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REPORT SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of the second Nonprofit Executive Outlook Survey conducted by Baruch College, School of Public Affairs, through its Nonprofit Group and Survey Research Center. Responders to the online survey in January and February 2006 include the chief executives of 100 human services agencies in New York City. Like the initial Survey conducted in Spring 2005, this project involved collaboration with Human Services Council of New York City, Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, UJA-Federation of New York, United Neighborhood Houses of New York and their member agencies, as well as the cooperation of executive directors of member agencies of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York and the Diocese of Brooklyn and Queens, Hispanic Federation, Asian American Federation of New York, Black Agency Executives, and Black Equity Alliance.

HOW THE SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED

The survey was conducted over the internet from January 17 through February 14, 2006, and included online responses from 100 executive directors of human services agencies in the New York area. The individuals responding to the survey were the heads of their organizations—89% executive directors, presidents, or CEOs. More than half have at least 11 years of experience in their organizations, and 28% have more than 20 years. Most are male, but 42% are female. Nearly two-thirds are white, 14% are Black, 12% Hispanic, and 8% Asian. Ninety percent of the organizations are direct service providers.
The survey assesses the views of these executives about conditions in New York City, especially for vulnerable groups in the population, about the priorities set by City government, about governmental policies at all levels, and about the response of human services agencies to disasters and emergencies. Compared with the previous survey nearly a year ago, the current survey finds that a substantially greater proportion of responders believe that things in New York City are generally headed in the right direction—69% in Winter 2006 versus 39% in Spring 2005 (Fig. 1). Only one-quarter think that problems are getting somewhat or much worse, compared with more than one-half in the 2005 survey (Fig. 2).
Prospectively, more than half are very or somewhat optimistic about social conditions in the City, while less than 30% felt that way in 2005 (Fig. 3). As indicated later in this report, respondents also increased their approval rating of City social policy and programs, compared with that of State government, and especially, the federal government.

**CONDITIONS ARE WORSE FOR POOR FAMILIES, OTHER GROUPS**

For specific groups in the population, however, substantial portions of the responding human services executives still think conditions are getting worse—61% for poor families, 43% for immigrants, 41% for youth and teens, and 40% for the elderly. (Fig. 4) These percentages are somewhat lower than they were for the same groups in 2005, but still are indications of their vulnerability in the view of the executives. The greatest improvement is in the view of conditions for the homeless, but 35% still feel that things are getting worse for them. Conditions are viewed as staying about the same for several groups, including the physically disabled, people with HIV/AIDS, and people addicted to drugs and/or alcohol.

**Fig. 3** Looking ahead a few years are you optimistic or pessimistic about future social conditions in New York City?

**Fig. 4** In New York City these days do you think things are generally getting better or worse for...
The report also examined policies and priorities in human services—respondents’ views of Mayor Bloomberg’s priorities during his first term, what those priorities should be in his second term, and what respondents think about federal, State, and local social policies. About 60% indicate that the Bloomberg Administration has given a fair amount of attention to human services (Fig. 5), and another 15% think it has given a great deal of attention. Nevertheless, 55% think the Administration should increase funding and restructure services, and another 31% favor increased funding alone (Fig. 6).

**Fig. 5** Generally speaking, how much attention would you say the Bloomberg administration has given to human services?

**Fig. 6** In general, thinking about human services in the city, do you think the Bloomberg administration should . . .
HUMAN SERVICES EXECUTIVES WANT HIGHER PRIORITY FROM BLOOMBERG ADMINISTRATION; ZERO TOLERANCE FOR FEDERAL POLICY

The Survey also compared the priority that respondents felt the Bloomberg Administration gave to particular areas of human services in the first term and the priority it should give to these areas in the second term. There was general agreement that the Administration did and should give very high priority to education—about 79%. By contrast, in most areas of human services, these executives indicated that the Administration should give much higher priority in the second term than it did in the first term—including affordable housing, child welfare, child care, youth services, elderly services, Medicaid/health care, and other services. In the areas of homeland security, economic development, and crime, the respondents believe that the Administration should give lower priority in the second term than it did in the first (Fig.7).

**Fig. 7** What priorities do you think the Bloomberg administration had during their FIRST TERM? What priorities should it have in its SECOND TERM?
As it did in 2005, the survey asked whether respondents generally approved or disapproved of federal, State, and City government social policy and programs. Zero percent—no one—approved of federal policy. Nine percent approved of State policy and programs, up from 3% in 2005, and 39% approved of City policy and programs, up from 18% (Fig. 8)

**Fig. 8** Do you generally approve, or disapprove, of the current social policy and programs of the federal, State, and City government?
AGENCIES RESPOND TO DISASTER AND EMERGENCIES

Finally, the Survey asked whether organizations were involved in emergency response to natural disasters or terrorist attacks. Nearly 34% responded that they were (Fig. 9). In particular these organizations provided case management (49%), counseling or mental health services (42%), other social services (42%), and public information and education (41%). To a lesser extent, they also provide emergency preparedness training, housing assistance, employment training and job placement, and financial and legal assistance (Fig. 10).

**Fig. 9** Is your organization involved at all in responding to emergencies -- such as a natural disaster, blackout, or terrorist attack?

**Fig. 10** For those organizations involved in emergency preparedness and response activities, what services do you provide? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)