

PY 2017 Participant Evaluation of SCSEP

Overview

The PY 2017 nationwide participant survey is the second administration of the revision of the original survey developed in 2004.¹ 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 2017 survey, a nationwide random sample of 21,347 participants was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in October 2017. Collection of the third and last wave of surveys was closed in February of 2018. The nationwide analyses below include results for all survey 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 2017 is 81.7, nearly identical to the score of 81.6 in PY 2015. For PY 2017, of the 21,347 surveys mailed, 11,210 participants returned surveys with valid responses for the first three questions that make up the ACSI. The response rate, significantly lower than PY 2015 (60%), was 52.5 percent. 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. It is a stratified, random sample of all eligible participants, defined as any individuals who received service at any time within the twelve months prior to the drawing of the survey sample in September 2017. The respondents are all participants in the sample who answered the survey.

Most characteristics of the respondents, including average age, race, and education, are similar to the SCSEP population as a whole. Although the respondents have differences from the SCSEP population as a whole for gender, ethnicity, and some other demographics, those differences have no impact on the representativeness of the survey responses.² Complete tables with demographics and characteristics of the survey sample are provided in Appendix B. Below is a brief summary of the demographics of the respondents:

¹ Due to the transition required by the national grantee competition, the participant survey was not administered in PY 2016.

² A study in 2014 by statisticians at the University of Connecticut determined that those who responded from the sample were also generally representative of the entire sample.

- The average age is 64
- 64.4 percent are female and 35.6 percent male
- 55.8 percent have a high school diploma or less. The remaining 44.2 percent have some post-secondary education, degree or certificate
- About 47.7 percent are racial minorities, and 9.2 percent are Hispanic.

To fill out 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 (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 3.2 barriers each, substantially higher than in PY 2015.

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

- 18.3 percent of the sample exited for regular employment
- 0.8 percent of the sample exited for self-employment
- 37.2 percent of the sample exited for reasons other than employment
- 44.4 percent of the sample were still in the program

Participants' Expectations for the Program

Question 4 was new to the survey in PY 2015. 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 their income, followed by feeling more useful and independent, and obtaining a part-time job. It is notable that the lowest percentage is for full-time work. This is consistent with data from SPARQ that show participants who exited were working an average of 29 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	3,638	9.2%
Obtain a part-time job	6,422	16.3%
Participate in training and host agency activities	4,695	11.9%
Provide service to my community	4,839	12.3%
Meet new people	4,440	11.2%
Increase my income	7,900	20.0%
Feel more useful and independent	6,720	17.0%

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:	Responses	
	Count	Percent of all Responses
Other	825	2.1%
Total of all reasons chosen	39,479	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.³ 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.	11,850	8.7	1	10
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	11,803	8.6	1	10
9. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	11,536	8.3	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 (8.7) is for how comfortable participants feel at the host agency assignment. The lowest rating (7.6) is for Question 11 (a new question in PY 2015), 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 8.3, mid-way between the other two ratings. 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. This suggests that grantees need to introduce the importance of choice into their discussions with participants when grantees prepare IEPS and with host agencies when they approach them with a new placement.

³ 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.	11,162	8.3	1	10
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	11,326	7.6	1	10
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	11,610	8.7	1	10

Participant Outcomes

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

The most direct outcomes within the program are associated with the one of the two principal purposes of the program: preparing participants for employment. Question 20 in Table 4 was a new question in PY 2015. 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 who had employment.⁴ 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 (38.5%), which makes sense given the nature of most participants' training sites (host agencies). Preparation for government and for-profit sectors was less frequently endorsed, with 23.9 percent for government and 25.5 percent for the for-profit sector. That 12.1 percent did not feel prepared for any sector may be the most important finding from this new question. This last percentage is nearly four percentage points higher than the rate in PY 2015. This is clearly a troubling trend and should be watched. Another important finding is that there was a greatly increased difference between preparation for the nonprofit (38.5%) and for-profit sectors (25.5%); in PY 2015, the difference was 6.5 % while this year the difference is 13%.

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	2,662	38.5%
I felt prepared for employment in government	1,651	23.9%
I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	1,759	25.5%
I did not feel prepared for employment in any sector.	835	12.1%

⁴ The findings in Table 4 were not substantially different when all respondents to this question were analyzed, including those who did not exit or did not have employment upon exiting.

A second way of looking at question 20 is whether some participants felt they were prepared for more than one sector. In fact, 901 participants out of the 4,593 who responded to the question saw themselves prepared in all three sectors, 512 saw themselves prepared in at least two of the three sectors, and 2,345 saw themselves prepared for at least 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 may have a modest influence on the respondent’s sense of the sectors in which he or she was best prepared. However, there are many participants who endorsed having preparation in sectors other than the one in which they obtained employment. For example, of the 515 employed after exit in the for-profit sector, 44% felt prepared for the nonprofit sector. Conversely, of the 610 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 question (also added in PY 2015) regarding preparation for success in the workforce are presented in Table 5. As evident in the table, the score for helping prepare participants for success is 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 score 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
	11,471	7.9	1	10

Two health outcomes continue to be collected in this revised survey. Table 6 shows the responses to Question 14. Thirty-two percent indicate they are in better physical health, and 58% indicate their health is about the same. Only 10 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	3,711	31.9%
	Worse	1,134	9.8%
	About the same	6785	58.3%

The second health question asks about mental health. As in previous years, the program produces strong, positive results as shown in Table 7. Seventy-three 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 in PY 2015, when the combined percentage for positive outlook was 74 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	285	2.4%
	A little more negative	549	4.7%
	About the same	2,374	20.2%
	A little more positive	3,030	25.8%
	Much more positive	5525	47.0%

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. Question 16 (revised in PY 2015) 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, over three-quarters of the respondents moderately to strongly agreed (ratings of 8, 9, or 10) that the pay was important to meeting basic expenses. This is slightly higher rate of agreement than in PY 2015

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	608	5.2%
	2	188	1.6%
	3	258	2.2%
	4	257	2.2%
	5	514	4.4%
	6	487	4.1%
	7	678	5.8%
	8	1,048	8.9%
	9	1,236	10.5%
	10 Strongly agree	6,467	55.1%

An ongoing concern is the impact on participants when they are pressured 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. This result is the same as PY 2015. 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	801	6.8%
	No	7554	64.6%
	Doesn't apply	3,339	28.6%

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. As was true in PY 2015, a third (34%) of the participants received the computer training they needed. Another quarter (25.8%) did not need computer training and did not receive any. In total, computer training was properly targeted for 60 percent of the participants. However, 20.4 percent needed computer training and received little or none, and another 12.6 percent received computer training that did not meet their needs. Overall, the targeting of training was not substantially improved from PY 2015.

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 40 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	3,948	34.0%
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1,487	12.8%
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2,368	20.4%
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	816	7.0%
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	2,996	25.8%

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 11,808 participants who responded to the question, 3572 (31.9%) did not indicate needing any supportive services. Of the 8,236 who did indicate a need for supportive services, 35 percent disagreed or were neutral (score of 1-5 out of 10) that the assistance met their needs. About 65 percent rated the assistance as positive (6-10 out of 10). As in PY 2015, the average rating was 6.6, indicating significant room for improvement.

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		1,333
2		324	3.9%
3		367	4.5%
4		317	3.8%
5		543	6.6%
6		473	5.7%
7		575	7.0%
8		826	10.0%
9		889	10.8%
10 Strongly agree		2,589	31.4%
Did not need support		3,572	31.9%
Total		11,808	100.0%

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 11 percent of participants experienced any inconvenience based on the location of their assignment. This is higher than in PY 2015 but generally 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		9,604
No		1,185	11.0%
Total		10,789	100.0%

While the program elements above provide support to participants during their host agency assignments, help in finding a job becomes critically important as the individual prepares to successfully exit. Question 19 asks how much help participants received from staff in finding employment. The participant rating of 7.2 is the lowest rating for any question in the survey. 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
	4,474	7.2	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 2017. 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 6, 9, and 18). For the methodology of the driver analysis, see Appendix C.

Questions 6, dealing with participants' treatment by the sub-grantee, 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 change on overall satisfaction. Question 6 has been a driver in previous years but was accompanied by Question 5. This year, although Question 5 retains a strong relationship with ACSI, it did not contribute a substantial, unique contribution to the ACSI over and above other variables.

Question 6 is an area of strength for the program. The score for Question 6 is 8.6, among the highest scores for any questions. There is some room for improvement but likely only by a few tenths of a point. This does suggest that continued attention to how participants are treated will help ensure high levels of satisfaction.

The second driver, Question 9, is similar to Question 6 in that Question 9 deals with how participants perceive their treatment. In this case, participants perceive the availability of personal support ("someone to talk to") as important to their satisfaction. Unlike Question 6, the average score is 8.3, still positive but leaving more room for improvement. Grantees have an opportunity to strengthen the sense among participants that there is someone they can always come to with any problems or needs.

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, the same as in PY 2015. This rating is lower than many other scores in the survey and leaves significant room for improvement. Moreover, this is the single, strongest driver of satisfaction as explained in the analysis below.

The shaded questions in Table 14 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.

- Other questions may have a lower correlation with the ACSI but 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 SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	Pearson Correlation	.665**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	11060
6. The SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.721**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	11024
9. There is someone in SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.671**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10765
10. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.668**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10426
11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.630**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10572
13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.618**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10853
16. The pay I receive from SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	Pearson Correlation	.364**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10978
18. Overall, how helpful has SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Pearson Correlation	.752**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10708
19. How much help did SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Pearson Correlation	.623**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	4139

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. For every one unit of change (e.g., from 7.9 to 8.9) in the answer to Question 18, the ACSI changes by 7.5 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 a 48-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	760	45.8
2	273	49.5
3	332	58.0
4	290	62.4
5	598	67.8
6	516	74.2
7	798	78.5
8	1339	83.8
9	1552	88.1
10 Strongly agree	4114	94.0

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 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, as there was with Question 11. These differences provide additional guidance to local programs regarding ways 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 70 percent 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 nearly 40 points in scores highlights the critical importance of providing supportive services for those that need them.

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	1226	55.39
2	306	58.50
3	340	65.08
4	296	66.36
5	514	74.38
6	448	78.33
7	543	82.18
8	776	86.38
9	844	89.34
10 Strongly agree	2403	95.11
Did not need support	3301	85.3

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. 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	3711	88.8
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1377	76.0
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2187	71.1
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	764	81.5
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2784	82.7
Total	10823	81.7

For the thirty-four percent of respondents (3,711) who needed computer training and got what they needed, the ACSI is extremely high, 88.8. Conversely, participants who did not receive the training they needed have satisfaction scores 13-18 points lower. In addition, those who did not need training but got it anyway have an ACSI score nearly identical to the nationwide average. 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 all in the mid to high 80s, although those who felt prepared for all three sectors or for the nonprofit and for-profit sectors did have significantly higher satisfaction. The 745 respondents who did not feel prepared for any industry sector, however, are about 25-30 points lower in satisfaction than those who felt prepared for some sectors. 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?		ACSI	
		Count	Mean
Areas in Which Participants were Prepared	All areas	802	88.5
	Non-profit and government	174	86.8
	Nonprofit and for-profit	240	89.3
	Government and for-profit	48	84.6
	Nonprofit only	1,181	86.0
	Government only	441	85.9
	For-profit only	498	85.8
	Not prepared for any	745	60.1
	Total	4129	82.0

Summary and Recommendations

This 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.

A 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 7.2, the lowest of any survey question, indicates that local programs need to do more

in this area, whether it be for part-time or full-time employment. The score is actually a tenth of a point lower than in PY 2015. The lack of improvement in this area reinforces the urgency of encouraging local programs to pay more attention.

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
- Local programs also need to work with host agencies to give participants a voice in the skills they acquire while at their assignment
- 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 (thirty-two 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			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	531	37.5%	884	62.5%
ANPPM	211	56.9%	160	43.1%
ATD	227	61.4%	143	38.6%
Easter Seals	342	51.9%	317	48.1%
Experience Works	660	43.4%	860	56.6%
Goodwill	367	52.0%	339	48.0%
IID(S)	72	67.9%	34	32.1%
Mature Services	235	63.5%	135	36.5%
NAPCA[S]	287	59.9%	192	40.1%
NAPCA[G]	203	54.9%	167	45.1%
NATABLE	203	54.9%	167	45.1%
NCBA	351	51.6%	329	48.4%
NCOA	412	48.5%	438	51.5%
NICOA[S]	217	58.6%	153	41.4%
NOWCC	92	45.5%	110	54.5%
NUL	239	53.7%	206	46.3%
OAGB	213	57.6%	157	42.4%
SER	254	52.5%	230	47.5%
SSAI	531	53.5%	462	46.5%
TWP	205	55.4%	165	44.6%
National Grantees	5852	50.9%	5648	49.1%
Alabama	152	62.3%	92	37.7%
Alaska	120	53.1%	106	46.9%
Arizona	63	52.9%	56	47.1%
Arkansas	114	56.7%	87	43.3%
California	205	55.4%	165	44.6%
Colorado	68	58.6%	48	41.4%
Connecticut	61	56.5%	47	43.5%
Delaware	126	51.2%	120	48.8%
District of Columbia	30	47.6%	33	52.4%

	Response			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Florida	184	49.7%	186	50.3%
Georgia	167	58.0%	121	42.0%
Hawaii	111	59.0%	77	41.0%
Idaho	28	50.0%	28	50.0%
Illinois	179	50.4%	176	49.6%
Indiana	174	51.8%	162	48.2%
Iowa	70	38.5%	112	61.5%
Kansas	45	64.3%	25	35.7%
Kentucky	119	55.1%	97	44.9%
Louisiana	128	52.7%	115	47.3%
Maine	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Maryland	70	59.3%	48	40.7%
Massachusetts	86	46.2%	100	53.8%
Michigan	221	65.0%	119	35.0%
Minnesota	132	54.8%	109	45.2%
Mississippi	97	70.3%	41	29.7%
Missouri	153	52.4%	139	47.6%
Montana	32	45.1%	39	54.9%
Nebraska	48	44.4%	60	55.6%
Nevada	47	56.0%	37	44.0%
New Hampshire	31	49.2%	32	50.8%
New Jersey	183	57.0%	138	43.0%
New Mexico	31	59.6%	21	40.4%
New York	214	57.8%	156	42.2%
North Carolina	175	58.3%	125	41.7%
North Dakota	38	46.9%	43	53.1%
Ohio	212	57.3%	158	42.7%
Oklahoma	113	64.2%	63	35.8%
Oregon	63	49.6%	64	50.4%
Pennsylvania	204	55.1%	166	44.9%
Rhode Island	9	47.4%	10	52.6%
South Carolina	122	61.6%	76	38.4%
South Dakota	42	70.0%	18	30.0%
Tennessee	166	57.4%	123	42.6%
Texas	196	53.0%	174	47.0%
Utah	31	43.7%	40	56.3%

	Response			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Vermont	20	37.7%	33	62.3%
Virginia	146	56.4%	113	43.6%
Washington	62	54.9%	51	45.1%
West Virginia	61	60.4%	40	39.6%
Wisconsin	178	55.6%	142	44.4%
Wyoming	31	43.7%	40	56.3%
State Grantees	5358	54.4%	4489	45.6%
Nationwide	11210	52.5%	10137	47.5%

Table 2. ACSI by Grantee

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	531	79.9	0	100
ANPPM	211	87.5	0	100
ATD	227	77.8	0	100
Easter Seals	342	84.1	0	100
Experience Works	660	73.8	0	100
Goodwill	367	83.9	0	100
IID(S)	72	91.8	43	100
Mature Services	235	80.1	0	100
NAPCA[S]	287	84.3	0	100
NAPCA[G]	203	79.8	0	100
NATABLE	203	76.1	0	100
NCBA	351	79.3	0	100
NCOA	412	81.7	0	100
NICOA[S]	217	86.6	0	100
NOWCC	92	73.0	11	100
NUL	239	82.7	0	100
OAGB	213	82.7	0	100
SER	254	79.6	0	100
SSAI	531	83.9	0	100
TWP	205	82.3	0	100
National Grantees	5852	81.0	0	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Alabama	152	85.1	7	100
Alaska	120	83.6	0	100
Arizona	63	87.9	8	100
Arkansas	114	80.3	0	100
California	205	85.9	0	100
Colorado	68	81.9	0	100
Connecticut	61	85.0	0	100
Delaware	126	83.4	0	100
District of Columbia	30	88.4	0	100
Florida	184	80.4	0	100
Georgia	167	83.7	0	100
Hawaii	111	87.8	18	100
Idaho	28	70.7	0	100
Illinois	179	79.9	0	100
Indiana	174	74.6	0	100
Iowa	70	78.5	0	100
Kansas	45	74.4	0	100
Kentucky	119	87.2	0	100
Louisiana	128	81.7	0	100
Maryland	70	80.8	0	100
Massachusetts	86	81.4	8	100
Michigan	221	82.5	0	100
Minnesota	132	85.9	22	100
Mississippi	97	87.2	0	100
Missouri	153	88.4	0	100
Montana	32	70.1	0	100
Nebraska	48	80.5	4	100
Nevada	47	71.9	0	100
New Hampshire	31	74.6	0	100
New Jersey	183	79.5	0	100
New Mexico	31	89.0	45	100
New York	214	87.2	0	100
North Carolina	175	85.9	0	100
North Dakota	38	74.5	0	100
Ohio	212	81.0	0	100
Oklahoma	113	86.0	0	100
Oregon	63	67.7	0	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Pennsylvania	204	82.4	0	100
Rhode Island	9	85.2	33	100
South Carolina	122	81.2	0	100
South Dakota	42	84.0	7	100
Tennessee	166	80.6	0	100
Texas	196	82.4	0	100
Utah	31	72.3	0	100
Vermont	20	77.3	0	100
Virginia	146	84.2	0	100
Washington	62	83.2	3	100
West Virginia	61	86.5	18	100
Wisconsin	178	83.3	0	100
Wyoming	31	71.4	22	100
State Grantees	5358	82.4	0	100
Nationwide	11210	81.7	0	100

Table 3. Reasons for Enrolling

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program.	1891	9.3%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program.	3357	16.5%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities.	2438	12.0%
		Provide service to my community.	2499	12.3%
		Meet new people.	2272	11.2%
		Increase my income.	4020	19.8%
		Feel more useful and independent.	3466	17.0%
		Other	407	2.0%
State Grantees	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program.	1747	9.1%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program.	3065	16.0%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities.	2257	11.8%
		Provide service to my community.	2340	12.2%
		Meet new people.	2168	11.3%
		Increase my income.	3880	20.3%
		Feel more useful and independent.	3254	17.0%
		Other	418	2.2%

4. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Reason for Enrollment	Obtain a full-time job after completing the program.	3638	9.2%
		Obtain a part-time job after completing the program.	6422	16.3%
		Participate in the program's training and host agency activities.	4695	11.9%
		Provide service to my community.	4839	12.3%
		Meet new people.	4440	11.2%
		Increase my income.	7900	20.0%
		Feel more useful and independent.	6720	17.0%
		Other	825	2.1%

Table 4. Treatment of Participants

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	5. At the time I enrolled, the SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	6173	8.7	1	10
	6. The SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	6151	8.6	1	10
	9. There is someone in SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	6022	8.3	1	10
State Grantees	5. At the time I enrolled, the SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	5677	8.8	1	10
	6. The SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	5652	8.7	1	10
	9. There is someone in SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	5514	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	5. At the time I enrolled, the SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	11850	8.7	1	10
	6. The SCSEP staff understood my employment interests and needs.	11803	8.6	1	10
	9. There is someone in SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	11536	8.3	1	10

Table 5. Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	7. 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	745 17.1%
		2	183 4.2%
		3	202 4.6%
		4	177 4.1%
		5	300 6.9%
		6	266 6.1%
		7	311 7.1%
		8	454 10.4%
		9	443 10.1%
		10 Strongly agree	1287 29.5%
State Grantees	7. 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	588 15.2%
		2	141 3.6%
		3	165 4.3%
		4	140 3.6%
		5	243 6.3%
		6	207 5.4%
		7	264 6.8%
		8	372 9.6%
		9	446 11.5%
		10 Strongly agree	1302 33.7%
Nationwide	7. 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	1333 16.2%
		2	324 3.9%
		3	367 4.5%
		4	317 3.8%
		5	543 6.6%
		6	473 5.7%
		7	575 7.0%
		8	826 10.0%
		9	889 10.8%
		10 Strongly agree	2589 31.4%

Table 6. Geographic Convenience

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	5023 89.0%
		No	622 11.0%
		Total	5645 100.0%
State Grantees	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	4581 89.1%
		No	563 10.9%
		Total	5144 100.0%
Nationwide	8. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	9604 89.0%
		No	1185 11.0%
		Total	10789 100.0%

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.	5854	8.2	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	5932	7.6	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	6057	8.7	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.	5308	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	5394	7.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	5553	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.	11162	8.3	1	10
	11. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	11326	7.6	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	11610	8.7	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.	1966	32.4%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs.	773	12.8%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered.	1293	21.3%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	427	7.0%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	1603	26.4%
State Grantees	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed.	1982	35.7%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs.	714	12.9%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered.	1075	19.4%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	389	7.0%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	1393	25.1%
Nationwide	12. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed.	3948	34.0%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs.	1487	12.8%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered.	2368	20.4%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	816	7.0%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	2996	25.8%

Table 9. Physical Health

	14. Compared to the time before you started working with 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	1903	31.3%	614	10.1%	3554	58.5%
State Grantees	1808	32.5%	520	9.4%	3231	58.1%
Nationwide	3711	31.9%	1134	9.8%	6785	58.3%

Table 10. Outlook on Life

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	15. Compared to the time before you started working with SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	137	2.2%
		A little more negative	276	4.5%
		About the same	1239	20.2%
		A little more positive	1598	26.0%
		Much more positive	2898	47.1%
State Grantees	15. Compared to the time before you started working with SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	148	2.6%
		A little more negative	273	4.9%
		About the same	1135	20.2%
		A little more positive	1432	25.5%
		Much more positive	2627	46.8%
Nationwide	15. Compared to the time before you started working with SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	285	2.4%
		A little more negative	549	4.7%
		About the same	2374	20.2%
		A little more positive	3030	25.8%
		Much more positive	5525	47.0%

Table 11. SCSEP Wages

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	16. The pay I receive from SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	289	4.7%
		2	82	1.3%
		3	148	2.4%
		4	138	2.2%
		5	290	4.7%
		6	273	4.4%
		7	368	6.0%
		8	583	9.5%
		9	652	10.6%
		10 Strongly agree	3318	54.0%

		Count	Percent
State Grantees	16. The pay I receive from SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	319 5.7%
		2	106 1.9%
		3	110 2.0%
		4	119 2.1%
		5	224 4.0%
		6	214 3.8%
		7	310 5.5%
		8	465 8.3%
		9	584 10.4%
		10 Strongly agree	3149 56.2%
Nationwide	16. The pay I receive from SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	608 5.2%
		2	188 1.6%
		3	258 2.2%
		4	257 2.2%
		5	514 4.4%
		6	487 4.1%
		7	678 5.8%
		8	1048 8.9%
		9	1236 10.5%
		10 Strongly agree	6467 55.1%

Table 12. Pressure to Leave the Program

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	17. During my host agency assignment, SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	455 7.5%
		No	3938 64.7%
		Doesn't apply	1694 27.8%
State Grantees	17. During my host agency assignment, SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	346 6.2%
		No	3616 64.5%
		Doesn't apply	1645 29.3%
Nationwide	17. During my host agency assignment, SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	801 6.8%
		No	7554 64.6%
		Doesn't apply	3339 28.6%

Table 13. Preparation for Success in Workforce

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	5988	7.8	1	10
State Grantees	18. Overall, how helpful has SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	5483	8.0	1	10
Nationwide	18. Overall, how helpful has SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	11471	7.9	1	10

Table 14. Help in Finding Employment

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	19. How much help did SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	2401	7.0	1	10
State Grantees	19. How much help did SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	2073	7.3	1	10
Nationwide	19. How much help did SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	4474	7.2	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	1427	20.7%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	823	11.9%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	927	13.4%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	458	6.6%
	Total	3635	52.6%
State Grantees	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	1235	17.9%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	828	12.0%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	832	12.0%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	377	5.5%
	Total	3272	47.4%

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
Nationwide	I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	2662	38.5%
	I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	1651	23.9%
	I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	1759	25.5%
	I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	835	12.1%
	Total	6907	100.0%

Appendix B
Sample Demographics and Characteristics

Table 1. Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Education

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Male	4092	35.6%
		Female	7393	64.4%
	Race	American Indian	435	4.0%
		Asian	711	6.5%
		Black	4196	38.6%
		Pacific Islander	13	0.1%
		White	5506	50.7%
		Ethnicity	Hispanic	1181
		Not Hispanic	9742	89.2%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	2250	19.6%
		HS diploma or GED	4373	38.1%
		Some college	2636	23.0%
		Technical degree	218	1.9%
		Associates degree	523	4.6%
BA/BS		1025	8.9%	
Bachelor's plus		459	4.0%	
State Grantees	Gender	Male	3117	31.7%
		Female	6712	68.3%
	Race	American Indian	274	2.9%
		Asian	218	2.3%
		Black	3854	40.8%
		Pacific Islander	48	0.5%
		White	5056	53.5%
		Ethnicity	Hispanic	869
		Not Hispanic	8537	90.8%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	1473	15.0%
		HS diploma or GED	4020	40.8%
		Some college	2304	23.4%
		Technical degree	271	2.8%
		Associates degree	479	4.9%
BA/BS		876	8.9%	
Bachelor's plus		418	4.2%	

		Count	Percent	
Nationwide	Gender	Male	7209	33.8%
		Female	14105	66.2%
	Race	American Indian	709	3.5%
		Asian	929	4.6%
		Black	8050	39.6%
		Pacific Islander	61	0.3%
		White	10562	52.0%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	2050	10.1%
		Not Hispanic	18279	89.9%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	3723	17.5%
		HS diploma or GED	8393	39.4%
		Some college	4940	23.2%
		Technical degree	489	2.3%
		Associates degree	1002	4.7%
BA/BS		1901	8.9%	
Bachelor's plus		877	4.1%	

Table 2. Barriers to Employment

		Count	Percent	
National Grantees	Disability	Yes	3411	29.7%
		No	8082	70.3%
	LEP	Yes	1420	12.4%
		No	10073	87.6%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	2202	19.2%
		No	9291	80.8%
	Rural	Yes	3273	28.5%
		No	8216	71.5%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	10591	92.2%
		No	902	7.8%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services	Yes	2689	23.4%
		No	8804	76.6%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	6438	56.0%
		No	5062	44.0%
	Veteran	Yes	1382	12.0%
		No	10111	88.0%

		Count	Percent		
	Severe Disability	Yes	23	0.2%	
		No	11477	99.8%	
	Frail	Yes	10	0.1%	
		No	11490	99.9%	
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	35	0.3%	
		No	11465	99.7%	
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	461	4.0%	
		No	11039	96.0%	
	State Grantees	Disability	Yes	3147	32.0%
			No	6695	68.0%
LEP		Yes	533	5.4%	
		No	9309	94.6%	
Low Literacy Skills		Yes	1638	16.6%	
		No	8204	83.4%	
Rural		Yes	3036	30.9%	
		No	6799	69.1%	
Low Employment Prospects		Yes	8229	83.6%	
		No	1613	16.4%	
Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services		Yes	1832	18.6%	
		No	8010	81.4%	
Homeless or at Risk		Yes	3977	40.4%	
		No	5870	59.6%	
Veteran		Yes	1249	12.7%	
		No	8593	87.3%	
Severe Disability		Yes	44	0.4%	
		No	9803	99.6%	
Frail		Yes	12	0.1%	
		No	9835	99.9%	
Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security		Yes	32	0.3%	
		No	9815	99.7%	
Severely Limited Employment Prospects		Yes	356	3.6%	
		No	9491	96.4%	
Nationwide		Disability	Yes	6558	30.7%
			No	14777	69.3%
		LEP	Yes	1953	9.2%
			No	19382	90.8%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	3840	18.0%	
		No	17495	82.0%	

		Count	Percent
	Rural	Yes	6309 29.6%
		No	15015 70.4%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	18820 88.2%
		No	2515 11.8%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIOA Services	Yes	4521 21.2%
		No	16814 78.8%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	10415 48.8%
		No	10932 51.2%
	Veteran	Yes	2631 12.3%
		No	18704 87.7%
	Severe Disability	Yes	67 0.3%
		No	21280 99.7%
	Frail	Yes	22 0.1%
		No	21325 99.9%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	67 0.3%
		No	21280 99.7%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	817 3.8%
		No	20530 96.2%

Table 3. Average Barriers per Participant

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Number of Barriers per Participant	11500	3.3	0	8
State Grantees	Number of Barriers per Participant	9847	3.0	0	8
Nationwide	Number of Barriers per Participant	21347	3.2	0	8

Table 4. Age

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Less than 65	7702	67.0%
	65 or Older	3791	33.0%
State Grantees	Less than 65	6289	63.9%
	65 or Older	3553	36.1%
Nationwide	Less than 65	13991	65.6%
	65 or Older	7344	34.4%

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 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 (7.9 to 8.9) will increase the ACSI by .322 standard deviations or 7.5 points on the ACSI scale.⁵ Given the fact that the average score for Question 18 is 7.9, there is significant opportunity for local programs to improve preparation for the workforce and thereby significantly improve overall satisfaction.

Table 1: Driver Model Test

	Standardized Coefficients	t-test Value	Sig.
	Beta		
6. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff understand my employment interests and needs.	.195	11.939	.000
18. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	.322	20.051	.000
19. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	.093	7.260	.000

⁵ The standard deviation for the nationwide ACSI is 23.441. The number of points is obtained by multiplying the Beta times the standard deviation.