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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Community Needs Assessment was commissioned on behalf of the Orange County Community Action Division and represents a comprehensive review of public health, public administration, and education data from a variety of local, state, and national data sources.

This assessment is meant to inform strategic planning and the tailoring of services to address the economic needs of Orange County citizens, prioritizing those who live below the federal poverty level (FPL). As a result, a variety of data sources were analyzed for this assessment including that from local community organizations, key stakeholders, other county divisions, and state, and federal sources. This assessment serves as a guide to the Community Action Board and the Community Action Division as they work together to strengthen existing economic self-sufficiency programs and services, and plan future interventions and services for disadvantaged residents.

In recognizing how economic self-sufficiency is determined by social, environmental, physical, and financial factors, this needs assessment includes elements from each of those domains in describing the total needs of the community on the causal pathway to self-sufficiency.

As was true during the last assessment period, the Distressed Community Index reflected and confirmed that geographic regions with community action centers had higher level of distress than the County overall. For example, the Distressed Index Score for Orange county has reduced dramatically to 19.1, but the Holden Heights zip code Distress Score is 91.8 - the highest in the area. While Orange County is ranked "prosperous" on the Distress Tier scale, two Community Action Service Centers are in areas that are considered "distressed," and three centers are located in "at risk" areas.

Housing remains the number one need sought by residents, and the Orange County Needs Assessment on Housing determined that housing challenges are more prevalent among income constrained residents who rent. While 55\% of Orange County residents own their homes, only $18 \%$ of Community Action clients own their home. The median cost of a mortgage in Orange

County is $\$ 50$ cheaper than the national average, but the average cost of rent is $\$ 127$ higher even though median household incomes in Orange County are over $\$ 6,000$ less than the national average.

Despite the challenges that persist, several services needed in the community are already occurring within the Community Action Division, or a partnership is planned for the commission of such services. Additionally, services that were identified in the previous needs assessment (GED and ESOL classes, computer classes, and financial literacy workshops), have been implemented in the Division. The Family Self-Sufficiency program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), and the Weatherization Program (WAP) will also continue to serve the community on the causal pathway to self-sufficiency.

## INTRODUCTION

## COMMUNITY ACTION DIVISION PROFILE

The Community Action Division (CAD) became a public agency under the Orange County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in 1969 and became a County division in 2001. The Division provides a range of services designed to assist low-income individuals and families to acquire skills and competencies necessary to obtain employment and to achieve economic selfsufficiency. The Division's mission is to enhance quality of life by promoting self-sufficiency and eliminating the causes and consequences of poverty; this is achieved by mobilizing and directing socioeconomic resources, collaboration and partnership, and by providing high-quality, easily accessible programs and services. The Division's vision is "to help individuals and families achieve economic self-sufficiency by leveraging partnerships that produce a range of culturallycompetent, accessible, high-quality services to meet the needs of a diverse community." The Division is funded by a Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) and the Orange County Board of County Commissioners - which serves as its governing board. In addition to the BCC, a tripartite
board consisting of elected public officials, private sector representatives, and representatives of low-income populations provide oversite and accountability to the Division.

The County also funds seven community service centers located strategically in low-income neighborhoods; each of these centers are fully operated by the Division. These centers serve as a focal point in the community and house a number of different activities and services. Each center includes meeting rooms and a computer lab that is open to the public. Services are provided to the public by staff and by partner agencies. These services differ from center to center but include youth activities; senior activities such as exercise, sewing classes, and congregate meals; health and community fairs including back-to-school, job, and college fairs; community gardens; afterschool food for children; and onsite programs to address substance abuse, domestic violence, and other similar challenges.

Through CSBG funding, the Division operates a family self-sufficiency program consisting of case management, employment counseling, and provision of tuition and financial support to assist individuals in attending vocational education programs. There are community services workers located in four quadrants of the County - East Orange County, Taft, Pine Hills and Apopka. Other areas with community centers are the Mercy Drive area, Holden Heights, and Winter Garden/Ocoee. Centers operated by other County divisions and/or community partners include Bithlo, Zellwood, Southwood, and the Raleigh Street area.

## RATIONALE FOR A COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Community action agencies are mandated to conduct a community assessment as required by the CSBG Act - Section 676(b) (11): "an assurance that the State will secure from each eligible entity in the State... a community action plan...that includes a community-needs assessment for the community served, which may be coordinated with community-needs assessments conducted for other programs..."

Community action agencies are directed to base their plan on a complete analysis of the community-wide conditions in order to address verified and urgent local needs. Consideration is given to the areas of greatest community need, the availability of resources, and the division's own strengths and limitations. The subject of the assessment is not only the community's needs but also its resources or assets. In addition, an assessment of both of the community actions agency's strengths (assets) and of its organizational limitations (needs) is mandated.

## Why do we do Needs Assessments?



Additionally, as outlined in the Community Action Partnership's Technical Assistance guide, local control of Federal CSBG resources is predicated on regular comprehensive community needs assessments that take into account the breadth of community needs as well as the partners and resources available in a community to meet these needs.

## ROOT CAUSES AND CONDITIONS OF POVERTY

The scientific literature identifies the root causes of poverty as a varied combination of personal and systemic factors. These factors including individual choices, community conditions, the systematic oppression and exploitation of women and minority groups, and political and
economic structures. While Orange County Government and many municipalities around the United States have established programs and services to mediate and eliminate the causes and consequences of poverty, there still remains much work to do. The National Academy of Sciences defines poverty as economic deprivation: a lack of resources needed to obtain basic goods and services. In Orange County, Florida, the living conditions of individuals with low resources put them at risk biologically, psychologically, and socially. Resources include access to not only financial capital, but also social, health, and human capital. Community sustainability is achieved through individual, organizational, and community-level action, as well as policy changes.

## KEY SECTOR ENGAGEMENT

Partners from 1) private, 2) non-profit, 3) faith based, 4) education, and 5) community sectors provide an array of services to assist the Division in achieving its performance indicators, which are linked to national goals. The Division currently has over 100 formal and informal partners who provide a variety of services. Some of these partners occupy space at the community centers, and some provide services through periodic onsite visits. Working closely with community partners is a great way to leverage funding and bring services into the community that would otherwise not exist. Working with partners also increases the diversity of activities and services available, and creates strong bonds and a sense of ownership within the local community.

## METHODOLOGY

The Division utilized the (1) Technical Assistance Guide developed by the Community Action Partnership, (2) the Community Health Needs Assessment Guide published by Community Commons, and (3) the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute's County Health Rankings Methodology to inform its needs assessment process. Several data sources were referenced in the aforementioned guides to obtain comprehensive data. The comprehensive assessment of community needs and resources as well as agency data informs the Division strategic planning process and the annual Community Action Plan. This assessment is also the first step in the Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) Cycle.

The Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) serves several purposes for community action agencies. First, the assessment offers a focus on local conditions, analyzing the economic opportunities and barriers for all residents who are at risk of remaining or becoming economically insecure. CNAs identify existing and potential resources that inform opportunities for collaboration and service delivery. Additionally, the CNA prepares the community action agency's leadership to plan a multi-year strategy by identifying and prioritizing unmet community needs.

The assessment and strategic planning processes require thinking about needs and resources in a more comprehensive framework. The assessment equips community action leaders to adopt a broad vision of the community's future and to plan the Division's role in leading change. This process includes using data to:

1. Understand the depth and breadth of emerging and ongoing needs of economically insecure residents in the community
2. Choose the role the organization will play in meeting some of those needs
3. Identify economic resources, social resources, and partnership opportunities in the community that can help meet the needs
4. Identify significant public policy issues
5. Educate community residents and leaders about the identified needs and provide input on policies and strategies
6. Explain to the community the rationale behind decisions to prioritize needs and allocate resources

This CNA covers fiscal years 2020-2023 for Community Action in Orange County, Florida. This assessment consists of information from several sources. Demographics and information on key indicators in the community were obtained primarily from Community Commons, a reference resource from the national Community Action Partnership. The Distressed Communities Index
produced by the Economic Innovation Group was also utilized, along with the U.S. Census Bureau's 2017 American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates (2018 data will not become until after this report is due). The Distressed Communities Index provides data on economic indicators relating to poverty and community distress by zip code, while the Community Commons data covers the County as a whole. In addition, several sources of local information were used. Data from Heart of Florida United Way 211 was used to help determine local community needs, and the needs assessment conducted by the Housing and Community Development Division of Orange County was utilized to determine housing needs in the county.

Direct inquiry was incorporated in several ways. A survey was conducted through interviews with key informants in the community including the following sectors: community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, private sector, public sector, and educational institutions (See attached survey in the appendices). The department's Head Start Division also completed a Community Assessment, which was referenced in completing this report. Finally, information on clients was directly obtained via the case management software that the Division utilizes to track all CSBG and LIHEAP services delivered.

## COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHIC \& STATISTICAL PROFILE

A profile of the County was obtained through the CNA tool available through the National Community Action Partnership. Data for the reports originated through a partnership with Community Commons. Data indicators included several socioeconomic and sociodemographic characteristics including data on age, gender, race, poverty, housing, food security, violent crime, nativity and citizenship, and certain indicators of health. Data included in this assessment are also stratified by income (the general county versus those who income qualify for our services), center location, and client status (Division client versus non-clients).

## COMMUNITY ACTION DIVISION SERVICE AREA

## POPULATION OF ORANGE COUNTY

According to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2018 estimate, the total population of Orange County, Florida is 1,380,645. This is over 180,000 more residents than our last needs assessment estimate in 2014, and just over 230,000 more residents since the 2010 Census. Since that 2010 Census, while the United States population is estimated to have grown 6\%, and the State of Florida has grown 13\%, the population of Orange County is estimated to have grown over $20 \%$.

Similar to the United States and the State of Florida, Orange County is about half male and half female. At present, there is no widely accepted estimate of residents who belong to a sexual and gender minority available on Orange County, the State of Florida, and the United States. As such, the data in this assessment are on biological sex only and not gender.

Orange County is slightly more racially and ethnically diverse than the State of Florida and the United States, although about the same number of Orange County Residents are foreign born as Florida residents. Proportionally, there are more veterans living in Orange County than in Florida or the United States. Table $\mathbf{1}$ contains the demographic characteristics in this section for Orange County, the State of Florida, and the United States.

Table 1. Census Demographic Estimates

| Data | Orange County | Florida | United States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population density per sq. mile | $1,268.5$ | 350.6 | 87.4 |
|  | Population Estimates |  |  |
| *2018 population estimate | $1,380,645$ | $21,299,325$ | $327,167,434$ |
| 2010 population estimate | $1,145,954$ | $18,804,580$ | $308,758,105$ |
|  | Age and Sex Percent |  |  |
| Persons under 5 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 6.1 |


| Data | Orange County | Florida | United States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Persons aged 0-17 | 22.2 | 19.9 | 22.4 |
| Persons aged 65+ | 11.9 | 20.5 | 16.0 |
| Female persons | 50.9 | 51.1 | 50.8 |
|  |  |  |  |
| White and Hispanic Origin Percent |  | 76.5 |  |
| Black or African-American | 68.1 | 77.3 | 13.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 22.7 | 16.9 | 1.3 |
| Asian | 0.6 | 0.5 | 5.9 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific | 5.7 | 3.0 | 0.2 |
| Islander | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |
| Two or more races |  | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2.7 | 26.1 | 18.3 |


|  | Selected Population Characteristics |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Foreign born persons (\%) | 20.7 | 20.2 | 13.4 |  |  |
| Veterans | 62,265 | $1,454,632$ | $18,939,219$ |  |  |

Data are from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5 year estimate unless otherwise stated
*Data are 2018 Census population estimates

## HOUSING

Just over half of the houses in Orange County are occupied by persons who own their property; this is less than the averages for Florida and the United States. The median value of these owneroccupied units is $\$ 192,400$ - similar to the United States, and almost $\$ 14,000$ more than the median home value in the State of Florida. On average, each household in Orange County is occupied by 2-3 people. This is the same for the State of Florida and the United States.

Housing remains the number one need sought by residents, and the Orange County Needs Assessment on Housing determined that housing challenges are more prevalent among income constrained residents who rent. While $55 \%$ of Orange County residents own their homes, only $18 \%$ of Community Action clients own their home. The median cost of a mortgage in Orange County is $\$ 50$ cheaper than the national average, but the average cost of rent is $\$ 127$ higher even though median household incomes in Orange County are over $\$ 6,000$ less than the national average. Approximately $40 \%$ of Orange County residents spend more than $30 \%$ of their income housing.

Over 90\% of Orange County residents report having a computer at home -more than the state and national averages- but $83 \%$ report having a broadband internet connection (still higher than the state and national averages). Over $35 \%$ of Orange County residents over the age of 5 speak a language other than English at home - 7\% more than in Florida and 14\% more than the United States. Housing and living characteristics for Orange County, the State of Florida, and the United States are detailed in Table 2, and the Orange County Housing and Community Development Division's comprehensive housing needs assessment is contained in the appendix section of this document.

Table 2. Housing and Living Characteristics

| Data | Orange County | Florida | United States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Housing |  |  |  |
|  | Characteristics |  |  |
| Housing units (2018) | 544,417 | $9,547,305$ | $138,537,078$ |
| Owner-occupied units (\%) | 54.5 | 64.8 | 63.8 |
| Median value of owner-occupied units | $\$ 192,400$ | $\$ 178,700$ | $\$ 193,500$ |
| Median mortgage costs | $\$ 1,465$ | $\$ 1,432$ | $\$ 1,515$ |
| Median rent costs | $\$ 1,109$ | $\$ 1,077$ | $\$ 982$ |
| Percent of people who spend more | 39.7 | 36.1 | - |
| than 30\% of their income on housing |  |  |  |


| Data | Orange County | Florida | United States |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Living Arrangements |  |  |  |
| Persons per household | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Living in the same house > 1 year |  |  |  |
| Language other than English spoken at home (\%) | 35.3 | 28.7 | 21.3 |
| Families with children under 18 (\%) | 33.2 | 27.3 | - |
| Percentage of overcrowded housing units | 4.4 | 3.7 | - |
| Percentage of housing with one or more substandard conditions | 40.1 | 36.7 | - |
| Computer and Internet Use Percent |  |  |  |
| Households with a computer | 91.8 | 88.1 | 87.2 |
| Households with broadband internet | 83.3 | 78.6 | 78.1 |

## EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

More Orange County residents over the age of 25 have a high school diploma and a college degree than persons in Florida or the United States. The on-time graduation rate in Orange County is more than $10 \%$ higher than in the State of Florida, and $4^{\text {th }}$ graders in Orange County perform just as well as the children in the State on reading proficiency exams. Nonetheless, the sections to follow will detail that these positive outcomes do not persist among those who live in poverty. Table 3 details education and economic characteristics of Orange County residents.

## Table 3. Socioeconomic Characteristics

| Data | Orange County | Florida | United States |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Education Characteristics Percent |  |  |  |
| Persons over 25 with a high school diploma | 88.2 | 87.6 | 87.3 |
| Persons over 25 with an associate's degree | 43.7 | 38.2 | - |
| Persons over 25 with a bachelor's degree or higher | 32.7 | 28.5 | - |
| On-time graduation rate | 79 | 68.9 | - |
| Percentage of $4^{\text {th }}$ graders who score "not proficient" or worse in reading | 43.0 | 43.9 | - |
| Number of Head Start Programs | 39 | 856 | - |
| Head Start programs per 10,000 children |  |  |  |
| Selected Economic Characteristics |  |  |  |
| Percent of persons aged $16+$ in the civilian labor force | $66.9$ | 58.4 | 63.0 |
| Percent of women aged $16+$ in the civilian labor force | $62.0$ | 54.1 | 58.2 |
| *Unemployment rate (\%) | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.7 |
| Transportation |  |  |  |
| Mean travel time to work (mins) | 27.6 | 27.0 | 26.4 |
| Percent of the population using public transit to commute to work | $2.7$ | 2 | - |


| Business Characteristics |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of women owner firms | 52,067 | 807,817 | $9,878,397$ |
| Number of minority-owned businesses (2012) | 63,938 | 926,112 | $7,952,386$ |

*Bureau of Labor Statistics 2019 estimate

## CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN'S SOCIAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH STATUS

As the Community Action Division's Family Self-Sufficiency Program case manages the entire household, it is important to also acknowledge that many of our families include children. While children do not qualify as service recepients independent of their parents, we recognize that persons in poverty who have children face unique challenges. Children who are raised in poverty are also more likely to become adults living in poverty. Additionally, parents who have children with special needs additional barriers, and this is especially true for parents with low-income. As a result, the complete Head Start Division's needs assessment is attached to this document in an appendix, and key educational, economic, and behavioral data on children are provided in Table

## 4.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation also provides a data center on key childhood outcomes. The Florida KIDS COUNT promotes the health and well-being of children and families by providing data driven knowledge and consultation services focusing on data sources, policy research, education, and community engagement. The following data are from the Florida KIDS COUNT data book.

Table 4. Characteristics of Children's Social and Physical Health Status

|  | Data | Orange County |  |  |  | Florida |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population Under 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ages | $\%$ | $0-18$ | $0-4$ | $5-9$ | $10-14$ | $15-17$ |  |
| Population in 2017 | 23.1 | 304,021 | 84,127 | 83,491 | 85,033 | 51,370 |  |
| Children Under 18 in Poverty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |  |
| Percent | 27.1 | 26.0 | 25.4 | 22.6 | 22.2 | 21.9 |  |
| Number | 74,437 | 71,808 | 71,168 | 64,759 | 65,087 | 65,440 |  |


| Data | Orange County | Florida |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Education Indicators |  |  |
|  | \# \% | \# \% |
| Students eligible for free or reduced lunch | 127,871 64.9 | 1,637,787 58.7 |
| Disciplinary Actions |  |  |
| In school suspensions | 10,849 | 198,882 |
| Out of school suspensions | 13,288 | 172,982 |
| Placement in alternate education | 891 | 7,182 |
| School dropouts | 326 | 29,060 |

## Explanation of data:

Students eligible for free or reduced lunch: Children's data on the number and percentage of students who are eligible to participate in the free and reduced lunch program.

Section on Disciplinary Actions: Florida Department of Education has identified nine types of disciplinary actions. More than one disciplinary action per student may have occurred during the year. In-School Suspensions - the temporary removal of a student from the school program not exceeding ten days. Out-of-School Suspensions - the temporary removal of a student from a school and the school program for a period not exceeding ten days or extended beyond ten school days pending School Board hearing for expulsion. Placement in Alternative Education Setting - the student is removed from the school for an offense, not expelled, and placed in an alternative education setting.

The number of public school students who withdraws from school for any reason cited in statute without transferring to another school, home education program, or adult education program. Dropout classifications used for data collection include, but are not limited to, voluntary withdrawal from school prior to graduation (i.e., after passing the age of compulsory school attendance), failure to meet attendance requirements due to excessive absenteeism, discontinued
attendance with whereabouts unknown, and failure to enter/attend school as expected after having registered.

## POVERTY IN ORANGE COUNTY

The 2019 Federal Poverty Guidelines specify that $100 \%$ of the poverty level consists of an annual income of $\$ 12,490$ for one person and $\$ 25,750$ for a family of 4 . Fifteen percent of Orange County residents are at or below the federal poverty guideline. This is a higher rate of poverty than both the state (14\%) and the country (12\%). The full Community Commons report in Appendix I contains detailed statistical and demographic information for the County, and Table 5 provides income and other selected characteristics on persons who live at or below $100 \%$ of federal poverty. Table 5. Poverty Characteristics


| Data | Orange County | Florida | United States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of people living in a food | 610,594 | $9,211,621$ | - |
| desert |  |  |  |
| Percent of the population with low | 18.8 | 21.8 | - |
| food access |  |  |  |


| Violent Crime |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Violent crime rate per 100,000 | 648.0 | 444.7 | - |

## PERSONS LIVING AT 125\% OF THE FEDERAL POVERTY GUIDELINE

Several of the data points mentioned in previous sections are provided in Table 6. Stratified by poverty status. All data in this table are reported on persons who live at $125 \%$ of the federal poverty guideline ( $\$ 32,187$ per year for a family of 4 ). These data were queried to demonstrate what people who qualify for Community Action services "look" like.

Almost a quarter of women and $20 \%$ of men in Orange County live at $125 \%$ of the federal poverty level or below. Over 30\% of children in Orange County live at this income level with their families. Thirty-two percent of Black or African American residents, 29\% of Hispanic or Latino residents, $22 \%$ of biracial residents, and $19 \%$ of White residents live at or below $125 \%$ of federal poverty, and qualify for most services in the Community Action Division.

Almost 13\% of persons living at this income level are married, $39 \%$ are female-headed households, and almost $9 \%$ have a college degree. Though it is worth noting that all levels of poverty decline in a graded fashion as educational attainment increases. Natural-born citizens are less likely to live in poverty than foreign born residents and non-citizens.

Almost a third of persons with a disability live at $125 \%$ FPL or below, and $7 \%$ of persons who work full-time, year 'round qualify for Community Action services. Table $\mathbf{6}$ provides the specific data on the outcomes in this section, and includes a comparison to state and national statistics.


Table 6. Selected Social, Economic, and Demographic Characteristics of persons below 125\% FPL

| Data | Orange County | Florida | United <br> States |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 22.4\% | 20.7\% | 19.2\% |
| Sex |  |  |  |
| Male | 21.1\% | 19.3\% | 17.6\% |
| Female | 23.6\% | 22.0\% | 20.6\% |
| Age |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 30.9\% | 29.3\% | 26.3\% |
| Related children of householder under 18 years | 30.6\% | 29.0\% | 26.0\% |
| 18 to 64 years | 20.4\% | 19.5\% | 17.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 16.7\% | 15.3\% | 14.1\% |
| Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin |  |  |  |
| One race | 22.4\% | 20.6\% | 19.0\% |
| White | 18.9\% | 17.9\% | 16.1\% |
| Black or African American | 31.5\% | 32.4\% | 31.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 18.3\% | 26.4\% | 33.6\% |
| Asian | 16.8\% | 16.3\% | 15.6\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 16.2\% | 28.8\% | 24.5\% |
| Some other race | 31.8\% | 30.1\% | 32.0\% |
| Two or more races | 22.1\% | 24.1\% | 23.7\% |
| Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) | 29.0\% | 27.1\% | 29.7\% |


| Data | Orange County | Florida | United <br> States |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White alone, not Hispanic or Latino | 13.8\% | 14.7\% | 13.7\% |
| Living Arrangement |  |  |  |
| In family households | 20.4\% | 18.4\% | 16.9\% |
| In married-couple family | 12.6\% | 11.4\% | 9.9\% |
| In Female householder, no husband | 38.6\% | 36.6\% | 38.6\% |
| present households |  |  |  |
| In other living arrangements | 31.4\% | 31.3\% | 30.4\% |
| Educational Attainment |  |  |  |
| Population 25 years and over | 17.9\% | 17.3\% | 15.5\% |
| Less than high school graduate | 33.9\% | 35.9\% | 35.1\% |
| High school graduate (includes | 23.6\% | 21.3\% | 19.2\% |
| equivalency) |  |  |  |
| Some college or associate's degree | 17.1\% | 14.9\% | 13.8\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 8.7\% | 8.0\% | 5.9\% |
| Nativity and Citizenship |  |  |  |
| Native | 21.7\% | 19.7\% | 18.5\% |
| Foreign born | 24.9\% | 24.7\% | 23.2\% |
| Naturalized citizen | 17.1\% | 18.5\% | 15.4\% |
| Disability Status |  |  |  |
| With any disability | 30.0\% | 27.2\% | 28.2\% |
| No disability | 21.5\% | 19.7\% | 17.9\% |

Work Status

| Data | Orange County | Florida | United <br> States |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Population 16 to 64 years | $20.7 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ | $17.9 \%$ |
| Worked full-time, year-round | $7.3 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
| Worked less than full-time, year-round | $29.0 \%$ | $26.5 \%$ | $24.6 \%$ |
| Did not work | $41.2 \%$ | $38.6 \%$ | $37.5 \%$ |

## HEALTH CHARACTERISTICS

As physical health and economic health are inextricably intertwined, data in the Table $\mathbf{7}$ provides an overview of the general health characteristics that are widely accepted metrics of community health. Income and educational attainment are also the most stable predictors of morbidity (if you have an illness) and mortality (what did you die from). As such, poverty and health are very closely related, and are said to have a reciprocal relationship in that being sick long-term can reduce earning potential, and well as earning more money can purchase goods and services to support mental and physical health.

The uninsurance rate is included in this report as a proxy for health care consumption. Persons who have had health insurance long-term are more likely to utilize health care services. Data on access to care are broken down by the availability of mental health, primary care, and dental health providers proportional to the population. The more providers there are to meet the needs in a specified geographic region, the shorter the wait times for an appointment, and the more likely people are to seek services. While Orange County has more mental health providers per capita than the State of Florida, Florida counties are notorious for under-funding the provision of mental health services. HIV screening rates and late entry or no prenatal care rates are slightly worse in Orange County than in the State of Florida. These screening and maintenance health services are most underutilized by the poor.

Just over a quarter of adults in the state and county are consuming enough fruits and vegetables per the nutrition guidelines published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Similarly, a quarter of adults in the state and county report no leisure time physical activities. Table $\mathbf{7}$ contains additional measures of health status, access, and behaviors that provide additional context.

Table 7. Health Characteristics

| Data | Orange County | Florida | United States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Insurance |  |  |
| Uninsured adults (\%) | 18.1 | 18.4 | - |
| Total uninsured (\% in 2017) | 15.7 | 16.0 | 13.7 |
|  | Access |  |  |
| Mental health providers per 100,000 | 213.0 | 150.1 | - |
| Primary care providers per 100,000 | 95.7 | 79.8 | - |
| Access to dentists per 100,000 | 46.3 | 25.8 | - |
| Number of federally qualified health | 1.6 | 2.2 | - |
| centers per 100,000 |  | 57.3 | - |
| Percent of adults screened for HIV | 53.5 | 27.7 |  |
| Percent of mothers with late or no | 21.8 |  | - |
| prenatal care |  |  |  |

## Climate

| Percentage of days with a high heat | 9.9 | 8.7 | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| index |  |  |  |


| Health Behaviors |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent of adults with inadequate fruit | 72.8 | 74.3 | - |
| and vegetable consumption |  |  |  |
| Percent of adults with no leisure time | 24.4 | 23.6 | - |
| physical activity |  | Page 24 of 41 |  |


| Data | Orange County | Florida | United States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Health Status |  |  |  |
| Percent of adults with asthma | 14.0 | 12.5 | - |
| Percent of adults on Medicare with <br> depression <br> Age-adjusted death rate due to | 18.1 | 18.9 | - |
| suicide per 100,000 | 10 | 14 | - |
| Percentage of adults who consider <br> their health generally poor <br> Population with HIV per 100,000 | 15.3 | 15.9 | - |

## DATA FROM ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION CLIENTS

Data provided in the tables below detail several of the data points already discussed in this assessment; however, these data are provided on clients who have been served by the Community Action Division in the past 2 fiscal years. Tables 8 and 9 detail the individual characteristics of clients who have been screened for, and who have received Community Action services. As these data are a point in time estimate of clients, some clients in the dataset are at the end of their program and exceed the poverty guidelines.

Greater that $50 \%$ of Community Action clients self-identify as non-Hispanic Black women. The average age range of clients enrolled is $25-44$, and $78 \%$ of their children are under 13 years of age. More than $40 \%$ of clients have a high school diploma either at the time of enrollment or by the time they are discharged from the program. Over $98 \%$ of our clients do not have health insurance, and $21 \%$ report having a disability. Less than $1 \%$ of clients reported any military service.

Of clients present in the current dataset, $48 \%$ are single mothers, and $55 \%$ have non-employment sources of income only. Among "non-employment" sources of income, SSI (Supplemental Security

Income) and Social Security Retirement were the greatest proportion. Seventy-eight percent of out clients rent their residences, and less than $1 \%$ are homeless ( 39 individuals at the last data collection period). Additional data points and raw numbers are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8. Client Individual Characteristics
Total unduplicated individuals about whom one or more characteristics were obtained: $\mathbf{1 8 , 5 6 4}$

| Total unduplicated households about whom one or more characteristics were obtained: |  |  | 6,329 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  | Ethnicity |  |
| Male | 7,385 | Hispanic/Latino | 2,701 |
| Female | 11,056 | Non-Hispanic/Latino | 15,863 |
| Unknown | 123 | Unknown | 0 |
|  |  | Race |  |
| 0-5 | 2,670 | American Indian/ Alaska Native | 2 |
| 6-13 | 4,151 | Asian | 47 |
| 14-17 | 1,885 | Black/ African -American | 11,516 |
| 18-24 | 1,439 | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | 9 |
| 25-44 | 4,289 | White | 2,405 |
| 45-54 | 1,560 | Other | 3,617 |
| 55-59 | 726 | Multi-Racial | 673 |
| 60-64 | 599 | Unknown | 295 |
| 65-74 | 646 |  |  |
| 75+ | 440 |  |  |
| Unknown | 32 |  |  |

Educational Attainment

|  | Ages 14-24 | Ages 25+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grades 0-8 | 1,402 | 205 |
| Grades 9-12 (non-grad) | 348 | 850 |



## Table 9. Client Individual Characteristics

Total unduplicated individuals about whom one or more characteristics were obtained: $\mathbf{1 8 , 5 6 4}$

| Total unduplicated households about whom one or more characteristics were obtained: | $\mathbf{6 , 3 2 9}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Household Type |  |  | Sources of Household Income |  |
| Single person | 1,445 | Employment income only | 200 |  |
| Two adults no children | 359 | Employment and other | 91 |  |
| Single parent female | 2,856 | Employment, other, and non-cash | 765 |  |


| Single parent male | 98 | Employment and non-cash | 1,153 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Two parent household | 832 | Other sources only | 174 |
| Multigenerational household | 2 | Other income and non-cash | 2,050 |
| Other | 326 | No income | 250 |
| Unknown | 401 | Non-cash benefits only | 248 |
|  |  | Unknown | 1,398 |
| Housing |  | Other income sources |  |
| Own | 1,154 | TANF - temporary assistance | 260 |
| Rent | 4,355 | SSI - supplemental security income | 1,602 |
| Other permanent housing | 31 | SSDI - social security disability | 251 |
| Homeless | 39 | VA service disability | 1 |
| Other | 19 | VA non-service disability | 29 |
| Unknown | 731 | Workers Compensation | 11 |
| Household Size |  | Social Security Retirement | 1,694 |
| Single Person | 1,673 | Pension | 104 |
| Two | 1,337 | Child Support | 800 |
| Three | 1,255 | Alimony | 2 |
| Four | 1,042 | Unemployment Insurance | 112 |
| Five | 568 | Other | 4,715 |
| Six or more | 454 |  |  |
| Level of Household Income* |  | Non-cash Benefits |  |
| Up to 50\% |  | SNAP - supplemental nutrition | 4,169 |
| 51\% to 75\% |  | Affordable Care Act subsidy | 2 |
| $76 \%$ to $100 \%$ |  | Public Housing | 470 |
| 101\% to 125\% |  | HUD-VASH | 1 |
| 126\% to 150\% |  | Childcare voucher | 6 |


| $151 \%$ to $175 \%$ | 144 | Other | 161 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $176 \%$ to $200 \%$ | 90 |  |  |
| $201 \%$ to $250 \%$ | 72 |  |  |
| $250 \%$ and over | 41 |  |  |
| *as a proportion of the federal poverty guidelines |  |  |  |

## COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY NEEDS AND CONDITIONS

The Division utilizes multiple data sources for its comprehensive community assessment of poverty needs and conditions. The CNA is integrated into the strategic plan as the basis for identifying critical issues or concerns for which long-term solutions are sought. This assessment takes into account the breadth and depth of community needs as well as the partners and resources available in the community to meet these needs. One data source utilized was the comprehensive community assessment conducted by the Head Start Division in 2016, which included a community asset mapping based on a windshield survey, as well as a parent survey.

The parent survey is relevant because it reflects customer engagement and levels of satisfaction from residents who reside in impoverished neighborhoods. This input is invaluable as it reflects the sentiments of the division's participants or potential participants who meet the eligibility criteria of $125 \%$ or less of the federal poverty guidelines. In addition, the Division utilized feedback from community action staff, as well as the Board, also referred to herein as key informant surveys.

The CNA data was also obtained from the Community Commons Forum, which enables local data to be integrated into customized reports, from public databases. Periodic assessment of needs and resources at the community level is the foundation of community action and a vital management and leadership tool that is used across the organizational network and the community to set the course for the utilization of both the CSBG and other agency resources.

Customer satisfaction data and customer input, collected as part of the CNA is included in the strategic planning process.

## COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED

## DISTRESSED COMMUNITY INDEX

The Distressed Communities Index (DCI) combines seven complementary economic indicators into a single holistic and comparative measure of community well-being. The index is constructed from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates and Business Patterns datasets.

The seven-component metrics of the DCI are:

1. No high school diploma: Percent of the $25+$ population without a high school diploma or equivalent
2. Housing vacancy rate: Percent of habitable housing that is unoccupied, excluding properties that are for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use
3. Adults not working: Percent of the prime-age population (25-64) not currently in work
4. Poverty rate: Percent of the population living under the poverty line
5. Median income ratio: Median household income as a percent of the state's median household income (to account for cost of living differences across states)
6. Change in employment: Percent change in the number of jobs
7. Change in establishments: Percent change in the number of business establishments

Each component is weighted equally in the index, which itself is calculated by ranking communities on each of the seven metrics, taking the average of those ranks, and then normalizing the average to be equivalent to a percentile. Distress scores range from
approaching zero to 100.0 , such that the zip code with the average rank of 12,500 out of 25,000 will register a distress score of 50.0. Communities are then grouped into quintiles, or fifths. The best-performing quintile is considered "prosperous," the second-best "comfortable," the third "mid-tier," the fourth "at risk," and the fifth, or worst-performing, "distressed."

The Distressed Communities Index (DCI) is based on data from the American Community Survey (five-year estimates 2012-2016). Distress scores are calculated at the zip code, city, and county and congressional district levels. They are calculated based on geography's rank on each of the seven equally weighted variables. The ranks are then averaged and normalized to be equivalent to percentiles, resulting in the distress score - the higher the score, the greater the economic distress.

Community action outreach offices are geographically dispersed in low-resourced neighborhoods throughout the County and provide case management services to income-qualified individuals. The administration center, which is also an outreach office, is centrally located in the heart of the County. All centers have experienced some economic distress improvements since the last needs assessment that was conducted.

Analysis of zip code data obtained from the DCI indicates that neighborhoods targeted with community action centers are considered to be in a higher level of distress than the County as a whole, demonstrating that resources are allocated in areas where they can presumably have the most impact. The lone exception to an area being in less distress than the County as a whole is Maxey Community Center, where adjoining suburban residential areas in the same zip code are believed to skew the data.

Significant observations regarding economic distress metrics include:

- The neighborhood registering the highest level of distress was Holden Heights at 91.8 compared to $19.1 \%$ for the County as a whole.
- The Hal P. Marston area had the second highest distressed score which was 83.6
- Overall each of the centers, with the exception of Maxey and Taft, had distress levels at least twice as high as the County. Again, it appears that Maxey's numbers were not representative due to its inclusion with a more affluent nearby suburban area. Taft's index was almost twice that of the county.

Figure $\mathbf{1}$ is a map of all Community Action center locations, Tables $\mathbf{1 0}$ and $\mathbf{1 1}$ present the DCI reports for the most recent data year (2012-2016), and the data period that immediately preceded this assessment (2007-2011)

Figure 1. Community Action Community Centers


## Distressed Communities Index by Orange County Community Center Locations

Table 10. Distressed Communities Index, 2012-2016

|  | Distress tier | DCI <br> score | State distress rank (920) | Population | Minority pop. | No HS | Vacant <br> Housing | Adults no work | Poverty rate | Med. Inc. ratio | Employ. change | Business change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Orange | Prosperous | 19.1 | 51/63 | 1,256,060 | 57.3\% | 12.3\% | 8.7\% | 25.2\% | 17.3\% | 101.0\% | 13.4\% | 13.0\% |
| County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bithlo | Comfortable | 39.4 | 542 | 9,420 | 46.7\% | 15.0\% | 8.4\% | 22.7\% | 13.6\% | 127.3\% | 1.2\% | 10.2\% |
| East | Mid-tier | 42.0 | 512 | 35,210 | 42.7\% | 10.9\% | 6.4\% | 27\% | 23.9\% | 87.9\% | 12.4\% | 19.6\% |
| Orange |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hal | Distressed | 83.6 | 126 | 51,510 | 86.1\% | 22.7\% | 11.9\% | 31.1\% | 29.2\% | 66.3\% | 2.5\% | 7.9\% |
| Marston |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holden | Distressed | 91.8 | 53 | 22,100 | 89\% | 25.4\% | 13.8\% | 41.2\% | 25.1\% | 48.6\% | -2.0\% | 9.7\% |
| Heights |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| John | Mid-tier | 48.8 | 444 | 49,220 | 53.3\% | 15.2\% | 9.3\% | 27.8\% | 20.7\% | 94.6\% | 19.7\% | 10.2\% |
| Bridges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maxey | At Risk | 11.5 | 247 | 39,750 | 80.6\% | 15.1\% | 9.2\% | 23.3\% | 12.6\% | 66.4\% | 21.1\% | 22.9\% |
| Pine Hills | At Risk | 63.5 | 312 | 51,820 | 87.3\% | 18.6\% | 6.4\% | 24.3\% | 20.2\% | 85.7\% | -5.5\% | 6.2\% |
| Taft | At Risk | 33.0 | 247 | 39,750 | 80.6\% | 15.1\% | 9.2\% | 23.3\% | 26.2\% | 66.4\% | 2.8\% | 4.4\% |

Table 11. Distressed Communities Index, 2007-2011

|  | Distress tier | $\begin{gathered} \text { DCI } \\ \text { score } \end{gathered}$ | State distress rank (920) | Population | Minority pop. | No HS | Vacant <br> Housing | Adults no work | Poverty | Med. Inc. ratio | Employ. change | Business change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Orange | Comfortable | 35.9 | 58/63 | 1,133,090 | 53.6\% | 13.1\% | 12.0\% | 25.4\% | 14.9\% | 104.0\% | -4.7\% | -5.2\% |
| County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bithlo | At Risk | 61.7 | 462 | 7,970 | 43.0\% | 11.7\% | 8.9\% | 26.4\% | 11.8\% | 132.5\% | -36.9\% | -18.5\% |
| East | Distressed | 82.5 | 234 | 25,410 | 40.6\% | 12.6\% | 13.7\% | 30.6\% | 20.9\% | 86.3\% | -25.0\% | -7.5\% |
| Orange |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hal | Distressed | 93.4 | 82 | 50,870 | 86.3\% | 24.0\% | 17.9\% | 29.2\% | 25.3\% | 75.9\% | -13.7\% | -11.7\% |
| Marston |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holden | Distressed | 80.8 | 251 | 38,000 | 81.7\% | 18.6\% | 17.3\% | 25.2\% | 21.4\% | 73.6\% | -5.3\% | -9.1\% |
| Heights |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| John | At Risk | 74.1 | 333 | 44,480 | 49.4\% | 17.6\% | 11.5\% | 25.6\% | 13.5\% | 100.1\% | -25.7\% | -11.8\% |
| Bridges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maxey | Prosperous | 6.6 | 901 | 12,750 | 25.2\% | 4.7\% | 6.6\% | 25.6\% | 7.8\% | 145.5\% | 8.3\% | 7.2\% |
| Pine Hills | At Risk | 75.3 | 322 | 45,840 | 81.0\% | 17.5\% | 9.2\% | 26.7\% | 16.2\% | 91.2\% | -16.0\% | -13.5\% |
| Taft | Distressed | 83.8 | 211 | 25,440 | 65.4\% | 22.1\% | 10.9\% | 27.3\% | 22.1\% | 81.1\% | -17.6\% | -7.8\% |

## High School Degree

- Four of the seven communities measured had rates of "no high school degree" higher than the County, with Holden Heights being the highest at twice the rate of the County. Pine Hills, Hal Marston, John Bridges, and Taft all had high rates of non-graduates.
- East Orange was lower than the County average.
- The three highest centers in lack of high school diplomas are also the areas targeted by on-site GED programs sponsored by the Division and Orange County Public Schools ("OCPS").


## Housing Vacancy

- The County has a housing vacancy rate of $8.7 \%$
- East Orange and Pine Hills are the only center areas with a housing vacancy rate below that of the county
- Holden Heights has the highest housing vacancy rate


## Adults Not Working

- One-quarter of the County's adults aged 16 and over are not working.
- With the exception of Maxey and Taft, all other centers are located in areas with higher unemployment rates.


## Median Income Ratio Relative to the State

- At 101\%, Orange County's median income mirrors that of the state. John Bridges is the only community that comes close at $94.6 \%$.
- Holden Heights has by far the lowest median income ratio at $48.6 \%$.


## Orange County Community

Action

## Change in Business Establishments

- The County experienced a 5.7\% growth in business establishments between 2010 and 2013.
- Four of the targeted neighborhoods had a slower growth.
- Pine Hills/Marston ( $-1.7 \%$ ) and Holden Heights ( $-1.7 \%$ ) had a negative growth while East Orange had zero growth.


## Analysis

- The Holden Heights neighborhood ranks first or second on each of seven indicators contained in the Distressed Community Index. Holden Heights also had the lowest employment growth and the second-lowest new business growth. At a distressed score of 91.8 , Holden Heights ranks among the most distressed communities in the nation.
- Close behind Holden Heights is the Hal Marston community center area, which has the second-highest high school drop-out rate, the highest housing vacancy rate, secondhighest poverty rate and the second-lowest income ratio in the County. The Marston area also has the lowest rate of change in business establishments.
- In summary, the County is roughly comparable to the nation as a whole on the seven indicators of the DCI. It has targeted areas for services by community centers which are spread out geographically around the County and which appear to be significantly more distressed than the County as a whole. This does not consider other distressed areas within the County that could benefit from more services as well.


## NEEDS AND SERVICES

## UNITED WAY 211 DATA

Data for the period of September 20, 2015 through September 18, 2016, was obtained from Heart of Florida United Way 211. United Way 211 operates a telephone helpline for social services needs covering the Central Florida area.

Information from 211 indicates that housing and shelter was the number-one requested service, far outstripping the other issues at $45.5 \%$ of requests. The breakdown of the housing and shelter category reveals that $25.6 \%$ of those requests were for shelters, indicating the continued seriousness of the homeless problem in Central Florida. 49.3\% of housing requests were for rental assistance for those still housed. Low-cost housing referrals were requested by $23 \%$ of callers, while home repair and maintenance made up just $1.4 \%$ of calls. Less than one percent of housing calls concerned landlord/tenant disputes and mortgage assistance. The second-most requested service from 211 was utility assistance at $18.8 \%$. This interest is certainly reflected in the popularity of the LIHEAP program operated by the Division.

After housing and utilities, percentages of requests drop off into the single digits for a number of issues such as food (7.8\%), healthcare (5.7\%), employment and income (4.8\%), mental health and addictions (4.4\%), legal services (2.5\%), clothing and household (1.9\%), and transportation (1\%). Education, disaster assistance and child care/parenting issues were less than one percent each and $5 \%$ of requests were for "other". The full report is included as Appendix VI.

## COMMUNITY INPUT

## KEY STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Key Stakeholders interviews are to be conducted with a variety of community leaders, clergy, community partners and citizens.

## Biggest Areas of Need to Reduce Poverty

Among the biggest areas of need identified were: jobs with sustainable wages and benefits, accessibility to more affordable housing, and accessible and affordable childcare. Several stakeholders and partners also emphasized a need for healthcare services, particularly mental health services; drug rehab programs; comprehensive financial literacy; soft-skills training; and functional transportation as large gaps in services to address poverty in Orange County.

Board members also acknowledged the challenges that Orange County residents have in conveniently accessing social and educational services. Stakeholders highlighted that getting out of poverty ofter requires overcoming insurmountable temporal barriers -such as transportation particularly when help is not always centralized.

Partners suggested that reducing gaps in knowledge by helping the community to better understand Community Action and other social service programs is a solution that would not require additional programming.

## What can Community Action do to improve conditions in which people live?

Key informants offered several recommendations for ways the division may directly or indirectly improve the conditions in which people live. Partners believe that the Division should:

- Coordinate more intentionally with anti-poverty partners and inter-county divisions
- Provide housing and housing support in the form of rent assistance
- Provide direct mental health services including offering programs specifically designed to improve self-esteem and self-efficacy for individuals with low-incomes
- Leverage incentives for families with low-income to complete our case management program
- Offer programs and services at times and locations more convenient to families with lowincome.
- Implement clean-up programs and education on recycling
- Work more closely with community advisory boards to hear from citizens
- Expand program eligibility requirements to include families who are above $125 \%$ of poverty as this is still not a living wage
- Conduct home visits to provide more comprehensive case management services
- Conduct more outreach activities to be better integrated into the community


## What is working well to reduce or eliminate poverty in our community?

Key informants believer that the following programs and services are working well to eliminate poverty in Orange County:

- Funding education and training through the Family Self-Sufficiency Program (FSSP)
- The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)
- The Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP)
- Offering Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) application services in the centers
- Providing Seniors First programming in the centers
- Providing First Time Homebuyers classes and housing education in the centers
- Collaborating with community partners
- Hosting school supply and food drives
- Having a Boys and Girls Club on or adjacent to Community Action centers
- General community center events and services


## What types of services should added?

Several stakeholders believer that the Division is doing a "good job" and should continue to strengthen and improve existing services. Nonetheless, and similar to last assessment period, key stakeholders believe that Community Action should focus more on affordable housing and homelessness. Additionally, partners and board members believe that the Division should create interventions for or work more on:

- Partnering to create affordable housing and providing rental assistance
- Making health services more available to the poor and underserved
- Mental health services and specific programs for suicide prevention
- Programs and services for the elderly and disabled
- Programming for youth
- Mentorship, soft-skills training, and job preparedness programs
- Hiring job placement specialists, legal aid specialists, and housing specialists
- Programs that address generational poverty


## What is the perception of how providers work together to serve low-income families?

Similar to the last assessment period, this questions generated a wide variety of responses. Several key informants believe that providers in the area are working well together to serve low-income communities, several do not, but all partners agree that there is room for growth. Key informants who did not believe that partnerships are working effectively cited limited opportunities to partner based on individual program goals. Stakeholders believe that partners are siloed based on their funding and their specific program goals, and that there is a lack of comprehensive referral services.

The vast majority of partners and board members believed that no matter how the current partnerships are working, we do not have enough partners and varied enough services to meet the current needs of families with low-incomes.

## STRATEGIC PLAN INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ANALYSIS

Borne out of the previous Community Needs Assessment process, the strategic plan and internal analysis for 2015 to 2020 and is included as an appendix. In 2020 as a result of this Community Needs Assessment process, the Community Action Division will create a new strategic plan to address the causes and consequences of poverty identified in this document.

## APPENDICES

Appendix I Community Commons Data
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Appendix III List of Community Partnerships
Appendix IV Housing and Community Development Division Needs Assessment
Appendix V Head Start Division Community Needs Assessment
Appendix VI United Way 211 data

