



CLEARFIELD

UTAH'S MILITARY CITY



CAFC - Exploring Opportunities for Improvement

We Love the CAFC!!



...but it does have its challenges

Common Goals

- *Confidence in a high-performing Division*
 - *8 Core Values*
 - *Great training-ground for youth*
 - *Proficient in addressing problems*
- *Minimize liability*
- *Maximize cost recovery / minimize subsidy*

Core Values

- *Communication*
- *Customer Service*
- *Dependability*
- *Initiative*
- *Productivity*
- *Professionalism*
- *Quality*
- *Teamwork*

At the Heart of the Challenge

- *Lack of disciplined supervision / management*
 - *Up to about 200 employees supervised by:*
 - *Full-time: CAFC Manager and 4 supervisors*
 - *Part-time: Head Guards, Managers on Duty (MODs), Daycare*
 - *Many employees are young people in their first jobs*
 - *First-line supervisors are part-time; often not very experienced in resolving personnel / performance problems*
 - *FT mid-level supervisors / managers struggle to give consistent correction*
- *Incomplete / inconsistent training*
 - *With PTEs frequently coming and going, and with their varied schedules, training on the many policies and procedures is difficult to accomplish*
 - *On-the-job training addresses frequent tasks and policies, but is not comprehensive*
 - *Safety-related training is foremost (e.g. lifeguard certification and policies), but general City policies and expectations are often on the back burner*

Leading to...

- *Struggles getting the “water to the end of the row”*
 - *General unawareness of City policies, objectives, and expectations*
 - *Insufficient attention to processes that impact other City departments (HR, Risk Management, Legal, Finance)*
- *Unclear expectations → accountability challenges*
 - *Minor issues are usually handled correctly (e.g. “no call, no show”)*
 - *Other, more serious policy violations also happen, warranting corrective action and sometimes employee discipline, but are not adequately resolved (e.g. bullying, favoritism, sexual harassment, sexual assault)*
- *A systemic mentality of:*
 - *“Good enough”*
 - *“We’ve always done it this way”*
 - *Apathy / lack of ownership or desire to make significant improvement*

Why That's a Problem

- *Lack of unity ("the City" is a different entity)*
- *Increased workload to other departments (leading to contention)*
- *Ineffective and / or inefficient operations*
 - *Reluctance to consider scaling back (programming, staffing, etc.)*
 - *Impact to staff or to certain patron groups is often seemingly the primary consideration, as opposed to what is the most responsible and efficient approach (the tail seems to wag the dog)*
 - *Cost recovery suffers*
- *Disservice to young people in their first jobs?*
 - *Fun job, but are they learning skills that will help them in later employment?*
- *Increased liability*

What are the Expectations?

- *Promote unity—not division—with “the City”*
- *Effectively communicate through all staffing levels*
- *Ensure complete training on all City policies*
- *High quality work; be thorough; do it right the first time*
- *When a mistake is made or a problem arises*
 - *Handle it completely, correctly, and promptly*
 - *Understand and follow City policies and processes (“by the book”)*
- *Actively pursue efficiency*
 - *Scrutinize why things are the way they are, and if they should continue*
 - *Be strategic in who/how we serve; don’t try to be “all things to all people”*
 - *Scale back where offerings are under-utilized*
- *Don’t let the tail wag the dog; take charge*

Addressing the Problem

- *Efforts to coach staff and encourage improvement since fall 2024*
 - *Little evidence of progress or proactive change*
 - *The same types of issues mentalities persist*
- *Ways to right the ship:*
 - *Revamp current operation with certain existing CAFC personnel*
 - *Start over with complete restructure of CAFC management*
 - *Outsource the operation*

RFP for CAFC Operations

- *A few months ago, I directed Eric to start preparing an RFP so that we can see who might be interested in taking over CAFC operations, and how they would propose to structure their offerings*
- *The Community Services Department would also submit a proposal, keeping the operation in-house (but with significant change)*
- *That RFP is almost ready to be issued, but I didn't want to take that step without first talking with the Council*

RFP for CAFC Operations

- *Potential Operators (no outreach has been made yet)*
 - *Boys & Girls Club*
 - *YMCA*
 - *Davis County*
 - *Davis School District*
 - *South Davis Recreation District*
 - *Private Gyms / Fitness Clubs:*
 - *VASA*
 - *Golds*
 - *EoS*
 - *Rush Funplex*

Changes Currently Being Considered

- *Hours of Operation*
- *Redistribute Supervisor Responsibilities*
- *Reducing PT Positions*
 - *MODs (6-8) & Welcome Desk (1-2)*
 - *Have FTE present during hours of operation*
- *Add Assistant Center Manager*
 - *Manage Personnel Issues*
 - *Manage Customer Concerns*
 - *Day-to-Day Operations*
- *Center Manager Focus*
 - *Culture and Policy & Procedures*
 - *Set Goals and Evaluate Progress*
 - *Supervisor Training*
 - *City Policy & Center Procedures*
 - *Customer Service*
- *Identify and Define Goals*
 - *Financial*
 - *Customer Service*
 - *Fitness Class Success*
 - *Child Care*
 - *Rentals*

Changes Currently Being Considered

- *Further Evaluating Operations*
 - *Hours of Operation*
 - *Fitness Classes*
 - *Number of Classes to offer/staffing*
 - *Criteria for success*
 - *Charging Additional Fees for Classes*
 - *Child Care*
 - *Hours of Operation*
 - *Adjusting Fees for Service*
 - *Facility Rentals*
 - *Additional FTE to Manage Rentals*
- *Additional Supervisor Training*
 - *Supervisory Skills*
 - *City Policy Review and Application*
- *Prioritizing Customer Service*
 - *Resolve issues at lowest level possible*
 - *Resolve Within the Department*

Possible Options / Outcomes

Revamp

- Restructure w/o RFP
- Keep some leadership
- Add more leadership
- Aggressively pursue quality and efficiency
- Could be effective in raising the bar
- Might cost more

Reboot / Reset

- Start over with completely new leadership
- More disruptive than “Revamp”
- Logistically complicated (closure?)
- More risk / no guarantee

RFP

- Get to see options and select the most advantageous
- “In-house” still an option
- Perception by staff is vote of no confidence
- Lose some control with outsourcing
- No guarantee of success