 63). The rankings within each area are presented below:

- 18-24, 45-64, 25-44, 65+: Central, North Central;
- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+: City of Little Rock;

- 45-64, 18-24, 25-44: Eastern;
- 18-24, 65+, 25-44, 45-64: Northeast;
- 18-24, 25-44, 65+, 45-64: Northwest;
- 25-44, 45-64, 65+, 18-24: Southeast;
- 65+, 18-24, 25-44, 45-64: Southwest;
- 18-24, 65+, 45-64, 25-44: West Central;
- 65+, 45-64, 18-24, 25-44: Western.

Table 73: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Received Most/All Services Needed - (Confidence Limits)					
Age & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Central	61.7 (52.4, 70.3)	46.3 (42.1, 50.6)	50.5 (45.5, 55.4)	46.1 (34.3, 58.3)	55.2 (27.8, 79.7)
City of Little Rock	54.9 (45.7, 63.8)	51.1 (47.1, 55.1)	45.8 (40.7, 51)	36.7 (25.1, 50.1)	35.9 (16.4, 61.5)
Eastern	63.6 (46.8, 77.7)	58 (46.6, 68.6)	66 (47.8, 80.5)	*	*
North Central	59.7 (45.8, 72.3)	54.7 (48.4, 60.8)	56.3 (48.7, 63.6)	44.9 (23.9, 68)	50 (12.1, 87.9)
Northeast	65.6 (54.4, 75.3)	55.2 (49.5, 60.8)	53.8 (46.4, 61.1)	60 (40.5, 76.7)	*
Northwest	55.7 (40.9, 69.6)	54.3 (47.8, 60.7)	45.8 (39.2, 52.6)	54.2 (36.3, 71)	19.4 (4.5, 55)
Southeast	48.1 (35.4, 60.9)	53.5 (47.1, 59.8)	52.3 (44.2, 60.3)	48.2 (28.1, 68.9)	*
Southwest	64.5 (51.4, 75.7)	59.9 (54.2, 65.4)	52.3 (44.8, 59.7)	66.4 (47.3, 81.3)	30.8 (7.9, 69.7)
West Central	57.2 (46.5, 67.3)	51.6 (46.9, 56.2)	52 (46.9, 57.2)	54.6 (41.4, 67.2)	31.8 (9.9, 66.5)
Western	53.3 (34, 71.6)	51 (42.3, 59.6)	55.9 (46.5, 64.9)	69.5 (44.2, 86.7)	38.1 (12.5, 72.7)

In all areas, except for the North Central and West Central areas, individuals who identified as two or more races reported lower rates of receiving needed services than individuals who identified as African American or white (Table 64). The rankings within each area are shown below:

- H/L, AI, W, O, AA, PI, T, A: Central
- A, H/L, T, AA, W, AI: North Central
- AA, AI, W, A, T, O, H/L: City of Little Rock
- H/L, A, AI, AA, W, T: Northeast
- W, AA, T: Eastern
- A, AA, AI, W, O, T: Northwest
- AA, W, AI, H/L, T: Southeast
- AI, AA, W, T, H/L, O, A: Southwest
- H/L, W, AA, AI, A, T, O: West Central
- W, AA, A, AI, H/L, T, O: Western

Table 74: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Received Most/All Services Needed - (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity & ADWS Area	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Central	51.4 (14.1, 87.2)	21.5 (6.4, 52.6)	50.5 (45.2, 55.8)	54.3 (35.1, 72.3)	49 (13.2, 85.9)	50.7 (20.2, 80.7)	29.6 (18, 44.5)	41.1 (23.3, 61.6)	50.9 (47, 54.7)
City of Little Rock	50 (15.2, 84.8)	44.9 (20.3, 72.2)	52 (48.3, 55.8)	22.9 (10, 44.3)	*	35.6 (16.5, 60.7)	34.8 (22.1, 50.3)	42.9 (26.8, 60.6)	47.6 (42.4, 52.8)
Eastern	*	*	61.9 (52.8, 70.3)	*	*	*	*	42.4 (8.8, 84.9)	73.3 (50.2, 88.2)
North Central	24 (2.6, 78.6)	80 (30.9, 97.3)	58.2 (40.8, 73.7)	59.7 (24.1, 87.3)	*	*	34.6 (11.1, 69.3)	58.9 (32, 81.3)	55.2 (50.4, 59.9)
Northeast	66.7 (15.3, 95.7)	76 (21.4, 97.4)	60.6 (52.7, 68.1)	89.1 (49.7, 98.5)	*	*	10.8 (2.6, 35.4)	9.7 (1.3, 47)	56.1 (51.2, 61)
Northwest	58.9 (29.5, 83.1)	84.6 (38.5, 98)	61.4 (38.3, 80.3)	32.8 (17.5, 52.8)	*	49.2 (16.5, 82.5)	27.6 (12.2, 51.3)	40.6 (14.2, 73.9)	51.2 (46.5, 55.9)
Southeast	43.2 (10.1, 83.8)	*	55.6 (49.8, 61.2)	42.9 (14.4, 77)	*	*	10 (1.4, 47)	12 (1.5, 54.5)	52.3 (44.2, 60.3)
Southwest	63.4 (23.7, 90.6)	10.7 (1.4, 50.5)	61 (55.2, 66.6)	44 (18.6, 73)	*	27.2 (5.7, 69.9)	35.6 (19, 56.6)	47.4 (21.2, 75.1)	59.7 (53.1, 66)
West Central	51.7 (26.5, 76)	50.6 (22.3, 78.5)	52.2 (43.6, 60.7)	65.6 (48.6, 79.4)	*	34.9 (13, 65.8)	30.4 (14.1, 53.6)	50.3 (28.7, 71.8)	52.5 (48.8, 56.1)

Western	40.3 (12.7, 75.9)	41.5 (12.7, 77.6)	43.4 (25.9, 62.8)	38.2 (18.3, 63)	*	18.2 (2.2, 68.8)	25 (7.9, 56.4)	20 (2.7, 69.1)	59.7 (52.9, 66)

The Central, City of Little Rock, North Central, Southeast, and Western areas saw individuals with less than high school education report the lowest rates of receiving needed services. In addition, the Eastern and North East areas saw individuals with a Bachelor's degree report the lowest rates of receiving needed services, while individuals with a graduate or professional degree reported the lowest rates of receiving needed services in the Southwest and West Central areas. The rankings within each area are shown below:

- HS, SC, AD, BD, G/P, LHS: Central
- AD, HS, BD, SC, G/P, LHS: City of Little Rock
- G/P, LHS, SC, AD, HS, BD: Eastern
- SC, AD, HS, G/P, BD, LHS: North Central
- HS, SC, G/P, LHS, AD, BD: Northeast
- LHS, SC, BD, AD, G/P, HS: Northwest
- SC, AD, HS, BD, G/P, LHS: Southeast
- LHS, AD, SC, HS, BD, G/P: Southwest
- HS, BD, SC, LHS, AD, G/P: West Central
- G/P, SC, BD, AD, HS, LHS: Western

Table 75: Status of WIOA Services Rendered - by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Received Most/All Services Needed - (Confidence Limits)							
Education & ADWS Area	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Central	34.3 (18, 55.3)	53.9 (48.2, 59.5)	51.8 (46.9, 56.8)	45.6 (37.9, 53.7)	45.3 (37.8, 53.1)	40.5 (30.3, 51.6)	*
City of Little Rock	41.2 (24.3, 60.4)	50.8 (45, 56.7)	47.1 (42.2, 52)	55.3 (47.3, 63.1)	49.9 (43.1, 56.8)	42 (33.2, 51.4)	50 (5.9, 94.1)

Eastern	68 (35.6, 89.1)	60.8 (47.7, 72.5)	64.9 (50.9, 76.7)	63.8 (41.7, 81.3)	43.4 (11.3, 82.2)	80.7 (29.3, 97.7)	*
North Central	50 (23, 77)	54.9 (47.5, 62.1)	58.7 (50.5, 66.4)	55.4 (44, 66.2)	52.3 (39, 65.3)	54.7 (35.1, 73)	*
Northeast	52.7 (30.4, 74)	58.4 (51.8, 64.8)	56.7 (49.7, 63.5)	50.8 (39.4, 62.1)	48.4 (35.2, 61.9)	53.9 (34.6, 72)	*
Northwest	67.4 (42.9, 85)	44.3 (35.9, 53.1)	57.3 (50, 64.4)	45.9 (35.6, 56.6)	47.9 (37.3, 58.8)	44.5 (29, 61.2)	31.5 (2.8, 88)
Southeast	18.6 (6.9, 41.4)	53.9 (45.8, 61.7)	56.6 (48.8, 64)	54.7 (42.1, 66.8)	45.9 (33.6, 58.8)	35 (15.7, 60.8)	*
Southwest	70.3 (46.9, 86.4)	59.3 (51.8, 66.4)	60.7 (53.9, 67.1)	63.9 (52.2, 74.1)	45 (32.4, 58.4)	38 (23.1, 55.5)	59.4 (11.1, 94.4)
West Central	50.6 (34.3, 66.8)	54.8 (49, 60.4)	51.5 (46, 56.9)	49.3 (40.6, 58.1)	54 (45.4, 62.3)	45.8 (33.4, 58.7)	*
Western	27.2 (5.7, 69.9)	49 (37.8, 60.2)	56.6 (47.3, 65.4)	51.2 (36.4, 65.8)	55.9 (40.3, 70.3)	72.2 (44.9, 89.2)	*

Overall were you satisfied with the services in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Program?

Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied

The proportion of ADWS WIOA recipients who reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the services in the WIOA program ranged from 59% in the Central, City of Little Rock, and Northwest areas to 72% in the Eastern area. Several statistically significant differences were present among the gender groups. The Central, Eastern, North Central, Northwest, Southeast, Southwest, and West Central areas saw women reported the highest satisfaction rates, followed by men, and other gender identities. In addition, women reported higher satisfaction rates than men in the City of Little Rock area (Table 66).

Table 76: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Satisfied/Very Satisfied - (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Central	60.8 (57.5, 64)	57.4 (52.4, 62.3)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	26.3 (11.4, 49.8)	58.6 (55.7, 61.5)
City of Little Rock	61.1 (57.9, 64.2)	57.1 (52.1, 62)	*	33.3 (18.3, 52.7)	58.8 (55.9, 61.6)
Eastern	75.8 (67.7, 82.3)	67.7 (49.7, 81.7)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	*	72.3 (64.3, 79)
North Central	70.5 (65.8, 74.8)	63.2 (55.4, 70.4)	50 (12.3, 87.7)	20 (2.7, 69.1)	66.6 (62.2, 70.7)
Northeast	65.6 (61.1, 69.9)	61.2 (54.3, 67.7)	*	33.3 (11.1, 66.7)	63.2 (59.1, 67)
Northwest	61.9 (56.9, 66.6)	57.1 (50.2, 63.7)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	37.5 (12.5, 71.5)	59 (54.7, 63.2)
Southeast	68.8 (63.9, 73.3)	61.6 (53.5, 69.2)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	65.4 (60.9, 69.7)
Southwest	72.3 (67.9, 76.2)	71.5 (64.6, 77.5)	33.3 (4.3, 84.7)	50 (22.4, 77.6)	71.4 (67.5, 75)
West Central	63.6 (60.1, 67)	58.3 (53, 63.4)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	22.2 (5.6, 57.9)	60.6 (57.5, 63.7)
Western	62.9 (56.1, 69.3)	64.9 (55.7, 73.1)	*	37.5 (12.5, 71.5)	63.5 (57.8, 68.9)

The Central, City of Little Rock, North Central, Northeast, Southwest, and West Central areas saw the 18-24 age group report the highest rate of satisfaction with the WIOA program. The Central, City of Little Rock, Eastern, Southeast, and Southwest areas saw the 65+ age group report the lowest rate of satisfaction with the WIOA program (Table 67). The rankings within each area are presented below:

- 18-24, 45-64, 25-44, 65+: Central;
- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+: City of Little Rock, Southwest;
- 25-44, 45-64, 18-24, 65+: Eastern, Southeast;
- 18-24, 65+, 45-64, 25-44: North Central;

- 18-24, 45-64, 65+, 25-44: Northeast;
- 65+, 18-24, 25-44, 45-64: Northwest;
- 18-24, 65+, 25-44, 45-64: West Central;
- 65+, 18-24, 45-64, 25-44: Western;

Table 77: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Satisfied/Very Satisfied - (Confidence Limits)					
Age & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Central	75.7 (67.1, 82.6)	57.4 (53.1, 61.6)	57.7 (52.7, 62.5)	48.1 (36.2, 60.1)	43 (18.6, 71.4)
City of Little Rock	63.5 (54.1, 71.9)	62.1 (58.2, 65.9)	55.2 (50.1, 60.3)	45.2 (32.4, 58.7)	31.2 (13.3, 57.3)
Eastern	69.5 (52.1, 82.6)	74.4 (63.3, 83.1)	70.6 (52.1, 84.1)	68.5 (23.4, 93.9)	*
North Central	79.9 (65.8, 89.1)	63.9 (57.6, 69.7)	66.3 (58.7, 73.1)	75.2 (50.3, 90)	28.6 (4, 79.5)
Northeast	78.4 (68, 86.1)	60.3 (54.6, 65.8)	62.9 (55.4, 69.8)	62.5 (43.1, 78.6)	18.2 (2.5, 65.6)
Northwest	65.2 (50.3, 77.7)	60.3 (53.8, 66.5)	56.4 (49.6, 62.9)	67.4 (48.8, 81.7)	30.5 (9.3, 65.3)
Southeast	59.6 (46.5, 71.5)	69.5 (63.3, 75.1)	61.7 (53.5, 69.4)	59.4 (37.6, 78)	*
Southwest	80.9 (69.6, 88.6)	73.6 (68.2, 78.3)	66.8 (59.4, 73.4)	61.4 (42.5, 77.4)	57.7 (23.2, 86)
West Central	71.1 (60.4, 79.9)	60 (55.4, 64.5)	59.2 (54, 64.1)	62.8 (49.3, 74.5)	41.2 (15.2, 73.2)
Western	70.8 (50.1, 85.4)	61.7 (53, 69.7)	64.1 (54.8, 72.5)	76.3 (50.7, 91)	25.4 (6.3, 63.2)

In all areas, African American individuals reported a higher satisfaction rate with the WIOA program than white individuals (Table 68). The rankings within each area are shown below:

- AI, AA, H/L, T, W, A, O, PI: Central;
- AA, A, W, T, O, H/L, AI: City of Little Rock;
- AA, W, T: Eastern;
- A, T, AA, H/L, W, AI: North Central;
- H/L, A, AA, W, T: Northeast;
- A, AI, H/L, AA, W, O, T: Northwest;
- AA, W, T, AI, H/L: Southeast;

- H/L, AA, W, T, AI, O, A: Southwest;
- H/L, T, AA, O, W, AI: West Central;
- A, AA, W, O, T, H/L, AI: Western.

Table 78: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Satisfied/Very Satisfied - (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity & ADWS Area	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Central	83.8 (35.8, 98)	50.9 (23.8, 77.4)	67 (61.9, 71.7)	66.8 (47.3, 81.9)	49 (13.2, 85.9)	50.7 (20.2, 80.7)	24.9 (14.7, 38.9)	57.8 (36.7, 76.4)	56.6 (52.7, 60.4)
City of Little Rock	26 (3.9, 75.6)	55.1 (27.8, 79.7)	66.8 (63.2, 70.3)	36.2 (18.9, 57.9)	*	40.4 (20.5, 64)	35.9 (22.7, 51.6)	47.5 (30.8, 64.8)	51.4 (46.1, 56.5)
Eastern	*	*	76.3 (67.6, 83.3)	*	*	*	*	42.4 (8.8, 84.9)	66.9 (44.5, 83.5)
North Central	24 (2.6, 78.6)	80 (30.9, 97.3)	78 (60.4, 89.1)	69.3 (29.1, 92.6)	*	*	43.6 (15.9, 76)	79.9 (54.9, 92.8)	65.6 (60.8, 70.1)
Northeast	*	76 (21.4, 97.4)	69.9 (62.1, 76.6)	89.1 (49.7, 98.5)	*	*	31.8 (13.3, 58.5)	29 (8.6, 64)	62.1 (57.2, 66.8)
Northwest	76.6 (44.6, 93)	84.6 (38.5, 98)	72.2 (49.5, 87.3)	73.7 (53, 87.4)	*	58.7 (21, 88.3)	28.8 (12.8, 52.6)	33.3 (10.5, 68.1)	58.8 (54.1, 63.4)
Southeast	43.2 (10.1, 83.8)	*	69.5 (64, 74.6)	42.9 (14.4, 77)	*	*	50 (21.3, 78.7)	50 (15.2, 84.8)	62.6 (54.5, 70.2)
Southwest	63.4 (23.7, 90.6)	32.1 (9.2, 68.8)	76.1 (70.8, 80.6)	88 (61.2, 97.2)	*	56.8 (16.2, 89.9)	53.4 (33.7, 72.1)	67.4 (36.3, 88.2)	69.1 (62.6, 74.8)
West Central	51.7 (26.5, 76)	*	66.5 (57.8, 74.1)	74.6 (57.5, 86.4)	*	64.2 (34.8, 85.8)	33.5 (16.4, 56.4)	68.6 (46.2, 84.8)	59 (55.3, 62.6)
Western	50 (18.4, 81.6)	81.6 (45.7, 95.9)	67.2 (47.9, 82.1)	58.5 (33.8, 79.6)	*	60.6 (13.7, 93.7)	15.9 (3.8, 47.4)	60 (20, 90)	65.5 (58.9, 71.6)

The Central, City of Little Rock, Northeast, and West Central areas saw individuals with high school or GED education report the highest satisfaction rate with the WIOA program. In addition, the North Central, Northwest, and Southwest areas saw individuals with less than high school education report the highest satisfaction rate with the WIOA program. The Central, City of Little Rock, Southeast, Southwest, and West Central areas saw individuals with a graduate or professional degree report the lowest satisfaction rate with the WIOA program. The rankings within each area are shown below:

- HS, AD, SC, LHS, BD, G/P: Central;
- HS, SC, AD, BD, LHS, G/P: City of Little Rock;
- AD, LHS, SC, HS, BD: Eastern;
- LHS, G/P, SC, HS, BD, AD: North Central;
- HS, AD, SC, G/P, BD, LHS: Northeast;
- LHS, SC, HS, G/P, AD, BD: Northwest;
- AD, SC, HS, BD, LHS, G/P: Southeast;
- LHS, AD, HS, SC, BD, G/P: Southwest;
- HS, LHS, SC, AD, BD, G/P: West Central;
- G/P, AD, SC, HS, LHS, BD: Western.

Table 79: Satisfaction with the WIOA Program - by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Satisfied/Very Satisfied - (Confidence Limits)							
Education & ADWS Area	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Central	55.1 (34.6, 73.9)	64.7 (59.1, 69.9)	58.5 (53.5, 63.4)	61.2 (53.3, 68.7)	53.9 (46.2, 61.4)	41.9 (31.7, 53)	*
City of Little Rock	49.1 (31, 67.4)	68.7 (63, 73.9)	59.1 (54.2, 63.9)	57.7 (49.6, 65.4)	55 (48, 61.8)	44.9 (35.9, 54.3)	50 (5.9, 94.1)
Eastern	76 (43.5, 92.9)	70.7 (57.5, 81.1)	74 (60.3, 84.1)	84.2 (64.3, 94.1)	30.4 (6.5, 73.2)	*	*

North Central	83.3 (49.8, 96.2)	67 (59.6, 73.6)	67.1 (59.1, 74.2)	62 (50.3, 72.4)	64.3 (50.3, 76.3)	77.4 (56.6, 90)	*
Northeast	48.5 (26.8, 70.8)	69.4 (63, 75.2)	60.4 (53.3, 67)	60.6 (48.9, 71.3)	55.1 (41.4, 68)	58.7 (38.9, 76)	*
Northwest	79.3 (53.8, 92.7)	57.9 (49.1, 66.3)	63.3 (55.9, 70.1)	54.8 (44.1, 65)	53.9 (43, 64.5)	55.5 (38.8, 71)	31.5 (2.8, 88)
Southeast	46.5 (24.8, 69.6)	63.5 (55.3, 70.9)	70.5 (62.9, 77.1)	74 (61.8, 83.3)	57.1 (44.1, 69.1)	44.7 (22.7, 69)	*
Southwest	81.2 (57, 93.4)	74.4 (67.6, 80.3)	71 (64.4, 76.8)	79 (68, 87)	61.4 (48, 73.3)	55 (37.9, 71)	59.4 (11.1, 94.4)
West Central	60.3 (43.2, 75.2)	66 (60.3, 71.2)	59.3 (53.7, 64.5)	59.1 (50.1, 67.5)	57.7 (49, 65.9)	50.7 (37.9, 63.4)	*
Western	56.8 (16.2, 89.9)	63.4 (51.9, 73.6)	64.5 (55.4, 72.8)	67.9 (52.7, 80.1)	52.8 (37.5, 67.6)	76.7 (48.8, 91.9)	*

How satisfied were you with the professionalism and accessibility of staff?

Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied

The proportion of ADWS WIOA recipients who reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied in ADWS staff ranged from 64% in the Central and City of Little Rock areas to 79% in the Eastern area. Several statistically significant differences were present among the gender groups. Among the Eastern, North Central, and Southwest areas, women reported the highest satisfaction rate in ADWS staff, followed by men, and other gender identities. In the Central and Northwest areas, men reported the highest satisfaction rate in ADWS staff, followed by women, and other gender identities. Lastly, women reported higher satisfaction rates in the ADWS staff than men in the Western area (Table 70).

Table 80: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Satisfied/Very Satisfied - (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Central	63.8 (60.5, 66.9)	65.7 (60.8, 70.3)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	31.6 (14.9, 54.8)	64.2 (61.3, 67)
City of Little Rock	64.8 (61.7, 67.8)	64.8 (59.9, 69.5)	*	40.7 (24.2, 59.7)	64.2 (61.4, 67)
Eastern	86.4 (79.4, 91.2)	67.7 (49.7, 81.7)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	*	79.2 (71.3, 85.3)
North Central	77.6 (73.2, 81.5)	67.7 (60, 74.6)	50 (12.3, 87.7)	20 (2.7, 69.1)	72.4 (68.2, 76.3)
Northeast	67.4 (63, 71.6)	67.2 (60.4, 73.3)	*	44.4 (17.7, 74.9)	67.1 (63.1, 70.8)
Northwest	64 (59, 68.6)	65.9 (59.1, 72)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	62.5 (28.5, 87.5)	64.9 (60.7, 68.9)
Southeast	69.3 (64.5, 73.8)	68.5 (60.5, 75.5)	*	*	68.4 (64, 72.5)
Southwest	77.4 (73.3, 81)	73.1 (66.3, 79)	33.3 (4.3, 84.7)	80 (45.9, 95)	75.2 (71.5, 78.7)
West Central	70.4 (67, 73.6)	68.8 (63.7, 73.5)	*	11.1 (1.5, 50)	69.2 (66.2, 72.1)
Western	76.1 (69.8, 81.4)	63.2 (54, 71.5)	*	62.5 (28.5, 87.5)	69 (63.2, 74.2)

The age groups had a few statistically significant differences. All areas, except for the Eastern, Northwest, and Southeast areas, saw the 18-24 age group report the highest satisfaction rate in the ADWS staff. The City of Little Rock, Eastern, Southeast, and Southwest areas saw the 65+ age group report the lowest satisfaction rate in the ADWS staff, while the Central, Northwest, and West Central areas saw the 45-64 age group report the lowest satisfaction rate in the ADWS staff (Table 71). The rankings within each area are presented below:

- 18-24, 65+, 25-44, 45-64: Central, West Central;
- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+: City of Little Rock, Southwest;

- 45-64, 25-44, 18-24, 65+: Eastern;
- 18-24, 65+, 45-64, 25-44: North Central, Northeast;
- 65+, 25-44, 18-24, 45-64: Northwest;
- 25-44, 45-64, 18-24, 65+: Southeast;
- 18-24, 45-64, 65+, 25-44: Western.

Table 81: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Satisfied/Very Satisfied - (Confidence Limits)					
Age & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Central	69.7 (60.6, 77.4)	63.8 (59.6, 67.8)	63.5 (58.6, 68.1)	66.3 (54, 76.6)	43 (18.6, 71.4)
City of Little Rock	67.8 (58.6, 75.8)	64.7 (60.8, 68.4)	64 (59, 68.7)	59 (45.2, 71.5)	42.2 (20.7, 67.1)
Eastern	73.4 (55.6, 85.8)	81.4 (70.3, 89)	86.8 (68.7, 95.2)	34.2 (4.9, 84)	*
North Central	81.3 (67.8, 90)	70.7 (64.6, 76.2)	72.7 (65.3, 79.1)	74.5 (47.4, 90.4)	28.6 (4, 79.5)
Northeast	74.7 (64, 83.1)	64.3 (58.6, 69.6)	68 (60.7, 74.6)	74.6 (56.1, 87.1)	36.4 (9.4, 75.8)
Northwest	65 (49.8, 77.6)	67.1 (60.8, 72.9)	62.4 (55.7, 68.7)	71.5 (52.6, 85)	48.6 (18.4, 79.9)
Southeast	63.7 (50.4, 75.1)	72.2 (66.1, 77.5)	67.4 (59.4, 74.5)	50.9 (30.3, 71.2)	*
Southwest	87.7 (77.8, 93.5)	77.1 (72, 81.6)	71.9 (64.5, 78.3)	51.9 (34.3, 69)	73.1 (34.2, 93.4)
West Central	75.5 (65.3, 83.5)	68.7 (64.2, 72.9)	68.3 (63.4, 72.9)	75.4 (62, 85.2)	31.8 (9.9, 66.5)
Western	79.7 (60, 91.1)	63.6 (54.7, 71.7)	73.4 (64.3, 80.9)	69.5 (44.2, 86.7)	58.8 (25.8, 85.4)

In all areas, except the Western area, African American individuals reported a higher satisfaction rate in ADWS staff than white individuals. In addition, in all areas, except the North Central and West Central areas, white individuals reported a higher satisfaction rate in ADWS staff than individuals who identified as two or more races (Table 72). The rankings within each area are shown below:

- AI, H/L, AA, A, W, O, T, PI: Central;
- A, AA, W, H/L, T, O, AI: City of Little Rock;
- AA, W, H/L, T: Eastern;
- H/L, AA, T, W, AI: North Central;
- AA, A, W, T: Northeast;
- AA, H/L, W, AI, O, T: Northwest;
- AA, AI, W, T, O, H/L: Southeast;
- AA, H/L, A, W, AI, T, O: Southwest;
- H/L, A, AA, T, W, AI, O: West Central;
- A, T, W, AA, O, AI, H/L: Western.

Table 82: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Satisfied/Very Satisfied - (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity & ADWS Area	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Central	83.8 (35.8, 98)	67.2 (36.4, 88)	71.4 (66.4, 75.9)	71.7 (52.1, 85.5)	49 (13.2, 85.9)	58.7 (25.7, 85.4)	30 (18.4, 45)	54.1 (33.4, 73.5)	63 (59.2, 66.6)
City of Little Rock	26 (3.9, 75.6)	75.6 (46.9, 91.6)	70.2 (66.6, 73.5)	56.4 (35.4, 75.3)	*	48.6 (26.7, 71.1)	44.2 (30, 59.5)	54 (36.4, 70.7)	58.5 (53.3, 63.5)
Eastern	*	*	84.7 (76.5, 90.4)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	*	*	*	42.4 (8.8, 84.9)	76.5 (52.8, 90.4)
North Central	47.9 (7.7, 91)	*	77.6 (59.1, 89.3)	79 (31.3, 96.9)	*	*	51.3 (21.4, 80.3)	74 (45, 90.8)	72 (67.4, 76.2)
Northeast	*	76 (21.4, 97.4)	77.9 (70.8, 83.7)	*	*	*	33.3 (14.3, 60.1)	9.7 (1.3, 47)	65 (60.1, 69.6)
Northwest	58.9 (29.5, 83.1)	*	79 (56, 91.7)	71.6 (50.5, 86.2)	*	58.7 (21, 88.3)	32.3 (15.3, 55.9)	46.9 (18.3, 77.7)	65.7 (61.1, 70)
Southeast	72.8 (30.1, 94.3)	*	73.3 (67.9, 78.1)	42.9 (14.4, 77)	*	50 (5.9, 94.1)	22.5 (6.8, 53.4)	64 (25.7, 90.2)	64.1 (56, 71.5)
Southwest	63.4 (23.7, 90.6)	78.6 (40.7, 95.1)	83 (78.3, 86.9)	82 (54.7, 94.5)	*	27.2 (5.7, 69.9)	39.8 (22.3, 60.4)	61.1 (31.5, 84.2)	72 (65.6, 77.6)

West Central	67.5 (39.8, 86.7)	78.1 (41.1, 94.8)	76.7 (68.5, 83.3)	80.1 (63.5, 90.2)	*	52.3 (24.7, 78.5)	33.5 (16.4, 56.4)	72 (49.5, 87.1)	68.4 (64.9, 71.7)
Western	59.7 (24.1, 87.3)	90.8 (53.8, 98.8)	66.8 (46.9, 82.1)	32.9 (15.8, 56)	*	60.6 (13.7, 93.7)	62.5 (31.4, 85.9)	80 (30.9, 97.3)	71.9 (65.3, 77.6)

The educational groups had several statistically significant differences. All areas, except for the Western area, saw the highest satisfaction rates in ADWS staff reported by individuals with either less than high school education, high school or GED education, or some college education. The Central, Northeast, Southeast, and Southwest areas saw individuals with a graduate or professional degree report the lowest satisfaction rates in ADWS staff. The rankings within each area are shown below:

- HS, BD, AD, SC, LHS, G/P: Central;
- HS, AD, LHS, SC, G/P, BD: City of Little Rock;
- SC, BD, HS, LHS: Eastern;
- SC, BD, LHS, G/P, HS, AD: North Central;
- HS, AD, LHS, SC, BD, G/P: Northeast;
- LHS, HS, AD, SC, G/P, BD: Northwest;
- SC, AD, HS, BD, LHS, G/P: Southeast;
- LHS, HS, SC, BD, AD, G/P: Southwest;
- LHS, AD, BD, HS, G/P, SC: West Central;
- G/P, BD, SC, LHS, HS, AD: Western.

Table 83: Satisfaction in ADWS Staff - by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Satisfied/Very Satisfied - (Confidence Limits)							
Education & ADWS Area	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Central	61.8 (40.4, 79.4)	70.8 (65.4, 75.6)	62.1 (57.1, 66.8)	62.8 (54.9, 70)	63.1 (55.5, 70.1)	55 (44.1, 65.6)	*

City of Little Rock	65.5 (45.8, 81)	69.1 (63.4, 74.3)	62.8 (57.9, 67.5)	66.7 (58.7, 73.8)	59.7 (52.7, 66.3)	62.7 (53.4, 71.1)	50 (5.9, 94.1)
Eastern	58.7 (25.7, 85.4)	70.5 (57, 81.1)	84.3 (70.7, 92.2)	*	71.7 (21.6, 95.9)	*	*
North Central	71.9 (39.3, 91)	70.5 (63.2, 76.9)	78 (70.8, 83.9)	66.9 (55.1, 76.8)	75 (61, 85.2)	71.1 (50.6, 85.5)	*
Northeast	66.9 (42.9, 84.4)	71.3 (65, 76.9)	66 (59, 72.3)	68.2 (56.7, 77.9)	56.8 (43, 69.6)	53.4 (34.1, 71.8)	*
Northwest	80 (58.3, 92)	68.6 (60, 76.2)	63.3 (56, 70.1)	67 (56.5, 76)	60.6 (49.7, 70.6)	61.1 (44.3, 75.7)	31.5 (2.8, 88)
Southeast	51.9 (28.7, 74.4)	67.6 (59.6, 74.6)	72.1 (64.7, 78.5)	71.7 (59.5, 81.4)	65.4 (52.5, 76.4)	49.6 (26.3, 73)	*
Southwest	81.2 (57, 93.4)	79.7 (73, 85.1)	75 (68.7, 80.4)	72.1 (60.4, 81.5)	73 (59.5, 83.2)	62.3 (44.5, 77.3)	59.4 (11.1, 94.4)
West Central	72.2 (55.1, 84.6)	70.3 (64.7, 75.3)	66.1 (60.7, 71.1)	71.9 (63.1, 79.3)	70.8 (62.5, 77.9)	69.9 (57.1, 80.2)	*
Western	70.4 (20.5, 95.7)	64.9 (53, 75.2)	70.5 (61.3, 78.4)	64.1 (48.4, 77.3)	72.2 (57, 83.6)	81.2 (52.3, 94.4)	*

Were you able to find employment in your career field after you completed this program?

No, I Did Not Find Employment; Yes, I Found Employment, but Not in My Career Field; Yes, I Found Employment in My Career Field

The proportion of ADWS WIOA recipients who reported that they found employment – either not in their career field or in their career field ranged from 46% in the City of the Little Rock and Western areas to 67% in the Eastern area. Several statistically significant differences were present among the gender groups. In the City of Little Rock, North Central, and Southeast areas, individuals who identified as other genders reported the highest rates of attaining employment, followed by women, and men. In the Southeast and West Central region, women reported higher

rates of attaining employment than men.

Table 84: Rate of Finding Employment -by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Found Employment- (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Central	48.7 (44.7, 52.8)	45.5 (39.7, 51.4)	*	25 (8.3, 55.2)	46.7 (43.2 ,50.3)
City of Little Rock	47.7 (44, 51.5)	43.8 (38.1, 49.6)	50 (5.9, 94.1)	42.1 (22.6, 64.4)	45.8 (42.5 ,49.2)
Eastern	66.7 (56.8, 75.2)	65.2 (44.3, 81.6)	*	*	66.5 (57.1 ,74.8)
North Central	60.9 (54.6, 66.8)	44.6 (35.2, 54.3)	66.7 (15.3, 95.7)	33.3 (4.3, 84.7)	53.1 (47.4 ,58.7)
Northeast	52.1 (46.3, 57.8)	47.2 (39.1, 55.4)	*	*	49.1 (44.1 ,54.2)
Northwest	51.9 (45.9, 57.9)	48.6 (40.6, 56.7)	*	25 (3.3, 76.2)	50.1 (45 ,55.3)
Southeast	55.1 (48.9, 61.1)	48.5 (39.1, 58.1)	*	*	51.7 (46.2 ,57.2)
Southwest	54.2 (48.5, 59.7)	53.1 (44.5, 61.5)	66.7 (15.3, 95.7)	50 (12.3, 87.7)	53.7 (48.6 ,58.7)
West Central	50.9 (46.5, 55.4)	42.9 (36.9, 49.2)	*	25 (3.3, 76.2)	46.6 (42.7 ,50.5)
Western	50.6 (42.9, 58.4)	43.3 (33.8, 53.3)	*	33.3 (8.4, 73.2)	46.2 (39.8 ,52.7)

There were several statistically significant differences among age groups. The Central, City of Little Rock, Northeast, North Central, and Southwest areas saw the 18-24 age group report the highest rate of attaining employment. In addition, the Northwest, West Central, and Western areas saw the 45-64 age group report the highest rate of attaining employment. The Central, City of Little Rock, Northeast, Northwest, West Central, and Western areas saw the 65+ age group report the lowest rate of attaining employment (Table 75). The rankings within each area are presented below:

- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+: Central, City of Little Rock, Northeast;

- 25-44, 18-24, 45-64: Eastern;
- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64: North Central, Southwest;
- 45-64, 25-44, 18-24, 65+: Northwest, Western;
- 25-44, 45-64, 18-24: Southeast;
- 45-64, 18-24, 25-44, 65+: West Central.

Table 85: Rate of Finding Employment -by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Found Employment - (Confidence Limits)					
Age & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Age 18 – 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Central	90.1 (78.7, 95.8)	87.1 (81.3, 91.3)	79 (69.6, 86.1)	70.4 (43, 88.3)	27.3 (3.3, 80.5)
City of Little Rock	92.7 (84.4, 96.7)	90 (85.7, 93.1)	87.3 (79, 92.7)	75 (35.2, 94.3)	53.3 (15.6, 87.6)
Eastern	86 (62.6, 95.8)	95.5 (83.5, 98.9)	78.3 (52.2, 92.3)	*	*
North Central	90.9 (73.7, 97.3)	87.7 (78.5, 93.3)	77.6 (63.5, 87.4)	*	*
Northeast	97.9 (86.2, 99.7)	91.9 (84.9, 95.8)	87.1 (74.3, 94)	82.6 (48.3, 96)	*
Northwest	83.4 (61.2, 94.1)	87.2 (77.3, 93.2)	89.9 (80.8, 94.9)	57.5 (27.4, 82.9)	63.6 (13.6, 95.1)
Southeast	81.8 (61.5, 92.7)	90.6 (82.2, 95.3)	87.3 (73.6, 94.5)	*	*
Southwest	91.4 (74.6, 97.4)	88.6 (81.9, 93)	88.1 (78.2, 93.8)	*	*
West Central	84.7 (66.6, 93.9)	84.6 (77.9, 89.5)	92.4 (84.3, 96.5)	59 (32.3, 81.3)	42.8 (4.5, 92.3)
Western	66.4 (38.8, 86)	76.8 (62.4, 86.9)	79.8 (63.5, 89.9)	31.5 (2.8, 88.1)	*

In all areas, except for the North Central, Southeast, and Western areas, African American individuals reported a higher rate of attaining employment than white individuals (Table 76). The rankings within each area are shown below:

- AA, W, T, O: Central;

- AA, W, T, H/L: City of Little Rock;
- AA, W: Eastern, Northeast, Southwest;
- W, AA, T: North Central, Southeast;
- AA, H/L, W: Northwest;
- AA, W, H/L, T, A: West Central;
- H/L, W, A: Western.

Table 86: Rate of Finding Employment -by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Found Employment - (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity & ADWS Area	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Central	*	*	85.6 (78, 91)	*	*	65.8 (16, 95.1)	63 (30.6, 86.8)	83.6 (52, 96)	83.6 (77.6, 88.2)
City of Little Rock	*	*	90.8 (86.9, 93.6)	75 (35.2, 94.3)	*	*	61.3 (32.9, 83.6)	85.4 (62.3, 95.4)	87.8 (79.8, 92.9)
Eastern	*	*	89.2 (79.2, 94.7)	*	*	*	*	*	76.8 (28, 96.6)
North Central	*	*	80 (50.6, 94)	*	*	*	*	77.2 (27.7, 96.8)	86.4 (79.7, 91.2)
Northeast	*	*	92.2 (80.1, 97.2)	*	*	*	*	*	90.6 (84.4, 94.5)
Northwest	*	*	92.7 (60.9, 99)	88.7 (63, 97.3)	*	*	85.2 (39.7, 98.1)	*	84.3 (77.3, 89.5)
Southeast	*	*	89.2 (82.1, 93.8)	*	*	*	*	24 (2.6, 78.6)	92.7 (78.9, 97.7)
Southwest	*	*	88.8 (81.8, 93.4)	*	*	*	88.7 (48.1, 98.5)	*	87.7 (79.2, 93)
West Central	*	58 (12.5, 93)	93.4 (84.9, 97.3)	74.8 (47.3, 90.8)	*	*	46.1 (10.7, 86)	66.7 (24.6, 92.4)	85.9 (80.3, 90)

Western	*	33.3 (4.3, 84.7)	*	83.8 (35.8, 98)	*	*	*	*	74.1 (63.3, 82.6)

The Central, City of Little, Northeast, Northwest, and Southwest areas, saw individuals with a high school or GED education report the highest rates of attaining employment. The City of Little Rock, Eastern, Northeast, and Western areas saw individuals with a Bachelor's degree report the lowest rates of attaining employment. The rankings within each area are shown below:

- HS, SC, BD, AD, G/P: Central;
- HS, SC, LHS, AD, G/P, BD: City of Little Rock;
- SC, HS, BD: Eastern;
- AD, G/P, HS, SC, LHS: North Central;
- HS, AD, SC, LHS, BD: Northeast;
- HS, AD, BD, SC, G/P: Northwest;
- HS, G/P, BD, SC, LHS, AD: Southeast;
- BD, AD, SC, HS, LHS: Southwest;
- G/P, SC, HS, BD, AD: West Central;
- AD, SC, HS, BD: Western.

Table 87: Rate of Finding Employment -by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Found Employment - (Confidence Limits)							
Education & ADWS Area	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Central	*	88.1 (80.2, 93.1)	87.1 (80.2, 91.9)	76.2 (60.9, 86.8)	78.7 (65.6, 87.8)	74.1 (50.7, 88.8)	*
City of Little Rock	90.3 (52.9, 98.7)	93.2 (88.4, 96.2)	92.2 (85.8, 95.8)	88.8 (77.8, 94.7)	77.2 (65.9, 85.6)	87.1 (71, 94.9)	*
Eastern	*	83.1 (63.9, 93.2)	91 (75.4, 97.1)	*	81.8 (31.2, 97.8)	*	*
North Central	58 (12.5, 93)	84.5 (71.8, 92.1)	81.3 (68.4, 89.7)	92.7 (79.5, 97.7)	87.7 (60, 97.1)	*	*

Northeast	88.3 (45.2, 98.6)	93.7 (85.9, 97.3)	89.5 (78.6, 95.2)	92.1 (73.1, 98)	79.3 (53.8, 92.7)	*	*
Northwest	*	90.9 (76.8, 96.8)	85.3 (74.5, 92.1)	88.6 (71.8, 96)	88.5 (71.8, 95.9)	61.2 (34.4, 82.6)	*
Southeast	83.8 (35.8, 98)	93.3 (84.1, 97.4)	86.7 (74, 93.7)	81.2 (60.5, 92.4)	88.4 (49.6, 98.3)	89.1 (49.7, 98.5)	*
Southwest	65.4 (29.5, 89.5)	88.1 (79.5, 93.3)	88.6 (79.3, 94)	92.2 (77.9, 97.5)	96.7 (79.3, 99.5)	*	*
West Central	*	85.6 (76.4, 91.6)	86.7 (78.2, 92.2)	81 (67.1, 90)	83.6 (68.6, 92.3)	92.2 (61.2, 98.9)	*
Western	*	65.3 (45.4, 81)	73 (57.1, 84.6)	92.2 (61.2, 98.9)	62.2 (32, 85.2)	*	*

If you found employment, are you likely to keep this job over the next six months?

Yes; No; Unsure

The proportion of ADWS WIOA recipients who found employment and reported that they would likely retain the position over the next six months ranged from 75% in the Western area to 91% in the Northeast area. Several statistically significant differences were present among the gender groups. Among the Central, West Central, and Western areas, women were more confident in retaining their employment in the next six months than men. In the City of Little Rock and Southwest areas, men were more confident in retaining their employment in the next six months than women.

Table 88: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Yes - (Confidence Limits)					
Gender Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Female	Male	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Total
Central	87.2 (82.7, 90.6)	82.3 (74.5, 88)	*	*	84.2 (79.9 ,87.7)
City of Little Rock	87.3 (83.3, 90.5)	92.5 (86.2, 96.1)	*	50 (20, 80)	89 (85.6 ,91.6)
Eastern	89.2 (79.1, 94.8)	86.7 (59.4, 96.6)	*	*	88.5 (78.6 ,94.2)
North Central	87.8 (81.5, 92.2)	82.2 (68.3, 90.9)	*	*	85.8 (79.5 ,90.4)
Northeast	89.8 (83.8, 93.8)	92.4 (83, 96.8)	*	*	91.1 (86.2 ,94.4)
Northwest	86.8 (80, 91.5)	85.9 (75.8, 92.3)	*	*	86 (80.2 ,90.4)
Southeast	90.6 (84.6, 94.5)	86 (73.4, 93.2)	*	*	88.6 (82.5 ,92.8)
Southwest	85.2 (78.8, 89.9)	94 (85.1, 97.7)	*	50 (5.9, 94.1)	89.1 (84.4 ,92.5)
West Central	88.8 (84.2, 92.2)	82.9 (74.4, 88.9)	*	*	85.7 (81.1 ,89.3)
Western	85.9 (76.3, 92)	66.7 (51.3, 79.2)	*	50 (5.9, 94.1)	75.1 (65.6 ,82.7)

A few statistically significant differences existed among the age groups. The Central, City of Little Rock, Northeast, North Central, and Southwest areas saw the 18-24 age group report the strongest confidence in retaining their new position over the next six months. In addition, the Northwest, West Central, and Western areas saw the 45-64 age group report the strongest confidence in retaining their new position over the next six months. All areas, except for the North Central, Southeast, and Southwest areas, saw the 65+ age group report the weakest confidence in confidence in retaining their new position over the next six months (Table 79). The rankings within each area are presented below:

- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+: Central, City of Little Rock, Northeast;

- 25-44, 18-24, 65+: Eastern;
- 18-24, 25-44, 45-64: North Central, Southwest;
- 45-64, 25-44, 18-24, 65+: Northwest, Western;
- 25-44, 45-64, 18-24: Southeast;
- 45-64, 18-24, 25-44, 65+: West Central.

Table 89: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Age Group & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Yes - (Confidence Limits)					
Age & ADWS Local Workforce Development Area	Age 18 - 24	Age 25 - 44	Age 45 - 64	Age 65+	Refuse to Disclose
Central	90.1 (78.7, 95.8)	87.1 (81.3, 91.3)	79 (69.6, 86.1)	70.4 (43, 88.3)	27.3 (3.3, 80.5)
City of Little Rock	92.7 (84.4, 96.7)	90 (85.7, 93.1)	87.3 (79, 92.7)	75 (35.2, 94.3)	53.3 (15.6, 87.6)
Eastern	86 (62.6, 95.8)	95.5 (83.5, 98.9)	78.3 (52.2, 92.3)	*	*
North Central	90.9 (73.7, 97.3)	87.7 (78.5, 93.3)	77.6 (63.5, 87.4)	*	*
Northeast	97.9 (86.2, 99.7)	91.9 (84.9, 95.8)	87.1 (74.3, 94)	82.6 (48.3, 96)	*
Northwest	83.4 (61.2, 94.1)	87.2 (77.3, 93.2)	89.9 (80.8, 94.9)	57.5 (27.4, 82.9)	63.6 (13.6, 95.1)
Southeast	81.8 (61.5, 92.7)	90.6 (82.2, 95.3)	87.3 (73.6, 94.5)	*	*
Southwest	91.4 (74.6, 97.4)	88.6 (81.9, 93)	88.1 (78.2, 93.8)	*	*
West Central	84.7 (66.6, 93.9)	84.6 (77.9, 89.5)	92.4 (84.3, 96.5)	59 (32.3, 81.3)	42.8 (4.5, 92.3)
Western	66.4 (38.8, 86)	76.8 (62.4, 86.9)	79.8 (63.5, 89.9)	31.5 (2.8, 88.1)	*

For all areas, except the North Central and Western areas, African American individuals reported a stronger confidence in retaining their new position in the next six months than white individuals (Table 80). The rankings within each area are:

- AA, W, T, O: Central;
- AA, W, T, H/L: City of Little Rock;

- AA, W: Eastern, Northeast, Southeast, Southwest;
- W, AA: North Central;
- AA, H/L, W: Northwest;
- AA, W, H/L, T, A: West Central ;
- H/L, W, A: Western.

Table 90: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment - by Racial/Ethnic Identity & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Yes - (Confidence Limits)									
Race/ Ethnicity & ADWS Area	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Other	Refuse to Disclose	Two or More Races	White
Central	*	*	85.6 (78, 91)	*	*	65.8 (16, 95.1)	63 (30.6, 86.8)	83.6 (52, 96)	83.6 (77.6, 88.2)
City of Little Rock	*	*	90.8 (86.9, 93.6)	75 (35.2, 94.3)	*	*	61.3 (32.9, 83.6)	85.4 (62.3, 95.4)	87.8 (79.8, 92.9)
Eastern	*	*	89.2 (79.2, 94.7)	*	*	*	*	*	76.8 (28, 96.6)
North Central	*	*	80 (50.6, 94)	*	*	*	*	77.2 (27.7, 96.8)	86.4 (79.7, 91.2)
Northeast	*	*	92.2 (80.1, 97.2)	*	*	*	*	*	90.6 (84.4, 94.5)
Northwest	*	*	92.7 (60.9, 99)	88.7 (63, 97.3)	*	*	85.2 (39.7, 98.1)	*	84.3 (77.3, 89.5)
Southeast	*	*	89.2 (82.1, 93.8)	*	*	*	*	24 (2.6, 78.6)	92.7 (78.9, 97.7)
Southwest	*	*	88.8 (81.8, 93.4)	*	*	*	88.7 (48.1, 98.5)	*	87.7 (79.2, 93)
West Central	*	58 (12.5, 93)	93.4 (84.9, 97.3)	74.8 (47.3, 90.8)	*	*	46.1 (10.7, 86)	66.7 (24.6, 92.4)	85.9 (80.3, 90)
Western	*	33.3 (4.3, 84.7)	*	83.8 (35.8, 98)	*	*	*	*	74.1 (63.3, 82.6)

The Central, City of Little Rock, Northeast, Northwest, and Southeast areas saw individuals with high school or GED education report the strongest confidence in retaining their new position in the next six months. In addition, North Central and Western areas saw individuals with an Associate's degree report the strongest confidence in retaining their new position in the next six months. The City of Little Rock, Eastern, Northeast, and Western areas saw individuals with a Bachelor's degree report the weakest confidence in retaining their new position in the next six month. The rankings within each are shown below:

- HS, SC, BD, AD, G/P: Central;
- HS, SC, LHS, AD, G/P, BD: City of Little Rock;
- SC, HS, BD: Eastern;
- AD, BD, HS, SC, LHS: North Central;
- HS, AD, SC, LHS, BD: Northeast;
- HS, AD, BD, SC, G/P: Northwest;
- HS, G/P, BD, SC, LHS, AD: Southeast;
- BD, AD, SC, HS, LHS: Southwest;
- G/P, SC, HS, BD, AD: West Central;
- AD, SC, HS, BD: Western.

Table 91: Confidence Rate of Retaining New Employment –
by Educational Attainment & ADWS Local Workforce Development Areas

Percentage of Respondents – Yes - (Confidence Limits)							
Education & ADWS Area	Less than High School	High School or GED	Some College	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree	Unknown
Central	*	88.1 (80.2, 93.1)	87.1 (80.2, 91.9)	76.2 (60.9, 86.8)	78.7 (65.6, 87.8)	74.1 (50.7, 88.8)	*
City of Little Rock	90.3 (52.9, 98.7)	93.2 (88.4, 96.2)	92.2 (85.8, 95.8)	88.8 (77.8, 94.7)	77.2 (65.9, 85.6)	87.1 (71, 94.9)	*
Eastern	*	83.1 (63.9, 93.2)	91 (75.4, 97.1)	*	81.8 (31.2, 97.8)	*	*
North Central	58 (12.5, 93)	84.5 (71.8, 92.1)	81.3 (68.4, 89.7)	92.7 (79.5, 97.7)	87.7 (60, 97.1)	*	*
Northeast	88.3 (45.2, 98.6)	93.7 (85.9, 97.3)	89.5 (78.6, 95.2)	92.1 (73.1, 98)	79.3 (53.8, 92.7)	*	*
Northwest	*	90.9 (76.8, 96.8)	85.3 (74.5, 92.1)	88.6 (71.8, 96)	88.5 (71.8, 95.9)	61.2 (34.4, 82.6)	*
Southeast	83.8 (35.8, 98)	93.3 (84.1, 97.4)	86.7 (74, 93.7)	81.2 (60.5, 92.4)	88.4 (49.6, 98.3)	89.1 (49.7, 98.5)	*
Southwest	65.4 (29.5, 89.5)	88.1 (79.5, 93.3)	88.6 (79.3, 94)	92.2 (77.9, 97.5)	96.7 (79.3, 99.5)	*	*
West Central	*	85.6 (76.4, 91.6)	86.7 (78.2, 92.2)	81 (67.1, 90)	83.6 (68.6, 92.3)	92.2 (61.2, 98.9)	*
Western	*	65.3 (45.4, 81)	73 (57.1, 84.6)	92.2 (61.2, 98.9)	62.2 (32, 85.2)	*	*

Comments from WIOA Recipients

As part of the evaluation of WIOA services, survey respondents were offered the opportunity to provide feedback comments. In total, 4,743 comments were provided with 3,653 unique comments. See Figure 4 for details.

The largest category of comments were “Nothing/No Changes” at 36.1% of total comments. The comments contained phrases such as “Nothing”, “None”, “No Complaints”, “No Changes”, “No Suggestion, “Not change anything”, etc. The category suggests that many individuals were sufficiently satisfied from their participation in the WIOA program. The categories of “Unsure” and “Not Applicable” comprised 1.1% and 0.9% of total comments, respectively. The former category contained phrases such as “Not Sure”, “Unsure,” or “I Don’t Know”, while the latter category contained obscure or irrelevant comments.

The next most common category was “Better Customer Service” at 16.5% of total comments. The comments centered on staff being characterized as “rude”, “unprofessional”, “uninformed”, “poor attitudes”, “unfriendly”, “inattentive”, “impatient”, and/or “unhelpful.” The category suggests that the ADWS needs to improve on customer service, possibly through training and feedback, from its staff, particularly at local offices.

The “Great Program” category comprised 7.4% of total comments and reflected explicit sentiments of the program being helpful. Comments commonly contained phrases which described the WIOA services/program as “Good”, “Great”, “Perfect”, “Well”, “Ok”, “Best”, “Sufficient”, “All needs were met”, among others. The category suggests that many individuals found the WIOA program to be beneficial.

The “Good Customer Service” category comprised 0.8% of total comments and reflected explicit comments of high-quality customer service by ADWS staff. Some of the common phrases describing ADWS staff were “Friendly”, “Helpful”, “Professional”, and/or “Kind”.

The “Answer the Phones” category comprised 6.5% of total comments and reflect inability to reach the ADWS in a timely manner over the phone. Comments contained phrases such as “Answer the phone”, “Accessibility”, and/or “Phone Line.” A significant portion of these comments highlighted the COVID pandemic and overload of the system, but suggested that the current system may be antiquated – ill-suited for periods of surged demand for workforce services.

The “Better Assistance with Job Search” category comprised 6.1% of total comments and spanned different topics. Common phrases were “More”, “Better” combined with “Job Search”, “Jobs”, and/or “Opportunities.” Many comments suggested job suggestions which were more tailored to their skills or job history. Many respondents also suggested the ADWS work more with local employers for a better job search and job match process.

The “More Employees” category comprised 4.2% of total comments and detailed the concern for more employees at offices. The comments highlighted concerns of wait times at offices, faster access to services, and feedback; all issues, respondents believed could be improved with greater staffing.

Staffing issues are relevant to the standalone comment categories of “Faster Response Time” and “Shorter Wait Times” were comprised 3.0% and 0.6% of total comments, respectively. The former category contained phrases such as “Timely”, “Faster service”, and/or “Faster response”, while the latter category contained phrases such as “Long wait times.” The categories highlight the delay, and its’ stress on recipients, of processing claims or visiting local offices for assistance with the WIOA

program.

The “Easier Access to Services” category comprised 3.6% of total comments. The common phrases were “Easier access”, “Accessibility”, “Access”, “Contact”, “Office”, and/or “Transport.” Sentiments raised among the comment related to accessibility of ADWS staff, and paperwork or program requirements which seemed to be tedious or acted as barriers. In addition, physical limitations such as distance to nearest ADWS office or a lack of transportation were voiced by respondents. A more online presence seems to be the remedy for some of the issues raised.

Relevant to accessibility, the “Improve Online Options/Access” category comprised 1.9% of total comments. Comments in this category brought up topics of improving the website, moving more requirements or aspects of the WIOA program online, and updating or making the website more user friendly.

The “Better Communication” category comprised 2.8% of total comments. The comments revolved around “more communication”, “follow-up”, “better communication”, making it easier to contact staff, and in general staff being better communicators.

The “Unemployment Benefits Issues” category comprised 2.1% of total comments. The comments covered topics such as improved unemployment benefits (pay), faster payment or processing of unemployment benefits, or grievances about the status of unemployment benefits.

The categories of “Better Services” and “Better Organization” comprised 1.5% and 0.3% of total comments, respectively. The former category deal with subjects such as broadening training to gain certificates in career fields, broaden the spectrum of training, and better educational resources. The

latter category concerned better organization from employees, and a streamlined and less rigid process.

The “More Engaged Case Manager” category comprised 1.4% of total comments. Comments brought up a need for more follow-up from case managers, a more hands on experience with case managers, and general availability issues with cases managers.

The “Better Explanation of Services” category comprised 1.4% of total comments. The comments dealt with uncertainty of WIOA offerings, a need for more information or explanations about programs and/or eligibility, or the failure to mention specific programs.

The “COVID Issues” category comprised 1.2% of total comments. The comments explicitly mentioned “COVID”, “Pandemic”, and/or ”Corona”. The respondents highlighted their personal situation and/or experience with the WIOA program were driven primarily by the COVID pandemic.

The “Complete Overhaul” category comprised 0.4% of total comments. The comments contained phrases such as “Complete overhaul”, “Reboot” or “Overhaul”, and reflect strong dissatisfaction with the WIOA program by respondents.

Figure 6: Summary of Comment from WIOA Recipients

Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients		
Comment Category	Total	Percent
Answer the Phones	306	6.5%
Better Assistance with Job Search	288	6.1%
Better Communication	135	2.8%
Better Customer Service	783	16.5%
Better Explanation of Services	66	1.4%
Better Organization	13	0.3%

Better Services	73	1.5%
Complete Overhaul	19	0.4%
COVID Issues	58	1.2%
Easier Access to Services	173	3.6%
Faster Response Time	142	3.0%
Good Customer Service	40	0.8%
Great Program	352	7.4%
Improve Online Options/Access	91	1.9%
More Employees	201	4.2%
More Engaged Case Manager	67	1.4%
Not Applicable	45	0.9%
Nothing/No Changes	1714	36.1%
Shorter Wait Times	27	0.6%
Unemployment Benefits Issues	100	2.1%
Unsure	50	1.1%
Total	4743	

The comment summaries when filtered by ADWS local workforce development areas follow the general trends of the state-wide summaries. Please reference to Figures 5 & 6 for specific details. There were some notable differences highlighted by:

- The Eastern area reported a lower percent (10.2%) of total comments for the "Better Customer Service" category than the overall average (16.5%), while also reporting a higher percent (11.1%) of "Great Program" comment than the overall average (7.4%).
- The City of Little Rock and Northwest Arkansas areas reported lower proportions (33.1%; 26.9%) of "Nothing/No Changes" comments than the overage average (36.1%).
- The Eastern, Northeast, Southeast, and Southwest areas reported much higher proportions (42.6%; 40.4%; 43.2%; 44.8%) of "Nothing/No Changes" comment than the overage average (36.1%).

- The Northwest Arkansas area reported a much higher proportion (21.5%) of "Better Customer Service" comments than the overall average (16.5%), while the Southwest area reported a much lower proportion (12.0%) than the overall average.

Figure 7: Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients - Central to Northeast Areas

Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients – by ADWS Local Workforce Development Area					
Comment Category	Central	City of Little Rock	Eastern	North Central	Northeast
Answer the Phones	7.1%	5.8%	3.7%	6.5%	6.6%
Better Assistance with Job Search	6.7%	7.4%	3.7%	7.1%	4.8%
Better Communication	4.5%	2.4%	5.6%	2.3%	1.3%
Better Customer Service	17.2%	17.8%	10.2%	15.3%	17.8%
Better Explanation of Services	1.4%	1.6%	0.9%	1.1%	1.3%
Better Organization	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%
Better Services	2.0%	1.5%	1.9%	0.3%	1.8%
Complete Overhaul	0.3%	0.4%	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%
COVID Issues	2.0%	0.7%	0.9%	1.4%	1.0%
Easier Access to Services	3.7%	3.1%	3.7%	3.7%	2.0%
Faster Response Time	2.3%	4.2%	2.8%	3.1%	1.8%
Good Customer Service	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	1.7%	1.3%
Great Program	5.7%	7.0%	11.1%	8.5%	7.1%
Improve Online Options/Access	1.5%	1.7%	1.9%	2.0%	2.8%
More Employees	4.8%	6.2%	2.8%	3.4%	3.6%
More Engaged Case Manager	1.5%	1.2%	1.9%	1.7%	1.8%
Not Applicable	0.8%	1.1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Nothing/No Changes	33.8%	33.1%	42.6%	37.2%	40.4%
Shorter Wait Times	0.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.9%	1.0%
Unemployment Benefits Issues	1.9%	1.6%	2.8%	2.0%	2.3%
Unsure	1.3%	1.2%	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%

Figure 8: Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients - Northwest to Western Areas

Summary of Comments from WIOA Recipients – by ADWS Local Workforce Development Area					
Comment Category	Northwest	Southeast	Southwest	West Central	Western
Answer the Phones	6.1%	4.8%	7.4%	7.3%	5.9%
Better Assistance with Job Search	4.9%	6.3%	5.1%	4.7%	7.9%
Better Communication	2.8%	3.0%	1.6%	3.3%	1.0%
Better Customer Service	21.5%	14.4%	12.0%	16.1%	15.3%
Better Explanation of Services	2.0%	1.8%	0.7%	1.4%	1.0%

Better Organization	0.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%
Better Services	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	1.5%	1.5%
Complete Overhaul	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	0.5%
COVID Issues	0.8%	0.9%	0.5%	1.9%	1.0%
Easier Access to Services	5.6%	2.4%	4.6%	4.0%	4.0%
Faster Response Time	3.1%	3.9%	2.5%	3.2%	1.0%
Good Customer Service	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.4%	0.0%
Great Program	9.2%	6.9%	9.7%	7.0%	7.4%
Improve Online Options/Access	2.6%	1.2%	1.1%	2.2%	3.5%
More Employees	5.4%	2.7%	2.5%	2.8%	5.9%
More Engaged Case Manager	1.0%	1.5%	1.1%	1.5%	1.5%
Not Applicable	1.3%	0.6%	0.7%	1.5%	0.5%
Nothing/No Changes	26.9%	43.2%	44.8%	35.0%	38.1%
Shorter Wait Times	0.0%	0.3%	0.9%	0.4%	0.0%
Unemployment Benefits Issues	3.1%	2.1%	1.6%	2.6%	2.5%
Unsure	0.8%	1.5%	0.9%	1.4%	1.0%

Overall Study Findings:

The purpose of this study is to provide an in-depth examination of the processes that are used to identify, analyze, and close skills gaps in economic regions served by three selected local workforce development centers. In addition, the evaluators examined a number of processes and procedures utilized by workforce centers and WIOA partners across the state to identify strengths and barriers related to the services provided to ADWS customers. From the data collected and the analysis of said data, the evaluators developed recommendations of "best practices" for identifying and closing skills gaps and for improving services to ADWS customers. The evaluators, in analyzing the results of the study, submit the following findings to Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board for consideration. Findings derived from the evaluation of project objectives one through three are listed first, followed by the survey information developedfor objective number four, by the Sam M. Walton Center for Business and Economic Research:

1. **Levels of Co-Enrollment in partner programs**: Co-enrollment is defined as enrollment in two or more WIOA programs, and/or special grant programs funded by Workforce Services. Co-enrollments will always be for the benefit of the customer and are used to leverage services that are available to ensure a positive outcome. Coordination of co-enrollment will eliminate the duplication of these services and reduce the amount of time staff spends providing intensive services such as case management, job search assistance, and follow-up services. Results of customer reviews in the three selected centersconfirmed a range of 2.5% co-enrollment to a high of 16.6% for these individual partnerproviders, with an overall average rate for all reporting providers of 7.34%. This

is not an optimum rate of co-enrollment. Two of the surveyed provider representatives, addressing these rates of co-enrollment described the results as "disappointing" and suggested that co-enrollment during the most recent program year was significantly hampered by the COVID Pandemic. These representatives expressed the opinion that co-enrollment in subsequent reporting periods would be significantly higher.

As previously noted, the rates of co-enrollment reported by the employers assigned for this survey by the workforce center managers may have been adversely affected by the inclusion of individuals in the Employment Services category. Because Employment Services is a universal category, individuals with this designation do not necessarily have specific barriers to employment, and therefore may not be candidates for co-enrollment. This distinction was not disclosed to the evaluators prior to the survey, and while the final rates of co-enrollment may have been affected somewhat, the evaluators nevertheless find that the rates of co-enrollment in partner programs during the most recent reporting period is not acceptable.

2. **Partner Programs and Agencies:** Managers in the three local workforce development areas provided a list of partner agencies and programs. The number of partners listed were thirty-six in the Central Arkansas Planning and Development District, fifteen in the Northeast Arkansas Workforce DevelopmentCenter, and ten in the Western Arkansas Planning and Development District. The discrepancy in these numbers is significant, and it is the opinion of the evaluators that other potential partner programs are available in at least two of the three workforce areas. One of the key principles of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) is to streamline services in order to promote efficiency and optimize performance. This can only be accomplished by leveraging resources and collaborating with partner programs and agencies.
3. **Referral Procedures**: WIOA authorizes "career services" for adults and dislocated

workers, and requires the provision of information and referrals to, and coordination of activities with, other programs and services. Referral procedures are in place for the three assigned workforce areas. Examples of referral forms and procedures are included in Appendix III. All three managers reported that referrals are also received via email and telephone as an alternative when necessary. Referral procedures and customersupport are well laid out and well documented at all three selected workforce areas. Procedures are in place and are available for review by potential customers. During the interviews conducted with workforce center staff, one area manager said, "We have good procedures in place, and do our best to maintain a good and effective online presence, but in the end, a solid referral is sometimes dependent upon one staff personmaintaining an old-fashioned rolodex." The opinion of the evaluators is that the three selected workforce areas are in substantial compliance with this requirement.

4. **Training Services:** The three selected areas provide training concerning available services as necessary. The most common method reported was through information provided on the center's website, with follow-up through staff face-to-face contact and the provision of print materials to customers. The evaluators find that the training opportunities are, in many cases, insufficient to meet the needs of the workforce customer base. While the website may contain pertinent information, and may, in fact work well for many customers, staff must have other training methods available at a moment's notice. The evaluators recommend the adoption of a series of training methods to ensure that potential customers are comfortable with the services provided. These methods should be varied to meet the needs of customers with varied learning

styles. One suggested method is the creation of a series of short but engaging videos that will educate potential customers and lead them through the application process. These should be short, simple and to the point. One additional point should be made here; all of the high-impact branding and marketing processes that can be developed cannot replace face-to-face communications. Staff must be encouraged to talk with (not just "to") customers. Though time consuming, the ideal way to educate is through personal outreach and conversation. The evaluators find that, while the customer training requirement is met at a minimal level in thethree selected workforce areas, more should be done to ensure understanding by all ADWS customers.

5. **Skills Gap Identification and Amelioration:** Strategies for identifying skills gaps clearly demonstrated significant differences among the centers. One area manager reported that no outreach or investigation was done concerning occupational or skill level gaps, saying, "We are dependent solely on the employer telling us their needs." The manager indicated that Career Advisors are asked to assess customers using O*NET and to discuss occupational skills with them.

The two remaining local workforce development areas in the cohort reported significant activities related to identifying gaps in both occupational and skill levels. Both centers reported collectingdata from www.discover.arkansas.gov as well as conducting in-person meetings with local industry and business leaders and consulting with the local and regional Chambersof Commerce and Chief Elected Officials. These two centers also reported regularly reviewing labor market information and attending industry specific meetings. At the occupational level, managers reported that WIOA and DWS staff serve

as members of the Workforce Development Committee through the Chamber of Commerce, where information is shared regarding local business needs and demand occupations.

At the skill level, these two centers reported “talking with employers one and one and reviewing job orders that are repeatedly placed” as well as meeting with employer forums or lead employers in specific industry sectors to identify those positions that are regularly posted. One manager reported that, “DWS works with the employer to determine the skill set needed for posted job positions.” Workforce centers report significant additional services to address identified gaps. One center manager said, “WIOA utilizes career services, occupational skills training, and supportive services to assist customers who have an interest in a demand occupation obtain the skill set needed to become employed in a demand occupation and maintain employment.” At this center, customers are encouraged to complete the Career Readiness Certificate (CRC) in order to meet their employment goals and to help determine what areas need improvement. The Workforce Center, in collaboration with the employer, determines which level rating on the (CRC) is needed for the job posting. Applicants who meet thislevel on the CRC can apply for this job and the employer has crucial information at the beginning of the interview process. If an applicant is not currently meeting a required level on the CRC, they are referred to the local Adult Education facility to improve theirskill sets and retest for the CRC.

The manager also reported that services such as On the Job Training (OJT) and Work Experience are offered to customers to assist in their career search. The manager

said, "Work Experience benefits employers and customers. The service is a planned, structured learning experience that takes place in a workplace for a limited period of time. It also leads to employers hiring customers who do not initially have the required skill set butgain the necessary skills and experience during the process."

Staff at the third Workforce Center reported using, "targeted recruiting to help employers build a pipeline…" to the training provided at the Workforce Center. This center also used online platforms and "…feet on the ground efforts," to create and expand work experience and OJT opportunities, and explore apprenticeship options. Staff also worked with partner agencies to locate additional funding to increase skill level training opportunities.

While it appears that two of the three selected centers are heavily engaged in identifying and addressing skills gaps in their regions, more work is clearly needed. The tools for identifying skills gaps are available in equal measure to all 28 DWS Centers in Arkansas; however the quality of skills gap analysis is not equivalent across all centers. The ability of centers to conduct a viable and quality analysis of skills gaps in their local areas is largely dependent upon the training and ability of the staff in those centers. The evaluators find that this is an area that begs for shared training across the state. The significant differences in quality work across workforce areas strongly suggests the need for stronger areas to develop best practices training programs to be shared with other regions.

6. **Assessing the Effectiveness of Skills Gaps Interventions:** All three of the selected workforce centers reported using "repeat/continued business with employers" as one

measure of the effectiveness of services provided. One center reported as additional specific measures, annual WIOA performance ratings, employer feedback, and the success of customers remaining employed. In addition to these performance measures, twomembers of the cohort reported a number of other measures of their effectiveness.

These include: WIOA customers becoming more self-sufficient and no longer depending on public services; employers reporting that they benefit from an increasingly skilled workforce; unemployment Rates for each county as reviewed quarterly; customer surveys of the workforce centers; and effective recruiting and placement of qualified applicants. It is the opinion of the evaluators that standard protocols for measuring the effectiveness of ameliorating skills gaps should be developed and shared with all workforce areas.

7. **Compliance Review**: The evaluators reviewed a sample of six Arkansas Workforce Centers approved by Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board, against the State's certification policy and applicable laws and regulations. All six centers reviewed meet or exceed minimum requirements established by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for physical accessibility. External entrances into the facilities in which workforce services arehoused are at least minimally accessible for individuals who have mobility impairments. Ramps and level entrances into the facilities are present at all locations reviewed.

The affiliate centers evaluated self-report that they are somewhat lacking in the areas of recruitment of employees for local industry, and report that they are not able to provide adequate information to customers regarding performance information and

program cost information on eligible providers of training services in the local area. They also report a weakness in providing information, in formats that are usable by and understandable to one-stop center customers, regarding how the local area is performing on the local performance accountability measures. In spite of the affiliate centers exacting self-evaluations, the evaluators find them to be in compliance with all requirements.

The comprehensive centers evaluated for this study meet or exceed all guidelines and requirements. It is the opinion of the evaluators that the six centers reviewed for this study are in substantial compliance with all ADWS regulations, and that the managers take their regulatory responsibilities seriously. The evaluators further believe that the review of these six centers provides a representative picture ofADWS centers across the state, and that ADWS and those who manage the Local Workforce Areas, as well as Arkansas' taxpaying citizens, should be confident in the work of the thirty-two workforce centers located throughout the state.

8. **Business Survey:** The survey of business partners was conducted for this evaluation by the Center for Business and Economic Research at the University of Arkansas' Walton College of Business. Overall, the report finds that WIOA recipients display a moderate degree of satisfaction with the WIOA program and the ADWS. Some areas of concern were reported, however, and these areas require attention by Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board. These include the following:

    a. Less than half of WIOA recipients (42%) reported receiving the majorityof

services needed to address workforce needs.

b. Many respondents described Workforce Center staff as “unresponsive” or “inattentive.”

c. Many comments brought up the difficulty of posting job openings through the ADWS or the online options made available to employers.

d. Several comments noted a lack of interaction between staff and businesses.

9. **Customer Survey:** This survey showed a 62% overall satisfaction rate with WIOA programs and a 68% satisfaction rate with Workforce Center staff. While these numbers are good, there are findings in the survey that require attention from Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board. The survey found that, “many” respondents reported “poor customer service”, “a rude attitude”, “inattentive staff”, or “uninformed staff”. In spite of the high overall satisfaction rating with the program, the fact that “many” respondents cited these issues, the evaluators recommend additional training in customer service for all local center staff. In addition, the survey found that, “The current phone system does not appear suited to surge demand of ADWS or WIOA services.” It is possible that the increased demand on the phone system due to the COVID pandemic is at least partially responsible for the problems reported by customers. This possibility should be evaluated as soon as possible. In addition, efforts to improve online accessibility of the WIOA program and an improved user experience (UX) design would streamline the program for many. The suggested upgrades, should the evaluation of the current system indicate such a need, will no doubt be expensive. The evaluators believe, however, that they will help improve the delivery

of quality services and ensure an effective and reliable communication system.

Overall Study Recommendations:

Creating better work opportunities for Arkansans means building a well-trained workforce for our state's employers. This will require ADWS to collaborate with businesses large and small, WIOA partners, nonprofit organizations, and others. It also requires a workforce system in which workforce centers are willing learn from the best practices across the state. The following recommendations may be used by ADWS to develop training courses or modules which can be provided to ADWS centers around the state. In doing so, ADWS may increase the quality of skills gap identification and analysis, as well as overall service quality across the state.

1. **Co-Enrollment**: Co-Enrollment in partner programs, though a WIOA mandate, seems to be little more than an afterthought for many center staff members. Data documenting rates of co-enrollment were not immediately available to the evaluators, and were obtained through surveys and interviews with partner programs. The evaluators recommend that Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board and area managers develop data collection methods to effectively track and monitor rates of co-enrollment. Only by having accurate and up-to-date information concerning co-enrollment can ADWS begin to encourage and promote additional co-enrollment with WIOA partners.
2. **Partner Programs and Organizations:** In an online "One-Stop Operations Guidance" document (doleta.gov TEGL), the Department of Labor states that, "WIOA places a strong emphasis on planning across multiple partner programs to ensure alignment in service delivery. One key goal is to develop effective partnerships across programs and

community-based providers to provide individuals the employment, education, and training services they need. Effective partnering is pivotal to maximize resources and to align services with career pathways and sector strategies." Many partner organizations reported that they do not have data available to adequately partner with Workforce Centers. Information collected from partner organizations in all assigned areas indicate that they have significant difficulty in collecting and providing quality data. These organizations are willing and even eager to partner with ADWS centers, but don't have processes in place to collect data and provide support and assistance. It is recommended by the evaluators that Arkansas Workforce Department Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board work with all workforce areas to identify and engage additional community partners, and to provide training and assistance to those partners in data collection techniques.

3. **Business Survey:** It is recommended by the evaluators that ADWS address each of the concerns expressed in the survey. These concerns are serious, and even though the overall results showed a "…moderate degree of satisfaction with WIOA programs…" the concerns must be addressed. These concerns include: Less than half of WIOA recipients (42%) reported receiving the majority of services needed to address workforce needs; Many respondents described Workforce Center staff as "unresponsive" or "inattentive;" Many comments brought up the difficulty of posting job openings through the ADWS or the employers' website; Several comments noted a lack of interaction between staff and businesses. The evaluators recommend that additional training programs be established to improve staff/customer relationships. It is further recommended that training and

promotional materials specific to web based job postings be developed and implemented. As an initial step, the evaluators recommend that all web based processes be evaluated for ease of use. Any processes that are considered unwieldy or awkward should be modified to maximize usefulness. It is necessary that the website used for posting job openings be user friendly in order to encourage its use. Upon completion of necessary website revisions, educational methods related to the use of the site for job postings should be developed and initiated. Ease of use must be the primary goal. According to Kelly Azevedo (shesgotsystems.com), "We're all busy people. Reading about something new feels like a chore. Most people are visual or kinesthetic learners, who need to see, feel and have their hands on something to really learn how it works. Set up ways for customers to watch your new service in action with a live demo, video guides or sample products for customers to test out themselves." The evaluators recommend that short video guides be developed and added to the website to lead potential posters and customers through the job posting process.

4. **Customer Survey:** This survey showed a 62% overall satisfaction rate with WIOA programs and a 68% satisfaction rate with Workforce Center staff. While these numbers are good, there are findings in the survey that require attention from Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board. The survey found that, "many" respondents reported "poor customer service", "a rude attitude", "inattentive staff", or "uninformed staff". In spite of the high overall satisfaction rating with the program, "many" respondents cited these issues. The evaluators, therefore recommend additional training in customer service for all local

center staff. In addition, the survey found that, “The current phone system does not appear suited to surge demand of ADWS or WIOA services.” Because it is possible that the increased demand on the phone system due to the COVID pandemic is at least partially responsible for the problems reported by customers, the evaluators highly recommend that the phone system be professionally evaluated immediately. If these problems continue post-COVID, the evaluators recommend that the system be upgraded as soon as it is feasible. This upgrade, installed across all workforce centers in the state will no doubt be expensive, but quality services are dependent upon an effective and reliable communication system.

5. **Compliance Review:** The evaluators make no recommendations for change in this area. As previously stated, it is the opinion of the evaluators that the six centers reviewed for this study are in substantial compliance with all ADWS regulations, and that the managers take their regulatory responsibilities seriously. The reviewed centers provided compliant but unique services. Centers were able to meet or exceed overall guidelines and regulations while maintaining unique services designed to meet the specific service needs of the regions in which they are located. The evaluators further believethat the review of these six centers provides a representative picture of ADWS center sacross the state.

6. **Other Recommendations**: It is highly recommended that ADWS establish methods for high performing centers and workforce areas to provide training for other centers. In the areas of referral procedures, training of service recipients, and skills gaps identification and assessment, centers all seem to recognize the need for the services. There exists, however, a significant difference in the quality and success of the services provided. It is

recommended that ADWS provide incentives for high performing areas to develop training modules (in-person and online) which can be shared with less successful centers. The evaluators further recommend Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board establish a system to ensure ongoing supervision and monitoring of the quality improvement process. This system should include regular formative and summative evaluation on a regular basis

Summary and Conclusion:

In 2020, the leadership of the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services (ADWS), engaged two University of Arkansas departments, the Counselor Education Program and the Center for Business and Economic Research at the Walton College of Business to complete a comprehensive WIOA Systems Evaluation, Skills Gap Analysis, and a series of Customer Service Surveys. The evaluators worked in cooperation with ADWS in the design and implementation of all surveys, analysis, assessments, and evaluations in order to implement processes and procedures necessary to ensure that accurate and relevant data were collected and used for evaluation purposes. The evaluation was completed under the leadership of the project's Principal Investigators, Dr. Brent Williams, Associate Professor, University of Arkansas Counselor Education and Supervision, and Mervin Jebaraj, Director, Center for Business and Economic Research at the University of Arkansas' Walton College of Business.

The evaluators are grateful to the leadership of ADWS and to the management and staff of the three workforce areas assigned for the bulk of the study. The managers of the three local areas, Dennis Williamson (Western Arkansas Planning and Development District), Rodney Larson

(Central Arkansas Planning and Development District), and James Morgan (Northeast Arkansas Works), were very helpful to the process, and were willing to provide all requested information to the evaluators.

ADWS leadership asked the evaluators to review a sample of Arkansas Workforce Centers located in different Local Workforce Development Areas against the State's certification policy and applicable laws and regulations. The six centers assigned to the evaluators for the review, along with their managers and staff, were very open and cooperative with the reviewers, and made the process a pleasure. The Workforce Centers included in the review were located in Conway, Mena, Hot Springs, Russellville, Searcy, and Arkadelphia. These Workforce Centers and their leadership are to be commended for their openness and as well as for their compliance with all regulations.

The Center for Business and Economic Research at the Walton College of Business conducted two separate statewide surveys for the study. The study results of the WIOA Business Survey and the WIOA Customer Survey were analyzed and are included in the study. The response rates for the customer and business surveys were 11.8% and 9.9% respectively. These response rates provide ample data from which to make solid conclusions.

Overall, the evaluators found that ADWS and the local workforce centers are viewed positively by both customers and businesses. There are, however, training and customer service issues associated with local centers that must be addressed as soon as possible. In addition, a number of complaints were received about the quality of the computer systems used by customers.

While the findings and recommendations sections of this report contain specific suggestions

for service quality improvements, the evaluators feel that the Arkansas Workforce Development Leadership and the Arkansas Workforce Development Board have reason to be pleased with the work done by the agency. Improvements can be realized across the state by identifying local centers that perform strongly in specific areas and providing incentives for thesecenters to share their best practices.

Appendices

Appendix I

Partners Listed By Managers of Assigned Areas

Western Arkansas Planning and Development District Partner Programs:

- Adult Education
- Arkansas Division of Workforce Services
- Arkansas Rehabilitation Services
- Western Arkansas Planning and
- Development District (WIOA Title I-B)
- Arkansas Career Pathways
- Division of Services for the Blind
- Job Corps
- Senior Community Service
- Employment Program (SCSEP)

Central Arkansas Planning and Development District Partner Programs:

- Adult Education and Family Literacy
- Career and Technical Education
- Job Corps
- Jobs for Veterans State Grants
- Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
- Senior Community Service Employment Program
- Trade Adjustment Assistance
- Unemployment Insurance
- Vocational Rehabilitation
- Wagner-Peyser Employment
- WIOA Title I Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth Program
- Youth Build
- Head Start Program and Community Services, Utility Assistance, Weatherization and Tax Preparation
- Career and Technical Education
- Staffing Service and Temporary Employment
- Educational Opportunity Center
- Transitional Employment Assistance
- Psychological Exams for Social Security/Disability

- Adult Education and Family Literacy
- Community Service Block Grant Employment & Training
- HUD Employment and Training Program
- Indian and Native American Programs
- Reentry Employment Opportunities
- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
- Homebound Senior Services and Family Home Health Services
- Title V – Older Workers Employment Services for workers 55 and older
- Employment Opportunities for teens with disabilities
- Communication and Outreach of Child Support Enforcement
- WIOA Title IV – Vocational Rehabilitation
- WIOA Title III - Jobs for Veterans State Grants
- Recreational and after school programs for Youth
- Women's Shelter
- Helps troubled Youth with school, counseling
- Spiritual, physical mental services for Ex-Offenders
- Juvenile County Services and Rehabilitation for Youth Convicted of Criminal Offences

Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Center:

- Adult Education
- Arkansas Rehabilitation Services
- Division Services for the Blind
- Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
- Unemployment Insurance
- Wagner-Peyser Employment Services
- Arkansas Northeastern College
- Arkansas State University – Newport
- Black River Technical College
- WIOA Title I Services – Adult, Dislocated Workers, and Youth
- American Indian Center of Arkansas
- Job Corps
- National Caucus and Center on Black Aging
- Senior Community Service Employment Program

Appendix II

Example Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
For the Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Area
Arkansas Workforce Center Operations

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into in accordance with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014 (WIOA). This agreement among the signature agencies and organizations describes how their resources will be utilized to better serve mutual customers in the Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Area, and the Arkansas Workforce Centers, which are a part of the Arkansas Workforce Development System. It is understood that the Arkansas Workforce Centers will be a collaborative effort based on trust and teamwork among agencies working together as partners to accomplish a shared goal of improving the quality of life for individuals through employment, training, and education.

Purpose

This MOU is executed between the Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Board (Local Board), the Arkansas Workforce Center network Partners (Partners), and the Chief Elected Officials (CEOs). They are collectively referred to as the "Parties" to this MOU. This MOU is developed to confirm the understanding of the Parties regarding the operation and management of the three Arkansas Workforce Centers in the Northeast Local Workforce Development Area (Local Area). The Local Board provides local oversight of workforce programming for the Local Area. The Local Board, with the agreement of the CEOs, has competitively selected Employment & Training Services, Inc. (ETS, Inc.) as the one-stop operator for the Local Area. as further outlined in the One-Stop Operator section. The One-Stop Operating Budget and Infrastructure Funding Agreement establish a financial plan, including terms and conditions, to fund the services and operating costs of the Local Area Arkansas Workforce Center network. The Parties to this MOU agree that joint funding is an essential foundation for an integrated service delivery system and necessary to maintain the Local Area's high-standard Arkansas Workforce Center network. The Vision, Mission, System Structure, Terms and Conditions, One-Stop Operating Budget, and Infrastructure Funding Agreement outlined herein reflect the commitment of the Parties to their job seeker and business customers, as well as to the overall community.

Vision

Arkansas will have a world-class workforce that is well educated, skilled, and working in order to keep Arkansas's economy competitive in the global marketplace.

Mission

To promote and support a talent development system in Arkansas that offers employers, individuals, and communities the opportunity to achieve and sustain economic prosperity.

Arkansas's Talent Development System Philosophy

- We believe that there must be a pipeline for skilled workers for employers and a job for every Arkansan

that wants one.

- We believe that the talent development system of Arkansas must be relevant to the labor market in order to meet the needs of employers and job seekers, and for Arkansas to compete globally.
- We believe that every Arkansan should have opportunity and access to training and education that leads to a career with gainful employment.
- We believe innovation and partnerships centered on local economic priorities maximizes effectiveness and puts the State in the best position to address local and regional workforce needs.
- We believe Arkansas's workforce system should be a viable resource for business and industry.
- We believe that in order for the talent development system to be the preferred system, the system must be accountable, flexible, and align education and training with business and industry needs.
- We believe that in order for the talent development system to be effective, we must eliminate overlap and duplication of resources and services and streamline investment of funds.

Characteristics of a High-Quality Arkansas Workforce Center

The publicly funded workforce system envisioned by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) is quality focused, employer-driven, customer-centered, and tailored to meet the needs of regional economies. It is designed to increase access to, and opportunities for, the employment, education, training, and support services that individuals need to succeed in the labor market, particularly those with barriers to employment. It aligns workforce development, education, and economic development programs with regional economic development strategies to meet the needs of local and regional employers, and provides a comprehensive, accessible and high-quality workforce development system. This is accomplished by providing all customers access to high-quality workforce development centers that connect them with the full range of services available in their communities, whether they are looking to find jobs; build basic educational or occupational skills; earn a postsecondary certificate or degree; obtain guidance on how to make career choices; or are businesses and employers seeking skilled workers.

For successful integration and implementation of Partner programs, all Partners agree to support and reinforce the following characteristics of a high-quality workforce delivery system.

Customer Service

- Reflect a Welcoming Environment
- Provide Career Services that Empower
- Value Skill Development
- Create Opportunities for Individuals at all Skill Levels
- Improve Job Seeker Skills
- Deliver Quality Business Services

Innovation and Service Design

- Integrated Intake Process
- Actively Engage Industry Sectors

- Use Market Driven Principles
- Use Innovative Delivery Models
- Offer Virtual and Center-Based Services
- Ensure Access to All Customers

Systems Integration and High-Quality Staffing

- Reflect Robust Partnerships
- Organize Services by Function
- Use Common Performance Indicators
- Implement Integrated Policies
- Cross-Train and Equip Center Staff
- Offer Highly Trained Career Counselors
- Maintain Integrated Case Management

Arkansas Workforce Centers (American Job Centers)

The Local Area has three Arkansas Workforce Centers, also known as one-stop centers thatare designed to provide a full range of assistance to job seekers and businesses under one roof. The Arkansas Workforce Centers are proud partners of the American Job Center network. Established under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and continued by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the centers offer a comprehensive array of services designed to match talent with opportunities.

Partner Program	Partner Organization	Authorization/Category	Contact Information
Literacy (WIOA Title II)		Literacy Act (AEFLA)program	Jonesboro, AR 72401
*Career and Technical Education	Arkansas State University- Newport	Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et sea.)	Arkansas State University - Newport 2311 East Nettleton, Suite G. Jonesboro, AR 7240 I
*Jobs for Veterans State Grants (JVSG)	Arkansas Division of Workforce Services	Jobs for Veterans State Grants (JVSG), authorized under chapter 41 of title 38, U.S.C.N	2311 East Nettleton Jonesboro, AR 7240 l 870.935.5594
*Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program	Arkansas Division of Workforce Services	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program, WIOA Title I	2311 East Nettleton Jonesboro, AR 72401 870.935.5594
*Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	Arkansas Division of Workforce Services	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), authorized under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 60 I et sea.)	2311 East Nettleton Jonesboro, AR 7240 I 870.935.5594
*Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA)	Arkansas Division of Workforce Services	Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), authorized under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et sea.)	2311 East Nettleton Jonesboro, AR 72401 870.935.5594

*Unemployment Insurance	Arkansas Division of Workforce Services	Unemployment Insurance (UI) programs under state unemployment compensation Laws	2311 East Nettleton Jonesboro, AR 7240 I 870.935.5594
*Vocational Rehabilitation (WIOA Title IV)	Arkansas Division of Workforce Services - Arkansas Rehabilitation Services	State Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program, authorized under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C.720 et seq.), as amended by title IV of WIOA	2311 East Nettleton Jonesboro, AR 7240 I 870.935.5594
*Vocational Rehabilitation (WIOA Title IV)	Arkansas Division of Workforce Services - Division of Services for the Blind	State Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program, authorized under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C.720 et seq.), as amended by title IV of WIOA	231 I East Nettleton Jonesboro, AR 7240 I 870.935.5594
*Wagner-Peyser Employment Services (ES) (WIOA Title Ill)	Arkansas Division of Workforce Services	Wagner-Peyser Employment Services (ES) program, authorized under the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), as amended by title Ill of WIOA, also providing the state's public labor exchange	2311 East Nettleton Jonesboro, AR 72401 870.935.5594
*WIOA Title I Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth Program	Employment & Training Services, Inc.	WIOA title I Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth Programs	2805 Forest Home Road Jonesboro, AR 7240 I 870.932.1564 etsincr@suddenlinkmflil.com

Arkansas Workforce Centers in the Local Area

Type of Center (Comprehensive or Affiliate)	Mailing Address	Operating Hours	Phone
Comprehensive	2311 East Nettleton, Jonesboro, AR 7240 I	8 : 00 am to 4:30 pm Monday thru Fridav	870.935.5594
Affiliate	2825 South Division Street, Blytheville, AR 72315	8:00 am to 4:30 pm Monday thru Friday	870.762 .2035
Affiliate	IO15 Linwood Suite 4, Paragould, AR 72450	8:00 am to 4:30 pm Mondav thru Friday	870-236-8512

One-Stop Operator

The Local Board selected the one-stop operator, Employment & Training Services, Inc. (ETS, Inc.) , through a competitive process in accordance with the Uniform Guidance,WIOA and its implementing regulations , and State and Local procurement laws and regulations . All documentation for the competitive one-stop operator procurement and selection process is published and may be viewed on *the* Local Board website at: http://www.neaworks .com /abo ut-ne awda.htm l. All Parties agree that this MOU shall be reviewed and renewed the lessor of every four years or whenever a new one-stop operator is selected. Functional details are outlined in the Roles and Responsibilities of Partners sect ion, under One-Stop Operator.

Partners

*Indicates a Required Program; **Not Physically Co-Located at an Arkansas Workforce Center**

Partner Program	Partner Organization	Authorization/Category	Contact Information
*Indian and Native American Programs	American Indian Center of Arkansas	Indian and Native American Programs (INA), WIOA sec. 166, 29 USC 3221	400 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 161 I Little Rock, AR 7220 I 1.800.441.4513
*National Farmworker Jobs Program	Arkansas Human Development Corporation	National Farmworker Jobs Program (NFJP)2, WIOA Sec. 167	2825 S. Division Street Blytheville, AR 72315 **870.**762.2386
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Employment & Training	Arkansas Department of Human Services	Section 4022 of the Agricultural Act of2014	1600 Browns Lane Access Road, Jonesboro, AR 72401-7291 870.972.1732
Job Corps	Odle Management	Job Corps, WIOA Title I, Subtitle C	Job Corps WIOA Title I, Subtitle C 6900 Scott Hamilton Rd. Little Rock, Ar. 72209 -501.618.2574
*Senior Community **Service** Employment Program	National Caucus and Center on Black Aging, Inc.	Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965	1220 L Street NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20005 202.637.8400

Additional One-Stop Partners

Other entities that carry out a workforce development program, including Federal, State, or Local programs and programs in the private sector, may serve as additional Partners in the Arkansas Workforce Center network if the Local Board and chief electedofficial(s) approve the entity's participation.

Partner Services

At a minimum, Partners will make the below services available, as applicable to the program, consistent with and coordinated via the Arkansas Workforce Center network system. Additional services may be provided on a case-by-case basis and with the approval of the Local Board and the CEO.

- Serve as a single point of contact for businesses, responding to all requests in a timely manner
- Provide information and services related to Unemployment Insurance taxes and

claims
- Assist with disability and communication accommodations, including job coaches
- Conduct outreach regarding Local workforce system's services and products
- Conduct on-site Rapid Response activities regarding closures and downsizings
- Develop On-the-Job Training (OJT) contracts, incumbent worker contracts, or pay-for-performance contract strategies
- Provide access to labor market information
- Provide customized recruitment and job applicant screening, assessment and referral services
- Provide employer and industry cluster-driven Occupational Skills Training through Individual Training Accounts with eligible training providers
- Assist with the interpretation of labor market information
- Conduct job fairs
- Develop customized training opportunities to meet specific employer and/or industry cluster needs
- Use of one-stop center facilities for recruiting and interviewing job applicants
- Consult on human resources issues
- Coordinate with employers to develop and implement layoff aversion strategies
- Post job vacancies in the state labor exchange system and take and fill job orders
- Provide information regarding disability awareness issues
- Provide incumbent worker upgrade training through various modalities
- Provide information regarding workforce development initiatives and programs
- Provide information regarding assistive technology and communication accommodations
- Develop, convene, or implement industry or sector partnerships

Job Seeker Services

- Basic Career Services
    - Outreach, intake and orientation to the information, services, programs, tools and resources available through theLocal workforce system
    - Initial assessments of skill level(s), aptitudes, abilities and supportive service needs
    - In and out of area job search and placement assistance (including provision of information on in-demand industry sectors and occupations and non-traditional employment)
    - Access to employment opportunity and labor market information
    - Performance information and program costs for eligible providers of training, education, and workforce services
    - Information on performance of the Local workforce system
    - Information on the availability of supportive services and referral to such, as appropriate
    - Information and meaningful assistance on Unemployment Insurance claim

filing
- Determination of potential eligibility for workforce Partner services, programs, and referral(s)
- Information and assistance in applying for financial aid for training and education programs not provided under WIOA

■ Individualized Career Services
- Comprehensive and specialized assessments of skills levels and service needs
- Development of an individual employability development plan to identify employment goals, appropriate achievement objectives, and appropriate combination of services for the customer to achieve the employment goals
- Referral to training services or group counseling
- Literacy activities related to work readiness
- Individual counseling and career planning
- Case management for customers seeking training services; individual in and out of area job search, referral and placement assistance
- Work experience, transitional jobs, registered apprenticeships, and internships
- a Workforce preparation services (e.g., development of learning skills, punctuality, communication skills, interviewing skills, personal maintenance, literacy skills, financial literacy skills, and professional conduct) to prepare individuals for unsubsidized employment or training

■ Training
- Occupational skills training through Individual Training Accounts (ITAs)
- Adult education and literacy activities, including English language acquisition (ELA), provided in combination with the training services described above
- On-the-Job Training (OJT)
- Incumbent Worker Training
- Programs that combine workplace training with related instruction which may include cooperative education Training programs operated by the private sector
- Skill upgrading and retraining
- Entrepreneurial training
- Customized training conducted with a commitment by an employer or group of employers to employ an individual upon successful completion of the training
- Other training services as determined by the workforce partner's governing rules

Roles and Responsibilities of Partners

The Parties to this agreement will work closely together to ensure that all Local Area Arkansas Workforce Centers are high performing work places with staff who will ensure quality of service.

All Parties
All Parties to this agreement shall comply with:

- Section 188 of the WIOA Nondiscrimination and Equal Opportunity Regulations (29 CFR Part 38; Final Rule, published December 2, 2016),
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352),
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended,
- The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336),
- The Jobs for Veterans Act (Public Law 107-288) pe11aining to priority of service in programs funded by the U.S. Department of Labor,
- Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) 37-14, Update on Complying with Nondiscrimination Requirements:
    - Discrimination Based on Gender Identity, Gender Expression and Sex Stereotyping are Prohibited Forms of Sex Discrimination in the Workforce Development System and other guidance related to implementing WIOA sec. 188,
- The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFRpart 99),
- Confidentiality requirements governing the protection and use of personal information held by the VR agency (34 CFR 361.38),
- The confidentiality requirements governing the use of confidential information held by the State UI agency (20 CFR part 603),
- all amendments to each, and
- all requirements imposed by the regulations issued pursuant to these acts.

The above provisions require, in part, that no persons in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity and/or expression, age, disability, political beliefs or religion be excluded from participation in, or denied, any aid, care, services or other benefits provided by federal and/or state funding, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination.

Additionally, all Parties shall:

- Collaborate and reasonably assist each other in the development of necessary service delivery protocols for the servicesoutlined in the Partner Services section above,
- Agree that the provisions contained herein are made subject to all applicable federal and state laws, implementing regulations, and guidelines imposed on either or all Parties relating to privacy rights of customers, maintenance of records, and other confidential information relating to customers, and
- Agree that all equipment and furniture purchased by any party for purposes described herein shall remain the property of the purchaser after the termination

of this agreement

Chief Elected Official
The CEOs will, at a minimum:

- In Partnership with the Local Board and other applicable Partners within the planning region, develop and submit a single regional plan that includes a description of the activities that shall be undertaken by all Local Boards and their Partners, and that incorporates plans for each of the Local areas in the planning region,
- Approve the Local Board budget and workforce center cost allocation plan, Approve the selection of the one-stop operator following the competitive procurement process, and
- Coordinate with the Local Board to oversee the operations of the Local Area Arkansas Workforce Center network.

Local Board

The Local Board ensures the workforce-related needs of employers, workers, and job seekers in the Local Area and/or the region are met, to the maximum extent possible with available resources. The Local Board will, at a minimum:

- In Partnership with the CEOs and other applicable Partners within the Local Area, develop and submit a Local Area plan that includes a description of the activities that shall be undertaken by the Local Board and its Partners, and that aligns its strategic vision, goals, objectives, and workforce-related policies to the regional plan and economy,
- In Partnership with the CEOs and other applicable Partners within the planning region, develop and submit a single regional plan that includes a description of the activities that shall be undertaken by all Local Boards and their Partners, and that incorporates plans for each of the Local areas in the planning region,
- In collaboration and Partnership with the CEOs and other applicable Partners within the planning region, develop the strategic regional vision, goals, objectives, and workforce-related policies,
- In cooperation with the Local CEOs and the other Local Boards within the regional area, design and approve the Arkansas Workforce Center network structure. This includes, but is not limited to:
    - Adequate, sufficient, and accessible one-stop center locations and facilities,
    - Sufficient numbers and types of providers of career and training services (including eligible providers with expertise in assisting individuals with disabilities and eligible providers with expertise in assisting adults in need of adult education and literacy activities),

    - A holistic system of supporting services, and
    - One or more competitively procured one-stop operators.

- In collaboration with the CEOs, designate through a competitive process, oversee, monitor, implement corrective action, and, if applicable, terminate the one-stop operator(s),
- Determine the role and day-to-day duties of the one-stop operator,
- Approve annual budget allocations for operation of the Arkansas Workforce Center network,
- Help the one-stop operator recruit operational Partners and negotiate MOUs with new Partners,
- Leverage additional funding for the Arkansas Workforce Center network to operate and expand one-stop customer activities and resources, and
- Review and evaluate performance of the Local Area and one-stop operator.

Local Workforce Development Board Staff

Specific responsibilities include, at a minimum:

- Assist the CEO and the Local Board with the development and submission of a single regional and local plan,
- Support the Local Board with the implementation and execution of the regional vision, goals, objectives, and workforce- related policies, including all duties outlined above,
- Provide operational and grant-specific guidance to the one-stop operator,
- Investigate and resolve elevated customer complaints and grievance issues,
- Prepare regular reports and recommendations to the Local Board, and
- Oversee negotiations and maintenance of MOUs with one-stop Partners.

One-Stop Operator

The one-stop operator will assist the Local Board in establishing and maintaining the Arkansas Workforce Center network structure. This includes but is not limited to:

- Ensuring that State requirements for center certification are met and maintained,
- Ensuring that career services such the ones outlined in WIOA sec. l34(c)(2) are available and accessible,
- Ensuring that Local Board policies are implemented and adhered to,
    - Adhering to the provisions outlined in the contract with the Local Board and the Local Board Plan,
- Reinforcing strategic objectives of the Local Board to Partners, and
- Ensuring staff are properly trained by their formal leadership organizations and provided technical assistance, as needed.
- Integrating systems and coordinating services for the center and its Partners, placing priority on customer service. Integrated Workforce Service Delivery, as defined by WIOA, means organizing and implementing services by function

(rather than by program), when permitted by a program's authorizing statute and as appropriate, and by coordinating policies, staff communication, capacity building, and training efforts.

- Aligning activities functionally, e.g. Skills Development Team or Business Services Team.
- Ensuring service integration focuses on serving all customers seamlessly (including targeted populations) by providing a full range of services staffed by cross-functional teams, consistent with the purpose, scope, and requirements of each program. The services are seamless to the customer, meaning the services are free of cumbersome transitions or duplicative registrations from one program service to another and there is a smooth customer flow to access the array of services available in the workforce center.
- Overseeing and coordinating partner, program, and Arkansas Workforce Center network performance. This includes but is not limited to:
    - Providing and/or contributing to reports of center activities, as requested by the Local Board,
    - Identifying and facilitating the timely resolution of complaints, problems, and other issues,
    - Collaborating with the Local Board on efforts designed to ensure the meeting of program performance measures, including data sharing procedures to ensure effective data matching, timely data entry into the case management systems, and coordinated data batch downloads (while ensuring the confidentiality requirements of FERPA, 34 CFR 361.38, and 20 CFR part 603),
    - Ensuring open communication with the formal leader(s) in order to facilitate efficient and effective center operations,
    - Evaluating customer satisfaction data and propose service strategy changes to the Local Board based on findings.
    - Managing fiscal responsibilities and records for the center. This includes assisting the Local Board with cost allocations and the maintenance and reconciliation of one-stop center operation budgets.

The one-stop operator will not assist in the development, preparation and submission of Local plans. They cannot manage or assist in future competitive processes for selecting operators or select or terminate one-stop operators, career services providers, or Youth providers. The operator cannot negotiate local performance accountability measures or develop and submit budgets for activities of the Local Board. Local Board is responsible for the negotiated performance measures, strategicplanning, budgets, and one-stop operator oversight (including monitoring).

Partners

Each Partner commits to cross-training of staff, as appropriate, and to providing other

professional learning opportunities that promote continuous quality improvement.
Partners will further promote system integration to the maximum extent feasible through:

- Provide access to its programs or activities through the workforce center system,
- Provide applicable career services,
- Effective communication, information sharing, and collaboration with the one-stop operator,
- Joint planning, policy development, and system design processes,
- Commitment to the joint mission, vision, goals, strategies, and performance measures,
- The design and use of common intake, assessment, referral, and case management processes,
- The use of common and/or linked data management systems and data sharing methods, as appropriate, Leveraging of resources, including other public agency and non-profitorganization services,
- Participation in a continuous improvement process designed to boost outcomes and increase customer satisfaction, and
- Participation in regularly scheduled Partner meetings to exchange information in support of the above and encourage program and staff integration.

Data Sharing

Partners agree that the use of high-quality, integrated data is essential to inform decisions made by policymakers, employers, and job seekers. Additionally, it is vital to develop and maintain an integrated case management system, as appropriate, that informs customer service throughout customers' interaction with the integrated system and allows information collected from customers at intake to be captured once. Partners further agree that the collection, use, and disclosure of customers' personally identifiable information (Pl I) is subject to various requirements set forth inFederal and State privacy laws. Partners acknowledge that the execution of this MOU,by itself, does not function to satisfy all of these requirements. All data, including customer Pll, collected, used, and disclosed by Partners will be subject to the following:

- Customer PII will be properly secured in accordance with the Local Board's policies and procedures regarding the safeguarding of PII.
- The collection, use, and disclosure of customer education records, and the PII contained therein, as defined under FERPA, shall comply with FERPA and applicable State privacy laws.
- All confidential data contained in UI wage records must be protected in accordance with the requirements set forth in 20CFR part 603.
- All personal information contained in VR records must be protected in accordance with the requirements set forth in 34 CFR 361.38.
- Customer data may be shared with other programs, for those programs' purposes, within the Arkansas Workforce Centernetwork only after the informed written consent of the individual has been obtained, where required. Customer data will be kept confidential, consistent with Federal and State privacy

laws and regulations.

- All data exchange activity will be conducted in machine readable format, such as HTML or PDF, for example, and in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794 (d)). All one-stop center
  and Partner staff will be trained in the protection, use, and disclosure requirements governing PII and any other confidential data for all applicable programs, including FERPA-protected education records, confidential information in UI records, and personal information in VR records.

Confidentiality

All Parties expressly agree to abide by all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations regarding confidential information, including Personally Identifiable Information (PH) from educational records, such as but not limited to 20 CFR Part 603, 45 CFR Section 205.50, 20 USC 1232g and 34 CFR part 99, and 34 CFR 361.38, as well as any applicable State and local laws and regulations. In addition, in carrying out their respective responsibilities, each Party shall respect and abide by the confidentiality policies and legal requirements of all of the other Parties.

Each Party will ensure that the collection and use of any information, systems, or records that contain **PII** and other personal or confidential information will be limitedto purposes that support the programs and activities described in this MOU and will comply with applicable law.

Each Party will ensure that access to software systems and files under its control that contain Pll or other personal or confidential information will be limited to authorized staff members who are assigned responsibilities in support of the services and activities described herein and will comply with applicable law. Each Party expressly agrees to take measures to ensure that no PII or other personal or confidential information is accessible by unauthorized individuals.

To the extent that confidential, private, or otherwise protected information needs to be shared amongst the Parties for the Parties' performance of their obligations under this MOU and to the extent that such sharing is permitted by applicable law, the appropriate data sharing agreements will be created and required confidentiality and ethical certifications will be signed by authorized individuals. With respect to confidentialunemployment insurance information, any such data sharing must comply with all of the requirements in 20 CFR Part 603, including but not limited to requirements for an agreement consistent with 20 CFR 603.10, payments of costs, and permissible disclosures, as well as relevant State laws regarding unemployment insurance information.

With respect to the use and disclosure of FERPA-protected customer education records and the Pll contained therein, any such data sharing agreement must comply with all of the requirements set forth in 20 U.S.C. § 1232g and 34 CFR Part 99. With respectto the use and disclosure of personal information contained in VR records, any such data sharing agreement must comply with all of the requirements set forth in 34 CFR 361.38.

Referrals

The primary principle of the referral system is to provide integrated and seamless delivery of services to workers, job seekers, and employers. In order to facilitate such a system, Partners agree to:

- Familiarize themselves with the basic eligibility and participation requirements, as well as with the available services and benefits offered, for each of the Partners' programs represented in the Local Area Arkansas Workforce Center network,
- Develop materials summarizing their program requirements and making them available for Partners and customers,
- Develop and utilize common intake, eligibility determination, assessment, and registration forms,
- Provide substantive referrals - in accordance with the Local Area Referral Policy - to customers who are eligible forsupplemental and complementary services and benefits under partner programs,
- Regularly evaluate ways to improve the referral process, including the use of customer satisfaction surveys,
- Commit to robust and ongoing communication required for an effective referral process, and
- Commit to actively follow up on the results of referrals and assuring that Partner resources are being leveraged at an optimal level.

Accessibility

Accessibility to the services provided by the Arkansas Workforce Centers and all Partner agencies is essential to meeting the requirements and goals of the Arkansas Workforce Center network. Job seekers and businesses must be able to access all information relevant to them via visits to physical locations as well as in vi1tual spaces, regardless of gender, age, race, religion, national origin, disability, veteran's status, or on the basis of any other classification protected under state or federal law.

Physical Accessibility

One-stop centers will maintain a culture of inclusiveness and the physical characteristics of the facility, both indoor and outdoor, will meet the ADA Standards for Accessible Design or subsequent federal standards. Services will be available in a convenient and accessible location, taking into account reasonable distance from

public transportation and adequate parking (including parking clearly marked for individuals with disabilities). Indoor space will be designed in an "equal and meaningful" manner providing access for individuals with disabilities.

Virtual Accessibility

The Local Board will work with the Arkansas Workforce Development Board (State Board) to ensure that job seekers and businesses have access to the same information online as they do in a physical facility. Information must be clearly marked and compliant with Section 508 of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services code. Partners will comply with the Plain Writing Act of 20 I 0, the law that requires that federal agencies use "clear Government communication that the public can understand and use" and all information kept virtually will be updated regularly to ensure dissemination of correct information. Partners should either have their ownweb presence via a website and/or the use of social media, or work out a separate agreement with the Local Board to post content through its website or the State Board website.

Communication Accessibility

Communications access, for purposes of this MOU, means that individuals with sensory disabilities can communicate (and be communicated with) on an equal footing with those who do not have such disabilities. All Partners agree that they will provide accommodations for individuals who have communication challenges, including but not limited to individuals who are deaf and hard of hearing, individuals with vision impairments, individuals with speech-language impairments, and individuals with limited English proficiency.

Programmatic Accessibility

All Partners agree that they will not discriminate in their employment practices or services on the basis of gender, gender identityand/or expression, age, race, religion, national origin, disability, veteran's status, or on the basis of any other classification protected under state or federal law. Partners must assure that they have policies and procedures in place to address these issues, and that those policies and procedures have been disseminated to their employees and otherwise posted as required by law.

Partners further assure that they are currently in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations regarding these issues. All Partners will cooperate with compliance monitoring that is conducted at the local level to ensure that all Arkansas Workforce Center programs, services, technology, and materials are physically and programmatically accessible and available to all. Additionally, staff members will be trained to provide services to all, regardless of range of abilities, mobility, age, language, learning style, or comprehension or education level. An interpreter will be provided in real time or, if not available, within a reasonable timeframe to any customer with a language barrier. Assistive devices, such as screen- reading software programs (e.g.,

JAWS, DRAGON, or MAGIC) and assistive listening devices must be available to ensure physical and programmatic accessibility within theArkansas Workforce Center network.

Outreach

The Local Board and its Partners will develop and implement a strategic outreach plan that will include, at a minimum:

- Specific steps to be taken by each partner,
- An outreach plan to the region's human resources professionals,
- An outreach and recruitment plan to the region's job seekers, including targeted efforts for populations most at-risk or most in need,
- An outreach and recruitment plan for out-of-school youth,
- Sector strategies and career pathways,
- Connections to registered apprenticeship,
- A plan for messaging to internal audiences,
- An outreach tool kit for Partners,
- Regular use of social media,
- Clear objectives and expected outcomes, and
- Leveraging of any statewide outreach materials relevant to the region.

Dispute Resolution

The following section details the dispute resolution process designed for use by the Partners when unable to successfully reach an agreement necessary to satisfy the requirements of the MOU. (Note: This is separate from the Local Area Customer Grievance and Complaint Management Policy.) A disagreement is considered to have reached the level of dispute resolution when an issue arises regarding the terms, conditions, or performance requirements of the MOU that cannot be resolved by agreement of the Parties. It isthe responsibility of the Local Board Chair (or designee) to coordinate the MOU dispute resolution to ensure that issues are being resolved appropriately. Any party to the MOU may seek resolution under this process.

1. All Parties are advised to actively participate in Local negotiations in a good faith effort to reach agreement. Any disputes shall first be attempted to be resolved informally.
2. Should informal resolution efforts fail, the dispute resolution process must be formally initiated by the petitioner seeking resolution. The petitioner must send a notification to the Local Board Chair (or designee) and all Parties to the MOU regarding the conflict within IO business days from the date that it is determined that agreement cannot be reached.
3. The Local Board Chair (or designee) shall place the dispute on the agenda of a special meeting of the Local Board's Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall attempt to mediate and resolve the dispute. Disputes shall be resolved by a 2/3 majority consent of the Executive Committee members present.

4. The decision of the Executive Committee shall be final and binding unless such a decision is in contradiction of applicable State and Federal laws or regulations governing the Partner agencies.
5. The right of appeal no longer exists when a decision is final. Additionally, final decisions will not be precedent-setting or binding on future conflict resolutions unless they are officially stated in this procedure.
6. The Executive Committee must provide a written response and dated summary of the proposed resolution to all Parties to the MOU.

Monitoring

The Local Board, or its designated staff, officials from the State and Local administrative entities, the U.S. Departments of Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services have the authority to conduct fiscal and programmatic monitoring to ensure that:

- Federal awards are used for authorized purposes in compliance with law, regulations, and State policies,
- Those laws, regulations, and policies are enforced properly,
- Performance data are recorded, tracked. and reviewed for quality to ensure accuracy and completeness,
- Outcomes are assessed and analyzed periodically to ensure that performance goals are met,
- Appropriate procedures and internal controls are maintained, and record retention policies are followed, and
- All MOU terms and conditions are fulfilled.

All Parties to this MOU should expect regular fiscal and programmatic monitoring to be conducted by each of the above entities, as appropriate.

Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunity

All Parties to this MOU certify that they prohibit, and will continue to prohibit, discrimination, and they certify that no person, otherwise qualified, is denied employment, services, or other benefits on the basis of: (i) political or religious opinion or affiliation, marital status, sexual orientation, gender, gender identification and/or expression, race, color, creed, or national origin; (ii) sex or age, except when age or sex constitutes a bona fide occupational qualification; or (iii) the physical or mental disability of a qualified individual with a disability.

The Parties specifically agree that they will comply with Section 188 of the WIOA Nondiscrimination and Equal Opportunity Regulations (29 CFR Part 38; Final Rule December 2, 2016), the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), the Non-traditional Employment for Women Act of 1991, titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights of 1964, as amended, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, the Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended, title IX of the Education Amendments of1972, as amended, and with all applicable requirements imposed by or pursuant to regulations

implementing those laws, including but not limited to 29 CFR Part 37 and 38.

Indemnification

All Parties to this MOU recognize the Partnership consists of various levels of government, not-for-profit, and for-profit entities. Each party to this agreement shall be responsible for injury to persons or damage to property resulting from negligence on the part of itself, its employees, its agents, or its officers. No Partner assumes any responsibility for any other party, State or non-State, for the consequences of any act or omission of any third party. The Parties acknowledge the Local Board and the one-stop operator have no responsibility and/or liability for any actions of the one-stop center employees, agents, and/or assignees. Likewise, the Parties have no responsibility and/or liability for any actions of the Local Board or the one-stop operator.

Severability

If any part of this MOU is found to be null and void or is otherwise stricken, the rest of this MOU shall remain in force.

Drug and Alcohol-free Workplace

All Parties to this MOU certify they will comply with the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, 41 U.S.C. 702 et seq., and 2 CFR part 182 which require that all organizations receiving grants from any Federal agency maintain a drug-free workplace. The recipient must notify the awarding office if an employee of the recipient is convicted of violating a criminal drug statute. Failure to comply with these requirements may be cause for suspension or debarment under 2 CFR part 180, as adopted by the U.S. Department of Education at 2 CFR 3485, and the U.S. Department of Labor regulations at 29 CFR part 94.

Certification Regarding Lobbying

All Parties shall comply with the Byrd Anti-Lobbying Amendment (31 U.S.C. Section 1352), 29 C.F.R. Part 93, and 34 CFR part 82, as well as the requirements in the Uniform Guidance at 2 CFR 200.450. The Parties shall not lobby federal entities using federal funds and will disclose lobbying activities as required by law and regulations.

Debarment and Suspension

All Parties shall comply with the debarment and suspension requirements (E.0.12549 and12689) and 2 CFR part 180 and as adopted by the U.S. Department of Labor at 29 CFR part 2998 and by the U.S. Department of Education at 2 CFR 3485.

Priority of Service

All Parties certify that they will adhere to all statutes, regulations, policies, and plans regarding priority of service, including, but not limited to, priority of service for veterans and their eligible spouses, and priority of service for the WIOA Title I Adult program, as

required by 38 U.S.C. sec. 4215 and its implementing regulations and guidance, and WIOA sec. 134(c)(3)(E) and its implementing regulations and guidance. Pa11ners will target recruitment of special populations that receive a focus for servicesunder **WIOA,** such as individuals with disabilities, low-income individuals, basic skills deficient youth, English language learners, and others with barriers to employment.

Non-Assignment

Except as otherwise indicated herein, no Party may, during the term of this MOU or any renewals or extensions of this MOU, assign or subcontract all or any part of the MOU without prior written consent of all other Parties.

Governing Law

This MOU will be construed, interpreted, and enforced according to the laws of the State of Arkansas. All Parties shall comply with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, and Local laws to the extent that they are not in conflict with State or Federal requirements.

Modification Process

Renewal of an MOU requires all parties to review and agree to all elements of the MOU and resign the MOU. An amendment or modification of the MOU must be in writing and must be signed by all parties. Non-substantive changes to the MOU, such as minor revisions to the budget or adjustments made due to the annual reconciliation of the budget, do not require renewal of the MOU. These changes may occur through the local MOU modification process. Substantial changes, such as changes in one-stop pat1ners, or a change due to the election of a new CEO, will require renewal of the MOU. A change to the MOU due to the election of a new CEO would ensure that the newly elected official is aware of the local one-stop partners, aswell as the terms and conditions of the MOU. When the local area has created a new Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IF A), the MOU must be updated in accordance with 20 CFR 678.500(e), 34 CFR 361.S00(e), and 34 CFR 463.S00(e). Updating the MOU
does not require renewal of the MOU.

The following steps will be taken to modify the MOU:

I. **Notification**
   When a Partner wishes to modify the MOU; the Partner must first provide written notification to all signatories of the existing MOU and outline the proposed modification(s).

2. **Discussion/Negotiation**
   Upon notification, the Local Board Chair (or designee) must ensure that discussions and negotiations related to the proposed modification take place

with Partners in a timely manner and as appropriate. Depending upon the type of modification, the modification can be accomplished through electronic communication among all the Parties. If the proposed modification is extensive and is met with opposition, the Local Board Chair (or designee) may need to call a meeting of the Parties to resolve the issue. Upon agreement of all Parties,a modification will be processed.

If the modification involves substitution of a party that will not impact any of the terms of the agreement, it can be accomplished by the original party and the new party entering into an MOU that includes the Local Board, wherein the new party assumes all of the rights and obligations of the original party. Upon execution, the Local Board Chair (or designee) presents the agreement as a proposed modification to the MOU, and the remaining steps are followed.

If determined that a Partner is unwilling to agree to the MOU modification, the Local Board Chair (or designee) must ensure that the process in the Dispute Resolution section is followed.

3. **Signatures**
   The Local Board Chair (or designee) must immediately circulate the MOU modification and secure Partner signatures. The modified MOU will be considered fully executed once all signatories have reviewed and signed.

   The modification may be signed in counterparts, meaning each signatory can sign a separate document as long as the Local Board Chair (or designee) acquires signatures of each party and provides a complete copy of the modification with each party's signature to all the other Parties.

Termination

This MOU will remain in effect until the end date specified in the Effective Period section below, unless:

- All Parties mutually agree to terminate this MOU prior to the end date.
- Federal oversight agencies charged with the administration of WIOA are unable to appropriate funds or if funds are not otherwise made available for continued performance for any fiscal period of this MOU succeeding the first fiscal period. If there is a risk of termination pursuant to this provision, the party unable to perform shall notify the other Parties as soon as the party has knowledge that funds may be unavailable for the continuation of activities under this MOU.
- WIOA is repealed or superseded by subsequent federal law.
- Local area designation is changed under WIOA.
- A party breaches any provision of this MOU and such breach is not cured within thirty (30) days after receiving written notice from the Local Board Chair (or

designee) specifying such breach in reasonable detail. In such event, the non-breaching party(s) shall have the right to terminate this MOU by giving written notice thereof to the party in breach, uponwhich tem1ination will go into effect immediately.

In the event of termination, the Parties to the MOU must convene within thirty (30) days after the breach of the MOU to discuss the formation of the successor MOU. At that time, allocated costs must be addressed. Any party may request to terminate its inclusion in this MOU by following the modification process identified in the Modification Process section above. All parties agree that this MOU shall be reviewed and renewed the lessor of every four years or whenever a new one stop operator is selected.

Effective. Period

This MOU is entered into on July I, 2020. This MOU will become effective as of the date of signing by the final signatory below and must terminate on June 30, 2023, unless any of the reasons in the Termination section above apply.

One-Stop Operating Budget

The purpose of this section is to establish a financial plan, including terms and conditions, to fund the services and operating costs of the Local Area Arkansas Workforce Center network. The Parties to this MOU agree that joint funding is a necessary foundation for an integrated service delivery system. The goal of the operating budget is to develop a funding mechanism that:

- Establishes and maintains the Local workforce delivery system at a level that meets the needs of the job seekers and businesses in the Local area,
- Reduces duplication and maximizes program impact through the sharing of services, resources, and technologies among Partners (thereby improving each program's effectiveness),
- Reduces overhead costs for any one partner by streamlining and sharing financial, procurement, and facility costs, and
- Ensures that costs are appropriately shared by Arkansas Workforce Center Partners by determining contributions based on the proportionate use of the one-stop centers and relative benefits received, and requiring that all funds arespent solely for allowable purposes in a manner consistent with the applicable authorizing statutes and all other applicable legal requirements, including the Uniform Guidance.

The Partners consider this one-stop operating budget the master budget that is necessary to maintain the Local Area's high- standard Arkansas Workforce Center network. It includes the following cost categories, as required by WIOA and its implementing regulations:

- Infrastructure costs,
- Career services, and
- Shared services.

All costs must be included in the MOU, allocated according to Partners' proportionate use and relative benefits received, and reconciled on a quarterly basis against actual costs incurred and adjusted accordingly. The one-stop operating budget is expected to be transparent and negotiated among Partners on an equitable basis to ensure costs are shared appropriately. All Partners must negotiate in good faith and seek to establish outcomes that are reasonable and fair.

The Infrastructure Funding Agreements (IFAs) and Operating Budgets will be implemented in accordance with the timelines established by the U.S. Department of Labor's Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) 17-16 and its' subsequent changes or guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Labor and may require a modification to this MOU to incorporate the changes.

Signatures

By signing below, you agree to comply with the terms of this agreement. Persons signing this MOU on behalf of a Party swear and affirm that they are authorized to act on behalf of such Party and acknowledge that the other Parties are relying on their representations to that effect.

_____ _____

Signature Date

Appendix III
Referral Forms and Procedures (Example)

(Western Arkansas Planning and Development District):

WIOA Partner Referral Ticket

Congratulations!

You are referred to:

Partner Organization Name: Partner Contact Name: Contact Number: Partner Address:

Appointment Date & Time *(If applicable)*:

For the following services:

□ Financial Assistance for Training □ Employment Placement □ Educational Advancement
□ Job Readiness Workshops □ Youth Services (14-24 y/o)

IMPORTANT:

Job Seeker must complete the following before visit:
Register on www.arjoblink.arkansas.gov AJL#
(registering in advance will expedite orientation/enrollment process)

Documents needed for first visit:

- ✓ Bring 2 valid IDs (e.g., Driver's License, State ID, Social Security card, Passport, CDIB card)
- ✓ Bring current resume, if available
- ✓ Selective Service Registration (Those born on or after 1960) - Will check during visit

Client Information (Please Print)				
First Name:			Last Name:	
Phone Number:			Email:	
Are you a Veteran?		No		

- ✓ Veterans bring DD214

Referral Information (Please Print)
Referred by:
Contact Person:
Email:
Referral Date:

Release of Information:

I authorize WAWDB to obtain information from and release information to the referring organization listed above as "Referring Organization" as it pertains to my employment and training services. The information released to the referring organization may include all relevant employment information that I have authorized WAWDB to collect about me.

Client Signature:_____Date:

Office Use Only: Date of Service_____/____/

approved ver. 5.14.2020

Procedures, Western Arkansas Planning and Development District:

TITLE	Referral Procedure
NUMBER	002-20
TYPE	Procedure - Programmatic
APPROVING AUTHORITY	Western Arkansas Planning & Development District
EFFECTIVE DATE	6/9/2020
NEW/REPLACED	New

Purpose

To outline protocol for referral of clients to services as addressed in Board policy P0005-20. References for this policy include Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) 3(59), 134(c)(2)(A), 20 CFR 678.430(a)(5), 681.570(i), TEGL 10-16 change 1, 21-16.

- Career Advisors will use the WIOA Partner Referral Ticket when a client requests services not provided by the title 1-B program enter the referral in the client's case notes.
- Career Advisors will enter the referral on the Service and Training Plan in Arkansas Job Links (AJL) appropriately.
- The completed and signed form is to be sent electronically to the referred partner and a copy retained by the Career Advisor for tracking.
- A copy of the Ticket is to be given to the client as well for reference to date, time, and location of referral appointment.
- Career Advisors are to follow up with referred agency after appointment date and enter notes into AJL.
- WIOA participant must have case notes that include references to referrals and the purpose of the referrals.

When referrals are made that could result in a co-enrollment with a core program partner, the Career Advisor is expected to communicate on an ongoing basis regardingwhen an individual completes an activity and coordinate exiting from the workforce system with notations in the participants case notes.

Northeast Arkansas Workforce Center:

Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Board (NEAWDB) Policy Procedures

Policy Number:	NEAWDB - Policy 2019-03
Chan2e Number:	None
Effective Date:	09-26-19
Date Approved by Board:	09-26-19

Purpose:

The purpose is to develop a policy to ensure WIOA participants are properly referred to other agencies where they can receive needed services.

Background Information:

WIOA Law - Section 129. Use of Funds for Youth Workforce Investment Activities (c)(3)(A) states:

"INFORMATION AND REFERRALS. - Each local board shall ensure that each participant shall be provided-

(i} information on the full array of applicable or appropriate services that are available through the local boardor other eligible providers or one-stop partners, including those providers or partners receiving funds under this subtitle; and

(ii} referral to appropriate training and educational programs that have the capacity to serve the participant either on a sequential or concurrent basis."

Policy:

A. Youth Requirement:

The Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Board requires that the following be available to each Youthparticipant:

1. Provide participants with information about the full array of applicable or appropriate services through theArkansas Workforce Center system and other appropriate providers.
2. Refer these participants to appropriate providers that have the capacity to serve them on a sequential or concurrent basis. A referral may be provided by telephone, written, electronically, face to face, or a combination of these processes. If a referral occurs, staff must document the following in the participant fileand/or Arkansas Joblink:
   a. The referral of the participant
   b. The outcome of the participant referral

B. Adult & Dislocated Worker Requirement:

The Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Board requires that the following be available to the Adult & Dislocated Worker participant:

1. A menu of services be posted at each Northeast Arkansas Workforce Center.
2. If needed, the Northeast Arkansas Workforce Development Board requires the service provider refer Adult and Dislocated Worker participants to appropriate providers that have the capacity to serve them on a sequential orconcurrent basis. A referral may be provided by telephone, written, electronically, face to face, or a combination of these processes. If a referral occurs, staff must document the following in the participant file and/or Arkansas Joblink:
   a. The referral of the participant
   b. The outcome of the participant referral

Appendix IV

Example of Web Page Listing Partner Services
Northeast Arkansas Workforce Center
https://www.neaworks.com/partners.html

PARTNER SERVICES

Adult Education

State Website - http://ace.arkansas.gov/adultEducation/Pages/default.aspx

Clay County
BRTC Corning Adult Education Center302 W. Second Street
Corning, AR 72422
Contact: Carolyn Baker
Email: carol.baker@blackrivertech.edu
Director: Tammie Lemmons
Email: tammiel@blackrivertech.org
Phone: 870-857-5364
FAX: 870-857-5364

Craighead County
ASU Newport
Adult Education Center
2601 Commerce Dr.
Jonesboro, AR 72401
Contact: John Kelly, Director
Phone: 870-512-7824
FAX: 870-512-7848
E-Mail: John_Kelly@asun.edu

Greene County
Black River Technical College
Paragould Adult ED
1105 W. Court Street, Suite C
Paragould, AR 72450
Contact: Joan Eveland
E-Mail: joan.eveland@blackrivertech.edu
Director: Tammie Lemmons
E-Mail: tammiel@blackrivertech.edu
Phone: 870-240-0332
FAX: 870-240-0331

Mission Outreach of NEA
901 E. Lake Street

Paragould, AR 72450
Contact: Mike Woodside
Phone: 870-236-8080
Email: mikew@grnco.net

Lawrence County
BRTC Walnut Ridge Adult Ed. Center
504 SE Southern Avenue
Walnut Ridge, AR 72476
Contact: Sheila Baltz
Email: sheila.baltz@blackrivertech.edu
Director: Tammie Lemmons
Phone: 870-886-2059
FAX: 870-886-2059
E-Mail: tammiel@blackrivertech.org

Mississippi County
Arkansas Northeastern College
Adult Education Program 2501
South Division
Blytheville, AR 72315
Director: Jason Williams
E-Mail: jwilliams@smail.anc.edu
Phone: 870-780-1280

Mississippi County Literacy Council
200 N. Fifth Street
Blytheville, AR 72315
Contact: Kay Martin
Phone: 501-779-8893
Email: marykaymartin@mcliteracy.org

Arkansas Northeastern College
Adult Education Program 2868
West Semmes
Osceola, AR 72370
Contact: Sherryl Cooley
E-Mail: Scooley@smail.anc.edu
Director: Jason Williams
E-Mail: jwilliams@smail.anc.edu
Phone: 870-563-3433
FAX: 870-563-8420

Arkansas Northeastern College
Adult Education Program

P.O. Box 281
103 North Main Street
Leachville, AR 72438

Contact: Sherryl Cooley
E-Mail: Scooley@smail.anc.edu
Director: Jason Williams
E-Mail: jwilliams@smail.anc.edu
Phone: 870-539-2393
FAX: 870-539-1424

Poinsett County
ASUN Marked Tree Adult Education Marked Tree Center
Adult Education Program
P.O. Box 280
33500 Hwy 63 East
Marked Tree, AR 72365
Contact: John Kelly, Director
E-Mail: John_Kelly@asun.edu
Phone: 870-512-7824

ASUN Marked Tree Adult Education Trumann Center
Adult Education Program
Sims-Talbot Center
212 South Melton
Trumann, AR 72472
Contact: John Kelly, Director
E-Mail: John_Kelly@asun.edu
Phone: 870-512-7824

Randolph County
Black River Technical College
Adult Education Program
P.O. Box 468
1410 Highway 304 East
Pocahontas, AR 72455
Contact: Tammie Lemmons, Director
Email: tammiel@blackrivertech.org
Phone: 870-248-4130
FAX: 870-892-1096
American Indian Center of Arkansas
1-800-441-4513
www.arindianctr.org

Arkansas Apprenticeship
arkansasapprenticeship.com

Arkansas Department of Human Services
www.accessarkansas.org/dhs

Arkansas Delta Workforce Opportunities for Rural Communities (ADWORC) ADWORC is focused on reimagining the Delta Workforce by creating a strong pipeline of skilled workers, improving the workforce readiness of the region's K-12 students and adult population, and connecting the Delta region's higher education institutions for workforce and economic development. Click the pictures below for more information or contact Mr. Marcus Woodson at 870.680.8956.

ADWORC FLYER

Arkansas Human Development Corporation
(Migrant Seasonal Farm Worker)
1-800-482-7641
www.arhdc.org

ARHDC FLYER

Arkansas Job Corp
jobcorps.doleta.gov

Arkansas Relay
www.arkansasrelay.com

Arkansas Rehabilitation Services
870-972-0025
2920 Longview Drive
Jonesboro, AR 72401
www.accessarkansas.org/dhs

Arkansas State University @ Jonesboro
www.astate.edu

Arkansas State University Technical Center @ Jonesboro / Marked Tree
870-358-2117
www.asun.edu

Arkansas Northeastern College @ Blytheville / Burdette / Paragould
www.anc.edu

Black River Technical College @ Pocahontas
www.blackrivertech.org

City Youth Ministries
cityyouthmin.com

Crowley's Ridge Development Council
www.crdcnea.com

Department of Mid-South Health Services
www.mshs.org

Department of Workforce Services
Jonesboro: 870-935-5594
Blytheville: 870-762-2035
Paragould: 870-236-8512
dws.arkanas.gov

Division of Services for the Blind
www.accessarkansas.org/dhs

Division of Children and Family Services
www.accessarkansas.org/dhs

Discover Arkansas
www.discover.arkansas.gov/

Experience Works
www.experienceworks.org

Health Insurance Marketplace
www.healthcare.gov

Hispanic Community Services, Inc.
www.jhcsi.org

Veteran Services
http://dws.arkansas.gov/Programs/Veterans/index.htm

Appendix V

Focus Groups/Interviews with Local Workforce Boards

The Arkansas Division of Workforce Services (ADWS) leadership team wants ascertain best practices implemented by your Board to identify and ameliorate skills-gaps in your area. The goal of our focusgroups is to document highly successful efforts undertaken by your Workforce Board in collaboration with regional industry and employers to address skills-gaps specific to your workforce area. The leadership team believes that there are, among the local workforce boards, servicesand initiatives that can be identified as "best practices" and that once identified, these best practices can be shared with other workforce boards. The sharing of these best practices may serveto facilitate the reduction of skills-gaps across the state. Likewise, it is probable that each workforce area has attempted some services and initiatives that have not proven to be as successful as hoped. It is equally as important to document and share these experiences with other workforce areas.

As previously stated, the goal of our focus groups is to understand the best practices implemented by your Board to identify and ameliorate skills-gaps in your region. We are particularly interested in how your interactions with employers facilitated this process. Through our focus groups we will be asking you to provide examples of methods you used to identify these gaps, and the extent to which you feel that these methods were successful, as well as the resources you brought to bear to address these skills gaps and the extent to which these resources were successful in addressing the identified skills-gaps.

To begin with, let's discuss the methods used to identify and the resources brought to bear to address skills gaps as they relate to:

- Occupation level,
- Demand level,
- Skill-level;

1. More specially, were the services that you had at your disposal appropriate to meet the needs of employers in addressing these skills gaps? Why and why not?
2. How did you select the services provided based on the identification of these gaps? We ask this because there may have been more appropriate services that you would have provided had they been available

to you.

3. In what specific ways were the service you provided successful in ameliorating the identified skills-gaps?
4. What services do you wish you had been available to address these skills-gaps?
5. Were there services that employers requested that you were unable to provide?
6. Were there services that individuals in the potential workforce (customers) requested that you were unable to provide?
7. Pulling back and thinking more broadly about "Best Practices"; please tell us the two or three most successful services that you provided to employers to help them close the identified skills-gaps.
8. To what extent would these best practices be transferable across state? Likewise, how would you recommend they be implemented statewide?
9. Tell us what we didn't ask that you wish we had thought of.

Appendix VI

Skills Gaps Surveys/Interviews, Local Employers

As part of our evaluation, we have surveyed the workforce managers in three ADWS centers and have received their responses. As a follow up to these responses, we are now asking you, as key employers in your region, to address the same questions. The ADWS manager in your region has recommended you for our study. Please address the following questions. If you wish to talk with us directly, please let me know and I willcontact you by phone. Thank you once again for agreeing to complete the survey.

1. Consider your partnership with your local Arkansas Division of Workforce Services Center:
    - Do you feel that you have a productive partnership with the ADWS center?
    - Have you had conversations with your ADWS center concerning skills gaps that you face?
    - If so, do you feel that the ADWS center adequately addressed your skills gap concerns:
    - What kinds of services did the ADWS center provide to assist your company with addressing your specific skills gaps?
    - How would you assess the effectiveness of the services provided in closing the skills gaps?
2. Do you have other thoughts, concerns, or comments related to your relationship with your ADWS center?

Appendix VII

ADWS Center Compliance Surveys/Interviews

Certification Policy:

Centers must:

1. Be strategically located to maximize service to employers and employees.
2. Have enough traffic to warrant operations.
3. Provide on-site services (interpreter, documents, etc.) based on demographic need.
4. Have hours of operation that are based on customer needs and are customer driven.
5. Ensure that uniform procedures are in place to implement priority of service for veterans, individuals with disabilities, English-as-a-Second Language persons, and any other priority populations identified at the federal, state or local level for job placement.
6. Ensure that priority of service for job training opportunities for veterans, individuals with disabilities, English-as-a-Second Language persons, and any other priority populations identified at the federal level is clearly implemented for all U.S. DOL programs such as employment, training, and placement services.

	Yes	No	If No, Is A Plan for Compliance in Place? Yes/No
Compliance with ADWS Policies (above)			
ADA Accessibility			
Use of Management Information Systems for customer tracking			
Memorandum of Understanding with Partners			
Arkansas Workforce Center and American Job Center Brands Used Appropriately			
Wagner-Peyser Services are Co-Located			

Required Program/Partner Checklist

A. In the column named "On-Site", indicate programs/partners that are currently located on-site.

B. In the column named "Off-Site Electronic Connection", make a check mark for the programs/partners that are off-site but their basic career services are made available to customers through an electronic connection. Note: Not all customers will be able to use the electronic connection(s) without help from workforce system staff.

C. For programs/partners that are off-site but an agreement is in place to provide their basic career services in another manner, check the last column and attach a narrative explaining how this is accomplished (use a separate sheet).

Required Programs/Partners	**One-Site (Average Hours/Week)**	**Off-Site Electronic Connection**	**Off-Site Basic Career Services Made Available in Another Manner**
WIOA Title I Adult Services WIOA Title I Dislocated Worker			
WIOA Title I Youth Services			
Wagner-Peyser Title III			
Adult Education and Family Literacy Title II			
Vocational Rehabilitation – Arkansas Career Education, Arkansas Rehabilitation Services			
Vocational Rehabilitation – Arkansas Department of Human Services, Division of Services for the Blind			
Title V – Older Americans Act/Senior Community Service Employment Program			
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families			
Career and Technical Education Programs			
Trade Adjustment Assistance			
Jobs for Veterans State Grant			
Community Services Block Grant			
Housing & Urban Development Employment and Training			
Unemployment Compensation			
Second Chance Act			

Additional Partners (not mandated)

Additional Programs/Partners	One-Site (Average Hours/Week)	Off-Site Electronic Connection	Off-Site Basic Career Services Made Available in Another Manner
Ticket to Work and Self Sufficiency			
Small Business Administration			
SNAP Employment and Training			
(Please add partners as appropriate)			
Orientation to Arkansas Workforce Centers			

Career Services Checklists

In the column named "On-Site", check the basic career, individualized career, and training services that are currently available on-site for all job seeking customers who come into the workforce center or affiliate site.

Basic Career Services	On-Site *(Mark with X)*
Initial assessment of skill levels (including literacy, numeracy, and English language proficiency), aptitudes, abilities (including skills gaps), and supportive service needs	
Outreach, intake and orientation to the information and other services available through the one-stop delivery system	
Eligibility determination	
Labor exchange services, including job search and placement assistance, career counseling, provision of information on in-demand industry sectors and occupations, provision of information on nontraditional employment	
Appropriate recruitment and other business services on behalf of employers, including small employers, which may include providing information and referral to specialized business services not traditionally offered through the one-stop delivery system	
Referrals to and coordination of activities with other programs and services, including programs and services within the one-stop delivery system and other workforce development programs	
Workforce and labor market employment statistics information, including accurate information relating to local, regional, and national labor market areas, including job vacancy listings in labor market areas; information on job skills necessary to obtain the jobs; and information relating to local occupations in demand and the earnings, skill requirements, and opportunities for advancement for such occupations	

Performance information and program cost information on eligible providers of training services and eligible providers of youth workforce investment activities, providers of adult education, providers of career and technical education activities at the postsecondary level, and career and technical education activities available to school dropouts, and providers of vocational rehabilitation	
Information, in formats that are usable by and understandable to onestop center customers, regarding how the local area is performing on the local performance accountability measures and any additional performance information with respect to the onestop delivery system in the local area	
Provision of information and assistance regarding filing claims for Assistance in establishing eligibility for programs of financial aid assistance for onestop center customers, relating to the availability of supportive services or assistance, including child care, child support, medical or child health assistance benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, assistance through the earned income tax credit, assistance under State program for temporary assistance for needy families, and other supportive services and transportation provided through funds made available in the local area	
Provision of information and assistance regarding filing claims for unemployment compensation	
Assistance in establishing eligibility for programs of financial aid assistance for training and education programs	
Translation Services	

Individualized Career Services	**On-Site** ***(Mark with X)***
Comprehensive and specialized evaluation to Identify barriers to employment and employment Goals	
Development of Individualized Employment Plan (IEP)	
Group Counseling	
Individual Counseling	
Career/ Vocational Planning	
Short-Term Preemployment/ Vocational Services	
Internships and work experiences	
Workforce preparation activities	
Financial literacy activities	
Out-of-Area Job Search and relocation assistance	
English language acquisition and integrated education and training programs	
Follow-up services	

Business Services Checklist

Check the business services that are available to employers.

Business Services	**On-Site** ***(Mark with X)***
Establish and develop relationships and networks with large and small employers and their intermediaries	
Develop, convene, or implement industry or sector partnerships	

Other Business Services (not mandatory)

Customized screening and referral of qualified participants in training services to employers	**On-Site** ***(Mark with X)***
Customized services to employers, employer associations, or other such organizations, on employment-related issues	
Customized recruitment events and related services for employers including targeted job fairs	
Human resource consultation services, e.g., writing/reviewing job descriptions and employee handbooks; Developing performance evaluation and personnel policies; Creating orientation sessions for new workers; Honing job interview techniques for efficiency and compliance; Analyzing employee turnover; or Explaining labor laws to help employers comply with	
Wage/hour and safety/health regulations;	
Customized labor market information for specific employers, sectors, industries or clusters	
Customized assistance or referral for assistance in the development of a registered apprenticeship program	
Listing of Job Orders	
Applicant Referral	
Employer Needs Assessment	
Unemployment Insurance Access	
Access to Facilities	
Translation Services	
Developing and delivering innovative workforce investment services and strategies for area employers, e.g., career pathways, skills upgrading, skill standard development and certification for recognized postsecondary credential or other employer use, apprenticeship, and other effective initiatives for meeting the workforce investment needs of area employers and workers	
Assistance in managing reductions in force in coordination with rapid response activities and with strategies for the aversion of layoffs, and the delivery of employment and training activitiesto address risk factors	

Marketing of business services offered to appropriate area employers, including small and mid-sized employers	
Assisting employers with accessing local, State, and Federal tax credits	

Evaluation Criteria

Each site is asked to work together with leadership and staff to develop responses to the following:

I. Rank on a scale of 1 to 5, where the site believes it is in its path toward meeting, or exceeding, the stated standard.

5 = achieved the standard and excelling

4 = significantly meeting standard with some work yet to do 3 = have some of the elements in place, some of the time

2 = making progress but long way to go 1 = no progress yet

These scores will be used by the Evaluation Team as benchmarks for the site and help point to both areas of excellence and those in need of improvement.

II. Provide clear evidence and examples of current status and future plans with strategies and timelines to reach these standards.

Functional and Programmatic Integration				
It is critical for Arkansas Workforce Centers and its partners to think and act as an integrated system. Arkansas Workforce Center partners ensure that client services are aligned to common goals and the customer experience is seamless – regardless of funding streams. Each customer is mutually regarded as a shared customer, with all staff and programs operating at the site having a vested stake in that customer's success. Integration of programs is incorporated into planning, intake, assessment, registration, and service processes, information sharing, resource decisions, actions, results, and analyses.				
Check the box where you think the site is with regard to Functional and Programmatic integration. ☐ 5	☐ 4	☐ 3	☐ 2	☐ 1

Describe your site's approach to integrated service delivery and the use of functional teams to deliver career services to all customers.
Please list any best practices to highlight and share for continuous improvement.

Performance Accountability
Results and outcomes for the public investment in Arkansas Workforce Centers are essential to the system's relevance. The effectiveness of Arkansas Workforce Centers for employers and job seekers is evident in system performance and service delivery decisions are based on data. On an ongoing basis, customer data from one-stop partners and regional economic data is collected, analyzed, and shared with all workforce system staff and community stakeholders. Plans for improvement, enhancement, or adjustment are established and acted upon.
Check the box where you think the site is with regard to Performance Accountability. ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1

Describe how you measure, analyze, review, and improve system performance through the use of data and information.
Please list any best practices to highlight and share for continuous improvement.

Service Provision, Universal Access, and Outreach
Improved availability, a welcoming atmosphere, inclusive settings, and high quality customer service benefit all customers. Arkansas Workforce Centers extend services and outreach not just to individuals who walk in the door, but also to those who have become disengaged in the labor force. Integrated, quality services are provided to all customers within the center and via technology through online or phone access. Principles of universal design are considered, which designs inclusive space and materials to be available to individuals regardless of their range of abilities, mobility, age, language, learning style, intelligence, or educational level.
Check the box where you think the site is with regard to Service Provision to all customers including Services, Access, and Outreach to populations with barriers. ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1
Provide evidence that basic ADA requirements have been met, including processes to provide reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities.
Describe initiatives or strategies in developing universal access and provide tangible evidence of implementation or solution driven plan development. Address the following four specific areas of access: 1. Physical: Architectural or building 2. Information: all paper, printed or posted materials 3. Digital: software, web-based programs and alternatives to print 4. Communication: verbal, non-verbal access for services, phone and other
Describe your wireless internet infrastructure.
How are the needs of populations with barriers met through staff-assisted and other means?
Please list any best practices to highlight and share for continuous improvement.

Customer Satisfaction
Performance and value are ultimately judged by customers – businesses and job seekers. Customer-centered design relies upon satisfying customer needs, identifying shortcomings and responding accordingly on a timely and ongoing basis. Tools to obtain feedback are appropriate for each customer's use and take into consideration factors including literacy levels, use of technology, disability, and language.
Check the box where you think the site is with regard to Customer Satisfaction. ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1
Describe how the voice of the customer is heard and how your site incorporates both job seeker and business customer feedback as part of continuous quality improvement? How are the voices of populations with barriers heard and brought to the table when designing services and facilities? How do you inform customers of how their feedback was reviewed and any action taken from their feedback? What metrics are used to show improvement and success?
Please list any best practices to highlight and share for continuous improvement.

Staff Competence and Staff Training Participation
Professional development is a key feature in order to ensure that staff are aware of the implications of recent evidence-based research and can implement the latest policies and procedures established at the local, State and Federal levels. Also of vital importance is the use of labor market information by staff to better inform customers' career and training decision-making. The investment in staff development is substantial, ongoing, and focused on cross-training with partner programs, overall skill development, and use of labor market information. Every member of the one-stop staff has the ability and authority to meet customer needs, either directly or, where appropriate, by helping the customer make the right connections to the expertise he or she seeks. Participation in one-stop-sponsored training is required.
Check the box where you think the site is with regard to Staff Competence and Staff Training Participation. ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1

How are staff and leadership trained and cross-trained on an ongoing basis to stay current on programs and services? How is this tracked to ensure that all staff participate?
How do you actively engage staff of all programs – Adult, Dislocated Worker, Youth, Wagner-Peyser, TANF, ABE, DVR, Perkins, etc. – in design of services, action planning and analysis of indicators and trends? How are all staff informed of progress towards site performance and goals?
Please list any best practices to highlight and share for continuous improvement.

Partnership
The one-stop system is built upon a foundation of partners linked together to deliver a comprehensive array of services and reach the shared outcomes of employment, education, skills gains, and earnings. All core and required one-stop partners are present at the site and invested in the development and implementation of service delivery to connect customers to resources.
Check the box where you think the site is with regard to Partnership. ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1
Describe how the partnerships function at the site and the roles of each core partner from Title I – Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth, Title II - Adult Basic Education, Title III - Wagner-Peyser, and Title IV - Vocational Rehabilitation.
Describe how the partnerships function at the site with other required partners from postsecondary Career and Technical Education (Perkins Act), CSBG, HUD, Job Corps, National Farmworker Jobs Program, Re-entry programs, SCSEP, TAA, TANF, UI, VETS, and YouthBuild.
Describe how the site is linked to other partners beyond the site to ensure alignment with community and regional strategies. Please give examples of how this functions and the results for customers.

Describe how leadership works together to set the vision and goals for the site and then implements service strategies to achieve shared objectives.
Please list any best practices to highlight and share for continuous improvement.

Employer Engagement
Business is one of our primary customers and one-stop partners work collaboratively to deliver value-added services and eliminate duplication. Business services staff from all one-stop partners have a comprehensive understanding of labor market conditions, economic development activities, skill needs of the workforce and are connected to regional and local business partnership activities and sector strategies. Employers' human capital needs are communicated to and acted upon by the workforce system. Business services are coordinated to the maximum extent possible to limit duplication and streamline the employer experience.
Check the box where you think the site is with regard to Employer Engagement.
5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1
Describe how partners work to deliver seamless business services. How do business services staff use and share labor market information? What strategies are used to involve employers in identifying skill gaps and developing solutions to meet their workforce needs?
Describe how regional and local sector strategies are used to target services and resources to focus workforce efforts on investments and improve outcomes.
How are career pathways and training modalities such as industry-recognized credentials, apprenticeship, on-the-job training, and other work-based learning opportunities aligned with employers' needs and marketed to support talent development?
Please list any best practices to highlight and share for continuous improvement.

Appendix VIII

Customer Service Survey, WIOA Title I and Title III Customers

Survey Responses by Question

1. What type of services did you from the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services? (Click all that apply)

Program	Total	Percent
Adult Education	358	5.0%
Adult (Training/Workforce) Services	956	13.3%
Dislocated Workers Services	1065	14.8%
Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	5537	77.1%
Rehabilitative Services	124	1.7%
Services for the Blind	21	0.3%
Youth Services	92	1.3%

WIOA Questions

2. Did you clearly understand your responsibilities to participate in the program?

	Total	Percent
Yes	6,211	86.4%
No	382	5.3%
Unsure	592	8.2%
Total	7,185	

3. Would you recommend this program?

	Total	Percent
Would not Recommend	568	7.9%
Would Possibly Recommend	1,272	17.7%
Would Recommend	2,802	39.0%
Would Strongly Recommend	1,070	14.9%
Would Very Strongly Recommend	1,473	20.5%
Total	7,185	

4. Did you receive the services needed to achieve your goal as outlined in the plan you developed with your case manager?

Total	Percent	
I don't know	1,072	14.9%
Received All Services Needed	874	12.2%
Received Most but Not All Services Needed	1,477	20.6%
Received None of the Services Needed	672	9.4%
Received Some of the Services Needed	3,090	43.0%
Total	7,185	

5. Overall were you satisfied with the services in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Program?

	Total	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	498	6.9%
Dissatisfied	468	6.5%
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	1,753	24.4%
Satisfied	2,599	36.2%
Very Satisfied	1,867	26.0%
Total	7,185	

6. How satisfied were you with the professionalism and accessibility of workforce center staff?

	Total	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	508	7.1%
Dissatisfied	627	8.7%
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	1181	16.4%
Satisfied	2654	36.9%
Very Satisfied	2215	30.8%
Total	7,185	

7. Were you able to find employment in your career field after you completed this program?

	Total	Percent
Not Seeking Employment At This Time	576	8.0%
Not applicable	1,586	22.1%
No, I Did Not Find Employment	2,570	35.8%
Yes, I Found Employment, but Not in My Career Field	1,038	14.4%
Yes, I Found Employment in My Career Field	1,415	19.7%
Total	7185	

8. If you found employment, are you likely to keep this job over the next six months?

	Total	Percent
Yes	6224	86.6%
No	304	4.2%
Unsure	657	9.1%
Total	7185	

9. What changes would you suggest to improve the services in this program?

Appendix IX

Business Survey, WIOA Title I and Title III Customers

Survey Responses by Question

1. What type of services did you from the Arkansas Division of Workforce Services? (Click all that apply)

	Total	Percent
Adult Education	6	7.1%
Local Workforce Services Provider	25	29.8%
Employment Services, such as Job Search or resumes	72	85.7%
Rehabilitative Services	3	3.6%
Services for the Blind	2	2.4%

WIOA Questions

2. Did you clearly understand your responsibilities to participate in the program?

	Total	Percent
Yes	62	73.8%
No	13	15.5%
Unsure	9	10.7%
Total	84	

3. Would you recommend this program?

	Total	Percent
Would not Recommend	11	13.1%
Would Possibly Recommend	25	29.8%
Would Recommend	32	38.1%
Would Strongly Recommend	4	4.8%
Would Very Strongly Recommend	12	14.3%
Total	84	

4. Did you receive the services needed for you to address your workforce needs?

	Total	Percent
I don't know	9	10.7%
Received All Services Needed	20	23.8%
Received Most but Not All Services Needed	20	23.8%
Received None of the Services Needed	7	8.3%
Received Some of the Services Needed	28	33.3%
Total	84	

5. Overall were you satisfied with the services in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Program?

	Total	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	6	10.7%
Dissatisfied	9	23.8%
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	28	23.8%
Satisfied	28	8.3%
Very Satisfied	13	33.3%
Total	84	

6. How satisfied were you with the professionalism and accessibility of workforce center staff?

	Total	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	6	7.1%
Dissatisfied	6	10.7%
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	26	33.3%
Satisfied	26	33.3%
Very Satisfied	20	15.5%
Total	84	

7. What changes would you suggest to improve the services in this program?

References

Arkansas Employment Security Department; *History and Organization.* https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/images/uploads/budgetManuals/0810_employment_security_2005.pdf

Congressional Research Service-Vulnerable Youth*: Employment and Job Training Programs.* https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20100205_R40929_416b91a040d9904cf4f7be395064595874e603aa.pdf

Encyclopedia of Arkansas. https://encyclopediaofarkansas.net/entries/arkansas-department-of-workforce-services-6026/

Legal Information Institute, Cornell Law School. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/20/682.220

One-Stop Operations Guidance for the American Job Center Network. (https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL/TEGL_16-16_Attachment-II_Acc.pdf

Required Elements for Submission of the Unified or Combined State Plan and Plan Modifications under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. https://www.doleta.gov/wioa/docs/State-Plan-ICR.pdf

15 Methods for Educating Customers About Your New Services and Products https://www.huffpost.com/entry/15-methods-for-educating_b_10968478

US Department of Labor. https://www.dol.gov

WIOA State Plan for the State of Arkansas FY-2018 https://www.dws.arkansas.gov/src/files/WIOA_State_Plan_April-10-2018.pdf

WIOA (H. R. 803) Chapter 4—Performance Accountability, Sec. 116 (Performance Accountability Systems