

**Report to the Mayor and Common Council
on the
Senior and After School Programs Study**

**by the
Subcommittee on Senior and After School Programs**

Members:

**Richard Berling, Chair, Community Services Commission
Joanne Brown, Chair, Early Childhood Care and Education Board
Sophia Estante, Chair, CDBG Commission
Paul Van Rooy, Alder, Community Services Commission and
Senior Citizens Advisory Committee
Patricia Lasky, Early Childhood Care and Education Board**

Staff:

**Dorothy Conniff, Community Services
Hickory Hurie, CDBG
Gray Williams, Community Services
Lorri Wendorf, Community Services
Mary O'Donnell, Community Services
Monica Host, Community Services**

**Meeting dates:
February 9, 2006
March 1, 2006**

STUDY OF SENIOR AND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM FUNDING

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Charge to the Commissions:

At the request of Mayor Cieslewicz and the Common Council, a study group consisting of representatives of the Community Services Commission, Early Childhood Care and Education Board, Senior Citizens Advisory Committee and the Community Development Block Grant Commission was convened to review the number of after school and senior programs funded by the City of Madison. The study group was charged with making recommendations on opportunities for potential savings by consolidation of some of programs, reviewing services provided to the target populations, considering the sites where programs are offered with the goal of eliminating program duplication and maximizing the use of the limited City funds available for these programs.

The Study Group, along with staff of the Office of Community Services and the Community Development Block Grant Office, present this report as a summary of their work.

Overall Conclusions

The Study Group reviewed the current funding system in order to make recommendations on opportunities for potential savings.

Over the years the two funding bodies, CDBG and Community Services, have used a variety of techniques--such as encouraging co-location of services, supporting consolidation of agencies and programs, helping plan for the deconsolidation of agencies and programs—to achieve fiscal efficiencies.

At this time, we feel that the opportunities for savings through consolidation and co-location are minimal in the two areas of concern. However, there may be some savings available through purchasing pools or other techniques. .

Recommendations

- Solicit suggestions from nonprofit agencies for program and administrative efficiencies.
- Provide nonprofit agencies the opportunity to share successful program and administrative strategies.
- Promote sharing resources for neighborhood centers and other agencies in areas such as space, health insurance groups, payroll and accounting services, supplies.
- Use the biannual application and review processes to examine potential consolidations or efficiencies in operations through increased communication between CDBG and Community Services staff and related committees.

BACKGROUND

The mission of the Office of Community Services is to provide information, assistance and funding that enhances the health and quality of life in Madison's neighborhoods for the elderly,

youth and families and to improve the quality of child care for all children. The mission is accomplished through our Community Resources Program by working through community-based non-profit agencies.

The mission of the Community Development Block Grant office is to serve as a public investment agency in community-based programs that produce affordable housing, business development, strong neighborhoods with viable focal points, and access of residents and community groups to resources.

To achieve these complementary missions, the Office of Community Services funds after school and senior programs, while the CDBG office helps improve the physical and organizational infrastructure for some agencies that provide these services. CDBG funds these agencies primarily as a way to strengthen neighborhoods, particularly low and moderate income neighborhoods. The Community Development office also provides capital funding for the acquisition, rehab, or construction of physical facilities that are owned or operated by many non-profit groups, including those that serve children, youth and seniors. The CD Office and CDBG Commission use one of its reserve funds, the Acquisition/Rehab Fund, as a source for these projects.

Both organizations fund the following organizations in different ways:

Allied Neighborhood Center

Atwood Community Center

Broadway-Lakepoint Neighborhood Center

East Madison Community Center

Neighborhood House

South Madison Neighborhood Center

Vera Neighborhood Center

Wexford Neighborhood Center

Wil-mar Neighborhood Center.

In addition, CDBG helped two resident associations establish new neighborhood centers (Bayview and Kennedy Heights), where Community Services now provides funding for afterschool and other programs.

CDBG provides capital funding for the acquisition, rehab or construction of physical facilities that provide Senior and Afterschool programs in neighborhoods. Some examples of acquisitions include the Allied Center, the Annex, New Loft's purchase of its Youth Center, Centro Hispano's purchase of its Badger Road building. Construction projects include Warner Community Center, the Boys' and Girls' Club Allied Center, two additions to East Madison

Community Center. Renovation projects have included some major repairs to eleven of the existing neighborhood centers.

The report provides information about the programs for seniors and youth, as well as the specific funding for neighborhood centers. Because the systems and issues are different in each case, they are discussed separately.

Neighborhood Centers

Both Offices view Neighborhood Centers as organizations that help advance their respective missions to deliver services to certain population groups and as agencies helpful in the revitalization of neighborhoods. Because neighborhood centers tend to serve specific geographical areas, they tend to either directly provide programming for youth and seniors or provide other community organizations organizational support for activities those organizations provide.

After school and summer programs for children and youth are an area of emphasis for all of the neighborhood centers in the city. Low-income families generally do not have access to after school and summer programs unless they live in a neighborhood center service area or attend a school that has a Community Learning Center. Moderate-income families also utilize these programs because of their accessibility and design. For these reasons, neighborhood centers are uniquely positioned to meet the needs of families in their neighborhoods.

AFTER SCHOOL AND SUMMER PROGRAMS

Half of the after school programs funded by the City for elementary, middle and high school youth are provided in neighborhood centers. The division of programs by age group creates the impression that they are stand-alone programs, whereas in fact they are a continuum of services for children, youth and families in the neighborhood center service area. If the youth programs were not divided for funding purposes and evaluation/technical support the number would drop from 43 to 14.

Neighborhood center programs serve specific geographic areas. They provide programs for all ages and that respond to the specific needs of the residents of the their neighborhoods. There is minimal overlap in the populations served by the neighborhood centers. Combining two centers would decrease the services provided to a particular neighborhood. After school and summer programs for children (elementary age) and youth (middle and high school age) are an area of emphasis for all of the neighborhood centers. Low-income families generally do not have access to after school and summer programs unless they live in a neighborhood center service area or attend a school that has a community learning center. Moderate-income families also utilize these programs because of their accessibility and design. For these reasons, neighborhood centers are uniquely positioned to meet the needs of families in their neighborhoods.

The geographic location of programs is an important factor in youths' ability to access programs. This is especially critical for elementary-aged children who have limited access to private transportation and who may not be old enough to access public transportation alone. The family and community connection to neighborhood centers and local schools provide a natural platform for building a connection with youth and children.

Elementary age after school and summer programs provide supervised recreation, social and enrichment activities along with academic support to the children served. The programs offer opportunities to develop interaction skills such as positive sense of self, respect for differences, problem solving and conflict resolution. In many instances the after school and summer programs serve a basic childcare function for families who cannot afford fee-based childcare. Research indicates that children from high-risk backgrounds have both the most to gain from after-school programs in terms of educational opportunity and the least access to after-school programs. (Posner and Vandell 1999)

Programs for middle school and high school youth funded by the City provide supervision, safety, positive peer interactions, leadership development opportunities, career and job development, mentoring, academic support, recreation and services to integrate low-income and minority youth into cultural activities. All of these programming elements support positive youth development. These programs provide a wide-array of supports and opportunities for youth who would otherwise not have access to them. Research shows that these types of holistic community-based strategies focused on promoting positive youth development are the most effective way to impact negative outcomes in the lives of youth and their families.

For older youth, many programs are offered outside the neighborhood center setting. While some programs serve the same age group in the same geographic area, it is necessary to consider the target population and focus of each program. Gender and/or culturally specific programming is often the most effective way to reach targeted populations of youth and address unique issues that they face. Specific programming tailored to offer youth a choice to find activities that best meet their needs; interests, learning styles and schedules make these programs successful. Programs include Big Brothers, Big Sisters; Centro Hispano youth programs, Commonwealth's Youth-business mentoring, Freedom Inc, for Asian girls, the Briarpatch program for runaway youth, Girl Neighborhood Power, and the Youth Integration programs.

Programs other than those offered in neighborhood centers do not have mutually exclusive service areas. Individual families often have ties to specific programs. Youth and families select what best fits their needs. However, looking at numbers of children and youth in the city and in specific neighborhoods, we see that there are many low-income children and youth who are not currently being served by existing programming. Any consolidation efforts should be managed to save effective programs, utilize collaboration among service providers and prevent a greater gap in service delivery.

An example of success through collaboration is the Urban League Schools of Hope Middle School program. With collaboration among major funders; City, County and United Way; a new approach to school-based services to middle school youth was created specifically to address duplication of service and outreach efforts. The Urban League was given responsibility for providing a foundation for all organizations serving this age group to work together by sharing participant lists, recruiting youth in need of services who aren't currently involved, coordinating programs and activities, and assuring that there is no duplication of participants or specific service areas.

Next Steps:

- Work with providers to develop collaborative relationships for better outreach and efficiency of service (such as Schools of Hope model).

- Exchange information among service providers to ensure that the maximum number of children/youth is served.
- Convene a workgroup to study whether or not there are efficiencies that could be generated with a more coordinated approach to transportation for summer field trips.
- Focus on recruitment of new participants

SENIOR PROGRAMS

The goal of City funded senior programs is to help seniors live as independently as possible; to maintain/improve seniors' health and well being; and to reduce seniors' isolation. City funding supports four areas of programming, first, a case management system, second, a citywide home chore system, third, an information and referral system, and fourth, activities for seniors at senior centers and neighborhood centers, and volunteer opportunities. Services in the first three program areas are provided almost exclusively by four geographically based senior coalitions. Services are not duplicative. For example in case management, seniors or their families can request and receive the service only from the coalition that covers their area. For home chore services a senior will contact his/her senior coalition, who will check the senior's eligibility, and then provide a volunteer to do the home chore services.

There are also citywide programs administered by one coalition for the benefit of all city residents. North/Eastside Senior Coalition provides case management services and a support group for all city Latinos. East Madison Coalition of the Aging has a caregiver resource library that is available to all city seniors and their families, and holds an annual caregiver conference. South Madison Coalition of the Elderly administers some long-term support programs for city and county residents (COP and Supportive Home Care). West Madison Senior Coalition administers the city wide home chore program.

Programming for senior activities – physical, education and recreational, are provided at a variety of sites. Because seniors often lack mobility, these programs are only successful if they are near people's homes. These activities are at neighborhood community centers (WilMar, Atwood and Neighborhood House and Warner Park Community Center), senior centers (West Madison Senior Center) and other sites e.g. such as churches and city administered housing, Romnes and Brittingham.

In general senior programming is area based, and in some cases, a senior is eligible for services only in the area he/she lives (e.g. home chore and case management).

Having four coalitions, which cover all of Madison, allows each coalition to develop other programs that suit their constituents. Coalitions also develop expertise in areas that benefit all city seniors (e.g. Adult Day Care, caregiver programs, cultural programs). The four coalitions get extensive senior input into their programming through their Board of Directors and program advisory committees. Because of this, and because they are respected by these seniors, the coalitions are able to fund raise significantly. The coalitions collectively fund raise more than a quarter of million dollars annually, which represents 11% of their overall budgets. Much of this comes from membership and senior support.

Senior Activity programming is available at three neighborhood centers, a senior center in West Madison, at Warner Park through NESCO and a city funded downtown senior center. Studies have show though that senior centers draw most heavily from those who live near to the center. For example, Atwood Community Center draws seniors from its immediate neighborhood. Many of these seniors are frail and need transport to the Center, which Atwood is able to provide because the seniors live close to each other, and close to the center. It would be financially prohibitive to transport all seniors to a central senior center, as well as requiring seniors to spend a great deal of time on a bus.

The Community Resources Program allocation for senior activities is small (less than \$100,000/year) but these programs draw more than 1,600 seniors to their programs (about 8% of the Madison senior population).

Next Steps:

- Work with providers to determine if there would be efficiencies obtained if all senior programs collaborated on a newsletter rather than have multiple newsletters.
- Include contract language that requires service delivery collaboration to minimize duplication when providing senior programs not offered through the geographic system (care-giver clinics, foot clinics, etc.)

Areas that need development

- Additional after school programs for the low-income children of the city. This would ideally be a partnership among funders such as the current collaboration to bring more programs to the Southwest area.
- Encourage and support outreach to hard-to-serve middle and high school age children. This is the group most at risk for negative behavior. Success will probably require additional staffing since staff in these programs are generally not given planning and outreach time, and are often young students who are employed for short periods. Relationship building is a key to success.
- Outreach to elderly in minority communities. While this has been an area of emphasis, it is underdeveloped for the need.

FACTORS IN REDUCING DUPLICATION AND MAXIMIZING RESOURCES OF CITY-FUNDED AFTER SCHOOL AND SENIOR PROGRAMS

Constraints on City actions:

- The City provides only a portion of the overall funding for these programs and the agencies that administer them.
- A small amount of funding from the City often helps leverage other funding and allows us to have an impact on program quality, but does not usually enable us to control basic administrative decisions.
- Each agency has a community-based board of directors that is very invested in the programs offered, and generally raises much of the funding.

Advantages to a multiple-agency, multiple funder system

- The City is part of funding system and City funding leverages other funding
- The risk to services is minimized when many sources of funding are brought to bear.
- Most services are neighborhood based, tailored to a specific group of residents
- Neighborhood-based services can be more effective, through the development of trusting relationship between staff and recipients.
- Neighborhood-based services provide easier access for populations with limited mobility.
- Low administrative costs—the agency director often performs many roles, which reduces staffing costs.
- The senior services are quite visible and well known to the population of elderly. Services are available where the elderly person lives.
- Volunteers are more motivated because of the local relationship
- Limited need for transportation and associated costs to access programs
- Neighborhood centers can take advantage of the varied economic levels of residents in their area, drawing on the expertise and skills of board members from professional backgrounds
- Resident/parent ownership/involvement in the programs
- The city gets a big return on its investment
- The variety of agencies promotes civic engagement
- Some current planning designs are moving in the direction of new ‘Urbanism’ Model (saves on pollution and transportation); neighborhood centers already work this way
- Small neighborhood agencies, improve quality of life for less fortunate, steered by those with the most resources
- School-based programs are also geographically based and compliment neighborhood center programming.

Disadvantages to a multiple-agency, multiple funder system

- Costs in some areas are high (for example, health care, consumable administrative supplies, payroll costs)
- Organizations can be fragile, depending on the strength of dedicated individuals
- Total capitol costs are more because of the number of agencies
- Fund development is uneven across agencies and services

- Some times a lack of administrative expertise
- Lack of opportunities to learn from each other; sharing knowledge
- Agency rivalries can get in the way of collaborative approaches. However, in the case of the neighborhood centers, rivalry was not lessened by a central administration, but rather exacerbated.
- Transportation is a significant barrier for those who need to access services in other parts of the City
- It is difficult to find an agency to develop services in new areas of need. Recently, Vera Court Community Center stepped up to take on Bridge Lakepoint, the Boys and Girls' Club took on Allied.
- It is difficult to provide uniformity of opportunity and services when new areas of need arise
- The director in the agency performs many roles due to lack of adequate resources

Strategies to increase effectiveness and efficiencies:

Over the last two decades, the four policy bodies and the two Offices have worked with agencies, other funders, and within our own processes to improve the funding and project management process, and to invest City funds in ways that improve their effectiveness. Sometimes this has led us to support organizational changes in the funded agencies, or work with selected agencies to help them improve their organizational structures.

Here are some of the strategies the CD Office and the Community Services Office have used to increase efficiencies within its funded programs:

- a) Co-locate related but distinct agencies or programs (Family Service Center, CAC and Energy Services, Warner Park Center MSCR, Parks, and NSSC).
- b) Consolidate organizations (The CD Office facilitated the consolidation of two home repair organizations, two community health agencies, and more recently, the merger of Transitional Housing Inc and Community Housing and Services. The Community Services Office facilitated the merger of several youth programs into Family Services, and the Loft program into Atwood Community Center)
- c) Consolidate services or contracts: (The CD Office used to have three contracts with Project Home, each with different levels of home repairs or points of focus; the Office combined these into one larger contract, with specific reporting requirements that resulted in administrative savings for both the agency and the CD Office. The Community Services Office combined two funding sources and two contracts into one contract for Community Coordinated Child Care, and also used a similar technique with the Rainbow Project.)
- d) Deconsolidate: (breaking up an organization to free up 'value' and promote efficiencies)(The CD Office provided transitional and training support to the former united Neighborhood Centers as a way to help them become independent, once the organization decided to disband.)
- e) Joint purchase (of architectural services, coordination of legal and development services)
- f) Establish longer term planning and budgeting (five year plan, two year application and contact)

- g) Aggregate narrowly focused programs to provide more discretion to the agency to meet community or customer demands, while ensuring accountability for the use of public funds (consolidation of several City rehab programs into one contract, and many others)
- h) Establish pilot programs to experiment with different partnerships (Spin-off organizations from Wisconsin Partnership);
- i) Examine service delivery systems, and strengthen the supplier chains or wholesale functions (Foodbank, pantry network, alternative food chain).

Moving into the future, the Community Services Commission, the CDBG Commission, the Senior Advisory Committee and the Early Childhood Care and Education Board, and the two Offices will continue to explore these opportunities to improve the effectiveness of service delivery. As noted in the Executive Summary, the summer funding process offers the best potential to review, on a case-by-case basis, opportunities to reinforce efficiencies and effectiveness of City support community agencies that serve children, youth, seniors, families and neighborhoods.