

## **PY 2019 Nationwide Participant Evaluation of SCSEP June 15, 2020**

### **Overview**

The PY 2019 nationwide participant survey is the fourth administration of the revised participant survey originally developed in 2004. Revisions were made in PY 2015 based on the analyses of survey responses over the prior decade, the evolving direction of the program, and feedback from customers and grantees.

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

For the PY 2019 survey, a nationwide random sample of 19,012 participants was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2019. The third and last wave of data collection was closed in March 2020. Except where indicated, the nationwide analyses below include results for all survey questions. Appendix A contains the results of each survey question at the state grantee, national grantee, and nationwide levels. An analysis of individual grantee performance is provided for each grantee in separate reports.

### **Overall Satisfaction: The American Customer Satisfaction Index**

The American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) continues to be the standard for measuring overall satisfaction. The nationwide participant ACSI score for PY 2019 is 82.6, not statistically significantly higher than the 82.4 score in PY 2018. As in other years, the average ACSI score compares very favorably with ACSI scores from non-profit, for-profit, and government organizations around the country and the world where the ACSI is used. For PY 2019, of the 19,012 surveys mailed, 9693 participants returned surveys with valid responses to the first three questions that make up the ACSI; only these participants are included in the response rate. This year's response rate, 50.4 percent, is nearly 3 points lower than the PY 2018 rate of 53.2%. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in the Appendix A.

### **Who Answered the Survey?**

The survey sample was and has always been generally representative of the SCSEP population nationwide. It is a stratified, random sample of all eligible participants, defined as any individuals who received service at any time within the twelve months prior to the drawing of the survey sample in September 2019. An individual is considered a respondent if the individual answered the three questions that constitute the ACSI.

Most characteristics of the respondents, including racial categories and education, are similar to the SCSEP population as a whole. Although the respondents have some differences from the SCSEP population as a whole for gender, Asian, Hispanic, age, and a few barriers to employment (primarily disability, low literacy skills, homeless or at risk for homelessness, and severely limited employment

prospects), those differences have no impact on the representativeness of the survey responses.<sup>1</sup> 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 64.5
- 69.2 percent are female and 30.8 percent male
- 61.5 percent have a high school diploma or less; the remaining 38.5 percent have some post-secondary education, degree or certificate
- About 51 percent are racial minorities, and 8.9 percent are Hispanic.

To fill out the picture of SCSEP respondents, 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, and being 75 or older . On average, participants in the sample have 2.76 barriers each, the same average number of barriers reported in the PY 2018 survey.

The other defining characteristic of the respondents is their program status at the time they took the survey:

- 11.2 percent of the sample exited for regular employment
- 0.5 percent of the sample exited for self-employment
- 20.1 percent of the sample exited for reasons other than employment
- 68.3 percent of the sample were still in the program

The percent of the sample that was still in the program is a little higher the percent in PY 2018.

### **Participants' Expectations for the Program**

Question 4 was new to the survey in PY 2015. It asks participants to indicate the primary reason(s) they enrolled in the program. Respondents could choose as many reasons as they deemed appropriate; therefore, the total number of answers is substantially higher than the number of survey respondents. The responses to the eight options in Table 1 indicate a wide range of reasons for enrolling in the program. The participants, on average, endorsed about 3.5 reasons, similar to PY 2018. The most frequently endorsed reason was increasing their income, followed by feeling more useful and independent and obtaining a part-time job. It is notable that the lowest percentage is for full-time work. This is consistent with data from SPARQ that show participants who exited and had unsubsidized employment were working an average of 29 hours per week. The results this year are nearly identical to those from last year.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

Table 1. Reasons for Enrollment

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:	Count	Percent of All Responses
4.1 Obtain a full-time job after completing the program.	2850	8.3%
4.2 Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	5692	16.6%
4.3 Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	3754	10.9%
4.4 Provide service to my community	4331	12.6%
4.5 Meet new people	4090	11.9%
4.6 Increase my income	6852	20.0%
4.7 Feel more useful and independent	6008	17.5%
4.8 Other	713	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, staff helped participants understand how the program worked, understood participants' needs and interests, and provided participants someone to talk to.<sup>2</sup> These scores are similar to those in previous years and reconfirm the care and concern with which staff work with the participants.

Table 2. Treatment of Participants

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
5. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	10,281	8.8	1	10
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	10,212	8.7	1	10
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	10,016	8.4	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 aspect of the host agency assignment. The highest rating (8.8) is for Question 13, how comfortable participants feel at the host agency assignment. The lowest rating (7.7) is for Question 11 (a new question in PY 2015), whether participants have a say in the types of skills they would gain at the host agency. The rating for receiving training to be successful in the host agency assignment, Question 10, is 8.3, mid-way between the other two ratings. The scores are identical to those from last year.

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

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise noted, questions are scored on a 1-10 scale.

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

Table 3. Host Agency Experience

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	9627	8.3	1	10
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	9768	7.7	1	10
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	10065	8.8	1	10

### Participant Outcomes

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

The most direct outcomes within the program are associated with one of the two principal purposes of the program: preparing participants for employment. Question 20 in Table 4 was a new question in PY 2015. It asks if participants felt that SCSEP prepared them for employment in different industry sectors. The data are reported only if the participant had employment after exiting. There were 1128 respondents who exited for employment, including 45 exiting for self-employment. The analysis in Table 4 is limited to those exiters.<sup>3</sup> 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 responses chose a particular employment sector? The answers in Table 4 are in the two columns to the right of each sector. Nationwide, the most frequently endorsed sector was nonprofit organizations (40%), 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 23.4 percent for government and 28.1 percent for the for-profit sector. The difference of 11.9 points between preparation for the nonprofit and for-profit sectors is 1.6 points lower than the difference in PY 2018, but still quite substantial.

130 respondents indicated they were not prepared for employment in any organization or business. This number equates to 8.5% of all responses and 13.5% of all respondents reporting this lack of preparation. The perception of not being prepared for any employment, in conjunction with the low score on Question 11 above (participants having a say in the types of skills they would gain), indicates that grantees and participants would benefit greatly if grantees paid more attention to participants' perception of whether they are receiving the preparation for employment they need.

<sup>3</sup> Although only those who exited with employment were included in the findings in Table 4, the findings were not substantially different when we analyzed all respondents who answered this question, including those who did not exit or did not have employment upon exiting.

Table 4. Prepared for Employment

20. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program prepared you for employment in these organizations?	Count	Percent of All Responses
I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	614	40.0%
I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	359	23.4%
I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	431	28.1%
I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	130	8.5%

A second way of looking at Question 20 is shown in Table 4a. This variable, constructed from the Question 20 data, shows for how many sectors (if any) participant felt they were prepared. Of 965 who responded to this question, 212 participants saw themselves prepared in all three sectors, 107 saw themselves prepared in two of the three sectors, and 516 saw themselves prepared for one sector, most often the nonprofit sector. These responses are similar to those in PY 2018

Table 4a: Prepared for Employment

Number of Sectors	Count	Percent of Respondents
1 sector	516	53.5%
2 sectors	107	11.1
All 3 sectors	212	22.0%
No sectors	130	13.5%
Total	965	100%

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. As evident in the table, the score for helping prepare participants for success is significantly lower than the ratings regarding the program’s and host agency’s treatment of participants (Questions 5, 6, 9, and 13). The lower score adds to the evidence that employment preparation needs work. The importance of this score is further evident in the Driver Analysis later in this report, where the analysis shows this question to be one of the strongest drivers of satisfaction in the survey. The score (8.1) is the same as PY 2018.

Table 5. Preparation for Success in Workforce

18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	9947	8.1	1	10

Two health outcomes continue to be collected in this revised survey. Table 6 shows the responses to Question 14. 31.8 percent indicate they are in better physical health, and 59.1% indicate their health is about the same. Only 9.1 percent indicate that their health declined in the course of participation. These results are very similar to those in PY 2018.

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	3186	31.8%
	Worse	916	9.1%
	About the same	5918	59.1%

The second health question asks about mental health. As in previous years, the program produces strong, positive results as shown in Table 7. Nearly 74 percent indicated that they were either “a little more” or “much more positive” in their outlook on life as a result of participating in the program. This is about the same as in the three prior surveys. These findings match the substantial number of respondents who indicated in Question 4 that one of their reasons for enrollment was to “feel more useful and independent.”

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	243	2.4%
	A little more negative	456	4.5%
	About the same	1979	19.5%
	A little more positive	2686	26.4%
	Much more positive	4800	47.2%

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

Table 8. SCSEP Wages

		Count	Percent
16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	439	4.3%
	2	155	1.5%
	3	194	1.9%
	4	252	2.5%
	5	491	4.8%
	6	425	4.2%
	7	580	5.7%
	8	956	9.4%
	9	1113	11.0%
	10 Strongly agree	5549	54.6%

An ongoing concern is the impact that pressuring participants to leave a host agency assignment before they felt they were ready can have on those individuals. Table 9 shows that very few participants feel that they have had such pressure. This result is the same as in PY 2018. It is important that the percent pressured remains as small as possible since the experience of being pressured lowers overall satisfaction by more than 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	659	6.5%
	No	6447	63.8%
	Doesn't apply	3001	29.7%

### Detailed Analysis of Computer Training

Past surveys had asked about computer training but not with the level of detail necessary for providing guidance to the grantees. Table 10 shows not only whether participants received computer training but also whether the training was appropriately targeted to the participants' needs. As was true in PY 2017 and PY 2018, a third (33.8%) of the participants received the computer training they needed. More than a quarter (27.7%) 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. However, 20.9 percent needed computer training and received little or none, and another 11.4 percent received computer training that did not meet their needs. Overall, the targeting of training was not substantially improved from the surveys of the three prior years.

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

Table 10. Computer Training

12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	Count	Percent
I received the computer training I needed	3279	33.8%
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1101	11.4%
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2023	20.9%
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	604	6.2%
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	2691	27.7%

## Supportive Services

In addition to providing training, grantees are required to assess whether participants need supportive services in order to successfully participate in SCSEP and, if so, to see that services are provided. In Table 11, Question 7 asks if supportive services were provided when needed. Of 10,176 participants who responded to the question, 3056 (30.%) indicated they did not need any supportive services. Of the 7,120 who did indicate a need for supportive services, one-third disagreed or were neutral (score of 1-5 out of 10) that the assistance met their needs. Two-thirds rated the assistance as positive (6-10 out of 10). The percentage indicating a positive rating was significantly lower than in PY 2018, when three-quarters of the ratings were positive. With the average score being only 6.7 on the 1-10 scale, there is substantial room for improvement in the provision of supportive services.

Table 11. Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	1110	10.9%
	2	257	2.5%
	3	318	3.1%
	4	302	3.0%
	5	423	4.2%
	6	444	4.4%
	7	448	4.4%
	8	722	7.1%
	9	788	7.7%
	10 Strongly agree	2308	22.7%
	Did not need support	3056	30.0%

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 11 percent of participants experienced inconvenience based on the location of their assignment. This is the same as in PY 2018 and PY 2017.

Table 12. Geographic Convenience

8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?			Count	Percent
	Yes		8269	89.2%
No		1006	10.8%	
Total		9275	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 7.2 is the lowest rating for any question in the survey scored on a 10-point scale, a

decrease of 0.1 points from PY 2018. Given the importance of the local program’s role in helping participants find employment, there is much room for improvement.

Table 13. Help in Finding Employment

19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	2928	7.2	1	10

## Variables Associated with the ACSI

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

### A. Driver Analysis

Table 14 presents the results for the first type of analysis. The results are derived from all responses to the survey conducted in PY 2019 that answered the specific question at issue and all three of the questions that constitute the ACSI. Different regression models were tested to determine the smallest number of questions that explains the ACSI. The questions that together account for the most variation in the ACSI are shaded in Table 14 (Questions 6, 9, and 18). These are the same drivers identified in PY 2018. For details on the driver analysis methodology, see Appendix C.

Questions 6, dealing with participants’ treatment by the sub-grantee (understanding their interests and needs), is highly correlated with the ACSI and has a strong, unique influence on the ACSI. The large size of its correlation and its unique contribution to explaining the ACSI suggest that any change in this score is likely to have a direct and independent change on overall satisfaction. Question 6 has been a driver in previous years but was usually accompanied by Question 5. For this year and the last two prior years, however, Question 5 retains a strong relationship with the ACSI, but it does not make a substantial, unique contribution to the ACSI over and above other variables.

Question 6 is an area of strength for the program. The score for Question 6 is 8.7, among the highest scores for any questions. In fact, it is two tenths of a point higher than the PY 2018 score. This suggests grantees have continued to attend to how participants are treated and helps to ensure high levels of satisfaction .

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

The third question in the driver model, Question 18, asks about how helpful the program was in preparing participants for success in the workforce. Respondents rated preparation at 8.1, slightly higher than in the prior three years. Nonetheless, this rating is lower than many other scores in the survey and leaves significant room for improvement. For example, a one-unit increase in preparing participants for success (8.1 to 9.1) will increase the ACSI by .431 standard deviations, or 9.8 points on the ACSI scale.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, this question is the single, strongest driver of satisfaction as explained below and in Appendix C.

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

- Some questions not in the chosen model may have high correlations and moderate participant ratings (they are unshaded in Table 14 because they are not independent of the influence exerted by the shaded questions), suggesting room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers services.
- Other questions may have a lower correlation with the ACSI but lower than usual participant ratings, 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	.688*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9557
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9495
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.707**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9318
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.701**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8962
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.680**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9128

<sup>4</sup> The standard deviation for the nationwide ACSI is 22.73. The number of points is obtained by multiplying the Beta times the standard deviation.

		Relation to ACSI
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.679**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9393
16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	Pearson Correlation	.438**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9467
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Pearson Correlation	.786**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9265
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Pearson Correlation	.632**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	2671

As stated above, Question 18, preparing for success in the workforce, has the greatest potential in relation to satisfaction and fulfilling the purpose of the program. For every one unit of change (e.g., from 8.1 to 9.1) in the answer to Question 18, the ACSI score increases by 9.8 points. Anything to improve the program in this area will yield substantial rewards to the program, as well as to its participants.

While Question 19 is not an independent driver, it has significant implications for participants' perception of program quality. The score for Question 19 is quite low (7.2 on a scale of 1-10), and the relation to the ACSI is very strong, over .63. Since there is so much room for improvement, helping participants find employment can be a significant path to improving program effectiveness.

Question 11 also has a strong relationship with the ACSI although it, too, is not an independent driver. It has significant implications for program management. Having a say in the skills gained is associated with the appropriate targeting of computer training (Question 12) and having participants feel prepared for employment (Question 20). Giving participants a say is probably the best way to identify training that will build necessary skills.

Question 11 is also closely related to overall satisfaction as seen in Table 15. There is a 48-point difference in the ACSI score for those who felt they had the most say and those who felt they had the least say. Preparing participants for the workforce involves giving them the right skills, and the results for Question 11 suggest that providing the right skills should involve giving participants a say in identifying those skills most likely to prepare them for the workforce.

Table 15. Having a Say in Training and the ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	1 Strongly disagree	638	46.6
	2	213	48.9
	3	253	56.3
	4	232	65.0
	5	537	70.0
	6	450	74.1
	7	640	79.4
	8	1087	83.3
	9	1370	88.4
	10 Strongly agree	3708	94.7

B. Other Questions Associated with the ACSI

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

Obtaining supportive services can have an impact on the ACSI, but only for those that needed those services. Because only 70 percent of the respondents indicated they needed supportive services, that feature of service was not entered into the driver model but is analyzed separately here. Table 16 shows the number of individuals who gave each rating on the scale of 1 = Strongly disagree to 10 = Strongly agree. As the table shows, the average ACSI score associated with each rating on the scale strongly rises as the level of agreement increases. Participants who strongly agreed that they had received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of over 95, while those who strongly disagreed that they received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of 55. This difference of 40 points in scores highlights the critical importance of providing supportive services for those who need them.

Table 16. Supportive Services and ACSI

7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Count	ACSI Score
1 Strongly disagree	988	55.4
2	240	60.1
3	302	61.1
4	288	67.7
5	404	75.6
6	425	80.7
7	431	81.5
8	672	86.0
9	728	89.1
10 Strongly agree	2125	95.7
Did not need support	2850	86.8

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

Table 17. Computer Training and ACSI

12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	Count	ACSI Score
I received the computer training I needed	3092	89.7
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1020	75.3
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1851	71.5
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	557	83.2
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2512	84.3
Total	9032	82.4

For the thirty-four percent of respondents (3,092) who needed computer training and got what they needed, the ACSI is extremely high, 89.7. However, participants who did not receive the training that met their needs, or needed training but little was offered, have satisfaction scores 14-18 points lower. In addition, those who did not need training but got it anyway have an ACSI score nearly identical to the nationwide average. These findings suggest that grantees should ensure that relevant computer training is provided and at least meets participants' needs even if the training exceeds the participants' actual needs.

Question 20, about preparation for different sectors of employment, also provides important guidance for local programs. Table 18 shows the average ACSI score for those who endorsed that they felt

prepared in 1, 2, 3 or no sectors. 909 respondents answered the sector question 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 28.3 to 33.4 points. In Table 18, the message is very clear: What matters is the quality of the preparation in general and not its relevance for any particular employment sector.

Table 18. Preparation for Employment and ACSI

Number of sectors for which the participant was prepared		Number of Respondents	ACSI Score
	1 Sector	479	89.2
	2 Sectors	105	87.1
	3 Sectors	203	92.2
	No Sectors	122	58.8

### Summary and Recommendations

This survey of participants provides important guidance for grantees. The first finding of value is that understanding participants' expectations for the program may help programs do a better job of serving their participants. The respondents tell us (Question 4) that full-time employment is not the primary goal of most participants. Beyond that, participants have a mix of motivations, and it will serve local programs 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 be 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 8.1, there is room for substantial improvement, and every point of improvement will yield significant increases in satisfaction. Staff help in finding employment (Question 19) is also an important part of preparing the path to employment, and the average score of 7.2, among the lowest of the survey questions, indicates that local programs need to do more in this area, whether it be for part-time or full-time employment. The score is slightly lower than in PY 2017 and PY 2018. The lack of improvement in this area reinforces the urgency of encouraging local programs to pay more attention to helping participants obtain employment that meets their needs, often part-time rather than full-time.

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.
- Local programs also need to work with host agencies to ensure participants have a voice in the skills they acquire while at their assignments.

- Computer training is an area where local programs need to do a better job of identifying those who need training and the type of computer training that is most relevant for the individual participant.
- Supportive services are not necessary for everyone (thirty percent did not need them), but for those who need supportive services, the failure to provide services significantly lowers overall satisfaction and reduces participant's chances for success in the program and in unsubsidized employment.

## Appendix A Complete Survey Tables

Table 1. Response Rate by Grantee

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	364	36.7%	628	63.3%
ANPPM	199	53.9%	170	46.1%
ATD	210	56.6%	161	43.4%
Easter Seals	318	50.0%	318	50.0%
Experience Works	225	52.7%	202	47.3%
Goodwill	343	53.8%	295	46.2%
IID [S]	149	55.4%	120	44.6%
NAPCA[S]	297	64.1%	166	35.9%
NAPCA[G]	206	55.5%	165	44.5%
National Able Network	211	56.1%	165	43.9%
NCBA	306	47.4%	339	52.6%
NCOA	392	46.3%	455	53.7%
NICOA[S]	199	53.6%	172	46.4%
NOWCC	89	39.4%	137	60.6%
NUL	213	50.2%	211	49.8%
OAGB	171	45.8%	202	54.2%
SER	201	47.3%	224	52.7%
SSAI	482	52.6%	435	47.4%
The WorkPlace	186	49.7%	188	50.3%
VANTAGE	207	55.1%	169	44.9%
National Grantees	4968	50.2%	4922	49.8%
Alabama	119	52.0%	110	48.0%
Alaska	91	44.4%	114	55.6%
Arizona	62	53.9%	53	46.1%
Arkansas	106	54.9%	87	45.1%
California	192	51.6%	180	48.4%
Colorado	37	41.1%	53	58.9%
Connecticut	46	50.0%	46	50.0%
Delaware	111	46.6%	127	53.4%
DC	22	56.4%	17	43.6%
Florida	153	41.1%	219	58.9%
Georgia	157	55.3%	127	44.7%
Hawaii	96	55.8%	76	44.2%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Idaho	24	43.6%	31	56.4%
Illinois	182	51.6%	171	48.4%
Indiana	133	47.2%	149	52.8%
Iowa	61	41.8%	85	58.2%
Kansas	56	47.9%	61	52.1%
Kentucky	109	58.3%	78	41.7%
Louisiana	97	49.2%	100	50.8%
Maryland	58	45.7%	69	54.3%
Massachusetts	77	45.6%	92	54.4%
Michigan	182	58.7%	128	41.3%
Minnesota	128	51.8%	119	48.2%
Mississippi	70	51.9%	65	48.1%
Missouri	156	52.9%	139	47.1%
Montana	31	53.4%	27	46.6%
Nebraska	44	51.8%	41	48.2%
Nevada	37	45.1%	45	54.9%
New Hampshire	29	44.6%	36	55.4%
New Jersey	149	47.8%	163	52.2%
New Mexico	28	56.0%	22	44.0%
New York	227	60.9%	146	39.1%
North Carolina	153	49.0%	159	51.0%
North Dakota	33	48.5%	35	51.5%
Ohio	188	50.1%	187	49.9%
Oklahoma	81	53.3%	71	46.7%
Oregon	56	44.4%	70	55.6%
Pennsylvania	152	41.1%	218	58.9%
Rhode Island	13	46.4%	15	53.6%
South Carolina	97	45.5%	116	54.5%
South Dakota	32	59.3%	22	40.7%
Tennessee	141	53.8%	121	46.2%
Texas	198	52.8%	177	47.2%
Utah	31	34.1%	60	65.9%
Vermont	19	40.4%	28	59.6%
Virginia	144	60.0%	96	40.0%
Washington	69	49.3%	71	50.7%
West Virginia	50	46.3%	58	53.7%
Wisconsin	169	59.3%	116	40.7%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Wyoming	29	43.3%	38	56.7%
State Grantees	4725	50.5%	4634	49.5%
Nationwide	9693	50.4%	9556	49.6%

Table 2. ACSI by Grantee

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	364	83.2	0	100
ANPPM	199	88.3	0	100
ATD	210	73.2	0	100
Easter Seals	318	83.5	0	100
Experience Works	225	74.9	0	100
Goodwill	343	82.1	0	100
IID [S]	149	90.7	15	100
NAPCA[S]	297	86.3	0	100
NAPCA[G]	206	82.8	0	100
National Able Network	211	78.5	0	100
NCBA	306	82.5	0	100
NCOA	392	80.9	0	100
NICOA[S]	199	85.7	0	100
NOWCC	89	77.0	0	100
NUL	213	83.1	0	100
OAGB	171	80.5	0	100
SER	201	85.4	0	100
SSAI	482	86.0	0	100
The WorkPlace	186	83.7	0	100
VANTAGE	207	83.0	0	100
National Grantees	4968	82.8	0	100
Alabama	119	87.8	7	100
Alaska	91	81.2	0	100
Arizona	62	83.7	0	100
Arkansas	106	83.4	0	100
California	192	85.1	0	100
Colorado	37	75.3	0	100
Connecticut	46	80.1	0	100
Delaware	111	80.6	0	100
DC	22	89.6	22	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Florida	153	80.0	0	100
Georgia	157	88.0	11	100
Hawaii	96	86.4	0	100
Idaho	24	70.6	0	100
Illinois	182	79.4	0	100
Indiana	133	77.5	0	100
Iowa	61	73.3	0	100
Kansas	56	80.2	15	100
Kentucky	109	84.6	4	100
Louisiana	97	83.5	0	100
Maryland	58	83.9	0	100
Massachusetts	77	77.8	0	100
Michigan	182	84.9	0	100
Minnesota	128	85.4	14	100
Mississippi	70	93.2	11	100
Missouri	156	85.1	0	100
Montana	31	84.0	26	100
Nebraska	44	76.7	22	100
Nevada	37	79.1	4	100
New Hampshire	29	74.0	0	100
New Jersey	149	83.4	0	100
New Mexico	28	86.0	11	100
New York	227	84.4	0	100
North Carolina	153	86.4	0	100
North Dakota	33	61.2	0	100
Ohio	188	81.9	0	100
Oklahoma	81	85.0	4	100
Oregon	56	67.4	0	100
Pennsylvania	152	78.1	0	100
Rhode Island	13	88.3	18	100
South Carolina	97	82.9	15	100
South Dakota	32	80.6	0	100
Tennessee	141	86.3	0	100
Texas	198	82.4	0	100
Utah	31	81.8	11	100
Vermont	19	69.0	0	100
Virginia	144	88.8	4	100
Washington	69	67.6	4	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
West Virginia	50	84.2	0	100
Wisconsin	169	82.1	0	100
Wyoming	29	70.5	0	100
State Grantees	4725	82.5	0	100
Nationwide	9693	82.6	0	100

Table 3. Reasons for Enrolling

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1507	8.7%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	2889	16.6%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	1895	10.9%
		Provide service to my community	2204	12.7%
		Meet new people	2083	12.0%
		Increase my income	3414	19.6%
		Feel more useful and independent	3047	17.5%
		Other	378	2.2%
State Grantees	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1343	8.0%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	2803	16.6%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	1859	11.0%
		Provide service to my community	2127	12.6%
		Meet new people	2007	11.9%
		Increase my income	3438	20.4%
		Feel more useful and independent	2961	17.5%
		Other	335	2.0%
Nationwide	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	2850	8.3%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	5692	16.6%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	3754	10.9%
		Provide service to my community	4331	12.6%
		Meet new people	4090	11.9%
		Increase my income	6852	20.0%
		Feel more useful and independent	6008	17.5%
		Other	713	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.	5248	8.8	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	5214	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	5109	8.4	1	10
State Grantees	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	5033	8.8	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	4998	8.6	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	4907	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	10281	8.8	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	10212	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	10016	8.4	1	10

Table 5. Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	581 11.2%
		2	124 2.4%
		3	168 3.2%
		4	152 2.9%
		5	234 4.5%
		6	230 4.4%
		7	245 4.7%
		8	387 7.4%
		9	393 7.6%
		10 Strongly agree	1127 21.7%
		Did not need support	1555 29.9%
		State Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.
2	133 2.7%		
3	150 3.0%		
4	150 3.0%		
5	189 3.8%		
6	214 4.3%		
7	203 4.1%		
8	335 6.7%		
9	395 7.9%		
10 Strongly agree	1181 23.7%		
Did not need support	1501 30.1%		
Nationwide	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.		
		2	257 2.5%
		3	318 3.1%
		4	302 3.0%
		5	423 4.2%
		6	444 4.4%
		7	448 4.4%
		8	722 7.1%
		9	788 7.7%
		10 Strongly agree	2308 22.7%
		Did not need support	3056 30.0%

Table 6. Geographic Convenience

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	4190 88.3%
		No	556 11.7%
		Total	4746 100.0%
State Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	4079 90.1%
		No	450 9.9%
		Total	4529 100.0%
Nationwide	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	8269 89.2%
		No	1006 10.8%
		Total	9275 100.0%

Table 7. Host Agency Experience

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	4937	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	5003	7.8	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	5153	8.8	1	10
State Grantees	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	4690	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	4765	7.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	4912	8.8	1	10
Nationwide	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	9627	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	9768	7.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	10065	8.8	1	10

Table 8. Computer Training

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	1628	33.0%
		I received the computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	552	11.2%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1056	21.4%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training any way	303	6.1%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1393	28.2%
State Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	1651	34.6%
		I received the computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	549	11.5%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	967	20.3%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training any way	301	6.3%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1298	27.2%
Nationwide	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	3279	33.8%
		I received the computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1101	11.4%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2023	20.9%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training any way	604	6.2%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2691	27.7%

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	1662	32.4%	482	9.4%	2987	58.2%
State Grantees	1524	31.2%	434	8.9%	2931	60.0%
Nationwide	3186	31.8%	916	9.1%	5918	59.1%

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	127	2.4%
		A little more negative	230	4.4%
		About the same	979	18.8%
		A little more positive	1348	25.9%
		Much more positive	2516	48.4%
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	116	2.3%
		A little more negative	226	4.6%
		About the same	1000	20.1%
		A little more positive	1338	27.0%
		Much more positive	2284	46.0%
Nationwide	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	243	2.4%
		A little more negative	456	4.5%
		About the same	1979	19.5%
		A little more positive	2686	26.4%
		Much more positive	4800	47.2%

Table 11. SCSEP Wages

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	200	3.9%
		2	72	1.4%
		3	109	2.1%
		4	127	2.4%
		5	243	4.7%
		6	213	4.1%
		7	321	6.2%
		8	494	9.5%
		9	605	11.7%
		10 Strongly agree	2807	54.1%

		Count	Percent	
State Grantees	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	239	4.8%
		2	83	1.7%
		3	85	1.7%
		4	125	2.5%
		5	248	5.0%
		6	212	4.3%
		7	259	5.2%
		8	462	9.3%
		9	508	10.2%
		10 Strongly agree	2742	55.2%
Nationwide	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	439	4.3%
		2	155	1.5%
		3	194	1.9%
		4	252	2.5%
		5	491	4.8%
		6	425	4.2%
		7	580	5.7%
		8	956	9.4%
		9	1113	11.0%
		10 Strongly agree	5549	54.6%

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	349	6.8%
		No	3324	64.4%
		Doesn't apply	1488	28.8%
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	310	6.3%
		No	3123	63.1%
		Doesn't apply	1513	30.6%
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	659	6.5%
		No	6447	63.8%
		Doesn't apply	3001	29.7%

Table 13. Preparation for Success in Workforce

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	5081	8.2	1	10
State Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	4866	8.0	1	10
Nationwide	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	9947	8.1	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?	1538	7.3	1	10
State Grantees	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	1390	7.0	1	10
Nationwide	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	2928	7.2	1	10

Table 15. Preparation for Employment

20. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP prepared you for employment in these organizations?		Number of Responses	Percent
National Grantees	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	319	41.8%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	164	21.5%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	213	27.9%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	67	8.8%
State Grantees	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	295	38.3%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	195	25.3%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	218	28.3%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	63	8.2%
Nationwide	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	614	40.0%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	359	23.4%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	431	28.1%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	130	8.5%

**Appendix B**  
**Respondent Demographics and Characteristics**

Table 1. Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Education

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Male	1576	31.8%
		Female	3386	68.2%
	Race	American Indian	240	5.2%
		Asian	432	9.3%
		Black	1860	40.1%
		Pacific Islander	10	0.2%
		White	2092	45.1%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	452	9.8%
		Not Hispanic	4151	90.2%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	806	18.5%
		HS Diploma or GED	1967	45.2%
		Some College	1035	23.8%
		Vocational/technical degree	95	2.2%
Post-Secondary Certificate		247	5.7%	
BA/BS		0	0.0%	
Bachelor's Plus		205	4.7%	
State Grantees	Gender	Male	1405	29.8%
		Female	3310	70.2%
	Race	American Indian	105	2.4%
		Asian	118	2.7%
		Black	1870	42.2%
		Pacific Islander	21	0.5%
		White	2319	52.3%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	353	8.0%
		Not Hispanic	4044	92.0%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	598	14.5%
		HS Diploma or GED	1851	44.8%
		Some College	1101	26.6%
		Vocational/technical degree	110	2.7%
Post-Secondary Certificate		255	6.2%	
BA/BS		0	0.0%	
Bachelor's Plus		217	5.3%	

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Gender	Male	2981	30.8%
		Female	6696	69.2%
	Race	American Indian	345	3.8%
		Asian	550	6.1%
		Black	3730	41.1%
		Pacific Islander	31	0.3%
		White	4411	48.6%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	805	8.9%
		Not Hispanic	8195	91.1%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	1404	16.5%
		HS Diploma or GED	3818	45.0%
		Some College	2136	25.2%
		Vocational/technical degree	205	2.4%
		Post-Secondary Certificate	502	5.9%
		BA/BS	0	0.0%
Bachelor's Plus		422	5.0%	

Table 2. Barriers to Employment

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Disability	Yes	1562	31.4%
		No	3406	68.6%
	LEP	Yes	682	13.7%
		No	4286	86.3%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	1093	22.0%
		No	3875	78.0%
	Rural	Yes	1354	27.8%
		No	3510	72.2%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	4489	90.4%
		No	479	9.6%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services	Yes	1000	20.1%
		No	3968	79.9%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	2796	56.3%
		No	2172	43.7%
	Veteran	Yes	534	11.1%
		No	4283	88.9%
	Severe Disability	Yes	40	0.8%
		No	4928	99.2%

		Count	Percent	
	Frail	Yes	23	0.5%
		No	4945	99.5%
	Old Enough for but Not receiving Social Security	Yes	25	0.5%
		No	4943	99.5%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	307	6.2%
		No	4661	93.8%
Seventy-five Plus	Less than seventy-five	4381	90.0%	
	Seventy-five plus	488	10.0%	
State Grantees	Disability	Yes	1599	33.8%
		No	3126	66.2%
	LEP	Yes	225	4.8%
		No	4500	95.2%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	971	20.6%
		No	3754	79.4%
	Rural	Yes	1374	29.6%
		No	3265	70.4%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	4066	86.1%
		No	659	13.9%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services	Yes	872	18.5%
		No	3853	81.5%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	2210	46.8%
		No	2515	53.2%
	Veteran	Yes	551	11.9%
		No	4082	88.1%
	Severe Disability	Yes	14	0.3%
		No	4711	99.7%
	Frail	Yes	8	0.2%
		No	4717	99.8%
Old Enough for but Not receiving Social Security	Yes	22	0.5%	
	No	4703	99.5%	
Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	198	4.2%	
	No	4527	95.8%	
Seventy-five Plus	Less than seventy-five	4081	88.0%	
	Seventy-five plus	558	12.0%	

		Count	Percent
Nationwide	Disability	Yes	3161 32.6%
		No	6532 67.4%
	LEP	Yes	907 9.4%
		No	8786 90.6%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	2064 21.3%
		No	7629 78.7%
	Rural	Yes	2728 28.7%
		No	6775 71.3%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	8555 88.3%
		No	1138 11.7%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services	Yes	1872 19.3%
		No	7821 80.7%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	5006 51.6%
		No	4687 48.4%
	Veteran	Yes	1085 11.5%
		No	8365 88.5%
	Severe Disability	Yes	54 0.6%
		No	9639 99.4%
	Frail	Yes	31 0.3%
		No	9662 99.7%
	Old Enough for but Not receiving Social Security	Yes	47 0.5%
		No	9646 99.5%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	505 5.2%
		No	9188 94.8%
Seventy-five Plus	Less than seventy-five	8462 89.0%	
	Seventy-five plus	1046 11.0%	

Table 3. Average Barriers per Participant

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Number of Barriers per Participant	4968	2.89	0	7
State Grantees	Number of Barriers per Participant	4725	2.62	0	7
Nationwide	Number of Barriers per Participant	9693	2.76	0	7

Table 4. Age

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Less than 65	2383	48.9%
	65 or older	2486	51.1%
State Grantees	Less than 65	2113	45.6%
	65 or older	2524	54.4%
Nationwide	Less than 65	4496	47.3%
	65 or older	5010	52.7%

## 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 (8.1 to 9.1) will increase the ACSI by .431 standard deviations or 9.8 points on the ACSI scale.<sup>5</sup> Given the fact that the average score for Question 18 is 8.1, there is significant opportunity for local programs to improve preparation for the workforce and thereby significantly improve overall satisfaction.

Table 1: Driver Model Test

	Standardized Coefficients	t-test Value	Sig.
	Beta		
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	.431	28.313	.000
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	.303	19.795	.000
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	.214	14.232	.000

---

<sup>5</sup> The standard deviation for the nationwide ACSI is 22.73. The number of points is obtained by multiplying the Beta times the standard deviation.