

PY 2023 Host Agency Evaluation of SCSEP

April 30, 2025

Overview

For PY 2023, a nationwide random sample of 11,096 host agencies was selected. Data collection occurred between January 2025 and April 2025. The PY 2023 host agency survey was administered as a digital survey emailed to the grantees' host agencies.

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 an individual 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) that is 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 with the number of respondents, the average score, and the range of responses (minimum and maximum). 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 determining those aspects of service 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 2023 presented in Table 1 is 84.1, similar to scores in previous years. 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	1916	84.1	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 11,096 host agencies that received a survey, 1916 agencies completed useable surveys that had responses to at least the first three questions making up the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI). A survey is considered useable (counted as a valid return)¹ if the respondent answered these three questions. The nationwide response rate is 21.5 percent, significantly lower than in PY 2021 and previous years. See Table 2. This is the first year the survey has been conducted solely by email. The lower response rate may be partially due to the method of administration as well as other unmeasured factors. While the response rate is disappointing, the results reported below are consistent with previous years, suggesting that the digital survey results, despite the lower response rate, are comparable to the paper survey that was used in the past.

Table 2: Response Rate

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Nationwide	1916	21.5%	6975	78.5%

Treatment by Sub-Grantee

The average scores for the four questions in Table 3 are similar to the scores for the same questions in PY 2021 and to other years.

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	1890	8.6	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	1862	8.6	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	1943	8.0	1	11
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	1874	8.5	1	10

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

Question 7 in Table 4 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, 77.6 percent indicated they had “limited choice,” the ability to accept or refuse the proposed individual. this is lower than the percentage from PY 2021 (82.3%) but slightly higher than PY 2020 (75 percent). 15.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they were given the “full choice” option, about the same as PY 2021 and previous years. 6.9 percent indicated that they were assigned a participant with no choice. In PY 2021 no one reported “no choice.” This percentage of less than 10 percent is similar to years previous to PY 2021.

Table 4. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	1453	77.6%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	291	15.5%
		I really have no choice	129	6.9%

In order to understand the impact of different choice situations, Table 5 shows how choice relates to satisfaction. Limited choice (accepting the individual offered or not) is associated with a satisfaction score that is significantly lower than full choice, suggesting that limited choice is acceptable to most host agencies but is not optimal. The full choice (choice among several candidates) appears to be strongly preferred by host agencies, with a related average satisfaction score over five and a half points higher than the limited choice option. The third option is no choice. As expected, the ACSI score is very low, clearly having a negative impact on host agencies’ satisfaction with local program services.

Table 5. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

			ACSI	
			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	1415	84.9
		I have a choice among several potential participants	281	89.1
		I really have no choice	125	66.6

Detailed Analysis of Preparation

Question 9 (Table 6) explores the degree to which host agencies perceive assigned participants as having the necessary preparation in specific areas recognized as important to both host agencies and employers. Agencies can select more than one answer for this question. As in PY 2021, the most frequently noted lack of preparation is in the area of basic computer knowledge. 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 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

			Count	Percent of All Responses
Nationwide	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	9a. Basic computer knowledge	926	28.5%
		9b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	787	24.2%
		9c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	739	22.7%
		9d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	797	24.5%

Table 7 suggests the importance of participants being well prepared as a means of ensuring host agency satisfaction. For those host agencies that reported no preparation concerns (31 percent), the average ACSI was 90.3, similar to the score for PY 2021 (91.5). For those agencies that identified only one training need, the ACSI score is about 5 points lower than for those agencies that reported no preparation issues but is still slightly above the average ACSI score for this sample of host agencies. The host agencies reporting more than 1 need are nearly 11 points lower than those reporting none. This further emphasizes the importance of assigning participants who are appropriately prepared in all four areas. The number of host agencies reporting no preparation issues is about the same proportion as in PY 2021 (34%). This suggests that grantees have maintained the progress they made in PY 2021. In years prior to PY 2021, only about 10 percent of host agencies reported no preparation needs.

Table 7. Preparation Needs and ACSI

		ACSI	
		Count	Mean
Number of needs	.00	589	90.3
	1.00	358	84.9
	2.00	282	79.6
	3.00	217	80.2
	4.00	387	80.1

Question 8, in Table 8, asks whether the participant is a good match with the host agency. The average nationwide score of 8.4 is the same as PY 2021. 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 for further discussion.)

Table 8. Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Nationwide	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	1926	8.4	1	11

Supportive Services

Question 11 in Table 9 shows the number of host agencies with participants who needed supportive services. Fifty-two percent of the host agencies that answered the question indicated that the participants assigned to them did not need supportive services, a somewhat smaller percentage than in PY 2021. Nearly 31 percent of host agencies reported that a few participants needed supportive services, and only about 17 percent reported that many or nearly all participants needed supportive services. However, for those agencies that reported that participants needed few or no service needs, satisfaction was 6 to 8 points higher than among those host agencies that reported many or nearly all participants needed supportive services. See Table 10 below. 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. The question responses also suggest that if there are multiple placements to a single host agency, some placements may need support services but having all the placements in a single agency needing support services may overwhelm the agency.

Table 9. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	911	52.4%
		Few	528	30.4%
		Many	161	9.3%
		Nearly all	138	7.9%

Table 10. Supportive Services and the ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	894	86.4
		Few	514	84.4
		Many	157	80.4
		Nearly all	136	78.5

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 12 in Table 11 asks if a participant was removed before the host agency

thought the person was ready. Nationwide, 76.8 percent of host agencies never had that experience, significantly lower than the percentage in PY 2021.

Table 11. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1325	76.8%
		Occasionally	328	19.0%
		Frequently	37	2.1%
		Nearly always	36	2.1%

The ACSI scores in Table 12 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 85.6. That is 3 to 8 points higher than the ACSI scores for those agencies that experience the occasional or frequent removal of a participants. Why the agencies reporting early removal nearly always is higher than agencies experiencing occasional or frequent removal is unclear. There may have been other aspects of service that moderated the impact of early removal in those few agencies.

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1297	85.6
		Occasionally	316	82.3
		Frequently	36	77.5
		Nearly always	35	86.3

Question 13 in Table 13 asks if the host agency has requested the local program to remove a participant. Instances of removal occurred 46 percent of the time, higher than reported in PY 2021 (41.0%) but similar to PY 2019 (44.8). As evident in Table 14, premature removal by the local program has a seriously negative impact on customer satisfaction.

Table 13. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	826	46.4%
		No	956	53.6%

As shown in Table 14, there is a 8-point difference in satisfaction between those host agencies that had requested a removal and those that said they had not requested one. This is a very large difference. Those agencies who must request that a participant be removed are 3 points below the average satisfaction rate. Given the high incidence of participants not working out from the host

agency perspective, this continues to be an area that warrants attention by the grantees and their local programs.

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant and ACSI

			ACSI	
			Count	Mean
Nationwide	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	803	81.1
		No	931	87.2

The last fixed response 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 15, 69.1 percent of host agencies indicate that participation has somewhat or significantly increased their ability to provide services, a significantly higher percentage than in the last four surveys. However, this is still significantly lower than the high point percentage for 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 15. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	11	0.6%
		Somewhat decreased	27	1.5%
		Neither decreased nor increased	515	28.8%
		Somewhat increased	481	26.9%
		Increased significantly	756	42.2%

Table 16 shows the association between SCSEP’s impact on the host agency’s capacity to provide services and overall satisfaction. For the 43 percent that experienced a significant increase in capacity, overall satisfaction is extraordinarily high, 91.0 nationwide. Even those agencies that only somewhat increased capacity have an average satisfaction score nearly 7 percentage points above those that experienced no increase or decrease. The few host agencies that experience a decreased capacity have ACSI scores significantly and substantially lower. Perhaps being a host agency imposes a significant burden on them that reduces their ability to provide their regular services.

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	10	56.7
		Somewhat decreased	26	69.4
		Neither decreased nor increased	497	76.4
		Somewhat increased	474	83.4
		Increased significantly	742	91.0

Driver Analysis

In the analyses above, questions that have a few fixed categories for responses or allow for multiple choices have been presented in association with the ACSI score to demonstrate how host agencies' differing evaluations of their experiences impact overall satisfaction. For the questions in Tables 3 and 8, which have a scale of 1-10, the driver analysis below was conducted to determine which aspects of service had the most important to overall satisfaction among all of the 1-10 scale service questions.

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 17 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 occurred 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.² 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 little 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 8. Question 8, which deals with the quality of the match, is the stronger of the two drivers by far and has been for several years. Question 4 deals with the ease of the assignment process; this question also has been a strong driver for many years.

For host agencies, Question 8 is the bottom line, providing a participant that is a good match is essential. With an average nationwide score of 8.4 (the same as PY 2021), 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 29 percent of host agencies gave scores on Question 8 below 8.0.

² 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.

The unshaded Questions 5, 6 and 10 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 5 is certainly an underlying factor in making a good match but it is very highly correlated with Question 4. Questions 6 and 10 are about communication and are strongly correlated with the ACSI although they do not make significant independent contributions as drivers. But, Question 6 has one of the lowest average scores (8.0) leaving significant room for improvement. In addition, Question 10 with a score of 8.5 (somewhat improved from PY 2021) suggests continued attention to staying in touch with the host agency throughout the process, since there is still room for local programs to improve service in this area.

Table 17. Driver Analysis

		ACSI Score
4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	Pearson Correlation	.738**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	1848
5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	Pearson Correlation	.742**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	1822
6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.600**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	1875
8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.747**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	1863
10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	Pearson Correlation	.612**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	1829

Summary and Recommendations

Although the response rate is different and the method of administration changed from mail to email, there are a number of similarities between PY 2023 and PY 2021. 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.

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 3 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 that local programs need to keep the initial assignment process easy. The importance of the host agencies having a choice in the assignment adds to our understanding of how host agencies wish to be treated. It certainly makes it easier when a range of choices are available.

Other analyses regarding preparation underline the importance of preparation as part of the match. Similar to PY 2021, nearly a third of host agencies in this survey reported no preparation issues. This suggests that local programs have maintained the progress they made over years prior to PY 2021 when only 10 percent of agencies reported no preparation needs. Recent surveys have provided the details about training preparation that point to specific improvements. Host agencies have identified the particular importance of better preparation of participants in four areas with particular emphasis on computer training. All four areas (computer basics, employability skills, knowledge of the assignment and how to interact with customers) can have a significant if modest effect on satisfaction.

One area that raises concern is the amount of choice host agencies are given. The percent reporting limited choice declined by 5 percentage points from the previous year and full choice declined by 2 percentage points from the previous year. Moreover, 6.9 percent of host agencies reported having no choice where in PY 2021 not a single host agencies reported have no choice. Given that choice is a strong driver of satisfaction, even small declines in the areas of choice and the rise in host agencies having no choice suggests that local programs need to renew efforts to ensure host agencies have at least limited choice so that customer satisfaction is maintained.

Except for the issue of choice, this survey suggests a consistent picture of service to host agencies. Local programs have areas where they can improve as just noted, but, nationwide, they are working well with their host agency partners.

Appendix

Compete Survey Tables for ACSI and Response Rate

Table 1: ACSI by Grantee

	Count	ACSI Score	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	185	84.2	4	100
ANPPM	35	89.0	41	100
ATD	31	74.2	11	100
Easter Seals	91	86.3	30	100
Goodwill	146	83.9	0	100
IID[S]	14	87.4	58	100
IPDC	3	98.8	96	100
NATABLE	24	84.7	56	100
NAPCA[S]	24	86.6	52	100
NAPCA[G]	52	82.9	0	100
NCBA	107	81.7	7	100
NCOA	91	83.8	11	100
NICOA[S]	12	84.4	48	100
NICOA[G]	18	77.3	33	100
NEWS	21	88.6	61	100
NUL	41	83.4	44	100
OAGB	23	79.7	11	100
SER	109	80.9	11	100
CWI	135	83.0	0	100
TWP	40	82.1	0	100
VANTAGE	44	84.4	7	100
National Grantees	1246	83.4	0	100
Alabama	10	92.8	69	100
Alaska	5	82.2	37	100
Arizona	13	75.0	45	100
Arkansas	18	88.9	60	100
California	31	88.6	59	100
Colorado	8	89.8	67	100
Connecticut	1	66.7	67	67
Delaware	22	84.9	44	100
District of Columbia	2	91.0	82	100

	Count	ACSI Score	Minimum	Maximum
Florida	23	83.2	33	100
Georgia	29	87.6	16	100
Hawaii	11	91.6	60	100
Idaho	4	95.3	85	100
Illinois	10	84.3	45	100
Indiana	21	81.4	30	100
Iowa	6	90.0	74	100
Kansas	12	92.3	70	100
Kentucky	25	85.4	44	100
Louisiana	14	90.0	67	100
Maine	1	96.0	96	96
Maryland	12	76.5	48	100
Massachusetts	3	97.6	93	100
Michigan	17	82.4	37	100
Minnesota	14	76.9	53	100
Mississippi	17	91.4	70	100
Missouri	17	84.4	15	100
Montana	5	73.0	52	97
Nebraska	9	89.0	78	100
Nevada	3	100.0	100	100
New Hampshire	4	79.0	68	100
New Jersey	13	81.0	22	100
New Mexico	3	86.4	70	100
New York	15	87.0	44	100
North Carolina	26	83.9	0	100
North Dakota	0	.	.	.
Ohio	31	79.3	0	100
Oklahoma	21	88.1	48	100
Oregon	11	85.8	59	100
Pennsylvania	49	77.3	0	100
Puerto Rico	2	98.2	96	100
Rhode Island	4	73.4	22	100
South Carolina	19	80.4	0	100
South Dakota	4	73.7	53	93
Tennessee	21	89.1	59	100
Texas	45	91.6	59	100
Utah	2	96.3	93	100
Vermont	0	.	.	.

	Count	ACSI Score	Minimum	Maximum
Virginia	16	87.5	45	100
Washington	3	92.6	78	100
West Virginia	9	87.7	56	100
Wisconsin	6	91.6	71	100
Wyoming	3	99.1	97	100
State Grantees	670	85.3	0	100
Nationwide	1916	84.1	0	100

Table 2: ACSI Response Rates

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	186	23.6%	603	76.4%
ANPPM	35	15.4%	192	84.6%
ATD	31	13.5%	198	86.5%
Easter Seals	90	19.1%	380	80.9%
Goodwill	146	22.5%	502	77.5%
IID[S]	14	21.5%	51	78.5%
IPDC	3	16.7%	15	83.3%
NATABLE	24	20.0%	96	80.0%
NAPCA[S]	23	20.9%	87	79.1%
NAPCA[G]	52	24.6%	159	75.4%
NCBA	107	21.2%	398	78.8%
NCOA	91	13.7%	571	86.3%
NICOA[S]	12	18.8%	52	81.3%
NICOA[G]	18	15.9%	95	84.1%
NOWCC	21	25.6%	61	74.4%
NUL	41	15.7%	220	84.3%
OAGB	23	18.5%	101	81.5%
SER	109	28.8%	270	71.2%
CWI	133	19.5%	549	80.5%
TWP	41	15.0%	233	85.0%
VANTAGE	43	26.9%	117	73.1%
National Grantees	1243	20.1%	4950	79.9%
Alabama	11	18.6%	48	81.4%
Alaska	5	9.6%	47	90.4%
Arizona	13	36.1%	23	63.9%
Arkansas	18	32.7%	37	67.3%
California	31	30.1%	72	69.9%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Colorado	8	40.0%	12	60.0%
Connecticut	1	8.3%	11	91.7%
Delaware	22	31.9%	47	68.1%
District of Columbia	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
Florida	23	19.3%	96	80.7%
Georgia	29	28.2%	74	71.8%
Hawaii	11	27.5%	29	72.5%
Idaho	4	22.2%	14	77.8%
Illinois	10	18.9%	43	81.1%
Indiana	21	41.2%	30	58.8%
Iowa	6	30.0%	14	70.0%
Kansas	12	27.9%	31	72.1%
Kentucky	25	30.5%	57	69.5%
Louisiana	14	30.4%	32	69.6%
Maine	1	12.5%	7	87.5%
Maryland	12	32.4%	25	67.6%
Massachusetts	3	12.0%	22	88.0%
Michigan	17	22.4%	59	77.6%
Minnesota	14	23.7%	45	76.3%
Mississippi	17	45.9%	20	54.1%
Missouri	17	25.0%	51	75.0%
Montana	5	31.3%	11	68.8%
Nebraska	9	31.0%	20	69.0%
Nevada	2	20.0%	8	80.0%
New Hampshire	4	17.4%	19	82.6%
New Jersey	13	16.5%	66	83.5%
New Mexico	3	17.6%	14	82.4%
New York	16	15.0%	91	85.0%
North Carolina	26	33.8%	51	66.2%
North Dakota	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Ohio	32	25.8%	92	74.2%
Oklahoma	21	38.9%	33	61.1%
Oregon	11	28.9%	27	71.1%
Pennsylvania	50	30.7%	113	69.3%
Puerto Rico	2	10.0%	18	90.0%
Rhode Island	4	22.2%	14	77.8%
South Carolina	19	25.0%	57	75.0%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
South Dakota	4	22.2%	14	77.8%
Tennessee	21	34.4%	40	65.6%
Texas	45	24.3%	140	75.7%
Utah	2	15.4%	11	84.6%
Vermont	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Virginia	16	23.5%	52	76.5%
Washington	3	15.8%	16	84.2%
West Virginia	9	25.7%	26	74.3%
Wisconsin	6	8.2%	67	91.8%
Wyoming	3	18.8%	13	81.3%
State Grantees	673	25.5%	1970	74.5%
Nationwide	1916	21.7%	6920	78.3%

Table 3. Treatment by Sub-Grantee

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	1228	8.5	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	1207	8.4	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	1261	7.9	1	11
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	1212	8.4	1	10
State Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	662	8.8	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	655	8.8	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	682	8.3	1	11

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	662	8.6	1	10
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff make the process of assigning participants easy for me.	1890	8.6	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff who make the assignment have a good understanding of my business needs.	1862	8.6	1	10
	6. I receive sufficient information about the backgrounds of the participants assigned to my agency.	1943	8.0	1	11
	10. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff stay in touch with my agency throughout the assignment to make sure it goes well.	1874	8.5	1	10

Table 4. Degree of Choice

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	921	75.6%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	205	16.8%
		I really have no choice	92	7.6%
State Grantees	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	532	81.2%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	86	13.1%
		I really have no choice	37	5.6%
Nationwide	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	1453	77.6%
		I have a choice among several potential participants	291	15.5%
		I really have no choice	129	6.9%

Table 5. Degree of Choice and Overall Satisfaction

			ACSI	
			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	901	84.5
		I have a choice among several potential participants	198	89.0
		I really have no choice	89	63.8
State Grantees	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	514	85.6
		I have a choice among several potential participants	83	89.3
		I really have no choice	36	73.5
Nationwide	7. What choice did you feel you had at that time?	I can accept the individual offered or not	1415	84.9
		I have a choice among several potential participants	281	89.1
		I really have no choice	125	66.6

Table 6. Need for Better Participant Preparation

			Count	Percent of All Responses
National Grantees	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	9a. Basic computer knowledge	597	27.8%
		9b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	523	24.3%
		9c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	505	23.5%
		9d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	525	24.4%
State Grantees	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	9a. Basic computer knowledge	329	29.9%
		9b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	264	24.0%

			Count	Percent of All Responses
		9c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	234	21.3%
		9d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	272	24.7%
Nationwide	9. Would you like the participants to have been better prepared in any of these areas?	9a. Basic computer knowledge	926	28.5%
		9b. Basic employability skills, like how to dress, how to interact with co-workers and supervisors, and punctuality	787	24.2%
		9c. Knowledge of what the assignment required	739	22.7%
		9d. How to interact with the host agency's customers or clients	797	24.5%

Table 7. Preparation Needs and ACSI

			ACSI	
			Count	Mean
National Grantees	Number of preparation issues	.00	369	89.4
		1.00	242	83.7
		2.00	176	79.4
		3.00	145	81.3
		4.00	262	79.6
State Grantees	Number of preparation issues	.00	220	91.7
		1.00	116	87.3
		2.00	106	79.9
		3.00	72	77.8
		4.00	125	81.2
Nationwide	Number of preparation issues	.00	589	90.3
		1.00	358	84.9
		2.00	282	79.6
		3.00	217	80.2
		4.00	387	80.1

Table 8. Quality of the Match

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	1251	8.4	1	11
State Grantees	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	675	8.5	1	11
Nationwide	8. The participants assigned are a good match with my agency.	1926	8.4	1	11

Table 9. Need for Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	593	52.9%
		Few	345	30.8%
		Many	97	8.7%
		Nearly all	86	7.7%
State Grantees	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	318	51.5%
		Few	183	29.7%
		Many	64	10.4%
		Nearly all	52	8.4%
Nationwide	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	911	52.4%
		Few	528	30.4%
		Many	161	9.3%
		Nearly all	138	7.9%

Table 10. Supportive Services and the ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	581	85.9
		Few	340	84.1
		Many	95	78.2
		Nearly all	86	77.5
State Grantees	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	313	87.3
		Few	174	84.9
		Many	62	83.8
		Nearly all	50	80.2
Nationwide	11. Do any of the older workers assigned to your agency need supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, uniforms, safety equipment, or medical care, to be successful.	None	894	86.4
		Few	514	84.4
		Many	157	80.4
		Nearly all	136	78.5

Table 11. Removal of Participant by the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	838	75.0%
		Occasionally	225	20.1%
		Frequently	28	2.5%
		Nearly always	26	2.3%
State Grantees	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	487	80.0%
		Occasionally	103	16.9%
		Frequently	9	1.5%
		Nearly always	10	1.6%
Nationwide	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1325	76.8%
		Occasionally	328	19.0%
		Frequently	37	2.1%
		Nearly always	36	2.1%

Table 12. Removal of Participant by the Program and ACSI

			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	821	85.1
		Occasionally	220	81.5
		Frequently	28	77.4
		Nearly always	25	87.7
State Grantees	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	476	86.4
		Occasionally	96	84.2
		Frequently	8	77.8
		Nearly always	10	82.9
Nationwide	12. Has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP removed any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	1297	85.6
		Occasionally	316	82.3
		Frequently	36	77.5
		Nearly always	35	86.3

Table 13. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	555	48.1%
		No	598	51.9%

			Count	Percent
State Grantees	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	271	43.1%
		No	358	56.9%
Nationwide	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	826	46.4%
		No	956	53.6%

Table 14. Host Agency Request to Remove a Participant and ACSI

			ACSI	
			Count	Mean
National Grantees	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	543	80.4
		No	581	86.9
State Grantees	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	260	82.5
		No	350	87.6
Nationwide	13. Has your agency requested that the Older Worker Program/SCSEP remove a participant because the participant was not working out?	Yes	803	81.1
		No	931	87.2

Table 15. Effect of Participation in SCSEP

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	9	0.9%
		Somewhat decreased	13	1.3%
		Neither decreased nor increased	287	28.7%
		Somewhat increased	268	26.8%
		Increased significantly	422	42.2%
State Grantees	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	1	0.2%
		Somewhat decreased	8	1.5%
		Neither decreased nor increased	149	27.7%
		Somewhat increased	144	26.8%
		Increased significantly	235	43.8%
Nationwide	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	10	0.7%
		Somewhat decreased	21	1.4%
		Neither decreased nor increased	436	28.4%
		Somewhat increased	412	26.8%
		Increased significantly	657	42.8%

Table 16. Effect of Participation in SCSEP and ACSI

			ACSI	
			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	9	63.0
		Somewhat decreased	18	65.9
		Neither decreased nor increased	325	76.0
		Somewhat increased	309	83.0
		Increased significantly	483	90.3
State Grantees	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	1	.0
		Somewhat decreased	8	77.4
		Neither decreased nor increased	172	77.2
		Somewhat increased	165	84.2
		Increased significantly	259	92.3
Nationwide	14. How has your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP affected the amount of service your agency provides to the community?	Decreased significantly	10	56.7
		Somewhat decreased	26	69.4
		Neither decreased nor increased	497	76.4
		Somewhat increased	474	83.4
		Increased significantly	742	91.0