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Introduction

The Kent County Essential Needs Task Force (ENTF) is a collaborative organization that focuses on bringing together organizations within Kent County to help meet residents’ basic needs by connecting stakeholders to work towards system alignment, coordination, and outcome measurements in five basic needs areas. Outcome measures in five basic need areas: workforce development, food/nutrition, energy efficiency, transportation, and housing. The Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy’s Community Research Institute (CRI) at Grand Valley State University was contracted by ENTF, with funding provided by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, to conduct a systems scan for its partners’ service population. This project utilizes the results of:

1. ten focus groups conducted,
2. a system scan of current workforce development clients,
3. a system scan of workforce development agencies and services, and
4. an analysis of the underlying population of residents to assess where workforce development services are being provided, where residents live who are facing unemployment, and how the two populations may or may not overlap. The key question of interest is to determine if there is a gap between unemployed residents in Kent County and the Neighborhoods of Focus, and the clients served by ENTF partner workforce development agencies.

Methodology

Ten focus groups were conducted. Three focus groups were centered on workforce development agencies, four were centered on residents who were using workforce development services, also referred to as clients within this report, and the last three were focused on residents who were not using workforce development services but were actively seeking employment, who are referred to as residents within this report. Focus groups were recorded and transcribed to assess themes in participants’ responses.

A system scan is an assessment of the services provided by system partners, locations of services, and home locations of clients. The goal of a systems scan is to better understand the system, rather than each individual agency/component. In addition to the Kent County workforce development system scan, this report includes an analysis of the underlying population of Kent County and the Neighborhoods of Focus to assess where geographic areas of need/risk may exist. All maps generated for this system scan are aggregated by census tract. The resident maps utilize data from the 2014 American Community Survey five year estimate. The partner agency system scan highlights where clients are coming from and what the client profile may look like when compared to the underlying population of residents. Maps are provided at the county level and also zoomed in on an area known as the “Neighborhoods of Focus” or NOF. The NOF are made up of 17 census tracts that have been previously identified by stakeholders as home to residents facing the greatest needs in the Grand Rapids area.
Unemployment rates appear to be higher in the city of Grand Rapids, and in the NOF in particular, than in outlying areas of Kent County. The total unemployment rate for Kent County is 8.9 percent, compared to 12 percent in the city of Grand Rapids and 17.3 percent in the NOF.

The maps created were supportive of other local findings, where race disparity in unemployment was higher in the Neighborhoods of Focus (NOF). This was found when assessing the percent of unemployed residents of a race out of the total number of residents of that race in a particular geography.

The within-race unemployment rates for Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and other races or ethnicities were higher than White or Caucasian residents. This indicates that unemployment is affecting people of different race or ethnicities differently, even within the same neighborhoods.

The majority of participating ENTF partner agencies are located within or near the NOF, with only a few outside the city of Grand Rapids. This appears appropriate, as the majority of unemployed residents are also concentrated in the city of Grand Rapids and in the NOF more specifically.

ENTF partners who provided data had contact with between 35.05 (tract 27) and 41.25 (tract 26) percent of unemployed residents within the central portions of the NOF. While most ENTF partners are located within NOF, utilization rate is still lower than expected. When this finding is considered alongside unemployment rates, it appears that ENTF partner agencies are serving the right people in the right areas, but simply at a lower utilization rate than is needed to keep up with the demand.

Participants of all ten focus groups noted that there was a need for increased transportation options to aid residents in accessing services, finding, and maintaining employment. ENTF workforce development partners noted the need to address issues relating to a "benefits cliff" where residents were afraid of obtaining employment, as employment may decrease or end the government assistance that they were receiving. Clients and residents did not mention this in the focus groups.

A capacity survey conducted by CRI indicated that there were six services from four agencies that were at 95 percent or greater service capacity. Services that were at capacity were prison re-entry, reemployment services for dislocated workers, career preparation for people with disabilities, mock interview workshops for single mothers experiencing homelessness, resume building for single mothers experiencing homelessness and skills for success.
Key Findings (cont.)

Focus groups with residents and clients indicated a desire for more assistance in navigating around the use of computers and more access to sources of communication that would reduce their reliance on their limited cellular phone plan minutes.

Clients who participated in the focus groups stated the supportive nature of some staff at the ENTF partner agencies and had success stories to share. However, some residents who are not using services have different perspectives, they stated that they were uncomfortable asking for workforce services because they thought that the people who were working at the organizations did not understand or respect them. Residents suggested that having a representative to recruit people may increase their awareness of the different workforce development services available to them.

Partners acknowledged that there are barriers to their current referral-making processes. Partners who participated in the focus groups noted the need for alignment of intake forms to reduce the time needed for their clients to complete the intake process when transitioning from one agency to the other.

Partners also stated the need to reduce service duplication. The partners suggested that open communication is the biggest key to increasing collaborative efforts between agencies. The partners believed that participating in the ENTF Workforce Development monthly meetings was one of the avenues to increase collaborative efforts.
The Kent County Essential Needs Task Force (ENTF) is a collaborative organization that focuses on bringing together organizations within Kent County to help meet residents’ basic needs by connecting stakeholders to work towards system alignment, coordination, and outcome measurements in five basic need areas. The ENTF Workforce Development committee is a collaborative of organizations that provide and support workforce development services in Kent County. The following is a complete list of agencies that participated in the study and of agencies that participate in the Essential Needs Task Force Workforce Development Committee. Agencies were identified either because the agencies participated in the ENTF or because the 211 community database identified agencies as providing workforce development services:

**INTRODUCTION**

ENTF holds open monthly meetings for all organizations providing and supporting workforce development services to check in, learn about services provided, discuss greater system alignment, policy changes, and review community data regarding workforce development. According to Gilbride, Mitus, Coughlin, & Scott (2007) organizations that work collaboratively increase job placements for residents and identify strategies to reach out to clients. Satisfaction levels for both the employee and employer are also increased when there is a collaboration of organizational support advocating for job placement for these individuals (Gilbride, Mitus, Coughlin, & Scott, 2007). Organizational partnership promotes a multi-faceted approach to the intertwining challenges an individual may encounter. For example, if a client is disabled, homeless, and has a criminal record then the organizations that have diverse expertise through collaboration would be more suitable to help this individual compared to an organization that only focuses on clients with one of the identities/risks noted above. ENTF seeks to reduce duplication of services and identify workforce development services gaps present in Kent County.

**ENTF Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACSET/West Michigan Works!*</th>
<th>Grand Rapids Housing Commission*</th>
<th>Jubilee Jobs’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Agency on Aging West Michigan</td>
<td>Grand Rapids HQ*</td>
<td>Labor Ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Advocates of Kent County*</td>
<td>Grand Rapids Urban League*</td>
<td>LINC Up*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endless Opportunities</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>Literacy Center of West Michigan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat River Outreach Ministries**</td>
<td>Health Care for Homeless Veterans</td>
<td>Michigan Economic Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill Industries of Greater Grand Rapids*</td>
<td>Heart of West Michigan United Way**</td>
<td>Michigan Rehabilitation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Community College*</td>
<td>Hispanic Center of Western Michigan</td>
<td>North Kent Community Services*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Community Foundation**</td>
<td>Hope Network West Michigan*</td>
<td>Restorers, Inc.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENTF Partners</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency participates in the ENTF</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency participates in the ENTF but did not participate in the study</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy’s Community Research Institute (CRI) at Grand Valley State University was contracted by ENTF to conduct a systems scan for its partners’ service population. This project utilizes the results of:

1. ten focus groups conducted,
2. a system scan of current workforce development clients,
3. a system scan of workforce development agencies and services, and
4. an analysis of the underlying population of residents to assess where workforce development services are being provided, where residents live who are facing unemployment, and how the two populations may or may not overlap. The key question of interest is to determine if there is a gap between unemployed residents in Kent County and the Neighborhoods of Focus, and the clients served by ENTF partner workforce development agencies.
**System Scan Methodology**

A key activity of this project was to assess where workforce development clients are living within the county and then compare that to the underlying unemployed population. ENTF reached out to all organizations who were participating in their workforce development committee to request participation in this project. Organizations that agreed to participate in the system scan efforts discussed data sharing with CRI, signed a data sharing agreement, and provided de-identified data to CRI. The organizations who participated in the workforce development system scan were:

- ACSET/West Michigan Works!
- Disability Advocates of Kent County
- Goodwill Industries of Greater Grand Rapids
- Grand Rapids Community College
- Hispanic Center of Western Michigan
- Hope Network West Michigan
- Jubilee Jobs
- LINC UP
- Literacy Center of West Michigan
- The SOURCE
- Women’s Resource Center

The data shared included de-identified clients’ addresses, dates of birth, races/ethnicities, genders, service start dates, service end dates, employment status at service start dates, employment at service end dates, and program completion when available. Not all organizations shared all the requested data points due to data security concerns or lack of data availability. Hispanic Center of Western Michigan and Goodwill Industries of Greater Grand Rapids did not share de-identified client addresses but provided clients’ zip codes. This did not allow client data to be accurately placed within Kent County and the NOF. Additional maps of all data aggregated to the zip code level (rather than census tract) are included in this report. Hispanic Center of Western Michigan also opted out from sharing clients’ dates of birth.

Additionally, most organizations did not provide data relating to employment status at the program end date. The organizations that provided CRI with data related to employment status at the end of the program were ACSET/West Michigan Works!, Hope Network West Michigan, and Women’s Resource Center. The limited availability of employment status at the start and end of receiving services resulted in limitations for CRI to interpret the impact of participating organizations on affecting employment status. This also resulted in an inability to assess what proportion of current workforce development agency clients were unemployed when they began services.

Additionally, CRI also used publicly available data from the 2014 American Community Survey (ACS) five years estimate to generate resident maps and analyses. Additional information on the ACS can be found at census.gov. ACS data utilizes a subsample of the population and provides an estimate along with a margin of error. Margins of error are not included in this report but are available online. The information found here was also compared to the information presented by White, Arthur, and Hirschfeld (2015) which used 2013 American Community Survey five year estimate data and the On the Map tool (www.onthemap.ces.census.gov) which was presented throughout Kent County in 2015.

All system scans or maps generated were aggregated by census tract. Census tract reference maps (Appendix B – M1 and M2) were developed to increase readability of the maps in this report. These reference maps indicate the tract numbers throughout Kent County so that greater detailed reference data is more easily accessible when needed.

The resident maps highlight the unemployment rates within Kent County overall and for various subsets of the population (Appendix C). The partner agency system scan highlights where clients reside (based on data provided by the participating partner agencies) and what the client profile may look like when compared to the underlying population of residents (Appendix D). One of the system scan goals was to identify if there were gaps between workforce services available and the available workforce in Kent County. This was achieved by making comparative maps to identify potential gaps (Appendix E), which was calculated using the number of clients divided by the total unemployed population in each tract.
Focus Group Methodology

This project was a collaborative process with Inclusive Performance Strategies (IPS). IPS aided CRI in participant recruitment and focus group logistics. Three ENTF partner agency focus groups were conducted. Two focus groups were conducted during one of ENTF’s monthly meetings while another was conducted at Johnson Center for Philanthropy on a separate date. All participants were recruited by IPS through emails and announcements at ENTF workforce development committee meetings.

The client focus groups were also recruited by IPS. IPS sent out emails to ENTF partners and the ENTF partners assisted in recruiting participants for the client focus groups. Additionally, IPS created a flyer that was posted at various ENTF partners’ locations to recruit participants. Participants who were interested called CRI to be assessed for eligibility and RSVP. Four focus groups centered on clients were conducted.

Lastly, three focus groups were conducted to learn more about residents who were currently looking for employment but were not using services provided by the ENTF partners. CRI created a flyer (Appendix A) and posted the flyers at numerous locations within Grand Rapids. These locations include but are not limited to the following:

- Café Aromas
- Degage Ministries
- East Town Ministries
- Eastern Avenue Christian Reformed Church
- Endless Opportunities
- Family Promise
- Guiding Light Mission
- Habitat for Humanity
- Health Care for Homeless Veterans
- Hope Community Housing
- La Familia Stop-N-Shop
- MI Rehabilitation Services
- Neland Avenue Christian Reformed
- New Hope Baptist Church
- Restorer’s Inc.
- Roosevelt Park Ministries
- Sherman Street Christian Church
- Spanish Church of God

CRI researchers also connected with various organizations via telephone and requested the office managers to post the flyers at their facilities. In an effort to reach out to more participants, CRI also handed out flyers to individuals in the vicinity of Division Avenue, Cherry Street, and Oakes Street. It should be noted that many homelessness service providers are also located in this vicinity, which may have contributed to the higher than expected number of focus group participants who were experiencing homelessness (at least 2 participants in each resident focus group shared that they were homeless). Residents who were interested called CRI to be assessed for eligibility and RSVP. Residents who called were asked if they had used services provided by ENTF partner agencies within the last six months. Each partner agency and some programs were named during eligibility screening since it was unlikely that residents would be familiar with ENTF by name. The callers were screened to ensure they met the focus group eligibility goals.

Researchers at CRI facilitated all of the focus groups. CRI researchers asked ENTF partners to define the current state of workforce development services being offered. Specifically, CRI asked about the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for these workforce development services. The partners that participated in these focus groups were from the following organizations:

- Area Agency on Aging of Western Michigan
- ASCET / West Michigan Works!
- Disability Advocates of Kent County
- Goodwill Industries of Greater Grand Rapids
- Grand Rapids Community College
- Grand Rapids HQ
- Grand Rapids Urban League
- Hispanic Center of Western Michigan
- Hope Network West Michigan
- Literacy Center of West Michigan
- North Kent Community Services
- Seeds of Promise
- Steepletown Neighborhood Services
- The Other Way Ministries
- The SOURCE
- United Church Outreach Ministries
- West Michigan Center for Arts and Technology
- Women’s Resource Center
- Wyoming Public Schools/Wyoming Community Education
CRI identified key themes among partners’ responses to understand the scope of ENTF’s current workforce development services, the populations using these services, the barriers that exist to resident participation, and opportunities for improvement.

Throughout the report, residents who are using workforce development services are identified as clients whereas residents who are not using any workforce development services are identified as residents.

Researchers at CRI also facilitated focus groups with clients and residents to evaluate their level of knowledge about the ENTF partner agency programs available and the accessibility of these programs. Clients and residents discussed the barriers to receiving workforce development services and possible suggestions for improvement. From these dialogues, researchers identified, compared, and contrasted key themes between focus groups for residents and clients. A Spanish translator was present for the majority of the client and resident focus groups.

Clients shared that they used workforce development services from the following organizations:

- ASCET/ West Michigan Works!
- Goodwill Industries of Greater Grand Rapids
- Grand Rapids Urban League
- Hispanic Center of Western Michigan
- Labor Ready
- Literacy Center of West Michigan
- Michigan Rehabilitation Services (MRS)
- Seeds of Promise
- The Other Way Ministries
- The SOURCE
- West Michigan Center for Arts and Technology (WMCAT)
- Women’s Resource Center

For the resident focus groups, the researchers recruited 19 participants. Approximately 72 percent of these residents were Caucasian or White, while 17 percent identified as Latino or Hispanic, and 11 percent as Black or African American compared to the overall unemployment rate in Kent County of 8.7 percent who identified as Caucasian or White, 23.1 percent who identified as Black or African American, and 14.8 percent identified as Hispanic or Latino (ACS 5 year estimate 2013). Since those who identified as Black or African American are not representative in the focus groups, this is a limitation of CRI. The majority of these clients were between 40 and 55 years old, the total age range was 18 to 61.

Residents from the focus groups who had not used ENTF services were unemployed for an average of 1.9 years. These residents reported that they would spend an average of 3.4 hours per day searching for jobs. Client and resident focus group participants received a $25 Visa gift card as means of compensation for their time.
Understanding System Scans or Maps

All maps were aggregated into Census Tracts. A tract contains multiple block groups. A block group is smaller than an overall tract but larger than the general block. Typically, per the United States Census, a block group consists of 700 residents and is the smallest unit the United States Census Bureau uses in reporting census data.

Reference maps were also generated to increase the ease of understanding the maps within the report. These maps are available in Appendix B. Due to the limited participation, only known ENTF partners were included in all maps. While there was limited participation, ENTF reviewed the data and believed that the data available are fairly comprehensive of all currently participating ENTF partners. Additionally, only sites that provide workforce development services were listed, not administrative headquarters.

Maps were generated using color scales representing the indicator(s) noted in the legend. The color scales are standardized for each comparison group. For example, there are four different maps created for race (Caucasian/White, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, and Other) using the same standard color scale and break points between colors. This allows for side-by-side comparisons of the maps. Color scale cut offs may differ between types of maps (e.g. within race unemployment rate maps differ in scale from married unemployment rate maps). Maps for the residents are in percentages using two different formulas, below.

**Formula 1: Formula Used for Resident System Scan**

\[
\text{Resident Scan Percentage} = \frac{\text{Population of Interest}}{\text{Sum of People in Civilian Labor Force}}
\]

Formula 1 is used to look at a population of interest as they compare to the entire underlying population, such as unemployed African American residents as a percent of all residents. This is useful to see where unemployment rates are high in general as compared to the total number of people in that geography.

**Formula 2: Formula Used for Resident System Scan (R30 to R33)**

The second formula used for the resident maps calculates a percentage based on the population of interest divided by the same population of interest in the labor force, such as unemployed Black or African American residents as a percent of all Black or African American residents in that geography. This second calculation allows you to assess if unemployment is affecting groups of people equally, or if certain subpopulations (such as race/ethnicity groups) are experiencing greater occurrences of unemployment. This controls for differing numbers people in various subgroups in the underlying population (e.g. the total population is not made of equal percentages of White/Caucasian, African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Other residents).

“Civilian labor force” is defined by the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS) as individuals who are over 16 years of age and are not employed by government or military entities and who have not chosen to leave the labor force (for reasons such as retirement or being a stay-at-home parent).

The overall ENTF client system scan is displayed using counts or number of clients in each census tract. Formula 3 (below) was used to determine the density of clients’ race, gender, and unemployment at start and end date within each tract.

**Formula 3: Formula Used for Clients Using ENTF Services**

\[
\text{ENTF Collaborative Clients Percentage} = \frac{\text{Population of Interest}}{\text{Sum of Clients in ENTF Workforce Collaborative}}
\]
Formula 4 was used to determine the average age of clients within each tract.

**Formula 4: Formula Used for Clients Age**

Most maps utilized de-duplicated data where duplicates were removed from the data set to ensure the clients were not calculated multiple times. Additionally, clients using services from multiple agencies were not de-duplicated. However, when observing the data for unemployment at end and start dates, the data remained as duplicated data to capture the number of times clients received services. These maps refer to the clients as respondents.

The comparative maps overlay the client maps on the resident maps, showing the number of clients overlaid against the underlying population in that same geography and subgroup. This enables the viewer to more easily compare the two maps and shows what may be called a utilization rate. There are two aspects to consider when analyzing the comparative maps. The first is to note the black circles which represent the total number of clients from participating ENTF partner agencies from that geography. The second is the shaded color which represents the unemployment rate of the underlying population. This can also be thought of as describing utilization rates, where large dots alongside dark shading indicate both high unemployment and high numbers of clients. The particular areas to be concerned about in these maps are those where the dots and shading don’t match up, either with large dots and light shading or small dots and dark shading.

All maps for this report are listed in the Appendices (B to E). Generally, the best way to read the maps in this system scan is as follows:

1. Ensure the reference maps are easily accessible so one can easily make comparisons to the rest of the maps (M1 thru M6).

2. Identify the title of the map which is listed in the top center of the map.

3. Look at the legend to understand the indicators displayed, scale level, and the corresponding colors.

4. Scan the map for ENTF partners. These are represented by blue dots. Blue squares indicate ENTF partners that did not provide data to CRI. Note that the dots are not exhaustive, only known satellite locations were included in the system scans.

5. Identify the tract(s) with a darker shade. This is the area that requires the most attention. For instance, when looking at the Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI, a census tract shaded in dark brown means that Census tract has the highest unemployment rate (17.1% to 25.5%)

6. Compare the map to other related maps. Using race as an example, compare those who identified as Caucasian/White with those identified as African American/Black to see how unemployment or utilization rates are manifesting differently.

**Note:** If you are interested in identifying the raw numbers for each tract, please visit: [cridata.org/unemployment](http://cridata.org/unemployment). The interactive dashboard was made for personalized explorations to validate information on the generated maps. Please note that all numbers were obtained from the 2014 American Community Survey five year estimate and do not account for margins of error. That means that some areas where zero percent unemployment is indicated may actually have unemployed residents and maps that show number of clients divided by the total underlying population may show percentages that are greater than 100 percent.
Report Layout

This report integrates the information gathered from focus groups and two systems scans (underlying population and clients receiving workforce development services) to provide more context to the results found. The report begins with an overview of what the underlying population at Kent County and the Neighborhoods of Focus are, then the report funnels down to the clients served at different workforce development agencies within Kent County and the Neighborhoods of Focus. Comparative maps were produced to distinguish potential gaps that may be present between the underlying population and the clients served. Lastly, reasons for successes, identified barriers, and the opportunities for growth were gathered from focus groups which concludes the findings or results of this project.
Unemployment Rates in Grand Rapids

Overall
The first set of unemployment maps are an overall look at the entire Kent County (R1 to R14). The second set of maps is zoomed in on the Neighborhoods of Focus (R16 to R30). According to the 2014 American Community Survey data (five year estimate), there is an overall unemployment rate of 8.9 percent within Kent County, Michigan. Based on the data analyzed, unemployment in Kent County was concentrated within the Neighborhoods of Focus (NOF) with some additional areas of high unemployment towards the northeast side of Kent County (R1). The highest unemployment rates occurred along the eastern border of the NOF, as well as the northeastern corner of the NOF (tracts 15, 28, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37 and 38). Additionally, there were some regions of high unemployment directly adjacent to the NOF (tracts 8, 20, and 135). CRI further analyzed the overall unemployment rate within each tract by gender, marital status, and race/ethnicity. Data were analyzed to assess for any disparity in unemployment rates by demographic and geographic factors.

Below and in Appendix B (M3 and M4), the underlying population density of Kent County is shown, with one dot representing each resident and the color of that dot representing that resident’s race/ethnicity. As indicated by the green and yellow dots within the NOF, Black or African American and Hispanic or Latino residents are concentrated in the south and southeastern portions. This is consistent with the findings of White, Arthur, and Hirschfeld (2015) (Figures 2 and 3).

Figure 1: Overall Population (M3 and M4)

Figure 2: Black or African American

Figure 3: Hispanic or Latino

Race
White, Arthur, and Hirschfeld (2015) noted that there was high unemployment disparity among Black or African American and Hispanic or Latino residents within the NOF. The findings by White, Arthur, and Hirschfeld (2015) were consistent with the findings of CRI where unemployment was greater (as a proportion of the number of residents) within the NOF than elsewhere in Kent County (R1). The total unemployment rate in Kent County was 8.9 percent whereas within the NOF the unemployment rate was 17.3 percent (ACS 2014 5 year estimate).
White, Arthur, and Hirschfeld’s (2015) finding of disparities in unemployment by race was further supported by the maps created by CRI, where unemployment was 26 percent for Black or African Americans within the NOF and 21.6 percent for Kent County (R30). For those who identified as White or Caucasian (R33), the overall unemployment rate in the NOF was 13.2 percent, compared to 7.4 percent in Kent County.

The unemployment rate was also high within the NOF and the surrounding tracts for those who identified as Latino or Hispanic (R31). The overall unemployment rate for Hispanic or Latino residents in the NOF was 18.4 percent, compared to 14 percent for Kent County. Areas with high unemployment rates (where over 30% of Latino or Hispanic residents are unemployed) for Latino or Hispanic residents were found in the northern portion of the NOF (tract 19) and eastern NOF (tract 28). Using the population density maps (M3 and M4), areas of high Hispanic population in the southern portion of the NOF (surrounding Grandville Avenue; tracts 40, 38, 39, 26, and 37) corresponded to a high unemployment rate (20 to 30%) for those identified as Hispanic or Latino. The analyses conducted by White, Arthur, and Hirschfeld (2015) were aggregated for the entire NOF whereas the maps created by CRI provide an in-depth look at the disparity within the NOF at each census tract.

CRI also prepared another set of maps to assess the unemployment disparity by race in Kent County. These maps were calculated differently where the population of interest (specific race) was divided with the total unemployment rate. The shading on these maps will be affected by the unequal proportion of residents of each race within a census tract. Additional unemployment by race maps where a different formula was used to identify the unemployment rate divided by the corresponding race was used to identify race disparity in unemployment. The maps can be found in Appendix B: African American or Black (R2 and R17), Hispanic or Latino (R3 and R18), White or Caucasian (R4 and R19), and other races (R5 and R20). For this project ‘other races’ includes Asian, Native American and American Indian, those who identify as more than one race, and anyone who identifies as a race other than Caucasian or White, African American or Black, or Hispanic or Latino.

Gender
When reviewing the maps for gender differences (R21 to R23), a few areas exhibited a disparity in the unemployment rates. Males (R23) accounted for a higher percentage of the unemployed workforce in areas on the east of Grand Rapids (tract 33), north of Burton Street/west of Division Avenue (tract 38), and just outside the eastern border of the NOF north of Wealthy Street (tracts 14 and 20). Regions of disproportionately higher female unemployment (R22) were found adjacent to the NOF along the southwest corner (tract 135) and to the north (tract 8). Within the NOF, a small pocket of higher unemployment rates for female residents was discovered south of Wealthy Street (tracts 29, 30 and 32).

Only minor differences were noted between female residents (R22) and female head-of-households (R21). Female head-of-households had a higher rate of unemployment compared to the overall female unemployment rate in the region north of Hall Street/east of Division (tract 37) and directly to the east adjacent to the NOF (tract 35). In other geographies, there were minimal differences between unemployment rates in female head-of-households and females in general.

Marital/Family Status
The maps (R24 to R29) were analyzed to better understand the marital/family status of the unemployed population within the NOF. For the purpose of married couples, the employment status of each individual was determined by the same method as for the overall population. A spouse was not counted as unemployed unless the individual was seeking employment. There is very little variation in the areas of unemployment between married couples with or without children (R24 to R27). One area of concern within the NOF is the area along Division Avenue and north of Hall Street (tract 26) which has the highest percentage of married couples with both individuals unemployed. The most concerning group analyzed was for single-parent households (R28), which showed a higher proportion of unemployment in the southeastern quadrant of the NOF (tracts 28, 31, 32, 36, 37, and 39).
Client and Resident Knowledge and Utilization of Services (Focus Groups)

In addition to assessing if there was a gap between the clients served by ENTF partner agencies and the underlying population, focus groups were held with current clients and residents who were potential clients to see why they felt there may be a gap in utilization. Residents who do not currently use ENTF partner agencies’ services were aware of some of the available programs, however, their knowledge was limited. Residents not using services made the following statements about what they know regarding the services available to them:

“I heard they help you look for a job, but that’s all I know.”

“You learn how to do a resume, take interviews...to help you get a job.”

“[Employment services are] available but they’re so restrictive.”

“Manpower or Michigan Works helps you with interview clothes.”

“At Goodwill they try to find you something permanent.”

“It’s my understanding that at Goodwill, you have to work with Goodwill and train at Goodwill and you are training ... longer than is absolutely necessary.”

Although the residents who were not using ENTF services stated the restrictions above, clients (residents who used ENTF services) indicated that they have been successful in finding employment. One ENTF partner agency client shared, “I just started knowing Michigan Works...Michigan Works is a workforce development agency that helped me find a job. [They] found me my first job, then Michigan Works found me another one.” The same client also said, “I like that they help you build your resume, cover letter, and workshops. [There are] other options in different areas [of workforce development].” Another client described liking workforce development services because the programs the resident participated in made him feel more self-sufficient. “[If you find the right person, they’re going to help you all the way through and they’re going to teach you how to do things not just do it for you.” This same quote indicated a feeling of success being tied to the “right” service provider staff member, suggesting possible differences in quality of service provision. Another client mentioned that “MRS (Michigan Rehabilitation Services) … can even help you set up a business of your own.” Many clients who were using services agreed when a client shared, “if you go through [services like] MI Works to get a job, you’re going to have that job for sure for a while.”

Client and Resident Barriers for Receiving Services and Finding Employment (Focus Groups)

Residents and clients described experiencing the same barriers to receiving services and finding employment. Firstly, residents indicated they often lack reliable means of transportation. A resident said, “[Y]ou’ve got to have transportation...that’s like the key word in everything, you must have transportation.” All focus groups conducted mentioned the same barrier to finding a job and going to organizations to obtain services. Without transportation, residents and clients felt their options for receiving services and obtaining employment were extremely limited. Many residents and clients stated that their likelihood of looking for a job decreased dramatically if they did not have their own transportation. One client said, “there are some employment agencies that won’t even let you apply if you don’t have transportation.”

Residents also noted that jobs were unsustainable for them because, “sometimes there are jobs out there, but they’re too far to commute back and forth [where] you spend more money [than you make] to get there on gas when you don’t have a [steady] income.” ENTF partner agency clients responded similarly, saying that it was difficult for them to get around; they said that often times relying on public transportation can be a challenge, “you [either] can’t afford the bus line or the bus line doesn’t go there.” Clients also shared that there were numerous jobs that they would qualify for, but the positions were located outside of the bus line or outside of Kent County. They said, “jobs are too far and don’t pay enough.” One client added, “[employment services] did find me [a job] that was permanent, that paid pretty good an hour, but it was way out by the airport. I had to transfer 2-3 busses to get there, so I had to quit.”
Both residents and clients also indicated that some had criminal histories which were a barrier to their success. One resident said that it was difficult finding employment because employment services do not help them explain felonies on their record. The residents shared that having a criminal history automatically prevented one from being considered for a job, “a lot of these organizations (partners’ agencies)...say they’re going to help the person [with felonies], but it’s wishy-washy.” Another stated, “If you have felonies on your record, it’s even harder to get an apartment.” It seemed that a criminal history may be a perceived barrier that prevented residents from even seeking out workforce development services. A resident who previously used ENTF services also acknowledged that having felonies can set one back from finding a job.

Access to technology needed for communication was also a common problem in several different ways for both clients and residents. Firstly, technological skills and lack of access to technological devices such as computers and phones make it difficult for residents to communicate. One resident who had not been using services stated, “I’m homeless, [I] don’t have access to the internet all the time.” These residents then said that the lack of access to information about available services was a barrier to using services; one resident stated that “not knowing what they offer [meant] I had no idea they help you find a job.” A client using services stated that “not everyone has access to the internet,” and “I can’t call for information if I can’t afford minutes on my phone.” Clients who have used ENTF partner agency services also shared that they struggle with their current computer skills and using different communication tools. Most of the residents who attended the focus groups also shared that their knowledge about using a computer was limited and that they found it to be overwhelming. One resident shared, “I find it difficult using the computer; I do spend a long time just trying to work the computer because I don’t have those skills.”

Secondly, miscommunication between program staff and clients or issues in service delivery were also perceived barriers by those who have and have not used the workforce development services. Clients claimed to be disappointed with some workforce development services because they thought they would be guaranteed a job and did not get one. A frustrated client explained that some organizations were not to the point, forcing the clients to show up for a prospective job that may or may not be suitable for them, “[showing up] isn’t a guarantee you’re going to get placed somewhere.” One client stated that the services helped him find job that he was “not even remotely interested in...it’s really hard to find a job that I love.” Another issue that the resident shared was that they felt the employees at the workforce development organizations “just don’t pay attention to what your needs are or what they should be at the time you’re trying to find work.” Another resident added to this feeling of being misunderstood, saying, “you’ve got all those folks with all that smart book knowledge up there [trying to help us], but you don’t know a darn thing about a human being out on the streets, or what they’ve been through.”

Residents also indicated that some felt discriminated against for various reasons. Many shared that they were viewed differently by people who worked at the workforce development organizations. “They discriminate because of age or homelessness,” one resident added, “I do think there is such a thing as age discrimination.” Another resident stated she was discriminated for not looking like everyone else, “I get discriminated against because I have no teeth.” Another resident stated, “there are a lot of business people (service providers and employers)... who sometimes they look at another human being like they’re better than they are” which made them feel less comfortable to ask for help. This is another indication that personal recruitment and referrals could benefit clients.

Other life stability factors also serve as barriers to residents and clients. These factors include housing, child care, language, lack of food, and financial support through transitions. These barriers were not prominent in the focus groups but were discussed briefly.

Utilizing the information provided by participating ENTF workforce development organizations data, CRI was able to create several maps to explore the populations served in Kent County. The maps generated for Kent County and Neighborhoods of Focus using census tracts are:

- Overall number of clients
- Clients’ race
- Clients’ gender
- Clients’ age
- Clients’ unemployment status at start and end date (note that this is a subset of participating agencies due to incomplete data)
Additional maps using aggregated zip code level were developed to include data from Goodwill Industries and Hispanic Center of Western Michigan. The zip code maps for Kent County and NOF (approximately) include:

- Overall number of clients
- Clients’ race
- Clients’ gender

There were numerous limitations to the maps created because there was not full participation from ENTF partners which hindered CRI in providing a true representation of clients served in Kent County. Additionally, there may be a duplication of clients in different organizations. CRI de-duplicated those receiving numerous services from one organization to ensure that a client was not being counted as numerous clients. This was not possible to do across organizations, as the data were de-identified prior to providing them to CRI.

### Programs and Services Provided by ENTF Partner Agencies

Many ENTF partner agencies also completed a participation survey and submitted information about services or programs the organizations provide. The services provided by the organizations are listed below. Please note that this is not a comprehensive list of all programs or services provided by the ENTF partner agencies, as not all agencies participated.

There were six services from four agencies that were at or greater than 95 percent service capacity. Services that were at capacity were prison re-entry (ASCET West Michigan Works!), reemployment services for dislocated workers (ASCET West Michigan Works!), Career preparation for people with disabilities (Disability Advocates of Kent County), mock interview workshops for single mothers experiencing homelessness (Grand Rapids Housing Commission), resume building for single mothers experiencing homelessness (Grand Rapids Housing Commission) and skills for success (Women’s Resource Center).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACSET West Michigan Works!</td>
<td>Job Readiness Workshops</td>
<td>500+</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>All populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant &amp; Seasonal Farmworkers</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PATH</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prisoner Reentry</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Prisoner re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reemployment Services</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>AD; DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade Adjustment Act</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Adult; DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner-Peyser/Career Navigation</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>All populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIOA Career Coaching</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Adult; DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Advocates of Kent County</td>
<td>ADA Employment Advocacy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career Preparation</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veteran Work Assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Veterans with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Readiness Workshop Series</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill Industries of Greater Grand Rapids</td>
<td>Career Center (walk-in)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>All populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certified Nurse Aide Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Those interested in a career in health care who meet eligibility requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Workshops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>All populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Skills and Soft Skills classes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>All populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Placement and Retention</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>All populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personalized Resume</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>All populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Customer Service Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>All populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Certification Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted cells indicate at least 95% service capacity. "-" denotes no data provided by workforce development agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Housing Commission</td>
<td>College Preparation</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Single mothers experiencing homelessness; Low income families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Skills Workshop</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Single mothers experiencing homelessness; Elderly population; Low income families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GED Practice</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Single mothers experiencing homelessness; Low income families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Search</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Single mothers experiencing homelessness; Low income families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mock Interviews Workshops</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single mothers experiencing homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resume Building</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single mothers experiencing homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Center</td>
<td>Employment referrals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Latino/Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resume assistance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Latino/Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Network of West Michigan</td>
<td>Employment Services Collaborative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50 (annually)</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 (annually)</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prisoner Reentry</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125 (annually)</td>
<td>Prison re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ready for Work</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80 (annually)</td>
<td>Jail re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situational Assessments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 (annually)</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Jobs</td>
<td>GED Cafe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GED Cafe-Prep</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GED Corrections Testing</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>20 (weekly)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GED Testing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 (daily)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GED Testing Center</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>60 (weekly)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juvenile Justice Involved Aftercare</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Justice</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>36 (monthly)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISE Employment Readiness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES!4U</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 (summer)</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISE Walk-in Center Coaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINC Up</td>
<td>Employment Fairs</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Unemployed; Underemployed; Re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Unemployed; Re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Readiness</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Unemployed; Underemployed; Re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-on-one Coaching</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Unemployed; Underemployed; Re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Center of West Michigan</td>
<td>Customized Workplace English</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SOURCE</td>
<td>Barrier Navigation</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Incumbent workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Incumbent workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Resource Center</td>
<td>Community Mentoring</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Currently for New Beginnings participants, plan to expand in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Classes: Intro, Word, Excel</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>10 (per class)</td>
<td>Anyone in ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empower Program</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Anyone coming to wRC for services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Seeker’s Support Group</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Open to all Employment Services Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Beginnings</td>
<td>60 (roughly)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Jail re-entry for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resume Coaching</td>
<td>By appointment</td>
<td>By appointment</td>
<td>Open to anyone in ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills for Success</td>
<td>15 (per class)</td>
<td>15 (per class)</td>
<td>Open to anyone in ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming Community Education</td>
<td>Adult Basic English</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Youth, Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Youth, Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GED</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Youth, Adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted cells indicate at least 95% service capacity. **"** denotes no data provided by workforce development agency.
Scope and Criteria of Programs/Services (Focus Groups)

ENTF’s partner agencies considered themselves as organizations that provide assistance to people in need related to career and employment services because the partners were offering a variety of services in workforce development. Partners shared that services include "resume building to soft skills". They shared the goal of helping residents become self-sufficient. One partner agency said that their process includes "looking at someone’s journey map and helping them work through a career pathway and laddering those skills, those credentials, to get them to that ultimate goal of self-sufficiency." In doing this, partners agreed that "[partners are] all helping agencies...meeting a need"—a need that they claim is often overlooked and unmet in society. As one person stated, "In our society, we have the tendency of just putting Band-Aids when we see issues and problems rather than going deeper and looking at the root cause of the problem...we [should] look at the root cause."

ENTF partner agencies stated that each agency had different approaches to meeting the different population needs such as community focused or system focused. One partner agency utilized a bottom-up approach in which "the residents are the ones who are leading the strategy for change" The partner agencies said that "many people in the inner-cities feel powerless and hopelessness." To empower these people, this partner said that "residents are developing the programs." A different community partner utilized a more systems focused approach in which they view the employers as their primary customer: "understanding what our employers’ needs are is going to better help us serve the clients who walk through our center doors." ENTF partners serve community members of all kinds, but each partner’s criteria for program participation varies. Through the agency collaboration via ENTF, partners indicated that there were services that were "essentially open to everybody." Following is a list of some of the mentioned criteria/target clients for program participation:

- "those who have disabilities"
- "dislocated workers...adults based on income eligibility and need...Low-income individuals with children and other members who aren’t contributing to household income"
- "those who have been incarcerated"
- "adults who don’t speak English, read under eighth- or ninth-grade level, GED-ready students, [those pursuing a] high school diploma, and English language learners"
- "women with children in northern Kent County"
- "16 to 18-year-olds"
- "14 to 24-year-olds"
- "people [who are] at least 55, who are unemployed, and meet low-income requirements"
- "African American and Hispanic people"
- "women who come out of jail"
- "18 to 24-year-olds"
- "Mostly working with African Americans,...29 percent have criminal background"

These services range from serving “entry level to continuing employment” participants while “empowering the people [to reach] a goal they set for themselves.” By asking the clients to set their own goals, community partners are helping individuals to overcome the “fear of accomplishment or not believing in themselves.” By "not dictating [to] the participant but listening to the participant and having them drive services," the community partners are able to deliver personalized services to the needs of each client.
Workforce Development Clients

The maps for ENTF partner agency clients indicated that there were large numbers of clients who reside in northern Alpine township, Grand Rapids, Wyoming, and Kentwood (E1). Focusing within the NOF (E20), large groups of clients reside between Fulton Street and Second Street (tract 19). There were also high concentrations of clients in the southeastern portion of the NOF (tracts 31, 32, 36 and 38) as well as adjacent to these regions but outside of the NOF (tract 35). When analyzing the counts of clients using zip codes, 695 and 1072 clients reside in zip 49504 and 49507, respectively (E12). The maps created using zip codes were less reliable since the clients’ specific residence could not be pin-pointed.

Using ranges, the average age of clients within Kent County was 37.98 (E8). Clients in the NOF (E21) were younger (34.20) on average than in surrounding areas. Ages for unemployment and living retrieved from ACS 2014 five-year estimate are divided into ranges, the majority of those who are unemployed living in Kent County were between ages: 35 to 44 years old (16.4%, N=28,868) and 45 to 54 years old (N=28,868). The unemployed civilians living in NOF is consistent with the clients served as most of the unemployed civilians in NOF are younger where their ages range from 25 to 29 years old (18.3%, N=4,999). The zip code map highlights that clients living in zip 49301 are generally older than clients living in Grand Rapids and inside the NOF (E13).

Comparing clients within the NOF based on gender (E26 and E27), there was a wide disparity in the number of clients by gender as split by Market Avenue. To the north of Market Avenue (tract 27) the majority of clients were male, whereas to the south (tract 26) the majority of clients are female. The zip code maps indicated that there were more male clients (65.12%) compared to female clients (20.93%) in zip code 49302 (E19). Contrastingly, there were more female clients (50.11%) than male clients (41.08%) living in zip code 49505 (E18). A more thorough comparison of the unemployment rates and clients being served by gender is noted in the comparative section of the report.

CRI created another map to provide a different view of those who identify as Caucasian or White using natural breaks (E31). Natural breaks are statistically driven breaks in the color scale of the map, where splits are made based on how the proportions naturally group rather than at set intervals. The map using natural breaks provided a more descriptive representation of those who are White or Caucasian within each tract.

The largest proportion of clients who identify as Black or African American reside within the NOF and in Kentwood (E2 and E22). Generally, there were very few who identify themselves as African American who reside in cities outside of Kentwood, Grand Rapids, Walker, and Wyoming (E2). The observation is similar for those who identified as Hispanic or Latino (E3 and E23) and of other races (E5 and E25). Most of the clients who identified as Hispanic or other races were residing in the southwest of Kent County and within the NOF. The maps using zip codes support the previous findings where there were more clients who identify as African American living in Kentwood and Grand Rapids (E14).

Percentage of Unemployed at Start and End of Services

Unemployment data at end and start date includes duplicated data (N=13,485) to ensure that clients who were receiving multiple services were counted multiple times. However, this information was limited because many agencies do not collect or were not able to share employment information at the end of services. There were 5,414 (40.15%) fields missing from the unemployment at start of services and 12,433 (92.20%) missing fields in the unemployment at end of services. Due to the high amount of missing data points, no strong interpretation can be attributed to the unemployment at service start and end date maps (E9 and E28).
The maps created for comparisons provide a view of clients being served by participating ENTF partner agencies and the unemployment rate present in Kent County to assess any utilization disparity.

Overall
The overall comparison maps (C1 and C8) require different interpretation than the client and resident maps because the maps were comparing the number of clients served divided by the total unemployed civilian workforce at each tract. Thus, a higher percentage indicates that ENTF partners reached a higher percentage of the unemployed civilian workforce within a region. When analyzing the map, the gap in services may be indicated by the lower percentages. Within the NOF, the area where unemployment was high and participation was lowest was in tract 33 (12.87%) which indicates the need for further examination. Outside of the NOF but within Kent County, areas of low participation were found in northwestern Cascade, Byron, western Sparta, southern Plainfield, Courtland, Oakfield, Cannon, western Spencer, Cedar Springs, and Vergennes. The low levels of participation in areas outside of the NOF are expected due to the limited number of providers located far outside the city of Grand Rapids.

Within the NOF along Market and Grandville Avenues, 41.25 percent (tract 26) and 35.06 percent (tract 27) of the unemployed civilian labor workforce was using ENTF services. There were areas within the NOF that had less than 25 percent utilization (tracts 15, 29, 37, and 38). Areas north of Burton Street and between Eastern Avenue and Clyde Park Avenue (tracts 37 and 28), with 15.1 to 25 percent of the target population using services, suggest a need for further examination.

Race
When analyzing unemployment and percent of clients who identified as Black or African American (C2 and C9), the highest proportion of service utilization occurred in the southeastern portion of the NOF where there were also higher percentages of unemployment. There were relatively high percentages of White or Caucasian clients across Kent County (C4 and C11). There were higher percentages of White or Caucasian clients than would be expected given the underlying unemployment rate in Ada, Solon, Gaines, Caledonia, and southeast side of Grand Rapids. The comparisons for those who identified as Hispanic or Latino (C3 and C10) and other races (C5 and C12) based on participation rate were quite similar to one another. There were higher percentages of unemployment and moderate percentages of clients near the NOF for Hispanic or Latino residents and those who identified as other race. This indicates that future outreach for those who identified as Hispanic or Latino, and other races specific in the stated areas should be explored.

Gender
When comparing the unemployment rate and the percent of clients, no major disparity was noted based on gender. Out of the 10,144 de-duplicated data available, 4,227 (50.91%) clients were female and 4,076 (49.09%) were male. Within NOF (N=1318), 52.43% of the clients were female and 47.57% were male. The observation provided an indication that ENTF partners were serving more female clients than male clients in the NOF areas. Specifically, in tract 26 (N=86, missing 13), south of Market Avenue, where there were more female clients (65.12%) compared to male clients (34.88%). This is an inverse of tract 27 (N=78, missing 10), where there were more male clients (67.95%) served compared to female clients (32.05%, N=78). Since there were no big differences in the number female and male clients served, there were not any striking disparities present in terms of number of clients served. The approximately equal representation of female and male clients correlates to the unemployment rate in NOF where the maximum unemployment in NOF at a tract was 19.1 percent which was slightly lower than the maximum unemployment rate for male (20%) (C13 and C14). There were not any striking disparities identified in map C13 and C14.
During the partner focus groups, the partners were provided with opportunities to reflect on what their organizations' successes were and barriers that they witnessed while providing services to clients. Below are information gathered that reflect successes and barriers the partners experienced.

**Perceived Barriers (Focus Groups)**

ENTF partners see clients' ability or inability to meet fundamental needs as a barrier to providing them with services. “System barriers such as housing, child care, [and] transportation …are probably some of the main barriers we see every day.” The partner continued, “as soon as [fundamental needs such as] housing are gone, [clients] are not going to focus on what you’re working on in your program.” Another partner added, “it can be difficult to get clients to think long term [because] their needs are so immediate and in front of them.” One of the partners stated, *“You’re talking about this person’s future, but their mind is full of the moment that they’re living in.”*

Likewise, if clients cannot meet fundamental needs, it is likely that the clients are also having difficulty to afford or meet their needs for communication technology like phones and computers/internet access. One partner said that their clients often “can’t afford the tools to communicate effectively,” and therefore, the partners struggled to contact clients to serve them. “Sometimes they run out of phone minutes while I’m speaking to them… and they can’t call me back for another month until they can get more minutes.” Partners also recognized that the inability to communicate using computers was an issue, *“many of the residents we work with don’t have computers or listen to the news, so the information doesn’t get down to them,”* and “even those who do have a computer cannot afford internet service.” Therefore, partners stated strongly that it was difficult to communicate with clients on a consistent basis.

As briefly stated before, the lack of “transportation, not just to a job, but to the services or other appointments” posed as a problem for clients accessing services. Several partners noted that bus lines do not reach their buildings, “we don’t have bus lines coming to where we are.” As workforce development service providers, the partners had to creatively identify “how [we can] provide our services a little closer to the people who are in need.” One partner said that they have to “choose programs that are as close to [clients] as possible to minimize the transportation issues,” and this can prevent clients from receiving the best services. Another partner described that they addressed this issue by “develop[ing] our own buses to get people out there.” However, other partners said that they do not have the funding to do this. One partner asked, *“Where is the fund that says we are going to fund transportation? … Someone needs to create that transportation system.”*

ENTF community partners also agree that the “benefits cliff” residents experience while using their services is a barrier. A lot of the partners discussed the potential hurdle to accepting a full-time job. “As soon as someone steps forward and gets a job, so many of these support services that were steadying the boat are immediately pulled.” Partners said, *“We can get them started [in a job] but they will get dropped from their benefits … [therefore,] mom[s] and young kids most often are gone instantaneously.”* Because “*your support system can fall out from under you as soon as your first check...the fear of taking a job will turn your life upside down.*” Partners reported that when their clients “take a job, [they often] quit and panic when everything is taken [from them].” To address this, one partner suggested that they “invest time [in the client] so the person understands that if they get a job they may lose benefits so it’s not a surprise, and get them invested in longer term of working in like a career model [instead of a] working just for a paycheck model.” The “benefits cliff” was not brought up by clients or residents as a barrier. Recent legislation that aimed to eliminate the benefits cliff in relation to child care has also passed in the past year. It is unclear if partner agencies were not aware of this change, if the change did not result in measurable differences for clients, or if the perceived cliff by clients has not changed since the new legislation.

Stigma was also another barrier that was discussed often by partner agencies. One of the partners stated, *“For the people who can get to us and can participate in programming, there’s also getting over the stigma associated with utilizing a program for somebody who maybe has been employed for a while and wants to get back to being employed.”*
This stigma derives in many forms, both in stigma about receiving services and feared stigma from employers. One population of clients are afraid of the stigma associated with receiving services and another population of clients face compounding social stigma regarding their disability or criminal records in addition to their unemployment.

Partners mentioned concerns about “stigma against hiring people with disabilities” and “stigma against those who have been involved with the justice system.” Therefore, partners indicated that stigma and “the fear of people finding out” keeps clients from utilizing their services.

**Successes (Focus Groups)**

Despite perceived barriers, ENTF community partners view themselves as successful for several reasons. One common reason is that the partners are invested and multifaceted, “we become job coaches, writing resumes so people get jobs for a sustaining level of employment.” However, ENTF partners realized that the task of helping clients find jobs goes beyond helping the clients with resumes. The partners believed that job retention was critical, a partner said, “you can get somebody as trained as you want, but if it’s not a right fit for them, if it’s a work environment that isn’t conducive to what they’re looking for, it’s not [going to] go anywhere.” Partners stressed the importance of making explicit to clients that the partners are invested and continued to remind the clients of “what’s in it for them.” Community partners noted that “when unemployment gets this low, the people who come to see you for help usually have very challenging, multiple, layered issues, it’s not just a job issue.” The partners stated that assisting clients with finding a job can help to address other underlying issues such as self-esteem. The partners explained that “when people have gained full employment they have good self-esteem.” The partners stated that helping their clients gain full employment can also help increase clients’ self-sufficiency and self-esteem.

Additionally, ENTF partner agencies said that they were successful because they asked the right questions for clients’ well-beings. The partners asked questions related to the clients’ past experiences and how the experiences could be integrated into the clients’ career pathway rather than “[what’s] the fastest way to get you into school?” The partners also shared that the success was due to the relationships the partners built with the clients, employers, and other partners. One of the partners commented, “I think it is most successful because of the relationship building side of things that goes on with the program[s].” The partners also aimed to understand their clients to be “proactive and forward thinking [about clients’ background] ...[which] comes from the relationship building side of things...taking the time to know the person so you can see the hurdle before you get to the hurdle.” Therefore, in order to effectively learn about and serve clients, partners believed the importance in establishing a genuine relationship with clients. A partner noted, “you have to establish that relationship with the client up front,” to gain clients’ trust.
Resident Suggestions for Reaching More People (Focus Groups)

Residents who do not use services gave suggestions on how to better reach people like themselves who could use the services ENTF partner agencies provide. The first suggestion was to post more flyers at places that they frequent such as homeless shelters, libraries, and churches. One resident suggested that having a representative go to where the residents are at would help them learn about the services and open positions: “come down with flyers saying hey, we’ve got job openings.” Another resident said that flyers were very helpful when reaching out: “it should be a flyer that says the whole list of services.” The same resident also shared that currently there were no job postings or postings of services available to them at one of the places that he frequents. He stated, “There aren’t even any flyers for job fairs up [at Degage Ministries] right now.” There were at least two participants in each of the resident focus group who shared that they were experiencing homelessness. This was a limitation on CRI’s recruiting methodology. Residents who were experiencing homelessness stated that the organizations should think differently when dealing with people who are experiencing homelessness. One resident said, “They’ve got to think about the homeless, those who don’t have somewhere to live or access to the internet…how are you [going to] reach them? Through flyers, and through getting out into the community yourselves. To get out there and interact.”

Residents suggested that they would like to receive more employment services. However, they were not aware of those services. A resident said, “just put your hand out and we’ll take it.” The residents were not aware of the different employment services available as evidenced by the following statement, “make more of an effort to reach us.” As some of the residents CRI interviewed were experiencing homelessness, they said that to best reach them, “you’ve got to be in the right place at the right time.” The residents were asking the workforce development agencies to identify ways to help the homeless population to seek for jobs. The residents suggested that in order to reach out, consistency is the key. A resident shared, “Be consistent—don’t show up the first Monday of January and not come back until the second Tuesday of March, and then again the last Friday in July—if nobody knows you’re coming and nobody knows when to expect you, they’re not going to wait around to talk to you.”

Residents also suggested that employment services should “have a representative from [partner agencies] to come out to make their rounds” and “be available to let people know what jobs [and services] employment agencies] has to offer.” Another resident stated clearly that they just needed someone to treat them with respect. The resident said, “You came in. You talked to us. What if a recruiter came in and did the same thing?” That statement was supported by others saying that if someone were to reach out to them, they would accept the assistance.

The residents reiterated the importance of communicating to them with respect, “if someone came in and was so sweet, polite, and nice, who didn’t just treat us like homeless people…and really wanted to help us get a job…that would be phenomenal.” Another resident stated the following: “we’re here...we’re trying, and we’re passionate about [finding work].” “A gift card, that’s going to last a couple days. We want a job that will last several years.”

Client and Resident Suggestions for Additional Services (Focus Groups)

Residents and clients gave suggestions for the services they would like implemented, or if they already exist, they would like more information on how to better serve them. These questions were asked to attempt to identify why there is a gap between the unemployed population and the clients of ENTF workforce development partner agencies. Clients suggested that the organizations need to find a way to provide transportation to clients. A resident who was not using services said that having “an actual transportation system [would be helpful because] if I get the job, [I need] a way to get me there and back until I can afford a car.” The residents shared that that having a service where they can be picked up and dropped off to obtain services or to interviews would be a wonderful addition. A client stated, “If [employment services] can hook us up with a job, they can hook us up with transportation to and from the job, too.”
Residents also stated that they want more opportunities to interact with people who were hiring. One way to do this was hosting and providing information about job fairs. “I think if there were job fairs...that would help tremendously...and [employers would] probably keep a lot more workers.” ENTF partner agencies have indicated that numerous job fairs like this exist in the community, pointing to disconnection in awareness. Additionally, residents said that they wanted to make good first impressions with employers, and to do this, the residents who were not currently using services suggested that employment services can provide interview training and practice, child care, and places for residents experiencing homelessness to store their bags when they are interviewing for a position. One resident shared, “Somewhere to store our stuff for interviews [would help because] my bags are checked in at Mel Trotters right now, but if we go out for interviews, we have nowhere to store our bags...it doesn’t look good.”

Residents also wanted services to help them to overcome potential discrimination or to explain their work history. Some residents struggled with past criminal records, so they would appreciate help on how to explain their absence from the workforce. A client stated that he was having difficulty relating to the jobs available due to his age said, “someplace that would help people get a job who aren’t necessarily young.” Another resident echoed the statement above and said that they have experiences and credentials needed but are finding it difficult to secure permanent positions. Additionally, non-English speaking residents and clients indicated they would like help overcoming the language barrier, because they reported that having people understanding them was difficult. One resident stated that “the most difficult thing for me is the language.” Many Spanish-speaking residents felt that they were not eligible for a lot of positions because the positions require them to speak English. Spanish-speaking clients and population at large who used temp services said that it was difficult to find steady jobs because they do not have a set schedule for work. Clients indicated that they would be asked to work two days a week or were being called in last minute was not the permanent positions that they were hoping for. Similar to other residents, the Spanish-speaking residents were also looking for permanent jobs with more structure.

Clients also suggested employment services could offer better and more information on potential employers and open job positions. A client said, “You go in for one job, but when you get there you find out you’re doing something else.” Clients wanted more information on the jobs that they were applying for and they would like to know more about the culture of the company to ensure that they fit in well. They suggested that this will decrease turnover rates and ensure that the residents and clients have jobs on a more permanent basis. One client stated, “I wish that someone could profile companies, that way it will let you know what they do.”

A client said that they would like “a website that gives more options and information [about jobs that shows] qualifications and descriptions of multiple jobs at one time.” Residents and clients indicated they need information about workforce development organizations to be more easily accessible, so a resident suggested that “[employment services] should just have some more information out there, somewhere we can easily look at it, like at Degage, because you always see the same stuff up there that isn’t benefitting to anyone.”

Residents would also appreciate “more education support.” Some residents suggested that many do not consider the experience that they had. A resident expressed that if employment services “[paid] attention to the training I already have it would save time” to find suitable jobs for him. The residents also suggested that ENTF partners offer “free training and funding for certification” so that residents can qualify for jobs they really want. Although ENTF partners offer certain certifications at no cost, this provides an indication that it may be an awareness issue where residents are not aware of all the services available. Residents also shared that they enjoyed on-the-job training because it allowed them to learn and get paid at the same time. A resident expressed “when you're working (on-the-job training), you're actually getting paid, and when you're done, that's the company you end up working for.” This allowed the residents to step a little closer to a permanent position and get started without previous experience.
Opportunities for Growth (Focus Groups with ENTF Partners)

ENTF partner agencies saw opportunities for growth in improving the way they serve their clients. These opportunities primarily exist in continuing to build stronger relationships with other partners in order to increase communication and collaborative efforts. Partners said that “it can be exhausting, mentally and physically...exhausting to work in space and be dealing with other organizations to coordinate some of the clients we’re working with.” Partners would like to find a way to “solidify partnerships” to better “blend [skill sets] together to make a more fluid [collaborative] process.”

Partners agreed that they need to pool their skills, resources, and information to make referrals to each other to serve their clients more smoothly and effectively. One partner stated the following: “none of us can be everything to whoever our client is going to be...I couldn’t begin to [serve my clients well] without other [community partners].” Therefore, partners agreed that being and making more referrals to other partners could maximize the community resources available. Another partner explained, “Maybe I’m not doing something well right now, maybe there’s somebody else can do it.

However, partners acknowledged there are barriers to their current referral-making processes. Partners noticed that “each organization has dramatically different intake processes,” which they stated was frustrating for both partners and clients to circumnavigate. Therefore, partners suggested that they find better ways to align communication and increase knowledge of services between partners to ensure a smoother referrals process.

One partner stated that agencies should “not [start] a program that serves the same population, but [build] a relationship [between other partners] so that you know you can make those referrals.” Many of the partners agreed that “… continued open communication is key” to offering a wide range of services to the population in need. Community partners suggested to group services together so services can be standardized by creating a “resource map of who provides what” to better partners’ knowledge of each other’s services. Another partner suggested that holding a resource fair for the partners may increase collaborative efforts effectively,

“Resource fairs are a great way to collaborate because if you are in the same building and the same room with all these other organizations, it provides an opportunity for new clients to come in, but it also provides an opportunity for the organizations that are participating [to connect with others].”

Although partners agreed that they need to increase their collaborative efforts to better serve clients, the partners mentioned that each organization needs to “… give up our self-interest which is a barrier and look at it that we will benefit collectively and it’s [beneficial] for all of us...our 10 organizations [need to] become less competitive and more cooperative.” Partners suggested that there is a “need to break down the silos and really work together and understand that it’s about the people that we’re serving...it’s not about us, it’s about the people and how we can best serve them.”
Overall, unemployment rates appeared to be higher in the city of Grand Rapids and in the NOF. There were also slight peaks in unemployment in the northern portion of the county, in Tyrone, Sparta, and Spencer townships as well as the city of Cedar Springs. The total unemployment rate for Kent County was 8.9 percent, compared to 12 percent in the city of Grand Rapids and 17.3 percent in the NOF. When splitting unemployment by demographic factors, disparities emerged.

Unemployment rates were found to vary greatly by race or ethnicity, with White or Caucasian residents experiencing lower unemployment rates than Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and other races. The within race unemployment rate for Black or African American residents in the NOF was 26 percent, Hispanic or Latino residents was 18.4 percent, and White or Caucasian residents was 13.2 percent. The observation provided an indication that even within the same neighborhoods (and theoretically similar geographic access to resources), unemployment affects residents of different races differently. Additional inquiry is recommenced as to why different subgroups were differentially affected by unemployment and accessing workforce development services at different rates. The percent of clients utilizing services (Black or African American residents in the NOF was 31.06%, Hispanic or Latino residents was 16.04%, and White or Caucasian residents was 31.55%). Subgroup-specific recruitment and remediation of barriers may be beneficial. The observation was further supported by the comparative maps (C9, C10, C11, and C12) where the percent of clients being served within the NOF for minorities were slightly lower than clients who identified as White or Caucasian.

As indicated in the maps, the majority of participating ENTF partner agencies are located within or near the NOF, with only a few outside the city of Grand Rapids. This appears to be appropriate, as the majority of unemployed residents were also concentrated in the city of Grand Rapids and in the NOF more specifically. Utilization rate maps (E1 and E20) indicated that the majority of ENTF workforce development partner agency clients were also coming from the areas with the greatest underlying unemployment but utilization rates were still lower than expected, given the population in need.

Focus groups with residents and clients indicated a desire for more assistance in navigating around the use of computers and more access to sources of communication that would reduce their reliance on their limited cellular phone plan minutes. Residents expressed wanting to use the services but did not have a lot of knowledge regarding what services were provided by ENTF partners. Clients and residents had the same concerns about transportation limiting their ability to access services and maintain employment. Other common themes in resident focus groups included a desire for additional outreach and improved service delivery. Although many residents asked for additional outreach through flyers posted in areas such as libraries, churches, and homeless shelters, they also felt that a more personal approach for those living within the city may increase participation.

Clients who participated in the focus groups stated the supportive nature of some staff at the ENTF partner agencies and had success stories to share. However, some residents who are not using services...
have different perspectives. Residents stated that they were uncomfortable in asking for workforce services because they thought that the people who were working at the organizations did not understand or respect them. Residents suggested that having a representative to recruit people may increase their awareness of the different workforce development services available to them.

Additionally, partners acknowledged that there are barriers to their current referral-making processes. Partners who participated in the focus groups noted the need for alignment of intake forms to reduce the time needed for their clients to complete the intake process when transitioning from one agency to the other. Partners also stated the need to reduce service duplication. The partners suggested that open communication is the biggest key to increasing collaborative efforts between agencies. The partners believed that participating in the ENTF Workforce Development monthly meetings was one of the avenues to increase collaborative efforts.

The analyses in this report provided a more in depth description of the existing unemployment climate in Kent County. This report and the accompanying web visualizations are meant to serve as a tool for assessing potential areas for improvement and prioritization of efforts in relation to areas of greatest need. The number of unserved unemployed residents and the disparity between both unemployment and service provision based on race indicate a large opportunity for increased impact in the workforce development field.
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## Reference Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Census Tracts in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the census tracts for Kent County. It shows how Kent County is divided by the census bureau and is provided as a reference to allow readers to specify particular areas of interest and seek out exact numbers when needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Census Tracts in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the census tracts for the Neighborhoods of Focus (NOF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Race and Ethnicity in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the race and ethnicity distribution in Kent County, as provided by census data. Each dot represents one person. This map shows the most residents in the Northern and Eastern areas of the county identify as White or Caucasian, whereas in the Southwestern area (surrounding the city of Grand Rapids), there is greater diversity. This map also serves to show the population density, where residents in Kent County are more densely congregated in the Grand Rapids area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Race and Ethnicity in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the race and ethnicity distribution in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The majority of residents within the NOF identify as Black or African American and Latino or Hispanic. Population density is also high across most of the NOF, with the exception of the western portion, which is more industrial than residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>ENTF Service Providers in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the ENTF partner agencies in Kent County. It shows the majority of the ENTF service providers are in the Southern region of the county, centered around the Neighborhoods of Focus. The differing shapes and colors indicate which partners provided client data for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>ENTF Service Providers in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the ENTF service providers in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The differing shapes and colors indicate which partners provided client data for this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## System Scan (Residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the overall unemployment rate for those living in Kent County. The census tracts in the Southwest portion of the map appear to have the highest unemployment rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Black or African American: Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for people who identify as Black or African American living in Kent County. The census tracts in the Southwest area on the map appear to have the highest unemployment rates, particularly in the Eastern portions in and around the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Hispanic: Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for people who identify as Hispanic in Kent County. The highest unemployment rates appear to be within the Southwestern portion of the map, and concentrated in the Central area of the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for people who identify as White/Caucasian in Kent County. The highest unemployment rates occur in the Northern half of Kent County as well as the Southwestern census tract in and around Grand Rapids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>All Other Races: Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rates for people who identify as all other races in Kent County. Rates for these groups appear relatively low on this map due to the relatively low proportion of the population included in this race/ethnicity category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Female Headed Households with Children under 18: Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for female-headed households with children under 18 in Kent County. This is a proxy for assessing unemployment for single mothers, utilizing census data. The census tracts in the Southwestern portion of the map appear to have the highest unemployment rates, particularly in the Southeastern portion and along the Geographic border of the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Female: Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for female residents in Kent County. The highest unemployment rates appear to be in the Southwest area of the map, especially in the Southeast portion of Grand Rapids and within the borders of the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Male: Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for male residents in Kent County. The areas with the highest unemployment rates appear to be in the Northern and Northeastern areas of the map, as well as within the Neighborhoods of Focus with higher concentrations in the Eastern portion of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Percent Unemployment of Married Couples with Children in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for single parents with children (regardless of head of household gender) in Kent County. The highest unemployment rates occur in the Southwestern portion of the map around Grand Rapids, especially in the Southern part of the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Single Householder without Children: Percent Unemployment in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for single heads of household without children in Kent County. The highest unemployment rates occur along the Eastern side of the map, particularly just North of the Neighborhoods of Focus and in the Southeast portion of Grand Rapids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Married Couples - Both Unemployed with Children: Percent in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percent of people in the labor force who are married and have children but both partners are unemployed in Kent County. The rate of this occurring is very low overall, but peaks in a few neighborhoods in the Grand Rapids area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Married Couples - One Person Unemployed: Percent in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for married couples in Kent County in which only one partner is unemployed. The highest unemployment rates occur in Cedar Springs, as well as Northeast of the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Married Couples - One Person Unemployed with Children: Percent in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the rate for married couples with children in Kent County in which one partner is unemployed. The highest unemployment rates occur in Plainfield and Grand Rapids, particularly within the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Married Couples - Both Unemployed: Percent in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate in Kent County for married couples without children in which both partners are unemployed. The highest of these unemployment rates occur in the Southwestern portion of the map, especially in Northern Byron and the Central area of the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# System Scan (Residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Unemployment in The Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the overall unemployment rate for those living within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur along Eastern border of the Neighborhoods of Focus, as well as the Northeastern corner of the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Black or African American: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This is a map showing unemployment rate for residents who identify as Black or African American in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur in the Southeastern section and around the Northeastern border of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Hispanic: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for residents who identify as Hispanic in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur in the Southern half of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for residents who identify as White/Caucasian in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest employment rates occur in large sections along the Northern border and Western border of the NOF. There are also smaller sections of high unemployment rates that occur near the center and within and outside of the Southern part of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>All Other Races: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for residents who identify as all other races within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur in the Southeastern corner of the NOF, where Division Avenue and Hall Street cross, and the Northeastern corner of the NOF. There are also high unemployment rates around the Southern area and just outside and near Wyoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Female Headed Households with Children under 18: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for female-headed households with children under 18 in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur in the Southeastern area and above the Northern border of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Female: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for female residents in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur just South and North of the NOF border, as well as within the Southeastern section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R23</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Male: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for male residents in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur on the Eastern side of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R24</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Married Couples - Both Unemployed: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for married couples in which both partners are unemployed within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates within the NOF appear to occur along Division Avenue between Wealthy Street and Hall Street. Outside of the NOF the highest unemployment rates occur North of Leonard Street near Richmond Street between Walker Avenue and Alpine Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## System Scan (Residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Married Couples - Both Unemployed with Children: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for married couples with children in which both parents are unemployed within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates appear to occur along Division Avenue between Wealthy Street and Hall Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R26</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Married Couples - One Person Unemployed: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for married couples in which one partner is unemployed within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur in the Northeastern and Southeastern parts of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R27</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Married Couples - One Person Unemployed with Children: Percent in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for married couples with children in which one partner is unemployed within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur in the Northeast corner and Southeast corner, where Division Avenue and Mall Street cross within the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R28</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Single Householder with Children: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rates of single headed households with children in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest employment rates occur within the Southeastern corner and North of the NOF, as well as just East of Grand Rapids outside of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R29</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Single Householder without Children: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate within the Neighborhoods of Focus for single heads of household without children. The highest unemployment rates occur North and Southeast of the NOF, as well as along the Western and Eastern border of the NOF particularly near Eastern portion of Grand Rapids and just East of Walker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R30</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Black or African American: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rates for residents who identify as Black or African American within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur near the outer edges of the NOF, particularly West of Market Avenue and South of Hall Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R31</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Hispanic: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for residents who identify as Hispanic in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur between Fulton Street and 2nd Street, as well as east of 131.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R32</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Other Races/Ethnicity: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for residents who identify as all other races and ethnicities within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur east of 131 and North of Fulton Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R33</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Percent Unemployment in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the unemployment rate for residents who identify as white within the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest unemployment rates occur east of 131 and South of Hall Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## System Scan (Clients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the overall number of clients for participating ENTF partner agencies. The highest number of clients per census tract occurred in the NOF and southern region of Grand Rapids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Black or African American: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of clients who identify as African American/Black in Kent County. The greatest proportion of African American/Black clients reside within the cities of Grand Rapids and Kentwood, with particularly high concentrations in the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Hispanic: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of clients who identify as Hispanic within Kent County. The highest percentages of Hispanic clients appear to be within the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of clients who identify as White/Caucasian within Kent County. The highest percentages of White/Caucasian participation occur outside of Grand Rapids, likely due to the high numbers of White/Caucasian residents and comparative lack of racial diversity in those areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Other Race/Ethnicity: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of clients who identify as another race or ethnicity within Kent County. The highest percentages of other races/ethnicities participation occur Kentwood and Wyoming areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Female: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of clients who identify as female within Kent County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Male: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of clients who identify as male within Kent County. The highest percentage of male participation occurs mostly in the Grand Rapids and Walker areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Age: Average of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the average age of clients within Kent County. There are very few age disparities in clients across the county, but clients in Cannon and Cascade townships appear slightly older on average than other clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Unemployed at Service Start Date: Percent of Respondents in Kent County</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who were unemployed at their service start date in Kent County. The majority of clients were unemployed when they began receiving services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Unemployed at Service End Date: Percent of Respondents in Kent County</td>
<td>This map shows the percent of ENTF partner agency clients who were unemployed at the service end date. The data provided by partner agencies was very limited for this field, so this map should be interpreted with caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Females Unemployed at Service End Date: Percent of Respondents in Kent County</td>
<td>This map shows the percent of female ENTF partner agency clients who were unemployed at the service end date. The data provided by partner agencies was very limited for this field, so this map should be interpreted with caution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## System Scan (Clients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the total number of ENTF partner agency clients aggregated by ZIP code in Kent County. The highest number of participants appear to come from 49504 and 49507 ZIP codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Age: Average of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the average age of ENTF partner agency clients aggregated by ZIP code in Kent County. Clients are younger, on average, in the Northern portion of the county whereas clients in Ada and Cascade are slightly older.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Black or African American: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who identify as Black or African American, separated by ZIP code in Kent County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Hispanic: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who identify as Hispanic or Latino, separated by ZIP code in Kent County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who identify as White or Caucasian, separated by ZIP code in Kent County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Other Race/Ethnicity: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who identify as a race/ethnicity other than White/Caucasian, Black/African American, or Hispanic/Latino, separated by ZIP code in Kent County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Female: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who are female, separated by ZIP code in Kent County. The highest percentage of female clients occur in the Southwestern portion, especially in 49505 and in 49326.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Male: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who are male, separated by ZIP code in Kent County. The highest percentage of male participation occurs in the Southwestern portion of Kent County, particularly surrounding Bowne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of White/Caucasian ENTF respondents separated by ZIP code in Kent County. This map utilizes “natural breaks” in the legend to separate the color scale, allowing for more accurate representation of the differing numbers of residents represented here. The highest percentage of respondents occur on the Eastern side and in the Southeastern corner of Kent County, particularly in Walker and Byron.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D // E10

Unemployed at Service End Date
Percent of Respondents in Kent County, MI

Legend
ENTF Partners
- Provided Data
- No Data Provided
Cities and Townships
- Major Streets
- Highways
- Neighborhoods of Focus

Clients
Unemployed at End/ Total Responded
- 4.1 - 30.0%
- 30.1 - 45.0%
- 45.1 - 60.0%
- 60.1 - 75.0%
- 75.1 - 100%

Grand Valley State University
Johnson Center for Philanthropy
Community Research Institute
Map Created By: Chris Vandenberg
Map Created On: 2/8/2016
Females Unemployed at Service End Date
Percent of Respondents in Kent County, MI

Legend
ENTF Partners
- Provided Data
- No Data Provided
Cites and Townships
- Major Streets
- Highways
- Neighborhoods of Focus
Clients
Females Unemployed at End/Total Responded
- 4.1 - 6.0%
- 6.1 - 9.0%
- 10.1 - 15.0%
- 15.1 - 20.0%
- 20.1 - 33.4%

Grand Valley State University
Johnson Center for Philanthropy
Community Research Institute
Map Created By: Chris VandenBerg
Map Created On: 2/8/2016
Hispanic Percent of Clients in Kent County, MI

Legend
- Provided Data
- No Data Provided
- Cities and Townships
- Highways
- Major Streets
- Neighborhoods of Focus

Clients
- Hispanic Clients / Total Clients
  - 0.5 - 3.0%
  - 3.1 - 10.0%
  - 10.1 - 25.0%
  - 25.1 - 50.0%
  - 50.1 - 100.0%

Map Created By: Chris Vandenbarg
Map Created On: 2/8/2016
# System Scan (Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the total ENTF partner agency clients in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest number of clients appear to come from the Southeastern area of the NOF and just North of Fulton Street in the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Age: Average of Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the average age of ENTF partner agency clients in the Neighborhoods of Focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>African American or Black: Percent of Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who identify as Black/African American in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest rate of participation occurs in the Southeastern area of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Hispanic: Percent of Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who identify as Hispanic/Latino in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest percentage of participation appears in the Southernmost area of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Percent of Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who identify as White/Caucasian in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest percentage of clients mostly occur outside of the NOF, as well as, the Northern portion of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Other Race/Ethnicity: Percent of Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who identify as a race/ethnicity other than White/Caucasian, Black/African American, or Hispanic/ Latino in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The majority of the NOF occur to have low percentages of other races/ethnicities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Female: Percent of Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who are female in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest percentage of clients appear to be in the central area of the NOF, between Market Avenue and 131. There are also high percentages outside the Northern area of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Male: Percent of Clients in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who are male in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest percentage of clients appear to be in the central portion of the NOF; just North of Market Avenue and Northwest of the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E28</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Unemployed at Service Start Date: Percent of Respondents in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who are unemployed at the service start date in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest percentage of unemployment mostly occurs in the Southeastern and central portion of the NOF. There are also high percentages of unemployment in the Northern, Northeastern, and Southeastern areas surrounding the NOF. These data are limited in numbers and should be interpreted with caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E29</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Unemployed at Service End Date: Percent of Respondents in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who were unemployed at the service end date in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest percentage of unemployment appears to be in the Southeastern portion of the NOF, as well as, just West and East of the NOF. These data are limited in numbers and should be interpreted with caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Females Unemployed at Service End Date: Percent of Respondents in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients who are both female and unemployed at the service end date in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The highest percentage of unemployed, female participation occurs in the Southeastern area of the NOF, just South of Wealthy Street. There are also high percentages East of the NOF, surrounding Michigan Street and Fulton Street. These data are limited in numbers and should be interpreted with caution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX E

### Comparison (Kent County)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Clients and Total Unemployed: Comparison in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of total ENTF partner agency clients out of the total unemployed population in Kent County. This indicates utilization rates, where higher percentages (darker colors) indicate more of the target population is served. The lower percentages appear to be on the Northern side of Kent County. The higher percentages also appear in Alpine and some areas in Walker and Kentwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Black or African American: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison between African American/Black ENTF partner agency clients and African American/Black unemployment in Kent County. Here darker colored shading indicates a higher African American/Black unemployment rate and larger dots indicate greater percentages of African American/Black ENTF partner agency clients. The highest client participation occurs in the city of Grand Rapids, especially within the Neighborhoods of Focus, where there are also higher percentages of unemployment. In Wyoming, there is lower unemployment for African American/Black residents and a moderate amount of clients. In Sparta there is relatively higher unemployment, but limited client participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Hispanic: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison between Hispanic ENTF partner agency clients and Hispanic unemployment in Kent County. Here darker colored shading indicates a higher Hispanic/Latino unemployment rate and larger dots indicate greater percentages of Hispanic/Latino ENTF partner agency clients. The highest participation occurs near the Neighborhoods of Focus, where the highest percentage of unemployment is, as well. In Kentwood there is a moderate number of client participation and in the majority of the area there is little unemployment, except for an area in the Northeastern portion. There is also some unemployment in Tyrone, but there are limited numbers of clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison between White/Caucasian ENTF partner agency clients and White/Caucasian unemployment in Kent County. Here darker colored shading indicates a higher White/Caucasian unemployment rate and larger dots indicate greater percentages of White/Caucasian ENTF partner agency clients. There is high percentages of clients and unemployment in the Northern portion of Kent County, particularly in Tyrone, and near the Neighborhoods of Focus. There is very low participation in Alpine, but has higher percentages of unemployment. Although, there is high percentages of clients in Ada, there is a relatively low unemployment rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>All Other Races: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison between ENTF partner agency clients and unemployment for all other races in Kent County. There is higher percentages of unemployment and moderate percentages of clients near the Neighborhoods of Focus. Although, there is some unemployment in Tyrone, there are few clients in that area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Female: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison between ENTF partner agency clients and unemployment for females in Kent County. There is a higher percentage of participation in the Southeastern area of Kent County and mixed percentages of unemployment. In particular, Wyoming and Kentwood have high percentages of clients, but Wyoming has lower percentages of unemployment and Kentwood has higher percentages of unemployment. Within the Northern portion of Kent County in Cedar Springs there is higher percentages of unemployment and lower percentages of client participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>Male: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Kent County, MI</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison between ENTF partner agency clients and unemployment for males in Kent County. There appears to be higher percentages of clients in the areas surrounds the Neighborhoods of Focus and mixed percentages of unemployment. Although, in the Northern portion of Kent County, especially in Tyrone, Sparta, and Spencer, there appears to be higher percentages of unemployment, but very low percentages of clients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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White/ Caucasian
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Clients and Total Unemployed: Comparison in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage of ENTF partner agency clients out of the total number unemployed residents in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The percentages within the NOF appear to be slightly lower than areas South and Southwest of the NOF, especially in the Southeast area near Division Avenue and Hall Street. Although, more areas North of the NOF appear to have lower percentages than the NOF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Black or African American: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison of ENTF partner agency clients and unemployment for African American/Black residents in the Neighborhoods of Focus. There appears to be higher percentages of unemployment in Southern area of the NOF, but the Western portion appears to have lower participation and the Eastern portion appears to have higher participation. Northeast of the NOF, there appears to be higher percentages of unemployment, but lower percentages of clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Hispanic: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison of Hispanic ENTF partner agency clients and Hispanic unemployment in the Neighborhoods of Focus. There appears to be higher percentages of clients and unemployment in the Southern portion of the NOF, except South of Hall Street and East of Division Avenue, where there appears to be low percentage of participation and higher unemployment. There is also higher unemployment North and Southwest of the NOF, but low percentage of participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>White/Caucasian: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison of White/Caucasian ENTF partner agency clients and White/Caucasian unemployment in the Neighborhoods of Focus. In the southeastern portion of the NOF, there appears to be higher percentage of unemployment, but low percentage of clients, whereas in the northern portion of the NOF, there is high percentage of unemployment and clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>All Other Races: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison of ENTF partner agency clients and unemployment for residents of all other races in the Neighborhoods of Focus. There appears to be very low percentages of clients throughout the whole area, but in the southeastern portion, near Division Avenue and Hall Street, there is the highest percentages of unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Female: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison of ENTF partner agency clients and unemployment for females in the Neighborhoods of Focus. There appears to be high percentage of clients throughout the NOF and mixed percentages of unemployment, except for south of Hall Street and East of Division Avenue, there is very low percentage of clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>Male: Clients and Unemployed Comparison in Neighborhoods of Focus</td>
<td>This map shows the percentage comparison of ENTF partner agency clients and unemployment for males in the Neighborhoods of Focus. The Western portion of the NOF appear to have high percentages of clients and very low percentages of unemployment, but the Eastern portion of the NOF appear to have moderate to low percentages of clients and have higher percentages of unemployment, especially South of Hall Street and East of Division Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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