PY 2012 Customer Satisfaction Survey of Host Agencies
Nationwide Report
September 9, 2013

I. Overview

The nationwide report for the PY 2012 host agency customer satisfaction surveys consists of the tables below that present the nationwide scores for all of the survey questions, as well as the standard analyses – Key Drivers and Questions Most Closely Associated with ACSI Scores – in Section II K. Other than the driver analysis on pages 11-13, the usual narrative explanation has been omitted.

This nationwide report will be most useful if read in conjunction with the complete nationwide host agency survey report for PY 2009. The PY 2009 nationwide report contains the background of the host agency customer satisfaction survey project, the methodology employed by all grantees, an explanation of the nationwide results for each survey question, and an extended explanation of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI).

II. Survey Results

A. Host Agency Characteristics
Table 1

| | 20. For how long have you been a host agency? | | | |
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	5225	5.9	1	58
State Grantees	3409	6.0	0	40
Nationwide	8634	5.9	0	58

B. Response Rate

Table 2

| | Response Rate | | | |
| | Did Not Respond | | Responded | |
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	600	40.5%	883	59.5%
ANPPM	148	47.4%	164	52.6%
ATD	56	34.8%	105	65.2%
Easter Seals	213	43.6%	276	56.4%
Experience Works	817	38.1%	1328	61.9%

	Response Rate			
	Did Not Respond		Responded	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Goodwill	159	38.4%	255	61.6%
Mature Services	80	30.9%	179	69.1%
ABLE	131	36.7%	226	63.3%
NAPCA	93	44.3%	117	55.7%
NCBA	213	37.8%	350	62.2%
NCOA	335	44.1%	425	55.9%
NICOA	105	38.6%	167	61.4%
Urban League	168	48.4%	179	51.6%
SER	231	43.6%	299	56.4%
SSAI	412	37.1%	699	62.9%
National Grantees	3761	40.0%	5652	60.0%
Alabama	21	17.8%	97	82.2%
Alaska	22	25.3%	65	74.7%
Arizona	22	26.8%	60	73.2%
Arkansas	49	39.8%	74	60.2%
California	175	50.0%	175	50.0%
Colorado	17	30.9%	38	69.1%
Connecticut	22	39.3%	34	60.7%
Delaware	17	22.7%	58	77.3%
District of Columbia	10	58.8%	7	41.2%
Florida	116	41.6%	163	58.4%
Georgia	40	31.0%	89	69.0%
Hawaii	25	30.5%	57	69.5%
Idaho	23	39.7%	35	60.3%
Illinois	71	39.0%	111	61.0%
Indiana	63	34.2%	121	65.8%
Iowa	27	38.0%	44	62.0%
Kansas	14	23.3%	46	76.7%
Kentucky	14	17.9%	64	82.1%
Louisiana	32	35.2%	59	64.8%
Maine	13	27.7%	34	72.3%
Maryland	22	32.8%	45	67.2%
Massachusetts	46	38.0%	75	62.0%
Michigan	39	26.4%	109	73.6%
Minnesota	62	31.8%	133	68.2%
Mississippi	29	36.3%	51	63.7%

| | Response Rate | | | |
| | Did Not Respond | | Responded | |
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Missouri	47	32.2%	99	67.8%
Montana	12	35.3%	22	64.7%
Nebraska	20	66.7%	10	33.3%
Nevada	8	25.8%	23	74.2%
New Hampshire	14	30.4%	32	69.6%
New Jersey	68	45.6%	81	54.4%
New Mexico	12	28.6%	30	71.4%
New York	90	38.8%	142	61.2%
North Carolina	33	23.4%	108	76.6%
North Dakota	24	41.4%	34	58.6%
Ohio	64	30.6%	145	69.4%
Oklahoma	14	12.8%	95	87.2%
Oregon	26	26.5%	72	73.5%
Pennsylvania	77	27.9%	199	72.1%
Rhode Island	5	27.8%	13	72.2%
South Carolina	52	47.3%	58	52.7%
South Dakota	23	37.7%	38	62.3%
Tennessee	37	27.0%	100	73.0%
Texas	139	37.6%	231	62.4%
Utah	16	38.1%	26	61.9%
Vermont	11	36.7%	19	63.3%
Virginia	29	25.4%	85	74.6%
Washington	22	31.4%	48	68.6%
West Virginia	7	18.4%	31	81.6%
Wisconsin	36	28.8%	89	71.2%
Wyoming	21	52.5%	19	47.5%
State Grantees	1898	33.9%	3693	66.1%
Nationwide	5659	37.7%	9345	62.3%

C. American Customer Satisfaction Index

Table 3

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	883	79.9	0	100
ANPPM	164	84.5	4	100
ATD	105	76.6	11	100
Easter Seals	276	80.7	3	100
Experience Works	1328	80.7	0	100
Goodwill	255	80.3	13	100
Mature Services	179	83.0	22	100
ABLE	226	77.9	11	100
NAPCA	117	83.6	37	100
NCBA	350	85.2	0	100
NCOA	425	82.6	0	100
NICOA	167	83.4	0	100
Urban League	179	79.4	0	100
SER	299	80.5	0	100
SSAI	699	84.1	0	100
National Grantees	5652	81.5	0	100
Alabama	97	84.7	0	100
Alaska	65	79.5	22	100
Arizona	60	76.8	11	100
Arkansas	74	85.2	15	100
California	175	85.1	25	100
Colorado	38	68.7	9	100
Connecticut	34	79.5	23	100
Delaware	58	79.9	27	100
District of Columbia	7	77.2	53	90
Florida	163	82.4	0	100
Georgia	89	87.5	29	100
Hawaii	57	81.8	44	100
Idaho	35	72.0	0	100
Illinois	111	81.3	4	100
Indiana	121	78.8	3	100
Iowa	44	82.3	0	100
Kansas	46	81.1	4	100
Kentucky	64	90.2	23	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Louisiana	59	85.6	33	100
Maine	34	75.2	4	100
Maryland	45	79.8	19	100
Massachusetts	75	80.7	3	100
Michigan	109	82.1	0	100
Minnesota	133	80.7	11	100
Mississippi	51	84.6	19	100
Missouri	99	82.5	22	100
Montana	22	78.5	12	100
Nebraska	10	65.2	0	97
Nevada	23	76.2	11	100
New Hampshire	32	74.6	27	100
New Jersey	81	83.0	22	100
New Mexico	30	83.6	18	100
New York	142	83.2	4	100
North Carolina	108	84.5	22	100
North Dakota	34	78.6	22	100
Ohio	145	78.7	11	100
Oklahoma	95	85.5	12	100
Oregon	72	75.1	22	100
Pennsylvania	199	79.6	0	100
Rhode Island	13	74.1	22	100
South Carolina	58	79.1	0	100
South Dakota	38	80.7	19	100
Tennessee	100	89.8	40	100
Texas	231	81.1	0	100
Utah	26	83.6	30	100
Vermont	19	67.4	0	100
Virginia	85	87.2	34	100
Washington	48	79.4	8	100
West Virginia	31	80.1	12	100
Wisconsin	89	80.6	18	100
Wyoming	19	83.9	57	100
State Grantees	3693	81.7	0	100
Nationwide	9345	81.6	0	100

D. Treatment by Sub-grantee

Table 4

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	5748	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	5629	8.6	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	5212	8.3	1	10
State Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	3705	8.8	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	3627	8.7	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	3293	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	9453	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	9256	8.7	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	8505	8.3	1	10

E. Assignment Process

Table 5

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	5697	8.5	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	5634	7.9	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	5537	7.7	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	5656	8.1	1	10
State Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	3686	8.6	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	3620	8.0	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency,	3567	7.8	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	3658	8.2	1	10
Nationwide	6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	9383	8.5	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	9254	7.9	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency,	9104	7.8	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	9314	8.1	1	10

Table 6

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3825	74.5%
		Occasionally	972	18.9%
		Frequently	188	3.7%
		Nearly Always	148	2.9%
State Grantees	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2725	81.5%
		Occasionally	485	14.5%
		Frequently	80	2.4%
		Nearly Always	53	1.6%
Nationwide	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	6550	77.3%
		Occasionally	1457	17.2%
		Frequently	268	3.2%
		Nearly Always	201	2.4%

F. Supportive Services and Training

Table 7

	12. Did any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
National Grantees	695	12.1%	4077	71.1%	962	16.8%
State Grantees	521	14.0%	2607	69.9%	602	16.1%
Nationwide	1216	12.8%	6684	70.6%	1564	16.5%

Table 8

		National Grantees		State Grantees		Nationwide	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	172	26.8%	117	23.4%	289	25.3%
	Few	90	14.0%	64	12.8%	154	13.5%
	Some	208	32.4%	148	29.5%	356	31.2%
	Nearly All	171	26.7%	172	34.3%	343	30.0%

Table 9

| | 14. Do participants assigned to your agency ever need any additional training? | | | | | |
| | Yes | | No | | Don't Know | |
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
National Grantees	1554	27.2%	3741	65.4%	426	7.4%
State Grantees	1033	27.8%	2393	64.4%	288	7.8%
Nationwide	2587	27.4%	6134	65.0%	714	7.6%

Table 10

| 15. Does the Older Worker Program provide the needed training? | National Grantees | | State Grantees | | Nationwide | |
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Never Provides Training	203	16.0%	114	13.4%	317	14.9%
Sometimes Provides Training	427	33.6%	280	32.9%	707	33.3%
Often Provides Training	372	29.3%	277	32.5%	649	30.6%
Always Provides Training	268	21.1%	180	21.2%	448	21.1%

G. Quality of Participants

Table 11

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	4691	6.3	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	4130	8.7	1	90
State Grantees	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	3094	6.3	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	2751	9.2	1	90

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	7785	6.3	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	6881	8.9	1	90

H. The Impact of SCSEP

Table 12

18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	National Grantees		State Grantees		Nationwide	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Significantly Decreased	24	.4%	19	.5%	43	.5%
Somewhat Decreased	69	1.2%	47	1.3%	116	1.3%
Neither Decreased nor Increased	1153	20.8%	731	20.4%	1884	20.7%
Somewhat Increased	1561	28.2%	1058	29.6%	2619	28.7%
Significantly Increased	2730	49.3%	1721	48.1%	4451	48.8%

I. Would Recommend

Table 13

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	19. Would you recommend the services of the Older Worker Program to other agencies?	5711	9.1	1	10
State Grantees	19. Would you recommend the services of the Older Worker Program to other agencies?	3690	9.2	1	10
Nationwide	19. Would you recommend the services of the Older Worker Program to other agencies?	9401	9.2	1	10

J. Open-Ended Questions

The last two questions asked respondents to write what they felt was most valuable about the program and what they thought was most in need of improvement. Each grantee has received a CD with the comments that were included in the surveys completed by its host agencies.

K. Key Drivers and Questions More Closely Associated with ACSI Scores

1. Driver Analysis

An analysis was conducted to determine which aspects of service were most important to overall satisfaction. Table 14 presents those results. 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 respondents who answered the particular 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 five, which are shaded in the table. Questions with a smaller correlation or less substantial independent relationship are unshaded.

Using these two different criteria, five questions are key drivers of satisfaction, those with strong correlations and significant independent contribution to the ACSI: Questions 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11. Most of the drivers relate to the process of assigning the participant; therefore, the sub-grantees have a significant amount of control over these drivers and their associated ratings. Question 5 deals with the ease of the assignment process. Question 6 deals with the sub-grantee's understanding of the host agency's business needs in making the assignment. Question 7 deals with the adequacy of information about the participant provided to the host agency during the assignment process. Question 8 deals with whether the host agency had sufficient choice of participants during the assignment process. The last driver, Question 11, does not deal with the assignment process but instead looks at whether the sub-grantee followed up with the host agency by being helpful when any problems occurred.

---

[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.

Questions 7 and 8 are not only strong drivers, but they are also areas where the scores leave significant room for improvement: Question 7's score is 7.9 and Question 8's score is 7.8. These two scores are much lower than the score of 8.7 for Question 5, which leaves much less room for improvement.

The unshaded Questions 4, 9, 10, and 16 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 4 and 16 are about communication and are strongly correlated with the ACSI although they do not make significant independent contributions as drivers. Both questions are moderately strong in their relationship to satisfaction. They are closely related to the shaded questions regarding providing information and solving problems after the assignment is made. Put another way, sub-grantees that do a good job of explaining the nature of the program and of understanding the host agency's business needs also tend to provide the host agency with the information it needs, give the host agency sufficient background on the participant assigned, allow the host agency some choice in the assignment, and stay in touch after the assignment. Due to the strength of the correlations and the relatively low scores received on Question 16 (8.1), staying in touch with the host agency is likely to be important, along with helping to solve problems when they arise (Question 11).

Question 9, regarding computer skills, should not be ignored either. The score of 6.3 is very low although slightly improved from previous years. For host agencies that care about computer skills, the lack of such skills may be lowering the score on the quality of the match since there is a strong correlation between these questions. As computers become ever more critical to the operation of all agencies and organizations, grantees should consider a comprehensive approach to ensuring that participants have at least the minimal computer skills needed to be successful in both community service assignments and unsubsidized placements.

Question 10, whether the participant was a good match with the host agency, has a fairly high score (8.9) and the lowest correlation with overall satisfaction of any question in the survey. Since improving the score on this question will be relatively difficult and since it is unlikely to have much impact on satisfaction, grantee energy would be better spent on the shaded questions.

Table 14

		Relation to ACSI
4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	Pearson Correlation	.586**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9263

		Relation to ACSI
5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	Pearson Correlation	.655[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9062
6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	Pearson Correlation	.680[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9184
7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.605[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9065
8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.588[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8924
9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	Pearson Correlation	.477[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7629
10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.284[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6684
11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	Pearson Correlation	.668[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8340
16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	Pearson Correlation	.600[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9129

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

2. Other Questions Related to Satisfaction

Table 15

13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?		ACSI			
		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	None	167	77.0	0	100
	Few	88	70.3	0	100
	Some	201	79.0	18	100
	Nearly All	168	85.5	28	100

State Grantees	None	116	76.2	0	100
	Few	63	72.8	19	100
	Some	147	79.9	0	100
	Nearly All	169	87.3	33	100
Nationwide	None	283	76.7	0	100
	Few	151	71.4	0	100
	Some	348	79.4	0	100
	Nearly All	337	86.4	28	100

Table 16

15. Does the Older Worker Program provide the needed training?		ACSI			
		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Never Provides Training	199	66.7	0	100
	Sometimes Provides Training	417	74.4	0	100
	Often Provides Training	364	82.3	16	100
	Always Provides Training	260	88.2	14	100
State Grantees	Never Provides Training	111	65.8	0	100
	Sometimes Provides Training	274	77.0	0	100
	Often Provides Training	276	82.5	15	100
	Always Provides Training	178	88.0	22	100
Nationwide	Never Provides Training	310	66.4	0	100
	Sometimes Provides Training	691	75.4	0	100
	Often Provides Training	640	82.4	15	100
	Always Provides Training	438	88.1	14	100

Table 17

18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?		ACSI			
		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Significantly Decreased	20	36.1	0	100
	Somewhat Decreased	67	54.0	3	100
	Neither Decreased nor Increased	1119	68.6	0	100
	Somewhat Increased	1530	78.9	14	100
	Significantly Increased	2660	89.4	0	100
State Grantees	Significantly Decreased	17	68.5	0	100
	Somewhat Decreased	47	47.4	8	100
	Neither Decreased nor Increased	717	68.4	0	100
	Somewhat Increased	1042	79.7	15	100
	Significantly Increased	1705	89.8	0	100

		ACSI			
		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	Significantly Decreased	37	51.0	0	100
	Somewhat Decreased	114	51.2	3	100
	Neither Decreased nor Increased	1836	68.5	0	100
	Somewhat Increased	2572	79.2	14	100
	Significantly Increased	4365	89.5	0	100

Table 18

17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?		ACSI			
		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Never	3730	82.9	0	100
	Occasionally	949	80.4	0	100
	Frequently	183	73.5	0	100
	Nearly Always	144	72.1	0	100
State Grantees	Never	2692	82.5	0	100
	Occasionally	476	80.2	0	100
	Frequently	79	74.3	0	100
	Nearly Always	52	78.4	0	100
Nationwide	Never	6422	82.7	0	100
	Occasionally	1425	80.4	0	100
	Frequently	262	73.8	0	100
	Nearly Always	196	73.7	0	100