PY 2021 Nationwide Participant Evaluation of SCSEP
February 20, 2023

Overview

For the PY 2021 participant survey, a nationwide random sample of 16,929 participants was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in April 2022. The third and last wave of data collection was closed in September 2022. This report includes the nationwide results for all survey questions. Appendix A contains the results of each survey question at the national grantee, state 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 2021 is 85.9, significantly lower than the 87.2 score in PY 2020 but higher than the ACSI score for most previous 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.

For PY 2021, of the 16,929 surveys mailed, 8712 participants returned surveys with valid responses to the first three questions that make up the ASCI; only these participants with valid responses to the first three questions are included in the response rate and in the other survey analyses below. This year's response rate, 51.5 percent, is significantly lower than PY2020 rate of 59.5 but higher than the PY 2019 rate of 50.4%. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in 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, those who received service at any time within the twelve months prior to the drawing of the survey sample in April 2020. A survey is considered useable (counted as a valid return)[1] if the respondent answered the three questions that constitute the ACSI.

Most characteristics of the respondents, including race, ethnicity and education, are similar to the SCSEP population as a whole. There are some differences between the SCSEP population and survey respondents in regard to the number with less than a high school diploma and the percentage of Asians and American Indians. Differences were also evident regarding age at enrollment and the percentage of those with a few barriers to employment (primarily disability, low literacy skills, homeless or at risk for homelessness, severely limited employment prospects, and age 75 or over). However, those differences have no impact on the representativeness of the survey responses.[2] 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:

- The average age is 65.7
- 69.8 percent are female and 30.2 percent male

---

[1] Calculating and Reporting Survey Response Rates – Revised September 2009, GAO internal guidance.
[2] 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.

- 57.2 percent have a high school diploma or less. The remaining 43.9 percent have some post-secondary education, degree or certificate
- 52.2 percent are racial minorities, and 11.6 percent are Hispanic.

To complete 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, having severely limited employment prospects in an area of persistent unemployment, being 75 or older, and being formerly incarcerated. On average, participants in the sample have 2.8 barriers each, a somewhat lower average number of barriers than reported in the PY 2020 survey, in which the average number of barriers was 3.0.

The other defining characteristic of the respondents is their program status at the time they took the survey: 60.1 percent of the respondents were still in the program; 39.9 percent of the respondents had exited the program. Of those who had exited:
- 28.9 percent of the respondents exited for regular employment
- .7 percent of the respondents exited for self-employment
- 70.3 percent of the respondents exited for reasons other than employment

The percent of the sample that were still in the program is a little higher than the percent in PY 2019.

Participants' Expectations for the Program

Question 4 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 eight options in Table 1 indicate a wide range of reasons for enrolling in the program. The participants, on average, endorsed about 3.3 reasons, similar to PY 2020 and PY 2019. The most frequently endorsed reasons were increasing their income, feeling more useful and independent, and obtaining a part-time job. The next most frequent endorsements were for participating in training and host agency activities, providing service to the community, and meeting new people. It is notable that the lowest percentage was for full-time work. This is consistent with data from SPARQ that show participants who exited were working an average of 28.9 hours per week in unsubsidized employment. The results this year are similar to those from PY 2020.

Table 1. Reasons for Enrollment

5. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:	Count	Percent of All Responses
4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1781	6.3%
4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	4680	16.5%
4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	3360	11.9%
4d. Provide service to my community	3672	13.0%
4e. Meet new people	3522	12.5%
4f. Increase my income	5557	19.6%
4g. Feel more useful and independent	5128	18.1%
4h. Other	580	2.1%

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, participants give high ratings to all three ways staff worked with them while in the program.[3] 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.	8609	9.0	1	10
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	8475	8.7	1	10
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	8391	8.7	1	10

Participants' Experience in the Host Agency

The three questions below in Table 3 relate directly 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 component of the host agency assignment. The highest rating (8.9) is for Question 13, how comfortable participants feel at the host agency assignment. The lowest rating (8.1) is for Question 11), 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 8.5, mid-way between the other two ratings. All the scores are similar to those recorded in PY 2020.

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.	7985	8.5	1	10
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	8150	8.1	1	10
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	8373	8.9	1	10

---

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

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 one of the two principal purposes of the program: preparing participants for employment. Question 20 in Table 4 asks if participants felt that SCSEP prepared them for employment in different industry sectors. There were 1033 respondents who had a placement after leaving the program, including 26 who were self-employed. The analysis in Table 5 is limited to those exiters.[4] The respondents were able to choose all sectors in which they felt prepared for employment (nonprofit, government, or for-profit) or to 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 681 individuals who responded to Q20 made a total of 929 choices as shown in Table 4. Nationwide, the most frequently endorsed sector was nonprofit organizations (38.3%), 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 24.2 percent for government and 29 percent for the for-profit sector. The difference of 9.3 points between preparation for the nonprofit and for-profit sectors is much larger than the 6.6 difference in PY 2020. The percent who felt prepared for the for-profit sector is slightly lower than the percent in PY 2020.

86 respondents indicated they were not prepared for employment in any organization or business. This number equates to 8.5% of all responses and 7.3% of all respondents. In conjunction with the improvement on the score for Question 12 above (participants having a say in the types of skills they would gain), these scores suggest that participants perceived that the program is providing more appropriate and effective training even though such training was curtailed during the pandemic.

Table 4. Prepared for Employment

20. Do you feel that your participation in the Old Worker Program prepared you for employment in these organizations?	Count	Percent of Responses
20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	389	38.3%
20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	246	24.2%
20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	294	29.0%
20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	86	8.5%

A second way of looking at Question 20 is shown in Table 4a. This variable, constructed from the Question 20 data, shows the number of sectors (if any) for which participants felt they were prepared. Of the 681 who responded to this question, 110 participants saw themselves prepared in all three sectors, 93 saw themselves prepared in two of the three sectors, and 392 saw themselves prepared for one sector, most often the nonprofit sector. 12.6 percent of respondents did not feel prepared in any sector. These

---

[4] Although only those who exited with employment were included in the findings in Table 5, the results were not substantially different when we included all respondents who answered this question, including those who did not exit or did not have employment upon exiting.

responses are similar to those in PY 2020, except there are nearly twice as many who did not feel prepared in any sector.

Table 4a: Prepared for Employment

	Count	Percent of Respondents
1 sector	392	57.6%
2 sectors	93	13.7%
All 3 sectors	110	16.2%
No sectors	86	12.6%

Another aspect of preparation is covered in Question 18. The data for this question regarding preparation for success in the workforce are presented in Table 5. The score for helping prepare participants for success is the same as the score in PY 2020.

Table 5. Preparation for Success in the Workforce

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	8304	8.4	1	10

Two health outcomes continue to be collected in this survey. Table 6 shows the responses to Question 14. 31.9 percent indicate they are in better physical health, and 58.3% indicate their health is about the same. Only 9.8 percent indicate that their health declined in the course of program participation. These results are similar to PY2020 and slightly higher than previous years.

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	2642	31.9%
	Worse	813	9.8%
	About the same	4834	58.3%

The second health question asks about mental health. As in previous years, the program produces strongly positive results as shown in Table 7. Nearly 76 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 PY2020 and 3-5 points higher than in the four prior surveys.

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	158	1.9%
	A little more negative	333	3.9%
	About the same	1579	18.5%
	A little more positive	2273	26.6%
	Much more positive	4189	49.1%

Along with physical and mental health, the program can affect participants' financial wellbeing. We know from Question 4 that many participants come to SCSEP hoping to increase their income. Question 16 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, almost 82% 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 only slightly lower than in PY 2020 but 7-9 points higher than in the prior four years.

Table 8. SCSEP Wages

		Count	Percent
16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	222	2.6%
	2	87	1.0%
	3	115	1.3%
	4	139	1.6%
	5	316	3.7%
	6	276	3.2%
	7	402	4.7%
	8	708	8.2%
	9	966	11.2%
	10 Strongly agree	5360	62.4%

One potentially negative impact can arise if participants are pressured to leave a host agency assignment before they felt they were ready can have on those individuals. Table 9 shows that only 4.2 percent of participants feel that they have had such pressure, slightly lower than the 6.2 percent for PY 2020. It is important that the percent pressured remains as small as possible since the experience of being pressured lowers overall satisfaction by nearly 23 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	345	4.2%
	No	5316	64.5%
	Does not apply	2581	31.3%

Detailed Analysis of Computer Training

Earlier 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 2019 and PY 2020, a little over a third (36.4%) of the participants received the computer training they needed. A quarter (25.0%) did not need computer training and did not receive any. In total, computer training was properly targeted for more than 61 percent of the participants, somewhat higher than in PY 2020. However, 21.2 percent needed computer training and received little or none, and another 7.2 percent received computer training that did not meet their needs. Overall, the targeting of training was slightly better than in PY2020 but still needs improvement.

Computer training continues to be an important aspect of helping older workers prepare for an ever more computerized work environment. The individual grantee reports will provide clearer guidance on this issue for local programs.

Table 10. Computer Training

		Count	Percent
12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	3008	36.4%
	I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	849	10.3%
	I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1752	21.2%
	I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	599	7.2%
	I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2066	25.0%

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 ensure that services are provided. In Table 11, Question 7 asks if supportive services were provided when needed. Of 8,585 participants who responded to the question, 2,663 (31.0%) indicated they did not need any supportive services. Of the 5,922 who did indicate a need for supportive services, 20.5 percent disagreed or were neutral (score of 1-5 out of 10) that the assistance met their needs. Over 79.5% rated the assistance as positive (6-10 out of 10). The percentage indicating a positive rating was significantly higher than in PY 2020, when 69 percent of the ratings were positive. While there may be room for improvement, these scores show significant improvement in the delivery of supportive services.

Table 11. Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	752	8.8%
	2	227	2.6%
	3	215	2.5%
	4	183	2.1%
	5	405	4.7%
	6	314	3.7%
	7	410	4.8%
	8	665	7.7%
	9	750	8.7%
	10 Strongly agree	2001	23.3%
	Did not need support	2663	31.0%

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 just over 10 percent of participants experienced inconvenience based on the location of their assignment. This is one point lower than in than PY 2020. Over the past four years this percentage has remained substantially unchanged.

Table 12. Geographic Convenience

		Count	Percent
8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	6991	89.8%
	No	797	10.2%
	Total	7788	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 7.6 is the lowest score for any question in the survey scored on a 10-point scale, similar to PY 2020. While this is a significant improvement over years prior to PY 2019, there continues to be much room for improvement especially since so many fewer participants were able to find employment.

Table 13. Help in Finding Employment

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	687	7.6	1	10

Variables Associated with the ACSI

There are two types of analyses associated with the customer satisfaction index. The first of these is a multi-variate analysis that 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 is a bi-variate analysis used for questions that cannot be easily included 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 responses to the survey conducted in PY 2020 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 variation in ACSI scores. The questions that together account for the most variation in the ACSI are shaded in Table 14 (Questions 5, 6, and 18). Questions 5 and 18 were also drivers in PY 2020. Question 6 is a new driver for PY 2020, although it has always had a strong association with customer satisfaction. Question 10 has previously been a driver and continues to be important although it did not

provide enough unique explanatory power to be included. For details on the driver analysis methodology, see Appendix C.

The strongest driver Question 18 -- how helpful SCSEP is in preparing participants for the workforce -- 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 impact on overall satisfaction. Question 5 was also a driver in PY 2020. The correlation is very high, but, more importantly, its unique contribution to the ACSI is second only to that of Question 18.

Question 6 deals with the nature of the assignment at the host agency. The score for Question 6 is 8.7, among the higher scores for any questions but there are other aspects of the host agency assignment that are .2 to .3 of a point higher suggesting there could be some improvements made. Clear information about how the program works, the appropriateness of the assignment, and how helpful the assignment was in preparing the participant for success account for nearly all of the variation in satisfaction.

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 regression 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 also lower than usual participant ratings, 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	.656**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	8609
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.643**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	8475
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.620**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	8391
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.640**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	7985

		Relation to ACSI
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.609**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	8150
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.044**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	8593
16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	Pearson Correlation	.363**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	8591
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Pearson Correlation	.695**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	8304
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Pearson Correlation	.600**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	1988

Although not a key driver, Question 11 is closely related to overall satisfaction as seen in Table 15. There is a 43-point difference in the ACSI score for those who felt they had the most say and those who felt they had the least say in the skills they would gain. This is the largest difference we have seen to date. 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	439	52.1
	2	144	54.3
	3	173	61.2
	4	199	66.4
	5	397	73.5
	6	358	78.7
	7	503	81.0
	8	1062	85.0
	9	1292	89.5
	10 Strongly agree	3583	95.2

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 multi-variate 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 for improving 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 participants who needed those services. Because only 67 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 96, while those who strongly disagreed that they received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of around 65. This difference of 31 points in scores highlights the critical importance of providing supportive services for those who need them.

Table 16. Supportive Services and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	752	65.1
	2	227	64.7
	3	215	70.5
	4	183	72.8
	5	405	79.8
	6	314	80.0
	7	410	83.3
	8	665	87.0
	9	750	90.6
	10 Strongly agree	2001	96.0
	Did not need support	2663	88.4

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

		Count	ACSI Score
12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	3008	90.8
	I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	849	81.0
	I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1752	78.3
	I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	599	86.8
	I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2066	86.8

For the thirty-five percent of respondents (3,008) who needed computer training and got what they needed, the ACSI is extremely high, 90.8. However, participants who did not receive the training that met their needs, or needed training but little was offered, have satisfaction scores 9-12 points lower. In addition, those who did not need training but got it anyway have an ACSI score close to the satisfaction rating for those who needed it and received it. 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 1, 2, 3 or no sectors. 560 respondents answered the sector questions and the three ACSI questions. There are small, non-significant differences in the ACSI scores for those who said they were prepared for 1, 2, or all 3 sectors. However, all of those who felt prepared expressed significantly higher satisfaction than those who did not feel prepared for any sector: the difference in ACSI scores ranges from 21.6 to 27.6 points. In Table 19, 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

		Count	ACSI Score
20. Number of sectors for which the participant was prepared	1 Sector	1185	89.1
	2 Sectors	239	87.6
	All 3 sectors	254	92.6
	No sectors	327	65.0

Summary and Recommendations

This survey of participants provides important guidance for grantees. Our first finding from the survey results is that understanding participants' expectations for the program may help programs do a better job of serving their participants. As in previous years, the respondents tell us in Question 4 that full-time employment is not the primary goal for most participants. Beyond that, participants have a mix of motivations, and it will serve local programs well to talk with participants at the start of enrollment and learn as much as they can about what participants hope to get from the program, as well as what their needs are to feel successful.

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 8.4, there is still 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. The average score of 7.6 for PY 2021 nearly the same PY 2020, but it is still among the lowest scores on the survey and indicates that local programs can do considerably more in this area, whether it be for part-time or full-time employment.

Newly Significant Issues

There has been significant improvement in the delivery of supportive services. Nearly 80 percent of respondents gave the support they received a positive rating, 10 percent more than in PY 2020. On another front, the survey results strongly reinforced the importance of giving participants a voice in their training and the skills they gain in their assignments. There was a 42 point difference in satisfaction between those that felt most strongly they had a say in the types of skills gained and those who felt most strongly they did not have a say.

The remaining recommendations in many ways flow from obtaining a better understanding of participants' interests and needs that should be derived from participants' assessments and reflected in their IEPs:
- Local programs need to spend time listening to participants to assess the skills participants will need to succeed in the workforce (Question 6).
- Local programs also need to work with host agencies to ensure participants have a voice in the skills they acquire while at their assignments (Question 11).
- Computer training (Question 12) is an area where local programs need to do a better job of identifying those who need training and the type of computer training that is most relevant for the individual participant. However, the data also indicated providing computer training even when not needed is better than not doing any computer training.
- Supportive services (Question 7) are not necessary for everyone (one-third 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	477	48.7%	503	51.3%
ANPPM	213	57.7%	156	42.3%
ATD	211	57.0%	159	43.0%
Easter Seals	275	39.5%	422	60.5%
Goodwill	376	53.7%	324	46.3%
IID[S]	119	47.8%	130	52.2%
IPDC	51	62.2%	31	37.8%
NATABLE	196	53.0%	174	47.0%
NAPCA[S]	240	65.0%	129	35.0%
NAPCA[G]	214	57.8%	156	42.2%
NCBA	275	43.7%	355	56.3%
NCOA	452	53.8%	388	46.2%
NICOA[S]	118	48.6%	125	51.4%
NICOA[G]	162	55.1%	132	44.9%
NOWCC	116	41.9%	161	58.1%
NUL	246	58.6%	174	41.4%
OAGB	173	49.4%	177	50.6%
SER	246	58.6%	174	41.4%
CWI	442	52.6%	398	47.4%
TWP	190	51.4%	180	48.6%
VANTAGE	210	56.8%	160	43.2%
National Grantees	5002	52.0%	4608	48.0%
Alabama	87	49.7%	88	50.3%
Alaska	53	42.7%	71	57.3%
Arizona	40	39.6%	61	60.4%
Arkansas	74	51.7%	69	48.3%
California	185	56.6%	142	43.4%
Colorado	26	47.3%	29	52.7%
Connecticut	28	49.1%	29	50.9%
Delaware	71	51.1%	68	48.9%
District of Columbia	17	50.0%	17	50.0%
Florida	173	46.8%	197	53.2%
Georgia	123	60.3%	81	39.7%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Hawaii	66	54.5%	55	45.5%
Idaho	21	47.7%	23	52.3%
Illinois	134	54.0%	114	46.0%
Indiana	71	37.4%	119	62.6%
Iowa	65	40.9%	94	59.1%
Kansas	36	41.9%	50	58.1%
Kentucky	101	59.1%	70	40.9%
Louisiana	84	52.5%	76	47.5%
Maine	11	78.6%	3	21.4%
Maryland	39	52.0%	36	48.0%
Massachusetts	42	48.3%	45	51.7%
Michigan	122	58.7%	86	41.3%
Minnesota	93	51.4%	88	48.6%
Mississippi	65	63.7%	37	36.3%
Missouri	124	58.8%	87	41.2%
Montana	22	52.4%	20	47.6%
Nebraska	23	38.3%	37	61.7%
Nevada	18	48.6%	19	51.4%
New Hampshire	26	52.0%	24	48.0%
New Jersey	76	43.7%	98	56.3%
New Mexico	16	44.4%	20	55.6%
New York	170	56.9%	129	43.1%
North Carolina	134	56.1%	105	43.9%
North Dakota	11	37.9%	18	62.1%
Ohio	167	51.9%	155	48.1%
Oklahoma	80	53.7%	69	46.3%
Oregon	36	43.9%	46	56.1%
Pennsylvania	155	41.9%	215	58.1%
Puerto Rico	73	61.3%	46	38.7%
Rhode Island	14	45.2%	17	54.8%
South Carolina	91	54.8%	75	45.2%
South Dakota	33	60.0%	22	40.0%
Tennessee	89	50.3%	88	49.7%
Texas	166	44.9%	204	55.1%
Utah	24	30.8%	54	69.2%
Vermont	10	38.5%	16	61.5%
Virginia	87	56.1%	68	43.9%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Washington	47	51.6%	44	48.4%
West Virginia	41	47.7%	45	52.3%
Wisconsin	125	55.8%	99	44.2%
Wyoming	25	37.9%	41	62.1%
State Grantees	3710	50.7%	3609	49.3%
Nationwide	8712	51.5%	8217	48.5%

Table 2. ACSI by Grantee

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	477	85.1	0	100
ANPPM	213	91.9	0	100
ATD	211	82.2	0	100
Easter Seals	275	85.7	0	100
Goodwill	376	87.2	0	100
IID[S]	119	89.0	0	100
IPDC	51	84.5	19	100
NATABLE	196	85.1	0	100
NAPCA[S]	240	87.2	0	100
NAPCA[G]	214	86.4	0	100
NCBA	275	85.1	0	100
NCOA	452	84.3	0	100
NICOA[S]	118	88.7	27	100
NICOA[G]	162	84.0	4	100
NOWCC	116	83.5	0	100
NUL	246	88.1	0	100
OAGB	173	86.8	8	100
SER	246	85.5	0	100
CWI	442	87.1	0	100
TWP	190	85.6	0	100
VANTAGE	210	88.1	8	100
National Grantees	5002	86.2	0	100
Alabama	87	82.7	0	100
Alaska	53	87.3	16	100
Arizona	40	83.3	0	100
Arkansas	74	85.2	22	100
California	185	87.2	0	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Colorado	26	92.6	53	100
Connecticut	28	87.6	7	100
Delaware	71	87.4	4	100
District of Columbia	17	88.3	14	100
Florida	173	84.4	0	100
Georgia	123	92.2	0	100
Hawaii	66	84.1	0	100
Idaho	21	76.8	8	100
Illinois	134	87.4	0	100
Indiana	71	84.6	14	100
Iowa	65	76.2	0	100
Kansas	36	85.6	44	100
Kentucky	101	86.9	0	100
Louisiana	84	86.3	0	100
Maine	11	82.7	37	100
Maryland	39	81.0	11	100
Massachusetts	42	81.5	0	100
Michigan	122	89.3	3	100
Minnesota	93	86.3	19	100
Mississippi	65	91.9	39	100
Missouri	124	89.3	0	100
Montana	22	76.8	0	100
Nebraska	23	84.0	32	100
Nevada	18	80.8	20	100
New Hampshire	26	76.8	7	100
New Jersey	76	85.1	0	100
New Mexico	16	88.0	44	100
New York	170	86.9	0	100
North Carolina	134	88.3	0	100
North Dakota	11	58.0	0	96
Ohio	167	87.0	4	100
Oklahoma	80	78.8	0	100
Oregon	36	70.7	0	100
Pennsylvania	155	81.6	0	100
Puerto Rico	73	87.3	0	100
Rhode Island	14	90.5	47	100
South Carolina	91	85.4	0	100
South Dakota	33	84.6	44	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Tennessee	89	88.4	45	100
Texas	166	81.7	0	100
Utah	24	69.4	0	100
Vermont	10	68.7	0	100
Virginia	87	92.7	0	100
Washington	47	82.5	4	100
West Virginia	41	84.2	0	100
Wisconsin	125	86.8	0	100
Wyoming	25	81.0	0	100
State Grantees	3710	85.4	0	100
Nationwide	8712	85.9	0	100

Table 3. Reasons for Enrolling

			Count	Percent of All Responses
National Grantees	Reasons for Enrollment	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1039	6.5%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	2652	16.5%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	1893	11.8%
		4d. Provide service to my community	2108	13.1%
		4e. Meet new people	1993	12.4%
		4f. Increase my income	3095	19.3%
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	2922	18.2%
		4h. Other	329	2.1%
State Grantees	Reasons for Enrollment	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	742	6.1%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	2028	16.6%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	1467	12.0%
		4d. Provide service to my community	1564	12.8%
		4e. Meet new people	1529	12.5%
		4f. Increase my income	2462	20.1%
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	2206	18.0%
		4h. Other	251	2.0%

			Count	Percent of All Responses
Nationwide	Reasons for Enrollment	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1781	6.3%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	4680	16.5%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	3360	11.9%
		4d. Provide service to my community	3672	13.0%
		4e. Meet new people	3522	12.5%
		4f. Increase my income	5557	19.6%
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	5128	18.1%
		4h. Other	580	2.1%

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.	4950	9.0	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	4885	8.8	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	4816	8.7	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.	3659	8.9	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	3590	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	3575	8.8	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.	8609	9.0	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	8475	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	8391	8.7	1	10

Table 5. Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	405	8.2%
		2	131	2.7%
		3	119	2.4%
		4	105	2.1%
		5	244	5.0%
		6	199	4.0%
		7	254	5.2%
		8	393	8.0%
		9	443	9.0%
		10 Strongly agree	1125	22.8%
		Did not need support	1507	30.6%
State Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	347	9.5%
		2	96	2.6%
		3	96	2.6%
		4	78	2.1%
		5	161	4.4%
		6	115	3.1%
		7	156	4.3%
		8	272	7.4%
		9	307	8.4%
		10 Strongly agree	876	23.9%
		Did not need support	1156	31.6%
Nationwide	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	752	8.8%
		2	227	2.6%
		3	215	2.5%
		4	183	2.1%
		5	405	4.7%
		6	314	3.7%
		7	410	4.8%

			Count	Percent
		8	665	7.7%
		9	750	8.7%
		10 Strongly agree	2001	23.3%
		Did not need support	2663	31.0%

Table 6. Geographic Convenience

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	3985	89.3%
		No	477	10.7%
State Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	3006	90.4%
		No	320	9.6%
Nationwide	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	6991	89.8%
		No	797	10.2%

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.	4608	8.5	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	4693	8.1	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	4839	8.9	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.	3377	8.5	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	3457	8.0	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	3534	8.9	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	7985	8.5	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	8150	8.1	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	8373	8.9	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	1742	36.7%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	496	10.4%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	996	21.0%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	345	7.3%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1174	24.7%
State Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	1266	36.0%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	353	10.0%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	756	21.5%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	254	7.2%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	892	25.3%
Nationwide	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	3008	36.4%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	849	10.3%

			Count	Percent
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1752	21.2%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	599	7.2%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2066	25.0%

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	1580	33.2%	462	9.7%	2713	57.1%
State Grantees	1062	30.1%	351	9.9%	2121	60.0%
Nationwide	2642	31.9%	813	9.8%	4834	58.3%

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	92	1.9%
		A little more negative	183	3.7%
		About the same	887	18.1%
		A little more positive	1325	27.0%
		Much more positive	2418	49.3%
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	66	1.8%
		A little more negative	150	4.1%
		About the same	692	19.1%
		A little more positive	948	26.1%
		Much more positive	1771	48.8%
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	158	1.9%
		A little more negative	333	3.9%
		About the same	1579	18.5%
		A little more positive	2273	26.6%
		Much more positive	4189	49.1%

Table 11. SCSEP Wages

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	95	1.9%
		2	49	1.0%
		3	58	1.2%
		4	72	1.5%
		5	181	3.7%
		6	156	3.2%
		7	239	4.9%
		8	407	8.3%
		9	591	12.0%
		10 Strongly agree	3075	62.5%
State Grantees	16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	127	3.5%
		2	38	1.0%
		3	57	1.6%
		4	67	1.8%
		5	135	3.7%
		6	120	3.3%
		7	163	4.4%
		8	301	8.2%
		9	375	10.2%
		10 Strongly agree	2285	62.3%
Nationwide	16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	222	2.6%
		2	87	1.0%
		3	115	1.3%
		4	139	1.6%
		5	316	3.7%
		6	276	3.2%
		7	402	4.7%
		8	708	8.2%
		9	966	11.2%
		10 Strongly agree	5360	62.4%

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	204	4.3%
		No	3100	65.6%
		Does not apply	1422	30.1%
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	141	4.0%
		No	2216	63.0%
		Does not apply	1159	33.0%
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	345	4.2%
		No	5316	64.5%
		Does not apply	2581	31.3%

Table 13. Preparation for Success in the 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?	4769	8.4	1	10
State Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	3535	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	8304	8.4	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?	393	7.7	1	10
State Grantees	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	294	7.4	1	10
Nationwide	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	687	7.6	1	10

Table 15. Prepared for Employment

		Count	Percent of All Responses
National Grantees	20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	230	39.7%
	20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	141	24.3%
	20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	165	28.4%
	20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	44	7.6%
State Grantees	20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	159	36.6%
	20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	105	24.1%
	20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	129	29.7%
	20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	42	9.7%
Nationwide	20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	389	38.3%
	20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	246	24.2%

		Count	Percent of All Responses
	20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	294	29.0%
	20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	86	8.5%

Table 16. Employment Preparation by Number of Sectors

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	20. Number of sectors for which the participant was prepared	1 Sector	216	56.5%
		2 Sectors	55	14.4%
		All 3 sectors	67	17.5%
		No sectors	44	11.5%
State Grantees	20. Number of sectors for which the participant was prepared	1 Sector	176	58.9%
		2 Sectors	38	12.7%
		All 3 sectors	43	14.4%
		No sectors	42	14.0%
Nationwide	20. Number of sectors for which the participant was prepared	1 Sector	392	57.6%
		2 Sectors	93	13.7%
		All 3 sectors	110	16.2%
		No sectors	86	12.6%

Table 1. Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Education

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Male	1540	30.9%
		Female	3449	69.1%
	Race	White	2115	45.3%
		Black	1975	42.3%
		Asian	377	8.1%
		American Indian	13	0.3%
		Pacific Islander	193	4.1%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	592	12.5%
		Not Hispanic	4137	87.5%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	845	16.9%
		HS Diploma/GED	2012	40.3%
		Some college	1101	22.0%
		BA/BS	494	9.9%
		Bachelors Plus	215	4.3%
		Vocational/Technical degree	97	1.9%
		Associate's degree	234	4.7%
State Grantees	Gender	Male	1082	29.2%
		Female	2620	70.8%
	Race	White	1801	51.1%
		Black	1529	43.4%
		Asian	96	2.7%
		American Indian	17	0.5%
		Pacific Islander	84	2.4%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	362	10.3%
		Not Hispanic	3159	89.7%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	513	13.9%
		HS Diploma/GED	1508	40.8%
		Some college	860	23.3%
		BA/BS	355	9.6%
		Bachelors Plus	169	4.6%
		Vocational/Technical degree	96	2.6%
		Associate's degree	195	5.3%
Nationwide	Gender	Male	2622	30.2%

			Count	Percent
		Female	6069	69.8%
	Race	White	3916	47.8%
		Black	3504	42.7%
		Asian	473	5.8%
		American Indian	30	0.4%
		Pacific Islander	277	3.4%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	954	11.6%
		Not Hispanic	7296	88.4%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	1358	15.6%
		HS Diploma/GED	3520	40.5%
		Some college	1961	22.6%
		BA/BS	849	9.8%
		Bachelors Plus	384	4.4%
		Vocational/Technical degree	193	2.2%
		Associate's degree	429	4.9%

Table 2. Barriers to Employment

				Count	Percent
National and State Grantees	National Grantees	Disability	Yes	1679	33.6%
			No	3321	66.4%
		LEP	Yes	751	15.0%
			No	4243	85.0%
		Low Literacy Skills	Yes	1211	24.3%
			No	3773	75.7%
		Rural	Yes	355	7.1%
			No	4645	92.9%
		Homeless or at Risk	Yes	2806	56.2%
			No	2191	43.8%
		Poor Employment Prospects	Yes	4645	92.9%
			No	355	7.1%
		Veteran	Yes	467	9.4%
			No	4516	90.6%
		Severe Disability	Yes	93	2.3%
			No	3968	97.7%
		Frail	Yes	51	1.3%
			No	4008	98.7%
			Yes	98	2.4%

				Count	Percent
		Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	3975	97.6%
		Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	Yes	930	18.6%
			No	4072	81.4%
		Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	1028	25.2%
			No	3053	74.8%
		Seventy-five Plus	Yes	343	6.9%
			No	4657	93.1%
		Formerly Incarcerated	Yes	62	3.4%
			No	1750	96.6%
	State Grantees	Disability	Yes	1203	32.5%
			No	2493	67.5%
		LEP	Yes	248	6.7%
			No	3448	93.3%
		Low Literacy Skills	Yes	889	24.1%
			No	2806	75.9%
		Rural	Yes	475	12.9%
			No	3221	87.1%
		Homeless or at Risk	Yes	1741	47.1%
			No	1953	52.9%
		Poor Employment Prospects	Yes	3221	87.2%
			No	474	12.8%
		Veteran	Yes	395	10.7%
			No	3300	89.3%
		Severe Disability	Yes	86	2.7%
			No	3119	97.3%
		Frail	Yes	43	1.3%
			No	3159	98.7%
		Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	81	2.5%
			No	3121	97.5%
		Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	Yes	629	17.0%
			No	3081	83.0%
		Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	616	19.1%
			No	2602	80.9%
		Seventy-five Plus	Yes	301	8.1%
			No	3395	91.9%
		Formerly Incarcerated	Yes	53	3.4%
			No	1499	96.6%

				Count	Percent
	Nationwide	Disability	Yes	2882	33.1%
			No	5814	66.9%
		LEP	Yes	999	11.5%
			No	7691	88.5%
		Low Literacy Skills	Yes	2100	24.2%
			No	6579	75.8%
		Rural	Yes	830	9.5%
			No	7866	90.5%
		Homeless or at Risk	Yes	4547	52.3%
			No	4144	47.7%
		Poor Employment Prospects	Yes	7866	90.5%
			No	829	9.5%
		Veteran	Yes	862	9.9%
			No	7816	90.1%
		Severe Disability	Yes	179	2.5%
			No	7087	97.5%
		Frail	Yes	94	1.3%
			No	7167	98.7%
		Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	179	2.5%
			No	7096	97.5%
		Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	Yes	1559	17.9%
			No	7153	82.1%
		Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	1644	22.5%
			No	5655	77.5%
		Seventy-five Plus	Yes	644	7.4%
			No	8052	92.6%
		Formerly Incarcerated	Yes	115	3.4%
			No	3249	96.6%

Table 3. Average Number of Barriers to Employment

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Number of Barriers	5002	2.9	0	8
State Grantees	Number of Barriers	3710	2.7	0	8
Nationwide	Number of Barriers	8712	2.8	0	8

Table 4. Age

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Less than 65	2541	50.8%
	65 or older	2457	49.2%
State Grantees	Less than 65	1744	47.3%
	65 or older	1947	52.7%
Nationwide	Less than 65	4285	49.3%
	65 or older	4404	50.7%

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 (8.5 to 9.5) will increase the ACSI by .438 standard deviations or 8.3 points on the ACSI scale.[5] Given the fact that the average score for Question 18 is 8.4, there some significant opportunity for local programs to improve preparation for the workforce and thereby significantly improve overall satisfaction.

Table 1: Driver Model Test

	Standardized Beta	t-test Value	Sig.
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	.389	42.825	<.001
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.	.294	32.140	<.001
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	.238	25.655	<.001

---

[5] The standard deviation for the nationwide ACSI is 18.8. The number of points is obtained by multiplying the Beta times the standard deviation.