

PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

Item 3 November 4, 2021 Regular Business

AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION

TITLE:	Summer Camp 2021 Review	□ Discussion Only
		☐ Action Needed:
RECOMMENDED	Receive Staff Report- No presentation.	\square Motion
ACTION:		\square Ordinance
		☐ Resolution
STAFF:	Katie Herzog/Emily Moon, consultant	
COUNCIL LIAISON:	Jake Jacobson	
	1. Pilot program assessment example, data: Nature Vision	
EXHIBITS:	Pilot program assessment example, narrative questions: Contracted summer camps	

SUMMARY

As part of the Recreation Division's Reset Strategy a greater emphasis is being placed on program evaluation, conducting pilot trials of new offerings, and cost recovery reporting. Staff committed to providing the Commission with a year-end cost recovery report that describes how the Division's services and programs performed by aggregated cost recovery tier. Staff anticipates providing such a report near the end of the first quarter of the year, which summarizes the previous year's data. While that deadline is still months in the future, while the Division's activities are still impacted by the pandemic and while Staff is still working through how this data can be efficiently collected and aggregated, Staff wishes to share a sneak peek into the behind-the-scenes efforts to evaluate programs and to calculate direct cost recovery. In addition, this staff report provides a narrative summary of the overall performance of this year's summer camps.

This year, the City provided contractor-led summer camps over a 10-week period. In previous years, summer camp offerings were a mix of contractor-led and City employee-led. (More background on the decision to implement summer camps as contractor-led, only, can be found in the Parks and Recreation Commission's January 7, 2021 packet.) Parents and youth had eight different styles or themed camps from which to choose. While camp providers had to limit registrations to ensure compliance with COVID-19 public health guidelines, collectively the camps provided fun for 1,197 participants.

Staff received positive, informal feedback about the camps and believes the contractor-led model was a success.

Cost recovery

The City entered into contractual agreements with camp providers. Those agreements included provisions for a City share of the total revenue collected through camp registration fees. The City targeted providing enough camp offerings and participant slots to generate approximately \$60,000 in anticipated revenue. Actual

revenue to the City totaled \$88,705, with over 1,200 participants served as a result of Staff securing additional camp offerings, and coordinating with providers to remain flexible and adaptable to increased demand.

Total direct costs to the City were calculated at \$36,390. Indirect cost categories were identified but estimated expenses were not calculated. Those direct expenses included supplies and the staffing costs associated with planning the overall camp program, coordinating vendor agreements, marketing offerings and providing general oversight while the camps were in progress. Total cost recovery for summer camps was therefore 244%. The cost recovery category for this offering ("Youth camps, before and after school, school break programming") is found in Tier 2 and has a minimum recovery target of 50% of direct costs. Every individual camp exceeded the minimum cost recovery target.

Program evaluation and cost recovery example

Commissioners will find an example (Exhibit 1) of the program evaluation template that Staff is using to evaluate programs. This example analyzes one week of the Nature Vision camp. A slightly different version of the template is used for ongoing/recurring programs, pilot programs, and proposed programs. The evaluation is one the tools Staff will use to establish program fees (where the City is the direct provider of the program) and to capture program performance data. At the bottom of the template, several narrative questions are listed.

Staff has also attached an example (Exhibit 2) of the narrative evaluation form for the overall summer camp program (as a pilot program). Staff used the pilot program questions simply as an example. Summer camps are not new to the City. However, this was the first year that all the camps were contractor-led, and contractors were wholly responsible for taking registrations.

These tools and forms are works in progress and do not lend themselves perfectly to the way in which summer camps were offered this year. However, Staff would like to share its initial work with the Commission. In the future, Staff will not routinely provide individual program data to the Commission, as decisions regarding program offerings are determined at the Staff administration level. However, Staff will provide an annual year-in-review report on the Division's program portfolio and cost recovery performance.

RECOMMENDATION

Receive Staff Report- No presentation.