

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Kansas Center for Community Economic Development
Policy Research Institute
TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

ECKAN Needs Assessment Survey 2000 of Service Providers and Clients Survey Analysis

Prepared by

Genna Hurd
Co-Director, KCCED

May 2001

Report No. 50

Charles Krider
Project Director, KCCED

Steven Maynard-Moody
Interim Director, Policy Research Institute

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) with the Policy Research Institute at the University of Kansas. The KCCED is funded by a university center grant from Denver Regional Office of the Economic Development Administration (EDA), U.S. Department of Commerce. The statement, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the EDA, the U.S. Government, the University of Kansas, or any other individual or organization.

Special thanks and gratitude are extended to the service providers and clients who took the time to participate in the survey. Special thanks also go to Don Haider-Markel and Chad Kniss with the Survey Research Center at the Policy Research Institute, the University of Kansas.

A copy of this report can be obtain by contacting: ECKAN, 602 S. Maples Street, PO Box 100, Ottawa, KS 66067-0100, (785) 242-7450, e-mail: eckan@ott.net.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Findings.....	1
Section I. Housing.....	2
<i>Housing Service and Provision</i>	2
Table 1a. Housing: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)	3
Table 1b. Housing: Service Needs and Provision (Client Survey)	4
<i>Housing Issues</i>	5
Table 2a. Housing: Issues in Service Area (Service Provider Survey).....	8
Table 2b. Housing: Issues in Service Area (Client Survey).....	9
Table 3. Status of Client’s Housing (Client Survey)	10
Table 4. Condition of Property (Client Survey).....	11
Section II. Employment.....	11
<i>Employment Service and Provision</i>	11
Table 5a. Employment: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)	12
Table 5b. Employment: Service Needs and Provision (Client Survey).....	13
<i>Employment Issues</i>	14
Table 6a. Employment: Issues in Service Area (Service Provider Survey)	14
Table 6b. Employment: Issues in Service Area (Client Survey)	15
Section III. Other Services.....	15
<i>Childcare Service and Provision</i>	15
Table 7a. Childcare: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)	16
Table 7b. Childcare: Service Needs and Provision (Client Survey).....	17
<i>Education Service and Provision</i>	18
Table 8a. Education: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)19	19
Table 8b. Education: Service Needs and Provision (Client Survey)	20
<i>Transportation Service and Provision</i>	21
Table 9a. Transportation: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)	22
Table 9a. Transportation: Service Needs and Provision (Client Survey)	23
<i>Emergency Services/Intervention Service and Provision</i>	24
Table 10a. Emergency Services/Intervention: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)	25
Table 10a. Emergency Services/Intervention: Service Needs and Provision (Client Survey)	26
<i>Health/Nutrition Service and Provision</i>	27
Table 11a. Health/Nutrition: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)	28
Table 11b. Health/Nutrition: Service Needs and Provision (Client Survey)	29

<i>Use of Income Service and Provision</i>	30
Table 12a. Use of Income: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)	31
Table 12b. Use of Income: Service Needs and Provision (Client Survey).....	32
<i>Medical Service and Provision</i>	33
Table 13a. Medical Services: Service Needs and Provision (Service Provider Survey)	35
Table 13b. Medical Services: Family Health Care Services (Client Survey) ...	36
Table 14. Medical Services: Familiarity, Satisfaction, Convenience (Client Survey)	37
Table 15. Medical Service: Insurance Options and Doctor’s Visits (Client Survey)	38
Section IV. Family Profile	39
<i>Demographic Characteristics of Clients</i>	39
Table 16a. Demographic Characteristics (Residence, Sex of Family Member, Income).....	40
Table 16b. Demographic Characteristics (Age, Living, Marital, and Race Status)	41
Table 16c. Demographic Characteristics (Household Status)	42
Conclusion	43
Appendix A	
Table 1. Housing: Service Needs and Provision	A-1
Table 2. Housing: Issues in Service Area	A-2
Table 3. Housing: Status of Client’s Housing	A-3
Table 4. Housing: Condition of Property	A-4
Table 5. Employment: Service Needs and Provision	A-5
Table 6. Employment: Issues in Service Area	A-6
Table 7. Other Services – Childcare	A-7
Table 8. Other Services – Education.....	A-8
Table 9. Other Services – Transportation.....	A-9
Table 10. Other Services – Emergency Services/Intervention	A-10
Table 11. Other Services – Health Nutrition	A-11
Table 12. Other Services – Use of Income	A-12
Table 13. Other Services – Medical Services (Family Health Care Needs)	A-13
Table 14. Other Services – Medical Services (Familiarity, Satisfaction, Convenience)	A-14
Table 15. Other Services – Medical Services (Insurance Options and Doctor’s Visits)	A-15
Table 16a. Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics (Residence, Sex of Family Members, Income)	A-16
Table 16b. Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics (Age, Living, Marital, and Race Status)	A-17
Table 16c. Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics (Household Status).....	A-18

ECKAN Needs Assessment Survey of Service Providers and Clients

Introduction

The East Central Kansas Economic Opportunity Corporation (ECKAN) contracted with the Policy Research Institute (PRI) at the University of Kansas (in August 2000) to assist with a needs assessment survey of clients and service providers. The Survey Research Center (SRC) at PRI worked with ECKAN to develop the surveys administered to ECKAN's clients and providers in their service area.¹ The administration of the surveys was conducted by ECKAN (during November 2000). ECKAN sent surveys to all their providers and randomly sought 100 client surveys for each county. The completed surveys were then delivered to SRC for data entry into an SPSS database, which was completed in January 2001.

Twenty-nine out of 50 providers completed the Service Provider Survey for a response rate of 58 percent. They were asked to rate both the need for and provision of various services pertaining to housing, employment, childcare, education, transportation, emergency services/intervention, health/nutrition, use of income, and medical. The providers were also asked to respond to questions about housing and employment issues.

The Client Survey was administered in seven counties in the ECKAN area and 685 clients completed this survey, which is approximately 57 percent of ECKAN's clients.² The clients were asked to rate their need for a service as well as whether or not they were receiving the service. The Client Survey also included demographic and family profile questions, which were not part of the Service Provider Survey.

The Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) with PRI became involved in this process in February 2001 with the generation of preliminary tables for both the Service Provider and Client surveys. County-level tables for the Client Survey were also developed.

Findings

The findings are divided along the same sections as the Client Survey: I) Housing, II) Employment, III) Other Services, and IV) Family Profile. For each section, an analysis of the responses of the providers is followed by the responses of the clients. A county breakdown of the clients' responses is also reported. Tables for the county-level responses can be found in **Appendix A**. The following analysis provides an overview of the need for services and the services provided as well as differences among the counties served.

¹ ECKAN's eight county service area includes Anderson, Coffey, Douglas, Franklin, Johnson, Lyon, Miami, and Osage counties in Kansas.

² Johnson County was not included in the Client Survey because ECKAN was not active in the county at the time. ECKAN has approximately 1,212 clients.

Section I. Housing

Housing Service Needs and Provision

The surveys asked both the service providers and the clients a series of questions about the need for a service and whether or not the service is being provided (if provider) or received (if client). These services ranged from information on available houses or apartments to occasional help paying rent. **Table 1a** displays the results of service provider responses and **Table 1b** contains the results of the client responses.

Service providers indicated a greater need for housing services than clients indicated.

Service Providers. The majority of the providers responded that there was a need, rather it be some or large, for all the housing services mentioned in the survey (**Table 1a**). However, the majority of providers were also not able to provide the housing services needed, with 65 to 75 percent responding "No." Around 10 to 20 percent of the providers were able to "give a referral" for the need.

Providers saw the greatest need, in order of "Large" response, for:

1. information on available houses or apartments (55%),
2. ongoing assistance with paying rent (45%),
3. counseling on housing options (41%),
4. home repair and upkeep assistance (37%), and
5. occasional help with paying rent (30%).

Clients. The clients' responses indicate a different need for services than the providers (**Table 1b**). Sixty to 94 percent of the clients responding with regard to housing indicated "not at all" a need for the housing services listed in the survey. For those that did indicate a need, the greatest need based on "very much" response was for:

1. ongoing assistance with rent (40%),
2. information on available housing (25%),
3. occasional help with paying rent (18%),
4. counseling on housing options (17%), and
5. deposit assistance for renting (15%).

Clients' greatest housing needs include help with rent from ongoing to occasional to deposit assistance.

Table 1a
Housing: Service Needs and Provision
Service Provider Survey

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Information on available houses or apartments.....	55.2%	44.8%	0.0%	10.3%	10.3%	65.5%	13.8%
Help with completing forms	27.6	69.0	3.4	20.7	0.0	69.0	10.3
Ongoing assistance with paying rent	44.8	48.3	6.9	3.4	3.4	72.4	20.7
Counseling on housing options.....	41.4	58.6	0.0	24.1	0.0	65.5	10.3
Help with landlords	28.6	64.3	7.1	10.3	3.4	65.5	20.7
Home repair and upkeep assistance.....	37.0	59.3	3.7	7.1	7.1	67.9	17.9
Deposit assistance for renting	29.6	59.3	11.1	3.6	10.7	75.0	10.7
Occasional help with paying rent	29.6	63.0	7.4	3.6	10.7	71.4	14.3

N=29

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 1b
Housing: Service Needs and Provision
Client Survey

<u>Need for and receiving:</u>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Receiving Service</u>		
	Very <u>Much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	Not <u>at All</u>	<u>Yes</u>	Yes, Need <u>More</u>	<u>No</u>
Information on available houses or apartments.....	25.0%	0.3%	73.4%	21.6%	0.1%	77.1%
Help with completing forms	12.1	0.9	86.9	10.2	0.3	89.3
Ongoing assistance with paying rent	39.7	0.6	59.6	34.5	0.3	65.1
Counseling on housing options.....	16.6	1.0	81.9	15.2	0.4	83.6
Help with landlords	4.7	1.2	93.7	3.5	1.0	95.2
Home repair and upkeep assistance.....	14.0	4.5	80.7	4.4	1.8	93.3
Deposit assistance for renting	15.2	1.0	83.4	5.1	0.6	93.9
Occasional help with paying rent	18.4	1.5	78.8	9.1	0.3	89.8

N=685

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Clients by County. Table 1 in Appendix A shows that housing needs vary from county to county with most counties meeting most of their clients' needs and some counties, particularly Franklin County, having some obvious gaps. Several findings should be noted:

- For Anderson County, the greatest housing need is home repair and upkeep assistance with 44 percent indicating a need for this; however only 10 percent are receiving this assistance.
- In Coffey County, clients are basically receiving the assistance they need. A few clients did indicate a need for home repair and upkeep (7%) and deposit assistance for renting (4%) and are not receiving these services.
- Gaps exist for Douglas County between needs and provision for occasional help paying rent (25% need and only 1% receive) and home repair and upkeep (16% need and 4% receive). Otherwise needs are being met in the county.
- For every housing service mention, gaps exist in Franklin County and these gaps range from a difference of six percent (help with landlords) to 32 percent (deposit assistance for renting).
- Services in Lyon County are fairly well aligned with the needs of the clients. Three areas for improvement are concerned with renting – ongoing assistance with paying rent, deposit assistance for renting, and occasional help with paying the rent.
- Housing needs for Miami County are being met.
- Only a slight gap exists for housing needs in Osage County with regards to ongoing assistance with paying rent and home repair and upkeep assistance.

In general, most counties are providing the housing services needed.

Housing Issues

Service Providers versus Clients. Service providers and clients were also asked a series of questions about housing issues and these responses can be found in Tables 2a and 2b. When these responses are compared to the responses in Tables 1a and 1b, obvious housing needs emerge – more affordable housing for low-come as well as assistance with rent and first time buying.

While clients did not indicate a great need for the housing services listed in Table 1b, when asked questions about housing issues (Table 2b) obvious needs emerged – from more Section 8 housing and first-time buyer programs to more affordable rents and safe and suitable housing.

Thirty-six percent of the providers responded that their clients were “not at all” familiar with the Section 8 housing program, which provides rental assistance (Table 2a), while only 10 percent of the clients indicated that they were “not at all familiar” (Table 2b). Around 62 percent of the clients said they would be interested in Section 8 if more units were available. Forty percent of the clients also indicated interest in a first-time homebuyers program.

Service providers were asked how large a problem is homelessness and a large majority of the providers, 77 percent, responded that homelessness is a problem, with 35 percent classifying it as a “large” problem (Table 2a). Clients were asked if they know someone who is homeless; 25 percent said that they do know someone who is homeless (Table 2b).

Table 2a also shows that a little over half of the providers responding (58 percent) felt that a client was discriminated against while trying to find housing. Twenty-one percent of the clients responded that they felt discriminated against (Table 2b).

Around 21 percent of the providers responded that “Yes, enough” apartments or homes in their community are safe and suitable for rent (Table 2a). However, only 7 percent of the clients felt that there were enough safe and suitable apartments or homes for rent. Both service providers and clients agree that there are not enough housing units for low-income families – however, the number of units needed varies (Tables 2a and 2b).

The providers also indicated that families were often paying more than 30 percent of their gross income for rent with 55 percent responding “yes, some” and 45 percent responding “yes, many” (Table 2a). Only nine percent of the providers, however, responded that “yes, many” were paying 50 percent of their gross income for rent. Over 72 percent of the clients said that they knew someone who was/is unable to find housing (Table 2b).

Housing Issues for Clients by County. Table 2, Appendix A gives the client responses by county. Some key findings from this table are:

- Most clients are familiar with Section 8 rental assistance, with clients from Franklin County being the least familiar. The interest in Section 8 varies from county to county with over half of the clients interested if more units were available, except for Osage County, which only has 29 percent of the clients interested.
- In all counties, clients know someone who is homeless; however, Douglas County has the highest number with 55 percent of the clients saying they know a homeless person.
- Douglas County clients also feel the most discriminated against when it comes to housing with 47 percent indicating this response. Clients in Miami and Coffey counties feel the least discriminated against with only 6 percent reporting feelings of discrimination.
- The greatest interest in first-time homebuyer programs is in Douglas and Franklin counties, but all counties had interest.
- Franklin and Lyon counties have clients that are the least aware of minimum housing code, with only 22 and 30 percent, respectively, of the clients aware of this code. However, work is needed in all counties to increase awareness.

Safe and suitable apartments or homes for rent and housing units for low-income families is lacking for clients in the ECKAN service area. Most clients know someone who is or was unable to find housing.

- With regards to safe and affordable housing, a different picture for the service area emerges when a county breakdown is done. It appears that only Lyon County is addressing this issue of safe and affordable housing for rent and for low-income families. For three of the counties – Anderson, Coffey, and Osage – not one client said that there were enough safe and affordable apartments or home for rent. Add housing units for low-income families and Miami County can also be added to the list of not one client saying that there were enough.
- The majority of clients (over 50 percent) for all counties, but Lyon County, know someone who is or was unable to find housing. About 90 percent of the clients in Coffey County know someone who was unable to find housing.

The majority of clients (75%) pay less than \$299 a month for housing and, in general, the condition of their property is satisfactory (almost 90%). Still, the majority of clients (79%) indicated that there was not enough safe and affordable housing.

Status of Client Housing. **Table 3** shows the status of clients' housing for the service area from the client responses. Seventy-two percent of the clients surveyed rent and 57 percent pay under \$200 gross monthly rent/payment for housing. The mean monthly rent/ payment for housing is in the \$200 to \$299 range. Sixty-five percent of the clients surveyed live in a house. Most (70 percent) live in a two- or

three-bedroom place. The majority of clients (74 percent) pay less than one third of their gross income for rent. Only twelve percent said that they pay more than one-half of their gross income for rent.

Clients were asked to rate the condition of their housing property and the results of their responses are presented in **Table 4**. A very strong majority of clients rate their property "satisfactory" – from 88 percent to 93 percent for various aspects. The highest rated area for "needs repair" at 11 percent is plumbing. Around 10 percent of the clients also say that their roof "needs repair."

Housing Status for Clients by County. **Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix A** provide the status and condition of housing for the ECKAN service area based on the Client Survey. The majority of clients are renters, not owners, ranging from 57 percent and 59 percent, renters in Coffey and Osage counties, respectively, to 78 percent renters in Douglas County (**Table 3, Appendix A**). Clients in Douglas and Franklin counties pay higher rents, with 33 percent of the clients in Douglas County paying more than half their gross monthly income for rent. Rents appear to be more reasonable for Coffey, Miami, Osage, and Anderson counties.

Clients in Miami County experience the best housing options for the area in terms of cost and condition – that is, for those who can find housing.

Table 4, Appendix A shows the condition of housing by whether or not it needs work.

Anderson and Franklin counties contain property that needs the most repairs, replacement, or installation. Plumbing, insulation, and roof are areas where the condition is the poorest for Anderson County. For Franklin County, more than 20 percent of the clients indicated that work is needed on insulation, floors, plumbing, and

roof. Interestingly enough, no one in Miami County indicated that his or her housing needed work.

Table 2a
Housing: Issues in Service Area
Service Provider Survey

<i>Familiarity of potential clients with:</i>	<u>Very Familiar</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Section 8 program which provides rental assistance .	4.0%	60.0%	36.0%	25	
<i>How large a problem is:</i>	<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	<u>Not a problem</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Homelessness.....	42.3%	34.6%	23.1%	26	
<i>Felt that a client was:</i>	<u>Yes, once or twice</u>	<u>Yes, often</u>	<u>No, never</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Discriminated against while trying to find housing.....	42.3%	15.4%	42.3%	26	
<i>In your community are there enough safe and suitable:</i>	<u>Yes, enough</u>	<u>No, need few more</u>	<u>No, need many more</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Apartments or homes for rent.....	21.4%	28.6%	50.0%	26	
Housing units for low-income families.....	3.6	35.7	60.7	22	
<i>Families in area who pay more than:</i>	<u>Yes, one or two</u>	<u>Yes, some</u>	<u>Yes, many</u>	<u>No None</u>	<u>N=</u>
30 percent of gross income for rent	0.0%	54.5%	45.5%	0.0%	22
50 percent of gross income for rent	22.7	68.2	9.1	0.0	22

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 2b
Housing: Issues in Service Area
Client Survey

<u>Section 8:</u>	<u>Very Familiar</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>N=</u>
Familiarity with Section 8 program, which provides rental assistance	58.7%	31.5%	9.9%	680
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Interest in Section 8 if more units available	61.5%	38.5%	680	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Know someone who is homeless	25.4%	74.6%	677	
Ever felt discriminated against.....	20.6	79.4	681	
Interest in a first-time homebuyers program	39.9	60.1	676	
Awareness of a minimum Housing code	53.8	46.2	677	
<u>In your community are there enough safe and suitable:</u>	<u>Yes, enough</u>	<u>No, need few more</u>	<u>No, need many more</u>	<u>N=</u>
Apartments or homes for rent.....	7.1%	16.5%	76.4%	679
Housing units for low-income families.....	7.2	13.1	79.7	680
<u>Know anyone who is/was:</u>	<u>Yes, many</u>	<u>Yes, one or two</u>	<u>No, no one</u>	<u>N=</u>
Unable to find housing	16.2%	56.0%	27.8%	680

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 3
Housing: Status of Client's Housing
Client Survey

<u>Housing Status:</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>Own</u>	<u>N=</u>
Rent or own.....	71.1%	28.9%	675

Gross Rent/Monthly Payment:
Mean Monthly Rent/Payment: \$200-299 range

Under \$200	56.7%
\$200-299	18.8
\$300-399	14.6
\$400-499	5.6
\$500-599	2.7
\$600-699	0.9
\$700 or more	0.4

N=677

<u>Kind of Housing</u>	<u>Apartment</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>N=</u>
Apartment or House	33.9%	65.4%	676

Number of bedrooms:
Mean Number of Bedrooms: 2.1

One	24.0%
Two	40.2
Three	30.1
Four	5.0
Five or more	0.7

N=682

Statement which best applies to your family:

We pay less than one third of our gross income for rent	73.6%
We pay between one third and one half of our gross income for rent	14.2
We pay more than one half of our gross income for rent	12.2

N=670

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 4
Housing: Condition of Property
Client Survey

<u>Condition of:</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Needs Repair</u>	<u>Needs Replacement</u>	<u>Needs to be Installed</u>	<u>N=</u>
Roof.....	88.0%	9.7%	2.1%	0.3%	682
Walls.....	92.6	6.2	0.9	0.3	680
Floor	90.5	7.9	1.3	0.3	682
Insulation	85.8	8.5	3.7	2.1	682
Electrical.....	91.1	7.0	1.6	0.3	682
Plumbing	87.0	11.1	1.6	0.3	682
Heating.....	91.2	6.8	1.5	0.6	681
Cooling.....	91.1	5.4	0.9	2.6	682
Foundation.....	93.1	5.4	1.2	0.3	682

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Section II. Employment

Employment Service Needs and Provision

Service providers and clients were asked to classify the need for employment services in their area. The results of these responses can be found in **Table 5a** for the Service Provider Survey and **Table 5b** for the Client Survey.

Service Providers. The majority of service providers indicated a need for all the services listed in **Table 5a**, with the greatest need being for job training classes, help/advise about career goals and work experience projects. When asked to respond if they were providing the service, however, the majority of providers were not able to adequately provide the service – that is, they indicated either “yes, want to do more,” “no,” or “give a referral.” Some areas for improvement as indicated by the “no” response are help/advise with job-hunting skills, matching a client’s skills and needs with job openings, work experience projects, and job training classes.

While service providers see a need for the employment services listed in the survey, the majority of clients did not perceive a need and were not receiving employment services.

Clients. Clients, however, did not see much of a need for the employment services listed in the survey. Eighty-four to 95 percent of the clients responded “not at all” for the employment services listed in **Table 5b**. The greatest need appears to be in information on job openings/opportunities with 15 percent saying they “very much” need this

service. When asked in they were receiving the service, most of the clients indicated that they were not receiving the service – from 87 to 97 percent.

Employment Services by County. Table 5 in Appendix A gives a breakdown of employment service needs and provision by county. In general, it appears that most clients are receiving the employment services that they need. The largest gap can be found in Franklin County where 31 percent say they need information of job openings/opportunities and only 16 percent are receiving it. Slight gaps also exist for matching skills and needs with job openings, job training classes, and work experience problems.

Table 5a
Employment: Service Needs and Provision
Service Provider Survey

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Information on job openings/ opportunities.....	31.0%	62.1%	3.4%	20.7%	13.8%	34.5%	17.2%
Help with completing job applications, resumes and other forms.....	20.7	65.5	10.3	34.5	10.3	41.4	10.3
Help/advise with job hunting skills.....	37.9	51.7	6.9	20.7	6.9	62.1	6.9
Matching a client’s skills and needs with job openings....	24.1	65.5	6.9	13.8	10.3	58.6	13.8
Job training classes.....	41.4	55.2	0.0	20.7	20.7	44.8	10.3
Help/advise about career goals	41.4	55.2	0.0	27.6	20.7	37.9	10.3
Work experience projects..	37.9	55.2	0.0	13.8	17.2	48.3	13.8

N=29

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 5b
 Employment: Service Needs and Provision
 Client Survey

<i>Need for and receiving:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Receiving Service</u>		
	<u>Very Much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, Need More</u>	<u>No</u>
Information on job openings/ opportunities.....	14.7%	1.5%	83.4%	12.3%	0.7%	86.6%
Help with completing job applications, resumes and other forms.....	4.2	0.6	94.3	3.6	0.7	95.3
Help/advise with job hunting skills.....	8.5	0.9	90.1	7.3	1.2	91.1
Matching your skills and needs with job openings....	6.1	1.0	92.4	5.1	0.6	94.0
Job training classes.....	6.7	0.7	92.3	4.5	0.3	94.9
Help/advise about career goals	6.6	0.1	92.8	6.0	0.1	93.4
Work experience projects..	3.4	1.3	95.2	2.3	0.7	96.8

N=685

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Employment Issues

Providers versus Clients. Service providers and clients are in agreement about familiarity with the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) with around 56 compared to 54 percent of service providers and clients, respectively, indicating that the clients are “not at all familiar” with JTPA (Tables 6a and 6b). Responses for familiarity with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) varied between the service providers and the clients with more clients than providers responding that clients were either very familiar or not at all familiar with ADA. Seventeen percent of clients felt discriminated against while attempting to gain employment (Table 6b). Thirty-seven percent of the clients responding indicated that they were currently employed.

Clients are more familiar with the American with Disabilities Act than they are with the Job Training Partnership Act.

Employment Issues by County. The responses of clients by county for employment issues can be found in Table 6, Appendix A. This look reveals that familiarity with JTPA and ADA varies from county to county. The majority of clients in Coffey, Miami, Douglas, and Lyon counties are familiar with JTPA. Clients in Anderson and Franklin counties are least familiar. The majority of clients in all the counties are familiar with ADA. While 39 percent of the clients in Douglas County indicated that they felt discriminated against while attempting to gain employment, Douglas County had the largest percentage of clients currently employed at 59 percent.

Table 6a
Employment: Issues in Service Area
Service Provider Survey

<i>Familiarity of clients with:</i>	<u>Very Familiar</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>N=</u>
the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).....	4.0%	40.0%	56.0%	25
the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).....	14.3	71.4	14.3	28

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 6b
Employment: Issues in Service Area
Client Survey

<u>Familiarity with:</u>	<u>Very Familiar</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>N=</u>
the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).....	9.2%	36.5%	54.3%	676
<u>Felt Discriminated against:</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>	
while attempting to gain employment	16.6%	83.4%	680	
<u>Familiarity with:</u>	<u>Very Familiar</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>N=</u>
the American with Disabilities Act (ADA).....	41.4%	34.9%	23.7%	676
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Currently Employed	36.6%	63.4%	674	

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Section III. Other Services

Besides housing and employment needs, service providers and clients were also asked to indicate their service needs and provisions for other services, such as childcare, education, transportation, emergency/intervention, health/nutrition, use of income, and medical services. These will be discussed in this section – first by comparing service provider and client responses and then by comparing client responses by county.

Childcare Service Needs and Provision

Service Providers and Clients. Service providers saw a greater need for childcare services than did clients (Tables 7a and 7b). For example, 88 percent of clients indicated “not at all” need with help in finding childcare while working while all service providers surveyed indicated a “some” to “large” need for this service. The survey results also show that few childcare services are being received by the clients (Table 7b). Still, 11 percent of the clients did indicate that they “very much” need helping in finding childcare while working and 10 percent said that they “very much” need emergency childcare (Table 7b). Few clients have felt discriminated while trying to find childcare.

Childcare Needs of Clients by County. Table 7, Appendix A displays the results of the Client Survey for childcare needs by county. This table reveals some gaps that were not seen by looking at this issue for the service area as a whole. Gaps in childcare needs exist for several counties. The largest gap is for Douglas and Franklin counties with regards to emergency childcare, help in finding childcare while working, and help in budgeting for childcare. Not that many clients reported feeling discriminated against while trying to find childcare; however, 13 percent of the clients from Lyon County and 10 percent of the clients from Douglas County did indicate that they felt this way.

The greatest childcare needs not being met are emergency childcare, help in finding childcare while working, and help in budgeting for childcare.

**Table 7a
Childcare: Service Needs and Provision
Service Provider Survey**

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Help in finding childcare while working.....	51.7%	44.8%	0.0%	20.7%	6.9%	62.1%	6.9%
Help in finding childcare while in school or studying.	48.3	48.3	0.0	20.7	13.8	51.7	10.3
Emergency childcare.....	48.3	41.4	3.4	10.3	13.8	62.1	10.3
Help in budgeting for childcare.....	41.4	48.3	3.4	17.2	10.3	58.6	10.3

N=29

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 7b
 Childcare: Service Needs and Provision
 Client Survey

<i>Need for and receiving:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Receiving Service</u>		
	<u>Very Much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, Need More</u>	<u>No</u>
Head Start	6.7%	0.3%	92.0%	4.7%	0.0%	94.3%
Early Head Start (0-3 years)	4.4	0.3	94.3	2.8	0.0	96.2
Help in finding childcare while working	10.9	0.3	87.9	3.2	0.1	95.8
Help in finding childcare while in school	1.6	0.1	97.5	1.0	0.1	97.8
Emergency childcare.....	10.1	0.0	89.1	0.9	0.0	98.4
Help in budgeting for childcare	8.3	0.4	90.2	0.7	0.1	98.1
<i>N=685</i>						
<i>Felt Discriminated against:</i>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>		
while trying to find child care		5.1%	94.9%	680		

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Education Service Needs and Provision

Service Providers and Clients. Service providers perceive a greater need for educational services than they are able to provide (**Table 8a**). However, clients do not perceive much of a need for educational services and they are not receiving many educational services (**Table 8b**). The top needs that providers see as the greatest needs are (based "large" need responses):

1. Mentoring programs (59%),
2. Parenting and advocacy groups (55%),
3. Education for pre-school children (52%),
4. After school programs (48%), and
5. (Tie) Information on Head Start (45%),
Instruction on improving reading skills, and
Information on vocational/technical school.

Clients would like more information on technical/computer/internet training.

Clients, on the other hand, perceive the greatest need for the following educational services (based on "very much" responses) albeit small needs:

1. Information on technical/computer, Internet training (11%),
2. Education for pre-school (9%),
3. Help in completing requirements for GED or high school diploma (8%), and
4. Information on Head Start (8%).

Education Needs of Clients by County. **Table 8, Appendix A** shows the client responses for educational services. Few real gaps exist for the clients. Franklin County has some gaps in their educational services – information on technical/computer/internet training (26% need, 2% receive), instruction on improving reading skills (26% need, 4% receive), and help/advise about educational goals (16% need, 7% receive). It should also be noted that for Anderson County, more clients say they need help in completing requirements for GED or high school diploma (20%) than are receiving the help (9%).

Table 8a
 Education: Service Needs and Provision
 Service Provider Survey

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Education for pre-school children.....	51.7%	41.4%	0.0%	27.6%	17.2%	41.4%	6.9%
Information on Head Start for pre-school children	44.8	48.3	0.0	17.2	24.1	31.0	20.7
Help and advise about client's educational goals	41.4	51.7	0.0	10.3	20.7	51.7	10.3
Help in completing forms and applications.....	24.1	69.0	0.0	6.9	13.8	58.6	13.8
Instruction on improving reading skills.....	44.8	48.3	0.0	13.8	17.2	44.8	17.2
Help in completing requirements for GED or High School diploma	34.5	62.1	0.0	20.7	6.9	37.9	31.0
Information on vocational/technical school	44.8	51.7	0.0	17.2	6.9	41.4	31.0
Information about 2 and 4 year colleges.....	31.0	62.1	3.4	20.7	6.9	41.4	27.6
After school programs.....	48.3	41.4	6.9	24.1	10.3	34.5	20.7
Mentoring programs.....	58.6	34.5	3.4	17.2	10.3	51.7	17.2
Parenting and advocacy groups.....	55.2	37.9	3.4	17.2	27.6	27.6	20.7

N=29

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 8b
 Education: Service Needs and Provision
 Client Survey

<u>Need for and receiving:</u>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Receiving Service</u>		
	<u>Very Much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, Need More</u>	<u>No</u>
Education for pre-school children.....	8.6%	0.1%	90.5%	6.7%	0.0%	92.6%
Information on Head Start for pre-school children	8.0	0.3	91.1	6.1	0.1	93.1
Help and advise about educational goals	7.3	0.7	91.4	5.4	0.1	93.7
Help in completing forms and applications.....	2.5	0.3	96.8	2.0	0.1	97.4
Instruction on improving reading skills.....	6.9	0.4	92.1	2.0	0.1	97.4
Help in completing requirements for GED or High School diploma	8.3	0.1	90.8	5.1	0.0	94.2
Information on vocational/technical school	5.5	0.0	94.0	4.4	0.0	95.2
Information about 2 and 4 year colleges.....	2.0	0.0	97.1	1.2	0.0	98.4
Information on technical/computer/internet training	11.4	0.7	87.3	6.1	0.3	93.0
Contacting schools for special needs help.....	0.9	0.0	98.4	0.9	0.0	98.5
<i>N=685</i>						
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>		
My child could use a tutor.		3.8%	96.2%	664		

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Transportation Service Needs and Provision

Service Providers and Clients. Transportation is an area that service providers and clients agree that there are needs that are not being met (Tables 9a and 9b). Service providers see the greatest need to the provision of transportation on a regular basis (Table 9a). Providers would like to do more to provide assistance with auto repair payments with 69 percent responding “yes, more”. Clients perceive their greatest needs to be the provision of transportation as needed and on a regular basis (Table 9b). Twenty-eight percent indicated that they have access to public transportation and that it is, for the most part, affordable. Twenty-nine clients responded that they have stayed home from work because they did not have enough money for transportation.

Both clients and providers agree that transportation services are needed.

Transportation Needs for Clients by County. Table 9 in Appendix A shows that transportation needs vary by county. Some key findings are:

- Transportation needs are not being met in Anderson, Franklin, and Osage counties.
- Huge gaps exist in Coffey County for assistance with auto repair payments and assistance with gas and oil costs (79/80% need with 1% receiving).
- Assistance with auto repair and oil and gas cost is needed in all the counties with differences greater than 50% for all the counties except Lyon County.
- Douglas, Miami, and Lyon counties are doing the best job for their clients with regards to access to affordable public transportation.
- Osage County is lagging behind the other counties with only 20 percent of their clients saying they have access to public transportation. However, this county's clients also indicated the lowest need for this service.
- As to the affordability of public transportation, only 11 percent of Anderson County clients and 20 percent of Franklin County clients say that public transportation is affordable.
- Over half of the Anderson County clients indicated that they have stayed home from work because they did not have enough money for transportation. Almost half (47 percent) of the Franklin County clients had the same problem.

Assistance with auto repair and oil and gas costs is needed.

Table 9a
 Transportation: Service Needs and Provision
 Service Provider Survey

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Transportation provided on a regular basis.....	48.3%	41.4%	6.9%	24.1%	3.4%	55.2%	13.8%
Transportation provided as needed	41.4	41.4	6.9	13.8	3.4	65.5	10.3
Assistance with auto repair payments.....	24.1	48.3	13.8	3.4	69.0	17.2	89.7
Assistance with needed gas and oil costs.....	27.6	51.7	10.3	3.4	3.4	69.0	17.2
<i>N=29</i>							
<u>People in area have:</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>			
Access to public transportation.....		40.0%	60.0%	25			
<i>If so, is it affordable.....</i>		80.0	20.0	10			

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 9b
 Transportation: Service Needs and Provision
 Client Survey

<u>Need for and receiving:</u>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Receiving Service</u>		
	<u>Very Much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, Need More</u>	<u>No</u>
Transportation provided on a regular basis.....	64.1%	1.9%	33.9%	51.8%	0.3%	47.6%
Transportation provided as needed	64.7	2.0	33.1	52.6	0.3	47.0
Assistance with auto repair payments.....	55.9	3.2	40.0	2.5	1.2	95.8
Assistance with needed gas and oil costs.....	55.6	2.8	40.3	2.3	0.7	96.2
<i>N=685</i>						
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>		
Access to public transportation in your area.....		72.5%	27.5%	679		
<i>If so, is it affordable.....</i>		68.0	24.5	575		
Ever stayed home from work because did not have enough money for transportation...		28.6	71.4	664		

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Emergency/Intervention Service Needs and Provision

Service Providers and Clients. Service providers and clients were also asked to indicate the need and provision of emergency services/intervention services; these can be found in **Tables 10a and 10b**. Providers indicated the “largest” need (over 40% “large” response) for:

1. Mentor programs (66%),
2. Help with alcohol or drug abuse problems (45%), and
3. Help with resolving family conflicts or abuse of family members (41%).

Clients had a different set of critical needs for emergency/intervention services than providers (**Table 10b**). They consider the following to be their greatest needs (“very much” need for service):

1. Donated clothing (96%),
2. Donated household goods (91%),
3. Assistance paying medical/dental bills (83%), and
4. Short term loans for emergencies (50%).

Clients indicated that needs were being met for all these critical areas except for short-term loans for emergencies.

Clients have a need for short-term loans for emergencies that is not being met.

Emergency/Intervention Needs for Clients by County. In general, the counties as indicated in **Table 10, Appendix A**, are meeting emergency and intervention service needs. However, several counties are experiencing a few gaps in service with the most striking being Coffey, Douglas, and Miami counties and the lack of short-term loans for emergencies.

Table 10a
 Emergency Services/Intervention: Service Needs and Provision
 Service Provider Survey

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Help paying electric and gas bills	31.0%	55.2%	0.0%	6.9%	10.3%	55.2%	17.2%
Assistance paying Medical/ Dental bills.....	37.9	48.3	0.0	3.4	10.3	51.7	24.1
Short-term loans for emergencies.....	34.5	44.8	6.9	6.9	0.0	58.6	24.1
Help in resolving family conflicts or abuse of family members..	41.4	48.3	0.0	6.9	17.2	48.3	17.2
Help with alcohol or drug Abuse problems	44.8	44.8	0.0	17.2	10.3	48.3	17.2
Counseling during unemployment.....	27.6	58.6	3.4	10.3	3.4	62.1	17.2
Temporary shelter to escape abuse	27.6	58.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.6	31.0
Donated clothing	37.9	34.5	13.8	6.9	13.8	55.2	13.8
Donated household goods	34.5	44.8	6.9	6.9	10.3	51.7	20.7
Legal assistance.....	31.0	51.7	6.9	3.4	0.0	62.1	27.6
Mentor programs	65.5	24.1	0.0	10.3	20.7	37.9	27.6
Counseling for gang related activities.....	20.7	58.6	13.8	3.4	13.8	51.7	27.6

N=29

<u>Familiarity of clients with:</u>	<u>Very Familiar</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>N=</u>
the Hill Burton Act.....	3.8%	23.1%	73.1%	26

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 10b
 Emergency Services/Intervention: Service Needs and Provision
 Client Survey

<u>Need for and receiving:</u>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Receiving Service</u>		
	<u>Very Much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, Need More</u>	<u>No</u>
Help paying electric and gas bills	34.9%	2.0%	61.9%	25.5%	1.2%	72.3%
Assistance paying Medical/Dental bills.....	82.6	0.6	16.5	79.4	0.4	20.0
Short-term loans for emergencies.....	50.2	5.5	43.9	1.9	0.6	97.4
Help in resolving family conflicts or abuse of family members	95.0	6.7	1.3	91.8	4.2	0.6
Help with alcohol or drug abuse problems	7.0	1.0	91.5	5.1	0.7	94.0
Counseling during unemployment.....	7.7	0.9	91.1	6.6	0.4	92.8
Temporary shelter to escape abuse	1.9	0.0	97.8	1.3	0.0	98.2
Donated clothing	95.8	0.9	3.1	95.8	0.7	3.4
Donated household goods	90.7	1.3	7.7	90.7	1.2	8.0
Legal assistance.....	16.5	2.3	80.6	14.5	0.3	84.8
Mentor programs like Big Brothers/Sisters	16.8	0.3	82.6	11.7	0.1	88.0
Counseling for gang related activities.....	6.1	0.0	93.6	5.1	0.0	94.6

N=685

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Health/Nutrition Service Needs and Provision

Service Providers and Clients. **Table 12a** displays the results of the Service Provider Survey with regards to health and nutrition service needs and provision. Sixty-two percent of the service providers surveyed see a “large” need for free or reduced price school meals for children and 38 percent are providing this service with another 28 percent “giving a referral.” In general, service providers see a need for all the services listed in the survey even though these are not necessarily services that they can provide.

Table 12b displays the results of the Client Survey – and it basically shows that the services that clients are receiving are the services that they say they need. The services that more than half the clients surveyed say they “very much” need are:

1. Surplus government food (98%),
2. Donated produce and groceries (97%),
3. Produce from community gardens (82%), and
4. Seeds for a garden (64%).

In general, clients are receiving the health/nutrition services they need.

Health/Nutrition Needs for Clients by County. A look at the Client Survey’s results by county lets the counties know whether or not they are providing the services that their clients need. The results for health and nutrition can be found in **Table 12** in **Appendix A**. A few observations follow:

A. A few observations follow:

- Clients in Anderson and Franklin counties could use more counseling or classes on nutrition, diet and food preparation, vouchers or cash for food purchases, and tips about shopping wisely.
- Coffey, Douglas, and Lyon counties are meeting the health and nutrition needs of their clients with the level of services they offer.
- Although not a great need, a few clients in Miami and Osage counties did say that they would like counseling or classes on nutrition, diet and food preparation.

Table 11a
 Health/Nutrition: Service Needs and Provision
 Service Provider Survey

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Counseling or classes on Nutrition diet and food preparation.....	34.5%	51.7%	6.9%	24.1%	17.2%	37.9%	17.2%
Surplus government food ..	34.5	48.3	10.3	13.8	0.0	58.6	24.1
Donated produce and groceries	41.4	44.8	6.9	6.9	6.9	58.6	24.1
Hot meals	41.4	48.3	6.9	13.8	6.9	55.2	24.1
Free or reduced price school meals for kids.....	62.1	27.6	10.3	37.9	0.0	34.5	27.6
Vouchers or cash for food purchases	34.5	51.7	6.9	6.9	10.3	55.2	24.1
Produce from community gardens	17.2	62.1	6.9	3.4	0.0	69.0	17.2
Seeds for a garden.....	6.9	65.5	10.3	0.0	0.0	72.4	13.8
WIC (assistance for mothers and their infant children) ...	44.8	34.5	6.9	3.4	0.0	58.6	27.6
Tips about shopping wisely	34.5	41.4	10.3	6.9	10.3	55.2	17.2
Summer Feeding Program.	31.0	44.8	6.9	3.4	6.9	62.1	10.3

N=29

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 11b
 Health/Nutrition: Service Needs and Provision
 Client Survey

<u>Need for and receiving:</u>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Receiving Service</u>		
	<u>Very Much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, Need More</u>	<u>No</u>
Counseling or classes on nutrition, diet and food preparation.....	18.8%	6.0%	74.6%	10.5%	0.6%	88.5%
Surplus government food ..	98.4	0.0	1.2	98.2	0.0	1.5
Donated produce and groceries	95.6	0.6	3.5	95.0	0.6	4.1
Hot meals	20.6	0.4	78.5	20.1	0.3	79.1
Free or reduced price school meals for kids.....	37.8	0.0	61.6	37.5	0.0	62.2
Vouchers or cash for food purchases	48.8	0.3	50.5	37.2	0.1	62.3
Produce from community gardens	82.3	0.1	16.9	82.0	0.1	17.1
Seeds for a garden.....	63.9	0.0	35.5	63.6	0.0	35.9
WIC (assistance for mothers and their infant children) ...	7.2	0.1	92.1	7.2	0.0	92.3
Tips about shopping wisely	17.4	4.4	77.7	9.1	0.0	90.4
Summer Feeding Program.	4.1	0.0	95.0	3.6	0.0	95.6
<i>N=685</i>						
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>		
Skip any meals during the last month because did not have enough food or money to buy food.....		34.1%	65.9%	665		

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Use of Income Service Needs and Provision

Service Providers and Clients. Tables 12a and 12b lists the results of the surveys about financial, or use of income, services needed and provided. Over 90 percent of the providers see a need for all the services listed with the greatest need for help/advise preparing a household budget and for weatherization help (Table 12a). In general, with regards to the use of income, clients say that they are receiving the services needed (Table 12b). Slight gap needs to exist, however, for help/advise preparing household budget and instruction and work on homes to reduce heating and cooling costs.

In general, clients say they are receiving the “use of income” services needed. However, a look by county shows some gaps.

Use of Income Needs for Clients by County. Table 12 in Appendix A lists the results for the use of income by county for the clients. While the Client Survey results for the area as a whole (Table 12b) showed small gaps between needs and receiving the service, this table with the data by county shows several gaps:

- Anderson County clients indicated that they need more assistance with help/advise preparing household budgets, instruction on reducing heating/cooling costs, work on homes to reduce heating and cooling costs, and advise on how to make good shopping decisions.
- Franklin County clients also indicated that they need more assistance with the same four areas as Anderson County – household budgets, reducing heating and cooling costs, and making good shopping decisions – plus they would like some help/advise preparing income taxes.
- A few clients in Miami County could use help/advise with preparing household budgets and help with making good shopping decisions.
- For Osage County, clients also see a need for help with household budgets, reducing heating and cooling costs, and making good shopping decisions. A small number of clients would also like help/advise on loans and credit cards and help in establishing credit.

Table 12a
 Use of Income: Service Needs and Provision
 Service Provider Survey

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Help/advise preparing household budget.....	41.4%	41.4%	3.4%	10.3%	10.3%	44.8%	24.1%
Help/advise on loans and credit cards	34.5	48.3	3.4	6.9	3.4	48.3	31.0
Help/advise preparing Income Taxes.....	24.1	51.7	10.3	0.0	0.0	58.6	31.0
Instruction on reducing heating and cooling costs.	34.5	44.8	6.9	6.9	0.0	55.2	27.6
Work on homes to reduce heating and cooling costs.	31.0	51.7	3.4	3.4	6.9	48.3	31.0
Weatherization	41.4	48.3	3.4	6.9	6.9	44.8	37.9
How to make good Shopping decisions.....	37.9	51.7	3.4	10.3	10.3	55.2	20.7
Help establishing credit.....	27.6	62.1	3.4	3.4	6.9	62.1	24.1
Help setting up a savings account	20.7	65.5	6.9	10.3	6.9	62.1	17.2

N=29

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 12b
 Use of Income: Service Needs and Provision
 Client Survey

<i>Need for and receiving:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Receiving Service</u>		
	<u>Very Much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, Need More</u>	<u>No</u>
Help/advise preparing household budget.....	30.4%	5.5%	63.5%	22.5%	0.4%	76.6%
Help/advise on loans and credit cards	3.5	0.6	95.3	2.2	0.0	97.5
Help/advise preparing income taxes.....	60.6	0.7	38.4	58.7	0.4	40.6
Instruction on reducing heating and cooling costs.	67.0	3.1	29.6	63.9	0.4	35.3
Work on homes to reduce heating and cooling costs.	12.1	1.2	85.8	4.8	0.6	94.2
How to make good shopping decisions.....	21.3	5.7	72.3	16.2	0.4	82.9
Help establishing credit.....	1.6	0.0	97.8	0.7	0.1	98.5
<i>N=685</i>						
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>		
Interested in setting up a savings account.....		83.5%	16.5%	680		

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Medical Services Needs and Provision

Service Providers and Clients. The results of the Service Provider Survey for medical service needs and provision are displayed in **Table 13a**.

The majority of service providers indicated a “large” need for: 1) the Health Wave Insurance Program (55%) and 2) information on teen drug abuse or alcohol abuse (52%). All the service providers were in agreement that there was a need for information on teen pregnancy. The area with the most gaps between need and provision was the need for a prescription drug program.

A prescription drug program is needed.

Tables 13b, 14, and 15 present the results of the Client Survey with regards to medical service – clients’ family health care needs, familiarity, satisfaction, and convenience of services offered, and insurance options and doctors’ visits. Some key findings are:

- About half of the clients do not have dental insurance and 20 percent of the clients have skipped dental visits because there was not enough money (**Table 13b**).
- A little over one-fourth of the clients have someone in their family that needs an eye exam and need glasses (**Table 13b**).
- Twenty-two percent of the clients know someone who has AIDS (**Table 13b**).
- Thirty percent of the clients responding said that their family has a need for sex education and almost 90 percent said that teenage pregnancy is a problem in their area (**Table 13b**).
- While 96 percent of services providers indicated some need for the Health Wave Insurance program, only seven percent of clients are currently receiving Health Wave Insurance for their children (**Tables 13a and 13b**). Twenty percent of the clients are aware of the program.
- Most clients (65 percent) are “very familiar” with the Hill/Burton Act with says that you cannot be turned away from treatment at an emergency room (**Table 14**).
- Around 85 percent of the clients are “somewhat” to “very satisfied” with the health services in their area (**Table 14**). Twenty-two percent, however, travel to another town for health services and, for those who travel, the median distance is 40 to 60 miles.
- Almost 26 percent of the clients surveyed have NO health insurance (**Table 15**). Medicaid and Medicare supply the majority of health insurance needs for those who do have insurance. Only one percent work for employers who provide health insurance.
- In the past year, clients who completed the survey have visited a doctor an average of 6.58 times and have taken a family member to a doctor an average of 4.19 times (**Table 15**). They have visited an emergency room an average of 1.54 times, with one client having 80 visits.

Ninety percent of the clients surveyed say teenage pregnancy is a problem in their area.

Almost 26 percent of the clients surveyed have NO health insurance.

Medical Service Needs for Clients by County. Just how medical services compare among counties in the ECKAN service area can be ascertained by looking at **Tables 13, 14, and 15** in **Appendix A**. Some areas of note follow:

- Less than half of the clients in Anderson, Franklin and Lyon counties have dental insurance and over half of the clients in Franklin County have skipped a dental visit because they did not have enough money (Table 13, Appendix A).
- A large number of clients in Anderson and Franklin counties (74 and 69 percent, respectively) have someone in their family that needs and eye exam as well as someone that needs glasses (Table 13, Appendix A).
- Eleven percent of the clients in Anderson County and eight percent in Osage County indicated that someone in their family had a sexually transmitted disease (Table 13, Appendix A).
- Forty-five percent of the clients in Douglas County know someone who has AIDS (Table 13, Appendix A). Around one-fourth of the clients in Anderson, Franklin, and Osage counties also know someone who has AIDS.
- Clients in Anderson and Douglas counties (45 and 48 percent, respectively) see a need for sex education in their family (Table 13, Appendix A).
- An overwhelming majority of clients see teenage pregnancy as a problem in their area from 72 percent in Douglas County to 100 percent in Osage County (Table 13, Appendix A).
- Few clients have Health Wave Insurance for their children (Table 13, Appendix A). Awareness of the program is highest in Lyon County, where 40 percent indicated that they were aware. Utilization of the program is highest in Douglas County, where 15 percent of the clients have this insurance for their children.
- Clients in Franklin County are the least aware of the Hill/Burton Act regarding access to emergency room treatment, with 67 percent aware of the act (Table 14, Appendix A).
- The majority of clients are satisfied with the health services in their area *except for* Osage County, which only has 46 percent satisfied (Table 14, Appendix A). Also of note are the 26 percent of the clients in Franklin County that are *not* satisfied with health service.
- Not surprising, given the level of satisfaction in Osage County with health service, over 66 percent of the clients in Osage County travel to another town for health services (Table 14, Appendix A). These clients travel more than 20 miles for health services with over half traveling more than 60 miles.
- Almost all the clients in Douglas and Miami counties are able to find health services in their town (Table 14, Appendix A).
- Few employers furnish health insurance for the clients (Table 15, Appendix A). Forty percent of the clients in Douglas County have NO health insurance.
- In the past year, clients in Osage County, on average, have visited the doctor more than clients in the other counties (Table 15, Appendix A). Clients in Douglas County, on average, have taken family members to a doctor more times in the past year than other counties.

Few clients work for employers that provide health insurance.

Table 13a
 Medical Services: Service Needs and Provision
 Service Provider Survey

<i>In your service area, need for and provision of:</i>	<u>Need for Service</u>			<u>Provision of Service</u>			
	<u>Large</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, More</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Give Referral</u>
Help with dentist bills.....	34.5%	55.2%	3.4%	3.4%	3.4%	65.5%	24.1%
Help with doctor bills	37.9	51.7	3.4	3.4	3.4	65.5	24.1
Information on AIDS and Other sexually transmitted diseases.....	31.0	55.2	3.4	20.7	13.8	34.5	24.1
Information on teen pregnancy.....	37.9	55.2	0.0	27.6	10.3	37.9	20.7
Information on getting glasses and eye exams	24.1	62.1	3.4	17.2	17.2	34.5	24.1
Information on teen drug abuse or alcohol abuse.....	51.7	41.4	0.0	27.6	17.2	34.5	17.2
A prescription drug program	48.3	34.5	6.9	3.4	3.4	65.5	20.7
The Health Wave Insurance Program.....	55.2	34.5	3.4	24.1	10.3	31.0	24.1
Satisfaction with health services in area	24.1	55.2	6.9	0.0	13.8	48.3	24.1

N=29

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Service Provider Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 13b
Medical Services: Family Health Care Needs
Client Survey

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Have dental insurance.....	50.8%	49.2%	679	
During past year, skip dental visits because there wasn't enough money	20.1	79.9	680	
Anyone in family need an eye exam.....	26.8	73.2	680	
Anyone in family need glasses ..	25.6	74.4	680	
Any teens in family with an alcohol abuse problem	1.8	98.2	681	
	<u>Yes, one person</u>	<u>Yes, 2 or more</u>	<u>No, no one</u>	<u>N=</u>
Anyone in family had a sexually transmitted disease	3.8%	0.7%	95.4%	679
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Know anyone who has AIDS	22.2%	77.8%	675	
Need for sex education in your family.....	29.3	70.7	680	
In your area, teen age pregnancy is a problem	89.7	10.3	680	
Currently receiving Health Wave Insurance for your children.....	6.7	93.3	669	
Aware of the Health Wave Insurance Program	20.1	79.9	668	

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 14
 Medical Services: Familiarity, Satisfaction, Convenience
 Client Survey

<u>Familiarity with:</u>	<u>Very Familiar</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>N=</u>
the Hill/Burton Act, which says you can't be turned away from treatment at an emergency room.....	64.9%	27.4%	7.8%	683

<u>Satisfaction with:</u>	<u>Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>N=</u>
Health services in your area	54.8%	30.7%	14.5%	683

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>
Travel to another town for health services.....	21.8%	78.2%	678

If so, how far do you have to travel:

Median Distance: 40 – 60 miles range

- Less than 10 miles..... 2.6%
- 10-19 miles..... 15.1
- 20-39 miles..... 32.2
- 40-60 miles..... 19.1
- More than 60 miles..... 30.9

N=152

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 15
 Medical Services: Insurance Options and Doctor's Visits
 Client Survey

*Types of health insurance
 family presently has:*

Employer furnished	1.3%
Private Health Insurance.....	25.0
Medicare	36.8
Medicaid.....	56.6
Veteran's.....	1.0
No Health Insurance.....	25.7

N=685

*In the past year, number of times visited
 a doctor:*

Range	0 – 150 visits
Median	4 visits
Mean	6.58 visits

*In the past year, number of times taken
 a family member to a doctor:*

Range	0 – 50 times
Median	2 times
Mean	4.19 times

*During the past year, number of visits to
 an emergency room:*

Range	0 – 80 visits
Median	0 visits
Mean	1.54 visits

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Section IV. Family Profile

Demographic Characteristics

Tables 16a, 16b, and 16c provide a family profile of the clients that completed ECKAN's Client Survey. Because the surveyors sought a random sample of 100 survey responses from each county, with Johnson County excluded, the county of residence information is fairly equal for the counties (Table 16a). The residents in a county vary from 88 responses in Anderson County to 101 responses from Miami County. Ten respondents did not indicate a county of residence. The average client family for this survey has 1.48 males and 1.63 females. The majority of clients (68 percent) have an income below \$10,000.

Each county's client population is unique and this uniqueness should be considered when developing and providing programs.

Table 16b presents the ages of the family members, the living status, marital status, and race for the clients that responded to the survey. As seen by the ages of the family members, ECKAN serves a wide range of clients from infants to seniors. Forty percent of the clients have family members with school age children (age 5 to 19). Thirty-one percent of the clients responding have family members in the 45 to 64 age range. More than half of the clients surveyed (54 percent) are families with adults only and 27 percent are single parent families with school-aged children. About an equal number of clients are married, single, divorced or widowed. Almost 89 percent of the clients indicated European American/Caucasian as their race.

The Client Survey also asked questions about the household regarding disabilities, domestic violence, and language spoken in the home. These results of these questions and others can be found in Table 16c.

- Forty-three percent of the clients completing the survey indicated that the head of the household or spouse is disabled or handicapped. Of those households, eight percent indicated they have special housing needs.
- While eight percent of the clients said that there has been domestic violence in their home in the past year, only two percent said that there currently is domestic violence in their home.
- In 96 percent of the clients' homes everyone speaks English.
- Three percent of the clients indicated that they knew someone from another country who needs assistance.

Forty-three percent of the clients surveyed indicated that the head of the household or spouse is disabled or handicapped.

Demographic Characteristics of the Clients by County. See Tables 16a, 16b, and 16c in Appendix A for a breakdown of the demographic and other family profile characteristics by county of those completing the Client Survey. These tables show the uniqueness of each county's client population and that this uniqueness should be considered when developing and providing programs to meet the clients' needs.

Table 16a
Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics (Residence, Sex of Family Members, Income)
Client Survey

County of Residence:

Anderson.....	88 (12.8%)	Lyon.....	97 (14.2%)
Coffey.....	96 (14.0%)	Miami.....	101 (14.7%)
Douglas.....	98 (14.3)	Osage.....	98 (14.3%)
Franklin.....	97 (14.2%)	Missing.....	10 (1.5%)
Johnson.....	0 (0.0%)		

N=685

Number of Family Members

Male:

Range.....	0 – 8
Mean.....	1.48
Median.....	1.00

Percentage of Responses with:

0 male family members.....	2.6%
1.....	62.0
2.....	24.9
3.....	6.7
4.....	3.3
6.....	0.2
8.....	0.2

N=421

Percentage in the Income Range:

Below \$6,500.....	36.2%
\$6,500-\$9,999.....	32.0
\$10,000-\$13,499.....	16.6
\$13,500-\$16,999.....	7.6
\$17,000-\$20,499.....	2.9

N=685

Female:

Range.....	0 – 8
Median.....	1.00
Mean.....	1.63

Percentage of Responses with:

0 female family members.....	0.2%
1.....	58.4
2.....	24.9
3.....	12.9
4.....	2.7
5.....	0.7
6.....	0.2
8.....	0.2

N=591

\$20,500-\$23,999.....	0.9%
\$24,000-\$27,499.....	1.3
\$27,500-30,999.....	0.7
\$31,000-\$34,500.....	0.3
over \$34,500.....	0.3

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 16b
Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics (Age, Living, Marital, and Race Status)
Client Survey

Family Ages:

Mean Number in the Age Range:

0-4.....	1.20 (N=134)
5-19.....	1.87 (N=281)
20-24	0.95 (N=99)
25-34	1.13 (N=165)
35-44	1.09 (N=173)
45-64	1.13 (N=224)
65 +.....	1.06 (N=190)

N=685

*Number (Percentage) with **at least one** person in the Age Range:*

0-4.....	122 (17.8%)
5-19.....	271 (39.6%)
20-24	85 (12.4 %)
25-34	155 (22.6%)
35-44	161 (23.5%)
45-64	211 (30.8%)
65 +.....	180 (26.3%)

Living Status:

Adults only.....	369 (53.9%)
Adults with school-aged children.....	125 (18.2%)
Single Parent with school-aged children.....	187 (27.3%)

N=685

Marital Status:

Married	179 (26.1%)
Single	142 (20.7%)
Separated.....	56 (8.2%)
Divorced.....	140 (20.4%)
Widowed.....	142 (20.7%)
Partnered, but not married...	24 (3.5%)

N=685

Race:

African American/Black	63 (9.2%)
Native American/Alaskan Eskimo	11 (1.6%)
Asian/Pacific Islander.....	3 (0.4%)

N=685

European American/Caucasian	606 (88.5%)
Other.....	10 (1.5%)
Hispanic/Latino	26 (3.8%)

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Table 16c
Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics (Household Status)
Client Survey

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>	
Head of household or spouse disabled or handicapped	43.4%	56.6%	679	
If so, have special housing needs*		7.7	92.3	648
Head of household or spouse is a student.....	1.3	98.7	677	
Currently, domestic violence is in the home.....	1.9	98.1	676	
Domestic violence has been in the home in the past year.....	8.2	91.8	679	
Everyone speaks English**	96.3	3.7	677	
Know someone from another country who needs assistance***		3.2	96.8	666

**43 responses indicated special needs for wheelchair accessibility (ramps, low fixtures/switches, bathroom handles, etc.).*

***24 responses indicated Spanish as the language spoken in the home, 6= Indian, 2= sign language, 1= Italian, and 1= Vietnamese.*

****12 responses indicated that housing assistance was needed, 4=employment, 2=languages, 1=food program, and 1=health insurance.*

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2000, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Conclusion

In general, the providers responding to the Service Provider Survey indicated that the housing, employment, and other services mentioned in the survey are needed. And, the providers also indicated that they would like to be able to do more. The clients' responses to the Client Survey, with a similar list of services, show that they do not always agree with the providers about what is needed. And, it appears that the clients are more likely to indicate that services being received (programs and policies are already in place) are those that they need. This would tend to indicate support for continuing to provide current services.

However, because providers and clients do not always agree on the level of need and the ability to provide the service does not always exist, it is important to look at the gaps from the client's viewpoint. What does the client say is needed? Is the client able to receive the service (or be given a referral)? Where those gaps exist may indicate areas for adjustment and improvement while maintaining those programs that are working.

ECKAN serves a range of clients and their demographic characteristics vary from county to county. Therefore, it is also important to view the results at the county level. Different needs do exist between the counties as well as the county's ability to provide various services. This also supports the importance of continuing to ask the client what they need and are they able to get the services needed and then adjust the programs and policies accordingly.

Appendix A
Client Survey Results
by County