

Program Delivery Study Overview



BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS
OF GREATER WASHINGTON



April 2007

WHY DID WE DO THE PROGRAM DELIVERY STUDY?

- To increase our ability to carry out our mission
 - The mission of Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Washington is to help boys and girls of all backgrounds, with an emphasis on those who need us most, build confidence, develop character and acquire the skills needed to become productive, civic-minded, responsible adults.
- To increase our ability to provide high-quality programs in all of the 5 core program areas
- Strategic plan calls for a sustainable, long-term business and service model to ensure the long term presence of BGCGW for area youth and their families. It also calls for us to:
 - Serve the highest possible number of our target youth, with low-income as the first but not the only filter
 - Ensure that we can serve them in high-quality facilities
 - Manage our resources as effectively as possible for the maximum benefit of the kids

THE PROGRAM DELIVERY STRATEGY BASICALLY LINES UP WITH THE OVERALL STRATEGIC PLAN

Strategic Plan Timeline

“Balanced Budget Mode and Increased Capacity”

FY 2007-2009

“Quality Enhancements and Preparation for Growth”

FY 2008-2010

“Fiscally Responsible Growth”

FY 2010-2016

Program Delivery Implementation Timeline

- First, ensure that facilities have must-have elements (2007-09)
 - In the areas where the highest numbers of youth in need are
 - With the right capacity and the ability to deliver programs as defined by our mission
 - In safe, high-quality conditions for members and staff
 - With a sustainable operating budget

- Then focus on improving quality (2008-10)
 - Seek the “desired” program delivery elements in each club
 - Improve facilities that can be renovated at reasonable cost
 - Trade up below-par facilities for better ones, according to the must have and desired elements



- Then work toward measured growth (2010 and beyond)
 - Establish clubs in areas of high need that we aren’t currently serving
 - Expand utilization in existing facilities
 - Deepen our service to youth BGC&GW is already serving

PROBLEM SOLVING APPROACH OF THE PROGRAM DELIVERY STUDY

- Reviewed BGCGW Annual Reports and facilities documents, toured clubs and vacant lots, and interviewed many staff members, and collected external data for surrounding Census tracts and for 1-mile radii around the clubs
 - Used multiple sources to develop ranges for club statistics (esp. average daily attendance) where sources differed
 - Used tax assessed values to be conservative with property value estimates
- Worked with Task Force and program staff to identify must-have and desirable elements to support programming at each club
- Conducted external research to identify best practices in real estate management by nonprofits, especially BGCA and other BGC affiliates
- Analyzed quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate each property against the criteria set forth by Task Force
 - Value to serving our target audience of youth, with low-income as the first filter but not the only filter
 - Current and future capacity to serve target youth (including number of youth, facility quality, etc.)
 - Efficient cost of serving youth
 - Cost to achieve potential capacity, both in financial and human resources terms
 - Value of other options for that site
 - Fit with priorities and milestones in overall BGCGW strategic plan
- Focused early efforts on clubs fully-owned by BGCGW, then completed evaluation of other clubs
 - Task Force and/or Working Team developed options for each club and
 - Working Team assessed them based on the evaluation criteria and must have/desirable program elements to make recommendations

WE BEGAN WITH PROGRAM NEEDS, WHICH WAS THE BASIS OF THE PROGRAM DELIVERY CRITERIA

“Must have” elements

Desired elements

Value and capacity to serving target youth

- Accessible to high numbers of target youth
- Ability to assure safety of children and staff
- Sufficient space and layout for core programs
- Dedicated space for our prime programming time frames
- Programming space consistently set up for our program time
- Full control/security of equipment/other assets
- Ability to prevent outsiders from contacting youth while “in” club
- Ability to change/end service in reasonable time frame as youth or BCGGW needs change
- Sense by youth and staff that is “our space”
- Our rights protected and minimum occupancy term
- All facilities achieve compatibility with all relevant building codes

- Space flexible enough to fit other program needs or changeable to fit needs at reasonable cost
- Ability to partner with local governments or co-exist with other organizations such as YMCA, charter schools, etc

Efficient operating costs and management

- Reasonable operating costs on a per child and per square foot basis
- Ability to correct facilities issues in reasonable time frame
- Appropriate facilities management expertise/ability
- Ability to insure against loss of assets for ALL activities on site (and other activities cannot violate existing general liability policies that cover our normal operations)
- Ability to improve space cost-effectively

- Facilities management done at most efficient cost
- Flexibility to do revenue-generating activities or host partnerships (day care, elder care, bingo, charter schools)

Efficient capital allocation

- Capital allocated in areas of current and likely future need (where we are prepared to make a long-term commitment)
- Capital allocated to ensure safety and appropriate environment for youth and staff
- Ability to improve space cost-effectively
- Long-term assets produce “everyday” benefits
- Opportunity costs periodically reviewed
- Logical partnerships (with stable partners) evaluated, including with government and other nonprofits

- Value of any capital assets that go into building fully retained
- Entry into geographic area done with lowest effective capital allocation
- Long-term assets maintained in most “efficient” growth instruments
- Ability to make renovation, repurpose, sale, or redevelopment decisions based on our needs
- Long-term assets grow in value

Value of other options/opportunity cost

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CLUBS RATED OK

Recommendation	Clubs	Next steps
Continue effective service in current facility	• FBR at THEARC	Increase 9am-3pm utilization
	• Old Petworth School Clubhouse #6	Evaluate teen outreach options (located in police station)
	• Carteret Mortgage Branch	Actively manage to ensure ongoing success
	• Hylton Branch	Actively manage to ensure ongoing success
	• Herndon Branch	Negotiate longer lease agreement and more space with school
	• Gen. Heiser Branch	Continue to actively manage and monitor electric distribution wires and status of underground forced sewage line

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CLUBS RATED MONITOR

Recommendation	Clubs	Rationale	Next steps
Continue effective service with moderate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="458 287 719 429">• Culmore Character Club Branch <li data-bbox="458 562 719 654">• Brent Place (Essex) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="778 287 1296 429">• Club effectively utilized in near term and financial sustainable <li data-bbox="778 562 1296 705">• Recent surface renovation made improvement to quality of facility <li data-bbox="778 725 1296 862">• Current space likely the only way to serve those kids 	<p data-bbox="1367 287 1833 429">Evaluate options for larger club in area in medium term</p> <p data-bbox="1367 562 1833 701">Continue working with building management on moderate renovation</p>
Renovate or expand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="458 896 731 1086">• Richard England Clubhouse #14 <li data-bbox="458 1110 731 1200">• Germantown Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="778 896 1328 1086">• Sufficient number of low-income youth implies that we should maintain presence in neighborhoods <li data-bbox="778 1110 1328 1252">• Capacity constraints at Germantown (waiting list for members) 	<p data-bbox="1367 896 1852 1086">Work with local boards to ensure effective financial and renovation/expansion plans</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CLUBS RATED MONITOR (CONTINUED)

Recommendation	Clubs	Rationale	Next steps
Improve facility or evaluate other options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Orr Elementary School Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality is not acceptable for BGCGW youth and long-term lease is lacking May need renovation by volunteers 	Surface renovation and evaluate as satellite of larger club or evaluate other locations
Improve lease or evaluate other options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northwestern High School Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School has indicated that lease will terminate “soon” due to their space needs 	Negotiate better lease and/or evaluate other locations
Study further in Phase 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fredericksburg Regional Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working team yet to visit locations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue business planning process for new club and clarify potential gift terms
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camp Ernest Brown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camp Brown analysis different – and potentially more complex – than analysis on “typical” clubs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBD

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CLUBS RATED TAKE ACTION

Recommendation	Clubs	Rationale	Next steps
Participate in community redevelopment process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Butler-Wyatt Clubhouse #2 Silver Spring Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already involved in process and potential exists for new clubs with low up-front costs and ongoing operating funding Small number of low-income kids implies that we should stay in area only if investment required is appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue participation with NW1 and Montgomery Co. planning If process doesn't result in new club for Silver Spring, RFP with option of new club
Improve facility or evaluate other options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anthony Bowen Elementary Clubhouse #4 Hopkins Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality is not acceptable for BGCGW youth and long-term lease is lacking May need volunteer renovation Quality is not acceptable for BGCGW youth May need volunteer renovation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renovate or evaluate other locations Renovate and/or work with local boards to evaluate other locations
Renovate and monetize value of vacant lots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alexandria-Olympic Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient number of low-income youth implies that we should maintain presence in area Quality and capacity of club currently insufficient Local board has already raised capital funding for renovation Two vacant lots next to club valued at \$820,000 total 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure effective financial and renovation plans

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CLUBS RATED TAKE ACTION (continued)

Recommendation	Clubs	Rationale	Next steps
Seek redevelopment options with new BGCGW clubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mary & Daniel Loughran Clubhouse #10 Robert V. Murray Clubhouse #11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large number of low-income kids implies that we should stay in both areas At Clubhouse #10, high real estate value and under-utilization of site means redevelopment puts assets to better use At Clubhouse #11, redevelopment of St. Elizabeth's Hospital implies that BGCGW could be part of a broader community center and get newer, better facility while putting assets to better use Both clubs can be redeveloped without interruption of service 	Seek Redevelopment Ideas
Seek redevelopment options with potential for new BGCGW clubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jelleff Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood has low number of low-income children We now serve less than 100 kids per day (~40 in non-sports programs) Large, 50+ year old facility that needs significant renovation We are using \$20M of real estate to serve very few low-income children 	Seek Redevelopment Ideas

MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION FOR EASTERN BRANCH

Recommendation

Take Eastern offline in August 2007 after summer camp

Put out RFP to evaluate options

Rationale

- Branch is not consistent with needs of kids in local community
 - Too large (46,000 sq. ft.) for 298 kids in census tract* and less than 100 kids attending each day
 - Poorly configured space that is difficult to supervise
 - 70 year old building that needs significant renovation
- Running \$500,000 annual deficit even without doing renovations
- We will provide transportation options for every Eastern Branch member
- All staff will be relocated to other clubs where their support is needed to serve additional youth

Implications

- Approximately 4 months notice for kids, parents, community
 - Allows summer camp during period of highest need
- Continuous programming for our kids
- Potential of new, appropriately-sized, more efficient, and state-of-the-art club for community in approximately 2-3 years