

COMPASS II

2003 Community Asset Survey

**Surveys of Service Organizations and Businesses
Marquette and Alger Counties**

August 18, 2003

**Huron Mountain Research Services, LLC
121 East White Bear Drive
Negaunee, MI 49866-9678
Voice: 906 475 7572
Fax: 561 828 5895
jsilver@huronmountainresearch.com
<http://www.huronmountainresearch.com>**

INTRODUCTION

COMPASS II A Community-Building Initiative

COMPASS II is a community-building initiative to engage community stakeholders in sustained, collaborative, strategic efforts to strengthen and improve conditions in the community. This initiative is lead by the United Way of Marquette County (UWMC) on behalf of the Alger-Marquette Human Services Coordinating Body (AMHSCB) and the residents of Alger and Marquette Counties. This community-building initiative begins with an assets-based comprehensive community needs assessment, and the goal is the development and pursuit of a community-generated impact plan, including goals, objectives and measures.

COMPASS II goes beyond the original COMPASS, a needs assessment developed by United Way of America in 1988. The United Way of America modified, field-tested and validated this updated version, expanding it to a community-building guide. The last community needs assessment was completed in 1994-95 in an effort lead by the AMHSCB. That assessment focused primarily on the health and human service needs of Marquette and Alger Counties. Human service organizations continue to utilize the information from the 1994-95 assessment to procure funding, plan and initiate programs, and allocate funding to identified priority areas. Recently, area human service organizations' fund-seeking efforts have been hampered by the lack of current critical data. In addition, a significant number of events have occurred, nationally and locally since 1995, including the loss of all funding to the AMHSCB. Therefore, the UWMC assumed the leadership role and is actively sought sponsorship funds to cover the cost to implement this comprehensive community-building initiative.

As with the original COMPASS in 1995, this report describes the process and the partnership sponsoring this survey, relates when possible how this information will be used to develop solutions to the problems identified, and provides certain data and outcomes of surveys. This report exists mainly as a summary of the most pressing community needs according to assessment findings. The report format is designed specifically to replicate the format of its predecessor to facilitate ease in use. As the use of the 1995 COMPASS results continues to the present, comparisons between results of 1995 and 2003 are included herein. This report does not include all information gathered and analyzed in assessing our communities needs. Additional information appears in the attached appendices and through contacts mentioned later in this document. This document is available on the United Way of Marquette County website, www.unitedway@uwmqt.org and at local libraries.

SPONSORS

United Way of Marquette County gratefully acknowledges the following sponsors for their financial support of the 2003 COMPASS II (listed alphabetically):

- Alger Marquette Community Action Board
- Alger Marquette Human Services Coordinating Body
- Frazier Fund
- Lutheran Social Services
- Marquette Community Foundation
- Marquette County Health Department
- Marquette Alger Youth Foundation
- Medical Care Access Coalition
- Reynolds Foundation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A Community Stakeholder Advisory Group guided this assessment effort. Its members offered valuable insights and advice. Stakeholder segments and their representatives are:

Stakeholder Segment	Representative
Business/Economic Development	Sandy Spoelstra
Community Action	Earl Hawn
Disability Community	Carol Barbacovi-Muscoe
Disadvantaged	Robyn Loviska
Domestic Violence	Jane Richards
Education	June Schaefer
Elderly	Jackie Boxer
Faith Based Organizations	Nancy Amacher
Health	George Sedlacek
Hospitals	Karen MacLachlan
Law Enforcement	Tony Benaglio
Local Government	Rochelle Cotey
Local Government	Sandy Gayk
Mental Health	Doug Morton
Tribes	Leslie Young
Workforce Development	Deb Doyle
Youth	Judy Watson Olson
United Way of Marquette County	Jackie Thomas

Executive Summary

Four questionnaires were distributed to business and associations as part of the Compass II Community Assessment of United Way of America, administered by the United Way of Marquette County on behalf of the Alger– Marquette Human Services Coordinating Body. These questionnaires were distributed starting in early June. As of August 11, 2003, the following total questionnaires were submitted by respondents:

	Returned	Sent
Business Survey 2003	35	1,566
Public/Private Service Provider Survey 2003	47	202
Service Clubs/Associations 2003	2	76
Labor Survey 2003	1	33

Only a minority in each category returned completed surveys. The findings of the analysis of the 35 completed questionnaires of the Business Survey 2003 are that the respondents represent a large variety of organizations, including manufacturers, a university, consultants, a public transport system, and one, nonprofit, service provider. These 35 represent a total of 5,372 employees, with an average of 153 employees, ranging from 671 employees to zero employees. These 35 also contributed a sum of \$381,826 in charitable contributions during 2002, with a mean of \$15,909 and a range among the companies from \$275,000 to \$0.

Twenty-one of 23 responding companies indicated that they contributed to the United Way in 2002, including all of the manufacturers, consultants, and media. However, only 17 of the 35 indicated that they had conducted a workplace campaign in 2002.

An average of 43 hours per person were volunteered among the business survey respondents, and 23 of 32 responding companies indicate that they allow time off for volunteer work.

Finally, business survey respondents indicated that they already participate in 10 of the 16 initiatives listed in the questionnaire. The most frequently picked initiatives are “Planning for Community Renewal,” “Beautifying Community Spaces,” and “Promoting Arts & Culture.” Only eight respondents indicated that they would like to participate in an initiative. The more frequently chosen of these are “Planning for Community Renewal” and “Building Neighborhood Trust.”

With respect to the Public/Private Service Provider Survey 2003, a plurality of respondents, 20%, is private, nonprofit corporations. Another 15% are local governments or their agencies. Finally, 11% are faith-based organizations, including one religious broadcaster. A plurality, approaching 50%, designate a large area, “Region,” or the entire UP, as their area of service.

By mission statement, 31 are social service provider organizations, six are churches, or religious broadcasters, six are local governments, or agencies thereof, and four are other. The average number of paid employees of all respondents is 33.6 persons, but local governments weight this figure. The average number of employees for social service providers is 18, with a range from 220 to zero. The average number of employees of church organizations is 2.5, with a range from 4 to zero. And the average number of employees of local governments is 132.2 persons, with a range from 238 to 37.

A majority, 25 of the 47, indicate that their organization provides meeting space to community groups. Only 15 make materials and equipment available to these groups. Slightly more, 20, make employees with specific skills available to help these groups. Almost all, 43 of the 47, purchase their goods and services locally, and 19 organizations indicate that they reach out and hire people who are transiting from welfare to work.

With respect to the sources of funding of social service organizations, the vast majority of dollars derive from the Federal or State Governments, 73.2%. Individual organizational fund raising renders 8.5% of their average income. The United Way accounts for less than one per cent of social service organizational income.

Just over one-third, 33.5%, of the persons served by social service providers are adolescent youth, 13-19 years. Adults and young children account for 16% each. Thirty two percent are categorized as "Other." By type of service, the largest average number of persons served is for "Economic development," with an average of 10,503 persons served. The next two largest types of service, in terms of numbers served, are "Physical health services," with an average of 1,666 persons served, and "Youth development," with an average of 1,189 persons served.

Finally, with respect to initiatives organizations are currently participating in, the most frequently elected initiative is "Fostering Community Networks." The next three are "Connecting Neighbors," "Improving Access to Transportation," and "Beautifying Community Spaces." Only 10 respondents indicated which initiatives they would like to participate in. Three were selected by two respondents each. These are "Improving Access to Transportation," "Building Neighborhood Trust," and "Planning Community Renewal."

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	Page 4
List of Tables	Page 7
Introduction	Page 8
Business Survey 2003	Page 8
Summary of Business Survey	Page 15
Public/Private Service Provider Survey 2003	Page 15
Summary of Service Provider Survey	Page 28
Service Clubs/Associations Survey	Page 29
Labor Survey	Page 29
Summary and Conclusion	Page 30
Summary	Page 30
Conclusion	Page 32

List of Tables

Table 1	Commercial Focus of Respondents	Page 9
Table 2	Number of Employees by Commercial Focus	Page 10
Table 3	Charitable Contributions by Businesses	Page 10
Table 4	Whether Contributed to the United Way by Commercial Focus	Page 11
Table 5	Whether Workplace Campaign was Conducted by Commercial Focus	Page 12
Table 6	Average Volunteer hrs in 2002 by Commercial Focus	Page 13
Table 7	Whether Company Allows Volunteer Time by Commercial Focus	Page 13
Table 8	Initiatives Companies are Currently Involved in	Page 14
Table 9	Initiatives Companies Would Like to Participate In	Page 15
Table 10	Class of Organization	Page 16
Table 11	Largest Area Served	Page 17
Table 12	Mission Type	Page 17
Table 13	Employees by Type of Organization	Page 19
Table 14	Whether Meeting Space is Provided to Community Groups	Page 20
Table 15	Whether Equipment & Materials are Made Available	Page 21
Table 16	Whether Employees with Specific Skills are Made Available to Community Groups	Page 21
Table 17	Whether Goods and Services are Purchased Locally	Page 22
Table 18	Whether Organization Reaches Out to Hire TANF People	Page 23
Table 19	Organizational Income by Source – Social Organizations only	Page 23
Table 20	Program Participants – Social Organizations only	Page 24
Table 21	Numbers Served by Type of Service	Page 24
Table 22	Currently Participating in an Initiative	Page 27
Table 23	Would Like to Participate in Initiative	Page 28

Introduction

This is a report of two surveys conducted in the Spring and Summer of 2003 by the United Way of Marquette County, of businesses and service organizations in Marquette and Alger Counties. These surveys were conducted as part of the Compass II Community Assessment that is administered by the United Way of Marquette County on behalf of the Alger – Marquette Human Services Coordinating Body. Four separate questionnaires were distributed. These are:

- Business Survey 2003
- Public/Private Service Provider Survey 2003
- Service Clubs/Associations 2003
- Labor Survey 2003

By August 11, 2003, the following totals of returned questionnaires were received:

	Returned	Sent
Business Survey 2003	35	1,566
Public/Private Service Provider Survey 2003	47	202
Service Clubs/Associations 2003	2	76
Labor Survey 2003	1	33

Analysis was conducted of the returned questionnaires of the Business Survey and the Public/Private Service Provider Survey only. The findings of the Business Survey will be reported first, followed by the findings of the Public/Private Service Provider Survey. The Service Clubs and Labor Surveys will be discussed after. A copy of each questionnaire is appended.

Business Survey 2003

The businesses which responded ranged from manufacturing firms to nonprofit service providers. The distribution of the ‘Commercial Focus,’ the object of the first question, is displayed in Table 1. Note that, of the 35 respondents, three are manufacturing firms, three are social service organizations, four are educational institutions, and five are financial consultants. This constitutes a great variety, which precludes most generalizations. Of course, averages can be presented by type of commercial focus, but the numbers in each category are small. But since the commercial focus categories also provide meaning to such data a number of employees, the amount of charitable contributions, and whether respondent conducted a workplace campaign, most of the data will be presented by commercial focus category.

Table 1

Commercial Focus of Respondents		
Focus	Count	Percent
Manufacturing	3	8.6
Consultant	2	5.7
Social Services	3	8.6
Legal Services	1	2.9
Marketing	3	8.6
Media	3	8.6
Recreation	1	2.9
Education	4	11.4
Medical Services	4	11.4
Financial Services	5	14.3
Youth Services	2	5.7
Business Services	4	11.4
Total	35	100.0

Table 2, on the following page, displays the number of employees by commercial focus. It provides the mean number of employees, as well as the maximum and minimum in each category. Thus, of the four educational respondents, the average number of employees is 570.75, and the number of employees among them ranges from a low of 13 to a high of 950. Recreation is one respondent, but evidently has no employees.

Table 2**Number of Employees by Commercial Focus**

Commercial focus	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Manufacturing	51.00	25	78
Consultant	5.00	2	8
Social Services	14.33	7	22
Legal Services	2.00	2	2
Marketing	6.17	4	9
Media	29.67	6	74
Recreation	.00	0	0
Education	570.75	13	950
Medical Services	671.25	20	2,393
Financial Services	10.20	2	24
Youth Services	6.00	5	7
Business Services	6.25	1	20

Table 3 displays the average and range of charitable contributions made by business respondents in 2002, by commercial focus.

Table 3**Charitable Contributions by Businesses**

Commercial Focus	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Manufacturing	\$2,406.00	\$2,000	\$2,812
Consultant	\$2,775.00	\$550	\$5,000
Social Services	\$1,000.00	\$0	\$2,000
Legal Services	\$1,000.00	\$1,000	\$1,000
Marketing	\$6,333.33	\$4,000	\$10,000
Media	\$26,000.00	\$2,000	\$50,000
Recreation	\$200.00	\$200	\$200
Education	\$7,228.00	\$0	\$14,456
Medical Services	\$138,250.00	\$1,500	\$275,000
Financial Services	\$1,400.00	\$100	\$4,000
Youth Services	\$500.00	\$500	\$500
Business Services	\$536.00	\$0	\$1,500

Table 4 presents the responses to Question 4, whether respondent contributed to the United Way in 2002. Of the 33 responding, 21 had contributed to the United Way, and 12 had not. All of the manufacturers, the consultants, and the media had contributed.

Table 4

**Whether Contributed to the United Way by
Commercial Focus**

Commercial Focus	Contribute to UW?		Total
	Yes	No	
Manufacturing	3	0	3
Consultant	2	0	2
Social Services	2	1	3
Legal Services	1	0	1
Marketing	1	2	3
Media	3	0	3
Recreation	0	1	1
Education	3	1	4
Medical Services	1	2	3
Financial Services	3	2	5
Youth Services	1	1	2
Business Services	1	2	3
Total	21	12	33

Table 5 presents the responses to Question 5, whether a workplace campaign was conducted.

All 35 responded to this question. All three manufacturers reported to have conducted a workplace campaign.

Table 5**Whether Workplace Campaign was Conducted by
Commercial Focus**

Commercial focus	Workplace Campaign?		Total
	Yes	No	
Manufacturing	3	0	3
Consultant	2	0	2
Social Services	2	1	3
Legal Services	0	1	1
Marketing	0	3	3
Media	1	2	3
Recreation	0	1	1
Education	3	1	4
Medical Services	2	2	4
Financial Services	1	4	5
Youth Services	1	1	2
Business Services	2	2	4
Total	17	18	35

Table 6 presents the average, as well as the maximum and minimum, number of volunteer hours contributed by commercial focus. Note that volunteer hours vary greatly among respondents. Thus, among the manufacturers, there is a mean of 386, and a maximum of 1,000 and a minimum of eight. In education, there is a mean of 4,500, a maximum of 9,000 and a minimum of zero. And among the media, the range is 200 to 5,000. To overcome this extreme variation, volunteer hours were standardized by number of employees. With outliers removed, the average number of volunteer hours by employee is 42.8.

Table 6

Average Volunteer hrs in 2002 by Commercial Focus

Commercial focus	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Manufacturing	386.0	8.0	1,000.0
Consultant	300.0	100.0	500.0
Social Services	400.0	300.0	500.0
Legal Services	500.0	500.0	500.0
Marketing	163.0	125.0	201.0
Media	2,600.0	200.0	5,000.0
Recreation	8.0	8.0	8.0
Education	4,500.0	.0	9,000.0
Medical Services	501.0	501.0	501.0
Financial Services	924.0	10.0	3,600.0
Youth Services	300.0	300.0	300.0
Business Services	156.8	.0	501.0
Total	909.2	.0	9,000.0

Table 7 displays whether the responding company allows employees to take volunteer time.

Table 7

Whether Company Allows Volunteer Time by Commercial Focus

Commercial Focus	Co. allow vol time?		Total
	Yes	No	
Manufacturing	2	0	2
Consultant	2	0	2
Social Services	3	0	3
Legal Services	1	0	1
Marketing	1	2	3
Media	2	1	3
Recreation	0	1	1
Education	1	2	3
Medical Services	2	2	4
Financial Services	4	0	4
Youth Services	1	1	2
Business Services	4	0	4
Total	23	9	32

Table 8 displays the initiatives with which companies indicated that they were participating. Of the 16 initiatives listed in the questionnaire, the 31 companies that responded to this item, indicated a total of 10 initiatives.

Table 8

Initiatives Companies are Currently Involved in		
Initiative Currently Involved in	Count	Percent
Currently Increasing Access to Jobs	1	2.9
Currently Promoting Comm Revitalization	1	2.9
Currently Expanding Business	2	5.7
Currently Promoting Youth Development	2	5.7
Currently Increasing Rec Opportunities	3	8.6
Currently Promoting Arts & Culture	4	11.4
Currently Building Neighborhood Trust	3	8.6
Currently Improving Access to Transportation	2	5.7
Currently Beautifying Community Spaces	6	17.1
Currently Planning Community Renewal	7	20.0
Total	31	88.6
System Missing	4	11.4
Total	35	100.0

The most popular initiative, participating in by 20% of all respondents, is “Planning Community Renewal.” The next two initiatives are “Beautifying Community Spaces” and “Promoting Arts & Culture.”

Table 9 displays the responses to the “B” column of Question 8, indicating that respondent would like to participate in the indicated initiative. Only six initiatives were selected by the eight companies which responded to this part of Question 8. Only two of the six received more than one selection. These are “Planning Community Renewal” and “Building Neighborhood Trust.”

Table 9**Initiatives Companies Would Like to Participate In**

Initiative Company Would Like to Participate in	Count	Percent
Would Like to Foster Entrepreneurship	1	2.9
Would Like to Promote Good Health	1	2.9
Would Like to Increase Rec Opps	1	2.9
Would Like to Promote Arts & Culture	1	2.9
Would Like to Build Neighborhood Trust	2	5.7
Would Like to Plan Community Renewal	2	5.7
Total	8	22.9
System Missing	27	77.1
Total	35	100.0

Summary of Business Survey

In summary, there was a total of 35 Business Survey 2003 questionnaires returned by August 11, 2003, representing a large variety of organizations. These companies had an average number of employees of 153, with a range from 671 employees to zero employees. Charitable contributions in 2002 averaged \$15,909, with a range from \$275,000 to \$0.

Twenty-one of 23 responding companies indicated that they contributed to the United Way in 2002, including all of the manufacturers, consultants, and media. However, only 17 of the 35 indicated that they had conducted a workplace campaign in 2002.

An average of 43 hours per person was volunteered among the business survey respondents, and 23 of 32 responding companies indicate that they allow time off for volunteer work.

Finally, business survey respondents indicated that they already participate in 10 of the 16 initiatives listed in the questionnaire. The most frequently picked initiatives are "Planning for Community Renewal," "Beautifying Community Spaces," and "Promoting Arts & Culture." Only eight respondents indicated that they would like to participate in an initiative. The more frequently chosen of these are "Planning for Community Renewal" and "Building Neighborhood Trust."

Public/Private Service Provider Survey 2003

All but one of the 47 responding organizations indicated, in the first question of their questionnaire, what type of constitution their organization had. The distribution is displayed in

Table 10 below. Two thirds of respondents indicated they were private, nonprofit corporations. Another 15% (7) indicated that they were local governments, or their agencies. And five indicated that they were faith-based organizations, including one religious broadcaster.

Table 10

Class of Organization		
Designated Type	Count	Percent
A private, nonprofit, corporation	31	66.0
A private, for profit, corporation	2	4.3
City Government	3	6.4
County Government	4	8.5
Faith based/Congregational organization	5	10.6
Other	1	2.1
Total	46	97.9
System Missing	1	2.1
Total	47	100.0

Table 11 displays the largest area each organization serves. The local governments, of course are bound by their jurisdiction, which accounts for three of the four “City” selections, and four of the 14 “County” selections. Accounting for those, note that the tendency is for associations to serve a larger area. Thirteen selected “Region,” as compared to 11 for the non-local government selections of “County.” Further, among the nine “Others,” were written expansions indicating that the service area is the entire UP, or the entire State of Michigan.

Table 11**Largest Area Served**

Service Area	Count	Percent
Region	13	27.7
County	15	31.9
City	4	8.5
Township	2	4.3
Other	9	19.1
Total	43	91.5
System Missing	4	8.5
Total	47	100.0

Table 12, following, resolves the written mission statements of respondents into 12 categories. These categories will now be explained. First, “Emergency Service,” represents

Table 12**Mission Type**

Mission Category	Count	Percent
Emergency Service	2	4.3
Children & Families	4	8.5
Youth	4	8.5
Disability Service	6	12.8
Social Service	6	12.8
Gerontological Service	1	2.1
Housing	1	2.1
Religion, Practice	6	12.8
Medical/Health Service	6	12.8
Local Government	6	12.8
Physical Fitness	1	2.1
Other	4	8.5
Total	47	100.0

organizations which plan and provide for societal or regional emergencies, or family emergencies. In the instant case, included in this category is the Red Cross, and the Marquette Coalition for Emergency Service, which supplies funds or resources for families in danger of losing their home, heat, or running out of food.

Category 2, “Children and Families,” includes organizations which target families for service, along with their children. This includes the Michigan National Guard Family Fund, Teaching Family Homes, the Children’s Museum, and the Association for Little Friends. “Youth” refers to organizations which focus on pre- and young adolescents. These include the Girl and Boy Scouts and the Marquette Alger Young Authors. “Disability Service” refers to organizations dedicated to serving individuals with a medical or physical disability. Groups included in this category are the United Cerebral Palsy Association and Marquette Senior Day Care Center.

“Social Service” is a category which includes organizations which provide a wide array of social work services. This category includes Catholic Social Services, Pathways, and the Women’s Center. “Gerontological Services” includes only Marquette Senior Services, and “Housing” includes only Habitat for Humanity. “Religion, Practice” includes organizations dedicated to the practice of religion. This category includes Trinity Lutheran Church, the Apostolic Lutheran Church, Youth for Christ, Messiah Lutheran Church, and Gospel Opportunities.

“Medical/Health Service” refers to organizations dedicated to serving persons in need of medical attention, and educating the public about how to avoid specific conditions or diseases. Included here are Marquette General Health System Volunteers, Pregnancy Services, March of Dimes, the Spina Befida Association, and the Medical Care Access Coalition. “Local Government” is fairly self-evident, and includes the City of Ishpeming, the City of Marquette, Alger County, and Marquette County. “Physical Fitness” refers only to the YMCA of Marquette County, and “Other” includes association which fit nowhere else. These are four, and are the Marquette County Genealogical Society, the Marquette Beautification and Restoration Committee, Inc., the Council on Crime and Delinquency, and Associated Family Care, which, despite its name, is a consultancy which advises nonprofits on their operations and structure.

To interpret organizational income, employment, volunteers, and service populations, it is necessary to consolidate these mission categories further. This is especially advised given that there are only 47 cases to work with. Thus, these 15 categories have been further consolidated into three categories, as follows:

- Social Organization
 - Emergency Service
 - Children & Families
 - Youth

- Disability Service
- Social Service
- Gerontological Service
- Housing
- Medical/Health Service
- Physical Fitness
- Practicing Religion
 - Religion Practice
- Local Government
 - Local Government

In this taxonomy the “Other” associations are left out of the analysis. Thirty two organizations are in the Social Organization category; six are in the Practicing Religion category, and five are in the Local Government category.

Table 13, using the consolidated categories, displays organizational employees and volunteers by type of organization.

Table 13

		Employees by Type of Organization		
Type of Organization		Full-Time Employees	Part-Time Employees	Volunteers
Social Organization	Mean	18.04	17.56	167.61
	Sum	469	474	4,693
	Maximum	220	150	1000
	Minimum	0	0	0
Practicing Religion	Mean	2.50	4.83	68.00
	Sum	15	29	408
	Maximum	4	10	150
	Minimum	0	0	0
Local Government	Mean	132.17	60.00	47.25
	Sum	793	360	189
	Maximum	238	114	150
	Minimum	37	10	0
Total	Mean	33.61	22.13	139.21
	Sum	1,277	863	5,290
	Maximum	238	150	1000
	Minimum	0	0	0

Table 13 demonstrates the distinctiveness of the three consolidated categories. Comparing full-time employees shows that social organizations average 18 employees, while local governments average 132 full-time employees; faith based organizations average only 2.5 full-time employees. Volunteers show the opposite pattern. Social organizations average 168 volunteers to local government's 47. Faith-based organizations average 68 volunteers.

With respect to whether service provider organizations provide space for community groups to meet, it can be seen in Table 14 that Social Organizations are split, half do, and half do not, but Churches mostly do provide space, and Local Governments all provide space for groups.

Table 14

Whether Meeting Space is Provided to Community Groups

Type of Organization		Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Social Organization	Count	14	15	1	30
	% within Social Organization	46.7%	50.0%	3.3%	100.0%
Church	Count	4	1	1	6
	% within Church	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
Local Government	Count	6	0	0	6
	% within Local Government	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	24	16	2	42
	% within Type of Organization	57.1%	38.1%	4.8%	100.0%

With respect to the provision of equipment and materials to community groups, it can be seen in Table 15 that two-thirds of service provider groups do not provide such things, although Local Governments may be more inclined to do so. Of course the provision of equipment and materials represents costs to service provider organizations, which do not earn money themselves, but depend on the contributions of others. As Local Governments have a mandate to serve their constituents, and representatives of those constituents to disperse tax derived funds, there may be a duty to provide certain equipment and materials for certain purposes. Social Organizations and Churches have no such mandate, nor do they have the authority to collect taxes. This would make them pecuniarily cautious, and would explain their greater disinclination to provide equipment and materials to community groups.

Table 15

		Whether Equipment & Materials are Made Available		
Type of Organization		Yes	No	Total
Social Organization	Count	9	21	30
	% within Social Organization	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
Church	Count	2	4	6
	% within Church	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Local Government	Count	3	3	6
	% within Local Government	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	14	28	42
	% within Type of Organization	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Table 16 presents the responses to Question 7, which reads:

Are employees with specific skills made available to help community groups, for example, a health expert who helps a community-based group assemble health information for a neighborhood newsletter?

Table 16

		Whether Employees with Specific Skills are Made Available to Community Groups			
Type of Organization		Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Social Organization	Count	11	14	5	30
	% within Social Organization	36.7%	46.7%	16.7%	100.0%
Church	Count	3	2	1	6
	% within Church	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Local Government	Count	4	2	0	6
	% within Local Government	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	18	18	6	42
	% within Type of Organization	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	100.0%

As may be seen in Table 16, the provision of such skills is split evenly between all service provider organizations. Local Governments and Churches are more inclined to make such employees available, Social Organizations are less inclined.

Table 17 provides the responses to Question 8, which reads:

Does your organization reach out to purchase goods and services from locally owned enterprises in your area?

The overwhelming majority of all service provider organizations agreed that they reach out and purchase goods and services from locally owned enterprises. Three respondents indicated that they did not, and one was not sure. But the question is worded such as to provide confusion to all of these responses. It asks about purchases from “locally owned enterprises.” While there are some locally owned stores and offices which provide goods and services to local organizations, most of the distribution of goods locally is done so by large retail outlets owned by corporations located elsewhere. Were the three who answered “No” and the one who answered “Not sure” aware of this? It remains that while the impulse is clear, that local service provider organizations want to support local enterprises, many of which may provide them with support, that whether it is accurate that more than 90% only purchase goods from “locally owned enterprises” remains unclear.

Table 17

Whether Goods and Services are Purchased Locally

Type of Organization		Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Social Organization	Count	28	2	1	31
	% within Social Organization	90.3%	6.5%	3.2%	100.0%
Church	Count	5	1	0	6
	% within Church	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
Local Government	Count	6	0	0	6
	% within Local Government	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	39	3	1	43
	% within Type of Organization	90.7%	7.0%	2.3%	100.0%

Table 18 displays the responses to Question 9, which asks whether respondent’s organization reaches out to hire people who are trying to transition from welfare to work. The plurality indicates that it does not, but it should be recalled that Local Governments are restricted

by civil service rules, and Churches hire very few people at all. A majority of Social Organizations indicates that they do attempt to reach out to TANF persons.

Table 18

Whether Organization Reaches Out to Hire TANF People

Type of Organization		Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Social Organization	Count	14	12	4	30
	% within Social Organization	46.7%	40.0%	13.3%	100.0%
Church	Count	0	5	1	6
	% within Church	.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Local Government	Count	2	4	0	6
	% within Local Government	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	16	21	5	42
	% within Type of Organization	38.1%	50.0%	11.9%	100.0%

Table 19 provides the responses to Question 12, which asks for estimates of income received for last year's budget. These data reflect only the funding of Social Organizations. And it must be understood that some of these organizations operate Upper Peninsula wide, or statewide, and reflect, in their budgets, funds donated state- of UP wide, and funds received from United Way organizations outside of Marquette County. Nevertheless, a distinct pattern is revealed. First, social organizations have been overwhelmingly dependent on Federal and State funding. Second, that only a very small proportion of their overall funding comes from the United Way.

Table 19

Organizational Income by Source – Social Organizations only

Fund Source	Respondents*	Sum	Percent
Received from UW	23	\$506,861	1.0
Received from Fed/State	22	\$37,942,656	73.2
Received from Local Govt	17	\$1,167,305	2.3
Own fund raising	22	\$4,386,472	8.5
Fees	23	\$2,690,218	5.2
Other	13	\$5,157,744	9.9
TOTAL DOLLARS		\$ 51,851,256	100.1

* The sum of the respondents is not additive, as each was permitted to make entry in more than one fund category. The percent indicated in the rightmost column is based solely on the sum of the dollars.

Table 20**Program Participants – Social Organizations only**

	Respondents*	Sum	Percent
Children younger than 13	24	43,654	16.0
Youth 13 - 19	23	91,265	33.5
Adults	27	43,819	16.1
Elders	18	6,425	2.4
Others	5	87,249	32.0
TOTAL PARTICIPANTS		272,412	100.0

* The sum of the respondents is not additive, as each was permitted to make entry in more than one participant category. The percent indicated in the rightmost column is based solely on the sum of the participants.

Table 20 indicates the types of persons served by Social Organizations. The plurality of participants served is adolescent youth. The smallest group of participants is Elders. A large percentage of participants are grouped under Others. If they are not young children, youth, adults, or elders, it is not immediately apparent who these Others are. Presumably these are persons otherwise taxonomically grouped, such as disabled or homeless persons of whatever age.

Table 21 displays the responses to Question 15, which asks for an estimate of the total number of persons using the services offered by respondent's organization, and indicated under the column titled "Type of Service."

Table 21**Numbers Served by Type of Service**

Type of Service	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean
Q15A1 N served Financial Assist	21	1	1,500	4,783	227.76
Q15B1 Fam Eco self reliance	5	23	1,511	2,026	405.20
Q15C1 Eco Dev	2	6	21,000	21,006	10,503.00
Q15D1 Neighborhood revitalization	1	200	200	200	200.00
Q15E1 Housing lower income	11	10	190	712	64.73
Q15F1 Employment opp	4	75	200	555	138.75
Q15H1 Child Care	5	17	300	544	108.80

Table 21**Numbers Served by Type of Service**

Type of Service	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean
Q15I1 Recreation	12	30	6,000	10,785	898.75
Q15J1 Arts & Culture	8	20	4,250	8,163	1,020.37
Q15K1 Education	17	5	5,000	16,343	961.35
Q15L1 Phys Health Service	9	15	10,000	14,992	1,665.78
Q15M1 Home Health Care	1	18	18	18	18.00
Q15N1 Homemaker service	4	10	180	238	59.50
Q15O1 Home delivered meals	2	25	1,341	1,366	683.00
Q15P1 Nutrition counseling	5	18	2,740	4,368	873.60
Q15Q1 Respite, Phys disability	2	7	18	25	12.50
Q15R1 Adult day care	2	17	18	35	17.50
Q15S1 Homeless youth	3	25	300	564	188.00
Q15T1 Youth development	14	40	5,000	16,648	1,189.14
Q15U1 Family strengthening	15	6	3,300	12,251	816.73
Q15V1 Family planning	5	15	1,100	1,626	325.20
Q15W1 Counseling (Mental health)	11	6	3,300	6,752	613.82
Q15X1 N served Respite	4	4	50	107	26.75
Q15Y1 N served Adult day care	2	4	50	54	27.00
Q15Z1 N served Subst Abuse	5	3	3,000	5,021	1,004.20
Q15A2 N served Household Violence	6	9	3,000	3,979	663.17
Q15B2 N served Delinquency Prevent	7	15	3,000	3,635	519.29
Q15C2 N served Crime Prevent	4	15	3,000	3,315	828.75
Q15D2 N served Legal Services	1	7	7	7	7.00
Q15E2 N served Transportation	10	2	180	481	48.10
Q15F2 N served Information & referral	19	17	10,000	20,611	1,084.79
Q15G2 N served community organizing	4	4	75	104	26.00
Q15H2 N served Planning & Coordinating	7	5	200	586	83.71

Because this is a disparate collection of social organizations, varying greatly in size and number of persons served, the most meaningful data to compare groups are the mean numbers in the rightmost column. Of this collection of means, the five greatest means would indicate the five most emphasized services. As the numbers were drawn from different service area, they cannot be interpreted with direct pertinence to Marquette and Alger Counties. Rather, as these are number

cited by social service organizations functioning in this area, the mean numbers indicate relative salience of the areas to which they correspond. Understanding this, the five greatest means are:

	<u>Type of Service</u>	<u>Mean Number of Persons Served</u>
1.	Economic Development	10,503.00
2.	Physical Health Service	1,665.78
3.	Youth Development	1,189.14
4.	Information & Referral	1,084.79
5.	Substance Abuse Services	1,004.20

Except for Information & Referral, the remaining four service types correspond closely with the issues identified by the Marquette and Alger adult communities in the Compass II Community Survey, as well as the issues identified by the key informants of both counties. The first ranking service indicated is Economic Development, which, in terms of the activities of social service provider organizations is not clear. Specific service meaning also cannot be given to Information & Referral. That leaves three with clear service meanings.

Physical Health Service refers to, on the one hand, medical access for people defined by their lack of resources, to, on the other hand, services for infirm elderly, or for people with a physical disability.

Youth Development refers to after school and summer programs for adolescents, as well as to the Girl and Boy Scouts, and the YMCA, among other youth serving activities. And Substance Abuse Services include information programs, as well as recovery and detoxification programs. Again, these are the types of programs referenced by the community and key informants.

Question 10 of the Service Provider questionnaire asked respondents to indicate, for each “community initiatives or projects related to health and human services or community and economic development” listed, to indicate A) if respondent’s association is currently leading or participating in it, or B) whether respondent would like her or his association to become a leader for participant in it. Table 22, below, reports on A just above. Forty-four of the 47 respondents responded to this item. Within the list provided, the plurality chose “Fostering Community Networks.” The second through fourth ranks were occupied by the three way tie, of six choices each, for

- Connecting Neighbors
- Beautifying Community Spaces
- Improving Access to Transportation.

Table 22**Currently Participating in an Initiative**

Current Engagement	Count	Percent
Currently Promoting Educational Reform	1	2.1
Currently Promoting Good Health	1	2.1
Currently Increasing Neighborhood Safety	2	4.3
Currently Promoting Volunteering	1	2.1
Currently Fostering Community Networks	9	19.1
Currently Connecting Neighbors	6	12.8
Currently Building Neighborhood Trust	1	2.1
Currently Improving Access to Transportation	6	12.8
Currently Beautifying Community Spaces	6	12.8
Currently Planning Community Renewal	4	8.5
Currently Other	7	14.9
Total	44	93.6
System Missing	3	6.4
Total	47	100.0

Table 23 displays the responses to part B of Question 10. Of the 47 respondents, only 10 responded to this item. Three items got two choices each; all the others were chosen by only one association. These three with two choices each are:

- Building Neighborhood Trust
- Improving Access to Transportation
- Designing a Plan for Community Renewal

Table 23**Would Like to Participate in Initiative**

	Count	Percent
Would Like to Promoting Educational Reform	1	2.1
Would Like to Promote Arts & Culture	1	2.1
Would Like to Foster Community Networks	1	2.1
Would Like to Connect Neighbors	1	2.1
Would Like to Build Neighborhood Trust	2	4.3
Would Like to Improve Access to Transportation	2	4.3
Would Like to Plan Community Renewal	2	4.3
Total	10	21.3
System Missing	37	78.7
Total	47	100.0

Summary of Service Provider Survey

A total of 47 Public/Private Service provider Survey questionnaires was completed. Forty-six self designated themselves, with 33 designating themselves as corporations, all but two of which are nonprofit. Three indicated that they represented city governments, and four represented county governments. Five indicated that they represented a faith based or congregational organization. These 47 were then classed in three categories:

- ▶ Social Organizations, with 35 respondents,
- ▶ Practicing Religion, with 5 respondents, and
- ▶ Local Government, with 7 respondents.

Social Organizations are less inclined to provide meeting space to community groups than are church organizations or local governments, and Social Organizations are more inclined to hire TANF people than are the other two groups.

With respect to Social Organizations only, almost three-quarters of their funding comes from state or federal sources. The United Way provides only 1% of their total funding. With respect to participants served, one-third are youth. Just under one-third are Others.

Classifying participants by the type of service provided, the largest average number of participants, for all respondent groups, is for Economic Development. The next highest average

number is for Physical Health Service, and the third is for Youth Development. Substance abuse services ranked fifth.

Service Clubs/Associations Survey

Only two completed questionnaires were returned to the United Way of Marquette County. Both were from Marquette County.

The Negaunee Irontown Association has its mission:

To preserve the heritage of Negaunee and to encourage graduates, friends, and former residents to return to Negaunee to participate in a continuing relationship with the community and to encourage their support of the Negaunee Historical Museum.

It indicates that it currently participates in Promoting volunteering and Fostering community networks. And it further describes its involvement in the community as:

We organize and promote two annual events: Pioneer Days in July and the Heikki Lunta Winterfest in January. We also award at least one scholarship to a graduating NHS student yearly.

The Economic Club of Marquette County has its mission:

To provide our members a social network setting in which we create awareness and education of economic issues to the business community through programs of local, regional, and international interest.

It indicates that it currently participates in Promoting economic development, Promoting commercial revitalization, and Promoting youth development.

Labor Survey

Only one completed Labor Survey questionnaire was returned to the offices of the United Way of Marquette County. This was from UAW Local 1950. Its Community Services Program mission is:

Assist select charitable organizations in the local community through monetary or volunteer needs.

The union local offers information and education services to its members on health issues, peer counseling, food pantry, or general education diploma. The local does not provide space, nor make materials and equipment available to community groups. It does make union members with specific skills available to community groups. And it does reach out and support people who are trying to transition from welfare to work.

UAW Local 1950 also states that it had helped to improve local quality of life in the last year by:

Contributions (monetary & product) to Women's Center, Harbor House, Salvation Army, Support our Troops campaign, and FABCO striking workers.

Finally, the local indicated that it is currently participating in

- ▶ Preparing people for jobs
- ▶ Promoting good health
- ▶ Promoting volunteering

Summary and Conclusion

Summary

Four questionnaires were distributed to business and associations as part of the Compass II Community Assessment that is administered by the United Way of Marquette County on behalf of the Marquette–Alger Community Service Coordinating Body. These questionnaires were distributed starting in early June. As of August 11, 2003, the following total completed questionnaires were submitted by respondents:

	Completed	Sent
Business Survey 2003	35	1,566
Public/Private Service Provider Survey 2003	47	202
Service Clubs/Associations 2003	2	76
Labor Survey 2003	1	33

The findings of the analysis of the Business Survey 2003 are that the 35 respondents returning completed questionnaires represent a large variety of organizations, including manufacturers, a university, consultants, a public transport system, and one, nonprofit, service provider. These 35 represent a total of 5,372 employees, with an average of 153 employees, ranging from 671 employees to zero employees. These 35 also contributed a sum of \$381,826 in charitable

contributions during 2002, with a mean of \$15,909 and a range among the companies from \$275,000 to \$0.

Twenty-one of 23 responding companies indicated that they contributed to the United Way in 2002, including all of the manufacturers, consultants, and media. However, only 17 of the 35 indicated that they had conducted a workplace campaign in 2002.

An average of 43 hours per person was volunteered among the business survey respondents, and 23 of 32 responding companies indicate that they allow time off for volunteer work.

Finally, business survey respondents indicated that they already participate in 10 of the 16 initiatives listed in the questionnaire. The most frequently picked initiatives are "Planning for Community Renewal," "Beautifying Community Spaces," and "Promoting Arts & Culture." Only eight respondents indicated that they would like to participate in an initiative. The more frequently chosen of these are "Planning for Community Renewal" and "Building Neighborhood Trust."

With respect to the Public/Private Service Provider Survey 2003, a plurality of respondents, 20%, is private, nonprofit corporations. Another 15% are local governments or their agencies. Finally, 11% are faith-based organizations, including one religious broadcaster. A plurality, approaching 50%, designate a large area, "Region," or the entire UP, as their area of service.

By mission statement, 31 are social service provider organizations, six are churches, or religious broadcasters, six are local governments, or agencies thereof, and four are other. The average number of paid employees of all respondents is 33.6 persons, but local governments weight this figure. The average number of employees for social service providers is 18, with a range from 220 to zero. The average number of employees of church organizations is 2.5, with a range from 4 to zero. And the average number of employees of local governments is 132.2 persons, with a range from 238 to 37.

A majority, 25 of the 47, indicate that their organization provides meeting space to community groups. Only 15 make materials and equipment available to these groups. Slightly more, 20, make employees with specific skills available to help these groups. Almost all, 43 of the 47, purchase their goods and services locally, and 19 organizations indicate that they reach out and hire people who are transiting from welfare to work.

With respect to the sources of funding of social service organizations, the vast majority of dollars derive from the Federal or State Governments, 73.2%. Individual organizational fund raising renders 8.5% of their average income. The United Way accounts for less than one per cent of social service organizational income.

Just over one-third, 33.5%, of the persons served by social service providers are adolescent youth, 13-19 years. Adults and young children account for 16% each. Thirty two percent are

categorized as “Other.” By type of service, the largest average number of persons served is for “Economic development,” with an average of 10,503 persons served. The next two largest types of service, in terms of numbers served, are “Physical health services,” with an average of 1,666 persons served, and “Youth development,” with an average of 1,189 persons served.

Finally, with respect to initiatives organizations are currently participating in, the most frequently elected initiative is “Fostering Community Networks.” The next three are “Connecting Neighbors,” “Improving Access to Transportation,” and “Beautifying Community Spaces.” Only 10 respondents indicated which initiatives they would like to participate in. Three were selected by two respondents each. These are “Improving Access to Transportation,” “Building Neighborhood Trust,” and “Planning Community Renewal.”

The service clubs and labor union submitted insufficient completed questionnaires for analysis.

Conclusion

Compass II is a community needs assessment. Data have been gathered at three strata. First there is the representative community telephone survey, second there is the interviewing of key informants of Marquette and Alger Counties, and third there is the business, labor, and organization survey reported above. These three readings have given a reinforced message.

The issues with the most pronounced reinforcement are:

- Economic Development
- Medical Care Access
- Substance Abuse Recovery

A top-ranking issue in the Community Survey was “Anxiety.” This finding comes from the experientially based family issues, and should be addressed. There are, of course, other data which has been gathered in this needs assessment. The major issues are the most prominent findings, but other findings relevant to social action have also been produced.