

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION1
 Executive Summary.....1
 Methodology3

PROFILE OF MONROE COUNTY7

COMMUNITY CHALLENGES AND ASSETS: AN OVERVIEW.....8

Educational Attainment–Creating Opportunities & Removing Barriers11
Educational Attainment and Household Challenges
Challenges and Barriers to Learning Opportunities

Employment: Supporting those Entering or Making a Transition17
Work Status
Income Level
Jobs and Workforce Development
Employment Support Services
Transportation
Business and Job Creation

Affordable Housing30
Housing Affordability and Quality
Eligibility and Availability of Services

Health Care36
Health Insurance
Paying for Health Care
Service Gaps
Cultural Needs
Cost Issues
Health Needs of the Elderly
Addiction Services
Dental Health Services
Vision Health Services
Reproductive Health Services
Mental Health Services

Vulnerable Populations.....47
The Elderly
Individuals with Disabilities
Young Children and Affordable Day Care

Meeting Basic Human Needs	55
<i>Emergency Shelter, Hunger, Clothing</i>	
Household Economic Issues and Poverty	61
<i>Finding Employment</i>	
<i>Paying for Food and Clothing</i>	
<i>Paying for Health Care</i>	
<i>Finding Transportation</i>	
<i>Affordable Loans and Legal Aid</i>	
<i>Finding Affordable Child Care</i>	
<i>Barriers to Assistance</i>	
<i>Definitions of Poverty and Self Sufficiency</i>	
<i>Federal Guidelines</i>	
<i>Self-Sufficiency Measures</i>	
Youth Development	72
<i>Youth from Families Experiencing Poverty</i>	
<i>Agency Issues</i>	
<i>Program Area Needs</i>	
Rights and Personal Safety	77
<i>Household Crime and Vandalism</i>	
<i>Perceptions of Community Issues</i>	
<i>Domestic Violence</i>	
<i>Child Abuse and Neglect</i>	
<i>Justice System and Law Enforcement</i>	
<i>Legal Assistance</i>	
Civic Engagement and Voluntarism.....	82
<i>Community Strengths</i>	
<i>Voluntarism</i>	
<i>Cultural Diversity Services</i>	
THE HUMAN SERVICES NONPROFIT SECTOR IN MONROE COUNTY.....	88
Introduction.....	88
Management Capacities: Policies and Tools.....	89
Challenges Facing Nonprofits.....	91
COMMUNITY INDICATORS.....	102
Suggested Community Indicators.....	102
Comparison with 1997 SPAN/MC Data	103
THE HUMAN SERVICE COMMUNITY – GOALS & STRATEGIES.....	105
DATA AND MAP SUPPLEMENT	

Executive Summary

This Service Community Assessment of Needs (SCAN) provides comprehensive, valid and reliable information about the human service needs and capacity of Monroe County. The last community assessment, SPAN/MC, was completed in 1998 using data collected in 1997. Changes in social service demand and capacity over the past five years required that the information be updated for use by funding organizations, program providers, local nonprofits and other community decision makers.

This project was a true collaborative effort. The SCAN Steering and Research Committees had representatives from all sectors – nonprofit, government and business– including local funding groups, social service agencies and other nonprofits, Indiana University, and research organizations. An advisory board with service provision and data collection experts assisted the Committees. The Indiana University Office of Community Outreach and Partnerships in Service-Learning dedicated an ACE (Advocates for Community Engagement) to the assessment team. Dozens of trained volunteers conducted open-ended structured interviews with community representatives.

The nonprofit organizations participating in this study represented social services, health care, education, recreation, youth development, arts and culture, environment, animal-related, faith-based, and community development. Input was also sought from government and business (for-profit) representatives.

The SCAN Steering Committee anticipates that this report could be useful to program developers, service providers, policy makers, community leaders, grant writers, researchers, funders, and the general public.

The results of SCAN are based on information from a variety of primary and secondary sources including existing community data from local, state and national sources, interviews and surveys with key informants, and telephone interviews with Monroe County households conducted by the Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory. The questionnaire was designed to assess a household's experience with a series of potential challenges during the past year. Over 300 households answered questions about challenges including housing, education, economic needs, social and public safety concerns, environmental quality and community strengths. To reach individuals without telephone service, or those who may not speak English as a primary language, the same household survey was administered to clients at several agencies in the community. Forty-two clients participated, including one group of Spanish-speaking individuals.

The analysis of the data is presented in ten content area sections – the *Community Challenges and Assets* -- followed by a process section on the management capacities and challenges faced by the nonprofit human service sector in Monroe County. These sections depict a community that is very fortunate in many ways.

Monroe County has excellent resources for education and health care, culture and recreational opportunities, and youth development programs. It gets high marks on cultural diversity, understanding and inclusivity. However, not all families and individuals are able to take advantage of these amenities. A growing number of households are finding that their annual income is insufficient to make ends meet. Our county's housing costs are among the highest in the state, while our median income is one of the lowest. These families, many with two wage earners, struggle to pay for housing, food, utilities, medical bills, prescriptions, car maintenance and more. Many of our elderly could stay in their homes with modification assistance and deliveries of warm meals. Families caring for elder parents and individuals with disabilities need respite care and help with transportation. Single mothers trying to improve their lives through education and job skills development need transitional support for low-cost tuition loans, affordable child care and transportation.

We have a variety of nonprofit organizations that help by providing information and referral, and programs and services. Many are excellent, and have dedicated staff who follow good professional practices. But these organizations are also challenged by rapidly increasing demands for services, decreasing sources of traditional funding, high staff turnover, limited facilities, and a lack of time for long-range planning, networking, communication and coordination. The respondents felt that the community needs a defined vision and a comprehensive plan for addressing challenges with complex roots that are not readily solvable.

The information presented in SCAN provides a more detailed picture of our community, and can help us begin to understand these situations. Each section in the report contains several examples of effective approaches or partnerships designed to address the challenges. The additional recommendations that are presented were suggested by interview participants, and are intended to be starting points for further discussion. The community indicators section presents potential benchmarks that could be used to help measure progress. The path toward a community solution will require much more discussion and planning, and a respectful and true coordinated effort among all of the sectors – nonprofit, government and business.

The *Data Supplement* is an objective information source for program planners, agency directors, and other community decision makers.

Methodology

Introduction

The Service Community Assessment of Needs (SCAN) Steering and Research Committees developed a process to provide comprehensive, valid and reliable information about the human service needs and capacity of Monroe County. The last community assessment, SPAN/MC was completed in 1998, using data collected in 1997.

Human services in Monroe County are delivered by a variety of agencies and organizations in the nonprofit, private and public sectors. They range from organizations that have been in existence for decades to new grass-roots support groups. The nonprofit organizations participating in this study represented social services, health care, education, recreation, youth development, arts and culture, environment, animal-related, faith-based, and community development. Input was also sought from government and business representatives. Most of the organizations were direct providers of programs and services, although some were “umbrella” organizations that provide technical assistance, professional development, information and referral and related services to other nonprofits. A listing of many of the social service agencies in Monroe County can be found in the United Way Community Services *IRIS Manual* (www.bloomington.in.us/iris/), the *Youth and Family Services Directory* (Community and Family Resources Department – City of Bloomington, <http://www.city.bloomington.in.us/cfrd/>), the *Directory of Resources and Services for People with Disabilities* (City of Bloomington/Council for Community Accessibility) and similar reference publications by local organizations.

This project was a true collaborative effort. The SCAN Steering and Research Committees included members from all three sectors – nonprofit, government and business– representing local funding groups, social service agencies, other nonprofits, Indiana University, and research organizations. An advisory board with service provision and data collection experts assisted the Committees. The Indiana University Office of Community Partnerships in Service-Learning dedicated an ACE (Advocates for Community Engagement) to the assessment team. Dozens of trained volunteers conducted open-ended structured interviews with community representatives.

Data Collected

Some of the research instruments were adapted from COMPASS 2.0, an assessment tool developed by the United Way of America. Several types of primary and secondary data were collected, including:

1. **Existing community data from local, state and national sources.** Recent community studies, topical needs assessments, annual reports and similar documents were obtained from social service agencies and other nonprofit human service organizations. Comparisons were also made with the results of the last community

needs assessment, SPAN/MC (1998). Information from City and County departments, state and national associations, *Kids Count* (Indiana Youth Institute), the Indiana Business Research Center and the U.S. Census are available in the SCAN Supplement. The Supplement presents data specific to Monroe County. In some cases, there is data for the surrounding counties, particularly Greene, Lawrence and Owen. The Supplement contains statistical summaries, district and regional maps, and other useful tools for preparing grants and planning programs. Web sites are given where appropriate to allow the user to check for updated information as needed.

2. Interviews with key informants. Trained volunteers conducted 45-minute open-ended structured interviews with 125 key informants. The key informants who participated represented a broad spectrum of agencies and organizations providing human services in Monroe County. They included key informants from both large and small agencies, representing eight of the major National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) categories of nonprofit fields of activities. They answered in-depth questions about the programs, services, needs and capacities of their respective organizations. Other questions focused on community strengths, challenges, and trends. Responses were analyzed for common themes, and then divided into six categories: existing capacity, gaps in providing services, barriers, collaborations, systemic challenges, and recommended actions.

3. Key Informant Client Challenges Survey. Key informants who represented agencies providing direct services to clients were asked to complete a 63-item survey. Fifty surveys were collected. Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which their clients had experienced specific household challenges in the past year in areas like economics, basic needs, employment, literacy, environmental quality, health care, education, childcare, transportation and disability services. The data were analyzed to obtain frequencies, means and group comparisons.

4. Key Informant Community Strengths Survey. The key informants were also given a 10-item Likert-type scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree) questionnaire to determine their perceptions of the degree to which the community exhibits civility, neighborhood strength, diversity, and willingness to engage in collaborative activities. The data were analyzed to determine means and relative rankings. (Several of the items from this instrument were included in the Household Survey, described below.)

5. Household Survey Telephone Interviews. The Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory in Indianapolis (POL) worked with the SCAN Steering and Research Committees to develop the instrument and conduct the surveys. The questionnaire was designed to assess a household's experience with a series of potential challenges in the twelve months prior to the survey. The respondent was asked to report which were a "major challenge", "minor challenge" or "no challenge" to them. Areas that were addressed included housing, educational challenges, economic needs, social and public safety concerns, environmental quality and community strengths.

(The last comprehensive community needs assessment, SPAN/MC (1998), was modeled after the original COMPASS instruments. Both report general *perceptions* of community needs rather than specific household *experiences*, as is done in the present SCAN study.)

An initial question set was pilot-tested for validity. The final version, a 10-minute telephone survey, was administered by professional interviewers from the POL to 307 residents of Monroe County. Interviews were conducted in November of 2002. The data sample accurately represented the gender, ethnicity, geographic location, and income balance of Monroe County residents as reported on the 2000 Census. The data was analyzed to obtain frequencies, means and group comparisons.

[For the statisticians: Several charts in the sections below report what percentage of people gave a certain response. This can be used to determine the number of people in the community who would have answered that way. For instance, if 12% of the general population has a major problem finding a job that pays enough to make ends meet, that 12% can be multiplied by the number of Monroe County residents in the general population (about 120,000) to give an estimate of 14,400. Because we surveyed about 300 people, the estimate can vary as much as 5% in either direction. So, if everyone in the county was to be surveyed, the true number of people who would report this ranges from 13,680 to 15,120. To perform the same math with people who have annual incomes under \$25,000 a year, multiply the percentage by 49,200. For under \$15,000 a year, use 27,600.]

6. Client Interviews. To reach individuals who may not have telephone service or do not speak English, the same Household Survey was administered to clients at four community agencies. Forty-two clients participated, including one group of Spanish-speaking individuals (those for whom Spanish is a first language). For consistency with the data gathered by Telephone Interview, the surveys were administered by trained on-site volunteers who read the questions to the clients and recorded the answers. The results of the Household Surveys from the client groups were compared with the results from the same survey given by telephone.

The clients were also asked to participate in a brief open-ended interview that requested information about their short and long-term goals, successes and challenges, and interactions with human service agencies. The purpose of the interviews was to learn more about the needs and experiences of specific populations, including low-income individuals and families, individuals in homeless shelters, individuals without employment, individuals experiencing hunger, and Spanish-speaking individuals.

7. Provider Profiles. Representatives from 72 nonprofit organizations completed Provider Profile surveys that requested information about programs, service populations, demand for services, program fee structures, partnership activities, funding sources, organizational capacity and available management tools. Several sections of this instrument were designed to correspond with a state-wide study that was being conducted at the same time (*Indiana Nonprofits Scope and Community*

Dimensions—a Preliminary Report Prepared for the Central Indiana Community Foundation, February 2003, Kirsten A. Gronbjerg, Project Director). This allowed comparisons to be drawn between the results of the Gronbjerg study and SCAN.

Analysis and Results

Qualitative responses from the Key Informant Interviews, Provider Profiles and Provider Client interviews were analyzed to determine primary categories and themes. These are incorporated in ten topical sections under the general heading “Community Challenges and Assets”.

Numerical data was analyzed by the appropriate quantitative methods, including compiling frequencies, computing means, and calculating percentages. Relationships among data were examined using Chi Square, Factor Analysis and t-tests. All reported results are significant to either the .001, the .01 or .05 levels; this is indicated where relevant.

The instruments were designed to allow statistical comparisons to be made for the data from all the households responding to the telephone survey, and sub-groups such as households without students, and households with a specified income level (below \$15,000 and below \$25,000). Analysis by income level allows useful discussions of eligibility for services based on Federal poverty measures. Federal measures define eligibility strictly on income level.

Using more recent, complex measures of poverty (including that of the Indiana Coalition for Housing and Homelessness Issues [ICHHI]), the Research Committee developed a “low income” category for households that fell below a certain level of income based on their size and composition. Adjustments are made based on the ages of children and basic living expenses.

A parallel, but simpler analysis of the SCAN data was conducted that defined the variable “low income” as:

- a household size of 1-2 with an income less than \$15,000, or
- a household size of 3-4 with an income of less than \$25,000, or
- a household of 5 or more with an income less than \$35,000.

The tables and charts used throughout the document clearly indicate which of these populations or subgroups are being discussed for each topic.

The *Community Challenges and Assets* segments are followed by an analysis and discussion of the human services nonprofit sector in Monroe County, examples of community indicators, and suggested goals and strategies.

Profile of Monroe County

Monroe County is one of 92 counties in the state of Indiana. It has 394 square miles of land area, with a population density of 307.5 per square mile. From 1990 to 2000, the population grew by 10.6%. The latest estimates (2002) report that the current population is 121,229. The county had 46,898 households in 2000 (12th out of 92 in the state). The average household size is 2.27 persons.

The US Census Bureau reports these population demographics for Monroe County and Indiana:

People QuickFacts	Monroe County	Indiana
Population, 2001 estimate	119,880	6,114,745
Population percent change, April 1, 2000-July 1, 2001	-0.6%	0.6%
Population, 2000	120,563	6,080,485
Population, percent change, 1990 to 2000	10.6%	9.7%
Persons under 5 years old, percent, 2000	5.1%	7.0%
Persons under 18 years old, percent, 2000	18.0%	25.9%
Persons 65 years old and over, percent, 2000	9.2%	12.4%
Female persons, percent, 2000	50.9%	51.0%
White persons, percent, 2000 (a)	90.8%	87.5%
Black or African American persons, percent, 2000 (a)	3.0%	8.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native persons, percent, 2000 (a)	0.3%	0.3%
Asian persons, percent, 2000 (a)	3.4%	1.0%
Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin, percent, 2000 (b)	1.9%	3.5%
White persons, not of Hispanic/Latino origin, percent, 2000	89.8%	85.8%

In 2000, the greatest proportion of jobs was in the services sector, with an average wage per job of \$25,323, an increase of 6% since 1995 (adjusted for inflation). Per capita personal income for 2001 was \$25,302. The median household income in 2000 was \$33,311 [Data from STATS Indiana, 2003.]

For the convenience of the user, detailed statistical information for Monroe County and surrounding counties, including the recently expanded Bloomington MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area), can be found in the Statistical Supplement section of SCAN. Each item includes the source and/or web address to allow the user to access any updates that may have occurred after SCAN was printed. The on-line version of SCAN, available at www.bloomington.in.us/~scan contains links to these sites.

The Community Challenges and Assets sections also direct the reader to relevant reference documents in the Statistical Supplement.