PY 2013 Customer Satisfaction Survey of Host Agencies
Nationwide Report
March 17, 2014

I. Overview

The nationwide report for the PY 2013 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?				
	20. For how long have you been a host agency?			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4668	5.5	0	50
State Grantees	2778	5.6	0	38
Nationwide	7446	5.6	0	50

B. Response Rate

Table 2

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	775	57.5%	572	42.5%
ABLE	170	58.8%	119	41.2%
ANPPM	121	50.2%	120	49.8%
ATD	93	56.0%	73	44.0%

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Easter Seals	241	54.9%	198	45.1%
Experience Works	1281	60.1%	849	39.9%
Goodwill	232	62.5%	139	37.5%
Mature Services	134	67.3%	65	32.7%
NAPCA[S]	143	51.8%	133	48.2%
NCBA	250	54.2%	211	45.8%
NCOA	399	52.6%	360	47.4%
NICOA[S]	166	56.3%	129	43.7%
Urban League	119	48.8%	125	51.2%
SER	273	54.0%	233	46.0%
SSAI	663	59.8%	445	40.2%
National Grantees	5060	57.3%	3771	42.7%
Alabama	85	75.2%	28	24.8%
Alaska	55	68.8%	25	31.3%
Arizona	46	59.0%	32	41.0%
Arkansas	69	71.1%	28	28.9%
California	140	49.3%	144	50.7%
Colorado	29	63.0%	17	37.0%
Connecticut	25	40.3%	37	59.7%
Delaware	49	80.3%	12	19.7%
District of Columbia	7	46.7%	8	53.3%
Florida	125	51.2%	119	48.8%
Georgia	74	65.5%	39	34.5%
Hawaii	61	80.3%	15	19.7%
Idaho	23	56.1%	18	43.9%
Illinois	79	56.8%	60	43.2%
Indiana	99	55.9%	78	44.1%
Iowa	32	57.1%	24	42.9%
Kansas	38	65.5%	20	34.5%
Kentucky	59	69.4%	26	30.6%
Louisiana	47	56.6%	36	43.4%
Maine	14	50.0%	14	50.0%
Maryland	42	72.4%	16	27.6%
Massachusetts	60	58.8%	42	41.2%
Michigan	79	65.3%	42	34.7%
Minnesota	114	67.1%	56	32.9%

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Mississippi	39	69.6%	17	30.4%
Missouri	81	61.8%	50	38.2%
Montana	20	64.5%	11	35.5%
Nebraska	18	58.1%	13	41.9%
Nevada	11	73.3%	4	26.7%
New Hampshire	24	64.9%	13	35.1%
New Jersey	74	59.7%	50	40.3%
New Mexico	17	56.7%	13	43.3%
New York	112	51.6%	105	48.4%
North Carolina	106	77.9%	30	22.1%
North Dakota	27	65.9%	14	34.1%
Ohio	125	66.1%	64	33.9%
Oklahoma	85	76.6%	26	23.4%
Oregon	49	65.3%	26	34.7%
Pennsylvania	155	62.5%	93	37.5%
Puerto Rico	8	66.7%	4	33.3%
Rhode Island	8	57.1%	6	42.9%
South Carolina	40	49.4%	41	50.6%
South Dakota	37	59.7%	25	40.3%
Tennessee	81	64.3%	45	35.7%
Texas	206	58.9%	144	41.1%
Utah	24	58.5%	17	41.5%
Vermont	18	69.2%	8	30.8%
Virginia	67	65.7%	35	34.3%
Washington	30	58.8%	21	41.2%
West Virginia	25	75.8%	8	24.2%
Wisconsin	65	64.4%	36	35.6%
Wyoming	14	42.4%	19	57.6%
State Grantees	3017	61.7%	1874	38.3%
Nationwide	8077	58.9%	5645	41.1%

C. American Customer Satisfaction Index

Table 3

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	775	79.7	0	100
ABLE	170	78.0	0	100
ANPPM	121	85.5	8	100
ATD	93	78.9	18	100
Easter Seals	241	79.0	0	100
Experience Works	1281	81.3	0	100
Goodwill	232	80.9	0	100
Mature Services	134	82.8	22	100
NAPCA[S]	143	83.7	25	100
NCBA	250	83.0	22	100
NCOA	399	82.1	11	100
NICOA[S]	166	85.0	8	100
Urban League	119	81.4	0	100
SER	273	80.7	0	100
SSAI	663	82.9	0	100
National Grantees	5060	81.4	0	100
Alabama	85	86.7	38	100
Alaska	55	78.2	30	100
Arizona	46	84.2	41	100
Arkansas	69	87.6	12	100
California	140	81.8	0	100
Colorado	29	79.8	30	100
Connecticut	25	85.1	61	100
Delaware	49	83.0	40	100
District of Columbia	7	81.3	56	93
Florida	125	77.7	22	100
Georgia	74	85.5	8	100
Hawaii	61	84.4	38	100
Idaho	23	75.6	42	100
Illinois	79	78.3	7	100
Indiana	99	76.4	11	100
Iowa	32	79.3	44	100
Kansas	38	77.2	30	100
Kentucky	59	90.0	33	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Louisiana	47	89.7	35	100
Maine	14	65.3	29	100
Maryland	42	83.0	30	100
Massachusetts	60	78.3	3	100
Michigan	79	83.5	29	100
Minnesota	114	80.0	27	100
Mississippi	39	82.5	8	100
Missouri	81	83.8	9	100
Montana	20	63.5	0	93
Nebraska	18	71.0	27	100
Nevada	11	66.1	37	100
New Hampshire	24	71.3	16	97
New Jersey	74	86.3	22	100
New Mexico	17	82.4	56	100
New York	112	84.3	31	100
North Carolina	106	84.3	15	100
North Dakota	27	85.9	27	100
Ohio	125	81.5	14	100
Oklahoma	85	81.6	0	100
Oregon	49	69.8	0	100
Pennsylvania	155	79.1	0	100
Puerto Rico	8	86.7	41	100
Rhode Island	8	73.7	14	100
South Carolina	40	77.8	7	100
South Dakota	37	80.6	33	100
Tennessee	81	86.5	18	100
Texas	206	82.0	10	100
Utah	24	86.3	44	100
Vermont	18	74.0	27	100
Virginia	67	84.6	16	100
Washington	30	68.5	0	100
West Virginia	25	85.8	44	100
Wisconsin	65	80.7	11	100
Wyoming	14	85.4	52	100
State Grantees	3017	81.5	0	100
Nationwide	8077	81.5	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.	5090	8.6	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	4971	8.6	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	4506	8.2	1	10
State Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	3042	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	2960	8.7	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	2634	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	8132	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	7931	8.6	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	7140	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.	5047	8.5	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	4966	7.9	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	4897	7.7	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	4977	8.0	1	10
State Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	3012	8.6	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	2954	8.0	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	2882	7.8	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	2971	8.2	1	10
Nationwide	6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	8059	8.5	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	7920	7.9	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	7779	7.7	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	7948	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	3477	77.4%
		Occasionally	740	16.5%
		Frequently	157	3.5%
		Nearly always	121	2.7%
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	2291	84.4%
		Occasionally	338	12.4%
		Frequently	51	1.9%
		Nearly always	35	1.3%
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	5768	80.0%
		Occasionally	1078	15.0%
		Frequently	208	2.9%
		Nearly always	156	2.2%

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	604	11.9%	3616	71.2%	861	16.9%
State Grantees	391	12.8%	2182	71.6%	474	15.6%
Nationwide	995	12.2%	5798	71.3%	1335	16.4%

Table 8

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	156	26.8%
		Few	81	13.9%
		Some	184	31.6%
		Nearly all	162	27.8%
State Grantees	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	85	22.9%
		Few	58	15.6%
		Some	94	25.3%
		Nearly all	134	36.1%
Nationwide	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	241	25.3%
		Few	139	14.6%
		Some	278	29.1%
		Nearly all	296	31.0%

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	1334	26.2%	3336	65.6%	419	8.2%
State Grantees	823	27.1%	1999	65.8%	217	7.1%
Nationwide	2157	26.5%	5335	65.6%	636	7.8%

Table 10

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	15. Does the Older Worker Program provide the needed training?	Never provides training	170	16.1%
		Sometimes provides training	377	35.7%
		Often provides training	293	27.7%
		Always provides training	216	20.5%
State Grantees	15. Does the Older Worker Program provide the needed training?	Never provides training	92	14.2%
		Sometimes provides training	230	35.5%
		Often provides training	190	29.3%
		Always provides training	136	21.0%
Nationwide	15. Does the Older Worker Program provide the needed training?	Never provides training	262	15.4%
		Sometimes provides training	607	35.6%
		Often provides training	483	28.3%
		Always provides training	352	20.7%

G. Quality of Participants

Table 11

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	4191	6.4	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	5081	8.1	1	10
State Grantees	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	2514	6.4	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	3035	8.1	1	10
Nationwide	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	6705	6.4	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	8116	8.1	1	10

H. The Impact of SCSEP

Table 12

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	24	0.5%
		Somewhat decreased	61	1.3%
		Neither decreased nor increased	1055	21.9%
		Somewhat increased	1431	29.7%
		Significantly increased	2253	46.7%
State Grantees	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	7	0.2%
		Somewhat decreased	36	1.2%
		Neither decreased nor increased	651	22.5%
		Somewhat increased	870	30.0%
		Significantly increased	1333	46.0%

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	31	0.4%
		Somewhat decreased	97	1.3%
		Neither decreased nor increased	1706	22.1%
		Somewhat increased	2301	29.8%
		Significantly increased	3586	46.4%

I. Would recommend

Table 13

	19. Would you recommend the services of the Older Worker Program to other agencies?			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	5049	9.1	1	10
State Grantees	3012	9.2	1	10
Nationwide	8061	9.1	1	10

J. Open-ended Questions

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

1. Driver Analysis

The driver analysis is conducted to determine which aspects of service were most important to overall satisfaction. Table 14 presents those results. The methodology for determining the strongest drivers of satisfaction has been modified for this year's report. In previous years, we used a two-step process: 1) Identify those questions with the strongest correlation to the ACSI; and 2) use regression analysis to identify the questions with the strongest unique contribution to understanding overall satisfaction. The current methodology uses a series of regression analyses, giving less emphasis to initial correlations. This method involves testing different models (combinations of questions) to determine which combination provides the most understanding of the ACSI. The best combination of questions is highlighted in Table 14.

The results in Table 14 are based on all available nationwide responses to the survey conducted in PY 2103. Four questions (Questions 5, 6, 10 and 11) in Table 14 are shaded, providing the model (combination of questions) that best explains the ACSI. Questions 5, the ease of using the program, and Question 6, how well the sub-grantee understood the host agency, are strongly

correlated with the ACSI and, as part of the model, each has a strong, unique influence on the ACSI. The large size of these correlations and their strong unique contribution to explaining the ACSI suggest that any change in these scores is likely to have a direct and independent change on overall satisfaction. The average score for Question 5 is 8.6 and for Question 6 is 8.5. In general, these two questions are areas of strength for the program but have room for improvement.

The third question in the model, Question 10, relates to the quality of the match between the participant and host agency. This has the strongest correlation to the ACSI. Question 11, whether the sub-grantee was helpful in resolving problems is the final element of the model. The average score nationwide for Question 10 is 8.1 and for Question 11 is 8.3. Since both of these questions scored lower than many of the other questions, the power of these two questions in the model suggest that much can be done by sub-grantees to improve the quality of service in these two areas and thereby improve host agency satisfaction overall.

The shaded questions are not necessarily the only items that matter in relation to understanding the ACSI, however. What follows are some guiding principles for assessing the remaining questions and their relationship to the ACSI.

- Some questions not in the chosen model (unshaded in Table 14) may have high correlations and average participant ratings, suggesting room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers services.
- Others questions may have a lower correlation with the ACSI but have lower than usual participant ratings, also affording significant room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers the service.
- Several other questions that impact overall satisfaction are not part of these correlation and regression analyses. They are presented individually in Section K.2. Other Questions Related to Satisfaction

The other questions in Table 14 may be considered useful for program improvement based on these guiding principles.

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	.560**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8023
5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	Pearson Correlation	.631**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7824
6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	Pearson Correlation	.677**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7945
7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.611**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7810
8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.601**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7668
9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	Pearson Correlation	.511**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6612
10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.760**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8003
11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	Pearson Correlation	.655**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7043
16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	Pearson Correlation	.584**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7839

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

2. Other Questions Related to Satisfaction

Table 15

			ACSI	
			Count	Mean
National Grantees	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	155	78.8
		Few	79	69.0
		Some	181	77.9
		Nearly all	158	88.5
State Grantees	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	84	72.5
		Few	56	73.6
		Some	93	80.2
		Nearly all	132	86.9
Nationwide	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	239	76.6
		Few	135	70.9
		Some	274	78.7
		Nearly all	290	87.8

Table 16

15. Does the Older Worker Program provide the needed training?		ACSI	
		Count	Mean
National Grantees	Never provides training	169	70.1
	Sometimes provides training	372	72.6
	Often provides training	288	83.6
	Always provides training	211	89.5
State Grantees	Never provides training	91	65.8
	Sometimes provides training	226	73.4
	Often provides training	186	80.7
	Always provides training	132	87.3
Nationwide	Never provides training	260	68.6
	Sometimes provides training	598	72.9
	Often provides training	474	82.5
	Always provides training	343	88.7

Table 17

			ACSI	
			Count	Mean
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	3436	83.2
		Occasionally	728	79.5
		Frequently	153	73.3
		Nearly always	119	72.7
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	2261	82.2
		Occasionally	331	80.3
		Frequently	51	76.9
		Nearly always	35	70.5
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	5697	82.8
		Occasionally	1059	79.7
		Frequently	204	74.2
		Nearly always	154	72.2

Table 18

			ACSI	
			Count	Mean
National Grantees	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	23	57.0
		Somewhat decreased	59	57.8
		Neither decreased nor increased	1041	69.2
		Somewhat increased	1407	79.0
		Significantly increased	2230	89.7
State Grantees	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	6	30.3
		Somewhat decreased	34	45.2
		Neither decreased nor increased	636	69.1
		Somewhat increased	856	80.2
		Significantly increased	1320	89.8
Nationwide	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	29	51.5
		Somewhat decreased	93	53.2
		Neither decreased nor increased	1677	69.2
		Somewhat increased	2263	79.5
		Significantly increased	3550	89.8