PY 2017 Host Agency Evaluation of SCSEP

The PY 2017 nationwide host agency survey is the second 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 2017, a nationwide random sample of 14,901 host agencies was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2017. Collection for the third and last wave of surveys was closed in February of 2016. 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 analyses below, most survey questions are presented in two tables. The first table shows the number and percent of respondents that selected each of the possible values for the question. The second table shows the degree of overall satisfaction (the ACSI score) depending on which value respondents selected. This approach identifies questions 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 these 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 give the biggest return on investment in terms of program improvement producing increases in overall 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 2017 presented in Table 1 is 81.2, slightly lower than the score of 81.7 in PY 2015. 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. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in the Appendix A. The score for national grantees is 1.1 points lower than the score for state grantees.

Table 1. American Customer Satisfaction Index

	Count	Mean ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	7798	81.2	0	100

Survey Response Rate

The random sample was stratified by grantee, making the final sample representative of host agency customers nationwide. Of the 14,901 host agencies that received a survey, 7,798 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 52.3 percent. (See Table 2.) The response rate for national grantee host agencies (49.9%) is significantly lower than the rate for state grantee host agencies (56.5%). (See Appendix A.) This year's nationwide response rate of 52.3 percent is lower than the 60.1 percent response rate in PY 2015. It is possible that some of the decline in response is due to the effects of the national grantee competition; however, there is no evidence that the competition influenced answers to the survey questions by host agencies that did respond.

Table 2. Response Rate

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Nationwide	7,798	52.4	7,103	47.7

Treatment by Sub-Grantee

The five questions in Table 3 are similar to those asked in the pre-PY 2015 survey; each of the scores in these questions is only 0.1 points lower than the score in PY 2015. The one question that stands out as lower than the others is Question 6, receiving "sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants." The lower score for this slightly revised question highlights an area where local programs can make significant improvement.

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	Q4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	7747	8.3	1	10
	Q5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	7844	8.3	1	10
	Q6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	7734	7.7	1	10
	Q10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	7563	8.3	1	10
	Q11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	7913	8.0	1	10

Question 7 in Table 4 asks host agencies about the degree of choice they had 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 72 percent indicated they had the ability to accept or refuse an offer. That is a drop of over 16 percentage points. This dramatic reduction in score cannot be attributed to the PY 2016 national grantee competition because national and state grantees had similar scores on the question.

Table 4. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q7. What I can do when SCSEP staff propose a participant for our agency.	I can accept the individual offered or not.	6825	71.8%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	2214	23.3%
		I really have no choice.	470	4.9%

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. 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 2015, 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	Can accept the individual offered or not	6651	81.5
	Have choice among several potential participants	2147	86.3
	Have no choice	447	64.9

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 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 2015.

In Table 7 we can see that the last three training needs have associated ACSI scores that are similar and about six points below the nationwide average ACSI score. The ACSI score associated with needs in basic computer knowledge is about three points below the nationwide average ACSI score. This suggests that host agencies may attach less importance to lack of computer skills than to the other gaps in participant preparation for the community service assignment.

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

Q9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?			Count	Percent of Responses
Nationwide	Prepared for the assignment	Basic computer knowledge	3973	30.3%
		Basic employability skills	3060	23.4%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	3011	23.0%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers	3051	23.3%

Table 7. Need for Better Participant Preparation and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Basic computer knowledge	3875	78.0
	Basic employability skills	2960	74.9
	Knowledge of what the assignment required	2922	74.5
	How to behave with the host agency's customers	2964	75.2

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 88.8, similar to the score for PY 2015. For those agencies with one or more concerns for training needs, the ACSI score is 12-14 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 2015, 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	2446	88.8
	One or more preparation issues	5366	77.7

Question 8 in Table 9 is unchanged from the prior version of the survey. The average nationwide score of 8.1 is the same as in PY 2015 but is somewhat lower than in prior years. This year and in PY 2015, the relationship between the match question and overall satisfaction was very high, .779, making this question the strongest independent driver of overall satisfaction in the survey. See the driver analysis section on pages 8-9. 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	Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	7917	8.1	1	10

Supportive Services

Question 12 in Table 10 shows the number of host agencies with participants who needed supportive services. Similar to PY 2015, nearly two-thirds of the host agencies that answered the question indicated that the participants assigned 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, the satisfaction is a little higher than average (82.7) for those agencies that have no participants needing supportive services. Any experience at all with those needing supportive services was associated with a reduction in overall satisfaction of approximately three to five points. The need for supportive services, often a necessity for participants, affects host agency satisfaction, but it is not a major force compared to some other questions in the survey.

Table 10. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q12. 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	4883	66.7%
		Few	1623	22.2%
		Many	438	6.0%
		Nearly all	372	5.1%

Table 11: Supportive Services and the ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Q12. 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	4764	82.7
		Few	1587	80.0
		Many	416	78.1
		Nearly all	366	78.4

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 nearly identical to PY 2015.

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	5688	79.4%
		Occasionally	1216	17.0%
		Frequently	131	1.8%
		Nearly always	130	1.8%

The ACSI scores in Table 13 show that having participants removed occasionally reduces satisfaction. The ACSI score for those agencies that experience the occasional removal of a participant (80.0) is only slightly lower than the average ACSI score nationwide (81.2) and only about 3 points below the average score for agencies that never had a removal. When the removal happens more frequently, however, the ACSI scores are about three points lower than the nationwide ACSI average and three to five 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	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	4764	82.7
		Occasionally	1587	80.0
		Frequently	416	78.1
		Nearly always	366	78.4

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. As in PY 2015, this situation occurs just over 41% of the time, much more frequently than the previously discussed situation, in which the local program takes someone out of the host agency prematurely.

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	3017	41.1%
		No	4328	58.9%

What is more important, as shown in Table 13, there is a 6.6-point difference in satisfaction between those 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	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	2949	77.4
		No	4203	84.0

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. Fifty-nine percent of host agencies indicate that participation has somewhat or significantly increased their ability to provide services; in PY 2015, sixty percent gave this answer. This is a dramatic reduction in the scores for this question: In prior years, 75 percent or more of host agencies have reported a positive effect.   It is difficult to explain this reduction in the positive score unless the concern about the match discussed previously is affecting host agencies' perception of the value of SCSEP.

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	43	0.6%
		Somewhat decreased	86	1.2%
		Neither increased nor decreased	2866	39.0%
		Somewhat increased	2312	31.4%
		Increased significantly	2049	27.9%

Table 17 shows the association between SCSEP's impact on the host agency's capacity to provide services and the ACSI. For the 28 percent that experienced significant increase in capacity, the satisfaction is extraordinarily high (89.9 nationwide). Even those agencies only somewhat increasing capacity have satisfaction scores above the nationwide average. Those few host agencies that experience neither increase nor decrease and those few that experience decreases in capacity have ACSI scores considerably lower.

Table 17. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	38	49.2
		Somewhat decreased	81	62.2
		Neither increased nor decreased	2789	74.9
		Somewhat increased	2252	82.7
		Increased significantly	2000	89.9

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 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 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 the ACSI: Questions 4, 8, and 10. As in PY 2015, 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 10 shows the importance of local program staff being responsive to host agencies when they have problems. 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 8.1, there is some room for improvement. For every 0.5-point improvement in the quality of the match, e.g., from 7.6 to 8.1, overall satisfaction will increase by nearly five points on the ACSI scale. This is not an

---

[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.

unreasonable level of improvement given that 38 percent of grantees had scores on Question 8 from 7.1-7.9.

The unshaded Questions 6 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 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. These two questions are also closely related to the shaded questions regarding making the assignment process easy and solving problems after the assignment is made. Put another way, grantees that make the process easy, make a good match for the host agency, and are helpful in resolving problems will do so by staying in touch and providing enough information on the background of the participants.

Table 18. Driver Analysis

		Relation to ACSI
Q4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	Pearson Correlation	.715**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7561
Q5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	Pearson Correlation	.714**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7646
Q6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.629**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7535
Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.776**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7712
Q10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	Pearson Correlation	.662**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7370
Q11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	Pearson Correlation	.618**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	7705

Summary and Recommendations

Despite the reduction in host agency response rates, the results of the PY 2017 survey are strikingly similar to those for PY 2015. The findings of the driver analysis and the effects on the ACSI of key questions regarding service delivery are 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 .5-point change in the match question yields almost five points of change in satisfaction. The fact that scores have gone down from previous years on this question and on the value of SCSEP to host agencies suggests two things: Host agencies may have higher expectations than in the past; 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 be helpful in resolving problems once the participant has been assigned. 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: 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. These needed improvements also identify specific areas that could support attaining a better match, thereby strengthening host agency satisfaction and the relationship between the local programs and their host agencies.

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 88.8) compared to those that identify even one area where preparation needs improvement. 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, help reinforce the importance of a good match.

Table 1. ASCI

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	501	80.1	0	100
ANPPM	178	83.7	0	100
ATD	188	77.9	0	100
Easter Seals	302	82.1	0	100
Experience Works	425	75.7	0	100
Goodwill	348	82.6	0	100
IID(S)	56	90.0	7	100
Mature Services	137	83.5	22	100
NATABLE	200	75.2	11	100
NAPCA[S]	124	83.3	0	100
NAPCA[G]	173	81.7	0	100
NCBA	313	81.4	4	100
NCOA	364	80.8	0	100
NICOA[S]	128	83.1	4	100
NOWCC	52	77.8	0	100
NUL	186	78.4	0	100
OAGB	117	83.4	4	100
SER	226	79.6	8	100
SSAI	485	81.8	0	100
TWP	190	82.7	0	100
National Grantees	4693	80.7	0	100
Alabama	86	88.8	30	100
Alaska	69	81.5	0	100
Arizona	46	86.2	51	100
Arkansas	48	84.0	11	100
California	145	84.9	11	100
Colorado	31	74.1	20	100
Connecticut	39	83.9	38	100
Delaware	74	79.7	0	100
District of Columbia	7	80.6	44	96
Florida	151	81.2	0	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Georgia	91	84.5	18	100
Hawaii	51	81.3	22	100
Idaho	22	73.9	30	100
Illinois	65	77.8	4	100
Indiana	93	74.2	11	100
Iowa	36	74.5	15	100
Kansas	28	79.9	3	100
Kentucky	67	84.1	18	100
Louisiana	73	86.5	27	100
Maryland	39	76.4	33	100
Massachusetts	55	79.8	22	100
Michigan	95	80.2	15	100
Minnesota	97	81.6	11	100
Mississippi	46	87.5	38	100
Missouri	87	82.4	0	100
Montana	21	76.0	31	100
Nebraska	20	80.0	11	100
Nevada	14	85.1	53	100
New Hampshire	21	74.8	22	100
New Jersey	55	79.6	11	100
New Mexico	20	87.6	22	100
New York	113	86.2	19	100
North Carolina	102	86.0	8	100
North Dakota	25	76.0	42	100
Ohio	138	78.3	18	100
Oklahoma	74	85.9	0	100
Oregon	40	76.5	26	100
Pennsylvania	193	80.7	0	100
Rhode Island	1	66.4	66	66
South Carolina	44	85.9	30	100
South Dakota	28	84.2	44	100
Tennessee	87	82.4	0	100
Texas	166	81.8	0	100
Utah	23	77.3	52	100
Vermont	21	74.1	26	100
Virginia	85	82.5	26	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Washington	45	83.3	29	100
West Virginia	33	86.9	52	100
Wisconsin	89	81.6	19	100
Wyoming	20	77.1	41	100
State Grantees	3119	81.8	0	100
Nationwide	7812	81.2	0	100

Table 2: Response Rate by Grantee

	Response			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	501	46.5%	576	53.5%
ANPPM	178	48.1%	192	51.9%
ATD	188	50.8%	182	49.2%
Easter Seals	302	48.7%	318	51.3%
Experience Works	425	47.1%	477	52.9%
Goodwill	348	54.0%	296	46.0%
IID(S)	56	78.9%	15	21.1%
Mature Services	137	67.5%	66	32.5%
NATABLE	200	54.1%	170	45.9%
NAPCA[S]	124	49.4%	127	50.6%
NAPCA[G]	173	46.8%	197	53.2%
NCBA	313	51.3%	297	48.7%
NCOA	364	43.3%	477	56.7%
NICOA[S]	128	51.4%	121	48.6%
NOWCC	52	38.2%	84	61.8%
NUL	186	45.9%	219	54.1%
OAGB	117	55.5%	94	44.5%
SER	226	52.3%	206	47.7%
SSAI	485	53.1%	428	46.9%
TWP	190	51.4%	180	48.6%
National Grantees	4693	49.8%	4722	50.2%
Alabama	86	65.6%	45	34.4%
Alaska	69	64.5%	38	35.5%
Arizona	46	68.7%	21	31.3%
Arkansas	48	47.5%	53	52.5%

	Response			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
California	145	48.3%	155	51.7%
Colorado	31	60.8%	20	39.2%
Connecticut	39	67.2%	19	32.8%
Delaware	74	69.8%	32	30.2%
District of Columbia	7	38.9%	11	61.1%
Florida	151	46.3%	175	53.7%
Georgia	91	56.2%	71	43.8%
Hawaii	51	66.2%	26	33.8%
Idaho	22	59.5%	15	40.5%
Illinois	65	52.0%	60	48.0%
Indiana	93	51.4%	88	48.6%
Iowa	36	54.5%	30	45.5%
Kansas	28	60.9%	18	39.1%
Kentucky	67	55.4%	54	44.6%
Louisiana	73	62.4%	44	37.6%
Maryland	39	58.2%	28	41.8%
Massachusetts	55	55.0%	45	45.0%
Michigan	95	66.4%	48	33.6%
Minnesota	97	60.6%	63	39.4%
Mississippi	46	69.7%	20	30.3%
Missouri	87	53.4%	76	46.6%
Montana	21	52.5%	19	47.5%
Nebraska	20	38.5%	32	61.5%
Nevada	14	58.3%	10	41.7%
New Hampshire	21	60.0%	14	40.0%
New Jersey	55	42.3%	75	57.7%
New Mexico	20	50.0%	20	50.0%
New York	113	59.2%	78	40.8%
North Carolina	102	68.5%	47	31.5%
North Dakota	25	61.0%	16	39.0%
Ohio	138	65.4%	73	34.6%
Oklahoma	74	63.2%	43	36.8%
Oregon	40	50.6%	39	49.4%
Pennsylvania	193	58.7%	136	41.3%
Rhode Island	1	50.0%	1	50.0%

	Response			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
South Carolina	44	48.9%	46	51.1%
South Dakota	28	63.6%	16	36.4%
Tennessee	87	64.0%	49	36.0%
Texas	166	44.9%	204	55.1%
Utah	23	59.0%	16	41.0%
Vermont	21	56.8%	16	43.2%
Virginia	85	63.9%	48	36.1%
Washington	45	72.6%	17	27.4%
West Virginia	33	76.7%	10	23.3%
Wisconsin	89	59.3%	61	40.7%
Wyoming	20	50.0%	20	50.0%
State Grantees	3119	56.9%	2361	43.1%
Nationwide	7812	52.4%	7083	47.6%

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4. SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	4666	8.2	1	10
	5. SCSEP staff who make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	4706	8.2	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	4633	7.6	1	10
	10. SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	4550	8.2	1	10
	11. SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	4755	7.9	1	10
State Grantees	4. SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	3081	8.4	1	10
	5. SCSEP staff who make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	3138	8.4	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	3101	7.8	1	10
	10. SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	3013	8.4	1	10
	11. SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	3158	8.1	1	10
Nationwide	4. SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	7747	8.3	1	10
	5. SCSEP staff who make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	7844	8.3	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	7734	7.7	1	10
	10. SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	7563	8.3	1	10
	11. SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	7913	8.0	1	10

Table 4. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q7. What I can do when SCSEP staff propose a participant for our agency.	I can accept the individual offered or not.	4088	72.1%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	1316	23.2%
		I really have no choice.	269	4.7%
State Grantees	Q7. What I can do when SCSEP staff propose a participant for our agency.	I can accept the individual offered or not.	2737	71.4%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	898	23.4%
		I really have no choice.	201	5.2%

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q7. What I can do when SCSEP staff propose a participant for our agency.	I can accept the individual offered or not.	6825	71.8%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	2214	23.3%
		I really have no choice.	470	4.9%

Table 5. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Can accept the individual offered or not	3982	80.9
	Have choice among several potential participants	1278	85.8
	Have no choice	258	64.3
State Grantees	Can accept the individual offered or not	2669	82.4
	Have choice among several potential participants	869	87.1
	Have no choice	189	65.7
Nationwide	Can accept the individual offered or not	6651	81.5
	Have choice among several potential participants	2147	86.3
	Have no choice	447	64.9

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

Q9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?			Count	Percent of Responses
National Grantees	Prepared for the assignment	Basic computer knowledge	2384	29.7%
		Basic employability skills	1885	23.5%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	1855	23.1%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers	1902	23.7%
State Grantees	Prepared for the assignment	Basic computer knowledge	1584	31.4%
		Basic employability skills	1166	23.1%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	1149	22.8%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers	1142	22.7%
Nationwide	Prepared for the assignment	Basic computer knowledge	3968	30.4%
		Basic employability skills	3051	23.3%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	3004	23.0%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers	3044	23.3%

Table 7. Need for Better Participant Preparation and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Basic computer knowledge	2326	77.6
	Basic employability skills	1822	74.7
	Knowledge of what the assignment required	1796	74.5
	How to behave with the host agency's customers	1845	75.1
State Grantees	Basic computer knowledge	1544	78.5
	Basic employability skills	1129	75.3
	Knowledge of what the assignment required	1119	74.5
	How to behave with the host agency's customers	1112	75.2
Nationwide	Basic computer knowledge	3870	78.0
	Basic employability skills	2951	74.9
	Knowledge of what the assignment required	2915	74.5
	How to behave with the host agency's customers	2957	75.2

Table 8. Existence of Preparation Issues and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	No preparation issues	1432	88.0
	One or more preparation issues	3261	77.5
State Grantees	No preparation issues	1014	89.9
	One or more preparation issues	2105	77.9
Nationwide	No preparation issues	2446	88.8
	One or more preparation issues	5366	77.7

Table 9: Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	4749	8.0	1	10
State Grantees	Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	3168	8.1	1	10
Nationwide	Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	7917	8.1	1	10

Table 10. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q12. 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	2943	67.0%
		Few	968	22.0%
		Many	271	6.2%
		Nearly all	211	4.8%
State Grantees	Q12. 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	1940	66.4%
		Few	655	22.4%
		Many	167	5.7%
		Nearly all	161	5.5%
Nationwide	Q12. 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	4883	66.7%
		Few	1623	22.2%
		Many	438	6.0%
		Nearly all	372	5.1%

Table 11: Supportive Services and the ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Q12. 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	2876	82.3
		Few	942	79.1
		Many	258	78.1
		Nearly all	208	78.1
State Grantees	Q12. 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	1888	83.3
		Few	645	81.2
		Many	158	78.2
		Nearly all	158	78.7
Nationwide	Q12. 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	4764	82.7
		Few	1587	80.0
		Many	416	78.1
		Nearly all	366	78.4

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3339	77.3%
		Occasionally	799	18.5%
		Frequently	92	2.1%
		Nearly always	90	2.1%

			Count	Percent
State Grantees	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2349	82.6%
		Occasionally	417	14.7%
		Frequently	39	1.4%
		Nearly always	40	1.4%
Nationwide	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	5688	79.4%
		Occasionally	1216	17.0%
		Frequently	131	1.8%
		Nearly always	130	1.8%

Table 13. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3244	82.1
		Occasionally	787	79.3
		Frequently	87	71.6
		Nearly always	88	70.0
State Grantees	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2293	83.3
		Occasionally	406	79.6
		Frequently	39	67.2
		Nearly always	39	75.1
Nationwide	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	5537	82.6
		Occasionally	1193	79.4
		Frequently	126	70.2
		Nearly always	127	71.6

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1890	42.8%
		No	2525	57.2%
State Grantees	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1127	38.5%
		No	1803	61.5%
Nationwide	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	3017	41.1%
		No	4328	58.9%

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

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1847	77.3
		No	2449	83.5
State Grantees	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1102	77.6
		No	1754	84.8
Nationwide	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	2949	77.4
		No	4203	84.0

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	29	0.7%
		Somewhat decreased	55	1.3%
		Neither increased nor decreased	1689	38.5%
		Somewhat increased	1380	31.4%
		Increased significantly	1237	28.2%
State Grantees	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	14	0.5%
		Somewhat decreased	31	1.0%
		Neither increased nor decreased	1171	39.6%
		Somewhat increased	928	31.4%
		Increased significantly	810	27.4%
Nationwide	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	43	0.6%
		Somewhat decreased	86	1.2%
		Neither increased nor decreased	2860	38.9%
		Somewhat increased	2308	31.4%
		Increased significantly	2047	27.9%

Table 17: Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	25	44.0
		Somewhat decreased	50	62.1
		Neither increased nor decreased	1643	74.5
		Somewhat increased	1352	82.3
		Increased significantly	1202	89.1
State Grantees	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	13	59.3
		Somewhat decreased	31	62.4
		Neither increased nor decreased	1140	75.4
		Somewhat increased	896	83.2
		Increased significantly	796	91.3
Nationwide	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	38	49.2
		Somewhat decreased	81	62.2
		Neither increased nor decreased	2783	74.9
		Somewhat increased	2248	82.7
		Increased significantly	1998	89.9