

PY 2023 Nationwide Participant Evaluation of SCSEP

June 30, 2025

Overview

For the PY 2023 participant survey, a nationwide random sample of 17,402 participants was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in January 2025. The third and last wave of data collection was closed in April 2025. 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 2023 is 85.4, similar to the 84.5 score in PY 2022 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.¹

For PY 2023, of the 17,402 surveys mailed, 5,947 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, 34.2 percent, is significantly lower than PY 2022 (41%) and previous years where the response rate around 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)² 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.³ 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.

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

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

³ 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 basic demographics for PY 2023 are similar to those in PY 2022.

- The average age of respondents is 66.8
- 68.7 percent are female and 31.3 percent male
- 59.3 percent have a high school diploma or less. The remaining 40.7 percent have some post-secondary education, degree or certificate
- 53.2 percent are racial minorities, and 12.1 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 2.5 barriers, a slightly lower average number of barriers than reported in the PY 2022 and 2021, when the average number of barriers was around 3.0.

The other defining characteristic of the respondents is their program status at the time they took the survey: 57.9 percent of the respondents were still in the program; 42.1 percent of the respondents had exited the program. Of those who had exited:

- 27.1 percent of the respondents exited for regular employment
- .7 percent of the respondents exited for self-employment
- 72.2 percent of the respondents exited for reasons other than employment⁴

The percent of the sample exiting for regular employment is similar to PY 2022.

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 seven options in Table 1 indicate a wide range of reasons for enrolling in the program. The participants, on average, endorsed about 3.4 reasons, slightly higher than PY 2021 and PY 2022. 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 GPMS (the SCSEP data base) that show participants who exited were working an average of 28.6 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	1399	7.0%
4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	3091	15.6%
4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	2317	11.7%

⁴ 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
4d. Provide service to my community	2887	14.5%
4e. Meet new people	2590	13.0%
4f. Increase my income	3985	20.1%
4g. Feel more useful and independent	3591	18.1%

How Participants Rate Their Treatment in the Program

One of the great strengths of the program has always been the way staff treat participants. As evident in Table 2, they give high ratings to all three aspects of staff work with participants while in the program.⁵ These scores are similar to PY 2022 and previous years. Having someone to talk to is the lowest and suggests there is room for improvement in this area.

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.	6062	8.9	1	10
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	6022	8.7	1	10
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	5921	8.6	1	58

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 focusing on the local program experience) 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 2022.

⁵ 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.	5624	8.5	1	10
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	5814	8.0	1	10
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	5980	8.9	1	10

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 who had exited felt that SCSEP prepared them for employment in different industry sectors. There were 1676 respondents who had a placement after leaving the program, including 64 who were self-employed. The analysis in Table 5 is limited to those participants employed after exit.⁶ 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 462 individuals who responded to Q20 made a total of 524 choices as shown in Table 4. Nationwide, the most frequently endorsed sector was nonprofit organizations (41.8%), 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 21.2 percent for government and 29.2 percent for the for-profit sector. The percent who felt prepared for the for-profit sector is somewhat higher than the percent in PY 2022. 41 respondents indicated they were not prepared for employment in any organization or business. This number equates to 7.8% of all respondents, slightly lower than the percentage as PY 2022.

Table 4. Prepared for Employment

	Count	Percent of All Responses
20.. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program prepared you for employment in these organizations?		
20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	219	41.8%
20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	111	21.2%
20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	153	29.2%
20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	41	7.8%

⁶ 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.

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 462 who responded to this question, 100 participants saw themselves prepared in all three sectors, 38 saw themselves prepared in two of the three sectors, and 200 saw themselves prepared for one sector, most often the nonprofit sector. 10.2 percent of respondents did not feel prepared in any sector. These responses are somewhat different than PY 2022. A significantly higher percentage believed they were prepared for all 3 sectors. Significantly fewer felt they were not prepared for any sector.

Table 4a. Employment Preparation by Number of Sectors

Number of Sectors	Count	Percent
1 sector	200	58.5%
2 sectors	38	11.1%
All 3 sectors	69	20.2%
No sectors	35	10.2%

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 respondents included those who had exited as well as those still in the program. The score for helping prepare participants for success is slightly higher than the previous two years' surveys.

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?	5853	8.3	1	10

Data for two health outcomes continue to be collected in this survey. Table 6 shows the responses to Question 14. 34.1 percent indicate they are in better physical health, and 56.8% indicate their health is about the same. Only 9.1 percent indicate that their health declined in the course of program participation (the same percentage as last year). These results are somewhat better than PY 2022 when only 32 percent indicated better health.

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	2002	34.1%
	Worse	533	9.1%
	About the same	3329	56.8%

The second health question asks about mental health. As in previous years, the program produces strongly positive results as shown in Table 7. Nearly 75 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 PY 2022 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	140	2.3%
	A little more negative	224	3.7%
	About the same	1113	18.5%
	A little more positive	1467	24.4%
	Much more positive	3060	51.0%

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, nearly 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 about the same as in PY 2022 and 7-9 points higher than prior 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	223	3.7%
	2	70	1.2%
	3	86	1.4%
	4	102	1.7%
	5	297	4.9%
	6	243	4.0%
	7	299	5.0%
	8	534	8.9%
	9	607	10.1%
	10 Strongly agree	3563	59.1%

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, the same as in PY 2022 but slightly 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 the Program

		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	323	5.4%
	No	3787	63.5%
	Does not apply	1855	31.1%

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 2021 and PY 2022, a little over a third (35.4%) of the participants received the computer training they needed. A little over a quarter (28.3%) did not need computer training and did not receive any. In total, computer training was properly targeted for more than 63 percent of the participants, about the same as in PY 2022. However, 19 percent needed computer training and received little or none, and another 9.8 percent received computer training that did not meet their needs. Overall, the targeting of training was slightly better than in PY2022 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	2063	35.4%
	I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	571	9.8%
	I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1109	19.1%
	I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	431	7.4%
	I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1647	28.3%

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 6,024 participants who responded to the question, 1770 (29.4%) indicated they did not need any supportive services. Of the 4,254 who did indicate a need for supportive services, 21.9 percent disagreed or were neutral (score of 1-5 out of 10) that the assistance met their needs, both percentages similar to PY 2022. Over 48.6% rated the assistance as positive (6-10 out of 10). These percentages are largely in line with those in PY 2022.

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	607	10.1%
	2	137	2.3%
	3	156	2.6%
	4	141	2.3%
	5	280	4.6%
	6	228	3.8%
	7	260	4.3%
	8	428	7.1%
	9	496	8.2%
	10 Strongly agree	1521	25.2%
	Did not need support	1770	29.4%

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 2022 and PY 2021. 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	4962	89.7%
	No	570	10.3%
	Total	5532	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 who have exited for employment 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 2021 and PY 2022. 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?	358	7.6	1	10

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 2023 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 2022. Question 10 has previously been a driver and continues to be important although it did not provide enough unique explanatory power to be included in this year or in PY 2022. 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 2022. 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 of a point higher. This suggests that there is clearly room for improvement.

The shaded questions in Table 14 are not necessarily the only program areas 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 Score
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	.717**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5881
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.707**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5846
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.650**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5752
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.699**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5449
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.651**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5634
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.671**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5802
16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	Pearson Correlation	.402**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	5844
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Pearson Correlation	.765**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5682
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Pearson Correlation	.653**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
	N	1524

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Although not a key driver, Question 11 is closely related to overall satisfaction as seen in Table 15. There is a 46.4-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 somewhat larger than the difference in PY 2022. 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 include involving participants, giving them a say in how they are prepared 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	288	49.0
	2	100	52.1
	3	108	59.8
	4	131	59.2
	5	215	70.8
	6	240	74.6
	7	305	80.0
	8	614	84.3
	9	816	91.0
	10 Strongly agree	2284	95.4

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 70.6 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 95.9, while those who strongly disagreed that they received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of around 61.7. This difference of 34.2 points in scores highlights the critical importance of providing supportive services for those who need them.

Table 16. Supportive Services and the 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	514	61.7
	2	122	64.0
	3	140	64.3
	4	128	70.7
	5	261	77.5
	6	202	80.2
	7	225	81.1

		Count	ACSI Score
	8	383	87.3
	9	446	90.8
	10 Strongly agree	1303	95.9
	Did not need support	1556	89.2

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 the ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	1806	91.3
	I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	496	78.0
	I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	983	75.4
	I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	375	86.5
	I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1449	86.2

For the 1,806 who needed computer training and got what they needed, the ACSI is extremely high, 91.3. 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 13-16 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 2022. 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 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. 462 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 37.5 to 41.3 points (the gaps between no sectors and any number of sectors is significantly large than in PY 2022. 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

Number of Sectors	Count	ACSI Score
1 sector	200	89.4
2 sectors	38	88.5
All 3 sectors	69	92.2
No sectors	35	51.0

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 8.3, 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 2023, the same as in PY 2022 and PY 2021, continues to be the lowest score on the survey and indicates that local programs can do considerably more in this area, perhaps focusing more on part-time employment opportunities.

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 46.4 point difference in satisfaction (a larger difference than in PY 2022 and 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 appropriate services significantly lowers satisfaction.

Finally, it should be noted that the ACSI score for the program nationwide remains very high and compares favorably with the best organizations assessed by this international standard of excellence. While the program overall does well on this standard, individual grantees vary considerably in their individual ACSI scores and those with lower scores should work to bring themselves up to the standards maintained by the program overall.

Appendix A Complete Survey Tables

Table 1. Response Rate by Grantee

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	293	29.9%	687	70.1%
ANPPM	142	38.4%	228	61.6%
ATD	150	40.5%	220	59.5%
Easter Seals	196	27.7%	512	72.3%
Goodwill	226	32.2%	476	67.8%
IID[S]	92	36.2%	162	63.8%
IPDC	36	42.9%	48	57.1%
NATABLE	114	32.0%	242	68.0%
NAPCA[S]	232	38.9%	364	61.1%
NAPCA[G]	161	36.6%	279	63.4%
NCBA	191	30.3%	439	69.7%
NCOA	300	35.6%	543	64.4%
NICOA[S]	91	42.1%	125	57.9%
NICOA[G]	137	44.8%	169	55.2%
NEWS	107	32.5%	222	67.5%
NUL	153	36.4%	267	63.6%
OAGB	102	27.4%	270	72.6%
SER	137	32.5%	285	67.5%
CWI	294	34.0%	570	66.0%
TWP	149	39.6%	227	60.4%
VANTAGE	135	36.5%	235	63.5%
National Grantees	3438	34.4%	6570	65.6%
Alabama	56	32.6%	116	67.4%
Alaska	27	25.7%	78	74.3%
Arizona	30	28.6%	75	71.4%
Arkansas	51	35.2%	94	64.8%
California	143	38.4%	229	61.6%
Colorado	19	31.7%	41	68.3%
Connecticut	11	31.4%	24	68.6%
Delaware	49	32.0%	104	68.0%
District of Columbia	15	31.3%	33	68.8%
Florida	117	31.6%	253	68.4%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Georgia	94	39.8%	142	60.2%
Hawaii	42	35.9%	75	64.1%
Idaho	19	43.2%	25	56.8%
Illinois	55	27.6%	144	72.4%
Indiana	39	29.1%	95	70.9%
Iowa	68	36.6%	118	63.4%
Kansas	34	30.9%	76	69.1%
Kentucky	74	41.8%	103	58.2%
Louisiana	73	37.6%	121	62.4%
Maine	10	66.7%	5	33.3%
Maryland	27	30.7%	61	69.3%
Massachusetts	18	28.6%	45	71.4%
Michigan	100	45.9%	118	54.1%
Minnesota	58	34.7%	109	65.3%
Mississippi	31	45.6%	37	54.4%
Missouri	54	28.7%	134	71.3%
Montana	15	34.9%	28	65.1%
Nebraska	21	45.7%	25	54.3%
Nevada	10	33.3%	20	66.7%
New Hampshire	14	41.2%	20	58.8%
New Jersey	72	38.3%	116	61.7%
New Mexico	14	40.0%	21	60.0%
New York	127	33.6%	251	66.4%
North Carolina	130	38.7%	206	61.3%
North Dakota	8	34.8%	15	65.2%
Ohio	121	37.8%	199	62.2%
Oklahoma	33	28.4%	83	71.6%
Oregon	30	27.0%	81	73.0%
Pennsylvania	108	29.2%	262	70.8%
Puerto Rico	31	30.4%	71	69.6%
Rhode Island	14	41.2%	20	58.8%
South Carolina	60	28.8%	148	71.2%
South Dakota	16	32.0%	34	68.0%
Tennessee	55	43.7%	71	56.3%
Texas	95	25.7%	275	74.3%
Utah	18	24.3%	56	75.7%
Vermont	3	23.1%	10	76.9%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Virginia	60	47.6%	66	52.4%
Washington	22	27.5%	58	72.5%
West Virginia	34	29.8%	80	70.2%
Wisconsin	69	27.5%	182	72.5%
Wyoming	15	34.9%	28	65.1%
State Grantees	2509	34.0%	4881	66.0%
Nationwide	5947	34.2%	11451	65.8%

Table 2. ACSI by Grantee

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	293	85.3	0	100
ANPPM	142	88.6	0	100
ATD	150	80.9	0	100
Easter Seals	196	84.0	0	100
Goodwill	226	84.9	0	100
IID[S]	92	92.7	0	100
IPDC	36	90.8	0	100
NATABLE	114	77.4	0	100
NAPCA[S]	232	88.4	37	100
NAPCA[G]	161	89.7	19	100
NCBA	191	82.6	0	100
NCOA	300	84.6	0	100
NICOA[S]	91	88.7	11	100
NICOA[G]	137	83.7	0	100
NEWS	107	88.8	0	100
NUL	153	83.3	0	100
OAGB	102	86.7	8	100
SER	137	85.5	0	100
CWI	294	88.1	0	100
TWP	149	87.5	0	100
VANTAGE	135	88.9	7	100
National Grantees	3438	85.9	0	100
Alabama	56	91.4	56	100
Alaska	27	81.3	4	100
Arizona	30	81.7	0	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Arkansas	51	91.1	4	100
California	143	82.8	0	100
Colorado	19	84.9	0	100
Connecticut	11	79.1	7	100
Delaware	49	88.9	22	100
District of Columbia	15	86.8	0	100
Florida	117	80.9	0	100
Georgia	94	90.7	23	100
Hawaii	42	88.5	56	100
Idaho	19	78.4	3	100
Illinois	55	85.5	0	100
Indiana	39	85.6	0	100
Iowa	68	75.7	0	100
Kansas	34	83.6	30	100
Kentucky	74	87.2	11	100
Louisiana	73	88.5	0	100
Maine	10	85.5	55	100
Maryland	27	88.7	48	100
Massachusetts	18	85.0	37	100
Michigan	100	86.1	0	100
Minnesota	58	79.9	7	100
Mississippi	31	92.1	11	100
Missouri	54	87.5	0	100
Montana	15	79.2	4	100
Nebraska	21	82.8	37	100
Nevada	10	79.1	0	100
New Hampshire	14	87.4	61	100
New Jersey	72	85.7	0	100
New Mexico	14	94.0	81	100
New York	127	83.5	0	100
North Carolina	130	87.7	0	100
North Dakota	8	75.4	3	100
Ohio	121	83.6	0	100
Oklahoma	33	85.5	15	100
Oregon	30	81.7	11	100
Pennsylvania	108	79.0	0	100
Puerto Rico	31	87.8	15	100
Rhode Island	14	92.6	33	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
South Carolina	60	83.9	0	100
South Dakota	16	83.4	12	100
Tennessee	55	90.0	15	100
Texas	95	81.3	0	100
Utah	18	69.0	0	100
Vermont	3	60.6	0	92
Virginia	60	93.6	67	100
Washington	22	78.4	0	100
West Virginia	34	80.8	0	100
Wisconsin	69	83.7	0	100
Wyoming	15	79.8	29	100
State Grantees	2509	84.7	0	100
Nationwide	5947	85.4	0	100

Table 3. Reasons for Enrollment

			Count	Percent of All Responses
National Grantees	4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program were to:	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	825	4.2%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	1785	9.0%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	1341	6.8%
		4d. Provide service to my community	1687	8.5%
		4e. Meet new people	1466	7.4%
		4f. Increase my income	2233	11.2%
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	2072	10.4%
State Grantees	4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program were to:	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	574	2.9%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	1304	6.6%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	975	4.9%
		4d. Provide service to my community	1199	6.0%
		4e. Meet new people	1123	5.7%
		4f. Increase my income	1749	8.8%
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	1516	7.6%

			Count	Percent of All Responses
Nationwide	4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program were to:	4a. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program	1399	7.0%
		4b. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	3089	15.6%
		4c. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	2316	11.7%
		4d. Provide service to my community	2886	14.5%
		4e. Meet new people	2589	13.0%
		4f. Increase my income	3982	20.1%
		4g. Feel more useful and independent	3588	18.1%

Table 4. Treatment of Participants

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	3502	8.9	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	3473	8.8	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	3430	8.6	1	10
State Grantees	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	2556	8.8	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	2545	8.6	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	2487	8.6	1	58

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
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.	6058	8.8	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	6018	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	5917	8.6	1	58

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	340	9.8%
		2	86	2.5%
		3	87	2.5%
		4	82	2.4%
		5	161	4.6%
		6	138	4.0%
		7	161	4.6%
		8	258	7.5%
		9	276	8.0%
		10 Strongly agree	879	25.4%
		Did not need support	995	28.7%
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	267	10.4%
		2	51	2.0%
		3	69	2.7%
		4	59	2.3%
		5	118	4.6%
		6	90	3.5%
		7	99	3.9%
		8	170	6.6%
		9	219	8.6%
		10 Strongly agree	641	25.1%
		Did not need support	774	30.3%

		Count	Percent
Nationwide	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	607 10.1%
		2	137 2.3%
		3	156 2.6%
		4	141 2.3%
		5	279 4.6%
		6	228 3.8%
		7	260 4.3%
		8	428 7.1%
		9	495 8.2%
		10 Strongly agree	1520 25.2%
		Did not need support	1769 29.4%

Table 6. Geographic Convenience

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	2865 89.6%
		No	331 10.4%
State Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	2094 89.8%
		No	238 10.2%
Nationwide	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	4959 89.7%
		No	569 10.3%

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.	3210	8.5	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	3373	8.1	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	3450	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.	2410	8.4	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	2437	8.0	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	2526	8.8	1	10
Nationwide	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	5620	8.5	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	5810	8.0	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	5976	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	1212 36.3%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	327 9.8%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	621 18.6%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	262 7.8%

			Count	Percent
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	920	27.5%
State Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	849	34.3%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	244	9.9%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	488	19.7%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	169	6.8%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	726	29.3%
Nationwide	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed	2061	35.4%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	571	9.8%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1109	19.1%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	431	7.4%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	1646	28.3%

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	1214	35.7%	280	8.2%	1907	56.1%
State Grantees	787	32.0%	253	10.3%	1420	57.7%
Nationwide	2001	34.1%	533	9.1%	3327	56.8%

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	74	2.1%
		A little more negative	111	3.2%
		About the same	616	17.8%
		A little more positive	814	23.5%
		Much more positive	1846	53.3%
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	66	2.6%
		A little more negative	113	4.5%
		About the same	496	19.5%
		A little more positive	652	25.7%
		Much more positive	1212	47.7%
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	140	2.3%
		A little more negative	224	3.7%
		About the same	1112	18.5%
		A little more positive	1466	24.4%
		Much more positive	3058	51.0%

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	97	2.8%
		2	41	1.2%
		3	51	1.5%
		4	58	1.7%
		5	166	4.8%
		6	151	4.3%
		7	183	5.2%
		8	320	9.2%
		9	340	9.7%
		10 Strongly agree	2081	59.7%

		Count	Percent	
State Grantees	16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	126	5.0%
		2	29	1.1%
		3	35	1.4%
		4	44	1.7%
		5	131	5.2%
		6	90	3.6%
		7	116	4.6%
		8	214	8.5%
		9	266	10.5%
		10 Strongly agree	1481	58.5%
Nationwide	16. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	223	3.7%
		2	70	1.2%
		3	86	1.4%
		4	102	1.7%
		5	297	4.9%
		6	241	4.0%
		7	299	5.0%
		8	534	8.9%
		9	606	10.1%
		10 Strongly agree	3562	59.2%

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	188	5.5%
		No	2227	64.8%
		Does not apply	1024	29.8%
State Grantees	17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	135	5.4%
		No	1559	61.8%
		Does not apply	828	32.8%
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	323	5.4%
		No	3786	63.5%
		Does not apply	1852	31.1%

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?	3377	8.4	1	10
State Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	2472	8.2	1	10
Nationwide	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	5849	8.3	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?	185	7.7	1	10
State Grantees	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	173	7.5	1	10
Nationwide	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	358	7.6	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.	115	21.9%
		20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	56	10.7%
		20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	85	16.2%
		20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	16	3.1%

			Count	Percent of All Responses
State Grantees	Prepared for Employment	20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	104	19.8%
		20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	55	10.5%
		20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	68	13.0%
		20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	25	4.8%
Nationwide	Prepared for Employment	20a. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	219	41.8%
		20b. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	111	21.2%
		20c. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	153	29.2%
		20d. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	41	7.8%

Table 16. Employment Preparation by Number of Sectors

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Number of Sectors	No sectors	15 8.3%
		1 sector	109 60.6%
		2 sectors	21 11.7%
		All 3 sectors	35 19.4%
State Grantees	Number of Sectors	No sectors	20 12.3%
		1 sector	91 56.2%
		2 sectors	17 10.5%
		All 3 sectors	34 21.0%
Nationwide	Number of Sectors	No sectors	35 10.2%
		1 sector	200 58.5%
		2 sectors	38 11.1%
		All 3 sectors	69 20.2%

Appendix B Respondent Demographics and Characteristics

Table 1. Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Education

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Male	1110	32.4%
		Female	2313	67.6%
	Race	White	1171	44.0%
		Black	1192	44.8%
		Asian	148	5.6%
		American Indian	145	5.4%
		Pacific Islander	7	0.3%
		Ethnicity	Hispanic	361
	Not Hispanic	2365	86.8%	
	Education	Less than HS diploma	524	18.2%
		HS Diploma/GED	1224	42.4%
		Some college	547	19.0%
		Vocational/Technical degree	51	1.8%
Associates degree		143	5.0%	
BA/BS		295	10.2%	
Bachelors Plus		102	3.5%	
State Grantees	Gender	Male	741	29.7%
		Female	1758	70.3%
	Race	White	1054	50.3%
		Black	952	45.4%
		Asian	51	2.4%
		American Indian	31	1.5%
		Pacific Islander	7	0.3%
		Ethnicity	Hispanic	227
	Not Hispanic	1922	89.4%	
	Education	Less than HS diploma	323	14.5%
		HS Diploma/GED	956	43.0%
		Some college	467	21.0%
		Vocational/Technical degree	53	2.4%
Associates degree		106	4.8%	
BA/BS		232	10.4%	

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Gender	Bachelors Plus	87	3.9%
		Male	1851	31.3%
		Female	4071	68.7%
	Race	White	2225	46.8%
		Black	2144	45.1%
		Asian	199	4.2%
		American Indian	176	3.7%
		Pacific Islander	14	0.3%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	588	12.1%
		Not Hispanic	4287	87.9%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	847	16.6%
		HS Diploma/GED	2180	42.7%
		Some college	1014	19.8%
		Vocational/Technical degree	104	2.0%
Associates degree		249	4.9%	
BA/BS		527	10.3%	
Bachelors Plus		189	3.7%	

Table 2. Barriers to Employment

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Disability	Yes	1081	31.4%
		No	2357	68.6%
	LEP	Yes	384	13.3%
		No	2501	86.7%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	767	26.6%
		No	2121	73.4%
	Rural	Yes	652	19.0%
		No	2786	81.0%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	1574	45.8%
		No	1864	54.2%
	Poor Employment Prospects	Yes	2616	90.6%
		No	272	9.4%
	Veteran	Yes	768	22.3%
		No	2670	77.7%
	Severe Disability	Yes	8	0.2%

		Count	Percent		
	Frail	No	3430	99.8%	
		Yes	5	0.1%	
	Old Enough for but not Receiving Social Security	No	3433	99.9%	
		Yes	4	0.1%	
	Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	No	3434	99.9%	
		Yes	535	18.5%	
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	2352	81.5%	
		Yes	42	1.2%	
	Seventy-five Plus	No	3396	98.8%	
		Yes	30	0.9%	
	Formerly Incarcerated	No	3408	99.1%	
		Yes	117	4.0%	
	State Grantees	Disability	No	2773	96.0%
			Yes	746	29.7%
LEP	No	1763	70.3%		
	Yes	152	6.8%		
Low Literacy Skills	No	2073	93.2%		
	Yes	647	29.1%		
Rural	No	1580	70.9%		
	Yes	585	23.3%		
Homeless or at Risk	No	1924	76.7%		
	Yes	1020	40.7%		
Poor Employment Prospects	No	1489	59.3%		
	Yes	1914	85.9%		
Veteran	No	314	14.1%		
	Yes	452	18.0%		
Severe Disability	No	2057	82.0%		
	Yes	11	0.4%		
Frail	No	2498	99.6%		
	Yes	8	0.3%		
Old Enough for but not Receiving Social Security	No	2501	99.7%		
	Yes	3	0.1%		
Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	No	2506	99.9%		
	Yes	403	18.1%		
Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	1825	81.9%		
	Yes	29	1.2%		
Seventy-five Plus	No	2480	98.8%		
	Yes	30	1.2%		

			Count	Percent
	Formerly Incarcerated	No	2479	98.8%
		Yes	81	3.6%
		No	2147	96.4%
Nationwide	Disability	Yes	1827	30.7%
		No	4120	69.3%
	LEP	Yes	536	10.5%
		No	4574	89.5%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	1414	27.6%
		No	3701	72.4%
	Rural	Yes	1237	20.8%
		No	4710	79.2%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	2594	43.6%
		No	3353	56.4%
	Poor Employment Prospects	Yes	4530	88.5%
		No	586	11.5%
	Veteran	Yes	1220	20.5%
		No	4727	79.5%
	Severe Disability	Yes	19	0.3%
		No	5928	99.7%
	Frail	Yes	13	0.2%
		No	5934	99.8%
	Old Enough for but not Receiving Social Security	Yes	7	0.1%
		No	5940	99.9%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	Yes	938	18.3%
		No	4177	81.7%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	71	1.2%
		No	5876	98.8%
	Seventy-five Plus	Yes	60	1.0%
		No	5887	99.0%
	Formerly Incarcerated	Yes	198	3.9%
		No	4920	96.1%

Table 3. Average Number of Barrers to Employment

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Number of Barrers	3365	2.6	1	7.0
State Grantees	Number of Barrers	2432	2.5	1	7.0
Nationwide	Number of Barrers	5797	2.5	1	7.0

Table 4. Age

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Age	Less than 65	1314	45.8%
		65 or older	1552	54.2%
State Grantees	Age	Less than 65	926	42.1%
		65 or older	1273	57.9%
Nationwide	Age	Less than 65	2240	44.2%
		65 or older	2825	55.8%

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.⁷ 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

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