

## Social service provider survey

### ***Methods and participant characteristics***

United Way of Knox County initially administered the *COMPASS Service Provider Survey* in June-August 2004 to social service providers throughout the county. Along with questions designed to document organizational assets and the types of services provided by these agencies, this survey also included questions about funding cuts the organizations may have experienced during 2002 or 2003. In order to obtain updated information about funding cuts and increases during 2003, 2004, and early 2005, organizations were asked to participate in a Round 2 “update” survey during June-August 2005. Table 61 displays the number of surveys completed at each round and the response rates. Seventy-one percent of those invited to participate completed the Round 2 update survey on funding cuts and increases. Respondents from a total of 56 organizations participated in Round 1 or Round 2, representing approximately a half or more of all the social service agencies in Knox County. Volunteers helped to conduct the surveys by mail.

**Table 61: Survey response rates**

Funding source	Number invited to participate	Number who completed the survey	Response Rate
Round 1, June-August 2004 (COMPASS Social Service Provider Survey)	68	41	60%
Round 2, Update on Funding Cuts and Increases for 2003-05, June-August 2005	66	47	71%
Round 2, Supplemental Descriptive Information (for organizations that responded to Round 2, but not Round 1), June-August 2005	25	15	60%

Source: COMPASS Service Provider Survey, 2004, and Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005

Most of the respondents represented private not-for-profit organizations (70%), while 7% were from county government agencies and 6% from state government (see Table 62). Most reported that their agencies served the entire county (82%) (see Table 63). On average, the organizations reported employing 31 full-time staff and 13 part-time staff (see Table 64). Sixty-eight percent said they had volunteer staff.

**Table 62: Type of organization (n=54)**

	Number	Percent
A private, not-for-profit corporation	38	70%
A private, for-profit corporation	2	4%
A state government agency	3	6%
A county government agency	4	7%
Other	7	13%

Source: *COMPASS Service Provider Survey*, 2004, and *Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey*, 2005 (unduplicated)

**Table 63: Geographic area served (n=39)**

	Number	Percent
Region	5	13%
County	32	82%
City	1	3%
Other	1	3%

Source: *COMPASS Service Provider Survey, 2004*

**Table 64: Number of employees and volunteers (n=38-40)**

	Average number of employees/ volunteers per agency	Number of agencies with this type of staff	Percent of agencies with this type of staff
Full-time Employees	31	40	71%
Part-time Employees	13	39	70%
Volunteers	79	38	68%

Source: *COMPASS Service Provider Survey, 2004, and Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005* (unduplicated)

More than half of the respondents (64%) said their organizations serve adults. Many also serve children (55%) and youth (52%). One-third reported serving elders (36%) (see Table 65). Table 66 displays the types of services provided by the surveyed organizations. Almost half of the organizations surveyed reported that they provide information and referral services (40%). Emergency or financial assistance (including utilities and other basic needs) (38%), transportation assistance (29%), physical health (including medical assistance and health services) (29%), and housing assistance (including transitional housing and shelters) (24%) were the other most commonly provided services. Far fewer agencies reported providing substance abuse services, arts and culture, home health, legal services, planning and coordinating, mental health, or family planning services.

**Table 65: Age groups served by the organizations (n=20-36)**

	Number of organizations	Percent of organizations
Children (under 13 years old)	31	55%
Youth (13-19 years old)	29	52%
Adults	36	64%
Elders	20	36%

Source: *COMPASS Service Provider Survey, 2004, and Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005* (unduplicated)

**Table 66: Type of services provided by the organizations (n= 45)**

	Organizations that provide this type of service	
	Number	Percent
Information and referral	18	40%
Emergency or financial assistance	17	38%
Financial assistance	10	22%
Utilities assistance	7	16%
Other basic material needs, including clothing, toys, diapers, furniture, appliances, etc.	6	13%
Food	9	20%
Food assistance or food pantry	5	11%
Soup kitchen, group meals, or home-delivered meals	5	11%
Housing	11	24%
Housing assistance (help with rent, mortgage, repairs, weatherization, etc.)	10	22%
Transitional housing	3	7%
Homeless shelter	6	13%
Domestic violence	5	11%
Domestic violence shelter	2	4%
Domestic violence counseling and advocacy (services other than shelter)	4	9%
Transportation assistance (rides, car repairs, gas, etc.)	13	29%
Physical health	13	29%
Medical assistance (health insurance, help paying medical bills or prescriptions, etc.)	6	13%
Physical health services	9	20%
Mental health services/counseling	3	7%
Substance abuse services	2	4%
Parenting classes or other family strengthening	7	16%
Job training or employment opportunities for low-income people	4	9%
Child care	8	18%
Recreation	10	22%
Arts and culture	2	4%
Education	9	20%
Home health	3	7%
Home health care	2	4%
Homemaker or chore services	2	4%
Nutrition counseling	7	16%
Disability	4	9%
Respite care for people with physical disabilities	1	2%
Adult day care for people with physical disabilities	1	2%
Respite care for people who are cognitively or emotionally impaired	3	7%
Adult day care for people who are cognitively or emotionally impaired	2	4%
Youth	10	22%
Youth development, youth activities, mentoring for youth	7	16%

Table 66 continued	Number	Percent
Juvenile delinquency prevention or treatment	3	7%
Family planning	3	7%
Legal services	2	4%
Crime prevention	0	0%
Economic development	2	4%
Economic development in distressed areas	0	0%
Neighborhood revitalization	1	2%
Entrepreneurship	1	2%
Planning and coordinating services	2	4%
Other	6	13%

Source: *COMPASS Service Provider Survey, 2004*, and *Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005* (unduplicated)

### **Funding cuts and increases**

The *Round 2 Update Survey* asked respondents if their agencies had experienced any reductions, eliminations, or increases in funding during 2003, 2004, and the first five months of 2005; the surveys were conducted June-August 2005. Overall, more than half of the organizations experienced budget cuts, and decreases in funding were more common than funding increases. Sixty-eight percent of organizations said they experienced some kind of reduction or elimination in funding during 2003, rising to 74% in 2004 (see Table 67). These cuts most often came from the State of Ohio (58%, 54%), private or corporate foundations (46%, 55%), and individual donors or fundraising (47%, 50%). Fifty-eight percent reported an increase in funding from any source in 2003, rising to 67% in 2004. Increased funds were most likely to come from “other sources” (32%) and local government (29%) in 2003, or from individual donors/fundraising (40%) or local government (43%) in 2004. In general, state funding seemed to be decreasing during this time, causing many agencies to seek local or alternative funding sources.

**Table 67: Funding reductions, 2003 and 2004**

	Percent*	
	2003	2004
Any reduction or elimination of funds (all funding sources combined; 2003 n=44, 2004 n=42)	68%	74%
During the calendar years 2003 and 2004, has your organization experienced any reduction or elimination of funds from...		
State of Ohio (2003 n=24, 2004 n=24)	58%	54%
Federal Government (2003 n=25, 2004 n=23)	36%	48%
City, county, or other local government (2003 n=24, 2004 n=24)	33%	29%
Private or corporate foundations (2003 n=24, 2004 n=22)	46%	55%
Individual donors or fundraising (2003 n=30, 2004 n=28)	47%	50%
Other sources (2003 n=19, 2004 n=20)	16%	30%

\*Among organizations that received each type of funding. Respondents who selected “NA” were not included in the denominator.

Source: *Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005*

**Table 68: Funding increases, 2003 and 2004**

	Percent "Yes"*	
	2003	2004
Any increases in funding (all funding sources combined; 2003 n=43, 2004 n=42)	58%	67%
During the calendar years 2003 and 2004, has your organization experienced any increases in funding from...		
State of Ohio (2003 n=25, 2004 n=25)	12%	12%
Federal Government (2003 n=27, 2004 n=26)	26%	31%
City, county, or other local government (2003 n=28, 2004 n=28)	29%	43%
Private or corporate foundations (2003 n=31, 2004 n=31)	13%	36%
Individual donors or fundraising (2003 n=30, 2004 n=30)	20%	40%
Other sources (2003 n=22, 2004 n=20)	32%	35%

\*Among organizations that received each type of funding. Respondents who selected "NA" were not included in the denominator.

Source: *Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005*

Funding cuts continued to be more common than increases during the first five months of 2005. Forty-four percent said they had experienced funding reductions or cuts between January 1 and May 1, 2005 (see Table 69). One-third (32%) had experienced a funding increase during that same time period.

**Table 69: Funding reductions and increases in first four months of 2005 (n=41)**

Between January 1, 2005 and May 1, 2005, has your organization experienced*...	Percent "Yes"
Any funding reductions or cuts from any source?	44%
Any increases in funding from any source or any new sources of funding?	32%

\*The *Round 2 Update Survey* was conducted June-August, 2005.

Source: *Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005*

### **Staff and program cuts**

As a result of the funding cuts discussed above, many organizations reported that they had to reduce services or staff in some way. About one-third of those surveyed reported some kind of reduction or elimination of services in 2003 or 2004. Overall, cut-backs were more common in 2003 and eased somewhat in 2004. Thirty-five percent of the agencies reported some kind of elimination or reduction of programs or services in 2003, falling slightly to 29% in 2004 (see Table 70). Over one-quarter of the organizations (28%) said they had to turn clients away or start a waiting list in 2003, falling slightly to 23% in 2004. Almost half (47%) said they reduced or consolidated staff in 2003, dropping to 43% in 2004.

**Table 70: Service reductions and other cut-backs caused by lack of funding or budget cuts in 2003 and 2004**

	Percent "Yes"*	
	2003	2004
Any elimination or reduction of programs or services (2003 n=40, 2004 n=41)	35%	29%
Eliminated existing programs or services due to lack of funding or budget cuts? (2003 n=39, 2004 n=39)	21%	13%
Reduced existing programs or services due to lack of funding or budget cuts? (2003 n=39, 2004 n=39)	31%	31%
Turned clients away or started waiting list (2003 n=40, 2004 n=40)	28%	23%
Turned clients away who you could not serve due to lack of funding or budget cuts? (2003 n=40, 2004 n=40)	13%	10%
Had to start or continue a waiting list for clients because you could not serve all who were eligible due to lack of funding or budget cuts? (2003 n=37, 2004 n=38)	24%	23%
Reduced or consolidated staff (2003 n=38, 2004 n=40)	47%	43%
Laid off staff due to lack of funding or budget cuts? (2003 n=38, 2004 n=39)	18%	15%
Set a "hiring freeze" or did not hire needed staff due to lack of funding or budget cuts? (2003 n=38, 2004 n=38)	34%	37%
Combined positions or otherwise consolidated staff due to lack of funding or budget cuts? (2003 n=37, 2004 n=39)	41%	39%

\*Among organizations that responded to each question. Respondents who selected "NA" were not included in the denominator.

Source: *Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005*

Respondents were asked to "think back over the past five years—from 2000 to the year 2005" and "describe the change in the level of need in Knox County" for the kinds of services provided by their organization. The overwhelming majority (72%) said there is "more need now," while 17% said there was no change and 11% selected "don't know or mixed change." None of the respondents said they perceived less need now.

**Table 71: "Thinking back over the past 5 years—from 2000 to the year 2005—how would you best describe the change in the level of need in Knox County for the kinds of services your organization provides?" (n=47)**

	Percent
No change/ Same level of need	17%
Less need now	0%
More need now	72%
Don't know or mixed change	11%

Source: *Round 2 Update Social Service Provider Survey, 2005*

## Assets and leadership

The *Service Provider Survey (Round 1)* asked respondents to indicate what resources and leadership they provide to the community. (These questions were also asked of representatives from businesses and associations.) About half of the service providers (51%) said their agencies make employees with specific skills available to help community groups, and many said they provide meeting space for community groups (49%) or reach out to hire people from distressed neighborhoods (44%).

**Table 72: Resources available to the community (n=39-41)**

	Number of organizations	Percent of organizations
Employees with specific skills made available to help community groups, for example, a health expert who helps a community-based group assemble health information for a neighborhood newsletter	21	51%
Provide meeting space to community groups	20	49%
Reaches out to hire people from distressed neighborhoods, (for example, people who are trying to transition from welfare to work)	18	44%
Reaches out to purchase goods and services from enterprises in lower income areas, for example, enterprises that are part of community revitalization efforts	9	22%
Makes materials and equipment, for example, duplicating machines or computers, available to community groups	4	10%

Source: *COMPASS Service Provider Survey, 2004*

The survey also asked respondents to identify the types of community activities they participate in or lead. The majority said they promote volunteering (75%) and good health (73%) (see Table 73). By contrast, very few organizations said they were designing a plan for community renewal (11%), fostering commercial real estate improvement in lower income neighborhoods (7%), or expanding business and industrial development (0%).

**Table 73: Leadership and participation in community initiatives and projects (n=38-41)**

	Currently leading or participating in this type of activity	
	Number of organizations	Percent of organizations
Promoting volunteering	30	75%
Promoting good health	30	73%
Promoting youth development	26	63%
Fostering racial harmony	25	61%
Fostering community networks	24	60%
Increasing availability of recreation opportunities	22	54%
Building neighborhood trust	22	54%
Promoting educational reform	22	54%
Preparing people for jobs	20	49%
Connecting neighbors who need help with those who can help	19	46%
Promoting arts and culture	18	44%
Increasing availability of and access to jobs	14	34%
Fostering entrepreneurship	14	34%
Increasing affordable housing and home ownership	11	27%
Beautifying community spaces	10	25%
Promoting commercial revitalization in lower income areas	10	24%
Promoting economic development in distressed areas	9	22%
Improving access to transportation	8	20%
Designing a plan for community renewal	4	11%
Fostering commercial real estate improvement in lower income neighborhoods	3	7%
Expanding business and industrial development in distressed areas	0	--

Source: *COMPASS Service Provider Survey, 2004*