

**AN ANALYSIS OF SPENDING ON  
CHILDREN AND YOUTH  
IN THE PROPOSED  
CITY OF ROCHESTER  
2012-13 BUDGET**

**JUNE 18, 2012**

**PREPARED BY THE CHILDREN'S AGENDA**

**[WWW.THECHILDRENSAGENDA.ORG](http://WWW.THECHILDRENSAGENDA.ORG)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Table of Contents  | 1    |
| Acknowledgements   | 2    |
| Executive Summary  | 3    |
| General Findings and Observations  | 6    |
| Local Government Services for Children and Youth   | 6    |
| Impact of Budget Changes on Departments that Serve Children  | 7-12 |
| Methodology  | 13   |
| Background   | 13   |
|  |      |
| Appendix A: Transformational Policy Change - Youth Master Plan   |      |
| Appendix B: Expenditures by All Departments, 2006-07 through Proposed 2012-13                            |      |
| Appendix C: Expenditures by the Dept. of Recreation and Youth Services, 2006-07 through Proposed 2012-13 |      |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Children's Agenda thanks our Board Members for furthering and supporting our work:

**Laurie J. Leo, Chair, Klein Steel Service Inc.**  
**Roberta Borg**  
**Lisa A. Cauda, Rochester Institute of Technology**  
**Donna Dedee, The School of the Holy Childhood**  
**Tim Denniston, M&T Bank**  
**Edward J. Doherty, Rochester Area Community Foundation**  
**Lois Giess, Past President, Rochester City Council**  
**Leesha Hoilette, M.D., University of Rochester**  
**Jane Lynch**  
**Kelly McCarthy, Xerox Corporation**  
**Diane Cooney Miner, St. John Fisher College**  
**Kathy Nixon**  
**R. Danforth Ross**  
**Robert H. Thompson, Excellus BlueCross BlueShield**

We particularly thank our Policy Committee members who generously share their time and expertise with us:

**Ed Doherty**  
**Lois Giess**  
**Diane Larter**  
**Don Pryor**  
**Dan Ross**  
**MaryJane Link**  
**Jane Lynch**  
**Caroline Merenda**

The Children's Agenda staff:

**Jeff Kaczorowski, MD:** Executive Director  
**Larry Marx:** Strategy & Development Director  
**Brigit Hurley, MPA:** Policy Analyst  
**Carolyn Lee-Davis, MPP:** Policy Analyst  
**Leonard M. Brock, Ed.D., MPA**  
**Michelle Yale:** Administrator  
**Nancy Raca:** Communications Consultant

## Executive Summary

The Children's Agenda's analysis of the proposed City of Rochester budget, our fifth-annual such review, shows that City leaders have tried to hold the line on spending for kids, particularly in a difficult economic climate. City administrators made tough but informed choices; the situation for children's programs could be much worse.

We appreciate that the Mayors proposed budget preserves recreation and library hours, giving youth stability in the safe, out-of-school environments that are available to them. We are also glad that the City is participating in a study of summer food programs, as we requested in last year's budget analysis.

However, as advocates for children, we are keenly aware that Rochester's kids are still struggling:

- Child abuse and neglect reports in Monroe County rose by 47% over this past decade.
- 43% of Rochester's children live in poverty.
- Infant mortality, the number of kids who die before age one, is well above the national rate.
- Hospitalizations from assault are up since 1999.
- Rochester public school 3rd graders met or exceeded grade-level expectations only 28% of the time for math and 23% of the time for English.

We see the set-aside of \$50,000 for a study of coordinated service delivery between the City and the Rochester City School District (RCSD) in this year's budget as an important step in building a much-needed partnership. This service-delivery study is an ideal opportunity for the city to begin developing a Youth Master Plan.

A Youth Master Plan for Rochester would allow City officials, school leaders, community partners, and youth to take stock of local programs and services for young people, identify cost savings, reduce duplication of services, and strategically address pressing needs. Over the last 10 years in more than 30 U.S. communities, including Nashville and San Diego, mayor's offices and county human service departments have created comprehensive Youth Master Plans that establish a shared community vision and set the stage to coordinate services provided by multiple stakeholders. Bringing together research findings, local data, and input from youth, families and decision makers, these plans are founded in reality and research. Done well, these plans are a highly strategic to-do list of next critical steps that allow communities to take good ideas and put them into fast action for children.

Annual budgets, by their very nature, make policymakers, analysts, and citizens think in one-year increments, but this view is limiting. To be successful, we need to take a broader look at government spending and financing of public services. We need to take different action here given the tragic persistent poor outcomes for many of Rochester's children. The Children's Agenda has proposed five ideas for kids, including a Youth Master Plan, that could effect transformative change in our community. Details on these ideas are available on our website at [www.thechildrensagenda.org/transformational-change.php](http://www.thechildrensagenda.org/transformational-change.php).

We would like to partner with City of Rochester leadership to make transformational change in our community to improve the health, well-being, and success of our children and youth.

**As the city faces yet another year with a multi-million dollar budget deficit that must be closed, this proposed 2012-13 budget protects many basic services vital to residents, neighborhoods, and community institutions. Efforts to include city residents in decision-making have been made through open forums on how to best allocate the city's limited resources.**

We commend the Mayor and City leaders for:

- Solving this year's budget gap without cutting hours at city recreation centers or libraries. These community spaces provide vital, safe opportunities for youth to learn, play, and develop meaningful relationships with adults who care. We know this was another challenging year, one in which expected revenues are not sufficient to maintain current services. It is easy to ask children, who have no voice in city government, to shoulder the burden of filling budget gaps. We thank the City administration for rejecting such a short-sighted approach to developing a balanced budget.
- Continued implementation and integration of the COMET Data Management System. This system holds great promise for more effective planning around city recreation services, and for tracking children's attendance, behavior, and performance in recreation centers. Moreover, it has the advantage of possibly linking with RCSD data in the future.
- Allocating \$50,000 to creatively coordinate service delivery between the city and the Rochester City School District (RCSD).

We offer the following recommendations:

- Begin developing a Youth Master Plan, using the \$50,000 set aside in the budget for a study of coordinated City/RCSD service delivery. Both Mayor Richards and Superintendent Vargas have indicated their commitment to creating a community that highly values its children and families. With their joint leadership, these funds could initiate a community-wide discussion of what city children need most, and how those needs can be met by the City, RCSD, and other public and private community partners including the County.
- Ensure adequate oversight and planning of recreation and youth services. We are concerned about the continued erosion of administrative positions in the Department of Recreation and Youth Services: this year a recreation center coordinator, who oversaw multiple recreation center sites, has been eliminated. Just as permanent staff who are well trained to craft strong relationships with recreation center participants are critical to quality youth development, so is having adequate oversight of these staff to ensure safety and quality of service delivery in all 16 recreation centers.
- Invest more City dollars in effective programming for youth. While we appreciate that libraries, youth services, and recreation programs have been largely preserved in this year's proposed budget, we note an overall 7-year downward trend of City dollars devoted to the health and well-being of the city's youngest residents when compared to overall City spending. The City budget has increased 18% since 2006, for example, and the budget for

the Dept. of Recreation and Youth Services (DRYS) has decreased 39% in the same time period. Using inflation-adjusted (2012) dollars provides a more accurate picture of funding from 2006-07 through proposed 2012-13 - a decrease in funding of DRYS of 47%. Even after taking into account the responsibilities that have been moved out of the Department of Recreation and Youth Services<sup>1</sup>, it has not fared as well as other City departments (See Appendices B & C).

- Use the stability and planning enabled by this budget to begin a broader movement to transformational change for our City’s children. As noted, in our “Decade of Decline” report, children and youth in Monroe County have not fared well over the course of the last 10 years. Nowhere is this more true than for children and youth in the City, who largely are doing even worse than their non-city peers. Let’s define now what we are going to do differently beginning in 2013-14 and beyond. TCA has ideas about what could transform the decline we have seen for our children (available at <http://www.thechildrensagenda.org/transformational-change.php>) and we stand ready to assist in their implementation. There are more ideas needed, too, and action must follow.
- When making choices about staffing at City Rec Centers, we strongly recommend that City leaders keep in mind the research that has shown that strong mentoring relationships with caring adults have a positive impact on a youth's life. It is important that City Rec centers employ full-time permanent staff in order to encourage these relationships.
- With regard to the Summer Food Program, we encourage the City to:
  - ✓ Use the findings of the CGR study to identify underserved areas of the city.
  - ✓ Develop programs to fill the gaps.
  - ✓ Regularly coordinate with community sponsors and providers to ensure that all kids who need it have access to the Summer Food Program.
  - ✓ Promote the Summer Food Program widely so that families are aware of its availability.
- We commend the City administration for devoting \$100,000 for a joint effort (with RCSD) to combat truancy, and we strongly urge that it be used to scale-up or bring evidence-based programs to Rochester.
- As in the past, we recommend that funding for the Pathways to Peace program be increased so that it can undertake a rigorous evaluation process, to identify its most effective components.

---

<sup>1</sup> We acknowledge that it is difficult to track the amount of City dollars devoted to children and youth because of the many changes in the Dept. of Recreation and Youth Services areas of responsibility over the past ten years, and the complication of accounting for grant dollars received from the state and federal governments, who operate on a different fiscal year than the City. Despite these challenges, we feel confident in concluding that in 2012 fewer City tax dollars support DRYS and other departmental programs affecting children and youth than was true seven years ago.

## GENERAL FINDINGS & OBSERVATIONS

The Mayor's proposed 2012-13 budget is balanced at \$488,661,600, 2% more than the 2011-12 amended City budget. A projected \$40-million deficit was partially closed with a one-time \$15.4 million “spin-up” of state aid to Rochester. Higher-than-expected sales tax revenue helped close the gap, along with reductions in capital projects and projected retirement costs (due to the retirement incentive), use of reserves (\$3.5 million), cuts to departmental budgets, increased revenue from proposed fee increases and new Fire Department revenues from Town of Brighton and Rural Metro.

Expenditures for 2012-13 are projected to be similar to 2011-12, with the exception of employee health and pension benefits, which will increase by approximately \$21 million.

The City stayed within the 2 percent property tax cap and the tax levy is frozen. The typical homeowner will pay an extra 1% (\$21.45) in taxes and fees. Total City employment will be reduced by 16 positions. The Office of Budget and Management reports that they are assisting those laid off in filling vacancies within City Departments.

The City of Rochester collects property taxes on behalf of the school district and distributes those collected taxes to RCSD. These Maintenance of Effort dollars are paid entirely by the tax collection and are flat funded at \$119.1 million per year. We are not analyzing the expenditure of these dollars here, but merely noting the transaction.

---

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Monroe County, the Rochester City School District, and the City of Rochester all receive federal and New York State funds to provide essential programs and services to children. We ask decision-makers at all levels of government to join forces to strengthen their efforts to improve the well-being of kids in Rochester. This would improve planning, communicating, and coordination among government entities, and ideally would involve private partners as well.

The many ways in which the public sector supports families and children creates "silos" - programs that are delivered without regard to the impact each might be having on an individual child or family. For example:

- **Monroe County** receives and administers funds directed toward income support: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), child care (Child Care Block Grant), child safety and reduction of child abuse, health care (Medicaid), and nutritional assistance (Food Stamps).
- **RCSD**, with the primary responsibility for educational services for Rochester’s children, receives and administers funds directed, among other purposes, to children with special needs and to nutritional support (school breakfast and lunch).
- **The City of Rochester** provides services vital to child safety and well-being, with funds for Fire and Police, Recreation, Library, and Youth Employment programs from federal and state governments.

**IMPACT OF BUDGET CHANGES ON DEPARTMENTS THAT SERVE CHILDREN**

Within the City of Rochester there are 16 departments. Five of these provide direct services and programming for children and youth: Environmental Services, Fire Department, Library, Police Department, and Recreation and Youth Services.

The Department of Environmental Services, the Fire Department, and the Police Department all offer services that are vital and beneficial to child safety and well-being, as well as the safety and well-being of the community at large. Where there is specialized programming for children within these departments, we comment on them. The Library and Department of Recreation and Youth Services provide services to the full community. Major portions of their dollars are devoted to services for children, and these departments are discussed extensively below, as well as the indicators regarding youth found in the Police Department.

**THE DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION & YOUTH SERVICES**

In the proposed 2012-13 budget, the Department of Recreation & Youth Services (DRYS) appropriation is reduced by ~\$400K from \$11.33M in 2011-12 (estimated) to \$10.94M in 2012-13 (proposed).

| <b>Department of Recreation &amp; Youth Services (DRYS)</b> |                       |                       |                          |                         |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Bureau</b>   | <b>2009-10 Actual</b> | <b>2010-11 Actual</b> | <b>2011-12 Estimated</b> | <b>2012-13 Proposed</b> |
| <b>Office of the Commissioner</b>                           | \$1.007M              | \$446K                | \$413K                   | \$464K                  |
| <b>Recreation</b>   | \$8.64M               | \$7.42M               | \$7.93M                  | \$7.56M                 |
| <b>Youth Services</b>                                       | \$3.36M               | \$1.85M               | \$1.63M                  | \$1.71M                 |
| <b>Employment Opportunities</b>                             | NA                    | \$1.545M              | \$1.356M                 | \$1.205M                |
| <b>DRYS Total</b>   | <b>\$13.01M</b>       | <b>\$11.26M</b>       | <b>\$11.33M</b>          | <b>\$10.94M</b>         |

**Bureau of Recreation**

In addition to managing and operating the Rochester Public Market, the Bureau of Recreation provides leisure activities, physical recreation opportunities, and youth development programming to city residents. For the 2012-13 year, the department has maintained service hours at recreation centers. Despite this concerted effort to stabilize access to quality programs, as a community we must acknowledge that our kids need more from us - more opportunities to play, to develop relationships with adults, and to explore what possibilities lie ahead for them.

*Youth Attending  
Recreation  
Centers*

| <b>Recreation Indicators</b> | <b>2010-11 Actual</b> | <b>2011-12 Estimated</b> | <b>2012-13 Projected</b> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Registrations</b>         | 22,665                | 17,744                   | 16,400                   |
| <b>Attendance</b>            | 568,002               | 533,876                  | 538,000                  |

*Quality vs. Access*

Supportive relationships with mentoring adults have been found, through years of rigorous research, to improve a child’s life outcomes. Mentors can keep kids on track and out of trouble, making it more likely that they will finish school and be productive citizens. This is important, because many of the youth who attend recreation centers do not have many other venues for building supportive relationships with adults. ***We know that City administration and leaders face difficult budget decisions every year, but we strongly recommend that they keep this research in mind when weighing personnel decisions.***

*Recreation on the Move*

***Recreation on the Move***, begun in 2010-11, continues in the proposed 2012-13 budget. Two mobile units, one funded by the Greater Rochester Health Foundation, are stocked with recreation equipment, tables, and chairs and allow city recreation staff to connect with communities that are underserved or are overly represented by disengaged youth and families.

| <b>Recreation on the Move</b> | <b>2010-11 Actual</b> | <b>2011-12 Estimated</b> | <b>2012-13 Proposed</b> |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Attendance</b>             | 1,695                 | 3,925                    | 5,000                   |

*After School Programming in Recreation*

Many Rochester children and youth spend their out-of-school hours at one of the 16 recreation centers in Rochester. In addition to being a spot that youth can ‘drop in,’ the Bureau of Recreation provides specific after-school programming, which includes:

- **After-school satellite sites on site** at RCSD schools run and staffed by the Bureau of Recreation. With budget cuts, DRYS has been forced to consolidate administration of some of these sites.
- The **After-School in the Parks Program (ASIPP)** continues, serving children ages 6 to 13. This after-school opportunity is operated at Lake Riley Lodge.
- **School #28 After-School:** Originally an after-school program run by the City with federal 21<sup>st</sup> Century dollars, this program continued even when that funding ended thanks to a mix of local tax dollars and a grant from the Rochester Area Community Foundation. This program ended in Spring 2011.
- The City continues to run the well-regarded **Rochester After School Academy (RASA)** through the Bureau of Youth Services (please see below for more information).

---

**Bureau of  
Youth Services**

The Bureau of Youth Services offers a variety of programs and services for children and youth in the city. The proposed 2012-13 appropriation for this bureau is \$1.7M, a slight increase from last year. In general, programming within this bureau is paid for by government and private grants.

***Rochester After  
School Academy***

The Bureau oversees the ***Rochester After School Academy*** (RASA), which provides after-school programming in the city, free of charge. This programming started in 2002 and is funded by federal 21<sup>st</sup> Century dollars, which are funds distributed by the state to bolster the numbers of quality after-school programming in communities. Because state officials regard this programming as a quality model for other communities to follow, the City of Rochester has been particularly successful in applying for and receiving these dollars. By 2007, the City was able to offer 16 RASA sites, serving a total of 1,600 children with free quality after-school programming. Between 2007 and 2008, the State ended its funding of the 16 programs and these programs have since ended.

In June 2008, the City received notice that it was awarded an additional round of 21<sup>st</sup> Century dollars (roughly \$887K) through a new RFP process to run 5 new after-school programs. These programs currently serve 260 students.

***Pregnancy  
Prevention***

The City receives Teen Pregnancy Prevention (TPP) and Comprehensive Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention (CAPP) funds from the federal and state governments to provide pregnancy prevention programming to the community. Some services are provided by Youth Services staff, but the majority of dollars are distributed to community agencies, including Charles Street Settlement, Junior Achievement, SPCC (Society for the Protection and Care of Children), Baden Street/Metro Council, PRYD (Puerto Rican Youth Development, and the YWCA. Some of these dollars are used to provide comprehensive after-school programs, while others are for outreach, education, and events. Programs to reduce pregnancy include Making a Difference, Making Proud Choices, and the Teen Outreach Program.

---

***Hillside Work-  
Scholarship  
Connection  
(HWSC)***

The ***Hillside Work-Scholarship Connection*** program serves teens who enter in 7th-9th grade and receive one-to-one mentoring, academic support, job readiness training, and college assistance. This year's budget includes a \$100k reduction, which eliminates all funding for the Hillside Work-Scholarship Connection.

---

***Summer Food  
Service Program***

The Bureau oversees the ***Summer Food Service Program***, a federally-funded program that provides breakfast and lunch during the summer break to Rochester children.

We commend the mayor for devoting staff time and resources to the community's response to concerns raised in our 2011 City budget analysis regarding the Summer

Foods Program. The Children’s Agenda recommended that there be an investigation of the barriers that prevent children from accessing free food during the summer months. The Rochester Area Community Foundation (RACF) convened a series of gatherings on this topic, in which the City was an active participant. RACF funded a study on this issue, and it is now being completed by the Center for Governmental Research (CGR). CGR is assessing what families need in terms of free food during the summer, how/where children participated in the Summer Food Program in the past, and what can be done to bridge the gap between their needs and what is currently available.

***We encourage the city to:***

- ***Use the findings of the CGR study to identify underserved areas of the city.***
- ***Develop programs to fill the gaps.***
- ***Regularly coordinate with community sponsors and providers to ensure that all kids who need it have access to the Summer Food Program.***
- ***Promote the Summer Food Program widely so that families are aware of its availability.***

| <b>Summer Food Service Program</b> | <b>2010-11 Actual</b> | <b>2011-12 Estimated</b> | <b>2012-13 Proposed</b> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Breakfast Sites</b>             | 46                    | 37                       | 40                      |
| <b>Breakfasts Served</b>           | 40,275                | 39,178                   | 45,400                  |
| <b>Lunch Sites</b>                 | 56                    | 45                       | 50                      |
| <b>Lunches Served</b>              | 66,119                | 65737                    | 75,200                  |

**Bureau of Employment Opportunities**

The Bureau of Employment Opportunities has been allocated \$1.2M in the proposed 2012-13 budget. Employment Opportunities includes the Pathways to Peace program, the Summer of Opportunities program, and PRIME (a program developed by the Youth Services Bureau in 2008 to improve employment opportunities). The Manager of Employment Opportunities position that was transferred into the Youth Services Bureau from the Mayor’s Office last year “to facilitate job opportunities for youth and young adults” moves over to the Bureau of Employment Opportunities as well.

***Pathways to Peace***

***Pathways to Peace*** (PTP) is a program that identifies at-risk youth between the ages of 12 and 25 who are in need of preventive and intervention services. Program staff collaborate with community service providers and law enforcement to proactively address youth violence by resolving conflicts between two or more youth in the heat of the moment, making referrals to appropriate services, conducting follow-ups on

referrals and services, and monitoring the results of violence reduction among youth in the city.

The budget includes dramatic cutbacks in personnel to Pathways to Peace. We understand that the personnel losses were expected and are entirely due to the completion of a federal grant. Yet it raises the question of how the City intends to address the critical issue of violence in the future. Pathways to Peace is the last remaining program within DRYS directed at reducing or intervening in youth violence. In the past, the department has overseen a variety of efforts and grant dollars, including the Slater’s Raiders of Peace Program and work done under the Rochester Safe and Sound grant, both directed toward reducing youth violence. Pathways to Peace has been moved from one department to another, subjected to irregular staffing, and forced to rely increasingly on grant dollars to operate. *As in the past, we recommend that funding for the Pathways to Peace program be increased so that it can undertake a rigorous evaluation process, to identify its most effective components.*

| <b>Pathways to Peace, Indicators of Performance</b> |                           |                              |                             |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|   | <b>2010-11<br/>Actual</b> | <b>2011-12<br/>Estimated</b> | <b>2012-13<br/>Proposed</b> |
| <b>Referrals to Program</b>                         | 140                       | 160                          | 150                         |
| <b>Conflicts Mediated</b>                           | 90                        | 124                          | 100                         |
| <b>Youth Linked to Services</b>                     | 105                       | 42                           | 60                          |

*PRIME* is a youth employment strategy that was created locally in 2008. The program seeks to engage older youth, give them job training, and then assist them to find employment.

| <b>PRIME, Indicators of Performance</b> |                           |                              |                             |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|   | <b>2010-11<br/>Actual</b> | <b>2011-12<br/>Estimated</b> | <b>2012-13<br/>Proposed</b> |
| <b>PRIME Applicants</b>                 | 620                       | 700                          | 630                         |
| <b>PRIME Participants</b>               | 231                       | 180                          | 200                         |
| <b>PRIME Participants Placed</b>        | 125                       | 125                          | 75                          |

*Summer of Opportunities*

| <b>Summer of Opportunities, Indicators of Performance</b> |                           |                              |                             |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|   | <b>2010-11<br/>Actual</b> | <b>2011-12<br/>Estimated</b> | <b>2012-13<br/>Proposed</b> |
| <b>Applicants, 14-20 years</b>                            | 2,533                     | 2,796                        | 2,700                       |
| <b>Number of Youth Places</b>                             | 333                       | 400                          | 325                         |

**DEPARTMENT OF  
LIBRARY  
SERVICES**

Libraries provide many important services and resources to our community. Programs for children and youth include the *Safe to be Smart* program. The *Safe to be Smart* program features library-centered activities for youth during after-school hours. The program began in 2001 and has a dedicated staff that currently serves youth at Arnett, Central, Lincoln, Maplewood, Sully at the Ryan Center, and Wheatley branches. Youth workers assist teenagers by showing them how to use the library resources and providing them with interesting programs and a safe place to call their own.

**POLICE  
DEPARTMENT**

Indicators in the 2012-13 proposed budget show a decrease in contacts between the Rochester Police Department (RPD) and Rochester’s troubled youth.

- **Juvenile/Youth arrests** are arrests of children and youth under the age of 18 who are suspected of committing a crime. This figure includes in-school arrests, which are a subset of juvenile arrests that are often made by School Resource Officers (SROs) who are RPD officers assigned to the schools. . Juvenile arrests have decreased by 24% since 2008-09.
- **'Youth diverted' numbers have dropped.** The 2012-13 proposed budget projects that 24% of youth will be diverted, a drop of 6 percentage points since 2010-11.
- The number of **'Students picked up under truancy'** has been rising, and no number is estimated for 2012-13 because of the special funding for truancy efforts. This number represents the number of kids (ages 6-16) who are picked up because they are not in school during school hours, which is legally required for children under 17. Truancy has been identified as an area of particular focus by Mayor Richards and is consistent with Superintendent Vargas' emphasis on attendance. *We commend the City administration for devoting \$100,000 for a joint effort (with RCSD) to combat truancy, and we strongly urge that it be used to scale-up or bring evidence-based programs to Rochester.*

| <b>Indicators from the Rochester City Police Department,<br/>2012-13 Proposed Budget</b> |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                 |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|  | <b>2008-<br/>2009<br/>Actual</b> | <b>2009-<br/>2010<br/>Actual</b> | <b>2010-<br/>2011<br/>Actual</b> | <b>2011-<br/>2012<br/>Estim.</b> | <b>2012-<br/>2013<br/>Budgt</b> |
| <b>Juvenile Arrests</b>  | 2,234                            | 2,475                            | 1,793                            | 1,695                            | 1,475                           |
| <b>Youth Diverted</b>  | 1,300                            | 891                              | 1,600                            | N/A                              | N/A                             |
| <b>Children Picked up for Truancy</b>  | 494                              | 841                              | 1,345                            | 1,000                            | N/A                             |

## METHODOLOGY

To conduct this analysis, The Children's Agenda analyzed data and narrative from the 2003-04 through 2012-13 budgets. The Children's Agenda downloaded and used the electronic versions of these budget documents for this and all analytical work in this study.

The 2012-13 proposed City of Rochester Budget was released on May 18, 2012. City Council held hearings with City Departments on June 6 and June 12. A public forum regarding the proposed budget was held June 13 and City Council is scheduled to vote on June 19, 2012.

For this report, The Children's Agenda has reviewed decisions regarding services and programs for children and youth in the Proposed City of Rochester 2012-13 Budget. The Children's Agenda has:

- Conducted an analysis of all accounts, with regard to all expenditures to determine projected funding levels for the coming year.
- Calculated the change in expenditures over time.
- Identified increases and decreases in funding proposed in the 2012-13 budget.
- Compared these identified increases and decreases over time
- Compared changes in expenditures on children over time to expenditures on other spending categories over time.
- Read and reviewed the budget narrative.
- Conducted interviews and asked questions of staff and administration.

## BACKGROUND

**We offer this report to help the community understand, achieve, and support informed decisions regarding effective services and programs for children and youth.**

The Children's Agenda improves the health, education and success of our community's children and youth, especially the most vulnerable, through advocacy for evidence-based solutions and policy change at the local, state and federal levels. The Children's Agenda was organized in 2004 to provide the community with research-based advocacy around children's issues. The Children's Agenda's founders believed it vital that The Children's Agenda analyze public expenditures on services for children to promote effective decision-making. The Children's Agenda first analyzed the proposed Monroe County budget in 2002; we have continued that effort to the present. In November 2007, The Children's Agenda's Board approved and added an analysis of the proposed City of Rochester budget to our strategic plan. We conducted our first analysis of spending for services for children and youth by the City of Rochester in June 2008. This report is our fifth analysis of the City of Rochester's spending on children.

## Appendix A: Transformational Policy Change - Youth Master Plan

### *Transformational Policy Ideas to make Systematic Change for Children*

| Creating a Youth Master Plan for Greater Rochester |   |
|--|---|
| Problem  | <p><b>Traditional approaches to solve our toughest community challenges are not working.</b> Policies affecting children are frequently fragmented across a number of government departments and agencies; philanthropic funders, public entities, non profits, and residents are often disconnected. Too many children and youth do not have access to vital preventive services nor positive opportunities that support their development.</p>  |
| Solution   | <p><b>Create a Youth Master Plan</b>, coordinated across all sectors, to identify gaps and better leverage already-invested resources to improve kids' outcomes, prenatal to age 21.</p>  |
| Existing Experience                                | <p>Local Efforts: there have been many important local efforts over the years to think strategically about the needs of children and youth in the Greater Rochester area, now including ROC the Future. Creating a Youth Master Plan, as discussed here, is a critical approach that would build on existing efforts and former work.</p> <p><b>These plans allow city officials, school leaders, community partners, and youth to take stock of local programs and services for young people, identify cost savings, reduce duplication of services, and strategically address pressing needs (NLC 2011).</b></p> <p>Over the last 10 years in more than 30 communities, including Nashville and San Diego, Mayor's Offices and County Human Services have created comprehensive youth master plans that set a shared community vision and set the stage to coordinate services provided by multiple stakeholders.</p> <p>Bringing together research findings, local data, and input from youth, families and decision makers, these plans are founded in reality and research. Furthermore, done well, these plans are a highly strategic to-do list of next critical steps that allow communities to take good ideas and put them to fast action for children.</p> |
| Next Steps & Questions to consider                 | <p>A Youth Master Plan can be made in many ways: the Mayor and County Executive could assign a department to co-lead a collaborative community process with the deliverable being a Master Youth Plan; City Council or the County Legislature could pass legislation calling for an annual Youth Master Plan. <b>Regardless, two key factors appear necessary for success: setting a time-table and ensuring there is a community-trusted champion to lead a collaborative process.</b></p>   |

| <b>Appendix B</b>   |                       |                       |                       |                     |                     |                        |                       |                                |                                   |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Departmental Expenditure Summary, as taken from Budgets 2009-2010 thru 2012-13</b> |                       |                       |                       |                     |                     |                        |                       |                                |                                   |
| <b>Department</b>   | <b>Actual '06-'07</b> | <b>Actual '07-'08</b> | <b>Actual '08-'09</b> | <b>Actual 09-10</b> | <b>Actual 10-11</b> | <b>Estimated 11-12</b> | <b>Proposed 12-13</b> | <b>% change 11-12 vs 12-13</b> | <b>% change '06-'07 to '12-13</b> |
| City Council and Clerk  | \$1,638,137           | \$1,714,630           | \$1,759,707           | \$1,756,985         | \$1,884,193         | \$1,847,800            | \$1,755,200           | -5.0%                          |                                   |
| Administration  | \$12,219,369          | \$14,147,578          | \$14,593,287          | \$11,242,718        | \$9,991,694         | \$8,902,500            | \$9,111,900           | 2.4%                           | -25.4%                            |
| Information Technology  | \$0                   | \$4,118,372           | \$4,111,518           | \$4,693,757         | \$4,675,957         | \$4,703,500            | \$5,740,700           | 22.1%                          |                                   |
| Finance*  | \$7,687,149           | \$5,211,951           | \$5,271,200           | \$6,925,900         | \$8,419,702         | \$9,535,000            | \$10,629,900          | 11.5%                          | 38.3%                             |
| Neighborhood & Bus. Dev.  | \$0                   | \$0                   | \$0                   | \$12,798,200        | \$13,041,370        | \$13,663,200           | \$13,693,200          | 0.2%                           |                                   |
| Community Development   | \$6,210,168           | \$5,945,187           | \$5,919,522           |                     |                     |                        |                       |                                | -100.0%                           |
| Economic Development  | \$2,520,636           | \$2,369,565           | \$2,350,864           |                     |                     |                        |                       |                                | -100.0%                           |
| Environmental Services  | \$71,623,011          | \$73,286,824          | \$74,470,014          | \$79,091,813        | \$78,572,147        | \$73,238,700           | \$78,144,700          | 6.7%                           | 9.1%                              |
| Emergency Comm.   | \$9,012,787           | \$9,595,252           | \$10,311,134          | \$10,570,261        | \$11,302,524        | \$12,873,600           | \$13,312,900          | 3.4%                           | 47.7%                             |
| Police Department   | \$69,854,953          | \$79,275,235          | \$79,330,674          | \$79,814,525        | \$84,461,411        | \$82,501,700           | \$85,439,200          | 3.6%                           | 22.3%                             |
| Fire Department   | \$41,197,073          | \$41,497,851          | \$42,718,114          | \$42,744,239        | \$43,350,772        | \$43,191,500           | \$44,660,900          | 3.4%                           | 8.4%                              |
| Public Library  | \$10,318,957          | \$10,479,699          | \$10,705,837          | \$11,064,976        | \$11,202,830        | \$11,014,400           | \$10,794,000          | -2.0%                          | 4.6%                              |
| Recreation and Youth Services   | \$18,099,413          | \$16,910,014          | \$16,681,587          | \$13,011,183        | \$11,260,722        | \$11,331,400           | \$10,938,800          | -3.5%                          | -39.6%                            |
| Undistributed Expenses  | \$87,986,643          | \$92,557,883          | \$98,379,178          | \$98,507,438        | \$105,555,712       | \$117,614,900          | \$136,003,500         | 15.6%                          | 54.6%                             |
| Contingency   | \$0                   | \$0                   | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                 | \$2,913,100            | \$2,695,900           | -7.5%                          |                                   |
| Capital Expense   | \$75,907,900          | \$87,934,500          | \$97,474,057          | \$98,042,119        | \$69,642,300        | \$70,979,100           | \$65,740,800          | -7.4%                          | -13.4%                            |

|       |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |      |       |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|-------|
| Total | \$414,276,196 | \$445,044,541 | \$464,076,693 | \$464,023,914 | \$453,361,333 | \$464,310,400 | \$488,661,600 | 5.2% | 18.0% |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|-------|

| <b>Appendix C</b>  |                       |                       |                       |                     |                     |                        |                       |                                |                                   |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Department of Recreation and Youth Services Expenditure Summary 2006-07 thru proposed 2012-13</b> |                       |                       |                       |                     |                     |                        |                       |                                |                                   |
| <b>Department</b>  | <b>Actual '06-'07</b> | <b>Actual '07-'08</b> | <b>Actual '08-'09</b> | <b>Actual 09-10</b> | <b>Actual 10-11</b> | <b>Estimated 11-12</b> | <b>Proposed 12-13</b> | <b>% change 11-12 vs 12-13</b> | <b>% change '06-'07 to '12-13</b> |
| Recreation and Youth Services - All  | \$18,099,413          | \$16,910,014          | \$16,681,587          | \$13,011,183        | \$11,260,722        | \$11,331,400           | \$10,938,800          | -3.5%                          | -39.6%                            |
| DRYS-Commissioner's Office   | \$1,997,751           | \$2,754,636           | \$2,210,669           | \$1,007,350         | \$446,039           | \$413,300              | \$463,800             | 12.2%                          | -76.8%                            |
| DRYS - Employment  | \$0                   | \$0                   | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$1,545,342         | \$1,356,100            | \$1,205,800           | -11.1%                         |                                   |
| DRYS - Youth Services  | \$2,202,635           | \$2,932,701           | \$3,327,998           | \$3,361,297         | \$1,849,678         | \$1,628,700            | \$1,705,200           | 4.7%                           | -22.6%                            |
| DRYS - Recreation  | \$9,976,331           | \$8,463,903           | \$8,530,243           | \$8,642,535         | \$7,419,663         | \$7,933,300            | \$7,564,000           | -4.7%                          | -24.2%                            |
| DRYS - Special Services  | \$3,922,696           | \$2,758,774           | \$2,612,677           | \$0                 | \$0                 | \$0                    | \$0                   |                                | -100.0%                           |