

# PY 2022 Nationwide Participant Evaluation of SCSEP

## April 30, 2024

### Overview

For the PY 2022 participant survey, a nationwide random sample of 16,689 participants was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2023. The third and last wave of data collection was closed in January 2024. This report includes the nationwide results for all survey questions. Appendix A contains the results of each survey question at the national grantee, state grantee, and nationwide levels. An analysis of individual grantee performance is provided for each grantee in a set of 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 2022 is 84.5, slightly lower than the 85.9 score in PY 2021 but similar to the ACSI scores for most years prior to PY 2021. This year's 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 example, this year's ACSI for SCSEP is 16.3 points higher than the average score for all government services. It is similar to the top scores for the companies in the food and drink industry.<sup>1</sup>

For PY 2022, of the 16,689 surveys mailed, 6,929 participants returned surveys with valid responses to the first three questions that make up the ACSI; only these participants with valid responses to the first three questions are included in the response rate and in the other survey analyses below. This year's response rate, 41.5 percent, is significantly lower than previous years where the response rate was above 50 percent. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in Appendix A.

### Who Answered the Survey?

The survey sample was and has always been generally representative of the SCSEP population nationwide. It is a stratified, random sample of all eligible participants, those who received service at any time within the twelve months prior to the drawing of the survey sample in September 2023. A survey is considered useable (counted as a valid return)<sup>2</sup> if the respondent answered the three questions that constitute the ACSI.

Most characteristics of the respondents, including race, ethnicity and education, are similar to the SCSEP population as a whole. There are some differences between the SCSEP population and survey respondents regarding the number with less than a high school diploma and the percentage of Asians and American Indians. Differences were also evident regarding age at enrollment and the percentage of those with a few barriers to employment (primarily disability, low literacy skills, homeless or at risk for homelessness, severely limited employment prospects, and age 75 or over). However, those differences have no impact on the representativeness of the survey responses.<sup>3</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. They track very closely with the previous year's data.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://theacsi.org/our-industries/>

<sup>2</sup> Calculating and Reporting Survey Response Rates – Revised September 2009, GAO internal guidance.

<sup>3</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.

- The average age of respondents is 65.6
- 65.5 percent are female and 35.5 percent male
- 59.2 percent have a high school diploma or less. The remaining 40.8 percent have some post-secondary education, degree or certificate
- 54.6 percent are racial minorities, and 11.7 percent are Hispanic.

To complete the picture of SCSEP participants, we report on characteristics that have been identified in Title V of the Older Americans Act (OAA) as creating significant barriers to employment. The list of barriers includes disability, severe disability, limited English proficiency, low literacy skills, living in a rural area, low unemployment prospects, failing to find employment after receiving WIOA services, being homeless or at risk of homelessness, being a veteran, being frail, old enough for social security but not receiving any benefits, having severely limited employment prospects in an area of persistent unemployment, being 75 or older, and being formerly incarcerated. On average, participants in the sample have 2.9 barriers, about the same as the average number of barriers than reported in the PY 2020 and 2021, when the average number of barriers was 3.0.

The other defining characteristic of the respondents is their program status at the time they took the survey: 58.6 percent of the respondents were still in the program; 41.4 percent of the respondents had exited the program. Of those who had exited:

- 28.1 percent of the respondents exited for regular employment
- .9 percent of the respondents exited for self-employment
- 71.1 percent of the respondents exited for reasons other than employment<sup>4</sup>

The percent of the sample exiting for regular employment is similar to PY 2021.

### Participants' Expectations for the Program

Question 4 asks participants to indicate the primary reason(s) they enrolled in the program. Respondents could choose as many reasons as they deemed appropriate; therefore, the total number of answers is substantially higher than the number of survey respondents. The responses to the eight options in Table 1 indicate a wide range of reasons for enrolling in the program. The participants, on average, endorsed about 3.2 reasons, similar to PY 2020 and PY 2021. The most frequently endorsed reasons were increasing their income, feeling more useful and independent, and obtaining a part-time job. The next most frequent endorsements were for participating in training and host agency activities, providing service to the community, and meeting new people. It is notable that the lowest percentage was for full-time work. This is consistent with data from SPARQ that show participants who exited were working an average of 28.9 hours per week in unsubsidized employment. The results this year are similar to those since this question was first asked in PY 2017.

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
4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1443	6.4%
4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	3585	16.0%
4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	2558	11.4%
4d. Provide service to my community	2994	13.3%
4e. Meet new people	2826	12.6%

<sup>4</sup> Rounding causes these percentages to appear to sum to over 100 percent.

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:	Count	Percent of All Responses
4f. Increase my income	4534	20.2%
4g. Feel more useful and independent	4078	18.2%
4h. Other	449	2.0%

### 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, they give high ratings to all three aspects of staff work with participants while in the program.<sup>5</sup> These scores are slightly lower than those in previous years, but not significantly different. This slight decline is only of concern if it is the beginning of a downward trend. These data will be closely watched in future surveys.

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.	7052	8.8	1	10
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	6989	8.6	1	10
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	6887	8.6	1	10

### Participants' Experience in the Host Agency

The three questions below in Table 3 relate directly to the nature of participants' experience at the host agency. Question 13 is similar to Questions 5, 6, and 9 (Table 2 above) in reflecting the sense of belonging that can be created in the host agency. The other two questions (Questions 10 and 11) focus explicitly on training, a crucial component of the host agency assignment. The highest rating (8.9) is for Question 13, how comfortable participants feel at the host agency assignment. The lowest rating (8.0) is for Question 11), whether participants have a say in the types of skills they would gain at the host agency. The rating for receiving training to be successful in the host agency assignment, Question 10, is 8.4, mid-way between the other two ratings. All the scores are similar to those recorded in PY 2021.

<sup>5</sup> Unless otherwise noted, questions are scored on a 1-10 scale.

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.	6606	8.4	1	10
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	6729	8.0	1	10
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	6937	8.9	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 asks if participants felt that SCSEP prepared them for employment in different industry sectors. There were 1033 respondents who had a placement after leaving the program, including 26 who were self-employed. The analysis in Table 5 is limited to those participants employed after exit.<sup>6</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 individuals felt prepared for a particular employment sector? The 831 individuals who responded to Q20 made a total of 920 choices as shown in Table 4. Nationwide, the most frequently endorsed sector was nonprofit organizations (40.9%), which makes sense given that most participants' host agency training sites are nonprofit organizations. Preparation for government and for-profit sectors was less frequently endorsed, with 24.6 percent for government and 25.9 percent for the for-profit sector. The percent who felt prepared for the for-profit sector is nearly the same as the percent in PY 2021. 80 respondents indicated they were not prepared for employment in any organization or business. This number equates to 8.7% of all respondents, about the same percentage as PY 2021.. .

---

<sup>6</sup> Although only those who exited with employment were included in the findings in Table 5, the results were not substantially different when we included all respondents who answered this question, including those who did not exit or did not have employment upon exiting.

Table 4. Prepared for Employment

20. Do you feel that your participation in the Old Worker Program prepared you for employment in these organizations?	Count	Percent of Responses
20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	376	40.9%
20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	226	24.6%
20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	238	25.9%
20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	80	8.7%

A second way of looking at the data from Question 20 is shown in Table 4a. This variable, constructed from the Question 20 data, shows the number of sectors (if any) for which participants felt they were prepared. Of the 831 who responded to this question, 100 participants saw themselves prepared in all three sectors, 43 saw themselves prepared in two of the three sectors, and 370 saw themselves prepared for one sector, most often the nonprofit sector. 13.5 percent of respondents did not feel prepared in any sector. These responses are similar to those in PY 2021, except there is a slightly higher percentage indicating they were not prepared for any sector.

Table 4a: Prepared for Employment

	Count	Percent of Respondents
1 sector	370	62.4%
2 sectors	43	7.3%
All 3 sectors	100	16.9%
No sectors	80	13.5%

Another aspect of preparation is covered in Question 18. The data for this question regarding preparation for success in the workforce are presented in Table 5. The score for helping prepare participants for success is the same as the score in PY 2021.

Table 5. Preparation for Success in the Workforce

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	6609	8.2	1	10

Data for two health outcomes continue to be collected in this survey. Table 6 shows the responses to Question 14. 31.9 percent indicate they are in better physical health, and 58.3% indicate their health is about the same. Only 9.1 percent indicate that their health declined in the course of program participation. These results are similar to PY2021 and slightly higher than previous years.

Table 6. Physical Health

		Count	Percent
14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better	2119	32.0%
	Worse	606	9.1%
	About the same	3900	58.9%

The second health question asks about mental health. As in previous years, the program produces strongly positive results as shown in Table 7. Nearly 76 percent indicated that they were either “a little more” or “much more positive” in their outlook on life as a result of participating in the program. This is about the same as PY2021 and 3-5 points higher than in the four prior surveys.

**Table 7. Mental Health**

		Count	Percent
15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	134	2.0%
	A little more negative	257	3.8%
	About the same	1276	18.8%
	A little more positive	1730	25.5%
	Much more positive	3393	50.0%

We know from Question 4 that many participants come to SCSEP hoping to increase their income. Along with physical and mental health, the program can positively affect participants’ financial wellbeing. Question 16 attempts to put a finer point on the issue of financial health by asking about the importance of income from SCSEP for meeting basic expenses. As evident in Table 8, almost 80% of the respondents moderately to strongly agreed (ratings of 8, 9, or 10) that the pay from SCSEP was important to meeting basic expenses. This is only slightly lower than in PY 2021 and 7-9 points higher than in the prior four years.

**Table 8. SCSEP Wages**

		Count	Percent
16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	244	3.6%
	2	72	1.1%
	3	111	1.6%
	4	107	1.6%
	5	282	4.1%
	6	244	3.6%
	7	317	4.6%
	8	588	8.6%
	9	735	10.7%
	10 Strongly agree	4147	60.6%

One potentially negative impact can arise if participants are pressured to leave a host agency assignment before they felt they were ready. Table 9 shows that only 5.4 percent of participants feel that they have had such pressure, somewhat higher than the percent in PY 2021 but lower than the 6.2 percent for PY 2020. It is important that the percent pressured remains as small as possible. Although it is rare, it negatively reflects on the quality of the placement. It also lowers overall satisfaction by nearly 23 points.

**Table 9. Pressure to Leave Host Agency**

		Count	Percent
17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	354	5.4%
	No	4223	64.3%
	Does not apply	1995	30.4%

**Detailed Analysis of Computer Training**

Earlier surveys had asked about computer training but not with the level of detail necessary for providing guidance to the grantees. Table 10 shows not only whether participants received computer training but also whether the training was appropriately targeted to the participants’ needs. As was true in PY 2020 and PY 2021, a little over a third (36.3%) of the participants received the computer training they needed. A little over a quarter (26.4%) did not need computer training and did not receive any. In total, computer training was properly targeted for more than 62 percent of the participants, about the same as in PY 2021 and somewhat higher than PY 2020. However, 20.1 percent needed computer training and received little or none, and another 9.7 percent received computer training that did not meet their needs. Overall, the targeting of training was slightly better than in PY2021 but still needs improvement.

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

**Table 10. Computer Training**

		Count	Percent
12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	2398	36.3%
	I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	643	9.7%
	I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1331	20.1%
	I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	492	7.4%
	I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1749	26.4%

**Supportive Services**

In addition to providing training, grantees are required to assess whether participants need supportive services in order to successfully participate in SCSEP and, if so, to ensure that services are provided. In Table 11, Question 7 asks if supportive services were provided when needed. Of 6,824 participants who responded to the question, 2,062 (30.2%) indicated they did not need any supportive services. Of the 4,762 who did indicate a need for supportive services, 22.3 percent disagreed or were neutral (score of 1-5 out of 10) that the assistance met their needs, slightly higher than in PY 2021. Over 77.7% rated the assistance as positive (6-10 out of 10). Given the slight drop in the number rating supportive services positively, and the fact that nearly a quarter of the participants did not have their needs met, there is room for significant improvement.

Table 11. Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	671	9.8%
	2	162	2.4%
	3	178	2.6%
	4	170	2.5%
	5	341	5.0%
	6	267	3.9%
	7	322	4.7%
	8	523	7.7%
	9	548	8.0%
	10 Strongly agree	1580	23.2%
	Did not need support	2062	30.2%

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 PY 2021 and one point lower than in PY 2020. Despite these minor fluctuations, over the past four years this percentage has remained substantially unchanged.

Table 12. Geographic Convenience

		Count	Percent
8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	5590	89.0%
	No	694	11.0%
	Total	6284	100.0%

While the program elements discussed above provide support to participants during their host agency assignments, help in finding a job becomes critically important as the individual prepares to successfully exit. Question 19 asks how much help participants received from staff in finding employment. The participant rating of 7.6 is the lowest score for any question in the survey scored on a 10-point scale, the same as in PY 2020 and PY 2021. While this is a significant improvement over years prior to PY 2020, there continues to be much room for improvement.

Table 13. Help in Finding Employment

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

### Variables Associated with the ACSI

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

#### A. Driver Analysis

Table 14 presents the results for the first type of analysis. The results are derived from all responses to the survey conducted in PY 2022 that answered the specific question at issue and all three of the questions that constitute the ACSI. Different regression models were tested to determine the smallest number of questions that explains variation in ACSI scores. The questions that together account for the most variation in the ACSI are shaded in Table 14 (Questions 5, 6, and 18). Questions 5, 6 and 18 were also drivers in PY 2021. Question 10 has previously been a driver and continues to be important although it did not provide enough unique explanatory power to be included. For details on the driver analysis methodology, see Appendix C.

The strongest driver Question 18 -- how helpful SCSEP is in preparing participants for the workforce -- is highly correlated with the ACSI and has a strong, unique influence on the ACSI. The large size of its correlation and its unique contribution to explaining the ACSI suggest that any change in this score is likely to have a direct and independent impact on overall satisfaction. Question 5 was also a driver in PY 2021. The correlation is very high, but, more importantly, its unique contribution to the ACSI is second only to that of Question 18.

Question 6 deals with the treatment of participants in finding them the right host agency assignment. The score for Question 6 is 8.6, among the higher scores for any questions but the average score for Question 5, getting informed by staff is .2 of a point higher and participants feeling of comfort in the host agency is rated .3 higher. This suggests that there is clearly room for improvement.

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

- Some questions for statistical reasons are not included in the regression equation
- Some questions in the regression equation are not in the chosen regression model may have high correlations and moderate participant ratings (they are unshaded in Table 14 because they are not independent of the influence exerted by the shaded questions). They nonetheless could be areas for improvement in the way the sub-grantees deliver services.

- Other questions may have a lower correlation with the ACSI but also lower than usual participant ratings, affording significant room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers the service.

The unshaded questions in Table 14 should still be considered for program improvement based on these guiding principles.

Table 14. Driver Analysis

		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	.689**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6839
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.657**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6778
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.668**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6691
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.659**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6412
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.604**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6537
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.631**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6733
16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	Pearson Correlation	.412**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	6847
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Pearson Correlation	.720**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6609
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Pearson Correlation	.562**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	1848

Although not a key driver, Question 11 is closely related to overall satisfaction as seen in Table 15. There is a 43.8-point difference in the ACSI score for those who felt they had the most say and those who felt they had the least say in the skills they would gain. This is the largest difference we have seen to date and slightly larger than the difference in PY 2021. Working with host agencies in their preparation of 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	361	50.7
	2	149	50.5
	3	143	58.9
	4	157	63.9
	5	356	71.4
	6	276	75.9
	7	401	79.2
	8	758	84.3
	9	1028	89.0
	10 Strongly agree	2908	94.5

**B. Other Questions Associated with the ACSI**

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

Obtaining supportive services can have an impact on the ACSI, but only for participants who needed those services. Because only 70.8 percent of the respondents indicated they needed supportive services, that feature of service was not entered into the driver model but is analyzed separately here. Table 16 shows the number of individuals who gave each rating on the scale of 1 = Strongly disagree to 10 = Strongly agree. As the table shows, the average ACSI score associated with each rating on the scale strongly rises as the level of agreement rises. Participants who strongly agreed that they had received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of 96, while those who strongly disagreed that they received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of around 65. This difference of 31 points in scores highlights the critical importance of providing supportive services for those who need them.

**Table 16. Supportive Services and ACSI**

		Count	ACSI Score
7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	671	60.1
	2	162	61.5
	3	178	65.9
	4	170	69.8
	5	341	75.7

	Count	ACSI Score
6	267	80.4
7	322	82.9
8	523	86.3
9	548	90.7
10 Strongly agree	1580	95.5
Did not need support	2062	88.5

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

Table 17. Computer Training and ACSI

	Count	ACSI Score	
12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	2398	90.8
	I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	643	78.1
	I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1331	74.8
	I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	492	86.5
	I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1749	84.6

For the thirty-five percent of respondents (2,398) who needed computer training and got what they needed, the ACSI is extremely high, 90.8. However, participants who did not receive the training that met their needs, or who needed training but were offered little or none, have satisfaction scores 12-15 points lower. In addition, those who did not need training but got it anyway have an ACSI score close to the satisfaction rating for those who needed it and received it. These findings closely match those in PY 2021. They suggest that local programs need to ensure that relevant computer training is provided and at least meets participants' needs even if the training exceeds the participants' actual needs. The local programs are better off offering training when it is not needed than not offering it at all. Training that matches the individuals needs is makes for higher levels of satisfaction.

Question 20 (only answered by those who exited for employment) 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. 593 respondents, who had exited for employment, answered the sector questions and the three ACSI questions. There are small, non-significant differences in the ACSI scores for those who said they were prepared for 1, 2, or all 3 sectors. However, all of those who felt prepared expressed significantly higher satisfaction than those who did not feel prepared for any sector: the difference in ACSI scores ranges from 23.3 to 28.4 points. In Table 18, the message is very clear: What matters is for the program to prepare participants for work, in general, and for any particular employment sector. The data in Table 18 reinforces this conclusion with no significant differences in satisfaction whether individuals felt prepared for 1, 2, or 3 sectors.

**Table 18. Preparation for Employment and ACSI**

		Count	ACSI Score
20. Number of sectors for which the participant was prepared	1 Sector	370	87.5
	2 Sectors	43	91.6
	All 3 sectors	100	88.9
	No sectors	80	63.2

### **Summary and Recommendations**

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

A second major finding is that preparation for the workforce (Question 18) is the single most important driver of participant satisfaction. With an average score of 8.2 (.2 lower than PY 2021), there is substantial room for improvement, and every point of improvement can yield significant increases in satisfaction. Staff help in finding employment (Question 19) is also an important part of preparing the path to employment. The average score of 7.6 for PY 2022, the same as in PY 2021, is still among the lowest scores on the survey and indicates that local programs can do considerably more in this area, whether it be for part-time or full-time employment.

#### **Other Significant Issues**

Once again, the survey results strongly reinforced the importance of giving participants a voice in their training and the skills they gain in their assignments. There was a 43.8 point difference in satisfaction (an even larger difference than in PY 2021) between those that felt most strongly they had a say in the types of skills gained and those who felt most strongly they did not have a say.

The remaining recommendations in many ways flow from obtaining a better understanding of participants’ interests and needs that should be derived from participants’ assessments and reflected in their IEPs:

- Local programs need to spend time listening to participants to assess the skills participants will need to succeed in the workforce (Question 6).
- Local programs also need to work with host agencies to ensure participants have a voice in the skills they acquire while at their assignments (Question 11).
- Computer training (Question 12) is an area where local programs need to do a better job of identifying those who need training and the type of computer training that is most relevant for the individual participant. However, the data also indicated providing computer training even when not needed is better than not doing any computer training.
- Supportive services (Question 7) are not necessary for everyone (one-third did not need them), but for those who need supportive services, the failure to provide services significantly lowers

overall satisfaction and reduces participant's chances for success in the program and in unsubsidized employment.

## Appendix A Complete Survey Tables

Table 1. Response Rate by Grantee

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	346	35.3%	634	64.7%
ANPPM	165	44.6%	205	55.4%
ATD	168	45.3%	203	54.7%
Easter Seals	219	31.4%	479	68.6%
Goodwill	312	44.6%	388	55.4%
IID[S]	116	44.4%	145	55.6%
IPDC	40	46.5%	46	53.5%
NATABLE	146	39.5%	224	60.5%
NAPCA[S]	210	56.8%	160	43.2%
NAPCA[G]	186	50.3%	184	49.7%
NCBA	240	38.1%	390	61.9%
NCOA	365	43.5%	475	56.5%
NICOA[S]	120	51.7%	112	48.3%
NICOA[G]	136	46.9%	154	53.1%
NOWCC	125	37.8%	206	62.2%
NUL	198	47.1%	222	52.9%
OAGB	131	44.0%	167	56.0%
SER	176	41.9%	244	58.1%
CWI	320	38.1%	520	61.9%
TWP	146	39.5%	224	60.5%
VANTAGE	175	47.3%	195	52.7%
National Grantees	4040	42.0%	5577	58.0%
Alabama	84	45.2%	102	54.8%
Alaska	40	31.7%	86	68.3%
Arizona	33	30.3%	76	69.7%
Arkansas	72	52.9%	64	47.1%
California	162	45.0%	198	55.0%
Colorado	13	28.9%	32	71.1%
Connecticut	16	45.7%	19	54.3%
Delaware	56	38.9%	88	61.1%
District of Columbia	14	32.6%	29	67.4%
Florida	132	35.7%	238	64.3%
Georgia	118	48.8%	124	51.2%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Hawaii	55	58.5%	39	41.5%
Idaho	18	48.6%	19	51.4%
Illinois	81	35.7%	146	64.3%
Indiana	50	32.7%	103	67.3%
Iowa	51	33.3%	102	66.7%
Kansas	38	48.1%	41	51.9%
Kentucky	96	51.6%	90	48.4%
Louisiana	82	43.9%	105	56.1%
Maine	7	46.7%	8	53.3%
Maryland	31	41.3%	44	58.7%
Massachusetts	31	36.5%	54	63.5%
Michigan	87	46.5%	100	53.5%
Minnesota	73	45.6%	87	54.4%
Mississippi	52	63.4%	30	36.6%
Missouri	77	39.1%	120	60.9%
Montana	19	32.8%	39	67.2%
Nebraska	26	44.1%	33	55.9%
Nevada	9	36.0%	16	64.0%
New Hampshire	17	34.0%	33	66.0%
New Jersey	81	46.3%	94	53.7%
New Mexico	15	48.4%	16	51.6%
New York	144	42.4%	196	57.6%
North Carolina	135	47.2%	151	52.8%
North Dakota	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
Ohio	130	42.9%	173	57.1%
Oklahoma	45	32.8%	92	67.2%
Oregon	22	28.2%	56	71.8%
Pennsylvania	130	35.1%	240	64.9%
Puerto Rico	48	49.0%	50	51.0%
Rhode Island	12	41.4%	17	58.6%
South Carolina	50	29.6%	119	70.4%
South Dakota	20	58.8%	14	41.2%
Tennessee	53	53.0%	47	47.0%
Texas	114	30.8%	256	69.2%
Utah	17	24.6%	52	75.4%
Vermont	11	50.0%	11	50.0%
Virginia	71	54.2%	60	45.8%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Washington	24	31.6%	52	68.4%
West Virginia	26	41.3%	37	58.7%
Wisconsin	76	33.9%	148	66.1%
Wyoming	19	41.3%	27	58.7%
State Grantees	2889	40.9%	4176	59.1%
Nationwide	6929	41.5%	9753	58.5%

Table 2. ACSI by Grantee

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	346	82.3	0	100
ANPPM	165	88.6	0	100
ATD	168	81.5	0	100
Easter Seals	219	83.6	0	100
Goodwill	312	86.2	0	100
IID[S]	116	91.6	37	100
IPDC	40	88.2	0	100
NATABLE	146	82.2	0	100
NAPCA[S]	210	85.8	11	100
NAPCA[G]	186	85.0	8	100
NCBA	240	84.3	0	100
NCOA	365	84.1	0	100
NICOA[S]	120	86.6	0	100
NICOA[G]	136	75.8	0	100
NOWCC	125	83.8	0	100
NUL	198	86.4	0	100
OAGB	131	86.4	0	100
SER	176	83.9	0	100
CWI	320	84.3	0	100
TWP	146	86.4	0	100
VANTAGE	175	87.1	0	100
National Grantees	4040	84.7	0	100
Alabama	84	83.3	0	100
Alaska	40	81.8	0	100
Arizona	33	83.0	0	100
Arkansas	72	86.3	10	100
California	162	82.0	0	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Colorado	13	89.8	12	100
Connecticut	16	76.7	11	100
Delaware	56	91.2	44	100
District of Columbia	14	92.5	8	100
Florida	132	84.6	0	100
Georgia	118	88.4	0	100
Hawaii	55	86.5	0	100
Idaho	18	77.5	0	100
Illinois	81	85.3	22	100
Indiana	50	78.6	0	100
Iowa	51	79.0	0	100
Kansas	38	84.5	8	100
Kentucky	96	89.5	3	100
Louisiana	82	86.6	0	100
Maine	7	89.6	67	100
Maryland	31	80.5	0	100
Massachusetts	31	79.0	4	100
Michigan	87	87.1	0	100
Minnesota	73	85.4	4	100
Mississippi	52	90.6	0	100
Missouri	77	87.0	8	100
Montana	19	70.2	0	100
Nebraska	26	80.2	36	100
Nevada	9	75.6	48	100
New Hampshire	17	70.7	0	100
New Jersey	81	86.7	0	100
New Mexico	15	90.9	60	100
New York	144	82.0	0	100
North Carolina	135	87.7	7	100
North Dakota	6	75.5	11	100
Ohio	130	86.1	0	100
Oklahoma	45	78.8	0	100
Oregon	22	78.0	0	100
Pennsylvania	130	78.3	0	100
Puerto Rico	48	85.6	4	100
Rhode Island	12	87.4	19	100
South Carolina	50	79.5	0	100
South Dakota	20	80.0	37	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Tennessee	53	83.2	4	100
Texas	114	83.1	0	100
Utah	17	69.3	4	100
Vermont	11	78.5	7	100
Virginia	71	91.9	0	100
Washington	24	77.9	0	100
West Virginia	26	87.6	11	100
Wisconsin	76	81.6	0	100
Wyoming	19	87.2	36	100
State Grantees	2889	84.2	0	100
Nationwide	6929	84.5	0	100

Table 3. Reasons for Enrolling

			Count	Percent of All Responses
National Grantees	Reasons for Enrollment	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	837	3.8%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	1981	9.1%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	1460	6.7%
		4d. Provide service to my community	1694	7.8%
		4e. Meet new people	1573	7.2%
		4f. Increase my income	2508	11.5%
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	2308	10.6%
		4h. Other	256	1.2%
State Grantees	Reasons for Enrollment	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	562	2.6%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	1502	6.9%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	1041	4.8%
		4d. Provide service to my community	1223	5.6%
		4e. Meet new people	1177	5.4%
		4f. Increase my income	1905	8.7%

			Count	Percent of All Responses
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	1653	7.6%
		4h. Other	172	0.8%
Nationwide	Reasons for Enrollment	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1399	6.4%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	3483	15.9%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	2501	11.4%
		4d. Provide service to my community	2917	13.3%
		4e. Meet new people	2750	12.6%
		4f. Increase my income	4413	20.2%
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	3961	18.1%
		4h. Other	428	2.0%

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.	3985	8.9	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	3964	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	3901	8.6	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
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.	2854	8.9	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	2814	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	2790	8.6	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.	6839	8.9	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	6778	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	6691	8.6	1	10

Table 5. Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	380 13.8%
		2	101 3.7%
		3	107 3.9%
		4	93 3.4%
		5	199 7.2%
		6	156 5.7%
		7	194 7.0%
		8	300 10.9%
		9	298 10.8%
		10 Strongly agree	930 33.7%

			Count	Percent
State Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	291	14.5%
		2	61	3.0%
		3	71	3.5%
		4	77	3.8%
		5	142	7.1%
		6	111	5.5%
		7	128	6.4%
		8	223	11.1%
		9	250	12.5%
		10 Strongly agree	650	32.4%
Nationwide	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	671	14.1%
		2	162	3.4%
		3	178	3.7%
		4	170	3.6%
		5	341	7.2%
		6	267	5.6%
		7	322	6.8%
		8	523	11.0%
		9	548	11.5%
		10 Strongly agree	1580	33.2%

Table 6. Geographic Convenience

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	3259	88.7%
		No	415	11.3%
State Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	2331	89.3%
		No	279	10.7%
Nationwide	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	5590	88.9%
		No	694	11.1%

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.	3740	8.4	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	3823	8.1	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	3933	8.9	1	10
State Grantees	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	2672	8.4	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	2714	8.0	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	2800	8.9	1	10
Nationwide	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	6412	8.4	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	6537	8.0	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	6733	8.9	1	10

Table 8. Computer Training

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	1415	36.9%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	376	9.8%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	775	20.2%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	294	7.7%

			Count	Percent
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	977	25.5%
State Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	983	35.4%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	267	9.6%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	556	20.0%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	198	7.1%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	772	27.8%
Nationwide	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	2398	36.3%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	643	9.7%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1331	20.1%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	492	7.4%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1749	26.4%

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	1254	32.4%	338	8.7%	2275	58.8%
State Grantees	865	31.4%	268	9.7%	1625	58.9%
Nationwide	2119	32.0%	606	9.1%	3900	58.9%

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	76	1.9%
		A little more negative	148	3.7%
		About the same	754	19.0%
		A little more positive	1009	25.4%
		Much more positive	1978	49.9%
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	58	2.1%
		A little more negative	109	3.9%
		About the same	522	18.5%
		A little more positive	721	25.5%
		Much more positive	1415	50.1%
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	134	2.0%
		A little more negative	257	3.8%
		About the same	1276	18.8%
		A little more positive	1730	25.5%
		Much more positive	3393	50.0%

Table 11. SCSEP Wages

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	133	3.3%
		2	38	1.0%
		3	65	1.6%
		4	55	1.4%
		5	179	4.5%
		6	140	3.5%
		7	186	4.7%
		8	347	8.7%
		9	432	10.8%
		10 Strongly agree	2413	60.5%
State Grantees	16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	111	3.9%
		2	34	1.2%
		3	46	1.6%
		4	52	1.8%
		5	103	3.6%
		6	104	3.6%
		7	131	4.6%
		8	241	8.4%
		9	303	10.6%

		10 Strongly agree	1734	60.7%
Nationwide	16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	244	3.6%
		2	72	1.1%
		3	111	1.6%
		4	107	1.6%
		5	282	4.1%
		6	244	3.6%
		7	317	4.6%
		8	588	8.6%
		9	735	10.7%
				10 Strongly agree

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	211	5.5%
		No	2477	64.6%
		Does not apply	1147	29.9%
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	143	5.2%
		No	1746	63.8%
		Does not apply	848	31.0%
Nationwide	17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	354	5.4%
		No	4223	64.3%
		Does not apply	1995	30.4%

Table 13. Preparation for Success in the Workforce

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	3857	8.3	1	10
State Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	2752	8.2	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	6609	8.2	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?	235	7.4	1	10
State Grantees	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	196	7.6	1	10
Nationwide	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	431	7.5	1	10

Table 15. Prepared for Employment

			Count	Percent of All Responses
National Grantees	Prepared for Employment	20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	129	20.8%
		20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	82	13.2%
		20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	92	14.8%
		20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	34	5.5%
State Grantees	Prepared for Employment	20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	107	17.3%
		20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	71	11.5%
		20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	75	12.1%
		20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	30	4.8%

			Count	Percent of All Responses
Nationwide	Prepared for Employment	20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	236	38.1%
		20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	153	24.7%
		20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	167	26.9%
		20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	64	10.3%

Table 16. Employment Preparation by Number of Sectors

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Number of Sectors	1.00	63	70.8%
		2.00	9	10.1%
		3.00	17	19.1%
State Grantees	Number of Sectors	1.00	58	66.7%
		2.00	14	16.1%
		3.00	15	17.2%
Nationwide	Number of Sectors	1.00	121	68.8%
		2.00	23	13.1%
		3.00	32	18.2%

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

Table 1. Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Education

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Male	1249	31.0%
		Female	2782	69.0%
	Race	White	1679	44.1%
		Black	1660	43.6%
		Asian	243	6.4%
		American Indian	205	5.4%
		Pacific Islander	18	0.5%
		Hispanic		
	Hispanic	436	11.4%	
	Not Hispanic	3395	88.6%	
	Education	Less than HS diploma	732	18.2%
		HS Diploma/GED	1658	41.2%
		Some college	850	21.1%
		BA/BS	365	9.1%
Bachelors Plus		177	4.4%	
Vocational/Technical degree		71	1.8%	
Associates degree		170	4.2%	
State Grantees	Gender	Male	792	27.4%
		Female	2094	72.6%
	Race	White	1299	47.1%
		Black	1242	45.1%
		Asian	109	4.0%
		American Indian	89	3.2%
		Pacific Islander	17	0.6%
		Hispanic		
	Hispanic	299	10.8%	
	Not Hispanic	2476	89.2%	
	Education	Less than HS diploma	423	14.7%
		HS Diploma/GED	1194	41.5%
		Some college	664	23.1%
		BA/BS	281	9.8%
Bachelors Plus		102	3.5%	
Vocational/Technical degree		63	2.2%	
Associates degree		150	5.2%	

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Gender	Male	2041	29.5%
		Female	4876	70.5%
	Race	White	2978	45.4%
		Black	2902	44.2%
		Asian	352	5.4%
		American Indian	294	4.5%
		Pacific Islander	35	0.5%
		Hispanic		
	Hispanic	Hispanic	735	11.1%
		Not Hispanic	5871	88.9%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	1155	16.7%
		HS Dipiloma/GED	2852	41.3%
		Some college	1514	21.9%
		BA/BS	646	9.4%
Bachelors Plus		279	4.0%	
Vocational/Technical degree		134	1.9%	
Associate's degree		320	4.6%	

Table 2. Barriers to Employment

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Disability	Yes	1381	34.2%
		No	2658	65.8%
	LEP	Yes	507	12.6%
		No	3521	87.4%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	1091	27.1%
		No	2940	72.9%
	Rural	Yes	931	23.0%
		No	3109	77.0%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	2263	56.0%
		No	1777	44.0%
	Poor Employment Prospects	Yes	3693	91.6%
		No	338	8.4%
	Veteran	Yes	386	9.6%
		No	3654	90.4%
	Severe Disability	Yes	62	2.6%
		No	2324	97.4%
	Frail	Yes	40	1.7%

		Count	Percent	
		No	2341	98.3%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	92	3.9%
		No	2286	96.1%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	Yes	782	19.4%
		No	3250	80.6%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	477	20.0%
		No	1909	80.0%
	Seventy-five Plus	Yes	202	10.0%
		No	1814	90.0%
	Formerly Incarcerated	Yes	74	3.5%
		No	2059	96.5%
	Sate Grantees	Disability	Yes	908
No			1981	68.6%
LEP		Yes	229	8.0%
		No	2648	92.0%
Low Literacy Skills		Yes	730	25.3%
		No	2151	74.7%
Rural		Yes	699	24.2%
		No	2190	75.8%
Homeless or at Risk		Yes	1432	49.6%
		No	1457	50.4%
Poor Employment Prospects		Yes	2553	88.6%
		No	329	11.4%
Veteran		Yes	270	9.3%
		No	2619	90.7%
Severe Disability		Yes	39	2.2%
		No	1718	97.8%
Frail		Yes	25	1.4%
		No	1729	98.6%
Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security		Yes	53	3.0%
		No	1699	97.0%
Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services		Yes	586	20.4%
		No	2293	79.6%
Severely Limited Employment Prospects		Yes	381	21.6%
		No	1381	78.4%
Seventy-five Plus		Yes	160	11.1%
		No	1283	88.9%
Formerly Incarcerated		Yes	48	3.0%

		Count	Percent	
Nationwide	Disability	No	1529	97.0%
		Yes	2289	33.0%
	LEP	No	4639	67.0%
		Yes	736	10.7%
	Low Literacy Skills	No	6169	89.3%
		Yes	1821	26.3%
	Rural	No	5091	73.7%
		Yes	1630	23.5%
	Homeless or at Risk	No	5299	76.5%
		Yes	3695	53.3%
	Poor Employment Prospects	No	3234	46.7%
		Yes	6246	90.4%
	Veteran	No	667	9.6%
		Yes	656	9.5%
	Severe Disability	No	6273	90.5%
		Yes	101	2.4%
	Frail	No	4042	97.6%
		Yes	65	1.6%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	4070	98.4%
		Yes	145	3.5%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	No	3985	96.5%
		Yes	1368	19.8%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	5543	80.2%
		Yes	858	20.7%
	Seventy-five Plus	No	3290	79.3%
		Yes	362	10.5%
	Formerly Incarcerated	No	3097	89.5%
		Yes	122	3.3%
		No	3588	96.7%

Table 3. Average Number of Barriers to Employment

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Number of Barriers	4040	3.0	.0	9.0
State Grantees	Number of Barriers	2889	2.8	.0	8.0
Nationwide	Number of Barriers	6929	2.9	.0	9.0

Table 4. Age

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Age	Less than 65	1975	49.4%
		65 or older	2023	50.6%
State Grantees	Age	Less than 65	1314	45.9%
		65 or older	1546	54.1%
Nationwide	Age	Less than 65	3289	48.0%
		65 or older	3569	52.0%

## Appendix C

### Driver Model

Table 1 provides the foundation for the methodology used to choose the services and service delivery questions that have the strongest independent effect on overall satisfaction. This is the simplest model while accounting for the most variation in the ACSI.

The third column shows the size of the t-test value, and the fourth column shows that all three questions are significant beyond chance. Beta, the second column, should be read as the strength of the relationship between the question and the ACSI score. For every one-unit increase in Beta, the ACSI increases by one standard deviation. For example, a one-unit increase in preparing participants for success (8.5 to 9.5) will increase the ACSI by .438 standard deviations or 8.7 points on the ACSI scale.<sup>7</sup> Given the fact that the average score for Question 18 is 8.2, there some significant opportunity for local programs to improve preparation for the workforce and thereby significantly improve overall satisfaction.

Table 1: Driver Model Test

	Standardized Beta	t-test Value	Sig.
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	.394	39.329	<.001
5. At the time I enrolled, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	.316	31.449	<.001
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	.223	21.823	<.001

---

<sup>7</sup> The standard deviation for the nationwide ACSI is 22.0. The number of points is obtained by multiplying the Beta times the standard deviation.