

## PY 2015 Host Agency Evaluation of SCSEP

The PY 2015 nationwide host agency survey is the first revision of the original survey that was developed in 2004. Revisions were made based on the analyses of survey responses over the last decade, the evolving direction of the program, and feedback from customers and grantees.

A major focus of the revisions for the host agency survey was to increase understanding of host agencies' needs regarding the background of participants, assessment of participants' skills and knowledge, and additional detail on the importance of computer training. Seven questions were eliminated, one question was substantially modified and several were slightly modified, and two new questions were added.

For PY 2015, a nationwide random sample of 15,126 host agencies was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2015. Collection for the third and last wave of surveys was closed in March of 2016. The nationwide analyses below include results for all of the questions, with special attention given to the new and revised questions. Appendix A contains the results of individual grantee response rates and American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) scores. Appendix A also contains the results of each survey question at the nationwide, national grantee, and state grantee levels. A separate analysis is being provided for each grantee.

In the analyses below, most survey questions are presented in two tables. The first table shows the number and percent of respondents that selected each of the possible values for the question. The second table shows the degree of overall satisfaction (the ACSI score) depending on which value respondents selected. This approach identifies questions where there is an opportunity to improve overall satisfaction by improving a particular area of service or, if that is not possible, designing actions that can mitigate the harm related to that area of service. The remaining questions in Tables 3 and 9 have values of 1-10 and are presented in a single table showing the number of respondents and the average score. The relationship of these questions to overall satisfaction is presented in the driver analysis section on pages 7-9. The driver analysis has the advantage of not only assessing the individual relation of certain aspects of service to satisfaction but also comparing across those aspects of service to determine which areas of service give the biggest return on investment in terms of program improvement producing increases in overall satisfaction.

### Overall Satisfaction: The American Customer Satisfaction Index

The American Customer Satisfaction Index continues to be the standard for measuring overall satisfaction. The nationwide host agency ACSI score for PY 2015 presented in Table 1 is 81.7, nearly identical to the score of 81.5 in PY 2014. As in other years, the ACSI score compares very favorably with ACSI scores from non-profit and for-profit organizations around the country and the world where the ACSI is used. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in the Appendix A. The scores for national and state grantees are virtually identical.

Table 1. American Customer Satisfaction Index

	Count	Mean ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	9096	81.7	0	100

## Survey response rate

The random sample was stratified by grantee, making the final sample representative of host agency customers nationwide. Of the 15,126 host agencies that received a survey, 9,096 agencies returned completed surveys (i.e., surveys that had responses to at least the first three questions that make up the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), for a nationwide response rate of 60.1 percent. (See Table 2.) The response rate for national grantees host agencies (58.4%) is somewhat lower than the rate for state grantee host agencies (62.9%). (See Appendix A.) This year’s nationwide response rate of 60.1 percent, is higher than the 58.9 percent response rate in PY 2014.

Table 2. Response Rate

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Nationwide	9096	60.1%	6030	39.9%

## Treatment by Sub-Grantee

The five questions in Table 3 are similar to those asked in the previous survey. The one question that stands out as lower than the others is Question 6, receiving “sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants.” The lower score for this slightly revised question provides an area where local programs can make significant improvement. (Question 4 is also slightly revised.)

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	Q4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	8958	8.4	1	10
	Q5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	9074	8.4	1	10
	Q6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	8980	7.8	1	10
	Q10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	8733	8.4	1	10
	Q11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	9097	8.1	1	10

Question 7 in Table 4 is substantially revised and provides new detail on the issue of choice in the assignment. Giving host agencies some choice about which participants are assigned has always been considered an important aspect of service. In past surveys we asked if only if the choice was sufficient.

The scores on the revised question in Table 4 outline experiences in which the host agency has different levels of choice.

Table 4. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q7. What I can do when SCSEP staff propose a participant for our agency.	I can accept the individual offered or not.	7913	87.4%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	2587	28.6%
		I really have no choice.	505	5.6%

In order to understand the impact of different choice situations, Table 5 shows how these choice situations relate to satisfaction. The first type of choice we might call limited choice: “Take it or leave it.” You have one individual to whom you can say “yes” or “no.” Limited choice is associated with a satisfaction score that is similar to the average score, suggesting that limited choice is acceptable to most host agencies and does not relate to either higher or lower satisfaction. The second type of choice might be called full choice: The host agency can choose among several different participants. This type of choice appears to be preferred by host agencies, with a related average satisfaction score more than five points higher than the average ACSI. The third type of choice is no choice. While only a small number of host agencies experience no choice, their lack of choice is related to extremely low levels of satisfaction. The lesson for local programs is clear.

Table 5. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Can accept the individual offered or not	5973	80.9
	Have choice among several potential participants	2558	86.3
	Have no choice	376	61.1

### Detailed Analysis of Preparation

Question 9 is a new question. It explores in more detail than the question on training in the previous survey the degree to which host agencies perceive assigned participants as having the necessary training. As evident in Table 6, the most frequently noted lack of preparation is in the area of basic computer knowledge. The other three areas are mentioned with equal frequency in regard to lack of basic employability skills, knowledge of the assignment, and how to behave with host agency customers.

In Table 7 we can see that the last three training needs have associated ACSI scores that are similar and about 5 points below the nationwide average ACSI score. The ACSI score associated with needs in basic computer knowledge is only a point or so below the nationwide average ACSI score. This suggests that host agencies may attach less importance to lack of computer skills than to the other gaps in participant preparation for the community service assignment.

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

Q9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?			Count	Percent of Responses
Nationwide	Prepared for the assignment	Basic computer knowledge	4509	30.1%
		Basic employability skills	3523	23.6%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	3481	23.3%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers	3446	23.0%

Table 7. Need for Better Participant Preparation and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Basic computer knowledge	4449	78.6
	Basic employability skills	3470	75.2
	Knowledge of what the assignment required	3429	75.2
	How to behave with the host agency's customers	3387	75.6

Table 8 gives us a different view of this question. For those host agencies that reported no concern about the preparation of participants, the average ACSI was nearly 90. For those agencies with one or more concerns for training needs, the ACSI score is almost 12 points lower. This suggests the importance assigning participants who are fully prepared in all four areas.

Table 8. Existence of Preparation Issues and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	No preparation issues	2762	89.7
	One or more preparation issues	6334	78.2

Question 8 in Table 9 is unchanged from the prior version of the survey. However, the average nationwide score of 8.1 is much lower than the score in previous years of around 8.9. We do know that, in previous years, the question about the match was only slightly related to overall satisfaction (e.g., .284 in PY 2012). This year the relationship between the match question and overall satisfaction is .787 more than 2 and a half times as strong as previously), making this question the strongest independent driver of overall satisfaction in the survey. See the driver analysis section on pages 7-9. Why the relationship to the ACSI has strengthened compared to previous years while the rating on this question has declined is unclear. It may be that the more detailed questions on training preparation and choice in accepting participants raised questions in the minds of respondents that caused them to look more critically at the quality of the match. Future research may be needed to confirm or deny this hypothesis. Regardless of the reasons for the change, since the quality of the match is so central to the relationship between the program and host agencies and since it now plays such an important role in overall satisfaction, programs should pay close attention to this question.

Table 9: Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	9144	8.1	1	10

### Supportive Services

Question 12 in Table 10 shows the number of host agencies with participants that needed supportive services. Two-thirds of the host agencies indicated that the participants assigned did not need supportive services. One-quarter of host agencies reported that few participants needed supportive services, and only 10.6 percent reported that many or nearly all participants needed supportive services. Significantly, the satisfaction is higher than average (83.6) for those agencies that have no participants needing supportive services. Any experience at all with those needing supportive services was associated with a reduction in overall satisfaction. However, the difference between those host agencies with no participants needing supportive services and those with many or nearly all participants needing supportive services is only about 5-6 points. The need for supportive services, often a necessity for participants, is not a major force related to host agency satisfaction.

Table 10. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	5550	65.9%
		Few	1980	23.5%
		Many	492	5.8%
		Nearly all	401	4.8%

Table 11: Supportive Services and the ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Q12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	5479	83.6
		Few	1949	80.4
		Many	483	78.2
		Nearly all	392	78.7

### Removal from the Assignment

There are two ways that a participant can be removed from an assignment. SCSEP staff can remove someone for various reasons (e.g., to provide the participant a different opportunity to acquire additional skills or training or at the request of the participant for personal reasons), and the host agency may request the removal of a participant because the assignment is not working out. The slightly revised Question 13, in Table 12, asks if a participant was removed before the host agency thought the person was ready. Nationwide, 78 percent of host agencies never had that experience.

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	6447	78.1%
		Occasionally	1468	17.8%
		Frequently	184	2.2%
		Nearly always	151	1.8%

The ACSI scores in Table 13 show that having participants removed occasionally reduces satisfaction, but not substantially. The ACSI score for those agencies that experience the occasional removal of a participant (80.1) is only slightly lower than the average ACSI score nationwide (81.7). When the removal happens more frequently, however, the ACSI scores are nearly 8 points lower than the nationwide average.

Table 13. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	6364	83.0
		Occasionally	1443	80.1
		Frequently	179	71.7
		Nearly always	146	75.0

Question 14 in Table 14, a new question, asks if the host agency has asked to have a participant removed. This situation occurs over 40% of the time, much more frequently than the previously discussed situation where the local program takes someone out of the host agency prematurely.

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	3529	41.7%
		No	4937	58.3%

What is more important, as shown in Table 13, there is approximately 7.5-point difference in satisfaction between those that said "Yes" and those that said "No."

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

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	3475	77.4
		No	4867	85.0

The last scored question in the survey is about the impact of participation in SCSEP on the host agency's ability to provide services to the community. Over 60 percent of host agencies indicate that

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

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

		Count	Percent	
Nationwide	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	38	0.4%
		Somewhat decreased	82	1.0%
		Neither increased nor decreased	3193	37.7%
		Somewhat increased	2743	32.4%
		Increased significantly	2418	28.5%

Table 17 shows the association between SCSEP program's impact on the host agency's capacity to provide services and ACSI. For the 28.5 percent that experienced significant increase in capacity, the satisfaction is extraordinarily high (90.5 nationwide). Even those agencies only somewhat increasing capacity have satisfaction scores above the nationwide average. Host agencies that experience neither increase nor decrease and those few that experience decreases in capacity have ACSI scores considerably lower.

Table 17. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score	
Nationwide	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	37	68.7
		Somewhat decreased	81	61.5
		Neither increased nor decreased	3140	75.3
		Somewhat increased	2702	82.9
		Increased significantly	2393	90.5

### Driver Analysis

In the analyses above, questions that have a few fixed categories for responses or allow for multiple choices have been presented in association with the ACSI score to demonstrate how host agencies' differing evaluations of their experiences impact overall satisfaction. For the questions in Tables 3 and 9, which have a scale of 1-10, the driver analysis below was conducted to determine which aspects of service were most important to overall satisfaction.

The structure of the questions in the survey require different analytic approaches, in order to understand how the various issues addressed in the questions affect overall satisfaction. The difference in the analytic approaches only reflects differences in the questions' structure; the subjects the questions address are all, in their own way, of similar importance to the customer satisfaction and program quality. The analytic approaches presented above identify questions where the respondent

makes specific choices and in some instances may choose more than one value. With the exception of the question about the quality of the match, the questions in the driver analysis below are specific to service quality and ask respondents for rating on a continuous 10-point scale. In all instances, the questions provide guidance on identifying actions that can improve service or mitigate the harm related to host agencies' evaluation of the service.

Table 18 presents the results of the driver analysis. First, each of the questions regarding customer service was correlated independently to the ACSI. The results in the last column indicate the strength of the relationship (the correlation) between each question's responses and the ACSI (the closer to 1.0, the stronger the relationship), the statistical significance of the relationship (the closer to zero, the more likely the relationship would not have appeared by chance), and the number of observations in the analysis. (Only those host agencies that answered the particular question under consideration and all three ACSI questions are included in the analysis.) Then the questions were analyzed together in a regression analysis in relation to the ACSI to see which questions made a significant contribution to understanding what drives overall satisfaction over and above the contribution of any other questions.<sup>1</sup> This analysis narrowed the number of questions with a substantial, independent relationship to the ACSI to three, which are shaded in the table. Questions with a smaller correlation or less substantial independent relationship are unshaded.

Using these two different criteria, three questions are key drivers of satisfaction, those with strong correlations and significant independent contribution to the ACSI: Questions 4, 8, and 10. Two of the drivers relate to the process of assigning the participant; therefore, local programs have a significant amount of control over these drivers and their associated ratings.

Question 4 deals with the ease of the assignment process the same question has been a strong driver for many years. Question 10 shows the importance of local program staff being responsive to host agencies when they have problems. Question 8, which deals with the quality of the match is the strongest of the three drivers by far. For host agencies, this is the bottom line. With an average nationwide score of 8.1, there is some room for improvement. For every 0.5-point improvement in the quality of the match, e.g., from 7.6 to 8.1, overall satisfaction will increase by nearly 5 points on the ACSI scale. This is not an unreasonable level of improvement given the large number of grantees with scores on Question 8 from 7.1-7.6.

The unshaded Questions 6 and 11 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. Questions 6 and 11 are about communication and are strongly correlated with the ACSI although they do not make significant independent contributions as drivers. In addition, Question 6 has the lowest score of the service questions, leaving significant room for local programs to improve service in this area. These two questions are also closely related to the shaded questions regarding providing making the assignment process easy and solving problems after the assignment is made. Put another way, sub-grantees that make the process easy, make a good match for the host agency, and are helpful in resolving problems will do so by staying in touch and providing enough information on the background of the participants.

---

<sup>1</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 18. Driver Analysis

		Relation to ACSI
Q4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	Pearson Correlation	.694**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8845
Q5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	Pearson Correlation	.704**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8943
Q6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.625**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8848
Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.787**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9017
Q10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	Pearson Correlation	.648**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8614
Q11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	Pearson Correlation	.592**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8963

### Summary and Recommendations

The driver analysis tells us that, among the questions in that analysis, making a good match has the strongest influence on overall satisfaction: A .5-point change in the match question yields almost 5 points of change in satisfaction. The fact that scores have gone down from previous years on this question and on the value of SCSEP to host agencies suggests two things: Host agencies may have higher expectations than in the past; and historical data indicate that with increased attention to this issue, local programs could meet or even exceed host agencies' expectations.

Another message from the driver analysis is to maintain two aspects of service that have always been important: Keep the initial assignment process easy and be helpful in resolving problems once the participant has been assigned. The survey confirms these aspects of service as important to host agencies. The new question about host agencies having a choice in the assignment adds to our understanding of how host agencies wish to be treated.

The new question on participant preparation yields some important guidance for grantees and sub-grantees. Training has been identified in previous surveys as important but without the detail that could point to specific improvements. Host agencies have now identified a need for better preparation of participants in several areas: employability skills, knowledge of the assignment, and how to behave with host agency customers. Each of these areas of preparation can have a modest effect on satisfaction.

These needed improvements also identify specific areas that could support attaining a better match, thereby strengthening host agency satisfaction and the relationship between the local programs and their host agencies.

Other analyses regarding preparation underline the importance of preparation as part of the match. Host agencies that report no need for better preparation in any area have extraordinarily high overall satisfaction (ACSI scores of 90+) compared to those that identify even one area where preparation needs improvement. The questions regarding removal from the host agency, either at the request of the agency or at the initiative of the local program, help reinforce the importance of a good match.

## Appendix A Complete Survey Tables

Table 1. ASCI

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	800	80.3	0	100
ANPPM	153	86.7	29	100
ATD	126	78.5	0	100
Easter Seals	272	80.8	4	100
Experience Works	1308	81.4	0	100
Goodwill	233	76.5	0	100
Mature Services	166	83.7	12	100
National ABLE	146	79.7	12	100
NAPCA[S]	134	83.5	0	100
NAPCA[G]	65	85.8	38	100
NCBA	332	84.4	0	100
NCOA	383	83.5	4	100
NICOA[S]	195	84.7	0	100
NULI	191	79.8	27	100
SER	286	81.0	11	100
SSAI	666	82.4	0	100
National Grantees	5456	81.7	0	100
Alabama	98	89.2	46	100
Alaska	74	80.2	4	100
Arizona	51	81.6	19	100
Arkansas	67	81.3	0	100
California	168	83.7	22	100
Colorado	30	77.4	15	100
Connecticut	38	83.3	49	100
Delaware	58	82.4	39	100
District of Columbia	7	79.1	51	97
Florida	154	76.3	11	100
Georgia	108	81.6	16	100
Hawaii	68	81.6	0	100
Idaho	23	80.6	38	100
Illinois	74	78.0	25	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Indiana	105	81.1	30	100
Iowa	46	70.8	11	100
Kansas	43	77.5	15	100
Kentucky	96	84.0	11	100
Louisiana	100	83.1	0	100
Maine	28	73.1	0	100
Maryland	59	78.3	0	100
Massachusetts	69	80.2	14	100
Michigan	102	82.7	0	100
Minnesota	126	79.4	0	100
Mississippi	55	90.7	8	100
Missouri	92	81.0	7	100
Montana	27	76.4	15	100
Nebraska	27	72.6	8	100
Nevada	17	79.3	0	100
New Hampshire	27	72.0	11	100
New Jersey	79	79.1	0	100
New Mexico	23	85.3	25	100
New York	121	85.8	30	100
North Carolina	115	84.1	26	100
North Dakota	19	84.3	56	100
Ohio	141	80.3	19	100
Oklahoma	75	81.8	7	100
Oregon	49	74.1	16	100
Pennsylvania	180	80.6	0	100
Puerto Rico	14	92.0	70	100
Rhode Island	12	81.6	26	100
South Carolina	42	82.8	44	100
South Dakota	30	82.7	39	100
Tennessee	102	86.7	14	100
Texas	202	82.8	0	100
Utah	27	83.9	41	100
Vermont	24	71.8	11	100
Virginia	84	84.4	43	100
Washington	34	80.7	40	100
West Virginia	40	86.9	33	100
Wisconsin	110	83.5	31	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Wyoming	23	86.3	67	100
State Grantees	3583	81.6	0	100
Nationwide	9096	81.7	0	100

Table 2: Response Rate by Grantee

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	800	56.8%	608	43.2%
ANPPM	153	50.5%	150	49.5%
ATD	126	55.8%	100	44.2%
Easter Seals	272	53.1%	240	46.9%
Experience Works	1308	62.4%	789	37.6%
Goodwill	233	58.5%	165	41.5%
Mature Services	166	66.9%	82	33.1%
National ABLE	146	62.4%	88	37.6%
NAPCA[S]	134	53.2%	118	46.8%
NAPCA[G]	65	57.5%	48	42.5%
NCBA	332	61.3%	210	38.7%
NCOA	383	53.9%	328	46.1%
NICOA[S]	195	55.2%	158	44.8%
NULI	191	54.4%	160	45.6%
SER	286	55.1%	233	44.9%
SSAI	666	62.2%	405	37.8%
National Grantees	5456	58.4%	3882	41.6%
Alabama	98	75.4%	32	24.6%
Alaska	74	70.5%	31	29.5%
Arizona	51	61.4%	32	38.6%
Arkansas	67	61.5%	42	38.5%
California	168	53.3%	147	46.7%
Colorado	30	57.7%	22	42.3%
Connecticut	38	62.3%	23	37.7%
Delaware	58	76.3%	18	23.7%
District of Columbia	7	31.8%	15	68.2%
Florida	154	52.0%	142	48.0%
Georgia	108	63.9%	61	36.1%

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Hawaii	68	76.4%	21	23.6%
Idaho	23	56.1%	18	43.9%
Illinois	74	56.9%	56	43.1%
Indiana	105	55.0%	86	45.0%
Iowa	46	56.1%	36	43.9%
Kansas	43	72.9%	16	27.1%
Kentucky	96	75.0%	32	25.0%
Louisiana	100	75.2%	33	24.8%
Maine	28	57.1%	21	42.9%
Maryland	59	64.8%	32	35.2%
Massachusetts	69	57.5%	51	42.5%
Michigan	102	68.0%	48	32.0%
Minnesota	126	68.1%	59	31.9%
Mississippi	55	69.6%	24	30.4%
Missouri	92	55.4%	74	44.6%
Montana	27	71.1%	11	28.9%
Nebraska	27	56.3%	21	43.8%
Nevada	17	50.0%	17	50.0%
New Hampshire	27	67.5%	13	32.5%
New Jersey	79	66.9%	39	33.1%
New Mexico	23	54.8%	19	45.2%
New York	121	61.1%	77	38.9%
North Carolina	115	72.8%	43	27.2%
North Dakota	19	63.3%	11	36.7%
Ohio	141	65.9%	73	34.1%
Oklahoma	75	71.4%	30	28.6%
Oregon	49	55.7%	39	44.3%
Pennsylvania	180	59.0%	125	41.0%
Puerto Rico	14	40.0%	21	60.0%
Rhode Island	12	60.0%	8	40.0%
South Carolina	42	53.8%	36	46.2%
South Dakota	30	55.6%	24	44.4%
Tennessee	102	70.8%	42	29.2%
Texas	202	58.2%	145	41.8%
Utah	27	71.1%	11	28.9%
Vermont	24	68.6%	11	31.4%

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Virginia	84	68.3%	39	31.7%
Washington	34	61.8%	21	38.2%
West Virginia	40	74.1%	14	25.9%
Wisconsin	110	74.3%	38	25.7%
Wyoming	23	63.9%	13	36.1%
State Grantees	3583	62.9%	2113	37.1%
Nationwide	9096	60.1%	5995	39.9%

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Q4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	5378	8.4	1	10
	Q5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	5443	8.3	1	10
	Q6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	5376	7.7	1	10
	Q10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	5227	8.4	1	10
	Q11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	5450	8.1	1	10
State Grantees	Q4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	3580	8.4	1	10
	Q5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	3631	8.4	1	10
	Q6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	3604	7.8	1	10
	Q10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	3506	8.4	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	Q11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	3647	8.1	1	10
Nationwide	Q4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	8958	8.4	1	10
	Q5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	9074	8.4	1	10
	Q6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	8980	7.8	1	10
	Q10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff are helpful in resolving any problems we have.	8733	8.4	1	10
	Q11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	9097	8.1	1	10

Table 4. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q7. What I can do when SCSEP staff propose a participant for our agency.	I can accept the individual offered or not.	4716	87.0%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	1587	29.3%
		I really have no choice.	293	5.4%
State Grantees	Q7. What I can do when SCSEP staff propose a participant for our agency.	I can accept the individual offered or not.	3197	88.0%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	1000	27.5%
		I really have no choice.	212	5.8%
Nationwide	Q7. What I can do when SCSEP staff propose a participant for our agency.	I can accept the individual offered or not.	7913	87.4%
		I have a choice among several potential participants.	2587	28.6%
		I really have no choice.	505	5.6%

Table 5. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Can accept the individual offered or not	3557	80.8
	Have choice among several potential participants	1569	86.1
	Have no choice	219	60.8
State Grantees	Can accept the individual offered or not	2416	81.0
	Have choice among several potential participants	989	86.6
	Have no choice	157	61.4
Nationwide	Can accept the individual offered or not	5973	80.9
	Have choice among several potential participants	2558	86.3
	Have no choice	376	61.1

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

Q9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?			Count	Percent of Responses
National Grantees	Prepared for the assignment	Basic computer knowledge	2703	29.5%
		Basic employability skills	2178	23.7%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	2157	23.5%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers	2139	23.3%
State Grantees	Prepared for the assignment	Basic computer knowledge	1806	31.2%
		Basic employability skills	1345	23.3%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	1324	22.9%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers	1307	22.6%
Nationwide	Prepared for the assignment	Basic computer knowledge	4509	30.1%
		Basic employability skills	3523	23.6%
		Knowledge of what the assignment required	3481	23.3%
		How to behave with the host agency's customers	3446	23.0%

Table 7. Need for Better Participant Preparation and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Basic computer knowledge	2674	79.0
	Basic employability skills	2153	75.8
	Knowledge of what the assignment required	2130	75.9
	How to behave with the host agency's customers	2110	76.1

		Count	ACSI Score
State Grantees	Basic computer knowledge	1775	78.2
	Basic employability skills	1317	74.3
	Knowledge of what the assignment required	1299	73.9
	How to behave with the host agency's customers	1277	74.6
Nationwide	Basic computer knowledge	4449	78.6
	Basic employability skills	3470	75.2
	Knowledge of what the assignment required	3429	75.2
	How to behave with the host agency's customers	3387	75.6

Table 8. Existence of Preparation Issues and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	No preparation issues	1615	89.4
	One or more preparation issues	3841	78.5
State Grantees	No preparation issues	1147	90.1
	One or more preparation issues	2493	77.8
Nationwide	No preparation issues	2762	89.7
	One or more preparation issues	6334	78.2

Table 9: Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	5477	8.1	1	10
State Grantees	Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	3667	8.0	1	10
Nationwide	Q8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	9144	8.1	1	10

Table 10. Need for Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	65.8%
		Few	23.9%
		Many	5.7%
		Nearly all	4.6%

			Count	Percent
State Grantees	Q12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	2236	66.0%
		Few	778	23.0%
		Many	204	6.0%
		Nearly all	171	5.0%
Nationwide	Q12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	5550	65.9%
		Few	1980	23.5%
		Many	492	5.8%
		Nearly all	401	4.8%

Table 11: Supportive Services and the ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Q12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	3281	83.9
		Few	1182	80.2
		Many	281	77.7
		Nearly all	226	77.1
State Grantees	Q12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	2198	83.1
		Few	767	80.6
		Many	202	78.8
		Nearly all	166	80.9
Nationwide	Q12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	5479	83.6
		Few	1949	80.4
		Many	483	78.2
		Nearly all	392	78.7

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3727	75.5%
		Occasionally	961	19.5%
		Frequently	135	2.7%
		Nearly always	111	2.2%
State Grantees	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2720	82.0%
		Occasionally	507	15.3%
		Frequently	49	1.5%
		Nearly always	40	1.2%

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	6447	78.1%
		Occasionally	1468	17.8%
		Frequently	184	2.2%
		Nearly always	151	1.8%

Table 13. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3685	83.1
		Occasionally	948	79.9
		Frequently	132	71.6
		Nearly always	108	74.9
State Grantees	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2679	82.8
		Occasionally	495	80.4
		Frequently	47	71.9
		Nearly always	38	75.3
Nationwide	Q13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	6364	83.0
		Occasionally	1443	80.1
		Frequently	179	71.7
		Nearly always	146	75.0

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	2178	42.8%
		No	2913	57.2%
State Grantees	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1351	40.0%
		No	2024	60.0%
Nationwide	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	3529	41.7%
		No	4937	58.3%

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

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	2149	77.5
		No	2875	85.0
State Grantees	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1326	77.2
		No	1992	85.1
Nationwide	Q14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	3475	77.4
		No	4867	85.0

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	27	0.5%
		Somewhat decreased	49	1.0%
		Neither increased nor decreased	1871	36.9%
		Somewhat increased	1626	32.1%
		Increased significantly	1493	29.5%
State Grantees	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	11	0.3%
		Somewhat decreased	33	1.0%
		Neither increased nor decreased	1322	38.8%
		Somewhat increased	1117	32.8%
		Increased significantly	925	27.1%
Nationwide	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	38	0.4%
		Somewhat decreased	82	1.0%
		Neither increased nor decreased	3193	37.7%
		Somewhat increased	2743	32.4%
		Increased significantly	2418	28.5%

Table 17: Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	26	73.5
		Somewhat decreased	48	59.5
		Neither increased nor decreased	1847	75.3
		Somewhat increased	1601	82.4
		Increased significantly	1480	90.4

State Grantees	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	11	57.2
		Somewhat decreased	33	64.4
		Neither increased nor decreased	1293	75.2
		Somewhat increased	1101	83.5
		Increased significantly	913	90.6
Nationwide	Q15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of services your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	37	68.7
		Somewhat decreased	81	61.5
		Neither increased nor decreased	3140	75.3
		Somewhat increased	2702	82.9
		Increased significantly	2393	90.5