Association of Community Centres

Association of Community Centres

Standing Committee
Executive

Cluster
Agency

Program
Association of Community Centres (AOCCs)

Service Type
External Service Delivery

Budget ($m)	
Gross	$15.6
Net	$7.3

Rationale for Core and Service Level Assessment

The 10 Board-operated Community Centres address community-based recreation and social needs and strive to promote a sense of community and civic engagement. The AOCC's provide core organizational structure to support delivery of programs, with the City funding core administrative costs. The services in this program are largely traditional, except for:

- Volunteer Engagement and Strategic Partnership development, which are discretionary services that support the program, and,
- Administration and Management of community centres, assessed as essential for effective program delivery.

Jurisdictional Examples

Most cities operate their community centres directly.

Chicago provides this service through a City ABC, the Chicago Park District- which manages parks, recreation and event facilities, beaches, museums, lagoons, conservatories, and gardens throughout Chicago (9 public skating rinks; 534 baseball fields).

Ottawa has community centres operated by community associations under purchase of service agreements.

Key Opportunities

- The key opportunity is to look at the community centres (and arenas) city-wide to determine the relative effectiveness of community board operation, direct city operation and other approaches to determine how arenas and community centres should be governed and operated to achieve peak efficiency and community responsiveness.

© 2011 KPMG LLP, a Canadian limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International, a Swiss cooperative. All rights reserved. Printed in Canada. KPMG and the KPMG logo are registered trademarks of KPMG International, a Swiss cooperative.

Association of Community Centres

Services								
Service Name	**Gross Cost ($m)**	**Net ($m)**	**% Net**	**Core Ranking**	**Service Level**	**Source of Standard**	**City Role**	**Notes**
Community Neighborhood and Civic Engagement	2.51	1.06	42%	3	S	C/ M / F	D	
Public Space and Facility Management – Community Centre Access	2.50	1.91	76%	3	S	C/M	D	• Facilities Operations and effective utilization. • Building Repairs and Maintenance. • Welcome Service and General Information.
Community Centre Programming	5.38	1.01	19%	3	S	C/F/M	D	• Social, Recreational and Cultural -150,000 individuals participated last year. • Educational and Training - 44,130 individuals participated last year. • Supportive Counseling and Advice 20,998 individuals participated last year. • Community Supports – meals and clothes.
Community Centre Fundraising Management	1.87	1.05	56%	3	S	M	D	• 120 grants are submitted annually and they raise on average 24% of program revenue. • 3,751 individual donors contribute on average 2.14% of program revenue.
Community Centre Volunteer Engagement	0.84	0.42	50%	4	S	F / M	D	• Each AOCC is governed by a local board of management made up of volunteers.
AOCC Administration and Management	1.89	1.51	80%	2	S	C/F/M/L	D	• Financial Management, Administration, Resource Development, Reporting Compliance, Communications, Community Engagement.
Community Centre Public/Private Strategic Partnerships	0.62	0.36	58%	4	S	M / F	D	• Private partners contribute an additional $1.5m of in-kind programs and services.

© 2011 KPMG LLP, a Canadian limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International, a Swiss cooperative. All rights reserved. Printed in Canada. KPMG and the KPMG logo are registered trademarks of KPMG International, a Swiss cooperative.

Association of Community Centres

Options, Opportunities, Risks and Implications					
Type	**Options and Opportunities**	**Risks and Implications**	**Potential Savings ***	**Timeframe ****	**Barriers**
SSR	Consider examining the existing business and governance models currently in place at all community centres (internally operated and association operated). This could be done with a similar study of arenas.	A clear identification of the relative advantages of the community board model and the city operation model is needed. A series of options could be examined, including: • Converting these community centres to city-operation , OR, • Converting more city run community centres to community board operation, OR, • Creating a single City-wide Board for community centres (including Parks, Forestry & Recreation Arena's) with several Community Advisory Committees • Other models for community centre operation, such as private operation, or operation by large non-profits with purchase of service agreement. In considering these options, a number of changes to the board model could be considered, including: • Opportunities to gain economies of scale by centralizing part of the function – such as IT systems to support booking and registrations, bulk purchasing, sharing of specialized facilities skills The study would need to consider these options under a number of criteria including impact on costs (to the city and to users), responsiveness to local communities and needs. The possibility that different models may be appropriate in different circumstances should not be ruled out.	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Medium

* Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.
** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

© 2011 KPMG LLP, a Canadian limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International, a Swiss cooperative. All rights reserved. Printed in Canada. KPMG and the KPMG logo are registered trademarks of KPMG International, a Swiss cooperative.