

PY 2015 Participant Evaluation of SCSEP

The PY 2015 nationwide participant survey is the first revision of the original survey developed in 2004. Revisions were made based on the analyses of survey responses over the last decade, the evolving direction of the program, and feedback from customers and grantees.

A major focus of the revisions for the participant survey was to increase understanding of participants' expectations for the program, gain a more detailed understanding of the role of training (especially computer training), and understand how well the program prepares participants for the changing economy. Four new questions were introduced, five questions were eliminated, and two existing questions were modified.

For PY 2015, a nationwide random sample of 21,566 participants was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2015. Collection of the third and last wave of surveys was closed in March of 2016. The nationwide analyses below include results for all of the questions, with special attention given to the new and revised questions. Appendix A contains the results of each survey question at the nationwide, national grantee, and state grantee levels. A separate analysis is being provided for each grantee.

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 2015 is 81.6, similar to the score of 81 in PY 2014. For PY 2015, of the 21,566 surveys mailed, 12,944 participants returned surveys with valid responses for the first three questions that make up the ACSI. The response rate was 60 percent, compared to 61.1% in PY 2014. As in other years, the ACSI 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. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in the Appendix A.

Who Answered the Survey?

The survey sample was and has always been generally representative of the SCSEP population nationwide. Average age, gender, race, ethnicity, and education among the sample were similar to the SCSEP population as a whole. Although there are differences from the SCSEP population as a whole for some of the characteristics, those differences have no impact on the representativeness of the survey responses.¹ Below is a brief summary of the demographics. Complete tables are provided in Appendix B. These demographics indicate that the basic profile of who participates in SCSEP remains fairly stable over time.

- The average age is 64 with, 63.1 percent below 65
- 55 percent are female and 45 percent male

¹ 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.

- 56 percent have a high school diploma or less. The remaining 44 percent have some post-secondary education, degree or certificate
- About 48 percent are racial minorities, and 9.7 percent are Hispanic.

To fill out the picture of SCSEP participants, we report on characteristics that have been identified in the 2006 revision of 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 (LEP), low literacy skills, living in a rural area, low unemployment prospects, failing to find employment after receiving WIA services, being homeless or at risk of homelessness, being a veteran, being frail, old enough for social security but not receiving any benefits, and having severely limited employment prospects in an area of persistent unemployment. On average, participants in the sample have 2.8 barriers each, a slightly higher number than in PY 2014, but nearly identical to the SCSEP population as a whole for PY 2015.

The other defining characteristic of the sample is participants' status in the program:

- 17 percent of the sample exited for regular employment
- 0.7 percent of the sample exited for self-employment
- 30 percent of the sample exited for other reasons
- 52 percent of the sample were still in the program

Participants' Expectations for the Program

Question 4 is new to the survey this year. It 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 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 3.5 reasons. The most frequently endorsed reason was increasing income, followed by feeling more useful and independent, and obtaining a part-time job. It is notable that one of the lowest percentages is for full-time work. This is consistent with data from SPARQ that show participants who exited were working an average of about 30 hours per week in unsubsidized employment.

Table 1. Reasons for Enrollment

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:	Responses	
	Count	Percent of all Responses
Obtain a full-time job	4,705	10.5%
Obtain a part-time job	6,893	15.4%
Participate in training and host agency activities	5,410	12.1%
Provide service to my community	5,336	11.9%
Meet new people	4,974	11.1%
Increase my income	8,791	19.6%
Feel more useful and independent	7,719	17.2%
Other	978	2.2%
Total of all reasons chosen	44,806	100.0%

How Participants Rate Their Treatment in the Program

One of the great strengths of the program has always been the way staff treat participants. As evident in Table 2, staff helped participants understand how the program worked, understood participants' needs and interests, and provided participants someone to talk to.² These scores are similar to those in previous years and reconfirm the care and concern with which staff work with the participants.

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.	13,417	8.7	1	10
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	13,304	8.6	1	10
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	13,111	8.4	1	10

Participants' Experience in the Host Agency

The three questions below in Table 3 directly relate to the nature of participants' experience at the host agency. Question 13 is similar to Questions 5, 6, and 9 (Table 2 above) in reflecting the sense of belonging that can be created in the host agency. The other two questions (Questions 10 and 11) focus explicitly on training, a crucial aspect of the host agency assignment. The highest rating (8.8) is for how comfortable participants feel at the host agency assignment. The lowest rating (7.6) is for Question 11 (a new question), 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 is 8.2, mid-way between the other two ratings. The new Question 11 gives more detailed insight into the host agency as a training site and clearly shows that participants desire more input into the skills and training they receive.

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.	12619	8.2	1	10
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	12756	7.6	1	10
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	13227	8.8	1	10

Participant Outcomes

There are two types of outcomes derived from the survey and administrative data: outcomes achieved while participants are in the program and outcomes associated with employment after participants leave the program.

² Unless otherwise noted, questions are scored on a 1-10 scale.

The most direct outcomes within the program are associated with the one of the two principal purposes of the program: preparing participants for employment. Question 20 in Table 4 is a new question. It asks if participants felt that SCSEP prepared them for employment in different industry sectors. The respondents were supposed to answer this question only if they had employment after exiting. Some respondents who were still in the program nonetheless answered the question. The analysis in Table 4 is limited to exiters that had employment. The respondents were able to choose all sectors in which they felt prepared for employment (nonprofit, government, or for-profit) or indicate that they felt unprepared for any.

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 answers by individual are in the two columns to the right of each sector. Nationwide, the most frequently endorsed sector was nonprofit organizations (36.8%), which makes sense given the nature of most participants' training sites. Preparation for government and for-profit sectors was less frequently endorsed, with 24.8 percent for government and 30.3% for the for-profit sector. That only 8.2 percent did not feel prepared for any sector may be the most important finding from this new question. Another important finding, however, is that there was very little difference between preparation for the nonprofit and for-profit sectors. These findings were not substantially different when all of the respondents to this question were included, including those who did not exit or did not have employment upon exiting.

Table 4. Prepared for Employment

20. Do you feel that your participation in SCSEP prepared you for employment in these organizations?	Count	Percent of all Responses
I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit	999	36.8%
I felt prepared for employment in government	673	24.8%
I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	822	30.3%
I did not feel prepared for employment in any sector.	223	8.2%

A second way of looking at question 20 is whether some participants felt they were prepared for more than one sector. In fact, 400 participants out of the 1,616 who responded to the question saw themselves prepared in all three sectors, 187 saw themselves prepared in at least two of the three sectors, and 841 saw themselves prepared for one sector, most often the nonprofit sector.

To provide context for these results, we tested for the potential influence of the type of employment a participant actually gained to determine whether it would influence the participant's evaluation of preparation for different sectors. An analysis of the endorsed sectors for preparation and the sectors in which the participant obtained employment suggests that the sector in which the respondent is employed has some influence on the respondent's sense of the sectors in which he or she was best prepared. However, there are many that endorsed having preparation in sectors other than the one in which they obtained employment. For example, of the 730 employed after exit in the for-profit sector, 50% felt prepared for the nonprofit sector as well. Conversely, of the 710 who obtained employment in the nonprofit sector, 43% also felt prepared for employment in the for-profit sector.

Another aspect of preparation is covered in Question 18. The data for this new question regarding preparation for success in the workforce are presented in Table 5. As evident in the table, the scores for

helping prepare participants for success are significantly lower than the ratings regarding the program’s and host agency’s treatment of participants (Questions 5, 6, 9, and 13). The importance of this outcome is evident later in this report, where the analysis shows this question to be the strongest driver of satisfaction in the survey.

Table 5. Preparation for Success in Workforce

18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	12,955	7.9	1	10

Two health outcomes that have regularly been collected over the years continue to be collected in this revised survey. Table 6 shows the responses to question 14. Thirty-one percent indicate they are in better physical health, and 60% indicate their health is about the same. Only 9 percent indicate that their health declined in the course of participation.

Table 6. 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?		Count	Percent
	Better	4,068	30.9%
	Worse	1,191	9.0%
	About the same	7,915	60.1%

The second health question asks about mental health. As in previous years, the program produces strong, positive results as shown in Table 7. Seventy-four 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 a slightly higher percentage than in PY 2014, when the combined percentage for positive outlook was 71.6 percent. These findings match the substantial number of respondents who indicated in Question 4 that one of their reasons for enrollment was to “feel more useful and independent.”

Table 7. Mental Health

15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?		Count	Percent
	Much more negative	317	2.4%
	A little more negative	637	4.8%
	About the same	2,592	19.5%
	A little more positive	3,542	26.6%
	Much more positive	6,230	46.8%

Along with physical and mental health, participants’ financial wellbeing can be affected. We know from Question 4 that many participants come to SCSEP hoping to increase their income. The revised 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 three quarters of the respondents moderately to strongly agreed (ratings of 8, 9, or 10) that the pay was important to meeting basic expenses.

Table 8. SCSEP Wages

16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.		Count	Percent
	1 Strongly disagree		705
2		228	1.7%
3		304	2.3%
4		311	2.3%
5		649	4.9%
6		554	4.2%
7		738	5.5%
8		1,187	8.9%
9		1,390	10.4%
10 Strongly agree		7,271	54.5%

We continued to ask about the effect of pressuring participants to leave a host agency assignment before they felt they were ready. Table 9 shows that very few participants feel that they have experienced such pressure. It is important that the percent pressured remains as small as possible since the experience of being pressured lowers overall satisfaction by more than 20 points.

Table 9. Pressure to Leave Host Agency

17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/CSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.		Count	Percent
	Yes		889
No		8,604	64.5%
Doesn't apply		3,847	28.8%

Detailed Analysis of Computer Training

Past 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. Nearly a third (32.8%) of the participants received the computer training they needed. Another quarter (26.2%) did not need computer training and did not receive any. In total, computer training was properly targeted for over 55 percent of the participants. However, 21.3 percent needed computer training and received little or none, and another 13.2 percent received computer training that did not meet their needs.

Computer training continues to be an important aspect of helping older workers prepare for an ever more computerized work environment. With computer training failing to meet the needs of 45 percent of participants, there is much room for improvement. Individual grantee reports will now provide clearer guidance on this issue for local programs.

Table 10. Computer Training

12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	Count	Percent
I received the computer training I needed	4,204	32.8%
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1,614	12.6%
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2,734	21.3%
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	919	7.2%
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	3,363	26.2%

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 see that services are provided. In Table 11, Question 7 asks if supportive services were provided when needed. Of 13,365 participants who responded to the question, 3917 (29%) did not indicate needing any supportive services. Of the 9,448 who did indicate a need for supportive services, 36 percent disagreed or were neutral (score of 1-5 out of 10) that the assistance met their needs. About 50 percent rated the assistance as positive (8-10 out of 10). The average rating was 6.6, indicating significant room for improvement. The average rating is lower than in PY 2014 when the nationwide rating was 6.8.

Table 11. Supportive Services

7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.		Count	Percent
	1 Strongly disagree	1,508	16.0%
	2	406	4.3%
	3	418	4.4%
	4	399	4.2%
	5	673	7.1%
	6	555	5.9%
	7	637	6.7%
	8	920	9.7%
	9	1,098	11.6%
	10 Strongly agree	2,834	30.0%
	Total	9,448	100.0%
	Did not need support	3,917	29.0%

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 fewer than 10 percent of participants experienced any inconvenience based on the location of their assignment. This is consistent with previous survey results.

Table 12. Geographic Convenience

8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Count		Percent
	Yes	11,182	90.1%
No	1,232	9.9%	
Total	12,414	100.0%	

While these program elements provide support to participants during their host agency assignments, help in finding a job becomes critically important as the individual prepares to successfully exit. Question 19 asks how much help participants received from staff in finding employment. The participant rating of 7.3 is among the lowest rating for any question. Given the importance of the local program’s role in helping participants find employment, there is much room for improvement.

Table 13. Help in Finding Employment

19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	4,968	7.3	1	10

Variables Associated with the ACSI

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

A. Driver Analysis

Table 14 presents the results for the first type of analysis. The results are derived from all available nationwide responses to the survey conducted in PY 2015. Different regression models were tested to determine the smallest number of questions that explain the ACSI. The questions that together account for the most variation in the ACSI are shaded in Table 14 (Questions 5, 6, 18 and 19). For details of the driver analysis, see Appendix C.

Questions 5 and 6, dealing with participants’ treatment by the sub-grantee, are highly correlated with the ACSI, and each has a strong, unique influence on the ACSI. The large size of these correlations and their strong, unique contribution to explaining the ACSI suggest that any change in these scores is likely to have a direct and independent change on overall satisfaction. Both of these questions have been drivers in previous years.

In general, these two questions are areas of strength for the program. The score for Question 5 is 8.7 and for Question 6 is 8.6, both relatively high. There is some room for improvement but only by a few tenths of a point. Continued attention to how participants are treated will help ensure high levels of satisfaction.

The third question in the driver model, Question 18, asks about how helpful the program was in preparing participants for success in the workforce. Respondents rated preparation at 7.9. This rating is lower than many others in the survey and leaves significant room for improvement. Moreover, this is the single, strongest driver of satisfaction as explained in the analysis below.

Question 19, another strong driver, asks about the amount of help staff gave participants to find employment. Its relationship to the ACSI is not nearly as strong as the relationship between Question 18 and the ACSI. In part, this is because of the overlap between Questions 18 and 19 for many respondents. This does not mean that helping people find jobs is not important to overall satisfaction, but preparation for employment is far more important. With a score of 7.3, Question 19 also has considerable room for improvement.

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

- Some questions not in the chosen model may have high correlations and moderate participant ratings (they are unshaded in Table 14 because they are not independent of shaded questions), suggesting room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers services.
- Others questions may have a lower correlation with the ACSI but have lower than usual participant ratings, also 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

		Relation to ACSI
5. At the time I enrolled, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	Pearson Correlation	.666**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12,787
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.694**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12,689
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.654**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12,510
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.638**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12,038

		Relation to ACSI
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.614**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12,178
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.584**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12,601
16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	Pearson Correlation	.354**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12,702
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Pearson Correlation	.743**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12,348
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Pearson Correlation	.620**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	4,656

As stated above, Question 18, preparing for success in the workforce, has the greatest potential in relation to satisfaction and fulfilling the purpose of the program. Every one unit of change (e.g., from 7.9 to 8.9) in the answer to Question 18 increases the ACSI by 9.7 points. Anything to improve the program in this area will yield substantial rewards to the program, as well as to its participants.

While Question 11 is not an independent driver, it has significant implications for program management. Having a say in the skills gained is associated with the appropriate targeting of computer training. Giving participants a say is probably the best way to identify training that will build necessary skills.

Question 11 is also closely related to overall satisfaction as seen in Table 15. There is approximately a 45-point difference in the ACSI score for those who felt they had the most say and those who felt they had the least say. Preparing participants for the workforce involves giving them the right skills, and Questions 18 and 11 together suggest that providing the right skills must involve giving participants a say in identifying those skills most likely to prepare them for the workforce.

Table 15. Having a Say in Training and the ACSI

11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Count	ACSI Score
1 Strongly disagree	842	47.9
2	361	52.3
3	376	55.9
4	353	63.8
5	723	69.0
6	607	73.7
7	859	78.7
8	1,596	83.2
9	1,864	88.4
10 Strongly agree	4,597	93.6

B. Other Questions Associated with the ACSI

Because of the way answers are structured in some of the questions, the contribution of those questions to explaining the ACSI is difficult to interpret through the driver analysis detailed above. For each of these questions, however, there are notable changes in the average ACSI scores depending on the participants' level of response. These differences provide additional guidance to local programs about how to improve 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 those that needed those services. Because only two-thirds of the respondents indicated they needed support 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 94 or 95, while those who strongly disagreed that they received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores in the high 50s and low 60s. This difference of over 30 points in scores highlights the critical importance of providing needed supportive services.

Table 16. Supportive Services and ACSI

7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Count	ACSI Score
1 Strongly disagree	1,404	58.6
2	388	56.7
3	400	64.0
4	386	67.5
5	646	73.8
6	527	77.6
7	619	81.5
8	892	84.9
9	1,050	89.3
10 Strongly agree	2,689	95.1
Did not need support	3,710	85.4

There are two more important questions related to the ACSI that could not be included in the driver analysis. These questions also tell us something about how programs can increase participant satisfaction. The first is question 12, participants’ experience with computer training, Table 17 below.

Table 17. Computer Training and ACSI

12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	Count	ACSI Score
I received the computer training I needed	4,043	88.2
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1,521	76.0
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2,513	72.4
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	3,944	82.3
Total	12,021	81.4

For the one-third of respondents (4,043) who needed computer training and got what they needed, the ACSI is extremely high. Conversely, participants who did not receive the training they needed have satisfaction scores 12-16 points lower. In addition, those who did not need training but got it anyway have a higher than average ACSI score. These findings suggest that grantees should ensure that relevant computer training is provided and at least meets participants’ needs even if the training exceeds the participants’ actual needs.

Question 20, about preparation for different sectors of employment, also provides important guidance for local programs. Whether participants felt they had been prepared for one, two, or all three industry sectors, their satisfaction scores were similar. The 16 percent of respondents who did not feel prepared for any industry sector, however, are about 30 points lower in satisfaction. In Table 18, the message is

very clear: What matters is the quality of the preparation in general and not its relevance for any particular employment sector.

Table 18. Preparation for Employment and ACSI

20. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP prepared you for employment in different industries?		
	Count	ACSI Score
All three types of industries	884	87.8
Two types of industries	571	88.0
One type of industry	2,335	85.8
Not prepared for any	689	58.2
Total	4,479	82.2

Summary and Recommendations

This year’s survey of participants provides important guidance for grantees. The first finding of value is that understanding participants’ expectations for the program may help programs do a better job of serving their participants. The responses tell us that full-time employment is not the primary goal of most participants. Beyond that, participants have a mix of motivations, and it will serve local programs to talk with participants at the start of enrollment and learn as much as they can about participants’ expectations, as well as their needs.

The second major finding is that preparation for employment is the single most important driver of participant satisfaction. With an average score of 7.9, there is room for substantial improvement, and every point of improvement will yield significant increases in satisfaction. Staff help in finding employment (Question 19) is also an important part of preparing the path to employment, and the average score of 7.3 suggests the need for local programs to pay more attention to helping prepare this path, whether it be for part-time or full-time employment.

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

- Local programs need input from participants to accurately assess the skills participants will need to succeed in the workforce
- Computer training is an area where local programs need to do a better job of identifying those who need computer training and the type of computer training that is most relevant for the individual
- Supportive services are not necessary for everyone (nearly 30 percent did not need them), but for those who need supportive services, the failure to provide services both lowers overall satisfaction dramatically and reduces participant’s chances for success in the program and in subsidized employment

Appendix A Complete Survey Tables

Table 1. Response Rate by Grantee

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	791	51.4%	749	48.6%
ANPPM	213	57.4%	158	42.6%
ATD	231	62.4%	139	37.6%
Easter Seals	289	51.6%	271	48.4%
Experience Works	1,424	65.6%	746	34.4%
Goodwill	230	54.8%	190	45.2%
Mature Services	250	67.6%	120	32.4%
National ABLE	227	61.2%	144	38.8%
NAPCA[S]	318	67.7%	152	32.3%
NAPCA[G]	224	64.6%	123	35.4%
NCBA	382	60.6%	248	39.4%
NCOA	449	58.4%	320	41.6%
NICOA[S]	292	62.9%	172	37.1%
NULI	236	56.2%	184	43.8%
SER	359	64.1%	201	35.9%
SSAI	633	56.5%	487	43.5%
National Grantees	6,548	59.8%	4,404	40.2%
Alabama	160	67.2%	78	32.8%
Alaska	115	44.4%	144	55.6%
Arizona	97	54.8%	80	45.2%
Arkansas	141	64.4%	78	35.6%
California	248	67.0%	122	33.0%
Colorado	61	58.7%	43	41.3%
Connecticut	66	54.5%	55	45.5%
Delaware	159	60.2%	105	39.8%
District of Columbia	36	63.2%	21	36.8%
Florida	212	57.3%	158	42.7%
Georgia	181	63.7%	103	36.3%
Hawaii	163	66.0%	84	34.0%
Idaho	45	57.7%	33	42.3%
Illinois	227	61.4%	143	38.6%
Indiana	202	59.4%	138	40.6%

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Iowa	86	46.0%	101	54.0%
Kansas	58	62.4%	35	37.6%
Kentucky	161	65.4%	85	34.6%
Louisiana	140	60.6%	91	39.4%
Maine	36	54.5%	30	45.5%
Maryland	117	65.7%	61	34.3%
Massachusetts	133	46.2%	155	53.8%
Michigan	238	64.5%	131	35.5%
Minnesota	185	64.2%	103	35.8%
Mississippi	106	71.6%	42	28.4%
Missouri	189	58.3%	135	41.7%
Montana	51	58.0%	37	42.0%
Nebraska	50	48.5%	53	51.5%
Nevada	46	56.8%	35	43.2%
New Hampshire	33	45.2%	40	54.8%
New Jersey	148	56.1%	116	43.9%
New Mexico	43	58.9%	30	41.1%
New York	219	59.3%	150	40.7%
North Carolina	214	66.5%	108	33.5%
North Dakota	41	55.4%	33	44.6%
Ohio	229	61.9%	141	38.1%
Oklahoma	111	60.7%	72	39.3%
Oregon	92	56.8%	70	43.2%
Pennsylvania	220	59.5%	150	40.5%
Puerto Rico	89	57.8%	65	42.2%
Rhode Island	39	67.2%	19	32.8%
South Carolina	95	51.6%	89	48.4%
South Dakota	49	67.1%	24	32.9%
Tennessee	168	61.8%	104	38.2%
Texas	229	61.9%	141	38.1%
Utah	49	67.1%	24	32.9%
Vermont	32	62.7%	19	37.3%
Virginia	168	64.1%	94	35.9%
Washington	90	68.7%	41	31.3%
West Virginia	85	60.7%	55	39.3%
Wisconsin	200	61.3%	126	38.7%

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Wyoming	44	61.1%	28	38.9%
State Grantees	6396	60.3%	4218	39.7%
Nationwide	12944	60.0%	8622	40.0%

Table 2. ACSI by Grantee

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	791	80.7	0	100
ANPPM	213	88.8	0	100
ATD	231	77.8	0	100
Easter Seals	289	84.2	0	100
Experience Works	1,424	82.4	0	100
Goodwill	230	78.6	0	100
Mature Services	250	79.5	0	100
National ABLE	227	82.0	0	100
NAPCA[S]	318	82.9	0	100
NAPCA[G]	224	81.0	0	100
NCBA	382	81.6	0	100
NCOA	449	79.4	0	100
NICOA[S]	292	86.9	0	100
NULI	236	81.6	0	100
SER	359	82.5	0	100
SSAI	633	82.6	0	100
National Grantees	6,548	82.0	0	100
Alabama	160	88.2	0	100
Alaska	115	79.4	0	100
Arizona	97	82.2	0	100
Arkansas	141	74.6	0	100
California	248	83.3	0	100
Colorado	61	82.0	9	100
Connecticut	66	79.6	0	100
Delaware	159	87.2	0	100
District of Columbia	36	78.9	0	100
Florida	212	80.5	0	100
Georgia	181	83.4	0	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Hawaii	163	84.2	0	100
Idaho	45	75.3	0	100
Illinois	227	81.2	0	100
Indiana	202	78.8	0	100
Iowa	86	64.4	0	100
Kansas	58	81.5	0	100
Kentucky	161	83.1	0	100
Louisiana	140	84.6	0	100
Maine	36	74.7	0	100
Maryland	117	78.4	0	100
Massachusetts	133	76.9	0	100
Michigan	238	80.8	0	100
Minnesota	185	83.2	0	100
Mississippi	106	87.7	0	100
Missouri	189	85.2	0	100
Montana	51	76.1	0	100
Nebraska	50	72.5	0	100
Nevada	46	72.3	9	100
New Hampshire	33	70.8	0	100
New Jersey	148	76.8	0	100
New Mexico	43	87.6	8	100
New York	219	82.6	3	100
North Carolina	214	84.4	0	100
North Dakota	41	83.3	8	100
Ohio	229	78.6	3	100
Oklahoma	111	84.3	0	100
Oregon	92	65.1	0	100
Pennsylvania	220	77.3	0	100
Puerto Rico	89	87.0	0	100
Rhode Island	39	84.2	27	100
South Carolina	95	83.8	0	100
South Dakota	49	76.1	0	100
Tennessee	168	87.7	0	100
Texas	229	83.0	0	100
Utah	49	84.1	4	100
Vermont	32	71.1	0	100
Virginia	168	84.5	4	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Washington	90	83.0	4	100
West Virginia	85	87.8	0	100
Wisconsin	200	78.6	0	100
Wyoming	44	78.3	31	100
State Grantees	6,396	81.3	0	100
Nationwide	12,944	81.6	0	100

Table 3. Reasons for Enrolling

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:	Responses	
	Count	Percent of all Responses
Obtain a full-time job	4,705	10.5%
Obtain a part-time job	6,893	15.4%
Participate in training and host agency activities	5,410	12.1%
Provide service to my community	5,336	11.9%
Met new people	4,974	11.1%
Increase my income	8,791	19.6%
Feel more useful and independent	7,719	17.2%
Other	978	2.2%
Total of All Reasons Chosen	44,806	100.0%

Table 4. Treatment of Participants

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	6,785	8.8	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	6,730	8.6	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	6,627	8.4	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.	6,632	8.7	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	6,574	8.6	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	6,484	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	5. At the time I enrolled, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	13,417	8.7	1	10
	6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	13,304	8.6	1	10
	9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	13,111	8.4	1	10

Table 5. Supportive Services

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	790	11.7%
		2	219	3.2%
		3	215	3.2%
		4	223	3.3%
		5	349	5.2%
		6	303	4.5%
		7	346	5.1%
		8	492	7.3%
		9	567	8.4%
		10 Strongly agree	1,418	21.0%
		Did not need support	1,843	27.2%
State Grantees	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	718	10.9%
		2	187	2.8%
		3	203	3.1%
		4	176	2.7%
		5	324	4.9%
		6	252	3.8%
		7	291	4.4%
		8	428	6.5%
		9	531	8.0%
		10 Strongly agree	1,416	21.5%
		Did not need support	2,074	31.4%
Nationwide	7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	1,508	11.3%
		2	406	3.0%
		3	418	3.1%
		4	399	3.0%
		5	673	5.0%
		6	555	4.2%

		Count	Percent
	7	637	4.8%
	8	920	6.9%
	9	1,098	8.2%
	10 Strongly agree	2,834	21.2%
	Did not need support	3,917	29.3%

Table 6. Geographic Convenience

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	5,627	89.3%
		No	673	10.7%
State Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	5,555	90.9%
		No	559	9.1%
Nationwide	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	11,182	90.1%
		No	1,232	9.9%

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.	6,406	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	6,478	7.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	6,694	8.8	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.	6,213	8.2	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	6,278	7.5	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	6,533	8.7	1	10
Nationwide	10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	12,619	8.2	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	12,756	7.6	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	13,227	8.8	1	10

Table 8. Computer Training

12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Experience with Computer Training	I received the computer training I needed	2,074	32.1%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	852	13.2%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1,415	21.9%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	482	7.4%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	1,648	25.5%
State Grantees	Experience with Computer Training	I received the computer training I needed	2,130	33.5%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	762	12.0%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	1,319	20.7%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	437	6.9%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	1,715	27.0%
Nationwide	Experience with Computer Training	I received the computer training I needed	4,204	32.8%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1,614	12.6%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2,734	21.3%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	919	7.2%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	3,363	26.2%

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	2,083	31.3%	577	8.7%	3,997	60.0%
State Grantees	1,985	30.5%	614	9.4%	3,918	60.1%
Nationwide	4,068	30.9%	1,191	9.0%	7,915	60.1%

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	160	2.4%
		A little more negative	303	4.5%
		About the same	1,263	18.8%
		A little more positive	1,810	26.9%
		Much more positive	3,199	47.5%
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	157	2.4%
		A little more negative	334	5.1%
		About the same	1,329	20.2%
		A little more positive	1,732	26.3%
		Much more positive	3,031	46.0%
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	317	2.4%
		A little more negative	637	4.8%
		About the same	2,592	19.5%
		A little more positive	3,542	26.6%
		Much more positive	6,230	46.8%

Table 11. SCSEP Wages

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	6,740	8.2	1	10
State Grantees	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	6,597	8.2	1	10
Nationwide	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	13,337	8.2	1	10

Table 12. Pressure to Leave the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/CSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	483	7.2%
		No	4,377	64.9%
		Doesn't apply	1,880	27.9%
State Grantees	17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/CSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	406	6.2%
		No	4,227	64.0%
		Doesn't apply	1,967	29.8%

Nationwide	17. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/CSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	889	6.7%
		No	8,604	64.5%
		Doesn't apply	3,847	28.8%

Table 13. Preparation for Success in Workforce

	18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6,554	7.9	1	10
State Grantees	6,401	7.8	1	10
Nationwide	12,955	7.9	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?	2,533	7.4	1	10
State Grantees	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	2,435	7.1	1	10
Nationwide	19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	4,968	7.3	1	10

Table 15. Preparation for Employment

National Grantees	20. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP prepared you for employment in these organization?	Responses	
		Count	Percent
	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	1,466	37.9%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	917	23.7%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	1,024	26.5%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	456	11.8%
	Total	3,863	100.0%
State Grantees	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	1,376	36.9%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	951	25.5%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	977	26.2%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	425	11.4%
	Total	3,729	100.0%
Nationwide	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	2,842	37.4%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	1,868	24.6%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	2,001	26.4%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	881	11.6%
	Total	7,592	100.0%

Appendix B
Sample Demographics and Characteristics

Table 1. Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Education

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Male	4008	36.7%
		Female	6920	63.3%
	Race	American Indian	416	4.1%
		Asian	775	7.6%
		Black	3958	38.8%
		Pacific Islander	25	0.2%
		White	5018	49.2%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	1152	11.2%
		Not Hispanic	9140	88.8%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	2076	19.1%
		HS diploma or GED	4130	37.9%
		Some college	2566	23.5%
		Post-secondary Certificate	195	1.8%
Associates degree		458	4.2%	
BA/BS		1027	9.4%	
Bachelors plus		445	4.1%	
State Grantees	Gender	Male	3359	31.7%
		Female	7230	68.3%
	Race	American Indian	279	2.8%
		Asian	264	2.6%
		Black	3665	36.2%
		Pacific Islander	60	0.6%
		White	5846	57.8%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	945	9.3%
		Not Hispanic	9197	90.7%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	1595	15.1%
		HS diploma or GED	4180	39.5%
		Some college	2627	24.8%
		Post-secondary Certificate	244	2.3%
Associates degree		476	4.5%	
BA/BS		978	9.2%	
Bachelors plus		495	4.7%	

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Gender	Male	7367	34.2%
		Female	14150	65.8%
	Race	American Indian	695	3.4%
		Asian	1039	5.1%
		Black	7623	37.5%
		Pacific Islander	85	0.4%
		White	10,864	53.5%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	2097	10.3%
		Not Hispanic	18337	89.7%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	3671	17.1%
		HS diploma or GED	8310	38.7%
		Some college	5193	24.2%
		Post-secondary Certificate	439	2.0%
		Associates degree	934	4.3%
		BA/BS	2005	9.3%
Bachelors plus		940	4.4%	

Table 2. Barriers to Employment

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Disability	Yes	2831	25.9%
		No	8095	74.1%
	LEP	Yes	1483	13.6%
		No	9459	86.4%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	2033	19.9%
		No	8174	80.1%
	Rural	Yes	3020	27.6%
		No	7918	72.4%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	10047	91.8%
		No	895	8.2%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIA Services	Yes	2442	22.5%
		No	8408	77.5%
	Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	Yes	5434	49.6%
		No	5518	50.4%
	Veteran	Yes	1344	12.3%
		No	9570	87.7%
	Severe Disability	Yes	183	2.1%
		No	8513	97.9%

			Count	Percent	
	Frail	Yes	67	0.8%	
		No	8628	99.2%	
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	174	2.0%	
		No	8550	98.0%	
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	1865	21.2%	
		No	6915	78.8%	
State Grantees	Disability	Yes	2982	28.1%	
		No	7622	71.9%	
	LEP	Yes	611	5.8%	
		No	9987	94.2%	
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	1334	12.6%	
		No	9271	87.4%	
	Rural	Yes	3477	32.8%	
		No	7114	67.2%	
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	8260	77.9%	
		No	2349	22.1%	
	Failed to Find Employment After WIA Services	Yes	1673	15.8%	
		No	8906	84.2%	
	Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	Yes	3513	33.1%	
		No	7101	66.9%	
	Veteran	Yes	1453	13.7%	
		No	9148	86.3%	
	Severe Disability	Yes	273	3.0%	
		No	8801	97.0%	
	Frail	Yes	153	1.7%	
		No	8918	98.3%	
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	149	1.6%	
		No	8921	98.4%	
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	1462	16.1%	
		No	7607	83.9%	
	Nationwide	Disability	Yes	5813	27.0%
			No	15717	73.0%
		LEP	Yes	2094	9.7%
			No	19446	90.3%
Low Literacy Skills		Yes	3367	16.2%	
		No	17445	83.8%	
Rural		Yes	6497	30.2%	

		Count	Percent	
	Low Employment Prospects	No	15032	69.8%
		Yes	18307	84.9%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIA Services	No	3244	15.1%
		Yes	4115	19.2%
	Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	No	17314	80.8%
		Yes	8947	41.5%
	Veteran	No	12619	58.5%
		Yes	2797	13.0%
	Severe Disability	No	18718	87.0%
		Yes	456	2.6%
	Frail	No	17314	97.4%
		Yes	220	1.2%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	17546	98.8%
		Yes	323	1.8%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	17471	98.2%
		Yes	3327	18.6%
		No	14522	81.4%

Table 3. Average Barriers per Participant

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Number of Barriers per Participant	10,822	2.9	1	14
State Grantees	Number of Barriers per Participant	10,070	2.6	1	9
Nationwide	Number of Barriers per Participant	20,892	2.8	1	14

Table 4. Age

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Less than 65	7,121	65.1%
	65 or Older	3,824	34.9%
State Grantees	Less than 65	6,469	61.0%
	65 or Older	4,138	39.0%
Nationwide	Less than 65	13,590	63.1%
	65 or Older	7,962	36.9%

Appendix C Driver Model

Table 1 provides the foundation for the methodology used to choose the service and service delivery questions that have the strongest independent effect on overall satisfaction. The third column shows the size of the t-test value, and the fourth column shows that all four 4 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 (7.9 to 8.9) will increase the ACSI by .413 standard deviations or 9.7 points on the ACSI scale.³ Given the fact that the average score for question 18 is 7.9, there is significant opportunity for local programs to improve that preparation for the workforce and thereby significantly improve overall satisfaction.

Table 1: Driver Model Test

	Standardized Coefficients	t-test Value	Sig.
	Beta		
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.	.224	16.750	.000
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	.216	15.709	.000
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	.413	31.269	.000
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	.109	9.312	.000

³ The standard deviation for the nationwide ACSI is 23.441. The number of points is obtained by multiplying the Beta times the standard deviation.