

# PY 2020 Host Agency Evaluation of SCSEP

## March 25, 2022

### Overview

For PY 2020, a nationwide random sample of 12,596 host agencies was selected. Data collection occurred between April 2021 and September 2021. The PY 2020 host agency survey was administered in two ways: A paper survey was mailed to most of the grantees' host agencies. A group of nine grantees' host agencies received the survey via text or email. The results from the two survey administrations are combined in this report.

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

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

The remaining questions in Tables 3 and 8 have values of 1-10 and are presented in single tables showing the number of respondents and the average score. The relationship of the questions with values of 1-10 to overall satisfaction is presented in the driver analysis section on pages 8-9. The driver analysis has the advantage not only of assessing the individual relation of certain aspects of service to the level of host agency satisfaction but also of comparing across those aspects of service to determine where improvement would give the biggest return on investment in terms of increased satisfaction.

### Overall Satisfaction: The American Customer Satisfaction Index

The American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) continues to be the standard for measuring overall satisfaction. The nationwide host agency ACSI score for PY 2020 presented in Table 1 is 84.0, a somewhat higher score than in PY 2019. As in other years, the ACSI score compares very favorably with ACSI scores from non-profit, for-profit, and government organizations around the country and the world where the ACSI is used. The score for national grantees is slightly lower than the score for state grantees. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in Appendix A.

Table 1. American Customer Satisfaction Index

	Count	Mean ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	5215	84.0	0	100

### Survey Response Rate

The random sample for the survey was stratified by grantee, making the final sample representative of host agency customers nationwide. Of the 12,596 host agencies that received a survey, 5215 agencies completed useable surveys that had responses to at least the first three questions that make up the

American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI). A survey is considered useable (counted as a valid return)<sup>1</sup> if the respondent answered these three questions. The nationwide response rate is 41.4 percent, significantly lower than the rate in PY 2019 (50.7%). See Table 2. The response rate for national grantee host agencies (40.1%) is significantly lower than the rate for state grantee host agencies (44.6%). See Appendix A.

This year’s drop of nine points is significantly lower statistically and substantively than the previous four years. One possible reason may be that many host agencies suspended operations during the pandemic or operated remotely and the host agency contact persons may not have received the survey. (The digital survey response rate was 1.5 percentage points higher than that of the paper survey, which might reflect that more host agency contact persons received the survey through that medium even if their offices were closed.) It is also possible that newer host agencies selected for the survey had little or no experience with SCSEP on which to base a response.

Table 2. Response Rate

	Responded		Did not Respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Nationwide	5215	41.4%	7381	58.6%

An additional question was added this year to determine what, if any, impact the COVID-19 pandemic had on the host agencies. As evident from Table 3, the most frequent impact was participants not being able to come to the workplace. Interestingly, over 18 percent of the host agencies experienced no effects.

Table 3. Effect of COVID-19 Pandemic

4. What effects or challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic have you experienced as a SCSEP host agency?		Count	Percent of Responses
Nationwide	4.1. It was difficult to find out when, of if, participants would be returning to work.	1582	19.6%
	4.2. Participants were not able to come to the workplace.	2990	37.0%
	4.3. It was difficult to ensure the safety of participants who continued to work or returned to work.	504	6.2%
	4.4. It was difficult to find work for participants to do because our normal operations were greatly affected.	1058	13.1%
	4.5. It was difficult to re-integrate participants into the organization after they were on hiatus due to COVID.	473	5.9%
	4.6. We experienced no serious effects from the COVID-19 pandemic.	1465	18.1%

### Treatment by Sub-Grantee

The four questions in Table 4 are similar to those asked in the last four surveys with the omission of a question about “resolving problems,” which was dropped from the current survey. The scores for the remaining four questions are essentially the same or slightly higher than the scores in PY 2019. The one question that continues to stand out among the others as significantly lower is Question 7, receiving

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

“sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants.” The lower score for this question highlights an area where local programs have room for significant improvement.

Table 4. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nation-wide	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	5068	8.5	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	5175	8.6	1	10
	7. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	5095	8.0	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency through the assignment to make sure it goes well.	5211	8.4	1	10

Question 8 in Table 5 asks host agencies about the degree of choice they have when they are offered a participant assignment. The first type of choice we might call “limited choice”: the host agency is offered one person, and they can take it or leave it. The second condition is a more open, “full choice,” since there are expanded numbers of participants from whom to choose. The third condition is self-explanatory, “No choice.”

In the current survey, 75 percent indicated they had “limited choice,” the ability to accept or refuse the proposed individual. This is a significantly higher percentage than PY 2019 (71.5 percent). 16.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they were given the “full choice” option. Only 8.6 percent indicated that they were assigned a participant with no choice.

Table 5. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	8. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	3791	75.0%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	839	16.6%
		I really have no choice	428	8.5%

In order to understand the impact of different choice situations, Table 6 shows how choice relates to satisfaction. Limited choice is associated with a satisfaction score that is somewhat lower than full choice, suggesting that limited choice is acceptable to most host agencies but is not optimal. The full choice appears to be strongly preferred by host agencies, with a related average satisfaction score over five points higher than the limited choice option. The third option is no choice. While only a small number of host agencies experience no choice, their lack of choice is related to extremely low levels of

satisfaction. These findings are similar to those in PY 2019, indicating that the “full choice” option is the standard for producing the highest level of satisfaction. The lesson for local programs is clear.

Table 6. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	8. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	3791	84.3
		I have a choice among several potential participants	839	89.8
		I really have no choice	428	70.3

### Detailed Analysis of Preparation

Question 10 explores the degree to which host agencies perceive assigned participants as having the necessary preparation. Agencies can select more than one answer for this question. As in PY 2019, the most frequently noted lack of preparation is in the area of basic computer knowledge (Table 7 below). The other three areas -- lack of basic employability skills, knowledge of the assignment, and how to behave with host agency customers -- are mentioned with nearly equal frequency.

Table 7. Need for Better Participant Preparation

			Count	Percent of Responses
Nationwide	10. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	a. Basic computer knowledge	2388	30.7%
		b. Basic employability skills	1735	22.3%
		c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	1785	23.0%
		d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	1859	23.9%

Table 8 suggests the importance of participants being well prepared as a means of ensuring host agency satisfaction. For those host agencies that reported no concern about the preparation of participants, the average ACSI was just under 89, similar to the score for PY 2019. For those agencies that identified one or more training needs, the ACSI score is more than 5 points lower than for those agencies that reported no preparation issues. This strongly suggests the importance of assigning participants who are appropriately prepared in all four areas. The number of host agencies reporting no preparation issues is a significantly and substantially smaller proportion of all responding to this question than the proportion reporting no preparation issues in PY 2019.

Table 8. Preparation Needs and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	No preparation issues	545	88.7
	One or more preparation issues	4670	83.4

Question 9, in Table 9, asks whether the participant is a good match with the host agency. The average nationwide score of 8.4 is significantly higher than in the prior four years. Since the quality of the match is so central to the relationship between the program and host agencies and since it plays such an important role in overall satisfaction, programs should pay close attention to this aspect of the program. See Driver Analysis below.

Table 9. Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	9. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	5224	8.4	1	10

### Supportive Services

Question 12 in Table 10 shows the number of host agencies with participants who needed supportive services. Similar to PY 2019, nearly two-thirds of the host agencies that answered the question indicated that the participants assigned to them did not need supportive services. Twenty-six percent of host agencies reported that a few participants needed supportive services, and only about 11 percent reported that many or nearly all participants needed supportive services. Significantly, for those agencies that reported few to nearly all participants needing supportive services, the ACSI is almost 5-11 points lower than for those agencies that had no experience with participants needing supportive service. See Table 11. The need for supportive services, often a necessity for participants, affects host agency satisfaction, although it should be noted that other factors over which local programs have control have a larger impact on satisfaction.

Table 10. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	2912	63.1%
		Few	1204	26.1%
		Many	285	6.2%
		Nearly all	214	4.6%

Table 11. Supportive Services and the ACSI

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

## Removal from the Assignment

There are two circumstances under which a participant can be removed from an assignment: SCSEP staff can remove someone for various reasons (e.g., to provide the participant a different opportunity to acquire additional skills or training or at the request of the participant for personal reasons); or the host agency may request the removal of a participant because the assignment is not working out. Question 13 in Table 12 asks if a participant was removed before the host agency thought the person was ready. Nationwide, 81.6 percent of host agencies never had that experience, slightly higher than the percentage in PY 2019.

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	13. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3739	81.6%
		Occasionally	729	15.9%
		Frequently	70	1.5%
		Nearly always	46	1.0%

The ACSI scores in Table 13 show that when the local SCSEP program removes a participant before the host agency thinks they were ready, satisfaction is lowered. The majority of agencies that never experience premature removal have an average ACSI score of 85.3. That is 3.5 points higher than the ACSI score for those agencies that experience the occasional removal of a participant (81.8) and slightly above the ACSI score nationwide (84.0). When the removal happens more frequently, however, the ACSI scores are about 10 points lower than the nationwide ACSI average.

Table 13. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	13. Has the Older Worker program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3739	85.3
		Occasionally	729	81.8
		Frequently	70	75.1
		Nearly always	46	82.1

Question 14 in Table 14 asks if the host agency has requested the local program to remove a participant. Instances of removal occurred 41 percent of the time, almost 4 percentage points lower than reported in PY 2019 (44.8%). This suggests some improvement, although this is still more frequent than would be optimal. As noted below, premature removal by the local program has a seriously negative impact on customer satisfaction.

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1968	41.0%
		No	2829	59.0%

As shown in Table 15, there is a 7-point difference in satisfaction between those host agencies that said "Yes" and those that said "No." While this is not as large a difference as in some other areas, it is still a substantive and statistically significant difference. Given the high incidence of participants not working out from the host agency perspective, this is an area that warrants attention by the grantees and their local programs.

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

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1968 80.0
		No	2829 86.9

The last scored question in the survey is about the impact of participation in SCSEP on the host agency's ability to provide services to the community. As shown in Table 16, sixty-three percent of host agencies indicate that participation has somewhat or significantly increased their ability to provide services, a somewhat higher percentage than in the last four surveys. However, this is a lower percentage than the response to this question in pre-PY 2015 surveys when more than 75 percent of host agencies reported some or significant increased ability to service their communities.

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

		Count	Percent
Nationwide	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	33 0.7%
		Somewhat decreased	50 1.0%
		Neither decreased nor increased	1718 35.6%
		Somewhat increased	1503 31.2%
		Increased significantly	1516 31.5%

Table 17 shows the association between SCSEP's impact on the host agency's capacity to provide services and the ACSI. For the 31 percent that experienced a significant increase in capacity, the satisfaction is extraordinarily high, 91.2 nationwide. Even those agencies only somewhat increasing capacity have average satisfaction scores 6 percentage points above those that experienced no increase. The few host agencies that experience a decrease in capacity have ACSI scores considerably lower, perhaps because being a host agency imposed a significant burden on them that reduced their ability to provide their regular services.

Table 17. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	33 71.9
		Somewhat decreased	50 68.3
		Neither decreased nor increased	1718 78.2
		Somewhat increased	1503 84.3
		Increased significantly	1516 91.2

## 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 4 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.

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

Table 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 specific question under consideration and all three ACSI questions are included in the analysis.) Then, the questions were analyzed together in a regression analysis in relation to the ACSI to see which questions made a significant contribution to understanding what drives overall satisfaction over and above the contribution of any other questions.<sup>2</sup> This analysis narrowed the number of questions with a substantial, independent relationship to the ACSI to two, which are shaded in the table. Questions with a smaller correlation or less substantial independent relationship are unshaded.

Using these two different criteria, two of the five questions are key drivers of satisfaction, those with both a strong correlation to the ACSI and significant independent contribution to variation in the ACSI: Questions 5 and 9. Question 9, which deals with the quality of the match, is the stronger of the two drivers by far and has been for several years. Question 5 deals with the ease of the assignment process; this question also has been a strong driver for many years.

For host agencies, Question 9 is the bottom line. With an average nationwide score of 8.4, there is some room for improvement. For every 0.5-point improvement in the quality of the match score, e.g., from 8.4 to 8.9, overall satisfaction will increase by over 3 points on the ACSI scale. This is not an unreasonable level of improvement to which grantees might aspire, given that 25.4 percent of host agencies gave scores on Question 9 below 8.0.

The unshaded Questions 6, 7 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. Question 6 is certainly an underlying factor in making a good match. Questions 7 and 11 are about communication and are strongly correlated with the ACSI although

---

<sup>2</sup> In the regression equation, the strongest driver for the ACSI, as determined by the correlations, is entered into the equation first. Other drivers are entered into the equation after the strongest, but they are only kept in the equation if they make a significant contribution over and above the previous driver.



they do not make significant independent contributions as drivers. In addition, Question 7 has the lowest score of the service questions, leaving significant room for local programs to improve service in this area. Question 11 are also closely related to the shaded questions regarding making the assignment process easy and creating a good match with each assignment.

Table 18. Driver Analysis

	Count	ACSI	Significance
5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	4764	.683	>.001
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	4764	.697	>.001
7. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	4764	.587	>.001
9. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	4764	.753	>.001
11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency through the assignment to make sure it goes well	4764	.598	>.001

### Summary and Recommendations

Despite the significant reduction in host agency response rates from last year’s survey, the results of the PY 2020 survey are generally similar to those for PY 2019. The difference in the response rates is likely due to the number of host agencies that suspended operation or worked remotely during the pandemic. The findings of the driver analysis have a similar emphasis on the importance of making a good match between the participant and the host agency. The effects on the ACSI of key questions regarding service delivery are nearly unchanged. As a result, the recommendations below for improvement are similar.

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

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

The 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 the particular importance of better preparation of participants in three of four areas: computer knowledge,

employability skills, and knowledge of the assignment. Each of these areas of preparation can have a modest effect on satisfaction.

Other analyses regarding preparation underline the importance of preparation as part of the match. Host agencies that report no need for better preparation in any area have extraordinarily high overall satisfaction (ACSI score of 89.9) compared to those that identify one or more areas where preparation needs improvement. While addressing individual preparation needs yields modest gains in satisfaction, placing a participant who is fully prepared for the host agency assignment yields extremely high levels of host agency satisfaction. The questions regarding removal from the host agency, either at the request of the agency or, more significantly, at the initiative of the local program, reinforce the importance of a good match.

## Appendix A

### Complete Survey Tables for ACSI and Response Rate

Table 1. ACSI by Grantee

	Count	ACSI Score	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	341	84.8	0	100
ANPPM	163	90.5	41	100
ATD	141	79.3	0	100
Easter Seals	226	82.6	0	100
Goodwill	533	84.3	0	100
IID [S]	42	88.3	30	100
IPDC	12	89.2	48	100
National Able Network	90	79.9	7	100
NAPCA[S]	60	87.8	37	100
NAPCA[G]	95	84.5	44	100
NCBA	432	79.9	0	100
NCOA	285	84.7	15	100
NICOA[S]	50	84.5	41	100
NICOA[G]	83	77.5	19	100
NUL	118	82.3	0	100
NOWCC	35	77.6	0	100
OAGB	56	83.3	44	100
SER	169	82.6	0	100
CWI	435	86.6	0	100
The WorkPlace	119	85.1	17	100
VANTAGE	75	80.4	7	100
<b>National Grantees</b>	<b>3560</b>	<b>83.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>
Alabama	52	87.3	37	100
Alaska	37	87.8	44	100
Arizona	20	82.2	37	100
Arkansas	35	86.9	33	100
California	59	87.6	48	100
Colorado	11	82.1	44	100
Connecticut	7	87.2	74	96
Delaware	37	88.0	5	100
DC	3	86.8	81	92
Florida	52	84.3	37	100
Georgia	34	84.9	22	100
Hawaii	35	79.8	19	100

	Count	ACSI Score	Minimum	Maximum
Idaho	14	74.7	34	100
Illinois	33	81.1	0	100
Indiana	33	81.7	11	100
Iowa	13	84.0	38	100
Kansas	31	81.1	41	100
Kentucky	49	89.9	48	100
Louisiana	40	89.5	60	100
Maryland	22	80.1	11	100
Massachusetts	23	88.9	52	100
Michigan	44	83.1	26	100
Minnesota	53	84.3	33	100
Mississippi	30	86.3	33	100
Missouri	62	87.4	26	100
Montana	14	68.6	7	100
Nebraska	10	81.3	44	100
Nevada	3	72.5	66	77
New Hampshire	17	70.5	30	100
New Jersey	28	86.2	44	100
New Mexico	15	82.4	33	100
New York	40	80.8	22	100
North Carolina	52	85.3	0	100
North Dakota	10	63.4	11	96
Ohio	48	79.5	15	100
Oklahoma	46	82.1	30	100
Oregon	23	84.2	67	100
Pennsylvania	127	85.0	22	100
Puerto Rico	12	97.0	85	100
Rhode Island	7	82.1	30	100
South Carolina	28	82.9	23	100
South Dakota	23	87.5	67	100
Tennessee	42	89.2	42	100
Texas	128	85.6	15	100
Utah	10	85.6	52	100
Vermont	8	75.5	37	100
Virginia	51	87.2	37	100
Washington	15	83.7	59	100
West Virginia	24	89.4	33	100
Wisconsin	35	83.7	44	100

	Count	ACSI Score	Minimum	Maximum
Wyoming	10	91.2	69	100
State Grantees	1655	84.6	0	100
Nationwide	5215	84.0	0	100

Table 2. Response Rate by Grantee

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	341	36.1%	603	63.9%
ANPPM	163	44.1%	207	55.9%
ATD	141	39.6%	215	60.4%
Easter Seals	226	40.1%	338	59.9%
Goodwill	533	42.2%	731	57.8%
IID [S]	42	43.8%	54	56.3%
IPDC	12	25.0%	36	75.0%
National Able Network	90	36.1%	159	63.9%
NAPCA[S]	60	39.2%	93	60.8%
NAPCA[G]	95	37.8%	156	62.2%
NCBA	432	36.5%	751	63.5%
NCOA	285	35.3%	522	64.7%
NICOA[S]	50	35.5%	91	64.5%
NICOA[G]	83	55.0%	68	45.0%
NUL	118	31.9%	252	68.1%
NOWCC	35	38.9%	55	61.1%
OAGB	56	37.8%	92	62.2%
SER	169	42.4%	230	57.6%
CWI	435	51.4%	411	48.6%
The WorkPlace	119	39.3%	184	60.7%
VANTAGE	75	50.0%	75	50.0%
National Grantees	3560	40.1%	5323	59.9%
Alabama	52	57.8%	38	42.2%
Alaska	37	55.2%	30	44.8%
Arizona	20	47.6%	22	52.4%
Arkansas	35	39.8%	53	61.2%
California	59	38.8%	93	61.2%
Colorado	11	50.0%	11	50.0%
Connecticut	7	23.3%	23	76.7%
Delaware	37	50.7%	36	49.3%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
DC	3	23.1%	10	76.9%
Florida	52	31.5%	113	68.5%
Georgia	34	35.4%	62	64.6%
Hawaii	35	53.0%	31	47.0%
Idaho	14	34.1%	27	65.9%
Illinois	33	35.1%	61	64.9%
Indiana	33	42.3%	45	57.7%
Iowa	13	38.2%	21	61.8%
Kansas	31	66.0%	16	34.0%
Kentucky	49	62.8%	29	37.2%
Louisiana	40	46.0%	47	54.0%
Maryland	22	47.8%	24	52.2%
Massachusetts	23	48.9%	24	51.1%
Michigan	44	52.4%	40	47.6%
Minnesota	53	46.5%	61	53.5%
Mississippi	30	62.5%	18	37.5%
Missouri	62	53.0%	55	47.0%
Montana	14	58.3%	10	41.7%
Nebraska	10	37.0%	17	63.0%
Nevada	3	16.7%	15	83.3%
New Hampshire	17	50.0%	17	50.0%
New Jersey	28	29.8%	66	70.2%
New Mexico	15	51.7%	14	48.3%
New York	40	30.8%	90	69.2%
North Carolina	52	54.2%	44	45.8%
North Dakota	10	50.0%	10	50.0%
Ohio	48	36.6%	83	63.4%
Oklahoma	46	59.7%	31	40.3%
Oregon	23	44.2%	29	55.8%
Pennsylvania	127	49.4%	130	50.6%
Puerto Rico	12	46.2%	14	53.8%
Rhode Island	7	58.3%	5	41.7%
South Carolina	28	38.9%	44	61.1%
South Dakota	23	65.7%	12	34.3%
Tennessee	42	42.9%	56	57.1%
Texas	128	39.6%	195	60.4%
Utah	10	52.6%	9	47.4%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Vermont	8	42.1%	11	57.9%
Virginia	51	53.7%	44	46.3%
Washington	15	48.4%	16	51.6%
West Virginia	24	60.0%	16	40.0%
Wisconsin	35	29.9%	82	70.1%
Wyoming	10	55.6%	8	44.4%
State Grantees	1655	44.6%	2058	55.4%
Nationwide	5215	41.4%	7381	58.6%

Table 3. Effects of COVID-19 Pandemic

4. What effects or challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic have you experienced as a SCSEP host agency?		Count	Percent of Responses
National Grantees	4.1. It was difficult to find out when, of if, participants would be returning to work.	1079	19.8%
	4.2. Participants were not able to come to the workplace.	2013	36.9%
	4.3. It was difficult to ensure the safety of participants who continued to work or returned to work.	333	6.1%
	4.4. It was difficult to find work for participants to do because our normal operations were greatly affected.	688	12.6%
	4.5. It was difficult to re-integrate participants into the organization after they were on hiatus due to COVID.	311	5.7%
	4.6. We experienced no serious effects from the COVID-19 pandemic.	1032	18.9%
State Grantees	4.1. It was difficult to find out when, of if, participants would be returning to work.	503	19.2%
	4.2. Participants were not able to come to the workplace.	977	37.3%
	4.3. It was difficult to ensure the safety of participants who continued to work or returned to work.	171	6.5%
	4.4. It was difficult to find work for participants to do because our normal operations were greatly affected.	370	14.1%
	4.5. It was difficult to re-integrate participants into the organization after they were on hiatus due to COVID.	162	6.2%
	4.6. We experienced no serious effects from the COVID-19 pandemic.	433	16.6%

4. What effects or challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic have you experienced as a SCSEP host agency?		Count	Percent of Responses
Nationwide	4.1. It was difficult to find out when, of if, participants would be returning to work.	1582	19.6%
	4.2. Participants were not able to come to the workplace.	2990	37.0%
	4.3. It was difficult to ensure the safety of participants who continued to work or returned to work.	504	6.2%
	4.4. It was difficult to find work for participants to do because our normal operations were greatly affected.	1058	13.1%
	4.5. It was difficult to re-integrate participants into the organization after they were on hiatus due to COVID.	473	5.9%
	4.6. We experienced no serious effects from the COVID-19 pandemic.	1465	18.1%

Table 4. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	3451	8.5	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	3518	8.6	1	10
	7. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	3465	8.0	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency through the assignment to make sure it goes well	3552	8.3	1	10
State Grantees	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	1617	8.6	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	1657	8.5	1	10
	7. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	1630	8.1	1	10



		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency through the assignment to make sure it goes well	1659	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff makes the process of assigning participants easy for me.	5068	8.5	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff that make the assignments have a good understanding of my business needs.	5175	8.6	1	10
	7. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	5095	8.0	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency through the assignment to make sure it goes well	5211	8.4	1	10

Table 5. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	2554	74.2%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	592	17.2%
		I really have no choice	296	8.6%
State Grantees	8. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	1237	76.5%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	247	15.3%
		I really have no choice	132	8.2%
Nationwide	8. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	3791	75.0%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	839	16.6%
		I really have no choice	428	8.5%

Table 6. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	8. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	2554	84.2
		I have a choice among several potential participants	592	89.2
		I really have no choice	296	69.3
State Grantees	8. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	1237	84.5
		I have a choice among several potential participants	247	91.1
		I really have no choice	132	72.8
Nationwide	8. When Older Worker Program staff propose a participant for our agency:	I can accept the individual offered or not	3791	84.3
		I have a choice among several potential participants	839	89.8
		I really have no choice	428	70.3

Table 7. Need for Better Participant Preparation

			Count	Percent of All Responses
National Grantees	10. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	a. Basic computer knowledge	1631	30.4%
		b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	1219	22.7%
		c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	1235	23.0%
		d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	1288	24.0%
State Grantees	10. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	a. Basic computer knowledge	757	31.6%
		b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	516	21.6%
		c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	550	23.0%
		d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	571	23.9%

			Count	Percent of All Responses
Nation-wide	10. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	a. Basic computer knowledge	2388	30.7%
		b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	1735	22.3%
		c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	1785	23.0%
		d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	1859	23.9%

Table 8. Existence of Preparation Issues

		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	No preparation issues	456	88.0
	One or more preparation issues	3104	83.0
State Grantees	No preparation issues	89	92.1
	One or more preparation issues	1566	84.2
Nationwide	No preparation issues	545	88.7
	One or more preparation issues	4670	83.4

Table 9. Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	9. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	3551	8.3	1	10
State Grantees	9. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	1673	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	9. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	5224	8.4	1	10

Table 10. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	1991	63.6%
		Few	797	25.4%
		Many	195	6.2%
		Nearly all	149	4.8%
State Grantees	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance	None	921	62.1%
		Few	407	27.4%

	with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	Many	90	6.1%
		Nearly all	65	4.4%
Nationwide	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	2912	63.1%
		Few	1204	26.1%
		Many	285	6.2%
		Nearly all	214	4.6%

Table 11. Need for Supportive Services and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	1991	86.6
		Few	797	81.2
		Many	195	78.9
		Nearly all	149	74.8
State Grantees	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	921	87.1
		Few	407	83.4
		Many	90	78.5
		Nearly all	65	78.0
Nationwide	12. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or health services, to be successful in their assignments?	None	2912	86.7
		Few	1204	81.9
		Many	285	78.8
		Nearly all	214	75.8

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	13. Has the Older Worker program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2527	80.6%
		Occasionally	524	16.7%
		Frequently	57	1.8%
		Nearly always	27	0.9%
State Grantees	13. Has the Older Worker program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1212	83.6%
		Occasionally	205	14.1%
		Frequently	13	0.9%
		Nearly always	19	1.3%
Nationwide	13. Has the Older Worker program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3739	81.6%
		Occasionally	729	15.9%
		Frequently	70	1.5%
		Nearly always	46	1.0%

Table 13. Removal of the Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	13. Has the Older Worker program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	2527	85.1
		Occasionally	524	81.7
		Frequently	57	73.2
		Nearly always	27	84.1
State Grantees	13. Has the Older Worker program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1212	85.6
		Occasionally	205	82.3
		Frequently	13	83.3
		Nearly always	19	79.1
Nationwide	13. Has the Older Worker program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3739	85.3
		Occasionally	729	81.8
		Frequently	70	75.1
		Nearly always	46	82.1

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1354	41.5%
		No	1907	58.5%
State Grantees	14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	614	40.0%
		No	922	60.0%
Nationwide	14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1968	41.0%
		No	2829	59.0%

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

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1354	79.6
		No	1907	87.0
State Grantees	14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	614	80.9
		No	922	86.8

Nationwide	14. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	1968	80.0
		No	2829	86.9

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	26	0.8%
		Somewhat decreased	39	1.2%
		Neither decreased nor increased	1123	34.3%
		Somewhat increased	1042	31.8%
		Increased significantly	1048	32.0%
State Grantees	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	7	0.5%
		Somewhat decreased	11	0.7%
		Neither decreased nor increased	595	38.6%
		Somewhat increased	461	29.9%
		Increased significantly	468	30.4%
Nationwide	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	33	0.7%
		Somewhat decreased	50	1.0%
		Neither decreased nor increased	1718	35.6%
		Somewhat increased	1503	31.2%
		Increased significantly	1516	31.5%

Table 17. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	26	68.6
		Somewhat decreased	39	67.4
		Neither decreased nor increased	1123	78.2
		Somewhat increased	1042	83.7
		Increased significantly	1048	90.8
State Grantees	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	7	84.1
		Somewhat decreased	11	71.7
		Neither decreased nor increased	595	78.2
		Somewhat increased	461	85.6
		Increased significantly	468	92.2

Nationwide	15. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	33	71.9
		Somewhat decreased	50	68.3
		Neither decreased nor increased	1718	78.2
		Somewhat increased	1503	84.3
		Increased significantly	1516	91.2