PY 2019 Host Agency Evaluation of SCSEP
June 15, 2020

Overview

The PY 2019 nationwide host agency survey is the fourth 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 2019, a nationwide random sample of 13,482 host agencies was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2019. Collection for the third and last wave of surveys was closed in March 2020. 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 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 selected values. This approach identifies results where there is an opportunity to increase 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 8 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 with values of 1-10 to overall satisfaction is presented in the driver analysis section on pages 8-9. The driver analysis has the advantage not only of assessing the individual relation of certain aspects of service to the level of host agency satisfaction but also of comparing across those aspects of service to determine where 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 2019 presented in Table 1 is 82.4, the same score as in PY 2018. As in other years, the ACSI score compares very favorably with ACSI scores from non-profit, for-profit, and government 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.

Table 1. American Customer Satisfaction Index

	Count	Mean ACSI	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	6841	82.4	18.99	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 13,482 host agencies that received a survey, 6,841 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 50.7 percent, slightly lower than the rate in PY 2018. See Table 2. The response rate for national grantee host agencies (49.1%) is significantly lower than the rate for state grantee host agencies (53.6%). See Appendix A. This year's nationwide response rate is not significantly lower than the PY 2018 rate of 51.9% or the PY 2017 rate of 52.4%, but it is significantly lower than the 60.1 percent response rate in PY 2015. The trend of the last three surveys suggests the response rate has reached a plateau at just over 50 percent.

Table 2. Response Rate

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Nationwide	6841	50.7%	6641	49.3%

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 three surveys. The scores for these questions are essentially the same as the scores in PY 2018. The one question that continues to stand 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.	6777	8.5	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	6907	8.4	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	6786	7.8	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	6754	8.2	0	10
	11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	6887	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, 71.5 percent indicated they had the ability to accept or refuse an offer, the same as in PY 2018 and PY 2017. 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.	6002	71.5%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	2042	24.3%
		I really have no choice.	347	4.1%

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 2018, 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.	5871	82.6
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	1986	87.4
		I really have no choice.	335	67.8

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 preparation. Agencies can select more than one answer for this question. As evident in Table 6, the most frequently noted lack of preparation is in the area of basic computer knowledge, the same as in PY 2018. The other three areas -- lack of basic employability skills, knowledge of the assignment, and how to behave with host agency customers -- are mentioned with nearly equal frequency.

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

			Count	Percent of Responses
Nationwide	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	Basic computer knowledge	3452	29.9%
		Basic employability skills	2753	23.8%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	2701	23.4%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients	2650	22.9%

Table 7 suggests the importance of preparation needs for host agency satisfaction. For those host agencies that reported no concern about the preparation of participants (about one-third of the host agencies reporting), the average ACSI was just under 90.0, similar to the score for PY 2018. For those agencies with one or more concerns for training needs, the ACSI score is more than 10 points lower than for those agencies that reported no preparation issues. This strongly suggests the importance of assigning participants who are fully prepared in all four areas. As in PY 2018, there is considerable room for improvement.

Table 7. Preparation Needs and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	No preparation issues	2142	89.88
	One or more preparation issues	4699	79.04

Question 8 in Table 8, 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 8.1 is nearly the same as in the prior

three years. 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 aspect of the program. See Driver Analysis below.

Table 8: Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	6906	8.1	1	10

Supportive Services

Question 12 in Table 9 shows the number of host agencies with participants who needed supportive services. Similar to PY 2018, nearly two-thirds of the host agencies that answered the question indicated that the participants assigned to them did not need supportive services. Twenty-five 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 3-6 points lower than the average ACSI for those agencies that had no participants needing supportive services. See Table 10. The need for supportive services, often a necessity for participants, affects host agency satisfaction, although it should be noted that other factors over which local programs have control have a larger impact on satisfaction.

Table 9. 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	4051	64.1%
		Few	1574	24.9%
		Many	384	6.1%
		Nearly all	308	4.9%

Table 10: 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	3976	84.1
		Few	1535	81.4
		Many	375	77.9
		Nearly all	303	79.5

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 11 asks if a participant was removed before the host agency thought the person was ready. Nationwide, 78.5 percent of host agencies never had that experience, nearly the same as in PY 2018.

Table 11. 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	4811	78.5%
		Occasionally	1093	17.8%
		Frequently	133	2.2%
		Nearly always	88	1.4%

The ACSI scores in Table 12 show that having participants removed reduces satisfaction. The majority of agencies that never experience premature removal have an average ACSI score of 83.8. That is 2 points higher than the ACSI score for those agencies that experience the occasional removal of a participant (81.2) 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 about 8-9 points lower than the ACSI scores for those agencies that never or only occasionally have someone removed. It is notable that the satisfaction for those that experience removal of participants frequently or nearly always is significantly lower than it was in PY 2018.

Table 12. 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	4711	83.9
		Occasionally	1072	81.2
		Frequently	130	73.6
		Nearly always	87	74.1

Question 14 in Table 13, a new question in PY 2015, asks if the host agency has asked the local program to remove a participant. Instances of removal occur about 45 percent of the time, two percentage points higher than reported in PY 2018 and nearly 4 points higher than in PY 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 13. 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	2853	44.8%
		No	3522	55.2%

As shown in Table 14, there is a 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 from the host agency perspective, this is an area that warrants attention by the grantees.

Table 14. 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	2796	78.5
		No	3448	85.6

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. As shown in Table 15, 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 the last three surveys. 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 15. 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	23	0.4%
		Somewhat decreased	83	1.3%
		Neither decreased nor increased	2392	37.6%
		Somewhat increased	2058	32.3%
		Increased significantly	1806	28.4%

Table 16 shows the association between SCSEP's impact on the host agency's capacity to provide services and the ACSI. For the 28% that experienced a significant increase in capacity, the satisfaction is extraordinarily high, 91.2 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 16. 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	23	76.6
		Somewhat decreased	79	62.2
		Neither decreased nor increased	2354	76.2
		Somewhat increased	2021	83.7
		Increased significantly	1776	91.2

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 8, 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.

Different analytic approaches are required 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 approach presented above identifies questions where the respondent makes a specific choice or, in some instances, chooses more than one value. The questions in the driver analysis below ask respondents for ratings on a continuous 10-point scale and, with the exception of the question about the quality of the match, are specific to service quality. In all instances, the questions provide guidance for identifying actions that can improve service or mitigate the harm related to host agencies' evaluations of the service.

Table 17 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.[1] 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 underlined 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 three surveys, 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 and has been for several years. 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 over 6 points on the ACSI scale. This is not an unreasonable level of improvement to which grantees might aspire, given that a quarter of them had scores on Question 8 below 8.0.

---

[1] 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.

The unshaded Questions 6, 10 and 11 have little or no <u>independent</u> 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

Table 17. Driver Analysis

		Relation to ACSI
4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	Pearson Correlation	.712
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6642
5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	Pearson Correlation	.725
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6735
6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.625
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6624
8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.787
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6758
10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	Pearson Correlation	.652
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6501
11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	Pearson Correlation	.631
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6733

Summary and Recommendations

Despite the slight, non-significant reduction in host agency response rates from last year's survey, the results of the PY 2019 survey are strikingly similar to those for PY 2018. 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 more than 6 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 the particular importance of better preparation of participants in three of four areas: computer knowledge, employability skills, and knowledge of the assignment. 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 no need for better preparation in any area have extraordinarily high overall satisfaction (ACSI score of 89.9) compared to those that identify one or more areas where preparation needs improvement. While addressing individual preparation needs yields 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	433	81.7	11	100
ANPPM	187	88.6	12	100
ATD	188	78.4	0	100
Easter Seals	257	82.5	0	100
Experience Works	229	77.2	0	100
Goodwill	343	83.6	4	100
IID [S]	72	88.2	19	100
NAPCA[S]	104	85.4	15	100
National Able Network	167	80.2	0	100
NAPCA[G]	161	81.8	11	100
NCBA	295	80.0	0	100
NCOA	363	82.8	11	100
NICOA[S]	112	85.6	15	100
NOWCC	37	81.9	7	100
NUL	172	81.5	0	100
OAGB	107	81.1	0	100
SER	220	81.0	7	100
SSAI	454	82.7	0	100
The WorkPlace	202	81.0	15	100
VANTAGE	118	83.5	22	100
National Grantees	4221	82.1	0	100
Alabama	79	85.5	22	100
Alaska	57	78.0	26	100
Arizona	34	79.7	8	100
Arkansas	42	80.4	11	100
California	125	85.3	15	100
Colorado	22	69.7	8	100
Connecticut	24	80.8	34	100
Delaware	55	82.6	22	100
DC	5	69.5	22	100
Florida	133	82.5	0	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Georgia	74	84.7	19	100
Hawaii	38	85.5	22	100
Idaho	16	82.4	48	100
Illinois	51	82.2	15	100
Indiana	44	78.7	0	100
Iowa	37	78.5	0	100
Kansas	42	80.7	37	100
Kentucky	68	91.8	48	100
Louisiana	63	83.9	0	100
Maryland	28	82.2	34	100
Massachusetts	43	83.6	0	100
Michigan	62	83.2	4	100
Minnesota	89	81.5	11	100
Mississippi	46	89.5	41	100
Missouri	85	80.2	0	100
Montana	14	73.4	30	97
Nebraska	20	81.5	33	100
Nevada	10	85.3	60	100
New Hampshire	23	82.2	37	100
New Jersey	59	82.7	8	100
New Mexico	22	89.4	30	100
New York	90	78.8	8	100
North Carolina	67	86.0	33	100
North Dakota	19	74.7	8	100
Ohio	107	83.5	4	100
Oklahoma	51	89.2	15	100
Oregon	41	76.7	19	100
Pennsylvania	160	84.3	0	100
Rhode Island	14	76.5	15	100
South Carolina	37	84.1	41	100
South Dakota	24	76.4	22	100
Tennessee	73	83.5	0	100
Texas	188	85.2	7	100
Utah	13	86.6	59	100
Vermont	13	73.3	15	100
Virginia	80	83.2	15	100
Washington	33	76.2	30	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
West Virginia	26	88.2	59	100
Wisconsin	63	83.8	33	100
Wyoming	11	84.6	51	100
State Grantees	2620	83.0	0	100
Nationwide	6841	82.4	0	100

Table 2: Response Rate by Grantee

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	433	44.4%	542	55.6%
ANPPM	187	50.5%	183	49.5%
ATD	188	50.7%	183	49.3%
Easter Seals	257	43.9%	329	56.1%
Experience Works	229	57.3%	171	42.8%
Goodwill	343	54.4%	287	45.6%
IID [S]	72	52.9%	64	47.1%
National Able Network	167	53.5%	145	46.5%
NAPCA[G]	161	45.0%	197	55.0%
NAPCA[S]	104	46.4%	120	53.6%
NCBA	295	49.8%	297	50.2%
NCOA	363	43.2%	477	56.8%
NICOA[S]	112	47.5%	124	52.5%
NOWCC	37	38.5%	59	61.5%
NUL	172	45.3%	208	54.7%
OAGB	107	51.9%	99	48.1%
SER	220	52.4%	200	47.6%
SSAI	454	50.9%	438	49.1%
The WorkPlace	202	54.6%	168	45.4%
VANTAGE	118	58.4%	84	41.6%
National Grantees	4221	49.1%	4375	50.9%
Alabama	79	68.7%	36	31.3%
Alaska	57	66.3%	29	33.7%
Arizona	34	52.3%	31	47.7%
Arkansas	42	41.6%	59	58.4%
California	125	49.2%	129	50.8%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Colorado	22	64.7%	12	35.3%
Connecticut	24	46.2%	28	53.8%
Delaware	55	54.5%	46	45.5%
DC	5	35.7%	9	64.3%
Florida	133	40.9%	192	59.1%
Georgia	74	53.2%	65	46.8%
Hawaii	38	58.5%	27	41.5%
Idaho	16	47.1%	18	52.9%
Illinois	51	44.0%	65	56.0%
Indiana	44	44.0%	56	56.0%
Iowa	37	59.7%	25	40.3%
Kansas	42	70.0%	18	30.0%
Kentucky	68	61.3%	43	38.7%
Louisiana	63	59.4%	43	40.6%
Maryland	28	50.0%	28	50.0%
Massachusetts	43	45.7%	51	54.3%
Michigan	62	52.1%	57	47.9%
Minnesota	89	64.0%	50	36.0%
Mississippi	46	71.9%	18	28.1%
Missouri	85	56.7%	65	43.3%
Montana	14	60.9%	9	39.1%
Nebraska	20	48.8%	21	51.2%
Nevada	10	34.5%	19	65.5%
New Hampshire	23	60.5%	15	39.5%
New Jersey	59	52.2%	54	47.8%
New Mexico	22	68.8%	10	31.3%
New York	90	52.0%	83	48.0%
North Carolina	67	55.8%	53	44.2%
North Dakota	19	55.9%	15	44.1%
Ohio	107	58.5%	76	41.5%
Oklahoma	51	62.2%	31	37.8%
Oregon	41	54.7%	34	45.3%
Pennsylvania	160	52.1%	147	47.9%
Rhode Island	14	77.8%	4	22.2%
South Carolina	37	46.3%	43	53.8%
South Dakota	24	60.0%	16	40.0%
Tennessee	73	60.3%	48	39.7%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Texas	188	50.8%	182	49.2%
Utah	13	39.4%	20	60.6%
Vermont	13	43.3%	17	56.7%
Virginia	80	66.1%	41	33.9%
Washington	33	46.5%	38	53.5%
West Virginia	26	65.0%	14	35.0%
Wisconsin	63	48.1%	68	51.9%
Wyoming	11	57.9%	8	42.1%
State Grantees	2620	53.6%	2266	46.4%
Nationwide	6841	50.7%	6641	49.3%

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	4194	8.4	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff who make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	4262	8.4	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	4183	7.7	1	10
	10. The Older worker Program staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	4163	8.2	0	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	4235	8.0	1	10
State Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	2583	8.6	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff who make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	2645	8.5	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	2603	8.0	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	10. The Older worker Program staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	2591	8.3	0	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	2652	8.3	1	10
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	6777	8.5	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff who make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	6907	8.4	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	6786	7.8	1	10
	10. The Older worker Program staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	6754	8.2	0	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	6887	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	3685	87.4%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	1260	29.9%
		I really have no choice	240	5.7%
State Grantees	7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	2317	88.2%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	782	29.8%
		I really have no choice	107	4.1%
Nationwide	7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	6002	87.7%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	2042	29.8%
		I really have no choice	347	5.1%

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	3609	82.3
		I have a choice among several potential participants	1230	87.2
		I really have no choice	232	67.6
State Grantees	7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	2262	83.0
		I have a choice among several potential participants	756	87.6
		I really have no choice	103	68.3
Nationwide	7. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	5871	82.6
		I have a choice among several potential participants	1986	87.4
		I really have no choice	335	67.8

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

			Count	Percent of Responses
National Grantees	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	Basic computer knowledge.	2148	29.3%
		Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact	1764	24.1%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	1715	23.4%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients	1698	23.2%
State Grantees	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	Basic computer knowledge.	1304	30.8%
		Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact	989	23.4%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	986	23.3%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients	952	22.5%

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation, continued

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	Basic computer knowledge.	3452	29.9%
		Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact	2753	23.8%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	2701	23.4%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers or clients	2650	22.9%

Table 7. Existence of Preparation Issues

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	No preparation issues	1381	31.4%
	One or more preparation issues	3011	68.6%
State Grantees	No preparation issues	935	34.1%
	One or more preparation issues	1804	65.9%
Nationwide	No preparation issues	2316	32.5%
	One or more preparation issues	4815	67.5%

Table 8. Existence of Preparation Issues and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	No preparation issues	1270	89.5
	One or more preparation issues	2951	78.9
State Grantees	No preparation issues	872	90.4
	One or more preparation issues	1748	79.3
Nationwide	No preparation issues	2142	89.9
	One or more preparation issues	4699	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.	4260	8.1	1	10
State Grantees	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	2646	8.2	1	10
Nationwide	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	6906	8.1	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	2495	64.1%
		Few	969	24.9%
		Many	236	6.1%
		Nearly all	192	4.9%
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	1556	64.2%
		Few	605	24.9%
		Many	148	6.1%
		Nearly all	116	4.8%
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	4051	64.1%
		Few	1574	24.9%
		Many	384	6.1%
		Nearly all	308	4.9%

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	2449	83.7
		Few	949	81.1
		Many	233	78.4
		Nearly all	188	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	1527	84.7
		Few	586	81.8
		Many	142	77.1
		Nearly all	115	81.5
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	3976	84.1
		Few	1535	81.4
		Many	375	77.9
		Nearly all	303	79.5

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	13. Has the Older Worker Program removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2895	76.6%
		Occasionally	738	19.5%
		Frequently	90	2.4%
		Nearly always	58	1.5%
State Grantees	13. Has the Older Worker Program removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1916	81.7%
		Occasionally	355	15.1%
		Frequently	43	1.8%
		Nearly always	30	1.3%
Nationwide	13. Has the Older Worker Program removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	4811	78.5%
		Occasionally	1093	17.8%
		Frequently	133	2.2%
		Nearly always	88	1.4%

Table 13. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	13. Has the Older Worker Program removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2839	83.7
		Occasionally	721	81.0
		Frequently	88	71.9
		Nearly always	58	73.9
State Grantees	13. Has the Older Worker Program removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1872	84.2
		Occasionally	351	81.5
		Frequently	42	77.0
		Nearly always	29	74.5
Nationwide	13. Has the Older Worker Program removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	4711	83.9
		Occasionally	1072	81.2
		Frequently	130	73.5
		Nearly always	87	74.1

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Has your agency requested that the Older worker Program remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1810	46.1%
		No	2120	53.9%
State Grantees	Has your agency requested that the Older worker Program remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1043	42.7%
		No	1402	57.3%
Nationwide	Has your agency requested that the Older worker Program remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	2853	44.8%
		No	3522	55.2%

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 remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1778	78.3
		No	2079	85.6
State Grantees	14. Has your agency requested that the Older worker Program remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1018	78.9
		No	1369	85.7
Nationwide	14. Has your agency requested that the Older worker Program remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	2796	78.5
		No	3448	85.6

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	15	0.4%
		Somewhat decreased	63	1.6%
		Neither decreased nor increased	1449	37.1%
		Somewhat increased	1255	32.2%
		Increased significantly	1121	28.7%
State Grantees	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	8	0.3%
		Somewhat decreased	20	0.8%
		Neither decreased nor increased	943	38.3%
		Somewhat increased	803	32.7%
		Increased significantly	685	27.9%

Table 17. Effect of Participation in SCSEP, continued

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	23	0.4%
		Somewhat decreased	83	1.3%
		Neither decreased nor increased	2392	37.6%
		Somewhat increased	2058	32.3%
		Increased significantly	1806	28.4%

Table 17. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	15	81.6
		Somewhat decreased	60	64.3
		Neither decreased nor increased	1429	76.2
		Somewhat increased	1232	82.9
		Increased significantly	1103	90.8
State Grantees	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	8	67.3
		Somewhat decreased	19	55.4
		Neither decreased nor increased	925	76.3
		Somewhat increased	789	84.8
		Increased significantly	673	92.0
Nationwide	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	23	76.6
		Somewhat decreased	79	62.2
		Neither decreased nor increased	2354	76.2
		Somewhat increased	2021	83.7
		Increased significantly	1776	91.2