

Attachment A

City to Youth: A Strategic Partnership Opportunity

Program Overview

In an effort to increase adult support for Portland's youth and increase youth educational attainment, the City to Youth Pilot Program allowed eligible City employees in five pilot bureaus and all Council offices to take up to four hours of paid work time per month to volunteer with Portland youth. The pilot program intended to test whether paid work time and centralized support and administration would act as an incentive for City employees to volunteer with Portland youth. The pilot aimed to test the response of City employees, the sustainability of the program, and to evaluate program limitations and barriers to implementation.

Participation in the pilot program was limited to non-represented employees in the Office of Sustainable Development, the Bureau of Housing and Community Development, the Water Bureau, the Bureau of Planning, the Mayor's Office, other Council offices, and OMF Business Operations. During the pilot program, non-represented employees in these bureaus were eligible to spend a maximum of four hours of work time per month engaging in a youth focused volunteer activity that occurred during the employee's regularly scheduled work hours, provided they had supervisory approval and participation did not negatively impact any work activities.

Qualitative data was gathered by a survey of both enrolled and non-enrolled employees in the pilot bureaus (see Appendix A).

Data Analysis Findings

The program's marketing efforts were successful.

Less than 3% of the non-registered survey respondents reported never having heard about the program. Non-registered employees identified email announcements and announcements at staff and departmental meetings as the most successful marketing strategies. Program staff report regularly disseminating flyers and brochures, holding brown bags, and maintaining the program's presence on PortlandOnline during the pilot program.

There is a need for greater program flexibility.

Perhaps the largest barrier to participation in the City to Youth Pilot Program during the pilot period lay in the program's restrictive eligibility requirements. As constructed, the pilot did not allow for the participation of represented employees. Nearly half of non-registered survey respondents – 47.1% – identified as represented employees ineligible to participate in City to Youth. Two-thirds of non-registered respondents – 66% – said it was important or very important that represented employees be able to participate in the program. Additional comments noted that because non-represented employees can already flex their schedules, the program offered less incentive for non-represented employees to participate.

Participants in City to Youth pilot were required to volunteer during regularly scheduled work hours. Only two registered employees reported volunteering during work hours. Similarly, several employees (28% of non-registered respondents) heard about the program and volunteered with youth during the pilot, but did not register with City to Youth. There are several possible explanations: ineligibility; volunteering outside of work hours; or prior arrangements with supervisors that support volunteerism without participating in a program like City to Youth.

There is a need for ongoing activity to support the program, by both internal and external partners.

Internal Partners – Qualitative data demonstrate that City to Youth staff have been successful in marketing the program within pilot bureaus. The data confirm that City staff is well suited to market the program to other City employees.

External Partners – Twenty people enrolled in the City to Youth pilot program. However, only two out of five registered employees reported volunteering during work hours in the Mid-Point Survey. Most of the participants who went through the process of enrolling did not begin volunteer service even after follow up emails and calls from City to Youth staff. When these enrollees were asked why they had not yet begun their service, they indicated they expected more active follow up from City to Youth.

Recommendations

1. ***Council Resolution*** – To extend program availability to more employees, a Council resolution deeming volunteer service to youth mission critical to all City bureaus is recommended. This will build upon the City of Portland’s adopted Human Resources Administrative Rule 4.05. This administrative rule allows paid volunteer service when the volunteer activity is directly related to the bureau’s mission and is approved by the Director. The resolution would open City to Youth to a wider range of City employees and reduce administration and paperwork. It would also provide the opportunity for unions to “opt in” to participate through City to Youth.
2. ***Temporarily Reestablish City to Youth in the Mayor’s Office*** – Housing the program in the Mayor’s Office helps ensure a strong advocate to facilitate a successful citywide launch in the short term. During annual reporting, directed in the resolution, this arrangement could be revisited.
3. ***Ongoing Evaluation*** – The resolution calls for ongoing reporting – through payroll codes and bureau reports – culminating in an annual report to Council.

City to Youth Survey for Non-Registered Employees: Major Findings

N = 68 respondents from all pilot bureaus

Table 1: Respondent Break Down by Bureau.

Bureau	Number	Respondent %	Bureau %
Water	32	47.1%	
OMF Business Operations	16	23.5%	
Planning	11	16.2%	
Sustainable Development	5	7.4%	
Housing and Community Development	2	2.9%	
Mayor's & Commissioners'	2	2.9%	

Nearly half (47%) of respondents identified as represented employees ineligible to participate in the pilot program. Other respondents indicated they work part time, also making them ineligible to participate.

Marketing and Outreach

The survey confirmed that pilot program staff did an excellent job marketing the program. Only two respondents (less than 3%) reported never having heard about the program. Also, 50% of respondents reported knowing they were able to volunteer in their child's classroom or daycare, demonstrating retention of program details.

Table 2: How did you hear about City to Youth?

Outreach Method	# Respondents	% Respondents
Email announcement	46	38.7%
All staff or department meeting	25	21%
Coworker or supervisor told me	14	11.8%
Brochure or flyer	11	9.2%
PortlandOnline	8	6.7%
Brownbag or information session	7	5.9%
Don't remember but aware of it	3	2.5%
Never heard about this program	2	1.7%
Heard about it from a community organization/school	1	.8%
OTHER: SMART volunteer for 5 years	1	.8%
OTHER: visionPDX at Council	1	.8%

* Note: respondents were allowed to choose multiple answers; 119 total responses

Non-registered employees identified email announcements and announcements at staff and departmental meetings as the most successful marketing strategies. However, it is important to note that the data may be slightly skewed since these respondents all elected to participate in an *email* survey. Therefore, the respondent pool may be slightly more responsive to email than their colleagues. Email messages were also the most commonly used outreach method according to pilot program staff.

Pilot program staff regularly disseminated flyers and brochures, held brown bags, and maintained the program's presence on PortlandOnline during the pilot program. However, there may be room for additional marketing to community organizations and schools. For example, working with Parent-Teacher Associations and daycare organizations, particularly those located near offices where a number of City employees work, might help make sure parents and guardians who work for the City know about this effort.

When asked which marketing methods most often catch their eye, employee responses reflect less diversity than when asked how employees heard about City to Youth.

Table 3: Which marketing methods most often catch your attention?

Outreach Method	# Respondents	% Respondents
Email announcement	51	50.5%
All staff or departmental meeting	25	24.8%
Brownbag or information session	11	10.9%
Brochure or flyer	6	6%
PortlandOnline	5	5%
E-Newsletter	4	4%
OTHER: Elevator posting	2	2%
OTHER: Supervisor or manager	1	1%

Building on these questions, Question 19 asked respondents what options would increase awareness and participation in their bureaus. Forty people (44%) said, "visit bureau/staff meetings to talk about the project." This was the most popular response. Other outreach strategies, such as inviting bureau staff to information sessions, offering brown bags, sending out more email updates, and sending out more interoffice mail, received between 10 and 4 votes.

Notably, eight people (8.8%) said they are already well informed about the program. When asked for any other strategies to increase awareness and participation in a follow up question most responses reiterated the data presented in **Tables 2 and 3**.

One response, however, was especially illuminating: *"We have offered awareness options at Water. I think we need more encouragement from managers and supervisors for people to volunteer."* This response indicates that marketing may not be the biggest obstacle to successful program implementation. The elements of a successful volunteer experience are explored in greater depth below.

City Employees and Volunteerism

Question 5 asked if respondents currently volunteer with youth, in a youth-based organization, or in their child's classroom or daycare. Nineteen people (27.9%) responded affirmatively. Because this is a

survey for non-registered employees, **this data set has especially important implications.** It indicates that a not immediately obvious group of City employees has heard about the program and currently volunteers with youth, but chose not to register during the pilot program. There are several possible explanations. Many employees were ineligible because they are represented or part-time employees. Also, employees may have already been volunteering outside of work hours or already worked out an arrangement with their supervisor that supported their volunteerism without participating in the pilot program. Unfortunately, no follow up data is available.

Factors most likely to encourage participation in City to Youth

Question 8 asked respondents what factors might be most likely to encourage participation in City to Youth. Their responses shed light on factors that might encourage non-registered employees to volunteer for a program like City to Youth. Although most responses are synthesized in this document, all responses for Question 8 are listed in order to demonstrate the consistent nature of the answers given in response to this open-ended question. The responses are groups into categories when possible:

- **Support from management** was the most common qualitative response. Eleven responses fell into this category.
 - Approval of all applications so it is clear that the supervisors truly do support the concept
 - Ease of volunteering/city support
 - Encouragement by direct supervisors and managers
 - Encouragement from bureau management
 - Manager's approval for time
 - Management buy-in
 - Management support of employees to volunteer
 - Management's total support
 - Supervisory support
 - Supervisor support
 - Support of one's supervisor and ample travel time or travel support

- **More specific marketing about volunteer activities and program guidelines** was another common area of responses. Seven responses fell into this category.
 - A good idea of what programs and where they are
 - Knowing if my volunteer program qualifies
 - Awareness and a variety of options
 - More info on what it is, what the commitment would be
 - More info about types of opportunities
 - Employees need to be repeatedly informed of the various needs for adult volunteers in schools and the difference they can make in a student's life and in their ability to learn
 - Knowledge of programs available in schools like Fernwood, Hollywood, Beaumont and Grant

- **Developing a user-friendly volunteer experience** was also a prevalent type of response. Again, seven responses fell into this category. Notably, two people suggested appointing a more active program point person in their bureau.
 - Having lots of organizations participating, make volunteering easy
 - Making it easier to gather information on available options and sign up
 - Developing some group time programs that employees can just step into; make sure everyone knows [about the program]

- Someone you could talk to who could help you find a good fit. A staff person who could talk to you about what you want to get out of the volunteering and show you the organizations that would best meet your goals.
 - More organization around the effort; designated person from pilot bureaus to talk to, encourage others
 - Have the people that are already involved be a "rep" for the rest of their workgroup
 - Clear rewards
- **Inclusiveness**, emphasizing the importance of making the program available to represented employees, was the fourth most prevalent area of responses. Six responses fell into this category.
 - Allow represented employees
 - Allow represented employees to participate!!
 - Available to all employees
 - Most employees are represented, so expand the program to represented employees
 - Open to all employees
 - Opening the program to all employees, having supervisors promote and support the program
- **Some misconceptions about the program were mentioned.** Three responses reflect a basic misunderstanding about the nature of the City to Youth program.
 - Paid time
 - Doing it on work time
 - Being allowed to participate during work hours
- A few responses did not fall easily into one category; however, they provide helpful insight into what City employees believe constitutes a good volunteer experience/program.
 - Peer recommendation
 - Proximity to work, good program
 - Flexibility
 - Being relatively young oneself
 - Higher profile advertising
 - Even more notifications
 - None

Barriers to Enrollment

A follow up question was asked to the 72.1 percent of non-registered employees (forty-nine people) who do not currently volunteer with youth, youth-focused organizations, or in a school or daycare. In Question 4, these employees were instructed to “please tell us the main reason you haven’t registered.” Forty-six responses were submitted. Reasons for not volunteering included a diverse array of responses. The questions were open-ended, but the responses have been grouped into sub-categories to make analysis easier. More than forty-sixty reasons are listed because several respondents offered multiple reasons.

- **Sixteen people attributed the choice not to participate to workload or to generally being too busy.** Ten of these people specifically mentioned being too busy at work, while six people generally referenced being too busy (not specifying at work or personally). *Samples responses included:*
 - "I don't feel I'm ever caught up enough at work to take time out for this activity."

- "I would like to, but feel I'm too busy to take the time to figure out what I can do and what is the best way for me to plug into an opportunity."
 - "Time demands of my work limit my willingness to spend time away from the office."
- **Eight people indicated that they currently volunteer outside of work hours, or would like to volunteer in other ways (besides working with youth).**

Sample responses:

 - "I would prefer to work with elderly or other groups."
 - "My volunteer work focuses on hunger-relief, including ending childhood hunger."
 - "I am a coach on my daughter's basketball team (middle school). I also volunteer for after school events (chaperone)."
- **Seven people pointed to personal reasons for not participating in the program.** Some of these people expressed concern about not having an opportunity to volunteer due to specific life circumstances or for other personal reasons. Others expressed a lack of certainty about their jobs or disclosed plans to retire.

Sample responses:

 - "no time; mother has Alzheimer's"
 - "Not certain of future employment with City."
 - "They [my kids] were on summer break so no opportunity to volunteer with kids."
- **Six people specifically stated they are not participating in the program because represented employees were ineligible to participate,** including one person who was not personally represented but believed the decision to exclude represented employees was unfair.

Sample responses:

 - "I believe represented employees may not be eligible to participate."
 - "Represented employees can't participate."
- **Four people, a relatively limited amount, expressed a lack of familiarity with program details.**

Sample responses:

 - "I'm not sure how much time is needed to volunteer as well as whether the times for volunteering are flexible."
 - "Not aware of the types of opportunities."
- **Four people expressed misconceptions about the program that made participation less attractive to them.** Although this is not a significant number, the program's literature should reiterate City to Youth's parameters to prevent the dissemination of misinformation. Data in this category includes comments from two people who did not know the program had actually started.

Sample responses:

 - "My interest would be volunteering with Youth at my church. It is my understanding that since [my volunteerism] is affiliated with a church it would not fall under the City to Youth pilot program."
 - "You don't allow private schools to participate."
- **Three people expressed a lack of interest in working with youth or volunteering.**

Sample response:

 - "I don't really like to be around kids."
- **Three people mentioned being hesitant about asking for supervisor permission, or did not have supervisor approval.**

Sample response:

 - "Also, because it doesn't feel worth the conversation with my manager – it feels a bit like a favor to allow this time and I'd rather not waste this favor at this time for this program."

- **Two people expressed hesitancy about enrolling in a pilot program, which may or may not continue on a permanent basis.**
Sample response:
 - "I would like to get involved but the organizations I would be looking at working with want a long term commitment. I would like to make sure the City is going to continue this program before I commit to something long term with an organization."
- **Two respondents indicated ineligibility due to working part time.** Greater flexibility could enable participation by people in this group.
Sample response:
 - "I have two part time jobs with the City, and while I work 40 hours, the part time [status] makes me ineligible."
- **Two additional people reported not being eligible, but did not specify the reason.**

Responses Given by only One Respondent:

- "I live in Clackamas County and my children attend a private non-profit school... you [don't] allow participation outside of Portland schools."
- "I was thinking I wanted to volunteer in North Portland, but it's a long ways from downtown so I've got to figure out the transportation thing."
- "I consider my volunteer work and charitable donations to be a private matter, best addressed outside the workplace."
- "One of the reasons that I don't volunteer more is that I am often on call, the job comes first."
- "Alter-abled"

A follow up question was asked of the select group of respondents (forty-nine people) who do not currently volunteer with youth. The prompt read: "If there is another reason you haven't registered, please note it here." Many people wrote 'see my response to the previous question' or 'see Question 4,' and by in large, responses to this question generally reiterated previously submitted responses. However, a few new points were raised. Two respondents criticized the timing of the pilot program. For example, one respondent said, "waiting until school started -- poor timing for a pilot." Another called for a more actively engaged point person at their bureau, saying "There hasn't been much info about this, and to my knowledge, no appointed OSD person who should have been keeping this in the forefront."

In a separate question, Question 7, respondents were asked, "Which of the following factors - if any - might keep you from participating in City to Youth?" Respondents were prompted to select up to three answers to this question from a list of ten choices. Fifty people answered this question, and **Table Four** displays the results.

Table Four. Factors Inhibiting Participation in City to Youth.

Factors that Discourage Participation	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
I don't have time to volunteer during the work day	22	19.6%
I'm a represented or part-time employee and therefore ineligible to participate at present	16	14.3%
I don't know if my supervisor will approve my participation in this	14	12.5%

program		
I'm not sure about the options for volunteering	13	11.6%
Transportation and/or travel time is difficult for me	11	9.8%
I don't have enough information about the program	9	8%
I don't know if I would be any good at working with youth	9	8%
I'm not interested in volunteering with youth at this time	8	7.1%
None - I'm planning to sign up for the program!	5	4.5%
Other (see discussion below)	5	4.5%

The major difference depicted by this data set is that travel time and transportation are listed as barriers to participation. Otherwise, respondents echoed previously discussed themes. Many people simply cut and paste answers given in response to previous questions, or wrote 'see Question 4' with one notable exception. *One respondent said, "Some field trip based programs require a full day volunteer commitment, so the 4 hour limit can be a barrier."*

Building on the existing data sets, Question 9 asked, "In your opinion, what factors are most likely to limit participation in City to Youth?" Travel time, concerns about "supervisor resistance," workload, and the fact that many City employees are represented were mentioned consistently. Although many responses were similar to those given in response to previous questions a few new responses were given. New responses included:

- "Liability"
- "Paperwork hassles"
- "Not everyone's comfortable with or enjoys working with youth; maybe have some behind the scenes opportunities (admin/organizing/etc.) if you are going to limit the age group for this program."
- "A disconnect between the generations"
- "Fear of supervisor negative targeting"

Finally, Question 10 asked about the importance of including represented employees in the City to Youth program. Two-thirds of respondents (65.9 percent or thirty-eight people) said it was "important" or "very important" that represented employees be able to participate in the program. Another eighteen respondents (26.5 percent) were "neutral." Only six people (8.9 percent of survey respondents) said it was "unimportant" or "not at all important" that represented employees be able to participate in the City to Youth program.

Additional Qualitative Data

Very few positive comments were given when respondents were asked an open-ended question asking for any input or advice they'd like to share about City to Youth. Many comments confirmed data solicited by other questions. However, some new points were illuminated:

- “A nice option for union folks, but not as a bargaining item that would be in place of something else. All wage and benefits issues come first.”
- “Non-represented employees can already flex their schedules (and work less than 8 hours on occasion), so this program doesn't offer anything of value except advertising.”

Some comments also revealed that City to Youth may have to overcome the impacts of unanticipated changes that took place during the pilot program:

- "I guess I find it strange that they [City to Youth] came and talked to our entire bureau and took up our time in explaining the whole program even though most of the employees can't participate."
- “Limiting the program to non-represented employees is probably the biggest mistake. In my Bureau, non-rep means management. What's good about a program that lets managers take time off to go on a field trip with their kid while the represented single mom at the front desk has to answer the phones for them while they are gone?”

Lastly, several people also gave comments indicating that they believe the program should support general volunteer opportunities, rather than limiting it to youth work.

- “What is the justification for limiting participation to youth-oriented volunteer opportunities? It doesn't really make sense.”
- “The focus should not be on one sector of the population - folks should be encouraged to commit to something that inspires and connects to them.”
- “I've spent many, many hours working projects that raise money for Mercy Corps. So saying that only directly working with youth is ‘worthwhile’ is, well, it bugs me.”

Additional Information

Several additional questions gauged interest on a variety of topics relevant to City to Youth. The data points below summarize relevant findings:

- A nearly even number of respondents were either neutral (42.6 percent) or said it was somewhat important or very important (41.1 percent) for City to Youth to offer other volunteer opportunities in addition to opportunities to work with youth. Less than 10 percent of respondents said this was "somewhat unimportant."
- When asked if they would be willing to participate in an optional "Day of Service" twenty-six people (38.3 percent of respondents) said "absolutely" or "probably." Another twenty-three people (33.8 percent) said maybe, and sixteen people (23.5 percent) said "probably not" or "not interested." Thus, over a third of respondents had some degree of interest in participating in such an activity.
- Responses were mixed when survey respondents were asked if the City to Youth program is worth continuing. Thirty-seven percent said “yes,” 27.9 percent said "too early to say," 26.5 percent said probably, and 2.9 percent said “no.”
- Finally, a very limited number of respondents answered questions about City to Youth's website. The data sample is too small to be conclusive because only nine people responded affirmatively when asked if they have ever visited the site. However, among this group of nine respondents, responses were consistently positive or neutral when respondents were asked whether the site was easy to use, and whether it was easy to find information. Three respondents indicated they would like to see more information and resources.

City to Youth Survey for Registered Employees: Major Findings

Registered employees also completed a Mid-Point survey; however, the data was largely inconclusive because only five employees completed the survey. In addition, at least one of the five respondents, a represented employee, was ineligible to participate in City to Youth. Because the represented employee is not actually able to participate in the program, many questions were only responded to by four people. Thus, the following information is helpful background information, but none of the findings are statistically significant.

Registered employees reported hearing about the City to Youth program in a variety of ways. However, **Table Five** demonstrates that email announcements were most commonly mentioned in their responses to the question “How did you learn about the City to Youth program?” Note that respondents were allowed to select more than one answer in response to this question.

Table Five. How Participants Learned About City to Youth

Outreach Method	Number of Responses*
Heard about City to Youth in email announcements	4
Attended a brownbag or an information session	1
Saw a brochure or flyer	1
Other – Flyer left on my desk	1

Registered employees have a high degree of general knowledge about the program. All registered employees reported knowing they could volunteer in their child’s classroom or daycare. Two reported encouraging co-workers or colleagues to join. Most registered employees (three) reported commuting fifteen minutes to reach their volunteer destination, one reported commuting thirty minutes or less, and one (possibly the ineligible employee) did not answer the question.

Only two registered employees reported volunteering during work hours. This data set indicates that the program’s lack of flexibility may impede its usefulness to participants. Two respondents reported volunteering with youth prior to enrolling in City to Youth, and two reported new involvement. Specifically, the two employees who began volunteering through City to Youth responded that they were motivated to “Becom[e] a Big Sister again” and “I wanted to be a Big Sister.” These two employees reported that the incentive of paid work time was “Somewhat important – the incentive helped me decide to participate” in their decision to volunteer. Both of these employees – new enrollees in the Big Brothers Big Sisters program – found volunteer opportunities by attending a City to Youth information session. All four respondents reported that the volunteer time was easy to negotiate with their supervisor, while one person did not respond to the question.

When asked to share a rewarding experience, only one person was able to relate information about a positive volunteer experience. Others reported not yet beginning their service. This data has important implications for the City to Youth program. Among registered employees, few people actually began volunteer service during the course of the pilot program. Anecdotal reports from City to Youth staff confirm that few registered employees actually actively participated in volunteer service. This finding indicates that, although City to Youth staff succeeded in marketing the program, they were not successful in encouraging registered employees to actively volunteer. Several reasons could account for this shortcoming: confusing online or print materials, lack of knowledge on the part of City to Youth

staff, timing, or hesitancy to begin a relationship with a young person due to City to Youth being a pilot program. *These findings suggest follow up with volunteers is important in a centrally staffed program like this.*

Three respondents reported that four hours of paid volunteer time per month is too few, and one responded reported that four hours is “just right.” When asked for comments on the amount of paid volunteer time, two people gave comments. One respondent wrote, “2 hours/week might be more useful to the youth organizations.” Another said, “I will likely volunteer double this time, and will enjoy every minute.” Four registered employees said the program is worth continuing beyond the pilot, and one respondent chose “probably.” This data set must be viewed cautiously because only one person in this group indicated actually volunteering prior to completing the mid-point survey. Thus, the respondents may not be able to reflect on the challenges of balancing volunteer and professional commitments.

Registered employees gave three responses when asked what factors must be present for City employees to participate in the City to Youth program:

- City employees can make a difference in their community;
- Opportunity for feedback and support from the non-profit organization;
- Support from management.

Concerns about securing support from management were repeatedly echoed in the non-registered employee data.

When asked what factors might keep City employees from participating in the City to Youth program, no registered respondents said support from management. Instead, they said:

- Family responsibility and work, one year commitment
- It takes time and energy
- Not able to coordinate travel to volunteer location (especially if it is unpaid)
- Time restraints, commitment time

Of all of the factors listed above, the one that is most likely to be addressed by a change in policy on the part of Pilot program staff is concerns about travel time. The concern about travel time has policy implications for the original structure of the City to Youth program.

Most registered employees were neutral when asked if City to Youth should allow other volunteer opportunities in addition to volunteering with youth. *However, three respondents said it was "important" for represented as well as non-represented employees to be able to participate in the program, emphasizing the importance of making the program available to represented employees.* Three respondents also expressed interest in volunteering in "days of service" with an organization like Hands On Portland.

Four respondents answered questions about City to Youth's online presence, and overall, feedback about the City to Youth website was very positive. All four respondents said the City to Youth registration form was “easy” or “very easy,” and all our respondents said it was easy or very easy to find information on the site. All four respondents said the amount of information on the site was "just right."

Finally, when asked how to increase awareness about the program two people said "visit bureau staff/team meetings to talk about the project," one person said "invite bureau staff to more info sessions with volunteer organizations," and one said "none - we are well informed already." Annual visits to bureau/departmental meetings could be continued to advantage as City to Youth marketing moves forward.