

Regent Park Community Health Centre Vision, Mission, Values

Approved by the Board of Directors August 14, 2018

Vision:

Equitable health outcomes and social justice for the communities we serve.

Mission:

Providing comprehensive health and community services that remove barriers and improve lives.

Values

EQUITY/SOCIAL JUSTICE

We oppose discrimination and oppression everywhere, in all their forms.

RESPECT AND DIGNITY

We value, accept and include all individuals for who they are.

ACCESSIBILITY

We commit to responsive, culturally safe, and stigma-free services.

EXCELLENCE AND INNOVATION

We embrace effective practices and create novel solutions to improve services.

ACCOUNTABILITY

We are responsible for the resources entrusted to us. We act ethically and with integrity.

COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP

We embed community engagement and decision making at all levels.



Regent Park Community Health Centre Strategic Plan

Approved by the Board of Directors August 14, 2018

Strategic Priority #1

We will demonstrate leadership in developing and delivering services to address the health and social conditions impacting members of communities who face barriers.

Strategic Objectives:

- 1. To strengthen quality improvement across the organization
- 2. To foster a culture of continuous learning
- 3. To develop, evaluate & promote innovative, responsive practices
- 4. To improve access to services
- 5. To increase meaningful partnership with clients and community members to design & evaluate services/programs
- 6. To address service gaps with community partners, as well as review & adapt catchment areas

Outcomes in Three Years:

- 1. Improved service performance & equitable outcomes
- 2. Increased research & education related activities focused on SDoH
- 3. Increased access to services & reduced wait times
- 4. Increased client & community members' participation
- 5. Increased client satisfaction
- 6. Revised catchment to reflect changing communities

Strategic Priority #2

We will work together across teams and agencies so that children and youth can thrive.

Strategic Objectives

- 1. Engage children, youth, families & communities to identify their needs
- 2. Involve children, youth & families in the design & implementation of meaningful initiatives
- 3. Provide integrated, accessible & holistic services across all programs
- 4. Build capacity internally (e.g. youth worker; resources)
- 5. Mobilize a cross sectoral coalition to respond to the needs of children & youth, especially those most vulnerable to all forms of violence.

Outcomes in Three Years

- 1. Development of youth advisory committee(s) across the agency
- 2. Increased engagement of children (including early & middle years), youth &families in community & service planning
- 3. Increased numbers of children & youth served by the CHC
 4. Increased community resources to respond to needs of children, youth & families 5.
 Framework to evaluate/assess equitable outcomes developed

Strategic Priority #3

We will collaborate and advocate for positive system changes.

Strategic Objectives

- 1. Identify & prioritize, policy & systemic issues affecting communities that are experiencing inequities
- 2. Strategize & advocate for the identified priorities including collaboration with allies & partners
- 3. Ensure that communities are meaningfully & equitably involved in the change processes
- 4. Increase the profile of RPCHC through research, education & practice.

Outcomes in Three Years

- 1. Advocacy plan developed & implemented.
- 2. Marginalized communities are meaningfully involved at RPCHC & with system-wide initiatives
- 3. New partnerships & collaborations are developed as needed
- 4. Communication plans developed & implemented

Enabler #1

We will provide an enabling internal environment for our staff

Objectives

- 1. Foster staff innovation & empowerment
- 2. Improve staff engagement & morale
- 3. Improve processes & systems to enhance collaboration & teamwork across the organization
- 4. Enhance organization infrastructure that promotes staff effectiveness
- 5. Optimize staff safety & wellbeing

Outcomes in Three Years

- 1. Increased number of cross-team initiatives
- 2. Reduced absenteeism
- 3. Evidence of innovation
- 4. Perceptions of staff empowerment
- 5. Staff satisfaction, trust & morale to increase engagement (measured through annual staff engagement survey)

Enabler #2

We will secure resources to strengthen the organization's infrastructure and sustainability

Objectives

- 1. Develop fundraising capacity of the organization to diversify funding sources
- 2. Maximize/pursue existing & additional funding opportunities within & outside of LHIN, MOHLTC & Pathways Canada
- 3. Secure funding to improve/ expand physical facilities

Outcomes in Three Years

- 1. Mechanisms/structures for fundraising in place
- 2. More diverse funding sources
- 3. Increased funding
- 4. New/improved physical facilities

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PATHWAYS PROGRAM REVIEW 2018

OBJECTIVES

In January 2018, an external consultancy was retained to conduct a comprehensive review of the Pathways Program. The key objectives were to:

- Conduct a comprehensive program review through a multi-stakeholder approach
- Identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and gaps
- Recommendations for re-alignment of our existing programming, operations and staffing, including expansionary plans

•

KEY MILESTONES

	•RFP Issued		
Jan/Feb	Work Plan Development		
	Data Collection		
March	Data Analysis		
	Staff Joint Analysis		
April	Data Validation		
	Preliminiary Action Planning		
May	r remining recent remining		
	Integration with Regent Park CHC		
June/July	Strategic Planning Process		
	• Regent Park CHC Strategic Priority #2 -		
August	Children, Youth, and Families		
	Integration with 3-Year Operational		
Oct-Nov	Planning		

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

- 1. Target Group definition & reach
- 2. Relevance and Implementation of the Four Pillars
- 3. Four Pillars and Unmet Needs
- 4. Effectiveness of Program Management
- 5. Program Outcomes

STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

Stakeholder Group	#	Method	
Pathways Staff	21	Focus groups, interviews	
RPCHC Youth Clinic Staff	3	Focus group	
Parents	4	Focus group	
Alumni	1	Interview – in person	
Students	85	Online survey	
Tutors	24	Online survey	
Community Organizations	13	Online survey	
Pathways Canada	3	Small group interview – in person	
Pathways – Lawrence Heights & Scarborough Village	2	Interviews - phone	
Schools – Central Technical, Riverdale, Jarvis, Northern, Harbord, Spruce Court, Nelson Mandela	14	Individual/small group interviews – phone/ in person	
Total	170		

KEY HIGHLIGHTS

Target Group - Definition and Reach

- There is a decrease of 26% in 15 to 19 year olds in Regent Park; however decrease in student enrolment has been limited to 9%
- Approx 17% of Pathways students have been living outside of RP in the last 4 years, potentially

- due to revitalization displacement or exceptions being made for student enrolled from outside catchment
- In 2015, 35% of RP families living below the Low-Income Cut-Off
- School Partners witnessed increased in youth gang activities and gun violence
- 2014 Toronto Youth Equity Strategy identifies RP as a community with higher number of vulnerable youths
- As a universal program, it does not conduct structured needs assessment or document specific vulnerabilities

Relevance and Implementation of the Four Pillars

- The four pillars remained the same since inception of the program – financial support, academic support, group and career mentoring, and one-on-one support
- Except for one school, 65% of students in program must take public or other kind of transportation to their high schools, thus TTC tickets were identified by students as the must important for them to stay in school; similar sentiment is shared by staff and parents
- 82% of graduates from program between 2014-2016 pursued postsecondary education
- Access to scholarship is important to them to pursue postsecondary education
- As scholarship is earmarked for postsecondary education, those graduates choosing nonacademic opportunities may not have full access to their earned scholarship
- 50% of students do not attend tutoring every years due to exemptions for achieving at least 70% in core subjects
- Some students find that after school group tutoring may not be suitable for them; lack of 1-1 tutoring by appointment outside of designated tutoring program time; students are unable to book tutors in advance with specific subject needs
- There are over 70 active volunteers from diverse backgrounds and have demonstrated longstanding commitment to support the tutoring program; the retention rate is high; 50% of tutees have been volunteer for more than one year and about 38% have been volunteering > 3 years

- Tutors identified focus has been on reinforcing concepts for homework or tests, but additional academic success workshops are needed
- Current structure may not fully support students that have different learning style or abilities (or learning disabilities); thus there may be opportunities to offer pscyho-educational assessments to support students' Individual Educational Plan (IEP) at the school level
- Coordination between SPSWs and teachers can be improved to reinforce a consistent approach
- Parents in the focus group are impressed by the variety of programs offered by group mentoring
- Increasing number of mentoring-alike offering in the community poses concern for Pathways' uniqueness; thus a well-coordinated approach to partnership will mean mapping what the role of Pathways and its partners is in supporting youth
- 89% of students in the survey indicated strongly agree or agreed that their SPSWs are important to help them stay in school; parents commended SPSWs for reaching out and supporting them; school partners expressed appreciation for the effective support that SPSWs offer to students
- There is no clear indication of a case management model adopted by Pathways Regent Park; respondents commented that their experience is dependent on the SPSW assigned, indicating that there is a level of inconsistency amongst staff
- A clearly defined case management model would ensure consistency in services as well as promote youth-centred planning
- The four pillars, if not monitored carefully, can turn into four silos of programs; the central role of SPSWs may create an informal hierarchy amongst staff groups; breaking down silos and hierarchy requires a concerted approach stemming from a youth-centered service model
- Case load is largely based on number of students and school allocations, regardless of the intensity or acuity of needs; however graduation rates have shown that outcomes amongst students from different cultural backgrounds may require dedicated resources and individual attention to the marginalized students
- Staff interaction with students limited to breaks in schools and can be limited if case load is high
- Students that require more intensive support will not be adequately served in a short period of time if the work is primarily in the school setting

 More intentional effort to engage with parents is needed to build long term relationship with families

Four Pillars and Unmet Needs

- Various stakeholders mentioned the need for mental health support – this is one of the gaps in the service model of Pathways Regent Park
- SPSWs do not feel equipped to deal with mental health needs of students
- Growing numbers of younger youth who are vulnerable to violence and serious crimes; school partners are calling for Pathways to reach out to students at a younger age – particularly before high school years
- The program does not reach out to students who are not academically inclined and have dropped out of the school or program; lack of alternative support to help them secure employment

Effectiveness of Program Management

- As the program is focused on youth education, there appears to be a disconnect from the rest of the health programs at Regent Park CHC
- There are concerns from staff on the need to prioritize infrastructure support for Pathways – physical space, financial, IT, public relations (marketing), research, and QI
- Wraparound support should be enhanced so that Pathways students can access the full range of Health Centre services
- Pathways Agreement should be formalized to demonstrate commitment from Pathways Canada and the host community organization
- Program should adapt to the specific needs that are deemed priorities by community members – program needs to remain locally relevant
- There have been de-stabilizing changes over the last 3-5 years, primarily due to budget cuts; issue of leadership, team morale, and staff satisfaction should be addressed
- A culture of staff working in silos can be improved if Program Coordinators are able to adopt a practice of joint program planning
- Regent Park Pathways still enjoy an overall positive reputation and image amongst various stakeholder groups in the community; student satisfaction survey consistently ranked favorably

Program Outcomes

- Pathways Regent Park has had impressive graduation rates consistently
- When a health equity lens is applied, and further analysis is carried out according to the students' cultural heritage, it appears that students of Caribbean backgrounds have the poorest outcomes; deliberate analyses with appropriate follow up actions is not a current practice
- On average 8% withdraw from the program, with lack of continuation or re-registration as the most common reasons; analysis should be conducted
- Postsecondary enrollment is the only outcome tracked beyond high school graduation. Students who pursue a non-academic career or straight to employment are not tracked or included in this outcome measure

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RPCHC

- ✓ Embrace Organization-Wide Youth-Centred Framework: RPCHC adopt the strategic priority to develop a youth-centred framework to guide its program and service design, planning, and delivery to support the youth in community and students in Pathways Regent Park
- ✓ Leverage Pathways' Program Uniqueness and Community Leadership: RPCHC leverage the unique role of Pathways Regent Park to take on a leadership role to rally community collaboration across different sectors to respond to the extensive and intensive needs of youth in Regent Park
- ✓ Align with Future Directions of Pathways Canada – Pathways RP reposition itself within the broader national movement by becoming an advocate for change within Pathways Canada to respond to the needs of marginalized youth
- Explore Opportunities Beyond Pathways Canada – RPCHC devote resources to explore investments from potential donors/funders and supporters to provide youth services that are beyond the scope of Pathways Canada but complementary with its services to meet the unmet needs of the youth in the community