PY 2018 Nationwide Participant Evaluation of SCSEP
June 26, 2019

Overview

The PY 2018 nationwide participant survey is the third administration of the participant survey originally developed in 2004. Revisions were made based on the analyses of survey responses over the last decade, the evolving direction of the program, and feedback from customers and grantees.

A major focus of the revisions for the participant survey was to increase understanding of participants' expectations for the program, gain a more detailed understanding of the role of training (especially computer training), and understand how well the program prepares participants for the changing economy. Four new questions were introduced, five questions were eliminated, and two existing questions were modified.

For the PY 2018 survey, a nationwide random sample of 19,036 participants was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2018. Collection of the third and last wave of surveys was closed in March 2019. The nationwide analyses below include results for all survey questions. Appendix A contains the results of each survey question at the state grantee, national grantee, and nationwide levels. An analysis of individual grantee performance is provided for each grantee in separate reports.

Overall Satisfaction: The American Customer Satisfaction Index

The American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) continues to be the standard for measuring overall satisfaction. The nationwide participant ACSI score for PY 2018 is 82.4, not statistically significantly higher than the 81.7 score in PY 2017. For PY 2018, of the 19,036 surveys mailed, 10,126 participants returned surveys with valid responses for the first three questions that make up the ASCI. The response rate, 53.2 percent, is slightly higher than the PY 2017 rate of 52.5%. As in other years, the average 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. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in the Appendix A.

Who Answered the Survey?

The survey sample was and has always been generally representative of the SCSEP population nationwide. It is a stratified, random sample of all eligible participants, defined as any individuals who received service at any time within the twelve months prior to the drawing of the survey sample in September 2018. The respondents are all participants in the sample who answered the survey.

Most characteristics of the respondents, including gender, racial categories, and education, are similar to the SCSEP population as a whole. Although the respondents have some differences from the SCSEP population as a whole for whites, ethnicity, average age, and a few barriers to employment, those differences have no impact on the representativeness of the survey responses.[1] Complete tables with demographics and characteristics of the survey respondents are provided in Appendix B. Below is a brief summary of the demographics of the respondents:

---

[1] A study in 2014 by statisticians at the University of Connecticut determined that those who responded from the sample were also generally representative of the entire sample.

- The average age is 63.5
- 66.2 percent are female and 33.8 percent male
- 56.9 percent have a high school diploma or less. The remaining 43.1 percent have some post-secondary education, degree or certificate
- About 48 percent are racial minorities, and 10.1 percent are Hispanic.

To fill out the picture of SCSEP participants, we report on characteristics that have been identified in Title V of the Older Americans Act (OAA) as creating significant barriers to employment. The list of barriers includes disability, severe disability, limited English proficiency, low literacy skills, living in a rural area, low unemployment prospects, failing to find employment after receiving WIOA services, being homeless or at risk of homelessness, being a veteran, being frail, old enough for social security but not receiving any benefits, and having severely limited employment prospects in an area of persistent unemployment. On average, participants in the sample have 2.7 barriers each, substantially lower than the average of 3.2 barriers reported in the PY 2017 survey.

The other defining characteristic of the sample is participants' status in the program:
- 12.9 percent of the sample exited for regular employment
- 0.7 percent of the sample exited for self-employment
- 28.2 percent of the sample exited for reasons other than employment
- 58.3 percent of the sample were still in the program

The percent of the sample that were still in the program is significantly higher this year than it was in PY 2017, when the percent was only 44.4.

Participants' Expectations for the Program

Question 4 was new to the survey in PY 2015. It asks participants to indicate the primary reason(s) they enrolled in the program. Respondents could choose as many reasons as they deemed appropriate; therefore, the total number of answers is substantially higher than the number of survey respondents. The responses to the seven options in Table 1 indicate a wide range of reasons for enrolling in the program. The participants, on average, endorsed about 3.5 reasons. The most frequently endorsed reason was increasing their income, followed by feeling more useful and independent, and obtaining a part-time job. It is notable that the lowest percentage is for full-time work. This is consistent with data from SPARQ that show participants who exited were working an average of 29 hours per week in unsubsidized employment.   The results this year are nearly identical to those from last year.

Table 1. Reasons for Enrollment

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:	Count	Percent of All Responses
4.1 Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	3192	8.9%
4.2 Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	5880	16.4%
4.3 Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	4055	11.3%
4.4 Provide service to my community	4470	12.5%
4.5 Meet new people	4198	11.7%
4.6 Increase my income	7151	19.9%
4.7 Feel more useful and independent	6145	17.1%
4.8 Other	786	2.2%
Total Reasons Chosen	35877	100.0%

How Participants Rate Their Treatment in the Program

One of the great strengths of the program has always been the way staff treat participants. As evident in Table 2, staff helped participants understand how the program worked, understood participants' needs and interests, and provided participants someone to talk to.[2] These scores are similar to those in previous years and reconfirm the care and concern with which staff work with the participants.

Table 2. Treatment of Participants

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
5. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	10,685	8.8	1	10
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	10,590	8.6	1	10
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	10,386	8.4	1	10

Participants' Experience in the Host Agency

The three questions below in Table 3 directly relate to the nature of participants' experience at the host agency. Question 13 is similar to Questions 5, 6, and 9 (Table 2 above) in reflecting the sense of belonging that can be created in the host agency. The other two questions (Questions 10 and 11) focus explicitly on training, a crucial aspect of the host agency assignment. The highest rating (8.8) is for Question 13, how comfortable participants feel at the host agency assignment. The lowest rating (7.7) is for Question 11 (a new question in PY 2015), whether participants have a say in the types of skills they would gain at the host agency. The rating for receiving training to be successful in the host agency assignment, Question 10, is 8.3, mid-way between the other two ratings. The scores are nearly identical to those from last year.

Question 11 gives more detailed insight into the host agency as a training site and clearly shows that participants desire more input into the skills and training they receive. This suggests that local programs

---

[2] Unless otherwise noted, questions are scored on a 1-10 scale.

need to involve participants when they prepare IEPs and when they identify a host agency as a potential training site.

Table 3. Host Agency Experience

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	10053	8.3	1	10
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	10244	7.7	1	10
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	10518	8.8	1	10

Participant Outcomes

There are two types of outcomes derived from the survey and administrative data: outcomes achieved while participants are in the program and outcomes associated with employment after participants leave the program.

The most direct outcomes within the program are associated with the one of the two principal purposes of the program: preparing participants for employment. Question 20 in Table 4 was a new question in PY 2015. It asks if participants felt that SCSEP prepared them for employment in different industry sectors. The data are reported only if the participant had employment after exiting. There were 881 respondents who exited for employment. The analysis in Table 4 is limited to those exiters.[3] The respondents were able to choose all sectors in which they felt prepared for employment (nonprofit, government, or for-profit) or indicate that they felt unprepared for any sector.

Because multiple responses were allowed for Question 20, there are two different questions to ask of the data. First, what number and percent of individuals felt prepared for a particular employment sector? The answers by individual are in the two columns to the right of each sector. Nationwide, the most frequently endorsed sector was nonprofit organizations (39.7%), which makes sense given that most participants' host agency training sites are nonprofit organizations. Preparation for government and for-profit sectors was less frequently endorsed, with 22.7 percent for government and 29.4 percent for the for-profit sector. Another important finding is the difference between preparation for the nonprofit (39.7%) and for-profit sectors (29.4%): In PY 2017, the difference was 13% while this year the difference is 10.5%. Both years are a dramatic increase from PY 2015, when this question was first introduced.

That 8.2 percent of the total responses (12.7% of the individual respondents) indicated that they did not feel prepared for any sector (Table 4a) may be the most important finding from this new question. This last percentage, 8.2, is lower than last year's 12.1%. This is a significant improvement that suggests grantees are paying more attention and providing more effort to employment preparation.

---

[3] The findings in Table 4 were not substantially different when all respondents to this question were analyzed, including those who did not exit or did not have employment upon exiting.

Table 4. Prepared for Employment

20. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program prepared you for employment in these organizations?	Count	Percent of All Responses
I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	544	39.7%
I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	311	22.7%
I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	403	29.4%
I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	112	8.2%

A second way of looking at Question 20 is shown in Table 4a. The constructed variable shows how many sectors (if any) participant felt they were prepared for. Of 881 who responded, 191 participants saw themselves prepared in all three sectors, 107 saw themselves prepared in two of the three sectors, and 471 saw themselves prepared for one sector, most often the nonprofit sector.

Table 4a: Prepared for Employment

Number of Sectors	Count	Percent of Respondents
1 sector	471	53.5%
2 sectors	107	12.1%
All 3 sectors	191	21.7%
No sectors	112	12.7%
Total	881	100%

To provide context for these results, we tested for the potential influence of the type of employment a participant actually gained to determine whether it would influence the participant's evaluation of preparation for different sectors. An analysis of the endorsed sectors for preparation and the sectors in which participants obtained employment suggests that the sector in which the respondent is employed may have a modest influence on the respondent's sense of the sector(s) in which he or she was best prepared. However, there are many participants who endorsed having preparation in sectors other than the one in which they obtained employment. For example, of the 494 employed after exit in the for-profit sector, 48.4% felt prepared for the nonprofit sector. Conversely, of the 557 who obtained employment in the nonprofit sector, 37.7% also felt prepared for employment in the for-profit sector.

Another aspect of preparation is covered in Question 18. The data for this question (also added in PY 2015) regarding preparation for success in the workforce are presented in Table 5. As evident in the table, the score for helping prepare participants for success is significantly lower than the ratings regarding the program's and host agency's treatment of participants (Questions 5, 6, 9, and 13). The importance of this score is evident later in this report, where the analysis shows this question to be the strongest driver of satisfaction in the survey.   The score (8.0) is 0.1 points higher than in PY 2017.

Table 5. Preparation for Success in Workforce

18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	10,330	8.0	1	10

Two health outcomes continue to be collected in this revised survey. Table 6 shows the responses to Question 14. 32.6 percent indicate they are in better physical health, and 58.6% indicate their health is about the same. Only 10 percent indicate that their health declined in the course of participation. These results are very similar to those in PY 2017.

Table 6. Physical Health

		Count	Percent
14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better	3,403	32.6%
	Worse	922	8.8%
	About the same	6,123	58.6%

The second health question asks about mental health. As in previous years, the program produces strong, positive results as shown in Table 7. Seventy-three percent indicated that they were either a little more or much more positive in their outlook on life as a result of participating in the program. This is about the same as in PY 2017 and PY 2015. These findings match the substantial number of respondents who indicated in Question 4 that one of their reasons for enrollment was to "feel more useful and independent." Again, the results are the same as in PY 2017.

Table 7. Mental Health

		Count	Percent
15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	266	2.5%
	A little more negative	467	4.4%
	About the same	2,142	20.2%
	A little more positive	2,804	26.5%
	Much more positive	4,913	46.4%

Along with physical and mental health, participants' financial wellbeing can be affected. We know from Question 4 that many participants come to SCSEP hoping to increase their income. Question 16 (revised in PY 2015) attempts to put a finer point on the issue of financial health by asking about the importance of income from SCSEP for meeting basic expenses. As evident in Table 8, three-quarters of the respondents moderately to strongly agreed (ratings of 8, 9, or 10) that the pay from SCSEP was important to meeting basic expenses. This is the same result as in PY 2015 and PY 2017.

Table 8. SCSEP Wages

16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.		Count	Percent
	1 Strongly disagree	491	4.6%
	2	185	1.7%
	3	203	1.9%
	4	227	2.1%
	5	525	5.0%
	6	469	4.4%
	7	565	5.3%
	8	1,014	9.6%
	9	1,157	10.9%
	10 Strongly agree	5,758	54.4%

An ongoing concern is the impact on participants when they are pressured to leave a host agency assignment before they felt they were ready. Table 9 shows that very few participants feel that they have experienced such pressure. This result is the same as in PY 2017. It is important that the percent pressured remains as small as possible since the experience of being pressured lowers overall satisfaction by more than 20 points.

Table 9. Pressure to Leave Host Agency

		Count	Percent
17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	676	6.4%
	No	6,832	64.7%
	Doesn't apply	3,044	28.8%

Detailed Analysis of Computer Training

Past surveys had asked about computer training but not with the level of detail necessary for providing guidance to the grantees. Table 10 shows not only whether participants received computer training but also whether the training was appropriately targeted to the participants' needs. As was true in PY 2015 and PY 2017, a third (34%) of the participants received the computer training they needed. Another quarter (26.4%) did not need computer training and did not receive any. In total, computer training was properly targeted for 61 percent of the participants. However, 20.3 percent needed computer training and received little or none, and another 12.2 percent received computer training that did not meet their needs. Overall, the targeting of training was not substantially improved from PY 2015 and PY 2017.

Computer training continues to be an important aspect of helping older workers prepare for an ever more computerized work environment. With computer training failing to meet the needs of 33 percent of participants, there is much room for improvement. Individual grantee reports now provide clearer guidance on this issue for local programs.

Table 10. Computer Training

12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	Count	Percent
I received the computer training I needed	3,504	34.6%
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1,239	12.2%
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2,057	20.3%
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	660	6.5%
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	2,673	26.4%

Supportive Services

In addition to providing training, grantees are required to assess whether participants need supportive services in order to successfully participate in SCSEP and, if so, to see that services are provided. In Table 11, Question 7 asks if supportive services were provided when needed. Of 10,606 participants who responded to the question, 3210 (30.3%) did not indicate needing any supportive services. Of the 7,396 who did indicate a need for supportive services, one-third disagreed or were neutral (score of 1-5 out of 10) that the assistance met their needs. Three-quarters rated the assistance as positive (6-10 out of 10). The percentage indicating a positive rating was significantly higher than in PY 2017. While this is an important positive change, there is still room for improvement, the average score being only 6.7 on the 1-10 scale.

Table 11. Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	1,100	10.4%
	2	279	2.6%
	3	268	2.5%
	4	295	2.8%
	5	560	5.3%
	6	447	4.2%
	7	487	4.6%
	8	762	7.2%
	9	841	7.9%
	10 Strongly agree	2,357	22.2%
	Did not need support	3,210	30.3%

Another aspect of the host agency experience relates to the convenience of the host agency assignment location. Finding a convenient location for the host agency assignment is a statutory requirement that depends on the transportation options of the participant and the remoteness of the host agency. Table

12 shows that 11 percent of participants experienced inconvenience based on the location of their assignment. This is higher than in PY 2015 but the same as in PY 2017 and previous survey years.

Table 12. Geographic Convenience

8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?		Count	Percent
	Yes	8,598	88.9%
	No	1,078	11.1%
	Total	9,676	100.0%

While the program elements discussed above provide support to participants during their host agency assignments, help in finding a job becomes critically important as the individual prepares to successfully exit. Question 19 asks how much help participants received from staff in finding employment. The participant rating of 7.3 is the lowest rating for any question in the survey and is barely improved (0.1 points) from 2017. Given the importance of the local program's role in helping participants find employment, there is much room for improvement.

Table 13. Help in Finding Employment

19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	2,969	7.3	1	10

Variables Associated with the ACSI

There are two types of analyses associated with the customer satisfaction index. The first of these seeks to identify local projects' services and the aspects of service delivery that are most likely to improve overall satisfaction if those services and service delivery characteristics are improved. This is referred to as a driver analysis. The second type of analysis is used for questions that cannot be analyzed in the driver analysis because they are multi-response questions, are only answered by a subset of respondents, or do not have a continuous set of scaled responses (the questions offer Yes/No or similar fixed choice answers).

A. Driver Analysis

Table 14 presents the results for the first type of analysis. The results are derived from all available nationwide respondents to the survey conducted in PY 2017 that answered the specific question at issue and all three of the questions that constitute the ACSI. Different regression models were tested to determine the smallest number of questions that explains the ACSI. The questions that together account for the most variation in the ACSI are shaded in Table 14 (Questions 6, 9, and 18). These are the same drivers identified in PY 2017. For details on the driver analysis methodology , see Appendix C.

Questions 6, dealing with participants' treatment by the sub-grantee (understanding their interests and needs), is highly correlated with the ACSI and has a strong, unique influence on the ACSI. The large size of its correlation and its unique contribution to explaining the ACSI suggest that any change in this score is likely to have a direct and independent change on overall satisfaction. Question 6 has been a driver in previous years but was usually accompanied by Question 5. This year and in PY 2017, although Question

5 retains a strong relationship with the ACSI, it did not make a substantial, unique contribution to the ACSI over and above other variables.

Question 6 is an area of strength for the program. The score for Question 6 is 8.6, among the highest scores for any questions. There is some room for improvement but likely only by a few tenths of a point. This does suggest that continued attention to how participants are treated will help ensure high levels of satisfaction.

The second driver, Question 9, is similar to Question 6 in that Question 9 also deals with how participants perceive their treatment. In this case, participants perceive the availability of personal support ("someone to talk to") as important to their satisfaction. Unlike Question 6, the average score is 8.4, still positive but leaving more room for improvement. Grantees have an opportunity to strengthen the sense among participants that there is someone they can always come to with any problems or needs.

The third question in the driver model, Question 18, asks about how helpful the program was in preparing participants for success in the workforce. Respondents rated preparation at 8.0, 0.1 points higher than in PY 2015 and PY 2017 . This rating is lower than many other scores in the survey and leaves significant room for improvement. Moreover, this is the single, strongest driver of satisfaction as explained in the analysis below.

The shaded questions in Table 14 are not necessarily the only items that matter in relation to understanding the ACSI, however. What follows are two guiding principles for assessing the remaining questions and their relationship to the ACSI.

- Some questions not in the chosen model may have high correlations and moderate participant ratings (they are unshaded in Table 14 because they are not independent of the influence exerted by the shaded questions), suggesting room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers services.
- Other questions may have a lower correlation with the ACSI but lower than usual participant ratings, also affording significant room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers the service.

The unshaded questions in Table 14 should still be considered for program improvement based on these guiding principles.

Table 14. Driver Analysis

		Relation to ACSI
5. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	Pearson Correlation	.664**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10023
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.716**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9937
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.663**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9743
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.652**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9441
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.625**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9620
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.598**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9861
16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	Pearson Correlation	.374**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9934
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Pearson Correlation	.743**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9698
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Pearson Correlation	.607**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	2719

As stated above, Question 18, preparing for success in the workforce, has the greatest potential in relation to satisfaction and fulfilling the purpose of the program. For every one unit of change (e.g., from 8.0 to 9.0) in the answer to Question 18, the ACSI score increases by 9.7 points. Anything to improve the program in this area will yield substantial rewards to the program, as well as to its participants.

While Question 19 is not an independent driver, it has significant implications for participants' perception of program quality. The score for Question 19 is quite low (7.3 on a scale of 1-10), and the

relation to the ACSI is very strong, over .6. Since there is so much room for improvement, helping participants find employment can be a significant path to improving program effectiveness.

Question 11 also has a strong relationship with the ACSI although it, too, is not an independent driver. It has significant implications for program management. Having a say in the skills gained is associated with the appropriate targeting of computer training. Giving participants a say is probably the best way to identify training that will build necessary skills.

Question 11 is also closely related to overall satisfaction as seen in Table 15. There is a 47-point difference in the ACSI score for those who felt they had the most say and those who felt they had the least say. Preparing participants for the workforce involves giving them the right skills, and the results for Question 11 suggest that providing the right skills should involve giving participants a say in identifying those skills most likely to prepare them for the workforce.

Table 15. Having a Say in Training and the ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	1 Strongly disagree	653	47.5
	2	236	53.6
	3	282	57.5
	4	266	61.3
	5	550	69.7
	6	519	75.7
	7	682	78.5
	8	1242	83.3
	9	1442	88.1
	10 Strongly agree	3748	94.4

B. Other Questions Associated with the ACSI

Because of the way responses are structured in some of the questions, the contribution of those questions to explaining the ACSI is difficult to interpret through the driver analysis detailed above. For each of these questions, however, there are notable changes in the average ACSI scores depending on the participants' level of response, as there was with Question 11. These differences provide additional guidance to local programs regarding ways to improve overall satisfaction and the quality of their programs in ways that matter to participants. In Tables 16-18, the analyses include only those participants who answered the specific question at issue and all three of the questions that constitute the ACSI.

Obtaining supportive services can have an impact on the ACSI, but only for those that needed those services. Because only 70 percent of the respondents indicated they needed supportive services, that feature of service was not entered into the driver model but is analyzed separately here. Table 16 shows the number of individuals who gave each rating on the scale of 1 = Strongly disagree to 10 = Strongly agree. As the table shows, the average ACSI score associated with each rating on the scale strongly rises as the level of agreement rises. Participants who strongly agreed that they had received

the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of 95, while those who strongly disagreed that they received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of 56. This difference of nearly 40 points in scores highlights the critical importance of providing supportive services for those who need them.

Table 16. Supportive Services and ACSI

7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Count	ACSI Score
1 Strongly disagree	1100	56.3
2	279	60.4
3	268	62.9
4	295	67.1
5	560	76.2
6	447	78.0
7	487	82.0
8	762	85.8
9	841	89.4
10 Strongly agree	2357	95.0
Did not need support	3210	86.0

There are two more important questions related to the ACSI that could not be included in the driver analysis. These questions also tell us something about how programs can increase participant satisfaction. The first is Question 12, participants' experience with computer training.

Table 17. Computer Training and ACSI

12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	Count	ACSI Score
I received the computer training I needed	3504	89.2
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1239	77.4
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2057	72.1
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	660	83.0
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2673	82.8
Total	10133	82.2

For the thirty-five percent of respondents (3,504) who needed computer training and got what they needed, the ACSI is extremely high, 89.2. Conversely, participants who did not receive the training they needed have satisfaction scores 12-17 points lower. In addition, those who did not need training but got it anyway have an ACSI score nearly identical to the nationwide average. These findings suggest that grantees should ensure that relevant computer training is provided and at least meets participants' needs even if the training exceeds the participants' actual needs.

Question 20, about preparation for different sectors of employment, also provides important guidance for local programs. Table 18 shows the average ACSI score for those who endorsed that they felt prepared in a particular sector (recalling that an individual could choose multiple sectors).   Whether participants felt they had been prepared for the nonprofit, for-profit, or government sectors, they had similarly high satisfaction scores. The 112 respondents (12.7% of all respondents who answered the question) who did not feel prepared for any industry sector, however, are 28-30 points lower in satisfaction than those who felt prepared for some sector. In Table 18, the message is very clear: What matters is the quality of the preparation in general and not its relevance for any particular employment sector.

Table 18. Preparation for Employment and ACSI

20. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program prepared you for employment in these organizations?		Count	ACSI Score
	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	544	87.9
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	311	89.5
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	403	87.5
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	112	59.5

Summary and Recommendations

This survey of participants provides important guidance for grantees. The first finding of value is that understanding participants' expectations for the program may help programs do a better job of serving their participants. The responses tell us that full-time employment is not the primary goal of most participants. Beyond that, participants have a mix of motivations, and it will serve local programs to talk with participants at the start of enrollment and learn as much as they can about participants' expectations, as well as their needs.

A second major finding is that preparation for the workforce (Question 18) is the single most important driver of participant satisfaction. With an average score of 8.0, there is room for substantial improvement, and every point of improvement will yield significant increases in satisfaction. Staff help in finding employment (Question 19) is also an important part of preparing the path to employment, and the average score of 7.3, among the lowest of the survey questions, indicates that local programs need to do more in this area, whether it be for part-time or full-time employment. The score is about the same as in PY 2017 and PY 2015. The lack of improvement in this area reinforces the urgency of encouraging local programs to pay more attention.

The remaining recommendations in many ways flow from a better understanding of participants' interests and needs that should be derived from participants' assessments and reflected in their IEPs:

- Local programs need input from participants to accurately assess the skills participants will need to succeed in the workforce
- Local programs also need to work with host agencies to give participants a voice in the skills they acquire while at their assignments
- Computer training is an area where local programs need to do a better job of identifying those who need computer training and the type of computer training that is most relevant for the individual
- Supportive services are not necessary for everyone (thirty percent did not need them), but for those who need supportive services, the failure to provide services significantly lowers overall satisfaction and reduces participant's chances for success in the program and in unsubsidized employment

Appendix A
Complete Survey Tables

Table 1. Response Rate by Grantee

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	401	40.9%	579	59.1%
ANPPM	204	55.1%	166	44.9%
ATD	196	53.0%	174	47.0%
Easter Seals	321	51.0%	309	49.0%
Experience Works	235	56.0%	185	44.0%
Goodwill	368	58.4%	262	41.6%
IID [S]	155	58.1%	112	41.9%
NAPCA[S]	311	68.1%	146	31.9%
NAPCA[G]	223	60.3%	147	39.7%
National Able Network	209	56.6%	160	43.4%
NCBA	313	49.7%	317	50.3%
NCOA	376	44.8%	464	55.2%
NICOA[S]	214	57.8%	156	42.2%
NOWCC	104	46.2%	121	53.8%
NUL	212	50.5%	208	49.5%
OAGB	179	48.4%	191	51.6%
SER	224	53.3%	196	46.7%
SSAI	524	57.6%	386	42.4%
The WorkPlace	212	57.3%	158	42.7%
VANTAGE	224	60.5%	146	39.5%
National Grantees	5205	53.2%	4583	46.8%
Alabama	136	63.0%	80	37.0%
Alaska	86	44.8%	106	55.2%
Arizona	67	60.4%	44	39.6%
Arkansas	87	51.5%	82	48.5%
California	226	61.1%	144	38.9%
Colorado	53	51.0%	51	49.0%
Connecticut	51	57.3%	38	42.7%
Delaware	129	51.0%	124	49.0%
DC	26	59.1%	18	40.9%
Florida	187	50.5%	183	49.5%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Georgia	124	51.2%	118	48.8%
Hawaii	112	61.9%	69	38.1%
Idaho	33	54.1%	28	45.9%
Illinois	173	47.9%	188	52.1%
Indiana	146	48.8%	153	51.2%
Iowa	82	45.3%	99	54.7%
Kansas	50	58.1%	36	41.9%
Kentucky	95	55.9%	75	44.1%
Louisiana	106	51.5%	100	48.5%
Maryland	57	53.8%	49	46.2%
Massachusetts	100	64.1%	56	35.9%
Michigan	177	56.4%	137	43.6%
Minnesota	120	48.8%	126	51.2%
Mississippi	72	56.7%	55	43.3%
Missouri	143	51.4%	135	48.6%
Montana	30	47.6%	33	52.4%
Nebraska	33	39.8%	50	60.2%
Nevada	24	40.7%	35	59.3%
New Hampshire	32	45.7%	38	54.3%
New Jersey	158	53.0%	140	47.0%
New Mexico	28	54.9%	23	45.1%
New York	219	59.2%	151	40.8%
North Carolina	167	54.9%	137	45.1%
North Dakota	40	63.5%	23	36.5%
Ohio	205	55.4%	165	44.6%
Oklahoma	100	58.5%	71	41.5%
Oregon	56	53.8%	48	46.2%
Pennsylvania	205	55.4%	165	44.6%
Rhode Island	10	47.6%	11	52.4%
South Carolina	98	49.2%	101	50.8%
South Dakota	24	50.0%	24	50.0%
Tennessee	141	57.3%	105	42.7%
Texas	205	55.4%	165	44.6%
Utah	35	41.2%	50	58.8%
Vermont	25	51.0%	24	49.0%
Virginia	155	65.4%	82	34.6%
Washington	47	44.8%	58	55.2%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
West Virginia	49	47.6%	54	52.4%
Wisconsin	174	55.8%	138	44.2%
Wyoming	23	44.2%	29	55.8%
State Grantees	4921	53.2%	4327	46.8%
Nationwide	10126	53.2%	8910	46.8%

Table 2. ACSI by Grantee

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	401	81.1	0	100
ANPPM	204	86.6	0	100
ATD	196	79.7	0	100
Easter Seals	321	81.9	0	100
Experience Works	235	75.4	0	100
Goodwill	368	83.6	0	100
IID [S]	155	89.6	0	100
NAPCA[G]	223	82.1	0	100
NAPCA[S]	311	86.1	19	100
National Able Network	209	77.1	0	100
NCBA	313	82.5	0	100
NCOA	376	80.9	0	100
NICOA[S]	214	85.9	0	100
NOWCC	104	72.1	0	100
NUL	212	82.2	0	100
OAGB	179	81.4	0	100
SER	224	82.2	0	100
SSAI	524	84.4	0	100
The WorkPlace	212	83.4	0	100
VANTAGE	224	84.8	0	100
National Grantees	5205	82.4	0	100
Alabama	136	86.1	0	100
Alaska	86	79.0	3	100
Arizona	67	89.0	33	100
Arkansas	87	76.3	0	100
California	226	83.7	0	100
Colorado	53	81.0	0	100
Connecticut	51	81.7	0	100

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Delaware	129	82.6	0	100
DC	26	87.2	0	100
Florida	187	87.1	0	100
Georgia	124	82.2	0	100
Hawaii	112	86.8	11	100
Idaho	33	75.7	19	100
Illinois	173	77.2	0	100
Indiana	146	74.4	0	100
Iowa	82	83.2	0	100
Kansas	50	71.5	0	100
Kentucky	95	86.8	0	100
Louisiana	106	84.3	7	100
Maryland	57	84.1	0	100
Massachusetts	100	80.3	0	100
Michigan	177	82.6	0	100
Minnesota	120	82.7	0	100
Mississippi	72	88.7	11	100
Missouri	143	82.6	0	100
Montana	30	69.5	0	100
Nebraska	33	66.9	0	100
Nevada	24	75.7	0	100
New Hampshire	32	77.3	0	100
New Jersey	158	85.6	0	100
New Mexico	28	82.3	4	100
New York	219	85.4	0	100
North Carolina	167	83.7	0	100
North Dakota	40	80.3	0	100
Ohio	205	81.3	0	100
Oklahoma	100	86.6	7	100
Oregon	56	72.0	0	100
Pennsylvania	205	80.6	0	100
Rhode Island	10	89.9	74	100
South Carolina	98	85.4	0	100
South Dakota	24	84.0	31	100
Tennessee	141	81.5	0	100
Texas	205	83.5	0	100
Utah	35	85.4	37	100
Vermont	25	71.0	0	100

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Virginia	155	86.9	0	100
Washington	47	71.9	11	100
West Virginia	49	82.7	0	100
Wisconsin	174	83.8	0	100
Wyoming	23	64.4	0	100
State Grantees	4921	82.4	0	100
Nationwide	10126	82.4	0	100

Table 3. Reasons for Enrolling

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1620	8.9%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	3026	16.6%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	2090	11.4%
		Provide service to my community	2276	12.5%
		Meet new people	2149	11.8%
		Increase my income	3585	19.6%
		Feel more useful and independent	3143	17.2%
		Other	383	2.1%
State Grantees	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1572	8.9%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	2854	16.2%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	1965	11.2%
		Provide service to my community	2194	12.5%
		Meet new people	2049	11.6%
		Increase my income	3566	20.3%
		Feel more useful and independent	3002	17.1%
		Other	403	2.3%
Nationwide	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	3192	8.9%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	5880	16.4%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	4055	11.3%
		Provide service to my community	4470	12.5%
		Meet new people	4198	11.7%
		Increase my income	7151	19.9%
		Feel more useful and independent	6145	17.1%
		Other	786	2.2%

Table 4. Treatment of Participants

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	5479	8.8	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	5427	8.6	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	5328	8.4	1	10
State Grantees	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	5206	8.7	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	5163	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	5058	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	10685	8.8	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	10590	8.6	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	10386	8.4	1	10

Table 5. Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	603	11.1%
		2	142	2.6%
		3	145	2.7%
		4	152	2.8%
		5	331	6.1%
		6	245	4.5%
		7	239	4.4%
		8	434	8.0%
		9	435	8.0%
		10 Strongly agree	1169	21.5%
		Did not need support	1550	28.5%
State Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	497	9.6%
		2	137	2.7%
		3	123	2.4%
		4	143	2.8%
		5	229	4.4%
		6	202	3.9%
		7	248	4.8%
		8	328	6.4%
		9	406	7.9%
		10 Strongly agree	1188	23.0%
		Did not need support	1660	32.2%
Nationwide	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	1100	10.4%
		2	279	2.6%
		3	268	2.5%
		4	295	2.8%
		5	560	5.3%
		6	447	4.2%
		7	487	4.6%
		8	762	7.2%
		9	841	7.9%
		10 Strongly agree	2357	22.2%
		Did not need support	3210	30.3%

Table 6. Geographic Convenience

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	4374	88.1%
		No	590	11.9%
		Total	4964	100.0%
State Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	4224	89.6%
		No	488	10.4%
		Total	4712	100.0%
Nationwide	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	8598	88.9%
		No	1078	11.1%
		Total	9676	100.0%

Table 7. Host Agency Experience

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	5185	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	5277	7.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	5390	8.8	1	10
State Grantees	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	4868	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	4967	7.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	5128	8.8	1	10
Nationwide	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	10053	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	10244	7.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	10518	8.8	1	10

Table 8. Computer Training

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	1709	33.0%
		I received the computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	639	12.4%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1102	21.3%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training any way	341	6.6%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1381	26.7%
State Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	1795	36.2%
		I received the computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	600	12.1%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	955	19.3%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training any way	319	6.4%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1292	26.0%
Nationwide	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	3504	34.6%
		I received the computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1239	12.2%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2057	20.3%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training any way	660	6.5%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2673	26.4%

Table 9. Physical Health

| | 14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same? | | | | | |
| | Better | | Worse | | About the same | |
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
National Grantees	1765	51.9%	476	51.6%	3115	50.9%
State Grantees	1638	48.1%	446	48.4%	3008	49.1%
Nationwide	3403	100.0%	922	100.0%	6123	100.0%

Table 10. Outlook on Life

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	130	2.4%
		A little more negative	227	4.2%
		About the same	1078	19.9%
		A little more positive	1454	26.8%
		Much more positive	2538	46.8%
State Grantees	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	136	2.6%
		A little more negative	240	4.6%
		About the same	1064	20.6%
		A little more positive	1350	26.1%
		Much more positive	2375	46.0%
Nationwide	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	266	2.5%
		A little more negative	467	4.4%
		About the same	2142	20.2%
		A little more positive	2804	26.5%
		Much more positive	4913	46.4%

Table 11. SCSEP Wages

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	236	4.3%
		2	94	1.7%
		3	93	1.7%
		4	112	2.1%
		5	270	5.0%
		6	265	4.9%
		7	302	5.6%
		8	545	10.0%
		9	642	11.8%
		10 Strongly agree	2877	52.9%
State Grantees	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	255	4.9%
		2	91	1.8%
		3	110	2.1%
		4	115	2.2%
		5	255	4.9%
		6	204	4.0%
		7	263	5.1%
		8	469	9.1%
		9	515	10.0%
		10 Strongly agree	2881	55.9%
Nationwide	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	491	4.6%
		2	185	1.7%
		3	203	1.9%
		4	227	2.1%
		5	525	5.0%
		6	469	4.4%
		7	565	5.3%
		8	1014	9.6%
		9	1157	10.9%
		10 Strongly agree	5758	54.4%

Table 12. Pressure to Leave the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	374	6.9%
		No	3461	63.8%
		Doesn't apply	1589	29.3%
State Grantees	17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	302	5.9%
		No	3371	65.7%
		Doesn't apply	1455	28.4%
Nationwide	17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	676	6.4%
		No	6832	64.7%
		Doesn't apply	3044	28.8%

Table 13. Preparation for Success in Workforce

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	5288	8.1	1	10
State Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	5042	8.0	1	10
Nationwide	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	10330	8.0	1	10

Table 14. Help in Finding Employment

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	1547	7.3	1	10
State Grantees	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	1422	7.3	1	10
Nationwide	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	2969	7.3	1	10

Table 15. Preparation for Employment

20. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP prepared you for employment in these organizations?		Count	Percent
National Grantees	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	262	38.8%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	141	20.9%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	209	31.0%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	63	9.3%
State Grantees	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	282	40.6%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	170	24.5%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	194	27.9%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	49	7.1%
Nationwide	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	544	39.7%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	311	22.7%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	403	29.4%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	112	8.2%

Appendix B
Respondent Demographics and Characteristics

Table 1. Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Education

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Male	1535	31.4%
		Female	3348	68.6%
	Race	American Indian	204	4.5%
		Asian	434	9.6%
		Black	1674	37.1%
		Pacific Islander	12	0.3%
		White	2186	48.5%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	425	9.5%
		Not Hispanic	4062	90.5%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	823	17.4%
		HS Diploma or GED	1823	38.5%
		Some College	1089	23.0%
		Vocational/technical degree	91	1.9%
		Post Secondary Certificate	223	4.7%
		BA/BS	475	10.0%
		Bachelor's Plus	216	4.6%
State Grantees	Gender	Male	1349	28.9%
		Female	3324	71.1%
	Race	American Indian	112	2.6%
		Asian	135	3.1%
		Black	1715	39.5%
		Pacific Islander	20	0.5%
		White	2361	54.4%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	396	9.2%
		Not Hispanic	3923	90.8%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	590	13.0%
		HS Diploma or GED	1843	40.6%
		Some College	1088	24.0%
		Vocational/technical degree	119	2.6%
		Post Secondary Certificate	232	5.1%
		BA/BS	455	10.0%
		Bachelor's Plus	210	4.6%

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Gender	Male	2884	30.2%
		Female	6672	69.8%
	Race	American Indian	316	3.6%
		Asian	569	6.4%
		Black	3389	38.3%
		Pacific Islander	32	0.4%
		White	4547	51.4%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	821	9.3%
		Not Hispanic	7985	90.7%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	1413	15.2%
		HS Diploma or GED	3666	39.5%
		Some College	2177	23.5%
		Vocational/technical degree	210	2.3%
		Post Secondary Certificate	455	4.9%
		BA/BS	930	10.0%
		Bachelor's Plus	426	4.6%

Table 2. Barriers to Employment

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Disability	Yes	1598	31.8%
		No	3432	68.2%
	LEP	Yes	274	5.3%
		No	4929	94.7%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	570	11.0%
		No	4633	89.0%
	Rural	Yes	1408	27.9%
		No	3634	72.1%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	4595	91.2%
		No	446	8.8%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services	Yes	1038	20.6%
		No	3991	79.4%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	2545	48.9%
		No	2658	51.1%
	Veteran	Yes	534	10.6%
		No	4485	89.4%
	Severe Disability	Yes	94	1.8%
		No	5109	98.2%

			Count	Percent
	Frail	Yes	40	0.8%
		No	5163	99.2%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	78	1.5%
		No	5125	98.5%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	776	14.9%
		No	4427	85.1%
State Grantees	Disability	Yes	1603	33.6%
		No	3168	66.4%
	LEP	Yes	110	2.2%
		No	4813	97.8%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	475	9.6%
		No	4448	90.4%
	Rural	Yes	1535	32.2%
		No	3232	67.8%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	4106	86.0%
		No	666	14.0%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services	Yes	868	18.2%
		No	3890	81.8%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	1896	38.5%
		No	3027	61.5%
	Veteran	Yes	588	12.3%
		No	4180	87.7%
	Severe Disability	Yes	99	2.0%
		No	4824	98.0%
	Frail	Yes	49	1.0%
		No	4874	99.0%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	95	1.9%
		No	4828	98.1%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	654	13.3%
		No	4269	86.7%
Nationwide	Disability	Yes	3201	32.7%
		No	6600	67.3%
	LEP	Yes	384	3.8%
		No	9742	96.2%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	1045	10.3%
		No	9081	89.7%
	Rural	Yes	2943	30.0%
		No	6866	70.0%

			Count	Percent
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	8701	88.7%
		No	1112	11.3%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services	Yes	1906	19.5%
		No	7881	80.5%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	4441	43.9%
		No	5685	56.1%
	Veteran	Yes	1122	11.5%
		No	8665	88.5%
	Severe Disability	Yes	193	1.9%
		No	9933	98.1%
	Frail	Yes	89	0.9%
		No	10037	99.1%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	173	1.7%
		No	9953	98.3%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	1430	14.1%
		No	8696	85.9%

Table 3. Average Barriers per Participant

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Number of Barriers per Participant	4751	2.8	0	8
State Grantees	Number of Barriers per Participant	4538	2.6	0	8
Nationwide	Number of Barriers per Participant	9289	2.7	0	8

Table 4. Age

		Count	percent
National Grantees	Less than 65	2926	61.6%
	65 or older	1825	38.4%
State Grantees	Less than 65	2591	57.1%
	65 or older	1947	42.9%
Nationwide	Less than 65	5517	59.4%
	65 or older	3772	40.6%

Appendix C

Driver Model

Table 1 provides the foundation for the methodology used to choose the services and service delivery questions that have the strongest independent effect on overall satisfaction. This is the simplest model while accounting for the most variation in the ACSI.

The third column shows the size of the t-test value, and the fourth column shows that all three questions are significant beyond chance. Beta, the second column, should be read as the strength of the relationship between the question and the ACSI score. For every one-unit increase in Beta, the ACSI increases by one standard deviation. For example, a one-unit increase in preparing participants for success (8.0 to 9.0) will increase the ACSI by .390 standard deviations or 9.7 points on the ACSI scale.[4] Given the fact that the average score for Question 18 is 8.0, there is significant opportunity for local programs to improve preparation for the workforce and thereby significantly improve overall satisfaction.

Table 1: Driver Model Test

	Standardized Coefficients	t-test Value	Sig.
	Beta		
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	.372	20.232	.000
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	.390	22.059	.000
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	.172	9.405	.000

---

[4] The standard deviation for the nationwide ACSI is 24.81. The number of points is obtained by multiplying the Beta times the standard deviation.