

# PY 2021 Host Agency Evaluation of SCSEP February 20, 2023

## Overview

For PY 2021, a nationwide random sample of 11,093 host agencies was selected. Data collection occurred between April 2022 and September 2022. The PY 2021 host agency survey was administered as a paper survey mailed to the grantees' host agencies.

The nationwide analyses include results for all questions from all valid responses to the survey. Appendix A contains the individual grantee response rates and American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) scores. Appendix A also contains the results of each survey question at the nationwide, national grantee, and state grantee levels. A separate set of analyses are provided in a report for each grantee.

In the analyses below, some survey questions are presented in two tables: The first table shows the number and percent of respondents who selected each of the possible values for the question; the second table shows the degree of overall satisfaction (the ACSI score) that is related to each of the selected values. This approach identifies results where there is an opportunity to increase overall satisfaction by improving a specific area of service or, if that is not possible, designing actions that can mitigate the harm related to that area of service.

The questions in Tables 3 have values of 1-10 and are presented with the number of respondents, the average score, and the range of responses (minimum and maximum). The relationship of the questions with values of 1-10 to overall satisfaction is presented in the driver analysis section on pages 7-9. The driver analysis has the advantage not only of assessing the individual relation of certain aspects of service to the level of host agency satisfaction but also of comparing across those aspects of service to determine where improvement would give the biggest return on investment in terms of increased satisfaction.

## Overall Satisfaction: The American Customer Satisfaction Index

The American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) continues to be the standard for measuring overall satisfaction. The nationwide host agency ACSI score for PY 2021 presented in Table 1 is 84.8, a somewhat higher score than in PY 2020. As in other years, the ACSI score compares very favorably with ACSI scores from non-profit, for-profit, and government organizations around the country and the world where the ACSI is used. The score for national grantees is slightly lower than the score for state grantees. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in Appendix A.

Table 1. American Customer Satisfaction Index

	Count	Mean ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	4645	84.8	0	100

## Survey Response Rate

The random sample for the survey was stratified by grantee, making the final sample representative of host agency customers nationwide. Of the 11,093 host agencies that received a survey, 4645 agencies completed useable surveys that had responses to at least the first three questions that make up the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI). A survey is considered useable (counted as a valid

return)<sup>1</sup> if the respondent answered these three questions. The nationwide response rate is 41.9 percent, similar to the rate in PY 2020 (41.4%) but significantly lower than PY 2019 (50.7%). See Table 2. The response rate for national grantee host agencies (41.1%) is significantly lower than the rate for state grantee host agencies (43.6%). See Appendix A.

Table 2. Response Rate

	Responded		Did not Respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Nationwide	4645	41.9%	6448	58.1%

### Treatment by Sub-Grantee

The four questions in Table 3 are the same as those asked in PY 2020. The scores for the first three questions are slightly higher than the scores in PY 2020. Question 10 is the same as PY 2020. The score for Question 6 is still the lowest scores among the 1-10 scaled questions.

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	4512	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	4569	8.7	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	4475	8.1	1	10
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	4592	8.4	1	10

Question 7 in Table 4 asks host agencies about the degree of choice they have when they are offered a participant assignment. The first type of choice we might call “limited choice”: the host agency is offered one person, and they can take it or leave it. The second condition is a more open, “full choice,” since there are expanded numbers of participants from whom to choose. The third condition is self-explanatory, “No choice.”

In the current survey, 82.3 percent indicated they had “limited choice,” the ability to accept or refuse the proposed individual, this is the highest percentage ever recorded for this level of choice significantly higher than PY 2020 (75 percent). 17.7 percent of the respondents indicated that they were given the “full choice” option, slightly higher than PY 2020. Unlike previous years, no one indicated that they were

<sup>1</sup> Calculating and Reporting Survey Response Rates – Revised September 2009, GAO internal guidance.

assigned a participant with no choice. This is the first time that no host agencies reported not having any choice.

**Table 4. Degree of Choice**

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	3430	82.3%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	740	17.7%
		I really have no choice	0	0.0%

In order to understand the impact of different choice situations, Table 5 shows how choice relates to satisfaction. Limited choice is associated with a satisfaction score that is significantly lower than full choice, suggesting that limited choice is acceptable to most host agencies but is not optimal. The full choice appears to be strongly preferred by host agencies, with a related average satisfaction score over five points higher than the limited choice option. The third option is no choice. While no host agencies experienced no choice, we should remember that lack of choice has always been related to extremely low levels of satisfaction and is best avoided, as was the case this year.

**Table 5. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction**

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	3430	84.9
		I have a choice among several potential participants	740	90.2
		I really have no choice	0	.

### **Detailed Analysis of Preparation**

Question 9 explores the degree to which host agencies perceive assigned participants as having the necessary preparation. Agencies can select more than one answer for this question. As in PY 2020, the most frequently noted lack of preparation is in the area of basic computer knowledge (Table 6 below). The other three areas -- lack of basic employability skills, knowledge of the assignment, and how to behave with host agency customers -- are mentioned with nearly equal frequency.

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

			Count	Percent of All Responses
Nationwide	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	9a. Basic computer knowledge	2214	31.2%
		9b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	1618	22.8%
		9c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	1612	22.7%
		9d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	1660	23.4%

Table 7 suggests the importance of participants being well prepared as a means of ensuring host agency satisfaction. For those host agencies that reported no preparation concerns, the average ACSI was 91.5, significantly higher than the score for PY 2020 (88.7). For those agencies that identified one or more training needs, the ACSI score is more than 10.1 points lower than for those agencies that reported no preparation issues. The gap is double that of PY 2020 (5 points). This further emphasizes the importance of assigning participants who are appropriately prepared in all four areas. The number of host agencies reporting no preparation issues is three times larger (34%) proportion of all responding to this question than the proportion (10%) reporting no preparation issues in PY 2020. This suggests that grantees have made significant improvements in their preparation of participants in comparison to previous years.

Table 7. Preparation Needs and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	One or more preparation issues	3068	81.4
	No preparation issues	1577	91.5

Question 8, in Table 8, asks whether the participant is a good match with the host agency. The average nationwide score of 8.4, the same as PY 2020 and significantly higher than in four years prior to PY 2020. Since the quality of the match is so central to the relationship between the program and host agencies and since it plays such an important role in overall satisfaction, programs should pay close attention to this aspect of the program. See Driver Analysis below for further discussion.

Table 8. Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	4614	8.4	1	10

## Supportive Services

Question 11 in Table 9 shows the number of host agencies with participants who needed supportive services. Nearly 60 percent of the host agencies that answered the question indicated that the participants assigned to them did not need supportive services, a significantly smaller percentage than in PY 2020. Twenty-seven percent of host agencies reported that a few participants needed supportive services, and only about 11 percent reported that many or nearly all participants needed supportive services. However, for those agencies that reported that participants needed few or no service needs, satisfaction was 3 to 7 points higher than among those host agencies that reported many or nearly all participants needed supportive services. See Table 10. The need for supportive services, often a necessity for participants, affects host agency satisfaction, although it should be noted that other factors over which local programs have control have a larger impact on satisfaction. The question responses also suggest that if there are multiple placements to a single host agency, some placements may need support services but having all the placements in a single agency needing support services may overwhelm the agency.

Table 9. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	2518	59.9%
		Few	1140	27.1%
		Many	296	7.0%
		Nearly all	250	5.9%

Table 10. Supportive Services and the ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	2518	87.4
		Few	1140	83.4
		Many	296	80.5
		Nearly all	250	79.1

## Removal from the Assignment

There are two circumstances under which 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. Question 12 in Table 11 asks if a participant was removed before the host agency thought the person was ready. Nationwide, 83.9 percent of host agencies never had that experience, slightly higher than the percentage in PY 2020.

Table 11. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3399	83.9%
		Occasionally	535	13.2%
		Frequently	66	1.6%
		Nearly always	52	1.3%

The ACSI scores in Table 12 show that when the local SCSEP program removes a participant before the host agency thinks they were ready, satisfaction is lowered. The majority of agencies that never experience premature removal have an average ACSI score of 85.7. The average score is 3.2 points higher than the ACSI score for those agencies that experience the occasional removal of a participant and slightly above the ACSI score nationwide (84.8). When the removal happens more frequently, however, the ACSI scores are nearly 8 points lower than the nationwide ACSI average.

**Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI**

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3399	85.7
		Occasionally	535	82.5
		Frequently	66	76.9
		Nearly always	52	83.4

Question 13 in Table 13 asks if the host agency has requested the local program to remove a participant. Instances of removal occurred 40 percent of the time, slightly lower than reported in PY 2020 (41.0%). This suggests continued improvement from PY 2019 (44.8%), although these removals are still more frequent than would be optimal. As evident in Table 14, premature removal by the local program has a seriously negative impact on customer satisfaction.

**Table 13. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant**

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1703	40.0%
		No	2551	60.0%

As shown in Table 14, there is a 7-point difference in satisfaction between those host agencies that said "Yes" and those that said "No." While this is not as large a difference as in some other areas, it is still a substantive and statistically significant difference. Given the high incidence of participants not working out from the host agency perspective, this is an area that warrants attention by the grantees and their local programs.

**Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant and ACSI**

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1703	80.6
		No	2551	87.7

The last scored question in the survey is about the impact of participation in SCSEP on the host agency's ability to provide services to the community. As shown in Table 15, nearly 65 percent of host agencies indicate that participation has somewhat or significantly increased their ability to provide services, a significantly higher percentage than in the last four surveys. However, this is a lower percentage than the

response to this question in pre-PY 2015 surveys when more than 75 percent of host agencies reported some or significant increased ability to service their communities.

**Table 15. Effect of Participation in SCSEP**

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	26	0.6%
		Somewhat decreased	45	1.0%
		Neither decreased nor increased	1404	32.6%
		Somewhat increased	1346	31.2%
		Increased significantly	1490	34.6%

Table 16 shows the association between SCSEP’s impact on the host agency’s capacity to provide services and overall satisfaction. For the 34.6 percent that experienced a significant increase in capacity, overall satisfaction is extraordinarily high, 91.9 nationwide. Even those agencies that only somewhat increased capacity have an average satisfaction score 6 percentage points above those that experienced no increase. The few host agencies that experience a decreased capacity have ACSI scores significantly and substantially lower. Perhaps being a host agency imposes a significant burden on them that reduces their ability to provide their regular services.

**Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI**

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	26	68.4
		Somewhat decreased	45	62.3
		Neither decreased nor increased	1404	79.0
		Somewhat increased	1346	85.2
		Increased significantly	1490	91.9

**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 8, which have a scale of 1-10, the driver analysis below was conducted to determine which aspects of service were most important to overall satisfaction.

Different analytic approaches are required in order to understand how the various issues addressed in the questions affect overall satisfaction. The difference in the analytic approaches only reflects differences in the questions’ structure; the subjects the questions address are all, in their own way, of similar importance to customer satisfaction and program quality. The analytic approach presented above identifies questions where the respondent makes a specific choice or, in some instances, chooses more than one value. The questions in the driver analysis below ask respondents for ratings on a continuous 10-point scale and all are about the quality of the match or service quality. In all instances, the questions provide guidance for

identifying actions that can improve service or mitigate the harm related to host agencies' evaluations of the service.

Table 17 presents the results of the driver analysis. First, each of the questions regarding customer service was correlated independently to the ACSI. The results in the last column indicate the strength of the relationship (the correlation) between each question's responses and the ACSI (the closer to 1.0, the stronger the relationship), the statistical significance of the relationship (the closer to zero, the more likely the relationship would not have occurred by chance), and the number of observations in the analysis. (Only those host agencies that answered the specific question under consideration and all three ACSI questions are included in the analysis.) Then, the questions were analyzed together in a regression analysis in relation to the ACSI to see which questions made a significant contribution to understanding what drives overall satisfaction over and above the contribution of any other questions.<sup>2</sup> This analysis narrowed the number of questions with a substantial, independent relationship to the ACSI to two, which are shaded in the table. Questions with a smaller correlation or little independent relationship are unshaded.

Using these two different criteria, two of the five questions are key drivers of satisfaction, those with both a strong correlation to the ACSI and significant independent contribution to variation in the ACSI: Questions 4 and 8. Question 8, which deals with the quality of the match, is the stronger of the two drivers by far and has been for several years. Question 4 deals with the ease of the assignment process; this question also has been a strong driver for many years.

For host agencies, Question 8 is the bottom line, providing a participant that is a good match is essential. With an average nationwide score of 8.4, there is some room for improvement. For every 0.5-point improvement in the quality of the match score, e.g., from 8.4 to 8.9, overall satisfaction will increase by over 3 points on the ACSI scale. This is not an unreasonable level of improvement to which grantees might aspire, given that 23.3 percent of host agencies gave scores on Question 8 below 8.0.

The unshaded Questions 5, 6 and 10 have little or no independent 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. Question 5 is certainly an underlying factor in making a good match. Questions 6 and 10 are about communication and are strongly correlated with the ACSI although they do not make significant independent contributions as drivers. In addition, Question 10 with a score of 8.1 suggests continued attention to staying in touch with the host agency throughout the process, since the low score leaves significant room for local programs to improve service in this area.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.



Table 17. Driver Analysis

		ACSI
4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	Pearson Correlation	.704**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	4512
5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	Pearson Correlation	.702**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	4569
6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.618**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	4475
8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.757**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	4614
10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	Pearson Correlation	.610**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	4592

### Summary and Recommendations

There are several similarities between PY 2021 and PY 2020. The response rate is similar to the rate in PY 2020. The findings of the driver analysis have a similar emphasis on the importance of making a good match between the participant and the host agency. The effects on the ACSI of key questions regarding service delivery are nearly unchanged.

The driver analysis tells us that, among the questions in that analysis, making a good match has the strongest influence on overall satisfaction: A 0.5-point change in the match question score yields 5 points of change in satisfaction. The value of SCSEP to host agencies suggests two things: Host agencies have high expectations for the participants placed with them; and historical data indicate that, with increased attention to this issue, local programs could meet or even exceed host agencies' expectations.

Another message from the driver analysis is to keep the initial assignment process easy. The survey confirms these aspects of service as important to host agencies. The importance of the host agencies having a choice in the assignment adds to our understanding of how host agencies wish to be treated.

Other analyses regarding preparation underline the importance of preparation as part of the match. Host agencies that report no need for better preparation in any area have extraordinarily high overall satisfaction (ACSI score of 89.9) compared to those that identify one or more areas where preparation needs improvement. While addressing individual preparation needs yields modest gains in satisfaction, placing a participant who is fully prepared for the host agency

assignment yields extremely high levels of host agency satisfaction. The results to the questions regarding removal from the host agency, either at the request of the agency or, more significantly, at the initiative of the local program, reinforce the importance of a good match.

One significant difference is the results on participant preparation. Three times as many host agencies reported no preparation issues compared to previous years. This suggests a highly significant improvement in older worker preparation for their host agency assignments. Recent surveys have provided the details about training preparation that point to specific improvements. Host agencies have identified the particular importance of better preparation of participants in four areas with particular emphasis on computer training. All four areas (computer basics, employability skills, knowledge of the assignment and how to interact with customers) can have a significant if modest effect on satisfaction.

Another difference in the results this year regards an important improvement in the area of giving host agencies choice. In past survey results for Question 7, there have always been a small proportion (8-10%) that have indicated they had no choice. This year, for the first time, no host agency indicated having no choice, a significant improvement that is most welcome and should be maintained. In addition, a higher percentage (82.3 %) indicated they had limited choice, the highest percentage since the question was first asked. Subgrantees are clearly improving their management of the assignment process.

## Appendix A Complete Survey Tables for ACSI and Response Rate

Table 1. ACSI by Grantee

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	340	84.6	0	100
ANPPM	163	88.4	22	100
ATD	131	78.0	4	100
Easter Seals	202	84.0	0	100
Goodwill	348	86.4	0	100
IID[S]	50	89.3	11	100
IPDC	9	91.0	71	100
NATABLE	115	82.9	19	100
NAPCA[S]	56	87.4	37	100
NAPCA[G]	117	84.1	0	100
NCBA	202	82.7	0	100
NCOA	302	86.9	0	100
NICOA[S]	44	87.2	18	100
NICOA[G]	70	77.7	0	100
NOWCC	47	83.2	0	100
NUL	107	84.1	8	100
OAGB	37	87.7	44	100
SER	142	80.6	0	100
CWI	394	85.9	0	100
The Workplace	120	84.9	0	100
VANTAGE	83	83.9	37	100
National Grantees	3079	84.7	0	100
Alabama	42	88.6	48	100
Alaska	26	86.2	41	100
Arizona	11	84.7	34	100
Arkansas	47	90.5	0	100
California	37	85.9	41	100
Colorado	7	69.9	11	100
Connecticut	6	79.1	52	100
Delaware	27	89.5	60	100
District of Columbia	3	96.3	89	100
Florida	64	83.9	37	100
Georgia	46	87.8	63	100
Hawaii	36	85.2	33	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Idaho	11	84.6	41	100
Illinois	34	83.0	37	100
Indiana	32	76.6	0	100
Iowa	21	79.0	41	100
Kansas	23	83.0	44	100
Kentucky	57	90.8	44	100
Louisiana	40	87.9	15	100
Maine	3	55.5	44	78
Maryland	22	86.3	59	100
Massachusetts	19	88.5	44	100
Michigan	45	83.2	30	100
Minnesota	56	83.8	22	100
Mississippi	29	90.0	19	100
Missouri	57	86.8	46	100
Montana	13	73.5	29	100
Nebraska	11	80.3	44	96
Nevada	1	81.8	82	82
New Hampshire	12	88.8	62	100
New Jersey	31	83.5	0	100
New Mexico	11	92.3	56	100
New York	34	83.7	37	100
North Carolina	53	87.6	19	100
North Dakota	5	85.2	74	100
Ohio	59	83.1	34	100
Oklahoma	41	82.6	30	100
Oregon	14	77.2	44	100
Pennsylvania	108	84.0	22	100
Puerto Rico	13	96.9	89	100
Rhode Island	7	78.4	23	100
South Carolina	22	83.8	33	100
South Dakota	20	77.2	22	97
Tennessee	53	87.1	26	100
Texas	115	86.8	0	100
Utah	8	84.3	41	96
Vermont	5	57.8	33	89
Virginia	35	87.9	45	100
Washington	17	86.7	63	100
West Virginia	31	78.4	0	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Wisconsin	38	83.8	19	100
Wyoming	8	89.0	74	100
State Grantees	1566	85.1	0	100
Nationwide	4645	84.8	0	100

Table 2. Response Rate

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	340	37.0%	578	63.0%
ANPPM	163	44.1%	207	55.9%
ATD	131	38.9%	206	61.1%
Easter Seals	202	37.8%	333	62.2%
Goodwill	348	51.3%	330	48.7%
IID[S]	50	45.0%	61	55.0%
IPDC	9	22.5%	31	77.5%
NATABLE	115	53.7%	99	46.3%
NAPCA[S]	56	36.4%	98	63.6%
NAPCA[G]	117	41.5%	165	58.5%
NCBA	202	37.8%	332	62.2%
NCOA	302	40.0%	453	60.0%
NICOA[S]	44	30.1%	102	69.9%
NICOA[G]	70	45.8%	83	54.2%
NOWCC	47	45.6%	56	54.4%
NUL	107	37.3%	180	62.7%
OAGB	37	25.5%	108	74.5%
SER	142	35.9%	253	64.1%
CWI	394	46.9%	446	53.1%
The Workplace	120	35.9%	214	64.1%
VANTAGE	83	49.1%	86	50.9%
National Grantees	3079	41.1%	4421	58.9%
Alabama	42	45.2%	51	54.8%
Alaska	26	38.2%	42	61.8%
Arizona	11	39.3%	17	60.7%
Arkansas	47	56.0%	37	44.0%
California	37	26.1%	105	73.9%
Colorado	7	31.8%	15	68.2%
Connecticut	6	21.4%	22	78.6%
Delaware	27	42.2%	37	57.8%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
District of Columbia	3	23.1%	10	76.9%
Florida	64	37.4%	107	62.6%
Georgia	46	46.5%	53	53.5%
Hawaii	36	64.3%	20	35.7%
Idaho	11	64.7%	6	35.3%
Illinois	34	34.3%	65	65.7%
Indiana	32	39.5%	49	60.5%
Iowa	21	38.9%	33	61.1%
Kansas	23	47.9%	25	52.1%
Kentucky	57	50.9%	55	49.1%
Louisiana	40	47.1%	45	52.9%
Maine	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
Maryland	22	57.9%	16	42.1%
Massachusetts	19	36.5%	33	63.5%
Michigan	45	53.6%	39	46.4%
Minnesota	56	44.4%	70	55.6%
Mississippi	29	59.2%	20	40.8%
Missouri	57	52.3%	52	47.7%
Montana	13	65.0%	7	35.0%
Nebraska	11	39.3%	17	60.7%
Nevada	1	14.3%	6	85.7%
New Hampshire	12	46.2%	14	53.8%
New Jersey	31	33.3%	62	66.7%
New Mexico	11	36.7%	19	63.3%
New York	34	28.3%	86	71.7%
North Carolina	53	57.0%	40	43.0%
North Dakota	5	35.7%	9	64.3%
Ohio	59	39.6%	90	60.4%
Oklahoma	41	53.2%	36	46.8%
Oregon	14	34.1%	27	65.9%
Pennsylvania	108	46.2%	126	53.8%
Puerto Rico	13	43.3%	17	56.7%
Rhode Island	7	50.0%	7	50.0%
South Carolina	22	36.1%	39	63.9%
South Dakota	20	55.6%	16	44.4%
Tennessee	53	53.5%	46	46.5%
Texas	115	44.4%	144	55.6%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Utah	8	47.1%	9	52.9%
Vermont	5	29.4%	12	70.6%
Virginia	35	36.1%	62	63.9%
Washington	17	47.2%	19	52.8%
West Virginia	31	72.1%	12	27.9%
Wisconsin	38	34.5%	72	65.5%
Wyoming	8	50.0%	8	50.0%
State Grantees	1566	43.6%	2027	56.4%
Nationwide	4645	41.9%	6448	58.1%

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	3002	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	3029	8.6	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	2967	8.0	1	10
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	3043	8.3	1	10
State Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	1510	8.8	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	1540	8.7	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	1508	8.2	1	10
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	1549	8.5	1	10
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	4512	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	4569	8.7	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	4475	8.1	1	10
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	4592	8.4	1	10

Table 4. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	2277	82.1%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	495	17.9%
		I really have no choice	0	0.0%
State Grantees	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	1153	82.5%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	245	17.5%
		I really have no choice	0	0.0%



Nationwide	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	3430	82.3%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	740	17.7%
		I really have no choice	0	0.0%

Table 5. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	2277	84.9
		I have a choice among several potential participants	495	89.5
		I really have no choice	0	.
State Grantees	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	1153	84.9
		I have a choice among several potential participants	245	91.5
		I really have no choice	0	.
Nationwide	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	3430	84.9
		I have a choice among several potential participants	740	90.2
		I really have no choice	0	.

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

			Count	Percent of All Responses
National Grantees	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	9a. Basic computer knowledge	1476	31.3%
		9b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	1081	22.9%
		9c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	1054	22.3%

			Count	Percent of All Responses
		9d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	1106	23.4%
State Grantees	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	9a. Basic computer knowledge	738	30.9%
		9b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	537	22.5%
		9c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	558	23.4%
		9d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	554	23.2%
Nationwide	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	9a. Basic computer knowledge	2214	31.2%
		9b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	1618	22.8%
		9c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	1612	22.7%
		9d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	1660	23.4%

<b>Table 7. Preparation Needs and ACSI</b>			
		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	One or more preparation issues	2053	81.4
	No preparation issues	1026	91.4
State Grantees	One or more preparation issues	1015	81.5
	No preparation issues	551	91.6
Nationwide	One or more preparation issues	3068	81.4
	No preparation issues	1577	91.5

Table 8. Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	3058	8.4	1	10
State Grantees	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	1556	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	4614	8.4	1	10

Table 9. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	1682	60.4%
		Few	755	27.1%
		Many	192	6.9%
		Nearly all	155	5.6%
State Grantees	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	836	58.9%
		Few	385	27.1%
		Many	104	7.3%
		Nearly all	95	6.7%
Nationwide	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	2518	59.9%
		Few	1140	27.1%
		Many	296	7.0%
		Nearly all	250	5.9%

Table 11. Need for Supportive Services and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	1991	86.6
		Few	797	81.2
		Many	195	78.9
		Nearly all	149	74.8
State Grantees	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	921	87.1
		Few	407	83.4
		Many	90	78.5
		Nearly all	65	78.0

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	2912	86.7
		Few	1204	81.9
		Many	285	78.8
		Nearly all	214	75.8

Table 11. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2240	83.4%
		Occasionally	367	13.7%
		Frequently	48	1.8%
		Nearly always	30	1.1%
State Grantees	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1159	84.8%
		Occasionally	168	12.3%
		Frequently	18	1.3%
		Nearly always	22	1.6%
Nationwide	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3399	83.9%
		Occasionally	535	13.2%
		Frequently	66	1.6%
		Nearly always	52	1.3%

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2240	85.6
		Occasionally	367	82.1
		Frequently	48	74.3
		Nearly always	30	82.9
State Grantees	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1159	85.8
		Occasionally	168	83.4
		Frequently	18	83.6
		Nearly always	22	84.1
Nationwide	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3399	85.7
		Occasionally	535	82.5
		Frequently	66	76.9
		Nearly always	52	83.4

Table 13. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1179	41.7%
		No	1645	58.3%
State Grantees	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	524	36.6%
		No	906	63.4%
Nationwide	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1703	40.0%
		No	2551	60.0%

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1179	80.4
		No	1645	87.7
State Grantees	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	524	81.0
		No	906	87.6
Nationwide	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1703	80.6
		No	2551	87.7

Table 15. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	17	0.6%
		Somewhat decreased	31	1.1%
		Neither decreased nor increased	941	32.9%
		Somewhat increased	882	30.9%
		Increased significantly	986	34.5%
State Grantees	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	9	0.6%
		Somewhat decreased	14	1.0%
		Neither decreased nor increased	463	31.8%
		Somewhat increased	464	31.9%
		Increased significantly	504	34.7%

Nationwide	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	26	0.6%
		Somewhat decreased	45	1.0%
		Neither decreased nor increased	1404	32.6%
		Somewhat increased	1346	31.2%
		Increased significantly	1490	34.6%

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	17	63.8
		Somewhat decreased	31	60.7
		Neither decreased nor increased	941	79.5
		Somewhat increased	882	84.8
		Increased significantly	986	91.6
State Grantees	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	9	77.0
		Somewhat decreased	14	65.7
		Neither decreased nor increased	463	78.0
		Somewhat increased	464	86.0
		Increased significantly	504	92.4
Nationwide	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	26	68.4
		Somewhat decreased	45	62.3
		Neither decreased nor increased	1404	79.0
		Somewhat increased	1346	85.2
		Increased significantly	1490	91.9