

**PY 2010 Customer Satisfaction Survey of Host Agencies  
Nationwide Report  
October 13, 2011**

**I. Overview**

The nationwide report for the PY 2010 host agency customer satisfaction surveys consists of the tables below that present the nationwide scores for all of the survey questions, as well as the standard analyses, Key Drivers and Questions Most Closely Associated with ACSI Scores, in Section II K. The usual narrative explanation has been omitted.

This nationwide report will be most useful if read in conjunction with the complete nationwide host agency survey report for PY 2009. The PY 2009 nationwide report contains the background of the host agency customer satisfaction survey project, the methodology employed by all grantees, an explanation of the nationwide results for each survey question, and an extended explanation of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI).

**II. Survey Results**

**A. Host Agency Characteristics**

Table 1

	20. For how long have you been a host agency?			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	5966	4.99	0	96
State Grantees	3894	5.00	0	56
Nationwide	9860	4.99	0	96

**B. Response Rate**

Table 2

Grantee	Response Rate			
	Did not respond		Responded	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	632	39.6%	964	60.4%
ANPPM	129	34.9%	241	65.1%
Easter Seals	203	42.5%	275	57.5%
Experience Works	826	38.2%	1337	61.8%
Goodwill	145	34.5%	275	65.5%
IID	42	38.2%	68	61.8%
Mature Services	105	32.3%	220	67.7%

Grantee	Response Rate			
	Did not respond		Responded	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
ABLE	114	31.0%	254	69.0%
NAPCA	114	34.1%	220	65.9%
NCBA	215	36.4%	376	63.6%
NCOA	272	35.3%	498	64.7%
NICOA	148	45.1%	180	54.9%
Urban League	155	41.9%	215	58.1%
QCS	40	35.4%	73	64.6%
SER	200	36.2%	353	63.8%
SSAI	429	38.4%	689	61.6%
VATD	99	54.4%	83	45.6%
TWI	51	36.4%	89	63.6%
<b>National Grantees</b>	<b>3919</b>	<b>37.9%</b>	<b>6410</b>	<b>62.1%</b>
Alabama	88	44.4%	110	55.6%
Alaska	66	56.9%	50	43.1%
Arizona	24	31.6%	52	68.4%
Arkansas	65	36.9%	111	63.1%
California	161	43.5%	209	56.5%
Colorado	38	49.4%	39	50.6%
Connecticut	36	45.6%	43	54.4%
Delaware	50	53.2%	44	46.8%
District of Columbia	21	72.4%	8	27.6%
Florida	148	40.0%	222	60.0%
Georgia	106	51.7%	99	48.3%
Hawaii	46	39.7%	70	60.3%
Idaho	22	43.1%	29	56.9%
Illinois	81	42.2%	111	57.8%
Indiana	125	38.9%	196	61.1%
Iowa	35	38.5%	56	61.5%
Kansas	32	32.0%	68	68.0%
Kentucky	42	33.9%	82	66.1%
Louisiana	62	47.3%	69	52.7%
Maine	29	45.3%	35	54.7%
Maryland	48	44.4%	60	55.6%
Massachusetts	68	49.6%	69	50.4%
Michigan	98	41.9%	136	58.1%

Grantee	Response Rate			
	Did not respond		Responded	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Minnesota	118	44.5%	147	55.5%
Mississippi	31	35.2%	57	64.8%
Missouri	71	38.8%	112	61.2%
Montana	14	25.9%	40	74.1%
Nebraska	15	37.5%	25	62.5%
Nevada	23	52.3%	21	47.7%
New Hampshire	29	49.2%	30	50.8%
New Jersey	93	53.4%	81	46.6%
New Mexico	14	36.8%	24	63.2%
New York	114	44.5%	142	55.5%
North Carolina	83	41.7%	116	58.3%
North Dakota	28	36.4%	49	63.6%
Ohio	106	34.0%	206	66.0%
Oklahoma	73	44.8%	90	55.2%
Oregon	51	40.8%	74	59.2%
Pennsylvania	132	35.7%	238	64.3%
Rhode Island	15	45.5%	18	54.5%
South Carolina	35	36.8%	60	63.2%
South Dakota	19	23.8%	61	76.3%
Tennessee	42	32.3%	88	67.7%
Texas	157	42.5%	212	57.5%
Utah	31	58.5%	22	41.5%
Vermont	23	60.5%	15	39.5%
Virginia	64	46.7%	73	53.3%
Washington	32	32.3%	67	67.7%
West Virginia	17	38.6%	27	61.4%
Wisconsin	70	40.9%	101	59.1%
Wyoming	13	43.3%	17	56.7%
State Grantees	3025	41.9%	4196	58.1%
Nationwide	6944	39.6%	10606	60.4%

## C. ACSI

Table 3

Grantee	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	964	80.3	0	100
ANPPM	241	83.6	0	100
Easter Seals	275	81.6	8	100
Experience Works	1337	82.1	0	100
Goodwill	275	81.3	0	100
IID	68	85.2	41	100
Mature Services	220	77.2	13	100
ABLE	254	80.6	3	100
NAPCA	220	82.8	4	100
NCBA	376	81.3	0	100
NCOA	498	83.2	6	100
NICOA	180	79.5	0	100
Urban League	215	81.7	0	100
QCS	73	84.8	22	100
SER	353	81.5	0	100
SSAI	689	81.7	0	100
VATD	83	76.7	8	100
TWI	89	79.2	20	100
<b>National Grantees</b>	<b>6410</b>	<b>81.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>
Alabama	110	78.8	0	100
Alaska	50	75.9	18	100
Arizona	52	83.0	37	100
Arkansas	111	83.9	37	100
California	209	81.8	7	100
Colorado	39	81.5	30	100
Connecticut	43	84.1	38	100
Delaware	44	80.7	0	100
District of Columbia	8	77.1	31	100
Florida	222	82.3	14	100
Georgia	99	79.6	16	100
Hawaii	70	79.6	23	100
Idaho	29	86.7	41	100
Illinois	111	83.3	0	100
Indiana	196	81.2	9	100

Grantee	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Iowa	56	76.6	19	100
Kansas	68	78.0	0	100
Kentucky	82	80.0	27	100
Louisiana	69	84.1	16	100
Maine	35	81.3	0	100
Maryland	60	82.8	4	100
Massachusetts	69	81.8	13	100
Michigan	136	85.4	12	100
Minnesota	147	84.1	8	100
Mississippi	57	84.0	44	100
Missouri	112	83.3	0	100
Montana	40	83.1	36	100
Nebraska	25	82.3	34	100
Nevada	21	75.6	16	100
New Hampshire	30	81.3	42	100
New Jersey	81	81.2	0	100
New Mexico	24	74.8	15	100
New York	142	78.2	11	100
North Carolina	116	83.3	11	100
North Dakota	49	84.2	11	100
Ohio	206	77.8	3	100
Oklahoma	90	78.9	7	100
Oregon	74	80.8	22	100
Pennsylvania	238	83.2	0	100
Rhode Island	18	76.9	37	100
South Carolina	60	85.5	42	100
South Dakota	61	88.8	16	100
Tennessee	88	89.3	38	100
Texas	212	84.2	0	100
Utah	22	73.8	12	100
Vermont	15	77.1	22	100
Virginia	73	83.3	4	100
Washington	67	73.5	0	100
West Virginia	27	83.0	16	100
Wisconsin	101	82.0	15	100
Wyoming	17	74.8	12	100

Grantee	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
State Grantees	4196	81.7	0	100
Nationwide	10606	81.6	0	100

#### D. Treatment by Sub-grantee

Table 4

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	6469	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	6349	8.6	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	5724	8.3	1	10
State Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	4233	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	4152	8.7	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	3801	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	10702	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	10501	8.7	1	10
	11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	9525	8.3	1	10

## E. Assignment Process

Table 5

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	6402	8.5	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	6316	7.9	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	6227	7.9	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	6314	8.0	1	10
State Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	4184	8.6	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	4117	7.9	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	4073	7.9	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	4131	8.1	1	10
Nationwide	6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	10586	8.5	1	10
	7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	10433	7.9	1	10
	8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	10300	7.9	1	10
	16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	10445	8.1	1	10

Table 6

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	4742	82.5%
		Occasionally	752	13.1%
		Frequently	130	2.3%
		Nearly always	126	2.2%
State Grantees	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3091	81.4%
		Occasionally	539	14.2%
		Frequently	94	2.5%
		Nearly always	74	1.9%
Nationwide	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	7833	82.0%
		Occasionally	1291	13.5%
		Frequently	224	2.3%
		Nearly always	200	2.1%

## F. Supportive Services and Training

Table 7

	12. Did any of the older workers assigned to your agency require supportive services?					
	Yes		No		Don't know	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
National Grantees	817	12.7%	4678	72.8%	935	14.5%
State Grantees	538	12.7%	3062	72.4%	627	14.8%
Nationwide	1355	12.7%	7740	72.6%	1562	14.7%

Table 8

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	187	24.5%
		Few	99	13.0%
		Some	214	28.0%
		Nearly all	264	34.6%
State Grantees	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	111	22.4%
		Few	78	15.7%
		Some	142	28.6%
		Nearly all	165	33.3%
Nationwide	13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?	None	298	23.7%
		Few	177	14.0%
		Some	356	28.3%
		Nearly all	429	34.0%



Table 9

	14. Do participants assigned to your agency ever need any additional training?					
	Yes		No		Don't know	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
National Grantees	1713	26.7%	4212	65.6%	498	7.8%
State Grantees	1140	27.2%	2784	66.3%	274	6.5%
Nationwide	2853	26.9%	6996	65.9%	772	7.3%

Table 10

15. Does the Older Worker Program provide the needed training?		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Never provides training	224	16.1%
	Sometimes provides training	480	34.6%
	Often provides training	390	28.1%
	Always provides training	295	21.2%
State Grantees	Never provides training	153	16.4%
	Sometimes provides training	295	31.7%
	Often provides training	287	30.8%
	Always provides training	196	21.1%
Nationwide	Never provides training	377	16.3%
	Sometimes provides training	775	33.4%
	Often provides training	677	29.2%
	Always provides training	491	21.2%

## G. Quality of Participants

Table 11

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	5118	6.2	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	6440	8.0	1	10
State Grantees	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	3303	6.3	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	4204	8.1	1	10

Nationwide	9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	8421	6.2	1	10
	10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	10644	8.0	1	10

## H. The Impact of SCSEP

Table 12

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	.5%
		Somewhat decreased	1.0%
		Neither decreased nor increased	22.4%
		Somewhat increased	31.1%
		Significantly increased	45.0%
State Grantees	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	.6%
		Somewhat decreased	1.3%
		Neither decreased nor increased	22.2%
		Somewhat increased	30.0%
		Significantly increased	46.0%
Nationwide	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	.5%
		Somewhat decreased	1.1%
		Neither decreased nor increased	22.3%
		Somewhat increased	30.7%
		Significantly increased	45.4%

## I. Would Recommend

Table 13

19. Would you recommend the services of the Older Worker Program to other agencies?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6423	9.2	1	10
State Grantees	4197	9.2	1	10
Nationwide	10620	9.2	1	10

## J. Open-Ended Questions

The last two questions asked respondents to write what they felt was most valuable about the program and what they thought was most in need of improvement. Each grantee has received a CD with the comments that were included in the surveys completed by its host agencies.

## K. Key Drivers and Questions Most Closely Associated with ACSI Scores

### 1. Driver Analysis

Table 14

		Relation to ACSI
10. The participant assigned to my agency was a good match with my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.765**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10478
6. The Older Worker Program staff that made the assignment had a good understanding of my business needs.	Pearson Correlation	.682**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10401
11. The Older Worker Program staff was helpful in resolving any problems I had.	Pearson Correlation	.658**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9375
5. The Older Worker Program staff made the community service assignment process easy for me to use.	Pearson Correlation	.638**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10296
7. I received sufficient information about the work history and education of the participant assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.623**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10284
8. I had sufficient choice about the participant assigned to my agency.	Pearson Correlation	.612**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10140
16. The Older Worker Program staff stayed in touch with my agency to make sure the assignment went well.	Pearson Correlation	.601**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10301
4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	Pearson Correlation	.571**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10518
9. The participant assigned to my agency had the necessary computer skills.	Pearson Correlation	.488**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8303

## 2. Other Questions Related to Satisfaction

Table 15

13. To what extent did the Older Worker Program provide the participants the supportive services they needed?		ACSI	
		Count	Mean
National Grantees	None	186	76.7
	Few	99	72.8
	Some	211	81.9
	Nearly all	260	87.3
State Grantees	None	105	74.4
	Few	76	72.0
	Some	141	80.4
	Nearly all	164	88.5
Nationwide	None	291	75.9
	Few	175	72.5
	Some	352	81.3
	Nearly all	424	87.8

Table 16

15. Does the Older Worker Program provide the needed training?		ACSI	
		Count	Mean
National Grantees	Never provides training	221	66.4
	Sometimes provides training	473	76.3
	Often provides training	388	80.5
	Always provides training	289	90.1
State Grantees	Never provides training	151	67.4
	Sometimes provides training	290	75.3
	Often provides training	282	83.3
	Always provides training	193	88.3
Nationwide	Never provides training	372	66.8
	Sometimes provides training	763	75.9
	Often provides training	670	81.7
	Always provides training	482	89.3

Table 17

			ACSI	
			Count	Mean
National Grantees	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	4677	82.4
		Occasionally	736	79.1
		Frequently	129	75.6
		Nearly always	124	76.4
State Grantees	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	3058	82.4
		Occasionally	532	81.7
		Frequently	93	72.3
		Nearly always	72	75.5
Nationwide	17. Did the Older Worker Program ever attempt to remove any participants from your agency before you thought they were ready to leave?	Never	7735	82.4
		Occasionally	1268	80.2
		Frequently	222	74.2
		Nearly always	196	76.1

Table 18

			ACSI			
			Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	30	63.0	0	100
		Somewhat decreased	58	52.4	0	100
		Neither decreased nor increased	1310	68.9	0	100
		Somewhat increased	1835	80.3	7	100
		Significantly increased	2639	89.7	0	100
State Grantees	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	23	64.2	0	100
		Somewhat decreased	49	50.1	0	100
		Neither decreased nor increased	850	71.4	0	100
		Somewhat increased	1159	80.2	11	100
		Significantly increased	1770	89.4	12	100
Nationwide	18. How has your agency's ability to provide services to the community been affected by its participation in the Older Worker Program?	Significantly decreased	53	63.5	0	100
		Somewhat decreased	107	51.3	0	100
		Neither decreased nor increased	2160	69.9	0	100
		Somewhat increased	2994	80.2	7	100
		Significantly increased	4409	89.6	0	100