# PY 2018 Host Agency Evaluation of SCSEP

**Overview**

The PY 2018 nationwide host agency survey is the third administration of the revision of the original 2004 survey. Revisions to the original survey were made based on the analyses of survey responses over the last decade, the evolving direction of the program, and feedback from customers collected through a series of structured focus groups.

A major focus of the revisions for the host agency survey was to increase understanding of host agencies' needs regarding the background of participants, assessment of participants' skills and knowledge, and additional detail on the importance of computer training. Seven questions were eliminated, one question was substantially modified, several were slightly modified, and two new questions were added.

For PY 2018, a nationwide random sample of 13,662 host agencies was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2018. Collection for the third and last wave of surveys was closed in March 2019. The nationwide analyses below include results for all of the questions, with special attention given to the new and revised questions. Appendix A contains the results of individual grantee response rates and American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) scores. Appendix A also contains the results of each survey question at the nationwide, national grantee, and state grantee levels. A separate analysis is being provided for each grantee.

In the nationwide analyses below, some survey questions are presented in two tables: The first table shows the number and percent of respondents who selected each of the possible values for the question; the second table shows the degree of overall satisfaction (the ACSI score) related to each of the possible values. This approach identifies results where there is an opportunity to improve overall satisfaction by improving a specific area of service or, if that is not possible, designing actions that can mitigate the harm related to that area of service. The remaining questions in Tables 3 and 9 have values of 1-10 and are presented in single tables showing the number of respondents and the average score.

The relationship of the questions to overall satisfaction is presented in the driver analysis section on pages 8-9. The driver analysis has the advantage of not only assessing the individual relation of certain aspects of service to satisfaction but also comparing across those aspects of service to determine which areas of service improvement would give the biggest return on investment in terms of increased satisfaction.

**Overall Satisfaction: The American Customer Satisfaction Index**

The American Customer Satisfaction Index continues to be the standard for measuring overall satisfaction. The nationwide host agency ACSI score for PY 2018 presented in Table 1 is 82.4, significantly higher than the score of 81.2 in PY 2017[1]. As in other years, the ACSI score compares very favorably with ACSI scores from non-profit and for-profit organizations around the country and the world where the ACSI is used. The score for national grantees is slightly lower than the score for state grantees. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in Appendix A.

---

[1] Determined using Independent Sample T-test.

Table 1. American Customer Satisfaction Index

|  | Count | Mean ACSI | Standard Deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 7090 | 82.4 | 18.76 | 0 | 100 |

## Survey Response Rate

The random sample for the survey was stratified by grantee, making the final sample representative of host agency customers nationwide. Of the 13,662 host agencies that received a survey, 7,090 agencies returned completed surveys (i.e., surveys that had responses to at least the first three questions that make up the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)), for a nationwide response rate of 51.9 percent. See Table 2. The response rate for national grantee host agencies (50.4%) is significantly lower than the rate for state grantee host agencies (54.5%). See Appendix A. This year's nationwide response rate of 51.9 percent is not significantly lower than the PY 2017 rate of 52.4% but is significantly lower than the 60.1 percent response rate in PY 2015. Although the response rate is lower than in PY 2015, the decline in response rate may be leveling out if this year is the beginning of a trend.

Table 2. Response Rate

|  | Responded | | Did not respond | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Nationwide | 7090 | 51.9% | 6572 | 48.1% |

## Treatment by Sub-Grantee

The five questions in Table 3 are similar to those asked in the pre-PY 2015 survey and again asked in the last two surveys. Each of the scores in these questions is 0.1 points higher than the scores in PY 2017. The one question that stands out among the others as significantly lower is Question 6, receiving "sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants." The lower score for this question highlights an area where local programs have room for significant improvement.

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

|  |  | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me. | 7011 | 8.4 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs. | 7140 | 8.4 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency. | 7026 | 7.8 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have. | 6850 | 8.4 | 1 | 10 |

|  |  | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well. | 7157 | 8.1 | 1 | 10 |

Question 7 in Table 4 asks host agencies about the degree of choice they have when a participant is offered for assignment to the agency. In PY 2015, the first year in which this new question was asked, 87.4 percent indicated they had the choice to accept the participant or not. In the current survey, only 71 percent indicated they had the ability to accept or refuse an offer. Although this is similar to PY 2017's result, it is still a drop of over 16 percentage points from PY 2015. About one quarter of the respondents indicated that they had a choice among several potential participants.

Table 4. Degree of Choice

|  |  |  | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency: | I can accept the individual offered or not. | 6163 | 71.1% |
|  |  | I have a choice among several potential participants. | 2099 | 24.2% |
|  |  | I really have no choice. | 412 | 4.7% |

In order to understand the impact of different choice situations, Table 5 shows how choice relates to satisfaction. The first type of choice we might call limited choice: "Take it or leave it." You have one individual to whom you can say "yes" or "no." Limited choice is associated with a satisfaction score that is similar to the average score, suggesting that limited choice is acceptable to most host agencies and does not relate to either higher or lower satisfaction. The second type of choice might be called full choice: The host agency can choose among several different participants rather than only taking or leaving a single offer. This type of choice appears to be preferred by host agencies, with a related average satisfaction score nearly five points higher than the average ACSI. The third type of choice is no choice. While only a small number of host agencies experience no choice, their lack of choice is related to extremely low levels of satisfaction. These findings are nearly the same as in PY 2017, indicating that full choice is the standard for producing the highest level of satisfaction. The lesson for local programs is clear.

Table 5. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

|  |  |  | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency: | I can accept the individual offered or not. | 6034 | 82.7 |
|  |  | I have a choice among several potential participants. | 2040 | 87.1 |
|  |  | I really have no choice. | 398 | 67.2 |

**Detailed Analysis of Preparation**

Question 9 was a new question in PY 2015. It explores in more detail than the question on training in the previous survey the degree to which host agencies perceive assigned participants as having the necessary training. As evident in Table 6, the most frequently noted lack of preparation is in the area of basic computer knowledge. The other three areas are mentioned with nearly equal frequency in regard to lack of basic employability skills, knowledge of the assignment, and how to behave with host agency customers. The scores are nearly identical to those for PY 2017.

Table 7 shows that all four training needs are associated with ACSI scores three to six points below the nationwide average ACSI score. These results are similar to the results in PY 2017. It is notable that basic computer knowledge continues to be the area in which the most participants need better preparation, a reminder of the increasing role of computers and digital media in the workplace.

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

| | | | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas? | Basic computer knowledge | 3489 | 29.5% |
| | | Basic employability skills | 2808 | 23.7% |
| | | Knowledge of what the assignment required | 2778 | 23.5% |
| | | How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients | 2759 | 23.3% |

Table 7. Need for Better Participant Preparation and ACSI

| | | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas? | Basic computer knowledge | 3390 | 79.0 |
| | | Basic employability skills | 2717 | 76.7 |
| | | Knowledge of what the assignment required | 2691 | 76.1 |
| | | How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients | 2667 | 77.1 |

Table 8 provides a different view of this question. For those host agencies that reported no concern about the preparation of participants, the average ACSI was 90.0, similar to the score for PY 2017. For those agencies with one or more concerns for training needs, the ACSI score is 10-11 points lower than for those agencies that found no preparation issues. This strongly indicates the importance of assigning participants who are fully prepared in all four areas. As in PY 2017, about a third of the participants had no training issues, so there is considerable room for improvement.

Table 8. Existence of Preparation Issues and ACSI

| | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | No preparation issues | 2210 | 90.0 |
| | One or more preparation issues | 4774 | 79.0 |

Question 8 in Table 9, whether the participant is a good match with the host agency, is unchanged from the prior version of the survey. The average nationwide score of 8.2 is nearly the same as in PY 2015 and

PY 2017.  Since the quality of the match is so central to the relationship between the program and host agencies and since it plays such an important role in overall satisfaction, programs should pay close attention to this question.

Table 9:  Quality of the Match

|  |  | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency. | 7174 | 8.2 | 1 | 10 |

**Supportive Services**

Question 12 in Table 10 shows the number of host agencies with participants who needed supportive services.  Similar to PY 2017, nearly two-thirds of the host agencies that answered the question indicated that the participants assigned to them did not need supportive services.  Twenty-two percent of host agencies reported that few participants needed supportive services, and only 11 percent reported that many or nearly all participants needed supportive services.  Significantly, for those agencies that had some experience with participants needing supportive services, the ACSI is about 4-6 points lower than the average ACSI for those agencies that had no participants needing supportive services.  The need for supportive services, often a necessity for participants, affects host agency satisfaction, although other factors over which local programs have control have a larger impact on satisfaction.

Table 10. Need for Supportive Services

|  |  |  | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments? | None | 4371 | 66.1% |
|  |  | Few | 1550 | 23.5% |
|  |  | Many | 391 | 5.9% |
|  |  | Nearly all | 296 | 4.5% |

Table 11:  Supportive Services and the ACSI

|  |  |  | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments? | None | 4279 | 84.4 |
|  |  | Few | 1513 | 80.5 |
|  |  | Many | 378 | 80.0 |
|  |  | Nearly all | 289 | 78.3 |

**Removal from the Assignment**

There are two ways that a participant can be removed from an assignment:  SCSEP staff can remove someone for various reasons (e.g., to provide the participant a different opportunity to acquire additional skills or training or at the request of the participant for personal reasons); or the host agency may request the removal of a participant because the assignment is not working out.  The slightly revised Question 13

in Table 12 asks if a participant was removed before the host agency thought the person was ready. Nationwide, 79.4 percent of host agencies never had that experience, a percentage identical to PY 2017.

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

| | | | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave? | Never | 5061 | 79.4% |
| | | Occasionally | 1106 | 17.3% |
| | | Frequently | 113 | 1.8% |
| | | Nearly always | 95 | 1.5% |

The ACSI scores in Table 13 show that having participants removed reduces satisfaction. The majority of agencies that never experience premature removal have an average ACSI score of 82.7. That is 2.7 points higher than the ACSI score for those agencies that experience the occasional removal of a participant (80.0) and similar to the ACSI score nationwide (82.4). When the removal happens more frequently, however, the ACSI scores are about four points lower than the nationwide ACSI average; it is 2-4 points lower than the ACSI scores for those agencies that never or only occasionally have someone removed.

Table 13. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

| | | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave? | Never | 4945 | 84.4 |
| | | Occasionally | 1513 | 80.5 |
| | | Frequently | 378 | 80.0 |
| | | Nearly always | 289 | 78.3 |

Question 14 in Table 14, a new question in PY 2015, asks if the host agency has asked the local program to remove a participant. This situation occurs just over 43% of the time, two percentage points higher than reported in 2017. This suggests a negative trend that requires attention since, as noted below, premature removal by the local program has a seriously negative impact on customer satisfaction.

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

| | | | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out? | Yes | 2863 | 43.0% |
| | | No | 3796 | 57.0% |

As shown in Table 15, there is a nearly 7-point difference in satisfaction between those host agencies that said "Yes" and those that said "No." While this is not as large a difference as in some other areas, it is still a substantive and statistically significant difference. Given the high incidence of participants not working out, this is an area that warrants attention by the grantees.

Table 15. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant and ACSI

|  |  |  | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out? | Yes | 2798 | 78.6 |
|  |  | No | 3711 | 85.7 |

The last scored question in the survey is about the impact of participation in SCSEP on the host agency's ability to provide services to the community.  Sixty percent of host agencies indicate that participation has somewhat or significantly increased their ability to provide services, essentially the same percentage as in in PY 2017 and PY 2015. This is a significant reduction in the scores for this question from the pre-PY 2015 version of the survey when more than 75 percent of host agencies reported some positive effect. It is difficult to explain this reduction in the positive score over the last few years.  It is possible that the reduction in the number of participants SCSEP has been able to serve, and thus assign to host agencies, has made the program less useful to host agencies.

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

|  |  |  | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community? | Decreased significantly | 41 | 0.6% |
|  |  | Somewhat decreased | 73 | 1.1% |
|  |  | Neither decreased nor increased | 2548 | 38.2% |
|  |  | Somewhat increased | 2131 | 31.9% |
|  |  | Increased significantly | 1882 | 28.2% |

Table 17 shows the association between SCSEP's impact on the host agency's capacity to provide services and the ACSI.  For the 28% that experienced significant increase in capacity, the satisfaction is extraordinarily high (90.7 nationwide).  Even those agencies only somewhat increasing capacity have satisfaction scores above the nationwide average.  The few host agencies that experience neither increase nor decrease and the few that experience a decrease in capacity have ACSI scores considerably lower.

Table 17.  Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

|  |  |  | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community? | Decreased significantly | 34 | 57.8 |
|  |  | Somewhat decreased | 67 | 64.6 |
|  |  | Neither decreased nor increased | 2492 | 76.6 |
|  |  | Somewhat increased | 2098 | 83.6 |
|  |  | Increased significantly | 1839 | 90.7 |

**Driver Analysis**

In the analyses above, questions that have a few fixed categories for responses or allow for multiple choices have been presented in association with the ACSI score to demonstrate how host agencies' differing evaluations of their experiences impact overall satisfaction. For the questions in Tables 3 and 9, which have a scale of 1-10, the driver analysis below was conducted to determine which aspects of service were most important to overall satisfaction.

The structure of the questions in the survey require different analytic approaches in order to understand how the various issues addressed in the questions affect overall satisfaction. The difference in the analytic approaches only reflects differences in the questions' structure; the subjects the questions address are all, in their own way, of similar importance to customer satisfaction and program quality. The analytic approaches presented above identify questions where the respondent makes a specific choice or, in some instances, chooses more than one value. With the exception of the question about the quality of the match, the questions in the driver analysis below are specific to service quality and ask respondents for ratings on a continuous 10-point scale. In all instances, the questions provide guidance on identifying actions that can improve service or mitigate the harm related to host agencies' evaluations of the service.

Table 18 presents the results of the driver analysis. First, each of the questions regarding customer service was correlated independently to the ACSI. The results in the last column indicate the strength of the relationship (the correlation) between each question's responses and the ACSI (the closer to 1.0, the stronger the relationship), the statistical significance of the relationship (the closer to zero, the more likely the relationship would not have appeared by chance), and the number of observations in the analysis. (Only those host agencies that answered the specific question under consideration and all three ACSI questions are included in the analysis.) Then, the questions were analyzed together in a regression analysis in relation to the ACSI to see which questions made a significant contribution to understanding what drives overall satisfaction over and above the contribution of any other questions.[2] This analysis narrowed the number of questions with a substantial, independent relationship to the ACSI to three, which are shaded in the table. Questions with a smaller correlation or less substantial independent relationship are unshaded.

Using these two different criteria, three questions are key drivers of satisfaction, those with strong correlations and significant independent contribution to variation in the ACSI: Questions 4, 5, and 8. As in the prior two years, two of the drivers relate to the process of assigning the participant; therefore, local programs have a significant amount of control over these drivers and their associated ratings.

Question 4 deals with the ease of the assignment process; this question has been a strong driver for many years. Question 5 shows the importance of local program staff understanding the business needs of the host agency. Question 8, which deals with the quality of the match, is the strongest of the three drivers by far. For host agencies, this is the bottom line. With an average nationwide score of 8.2, there is some room for improvement. For every 0.5-point improvement in the quality of the match, e.g., from 8.2 to 8.7, overall satisfaction will increase by nearly five points on the ACSI scale. This is not an unreasonable level of improvement given that a quarter of grantees had scores on Question 8 below 8.0.

The unshaded Questions 6, 10 and 11 have little or no independent relationship to the ACSI or have somewhat smaller correlations than the key drivers. Nonetheless, they may still be important to the successful operation of the program. Questions 6, 10 and 11 are about communication and are strongly correlated with the ACSI although they do not make significant independent contributions as drivers. In addition, Question 6 has the lowest score of the service questions, leaving significant room for local programs to improve service in this area. Questions 10 and 11 are also closely related to the shaded questions regarding making the assignment process easy and understanding the host agency's business needs. Put another way, grantees that make the process easy, understand the business needs, and make a good match for the host agency will do so by providing enough information on the background of the participants, staying in touch, and being helpful in resolving problems

---

[2] In the regression equation, the strongest driver for the ACSI, as determined by the correlations, is entered into the equation first. Other drivers are entered into the equation after the strongest, but they are only kept in the equation if they make a significant contribution over and above the previous driver.

Table 18. Driver Analysis

| | | Relation to ACSI |
|---|---|---|
| 4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me. | Pearson Correlation | .694** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 6867 |
| 5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs. | Pearson Correlation | .713** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 6975 |
| 6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency. | Pearson Correlation | .626** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 6864 |
| 8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency. | Pearson Correlation | .780** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 7014 |
| 10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have. | Pearson Correlation | .644** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 6689 |
| 11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well. | Pearson Correlation | .607** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 6989 |

**Summary and Recommendations**

Despite the slight, non-significant reduction in host agency response rates from last year's survey, the results of the PY 2018 survey are strikingly similar to those for PY 2017. The findings of the driver analysis and the effects on the ACSI of key questions regarding service delivery are nearly unchanged. As a result, the recommendations below for improvement are also unchanged.

The driver analysis tells us that, among the questions in that analysis, making a good match has the strongest influence on overall satisfaction: A 0.5-point change in the match question score yields almost five points of change in satisfaction. The value of SCSEP to host agencies suggests two things: Host agencies have high expectations for the participants placed with them; and historical data indicate that, with increased attention to this issue, local programs could meet or even exceed host agencies' expectations.

Another message from the driver analysis is to maintain two aspects of service that have always been important: Keep the initial assignment process easy and pay attention to the host agency's business needs. The survey confirms these aspects of service as important to host agencies. The question added in PY 2015 about host agencies having a choice in the assignment adds to our understanding of how host agencies wish to be treated.

The question on participant preparation, also added in PY 2015, yields some important guidance for grantees and sub-grantees. Training has been identified in previous surveys as important but without the detail that could point to specific improvements. Host agencies have now identified a need for better preparation of participants in several areas: computer knowledge, employability skills, knowledge of the assignment, and how to behave with host agency customers. Each of these areas of preparation can have a modest effect on satisfaction.

Other analyses regarding preparation underline the importance of preparation as part of the match. Host agencies that report <u>no need</u> for better preparation in any area have extraordinarily high overall satisfaction (ACSI score of 90.0) compared to those that identify one or more areas where preparation needs improvement. While addressing individual preparation needs yield modest gains in satisfaction, placing a participant who is fully prepared for the host agency assignment yields extremely high levels of host agency satisfaction. The questions regarding removal from the host agency, either at the request of the agency or, more significantly, at the initiative of the local program, reinforce the importance of a good match.

# Appendix A
## Complete Survey Tables for ACSI and Response Rate

Table 1. ASCI

| | ACSI | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
| AARP | 436 | 82.5 | 0 | 100 |
| ANPPM | 184 | 88.3 | 0 | 100 |
| ATD | 171 | 75.6 | 0 | 100 |
| Easter Seals | 278 | 82.8 | 0 | 100 |
| Experience Works | 229 | 76.3 | 0 | 100 |
| Goodwill | 352 | 83.9 | 0 | 100 |
| IID [S] | 83 | 89.6 | 41 | 100 |
| NAPCA[S] | 110 | 84.2 | 7 | 100 |
| National Able Network | 198 | 78.3 | 0 | 100 |
| NAPCA[G] | 178 | 81.2 | 0 | 100 |
| NCBA | 275 | 81.2 | 0 | 100 |
| NCOA | 356 | 81.1 | 0 | 100 |
| NICOA[S] | 112 | 87.0 | 38 | 100 |
| NOWCC | 46 | 77.9 | 8 | 100 |
| NUL | 199 | 80.1 | 4 | 100 |
| OAGB | 99 | 85.2 | 33 | 100 |
| SER | 230 | 81.3 | 15 | 100 |
| SSAI | 474 | 83.5 | 0 | 100 |
| The WorkPlace | 210 | 82.4 | 4 | 100 |
| VANTAGE | 134 | 84.5 | 38 | 100 |
| National Grantees | 4354 | 82.1 | 0 | 100 |
| Alabama | 76 | 87.0 | 15 | 100 |
| Alaska | 65 | 79.5 | 27 | 100 |
| Arizona | 44 | 85.8 | 44 | 100 |
| Arkansas | 40 | 84.5 | 4 | 100 |
| California | 117 | 83.7 | 22 | 100 |
| Colorado | 21 | 80.5 | 29 | 100 |
| Connecticut | 28 | 83.5 | 33 | 100 |
| Delaware | 68 | 81.6 | 11 | 100 |
| DC | 8 | 74.7 | 31 | 100 |
| Florida | 130 | 82.7 | 15 | 100 |

|  | ACSI | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
| Georgia | 67 | 82.9 | 0 | 100 |
| Hawaii | 41 | 84.3 | 44 | 100 |
| Idaho | 16 | 83.9 | 63 | 100 |
| Illinois | 48 | 79.6 | 26 | 100 |
| Indiana | 57 | 75.5 | 22 | 100 |
| Iowa | 35 | 82.1 | 33 | 100 |
| Kansas | 32 | 83.4 | 29 | 100 |
| Kentucky | 62 | 87.8 | 41 | 100 |
| Louisiana | 61 | 89.8 | 52 | 100 |
| Maryland | 36 | 73.9 | 22 | 100 |
| Massachusetts | 48 | 84.2 | 30 | 100 |
| Michigan | 71 | 77.2 | 0 | 100 |
| Minnesota | 89 | 79.0 | 11 | 100 |
| Mississippi | 46 | 92.9 | 67 | 100 |
| Missouri | 80 | 82.0 | 0 | 100 |
| Montana | 27 | 71.1 | 4 | 100 |
| Nebraska | 10 | 78.9 | 47 | 100 |
| Nevada | 11 | 91.0 | 64 | 100 |
| New Hampshire | 25 | 83.2 | 45 | 100 |
| New Jersey | 50 | 86.9 | 48 | 100 |
| New Mexico | 18 | 82.9 | 22 | 100 |
| New York | 97 | 83.5 | 4 | 100 |
| North Carolina | 76 | 86.4 | 0 | 100 |
| North Dakota | 27 | 84.5 | 38 | 100 |
| Ohio | 105 | 80.2 | 19 | 100 |
| Oklahoma | 68 | 86.7 | 41 | 100 |
| Oregon | 45 | 73.8 | 18 | 100 |
| Pennsylvania | 178 | 82.0 | 0 | 100 |
| Rhode Island | 13 | 79.9 | 59 | 100 |
| South Carolina | 33 | 83.2 | 0 | 100 |
| South Dakota | 18 | 81.6 | 11 | 100 |
| Tennessee | 88 | 83.4 | 15 | 100 |
| Texas | 205 | 84.1 | 0 | 100 |
| Utah | 19 | 84.4 | 38 | 100 |
| Vermont | 16 | 77.6 | 36 | 100 |
| Virginia | 78 | 84.2 | 29 | 100 |
| Washington | 30 | 84.5 | 19 | 100 |

|  | ACSI | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
| West Virginia | 28 | 87.3 | 56 | 100 |
| Wisconsin | 72 | 84.0 | 8 | 100 |
| Wyoming | 13 | 84.3 | 48 | 100 |
| State Grantees | 2736 | 82.9 | 0 | 100 |
| Nationwide | 7090 | 82.4 | 0 | 100 |

Table 2:  Response Rate by Grantee

|  | Responded | | Did not respond | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| AARP | 436 | 44.5% | 544 | 55.5% |
| ANPPM | 184 | 49.7% | 186 | 50.3% |
| ATD | 171 | 46.2% | 199 | 53.8% |
| Easter Seals | 278 | 48.1% | 300 | 51.9% |
| Experience Works | 229 | 54.5% | 191 | 45.5% |
| Goodwill | 352 | 55.9% | 278 | 44.1% |
| IID [S] | 83 | 65.4% | 44 | 34.6% |
| NAPCA[S] | 110 | 50.7% | 107 | 49.3% |
| National Able Network | 198 | 56.4% | 153 | 43.6% |
| NAPCA[G] | 178 | 48.1% | 192 | 51.9% |
| NCBA | 275 | 46.8% | 312 | 53.2% |
| NCOA | 356 | 42.4% | 484 | 57.6% |
| NICOA[S] | 112 | 48.7% | 118 | 51.3% |
| NOWCC | 46 | 46.5% | 53 | 53.5% |
| NUL | 199 | 50.5% | 195 | 49.5% |
| OAGB | 99 | 53.2% | 87 | 46.8% |
| SER | 230 | 54.8% | 190 | 45.2% |
| SSAI | 474 | 53.0% | 420 | 47.0% |
| The WorkPlace | 210 | 56.8% | 160 | 43.2% |
| VANTAGE | 134 | 64.1% | 75 | 35.9% |
| National Grantees | 4354 | 50.4% | 4288 | 49.6% |
| Alabama | 76 | 63.3% | 44 | 36.7% |
| Alaska | 65 | 63.7% | 37 | 36.3% |
| Arizona | 44 | 61.1% | 28 | 38.9% |
| Arkansas | 40 | 40.8% | 58 | 59.2% |
| California | 117 | 48.1% | 126 | 51.9% |

|  | Responded | | Did not respond | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Colorado | 21 | 52.5% | 19 | 47.5% |
| Connecticut | 28 | 58.3% | 20 | 41.7% |
| Delaware | 68 | 58.6% | 48 | 41.4% |
| DC | 8 | 53.3% | 7 | 46.7% |
| Florida | 130 | 44.5% | 162 | 55.5% |
| Georgia | 67 | 48.9% | 70 | 51.1% |
| Hawaii | 41 | 58.6% | 29 | 41.4% |
| Idaho | 16 | 44.4% | 20 | 55.6% |
| Illinois | 48 | 45.3% | 58 | 54.7% |
| Indiana | 57 | 42.2% | 78 | 57.8% |
| Iowa | 35 | 50.0% | 35 | 50.0% |
| Kansas | 32 | 68.1% | 15 | 31.9% |
| Kentucky | 62 | 56.4% | 48 | 43.6% |
| Louisiana | 61 | 59.2% | 42 | 40.8% |
| Maryland | 36 | 56.3% | 28 | 43.8% |
| Massachusetts | 48 | 50.0% | 48 | 50.0% |
| Michigan | 71 | 57.3% | 53 | 42.7% |
| Minnesota | 89 | 59.7% | 60 | 40.3% |
| Mississippi | 46 | 68.7% | 21 | 31.3% |
| Missouri | 80 | 51.9% | 74 | 48.1% |
| Montana | 27 | 62.8% | 16 | 37.2% |
| Nebraska | 10 | 31.3% | 22 | 68.8% |
| Nevada | 11 | 44.0% | 14 | 56.0% |
| New Hampshire | 25 | 67.6% | 12 | 32.4% |
| New Jersey | 50 | 50.5% | 49 | 49.5% |
| New Mexico | 18 | 43.9% | 23 | 56.1% |
| New York | 97 | 54.2% | 82 | 45.8% |
| North Carolina | 76 | 61.3% | 48 | 38.7% |
| North Dakota | 27 | 69.2% | 12 | 30.8% |
| Ohio | 105 | 64.0% | 59 | 36.0% |
| Oklahoma | 68 | 62.4% | 41 | 37.6% |
| Oregon | 45 | 57.7% | 33 | 42.3% |
| Pennsylvania | 178 | 55.8% | 141 | 44.2% |
| Puerto Rico | 0 | 0.0% | 30 | 100.0% |
| Rhode Island | 13 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| South Carolina | 33 | 41.8% | 46 | 58.2% |
| South Dakota | 18 | 58.1% | 13 | 41.9% |

|  | Responded | | Did not respond | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Tennessee | 88 | 65.2% | 47 | 34.8% |
| Texas | 205 | 55.4% | 165 | 44.6% |
| Utah | 19 | 55.9% | 15 | 44.1% |
| Vermont | 16 | 51.6% | 15 | 48.4% |
| Virginia | 78 | 65.0% | 42 | 35.0% |
| Washington | 30 | 46.9% | 34 | 53.1% |
| West Virginia | 28 | 73.7% | 10 | 26.3% |
| Wisconsin | 72 | 51.1% | 69 | 48.9% |
| Wyoming | 13 | 41.9% | 18 | 58.1% |
| State Grantees | 2736 | 54.5% | 2284 | 45.5% |
| Nationwide | 7090 | 51.9% | 6572 | 48.1% |

Table 3.  Treatment by Sub-Grantee

|  |  | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Grantees | 4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me. | 4330 | 8.4 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs. | 4390 | 8.4 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency. | 4330 | 7.8 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have. | 4227 | 8.3 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well. | 4405 | 8.1 | 1 | 10 |
| State Grantees | 4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me. | 2681 | 8.5 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs. | 2750 | 8.5 | 1 | 10 |

| | | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency. | 2696 | 7.9 | 1 | 10 |
| | 10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have. | 2623 | 8.5 | 1 | 10 |
| | 11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well. | 2752 | 8.2 | 1 | 10 |
| Nationwide | 4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me. | 7011 | 8.4 | 1 | 10 |
| | 5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs. | 7140 | 8.4 | 1 | 10 |
| | 6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency. | 7026 | 7.8 | 1 | 10 |
| | 10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have. | 6850 | 8.4 | 1 | 10 |
| | 11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well. | 7157 | 8.1 | 1 | 10 |

Table 4.  Degree of Choice

| | | | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency: | I can accept the individual offered or not. | 3762 | 70.4% |
| | | I have a choice among several potential participants. | 1320 | 24.7% |
| | | I really have no choice. | 258 | 4.8% |

Table 4.  Degree of Choice, continued

|  |  |  | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| State Grantees | 7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency: | I can accept the individual offered or not. | 2401 | 72.0% |
|  |  | I have a choice among several potential participants. | 779 | 23.4% |
|  |  | I really have no choice. | 154 | 4.6% |
| Nationwide | 7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency: | I can accept the individual offered or not. | 6163 | 71.1% |
|  |  | I have a choice among several potential participants. | 2099 | 24.2% |
|  |  | I really have no choice. | 412 | 4.7% |

Table 5.  Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

|  |  |  | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency: | I can accept the individual offered or not. | 3678 | 82.4 |
|  |  | I have a choice among several potential participants. | 1283 | 87.1 |
|  |  | I really have no choice. | 251 | 66.9 |
| State Grantees | 7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency: | I can accept the individual offered or not. | 2356 | 83.3 |
|  |  | I have a choice among several potential participants. | 757 | 87.3 |
|  |  | I really have no choice. | 147 | 67.9 |
| Nationwide | 7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency: | I can accept the individual offered or not. | 6034 | 82.7 |
|  |  | I have a choice among several potential participants. | 2040 | 87.1 |
|  |  | I really have no choice. | 398 | 67.2 |

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

| | | | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas? | Basic computer knowledge | 2134 | 28.9% |
| | | Basic employability skills | 1752 | 23.7% |
| | | Knowledge of what the assignment required | 1731 | 23.5% |
| | | How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients | 1761 | 23.9% |
| State Grantees | 9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas? | Basic computer knowledge | 1355 | 30.4% |
| | | Basic employability skills | 1056 | 23.7% |
| | | Knowledge of what the assignment required | 1047 | 23.5% |
| | | How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients | 998 | 22.4% |
| Nationwide | 9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas? | Basic computer knowledge | 3489 | 29.5% |
| | | Basic employability skills | 2808 | 23.7% |
| | | Knowledge of what the assignment required | 2778 | 23.5% |
| | | How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients | 2759 | 23.3% |

Table 7.  Need for Better Participant Preparation and ACSI

| | | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas? | Basic computer knowledge | 2073 | 78.8 |
| | | Basic employability skills | 1696 | 76.9 |
| | | Knowledge of what the assignment required | 1672 | 76.1 |
| | | How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients | 1704 | 77.2 |
| State Grantees | 9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas? | Basic computer knowledge | 1317 | 79.3 |
| | | Basic employability skills | 1021 | 76.4 |
| | | Knowledge of what the assignment required | 1019 | 76.2 |
| | | How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients | 963 | 76.9 |
| Nationwide | 9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas? | Basic computer knowledge | 3390 | 79.0 |
| | | Basic employability skills | 2717 | 76.7 |
| | | Knowledge of what the assignment required | 2691 | 76.1 |
| | | How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients | 2667 | 77.1 |

Table 8.  Existence of Preparation Issues and ACSI

| | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | No preparation issues | 1350 | 89.1 |
| | One or more preparation issues | 2934 | 78.9 |
| State Grantees | No preparation issues | 860 | 91.3 |
| | One or more preparation issues | 1840 | 79.1 |
| Nationwide | No preparation issues | 2210 | 90.0 |
| | One or more preparation issues | 4774 | 79.0 |

Table 9:  Quality of the Match

| | | Count | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency. | 4410 | 8.2 | 1 | 10 |
| State Grantees | 8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency. | 2764 | 8.2 | 1 | 10 |
| Nationwide | 8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency. | 7174 | 8.2 | 1 | 10 |

Table 10. Need for Supportive Services

| | | | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments? | None | 2692 | 66.2% |
| | | Few | 971 | 23.9% |
| | | Many | 227 | 5.6% |
| | | Nearly all | 176 | 4.3% |
| State Grantees | 12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments? | None | 1679 | 66.1% |
| | | Few | 579 | 22.8% |
| | | Many | 164 | 6.5% |
| | | Nearly all | 120 | 4.7% |
| Nationwide | 12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments? | None | 4371 | 66.1% |
| | | Few | 1550 | 23.5% |
| | | Many | 391 | 5.9% |
| | | Nearly all | 296 | 4.5% |

Table 11:  Supportive Services and the ACSI

| | | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments? | None | 2629 | 84.3 |
| | | Few | 952 | 80.0 |
| | | Many | 216 | 78.9 |
| | | Nearly all | 173 | 78.3 |
| State Grantees | 12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments? | None | 1650 | 84.5 |
| | | Few | 561 | 81.2 |
| | | Many | 162 | 81.5 |
| | | Nearly all | 116 | 78.4 |
| Nationwide | 12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments? | None | 4279 | 84.4 |
| | | Few | 1513 | 80.5 |
| | | Many | 378 | 80.0 |
| | | Nearly all | 289 | 78.3 |

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

| | | | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave? | Never | 3051 | 77.8% |
| | | Occasionally | 728 | 18.6% |
| | | Frequently | 80 | 2.0% |
| | | Nearly always | 61 | 1.6% |
| State Grantees | 13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave? | Never | 2010 | 81.9% |
| | | Occasionally | 378 | 15.4% |
| | | Frequently | 33 | 1.3% |
| | | Nearly always | 34 | 1.4% |
| Nationwide | 13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave? | Never | 5061 | 79.4% |
| | | Occasionally | 1106 | 17.3% |
| | | Frequently | 113 | 1.8% |
| | | Nearly always | 95 | 1.5% |

Table 13. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

|  |  |  | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave? | Never | 2976 | 83.8 |
|  |  | Occasionally | 715 | 79.3 |
|  |  | Frequently | 80 | 72.9 |
|  |  | Nearly always | 58 | 75.8 |
| State Grantees | 13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave? | Never | 1969 | 84.3 |
|  |  | Occasionally | 369 | 79.4 |
|  |  | Frequently | 32 | 74.2 |
|  |  | Nearly always | 34 | 82.5 |
| Nationwide | 13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave? | Never | 4945 | 84.0 |
|  |  | Occasionally | 1084 | 79.3 |
|  |  | Frequently | 112 | 73.3 |
|  |  | Nearly always | 92 | 78.3 |

Table 14.  Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

|  |  |  | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out? | Yes | 1801 | 43.9% |
|  |  | No | 2305 | 56.1% |
| State Grantees | 14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out? | Yes | 1062 | 41.6% |
|  |  | No | 1491 | 58.4% |
| Nationwide | 14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out? | Yes | 2863 | 43.0% |
|  |  | No | 3796 | 57.0% |

Table 15.  Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant and ACSI

|  |  |  | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out? | Yes | 1760 | 78.3 |
|  |  | No | 2245 | 85.5 |
| State Grantees | 14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out? | Yes | 1038 | 79.1 |
|  |  | No | 1466 | 85.9 |

| | | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out? | Yes | 2798 | 78.6 |
| | | No | 3711 | 85.7 |

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

| | | | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community? | Decreased significantly | 25 | 0.6% |
| | | Somewhat decreased | 51 | 1.2% |
| | | Neither decreased nor increased | 1533 | 37.5% |
| | | Somewhat increased | 1328 | 32.4% |
| | | Increased significantly | 1156 | 28.2% |
| State Grantees | 15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community? | Decreased significantly | 16 | 0.6% |
| | | Somewhat decreased | 22 | 0.9% |
| | | Neither decreased nor increased | 1015 | 39.3% |
| | | Somewhat increased | 803 | 31.1% |
| | | Increased significantly | 726 | 28.1% |
| Nationwide | 15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community? | Decreased significantly | 41 | 0.6% |
| | | Somewhat decreased | 73 | 1.1% |
| | | Neither decreased nor increased | 2548 | 38.2% |
| | | Somewhat increased | 2131 | 31.9% |
| | | Increased significantly | 1882 | 28.2% |

Table 17. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

| | | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Grantees | 15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community? | Decreased significantly | 19 | 53.4 |
| | | Somewhat decreased | 47 | 62.9 |
| | | Neither decreased nor increased | 1496 | 76.4 |
| | | Somewhat increased | 1309 | 83.0 |
| | | Increased significantly | 1128 | 90.5 |
| State Grantees | 15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community? | Decreased significantly | 15 | 63.3 |
| | | Somewhat decreased | 20 | 68.6 |
| | | Neither decreased nor increased | 996 | 76.9 |
| | | Somewhat increased | 789 | 84.7 |
| | | Increased significantly | 711 | 91.2 |

| | | | Count | ACSI Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide | 15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community? | Decreased significantly | 34 | 57.8 |
| | | Somewhat decreased | 67 | 64.6 |
| | | Neither decreased nor increased | 2492 | 76.6 |
| | | Somewhat increased | 2098 | 83.6 |
| | | Increased significantly | 1839 | 90.7 |