

CITY OF OAKLAND
AGENDA REPORT

FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND

04 SEP -1 PM 1:50

TO: Office of the City Administrator
ATTN: Deborah Edgerly
FROM: Office of Parks and Recreation
DATE: September 14, 2004

RE: REPORT ON THE FIVE HIGHEST AND FIVE LOWEST RATED RECREATION
CENTERS AND PLANS FOR PROGRAM AND SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

SUMMARY

The Life Enrichment Committee requested that staff provide a follow-up report to Council on the parks and recreation evaluation report presented on May 25, 2004, that would compare and rank recreation centers using RecWare data, Gibson Report findings and staff assessments, and identify elements of success and areas for improvement to increase the quality of Office of Parks and Recreation (OPR) services.

Since January 2003, Gibson & Associates has conducted three evaluations of OPR's recreation programming and facilities. Originally contracted to design and implement a full-scale needs assessment and to review all OPR programs and activities in several phases, Gibson & Associates had to significantly scale down their scope of work from \$250,000 to \$97,000. This resulted in limiting their efforts to a) analyzing participant surveys at each site, b) reviewing RecWare registration data, and c) performing site visits and focus groups at nine selected centers. The final evaluation report included Gibson & Associates' findings and recommendations.

When OPR staff presented a follow-up report to the Life Enrichment Committee on May 25, 2004, the Committee directed staff to return in September with specific rankings of each recreation center's performance together with recommendations for improvement based on the Gibson & Associates evaluation, RecWare registration data, and staff assessments. Each recreation center has been evaluated comparatively according to ten criteria (to be detailed under "Key Issues" later in this report).

The five recreation centers receiving the highest rankings overall are:

1. Redwood Heights (97)
2. Mosswood (87)
3. Lincoln Square (86)
4. DeFremery (85)
5. Dimond / Sheffield Village (both 78)

The five recreation centers receiving the lowest rankings overall are:

1. Bushrod (38)
2. Tassafaronga (40)
3. Allendale (41)
4. Golden Gate (42)
5. Franklin (45)

Item: 7
Life Enrichment Committee
September 14, 2004

The findings and plan of action to improve under-performing centers are presented in this report. Staff recommends the City Council accept the informational report.

FISCAL IMPACT

Since this report is an information only report, there is no fiscal impact.

BACKGROUND

Criteria used to evaluate and rank the performance of each recreation center were identified from a combination of Recreation Supervisor expertise, Council concerns, and OPR Director expectations for staff in youth development and program performance. Those criteria were: a) Safety, b) Accessibility, c) Cleanliness, d) Outreach, e) Registration Levels, f) Program Quality, g) Collaborations, h) Parent Involvement, i) Advisory Councils, and j) Fee-based Programs.

Each of the ten criteria was assigned a 10-point maximum with an overall grand total highest possible ranking of 100 points. Twenty recreation centers were reviewed (excluding city-wide special program sites), although Carmen Flores Recreation Center (formerly Sanborn) did not receive a rating because it is in the process of re-opening and programs are just beginning. Of the 19 centers rated, 6 received over 75 points out of 100, and 8 received under 50 points out of a possible 100 points. (Please refer to **Attachment A: Review of Recreation Center's Performance Chart** and **Attachment B: Recreation Center Participation Comparison Chart** for the findings.)

KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS

The following criteria were used to evaluate overall performance at each recreation center. The first three, "*Safety*", "*Program Quality*", and "*Accessibility*," were broad categories that incorporate several factors:

- "*Safety*" - Includes physical safety (number of incidents, staff to participant ratio, level of supervision) and emotional safety (availability and visibility of Center Director, ability for staff to communicate with patrons, and the perception of safety of the facility).
- "*Program Quality*" - Refers to whether the programs meet the specific needs of the community, level of structured, skills-building activities, qualifications of program staff, staff to participant ratio, level of school-linked and comprehensive after school programs, participant satisfaction levels, and whether or not there is ongoing demand for the programs.
- "*Accessibility*" - Includes the location of the recreation center, hours of operation, multi-lingual staff, ADA accommodations, and level of customer service.

The remaining criteria focused on very specific areas:

- "*Cleanliness*" – Appearance of recreation center, both inside and out (including restrooms)
- "*Outreach*" - Connections to the community, promoting OPR and center's programs, neighborhood visibility

- “*Registration Levels*” – Based on RecWare data of structured, registered activities (not drop-in)
- “*Collaborations*” – Links to schools, local agencies and services, partnerships, and joint programs
- “*Parent Involvement*” – Level of parent participation in developing, promoting, and implementing programs
- “*Advisory Councils*” - Whether or not the recreation center has an active Advisory Council and Teen/Youth Advisory Council that recommends programs and provides program support
- “*Fee-based Programs*” – Programs that charge a registration fee to the participants that may or may not fully cover the costs of the program (staff and supplies)

Findings and Plan of Action

Our findings show that the level and quality of efforts made by full time recreation staff in the areas of community outreach, development of collaborations, and initiation of new program partnerships to a large extent determine the overall quality of programs and services. Without strong and thriving connections to the community, all other areas of programs suffer. It is no longer adequate to provide consistent recreation programming at a recreation center that is not connected to schools and community needs.

The highest rated centers have learned to position themselves as key program providers working in partnership with the community to respond to ever-changing community needs. OPR’s veteran staff will benefit from strategic training and development in areas of building community partnerships and youth development. To that end, OPR full time staff will each take 60-85 hours of training, beginning September 2004, including a review of City policy and procedures, effective supervision and management, youth and program development, community collaboration and capacity building, and best practices. These trainings are being conducted in partnership with the Oakland Unified School District, in-house by the Personnel Department, and by professional trainers in the field of Recreation and Parks. Additionally, all recreation centers are currently working to develop active Advisory Councils and Teen/Youth Advisory Councils and will have those councils in place by January 2005. By having community members and neighborhoods actively advising staff on the most needed programs and services, OPR can more quickly move towards recapturing its rich legacy through people, parks and programs.

The lowest rated recreation centers will receive ongoing technical assistance in areas where they are deficient. OPR management will also work closely with staff to build leadership skills, program development capacity, and greater community collaboration for the next three months. Full-time Recreation Directors and Program Directors will receive written assessments on a quarterly basis to ensure that the community needs are being met. Furthermore, OPR is currently looking into how to strengthen its personnel resources by encouraging and rewarding professional development and growth. While OPR enjoys the benefits of having a stable and veteran workforce, the lack of advancement and training opportunities for the past several years has had the effect of diminishing motivation and creativity. OPR is actively working to change this through developing new opportunities, while requiring new skills development through internal and external trainings and workshops.

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
September 14, 2004

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

Economic: As staff becomes more creative in programming and building partnerships, there will be greater opportunity for Oakland residents to be hired in Parks and Recreation.

Environmental: No environmental opportunities have been identified in this report.

Social Equity: Improvements at recreation centers will increase the level and quality of programs and services that will benefit each of the center's surrounding communities.

DISABILITY AND SENIOR CITIZEN ACCESS

OPR has an Inclusive Recreation Coordinator who is responsible for ensuring that all patrons are accommodated in OPR's programs regardless of the patron's abilities. The support for disabled patrons includes specialized programming as well as efforts to make OPR facilities accessible and obstruction free. At Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center, OPR currently offers recreation programs for deaf and hearing-impaired youth.

RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE

Staff recommends the City Council accept this report on the ratings of the recreation centers and plan of action to increase program participation at facilities.

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Staff requests that the City Council accept this report on Oakland Parks and Recreation's five highest and five lowest rated recreation centers and plans for program improvement.

Respectfully submitted,


AUDREE V. JONES TAYLOR
Director, Office of Parks and Recreation

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE
LIFE ENRICHMENT COMMITTEE:


OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR

Item: 7
Life Enrichment Committee
September 14, 2004

Deborah Edgerly
 Re: OPR – Evaluation Follow-Up Report
 ATTACHMENT A - Review of Recreation Center's Performance Chart

LIFE ENRICHMENT CMTE.
 7
 SEP 14 2004

Criteria	Maximum Points	Allendale	Arroyo Viejo	Brookdale	Bushrod	Carmen Flores (Just opened)	deFremercy	Diamond	FM Smith	Franklin	Golden Gate	Ira Jinkins	Lincoln Sq.	Manzanita	Monclair	Mosswood	Poplar	Rainbow	Redwood Hts.	Sheffield	Tassia
Safety	10	5	4	8	5	*	9	9	8	5	6	9	8	7	10	9	5	4	10	10	5
Accessibility	10	7	8	8	6	*	10	9	9	6	5	9	9	9	7	10	5	8	10	7	5
Cleanliness	10	2	4	3	2	*	5	8	8	7	1	8	5	7	6	8	6	5	10	9	4
Outreach	10	3	3	3	3	*	8	6	4	3	3	3	10	9	2	5	6	5	9	5	3
Registration Levels	10	5	3	5	5	*	10	9	4	5	3	7	10	6	10	10	4	7	10	10	3
Program Quality	10	4	5	5	5	*	8	9	8	5	7	9	9	8	8	9	5	6	10	10	4
Collaborations	10	6	6	4	4	*	9	7	9	6	7	8	10	7	4	9	4	7	8	5	8
Parent Involvement	10	2	4	4	3	*	8	8	8	3	6	7	8	5	9	8	3	3	10	10	3
Advisory Councils	10	4	4	3	2	*	8	3	3	1	1	2	8	4	2	9	9	2	10	2	3
Fee-based Programs	10	3	7	4	3	*	9	10	4	4	3	9	9	2	10	10	3	1	10	10	2
	100	41	48	47	38	*	85	78	65	45	42	71	86	64	68	87	50	48	97	78	40

Shading = Highest-performing centers
 Black w/ white font = Lowest-performing centers

Deborah Edgerly
 Re: OPR – Evaluation Follow-Up Report
 ATTACHMENT B - Recreation Center Participation Comparison Chart

LIFE ENRICHMENT CMTE.
 7
 SEP 14 2004

SITE	FY 2002/2003 JULY 1, 2002 - JUNE 30, 2003			FY 2003/2004 JULY 1, 2003 - JUNE 30, 2004			CHANGE FROM FY 02/03 TO FY 03/04		
	ENROLLMENTS	INDIVIDUALS	DROP-IN AVG/Mo.	ENROLLMENTS	INDIVIDUALS	DROP-IN AVG/Mo.	ENROLLMENTS	INDIVIDUALS	DROP-IN AVG/Mo.
Golden Gate Recreation Center	1,971	173	2,550	774	80	1,689	(1,197)	(93.00)	(861.00)
Poplar Recreation Center	1,290	148	790	608	106	1,275	(682)	(42.00)	485.00
F M Smith Recreation Center	1,692	545	2,130	1,047	355	3,288	(645)	(190.00)	1158.00
Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center	988	265	996	602	200	1,871	(386)	(65.00)	875.00
Ira Jinkins/Brookfield	1,156	396	3,273	830	209	2,770	(326)	(187.00)	(503.00)
Tassafaronga Recreation Center	1,280	413	2,513	1,001	373	967	(279)	(40.00)	(1546.00)
Manzanita Recreation Center	695	120	737	457	89	576	(238)	(31.00)	(161.00)
Franklin Recreation Center	656	216	4,575	465	298	6,357	(191)	82.00	1782.00
Dimond Recreation Center	1,309	378	3,921	1,143	388	661	(166)	10.00	(3260.00)
Bushrod Recreation Center	1,658	305	10,223	1,499	223	11,180	(159)	(82.00)	957.00
Allendale Recreation Center	443	91	8,496	288	135	6,430	(155)	44.00	(2066.00)
Brookdale Recreation Center	998	460	1,558	867	404	2,067	(131)	(56.00)	509.00
Mosswood Recreation Center	3,029	457	2,629	3,001	459	3,163	(28)	2.00	534.00
Defremery Recreation Center	1,110	258	2,882	1,128	277	3,657	18	19.00	775.00
Redwood Heights Recreation Center	3,634	818	1,291	3,659	818	2,618	25	0.00	1327.00
Rainbow Recreation Center	405	235	1,295	453	186	1,977	48	(49.00)	682.00
Sheffield Village Recreation Center	727	186	1,676	776	179	331	49	(7.00)	(1345.00)
Lincoln Square Recreation Center	226	146	4,332	357	110	6,538	131	(36.00)	2206.00
Montclair Recreation Center	2,452	1,065	440	2,854	1,413	594	402	348.00	154.00
Carmen Flores Recreation Center	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
TOTALS	25,719	6,675	56,307	21,809	6,302	58,009	(3,910)	(373.00)	1702.00

Note: Decreases in individual participants and enrollments have occurred primarily for two reasons: 1) OUSD increased its after-school programs system-wide and so a number of centers lost after school participants, and 2) there have been demographic changes in some areas. The area around Poplar Recreation Center has seen a dramatic increase in single adults and a decrease in the number of families with children. The Dimond district has seen a marked increase in families with very young children, so the programming there has been modified for Fall '04 to serve more preschool-aged children.