

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

ECKAN Needs Assessment 2003 Survey of Clients

Prepared by

Genna Hurd
Co-Director, KCCED

October 2003

Report No. 71

Charles Krider
Project Director, KCCED

Steven Maynard-Moody
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 Matt Kaufman with the Survey Research Center at the Policy Research Institute, the University of Kansas and Charlotte Talley with the Policy Research Institute, the University of Kansas.

A copy of this report can be obtained by contacting: ECKAN, PO Box 100, Ottawa, KS 66067-0100, (785) 242-7450, e-mail: eckan@swbell.net.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Findings	1
Section I. Housing.....	2
Housing Service Needs and Provision	2
Table 1. Housing: Service Needs and Provision	3
Housing Issues	5
Table 2. Housing: Issues in Service Area	7
Table 3. Status of Client’s Housing	8
Table 4. Condition of Property.....	9
Section II. Employment.....	10
Employment Service Needs and Provision.....	10
Table 5. Employment: Service Needs and Provision	11
Employment Issues	12
Table 6. Employment: Issues in Service Area.....	12
Section III. Other Services	13
Childcare Service Needs and Provision	13
Table 7. Childcare: Service Needs and Provision	14
Education Service Needs and Provision.....	14
Table 8. Education: Service Needs and Provision	15
Transportation Service Needs and Provision	16
Table 9. Transportation: Service Needs and Provision	17
Emergency Services/Intervention Service Needs and Provision	18
Table 10. Emergency Services/Intervention: Service Needs and Provision	19
Health/Nutrition Service Needs and Provision	20
Table 11. Health/Nutrition: Service Needs and Provision	21
Use of Income Service Needs and Provision	22
Table 12. Use of Income: Service Needs and Provision	23
Medical Service Needs and Provision	24
Table 13. Medical Services: Family Health Care Services	25
Table 14. Medical Services: Familiarity, Satisfaction, Convenience	26
Table 15. Medical Service: Insurance Options and Doctor’s Visits	27
Section IV. Family Profile.....	29
Demographic Characteristics of Clients.....	29
Table 16a. Demographic Characteristics (Residence, Sex of Family Member, Income)	31
Table 16b. Demographic Characteristics (Age, Living, Marital, and Race Status)	32
Table 16c. Demographic Characteristics (Household Status).....	33
Conclusion	34

Appendix A. Client Survey Results by County	A-1
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
Appendix B. ECKAN Community Assessment Survey.....	B-1

ECKAN Needs Assessment 2003: Survey of Clients

Introduction

The East Central Kansas Economic Opportunity Corporation (ECKAN) contracted with the Policy Research Institute (PRI) at the University of Kansas in 2003 to assist with a needs assessment survey of clients. The Survey Research Center (SRC) at PRI worked with ECKAN to develop the surveys administered to ECKAN's clients in their service area.¹

The ECKAN survey was mailed to all of the 1,628 ECKAN client households in eight Kansas counties (Anderson, Coffey, Douglas, Franklin, Johnson, Lyon, Miami, and Osage). After fourteen days, a second mailing was sent to a random sample of 300 client households that had not responded to the initial mailing. In addition, about two weeks following the second mailing, households not responding to the mail survey were selected at random and contacted via the telephone to complete the survey. The two mailings were performed during the month of July 2003 and phone calls were made to 1,044 non-respondents on August 21, 22, and 25 – 29, 2003.

Of the 1,628 surveys mailed, the SRC received 381 responses, providing a mailing response rate of 23 percent. Of the 1,044 clients contacted by telephone 195 individuals agreed to complete the survey and 92 individuals refused, providing a telephone cooperation rate of 68%, and a telephone response rate of 19 percent. Thus, the total number of completed surveys was 576. As such, the total response rate from the survey is 36 percent. Given the number of completed surveys and question response distribution, the margin of error for the survey is ± 3.7 percent.

The Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) with PRI became involved in this process in September 2003 with the generation of tables for the Client surveys using SPSS.² 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. Sections I – III include an analysis of the provision of the services and the clients' views on whether or not the service is needed. A breakdown of the clients' responses by county is also reported. Tables for the county-level responses can be found in Appendix A.³ Therefore,

¹ ECKAN's eight county service area includes Anderson, Coffey, Douglas, Franklin, Johnson, Lyon, Miami, and Osage counties in Kansas. See Appendix B for a copy of the survey.

² The KCCED also analyzed the 2000 ECKAN Community Assessment Survey of both Providers and Clients. These results were published in *ECKAN Needs Assessment Survey of Service Providers and Clients*, PRI Technical Report No. 50, May 2001.

³ Only one client response was received from Johnson County; therefore, a breakdown for Johnson County was not included in Appendix A.

following analysis provides an overview of the need for services and the services provided as well as differences among the counties served.

Section I. Housing

Housing Service Needs and Provision

The survey asked the clients a series of questions about the need for a service and whether or not the service is being provided or received. These services ranged from information on available houses or apartments to occasional help paying rent. Table 1 displays the results of the client responses.

A comparison of housing needs and provisions shows that clients' needs are mostly being met with around three percent of the clients still need more assistance.

Most of ECKAN's clients, from 61 to 91 percent, are not receiving housing services (Table 1). Clients that are receiving housing services, most frequently indicated that they need more help paying electric and gas bills (11 percent). The housing services that more clients are receiving are:

1. help paying electric and gas bills (28%),
2. ongoing assistance with paying rent (21%),
3. information on available housing or apartments (17%),
4. home repair and upkeep assistance (14%), and
5. occasional help with paying rent (10%).

The largest needs gap is help paying electric and gas bills with 11 percent of the clients saying they need more help.

Sixty to 78 percent of the clients responding with regard to housing indicated "not at all" a need for most of the housing services listed in the survey (Table 1). For those that did indicate a need, the greatest need based on "very much" response was for:

1. help paying electric and gas bills (48%),
2. ongoing assistance with rent (38%),
3. home repair and upkeep assistance (32%),
4. information on available housing (27%), and
5. occasional help with paying rent (27%).

Table 1
Housing: Service Needs and Provision

Service	Receiving Service				Need for Service			
	Yes	Yes, Need More	No	N=	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
Information on available houses or apartments	16.5%	3.2%	80.3%	533	27.0%	12.6%	60.4%	492
Help with completing forms	9.8	2.4	87.8	539	15.5	13.0	71.5	491
Ongoing assistance with paying rent	20.7	3.0	76.3	540	38.0	10.7	51.3	495
Counseling on housing options	5.8	3.2	91.0	535	15.0	12.3	72.6	486
Help with landlords	5.6	3.4	91.0	533	12.4	9.2	78.4	490
Home repair and upkeep assistance	13.6	5.5	80.9	544	31.8	16.9	51.3	503
Help paying electric and gas bills	28.3	11.2	60.5	547	48.0	20.9	31.1	512
Deposit assistance for renting	8.8	2.1	89.2	535	21.1	9.7	69.2	497
Occasional help with paying rent	10.4	3.8	85.8	530	26.6	14.0	59.4	493
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>								

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

For those clients that need housing assistance, more help in needed paying gas and electric bills as well as help with home repair and upkeep.

Clients by County

Table 1 in Appendix A shows that housing needs vary from county to county with gaps existing for all the counties between needs for the service and receiving the service. Some of the gaps are minor while others are obvious and major. The greatest housing need by county is help paying electric and gas bills with 54 to 69 percent indicating this as a need and 26 to 51 percent of the clients saying they are receiving this assistance. Coffey and Douglas counties appear to be meeting this need better than the other counties in the ECKAN service area. Several findings should be noted:

- For Anderson County, the greatest housing need is help with paying electric and gas bills with 54 percent indicating a need for this and 35 percent receiving this assistance. Over a quarter of the clients in Anderson County also indicated a need for (in order of greatest need): information on available houses or apartments, home repair and upkeep assistance, and occasional help with paying rent. The largest gap in need and provision is for help paying electric and gas bills and occasional help paying rent at a 19 percent gap.
- In Coffey County, clients are basically receiving the assistance they need although gaps exist for all the housing services. The greatest gap is in home repair and upkeep assistance with 60 saying they need this service and only 27 percent indicating that they are receiving this assistance.
- Gaps exist for Douglas County between needs and provision of housing services. The largest gap is for home repair and upkeep with 38 percent needing the service and 16 percent receiving it. The second largest gap is with occasional help paying rent with 35 percent saying they need the service and 17 percent indicating they receive it.
- For every housing service mentioned, gaps exist in Franklin County and these gaps range from a difference of ten percent (help with landlords) to 38 percent (help paying gas and electric bills).
- Gaps in housing needs and provisions exist in Lyon County for all the services provided; the gaps range from 13 percent (information on available housing and help with landlords) to 27 percent (help with paying electric and gas bills). The three most notable areas for improvement are help with paying electric and gas bills, home repair and upkeep assistance, and occasional help paying rent.

In general, gaps exist for all the housing services between need and provision for all the counties.

- Housing needs for Miami County are not being met with large gaps (27 to 34 percent) existing for six of the nine services. Those services are (by largest gaps) ongoing assistance with paying rent, information on available houses or apartments, help paying electric and gas bills, occasional help paying rent, deposit assistance with renting, and home repair and upkeep assistance.
- Gaps exist for housing needs in Osage County with the greatest gap for home repair and upkeep assistance with 45 percent saying they need it and 12 percent saying they have received repair and upkeep assistance. More help is also needed for occasional help paying rent, help with landlords, and help paying electric and gas bills.

Housing Issues

Clients were also asked a series of questions about housing issues and these responses can be found in Tables 2, 3, and 4. When these responses are compared to the responses in Table 1, obvious housing needs emerge – more affordable housing for low-income as well as assistance with rent and first time buying.

A number of housing issues emerged for clients from more Section 8 rental assistance and first-time buyer programs to more safe and suitable low-income housing and rentals.

Forty-nine percent of the clients indicated that they were “not at all familiar” with the Section 8 program, which provides rental assistance (Table 2). A little over 50 percent of the clients said they would be interested in Section 8 if more units were available. Thirty-seven percent of the clients also indicated interest in a first-time homebuyers program.

Clients were asked if they know someone who is homeless and almost 18 percent said that they do know someone who is homeless (Table 2). Fifteen percent of the clients indicated that they have felt discriminated against while attempting to find housing because of their race, religion, national origin, or because they have children. Less than one-fourth of the clients (22 percent) were aware that their city has a minimum housing code.

Around 29 percent of the clients felt that there were enough safe and suitable apartments or homes for rent while not quite 19 percent thought there were enough safe and suitable housing units for low-income families (Table 2). Forty-six percent of the clients knew at least one person who was unable to find housing.

Housing Issues for Clients by County

Table 2, Appendix A gives the client responses by county regarding Section 8 housing, discrimination in housing, safe and suitable housing and other housing issues. Some key findings from this table are:

- Most clients are familiar with Section 8 rental assistance, with clients from Franklin, Lyon, and Osage Counties being the least familiar. The interest in Section 8 housing varies from county to county from 38 percent to 67 percent with over half of the clients in Miami, Lyon, Franklin, and Coffey counties interested if more units were available. The least interest was in Anderson County with 38 percent of those clients interested in Section 8 if more units were available.
- In all counties, clients know someone who is homeless. Douglas County has the highest number with 31 percent of the clients saying they know a homeless person. Few clients in Lyon and Anderson counties know someone who is homeless (six and seven percent, respectively).

Over 40 percent of the clients in each county know someone who is or was unable to find housing.
- Osage and Coffey County clients feel the most discriminated against when it comes to housing with 18 percent in each county indicating this response. Clients in Anderson County feel the least discriminated against with only 8 percent reporting feelings of discrimination.
- The greatest interest in first-time homebuyer programs is in Miami and Franklin counties, but all counties had an interest from 24 to 51 percent of the clients.
- Only Lyon, Douglas, and Franklin counties have over one-fourth of their clients that are aware of minimum housing code. Work is needed in all counties to increase awareness.
- With regards to safe and affordable housing for rent and for low-income families, a county breakdown shows all the counties need work in this area. In none of the counties do the majority of clients believe that there are enough safe and affordable apartments or homes for rent. Douglas County is the closest to having half of the clients believe that there are enough safe and affordable rental units with 47 percent indicating so. Franklin County appears to need the most work in this area with only 15 percent indicating enough safe and affordable rental units and only 9 percent indicating enough low-income housing.

Safe and suitable apartments or homes for rent and housing units for low-income families are lacking for clients in the ECKAN service area.

- Over 40 percent of the clients for all counties know someone who is or was unable to find housing. About 58 percent of the clients in Coffey County know someone who was unable to find housing.

Table 2
Housing: Issues in Service Area

	Very Familiar	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
<u>Section 8:</u>				
Familiarity with Section 8 program, which provides rental assistance	23.9%	27.0%	49.1%	544
Interest in Section 8 if more units available		<u>Yes</u> 50.4%	<u>No</u> 49.6%	<u>N=</u> 530
<u>Other Housing Issues:</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>
Know someone who is homeless		17.9%	82.1%	553
Ever felt discriminated against while attempting to find housing		14.5%	85.5%	553
Interest in first-time homebuyers program		36.8%	63.2%	543
Awareness of city's minimum housing code		22.2%	77.8%	535
<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	28.7%	34.3%	37.0%	505
Housing for low-income families	18.5%	28.5%	53.0%	502
<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	14.6%	31.5%	53.8%	533
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>				

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Status of Housing and Condition

Sixty-seven percent of the clients responding to the survey rent and 49 percent rent apartments while 51 percent rent houses (Table 3). Four-nine percent of the clients said they paid less than one-third of their gross income for rent, 31 percent paid between one-third and one-half, and almost 20 percent paid more than one-half of their gross income for rent. The gross rent/monthly payment for housing ranged from under \$200 for 39 percent of the clients to more than \$700 for three percent of the clients. The majority of clients (69 percent) live in one or two bedroom places.

Most clients pay less than \$299 a month for housing (58%) and live in property in satisfactory condition (65%).

While most of the clients live in housing they consider to be in satisfactory condition – from 65 to 82 percent – some areas need work (Table 4). The five areas most frequently cited as needing repair were walls, door, plumbing, roof, and foundation. Those areas most needing replacement were door and foundation.

Insulation and cooling are the two areas most in need to be installed. Regarding appliances in the home, almost half of the clients (47 percent) own all their appliances. Thirty-two percent said their appliances were provided by someone else.

Table 3
Housing: Status of Client's Housing

<i>Housing Status</i>	<i>Rent</i>	<i>Own</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Kind of Housing</i>	<i>Apartment</i>	<i>House</i>	<i>N=</i>
Rent or Own	67.0%	33.0%	515	Apartment or House	48.7%	51.3%	427
<i>Gross Rent/Monthly Payment:</i>				<i>Number of Bedrooms:</i>			
	<i>Percent</i>				<i>Percent</i>		
Under \$ 200	38.6%			One	32.3%		
\$ 200 - 299	19.4%			Two	36.5%		
\$ 300 - 399	15.6%			Three	24.7%		
\$ 400 - 499	12.4%			Four	5.2%		
\$ 500 - 599	7.4%			Five or More	1.4%		
\$ 600 - 699	3.4%			N=	502		
\$ 700 or more	3.2%						
N=	443						
<i>Statement which best applied to your family:</i>					<i>Percent</i>	<i>N=</i>	
We pay less than one third of our gross income for rent					49.2%	417	
We pay between one third and one half of our gross income for rent					31.2%		
We pay more than one half of our gross income for rent					19.7%		
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>							

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 4
Housing: Condition of Property

<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	71.6%	18.7%	8.4%	1.3%	476
Walls	71.7	20.9	6.1	1.3	459
Door	64.7	20.9	12.2	2.1	468
Insulation	72.1	12.8	7.8	7.4	462
Electrical	76.6	13.5	8.2	1.8	453
Plumbing	72.6	19.4	6.2	1.8	449
Heating	82.0	8.6	6.6	2.9	456
Cooling	73.3	11.6	7.7	7.4	457
Foundation	69.7	17.4	9.0	4.0	455

Appliances in the Home:

Concerning refrigerator, oven, washer, dryer, and the like, do you own all of these, some of these, or are they provided by someone else, such as a landlord?

Own all	46.7%	Provided by someone else	32.0%
Own some	18.0%	Other situation*	3.3%
N=	540		

Total Surveys=576

*Under "Other Situation," six clients indicated that these items were provided by the landlord but were in need of repair or replacement. Six clients indicated that they needed a washer/dryer, two clients said they needed a refrigerator, and two clients said they needed a stove. One client said they needed hot water.

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Housing Status and Condition 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 53 percent and 54 percent, renters in Anderson and Osage counties, respectively, to 85 percent renters in Miami County (Table 3, Appendix A). Clients in Douglas, Osage and Miami counties pay higher rents, with over 20 percent of the clients for each of those counties more than \$500 a month rent. Clients in Miami, Anderson, and Lyon counties spend more of their gross monthly income for rent, with 30 percent of the clients in Miami County paying more than half their gross monthly income for rent. Rents appear to be more reasonable with comparison to monthly income for clients in Douglas County, which had the highest percentage of clients (56 percent) reporting that they pay less than one-third of their gross income for rent.

A breakdown by county shows where work is needed on housing for the clients in the ECKAN service area in both affordability and condition.

Table 4, Appendix A shows the condition of housing by whether or not it needs work. A breakdown by county shows that work is needed on the condition of housing for all counties with 12 to 35 percent of the clients indicating some aspect of their housing needs work. Coffey, Franklin, and Osage counties contain property that needs the most repairs, replacement, or installation. Cooling, foundation, and insulation are areas where the condition is the poorest for Coffey County. For Franklin County as for Coffey County, more than 20 percent of the clients indicated that work is needed for all the areas except heating. In Osage County, the greatest areas of need are doors, roof, and insulation.

Section II. Employment

Employment Service Needs and Provision

Clients were asked to classify the need for employment services in their area and if they were receiving the services. The results of these responses can be found in Tables 5 and 6. A small number of ECKAN clients (from three to seven percent) are receiving employment services. And, clients did not see much of a need for the employment services listed in the survey with 75 to 85 percent of the clients responded “not at all” for the employment services listed in Table 5. The greatest need appears to be in information on job openings/opportunities with 16 percent saying they “very much” need this service. Matching skills with job openings and job training classes were two other areas of need with 13 and 12 percent, respectively saying they very much need those services. When asked in they were receiving employment services, most of the clients indicated that they were not receiving these services – from 93 to 98 percent.

The majority of clients in the ECKAN service area did not perceive a need and were not receiving employment services.

**Table 5
Employment: Service Needs and Provision**

Service	Receiving Service				Need for Service			
	Yes	Yes, Need More	No	N=	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
Information on job openings and opportunities	3.5%	3.1%	93.4%	515	16.0%	9.5%	74.5%	482
Help with completing job applications, resumes and other forms	3.9	1.3	94.8	519	9.0	9.8	81.2	489
Help/advice with job hunting skills	3.3	1.0	95.7	516	9.4	8.4	82.1	487
Matching your skills and needs with job openings	3.3	1.7	95.0	515	12.6	9.9	77.5	484
Job training classes	2.1	0.6	97.3	512	11.6	10.1	78.3	484
Help/advice about career goals	2.5	1.4	96.1	514	10.2	8.6	81.2	489
Work experience projects	1.7	0.8	97.5	482	7.8	9.1	83.1	450
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>								

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

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. For the breakdown by county, the “Need” category combines very much and somewhat responses; therefore, the county breakdown does show greater pockets of need for the services and gaps in meeting those needs. The largest gap can be found in Anderson County where 27 percent say they need information of job openings/opportunities and only 6 percent are receiving it. Coffey County has the next highest gaps (20 percent) with regards to information on jobs openings/opportunities and job training classes. Also of note is over one-fifth of the Lyon County clients reported a need for job training classes and only three percent said they are receiving this assistance.

A breakdown by county shows pockets of employment needs and gaps in service delivery.

Employment Issues

ECKAN clients are more familiar with the American Disabilities Act than they are with the Job Training Partnership Act (Table 6). Eighty-two percent of the clients responded that they are “not at all familiar” with JTPA compared to 57 percent for ADA. Fourteen percent of clients said that they felt discriminated against while attempting to gain employment. Only 19 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.

Table 6
Employment: Issues in Service Area

<i>Familiarity with:</i> the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	Very Familiar	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
	6.6%	11.7%	81.7%	497
<i>Felt Discriminated Against:</i> while attempting to gain employment	Yes	No	N=	
	14.0%	86.0%	523	
<i>Familiarity with:</i> the American with Disabilities Act (ADA)	Very Familiar	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
	11.3%	31.5%	57.3%	524
Currently Employed	Yes	No	N=	
	19.3%	80.7%	529	
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>				

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Employment Issues by County

The responses of clients by county for employment issues can be found in Table 6, Appendix A. For all the counties, clients are more familiar with ADA than JTPA; still, not very many clients are familiar with either of these acts. Coffey County has the largest percentage of its clients familiar with JTPA with 33 percent indicating familiarity while clients in Osage County are least familiar. Familiarity with ADA among the ECKAN counties ranged from 37 percent in Lyon County to 47 percent in Douglas County.

From seven (Miami County) to 21 percent (Coffey County) of the clients have felt discriminated against while attempting to gain employment. Coffey County has the lowest number of clients indicating that they are currently employed at nine percent and Miami County has the highest percentage currently employed at 24 percent.

Section III. Other Services

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

Child Care Service Needs and Provision

Most of the clients surveyed do not need nor do they receive child care services (Table 7). Eighty-nine to 94 percent of the clients indicated that they did “not at all” need child care services. However, for those clients that need child care, they “very much” need it. The greatest need is help finding child care while working with 9 percent saying they need this very much and three percent saying they somewhat need it. Emergency child care is also needed with 10 percent indicating a need for this service. Few clients have felt discriminated while trying to find child care.

The greatest child care needs are help in finding childcare while working and emergency child care.

Child Care Needs of Clients by County

Table 7, Appendix A displays the results of the Client Survey for child care needs by county. This table reveals some needs and gaps that were not seen by looking at this issue for the service area as a whole. Miami County has the greatest child care needs for the ECKAN service area with 21 percent indicating a need for help in finding child care while working, 16 percent saying they need emergency child care and Head Start. Gaps in child care needs exist for several counties. The largest gap is for Miami County with regards to emergency child care with 16 percent saying they need this service and only three percent saying they receive it. Not that many clients reported feeling discriminated against while trying to find child care; the largest percentage of clients feeling discriminated against was in Osage County at six percent. No clients in Anderson, Coffey, Franklin, or Miami counties reported feeling discriminated against while trying to find child care.

Table 7
Child Care: Service Needs and Provision

Service	Receiving Service				Need for Service			
	Yes	More	No	N=	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
Head Start	2.9%	0.6%	96.4%	476	6.4%	1.3%	92.3%	452
Early Head Start (0 - 3 years)	1.7	0.4	97.9	469	5.6	0.9	93.5	446
Help in finding child care while working	2.3	1.1	96.6	472	8.5	2.7	88.8	448
Help in finding child care while in school	1.5	0.6	97.9	472	5.4	2.3	92.3	444
Emergency child care	0.8	0.8	98.3	474	6.4	4.0	89.6	451
Help in budgeting for child care	0.8	0.2	98.9	472	4.2	2.5	93.3	449
<i>Felt discriminated against while trying to find child care</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>					
	1.6%	98.4%	442					
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>								

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Education Service Needs and Provision

Few clients, from two to seven percent, are receiving education services (Table 8). Most clients do not perceive a great need for these services with seven to 17 percent indicating the service is very much needed. The top needs as indicated by the clients are (based “very much” need responses):

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

1. Information on technical/computer/internet training (17%),
2. Help in completing forms and applications (13%),
3. Information about 2 and 4 year colleges (12%),
4. Help/advice with educational goals (11%), and
5. Information on vocational/technical school (10%).

Fifteen percent of the clients said that their child could use a tutor.

Table 8
Education: Service Needs and Provision

Service	Receiving Service				Need for Service			
	Yes	Yes, Need More	No	N=	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
Education for pre-school children	3.3%	1.0%	95.6%	480	7.5%	2.2%	90.4%	456
Information on Head Start for pre-school children	3.6	0.8	95.6	475	6.9	2.2	90.8	448
Help/advice about educational goals	3.3	1.9	94.8	479	10.9	4.7	84.4	450
Help in completing forms and applications	5.6	1.3	93.1	480	12.5	6.9	80.6	449
Instruction on improving reading skills	2.4	1.2	96.3	491	7.4	5.2	87.4	460
Help in completing requirements for GED or high school diploma	1.0	1.2	97.8	493	7.4	2.8	89.7	458
Information on vocational/technical school	2.0	1.6	96.4	495	10.3	8.1	81.6	457
Information about 2 and 4 year colleges	2.0	0.8	97.2	493	11.7	6.9	81.4	462
Information on technical/computer/internet training	1.2	1.4	97.3	489	16.7	10.1	73.2	455
Contacting schools for special needs help	1.4	0.8	97.8	490	10.0	4.2	85.8	452
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>					
My child could use a tutor	15.3%	84.7%	437					
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>								

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Education Needs of Clients by County

Table 8, Appendix A shows the client responses for educational services by county. The greatest gaps in educational services are with information on

technical/computer/internet training. The largest gap is in Coffey County with 30 percent indicating that they need this information and no one saying that they are receiving it. Douglas, Franklin, and Osage counties also have large gaps in this area with over one-fifth of their clients needing this service by not receiving it. More information is also needed on vocational/technical programs,

Information gaps exist for training and educational opportunities for technical and computer training, vocational/technical schools, and two- and four-year colleges.

particularly in Coffey, Douglas, Anderson, Osage, and Franklin counties where 11 to 18 percent of the clients saying they need this information but are not receiving it. More information is also needed on 2 and 4 year colleges for clients in Coffey, Miami, Franklin, Douglas, and Osage counties. Around one-fifth of the clients in Franklin and Osage counties say that their child could use a tutor.

Transportation Service Needs and Provision

More transportation services are needed in the ECKAN service area.

Transportation is an area where work is needed to meet clients' needs (Tables 9). Clients perceive their greatest needs to be the assistance with auto repair payments and assistance with gas and oil costs with around 46 percent of the client saying they need these services. A large need also exists for transportation provided as needed and on a regular basis. More clients are receiving transportation regularly and as needed than are receiving assistance with auto repair and oil and gas costs.

Sixty percent of the clients responding to the public transportation question indicated that they have access to public transportation in their area (Table 9). For the most part, public transportation is affordable. Nineteen percent of the clients (or 96 clients) responded that they have stayed home from work because they did not have enough money for transportation.

**Table 9
Transportation: Service Needs and Provision**

Service	Receiving Service				Need for Service			
	Yes	Yes, Need More	No	N=	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
Transportation provided on a regular basis	12.7%	3.2%	84.0%	526	22.1%	13.0%	64.9%	484
Transportation provided as needed	16.4	4.3	79.3	518	25.4	14.2	60.4	480
Assistance with auto repair payments	2.3	1.5	96.2	523	30.6	15.8	53.6	487
Assistance with needed gas and oil costs	5.5	3.0	91.5	527	31.9	14.0	54.1	492
Access to public transportation in your area?			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>			
			59.4%	40.6%	524			
If so, is it affordable?			76.5%	23.5%	307			
Ever stayed home from work because did not have enough money for transportation?			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>			
			18.9%	81.1%	508			

Total Surveys=576

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

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

- Anderson County clients indicated a need with assistance with auto repair payments and assistance with oil and gas costs.
- Gaps exist in Coffey County for assistance with auto repair payments and assistance with gas and oil costs (48/55% need with 5/13% receiving, respectively). Over one-fifth of the clients that need transportation on a regular basis and as needed are not receiving it.
- Assistance with auto repair and oil and gas cost is needed in all the counties with differences greatest in Coffey, Osage, and Miami counties.
- Douglas, Lyon, and Miami counties are doing the best job for their clients with regards to access to affordable public transportation. However, Douglas County appears to need the most work (have the largest gaps) in providing transportation on a regular basis and as needed for its clients.

Assistance with auto repair and oil and gas costs is needed in all the counties in the ECKAN service area.

- Osage County is lagging behind the other counties with only 18 percent of their clients saying they have access to public transportation. For those that have access to public transportation, Osage County has the lowest percentage indicating affordability at 41 percent.
- Over one-fourth of the Osage County clients indicated that they have stayed home from work because they did not have enough money for transportation. One-fifth (20 percent) of the Franklin County clients had the same problem.

Emergency/Intervention Service Needs and Provision

Clients were asked to indicate whether or not they were receiving certain emergency/intervention services; their responses can be found in Table 10. The three services that more clients are receiving are: assistance paying medical/dental bills (33%), donated clothing (29%), and donated household goods (25%).

More assistance with paying medical/dental bills is needed by clients in the ECKAN service area.

Clients consider the following five services to be their areas of greatest need (in order of need): assistance paying medical/dental bills (77%), short term loans for emergencies (51%), donated household goods (47%), donated clothing (43%), and legal assistance (37%).

Emergency/Intervention Needs for Clients by County

In general, the counties as indicated in Table 10, Appendix A, are meeting intervention service needs for help involving family conflict and abuse, alcohol or drug abuse, counseling during unemployment, temporary shelter to escape abuse, mentor

For all the counties, the top two areas of concern are short term loans for emergencies and assistance paying medical/dental bills.

programs, and counseling for gang-related activities. The gaps are occurring in assistance with paying medical/dental bills, short term loans for emergencies, donated clothing and household goods, and legal assistance. For all the counties, the top two areas of concern are short term loans for emergencies and assistance paying medical/dental bills. Coffey and

Franklin counties had the two highest differences between provision of short term loans and need for the service at 48 and 42 percent, respectively. The need for assistance paying medical/dental bills ranged from 65 percent in Franklin County to 73 percent in Osage and Coffey counties. The need for short term loans for emergencies ranged from 30 percent in Anderson County to 55 percent in Coffey County.

Table 10
Emergency Services/Intervention: Service Needs and Provision

Service	Receiving Service				Need for Service			
	Yes	Yes, Need More	No	N=	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
Assistance paying Medical/Dental bills	30.7%	12.0%	57.3%	534	58.5%	19.0%	22.4%	504
Short-term loans for emergencies	4.8	2.8	92.4	539	31.2	19.5	49.3	493
Help in resolving family conflicts or abuse of family members	3.7	1.1	95.1	536	7.2	8.0	84.8	501
Help with alcohol or drug abuse problems	0.9	0.4	98.7	537	3.5	2.0	94.5	509
Counseling during unemployment	2.4	2.1	95.5	535	7.8	7.0	85.3	503
Temporary shelter to escape abuse	0.7	0.2	99.1	536	3.8	1.2	95.0	499
Donated clothing	23.0	5.7	71.3	540	28.4	15.0	56.6	507
Donated household goods	19.3	5.4	75.3	518	29.0	18.0	53.0	479
Legal assistance	7.7	2.3	90.1	533	23.0	13.6	63.4	492
Mentor programs like Big Brothers/Sisters, Breakfast Buddies or Supper Buddies	3.4	0.6	96.0	528	11.1	5.2	83.7	485
Counseling for gang related activities	0.4	0.4	99.2	530	1.6	1.0	97.4	491
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>								

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Health/Nutrition Service Needs and Provision

The majority of ECKAN clients say they very much need surplus government food and donated produce and groceries.

Table 11 displays the results of the Client Survey with regards to health and nutrition service needs and provision. The services that clients say they need most, as indicated by “very much,” are surplus government food (commodities) at 70 percent followed by donated produce and groceries at 51 percent and vouchers or cash for food purchases at 42 percent. The services

that more clients say they are receiving, but need more, are also surplus government food and donated produce and groceries. A little over 28 percent of the clients indicated that they skipped a meal during the last month because they did not have enough food or money to buy food.

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 11 in Appendix A. Basically, clients’ needs are being met in all the counties with regards to free or reduced school meals for children, assistance for mothers and their infant children, and the Summer Feeding Program. Anderson County appears to be doing the best job of meeting its clients’ health and nutrition needs. All the other counties have gaps between provision and need with the most notable gaps for donated produce and groceries, vouchers or cash for food purchases, and produce from community gardens. A breakdown by county shows that 18 (Anderson County) to 33 percent (Franklin County) of the clients skipped a meal in the last month because there was not enough food or money to buy food.

Table 11
Health/Nutrition: Service Needs and Provision

Service	Receiving Service				Need for Service			
	Yes	Yes, Need More	No	N=	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
Individual counseling or classes on nutrition, diet and food preparation	5.9%	2.1%	92.0%	527	11.8%	12.0%	76.2%	484
Surplus government food (commodities)	65.5	9.0	25.5	534	70.1	18.6	11.3	512
Donated produce and groceries	33.3	8.8	57.9	534	51.0	23.5	25.5	506
Hot meals	10.7	2.5	86.8	523	19.3	11.1	69.5	486
Free or reduced price school meals for kids	25.1	0.8	74.1	502	28.0	3.1	68.9	479
Vouchers or cash for food purchases	19.6	5.5	74.9	525	42.2	15.8	42.0	493
Produce from community gardens	7.7	2.3	90.0	522	28.8	17.8	53.4	483
Seeds for a garden	1.9	0.8	97.3	521	15.6	8.0	76.3	486
WIC (assistance for mothers and their infant children)	9.0	0.2	90.8	499	10.9	2.6	86.5	459
Tips about shopping wisely	4.8	1.5	93.6	519	10.2	10.4	79.5	482
Summer Feeding Program	2.9	0.6	96.5	511	11.3	6.9	81.8	462
<i>Did you skip any meals during the last month because you did not have enough food or money to buy food?</i>					<u>Yes</u> 28.4%	<u>No</u> 71.6%	<u>N=</u> 528	
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>								

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Use of Income Service Needs and Provision

Table 12 lists the results of the surveys about financial, or use of income, services needed and provided. The most needed services for the clients, based on the “very much” response are: work on home to reduce heating and cooling costs (28%), instructions on reducing heating and cooling costs (25%), help/advice preparing income taxes (25%), and help establishing credit (23%). Gaps do exist for the provision of these and other financial services, particular when the “very much” and “somewhat” need responses are combined. Taking the combined need response and comparing it to the yes responses for receiving services, the gap between use of income services ranges from 14 percent (how to make wise shopping choices) to 31 percent (work on home to reduce heating and cooling costs).

Gaps exist in the provision of financial/use of income services and what clients say they need, most notably with regards assistance to reduce heating and cooling costs and help establishing credit.

Use of Income Needs for Clients by County

The use of income results of the client survey by county are displayed in Table 12, Appendix A. This table shows the counties where the gaps in service needs and provision are occurring.

- For Anderson County, around 20 percent of the clients indicated that they need more assistance with work on homes to reduce heating and cooling costs, help establishing credit, help/advice preparing household budgets, and instruction on reducing heating/cooling costs.
- Over one-third of Coffey County clients indicated that they need more assistance with reduce heating and cooling costs, with a 40 percent gap for work on homes and a 33 percent gap for instructions on reducing these costs. The survey results also show that almost one-fourth of Franklin County’s clients (23% service provision gap) could use help establishing credit but are not receiving it.
- In Douglas County, reducing heating and cooling costs is also an area where more assistance is needed along with help establishing credit (33%, 27%, and 21% gaps in service provision, respectively).
- Franklin County clients are experiencing the same needs as Douglas and Coffey counties with more assistance needed to reduce heating and cooling costs and establish credit. Around 20 percent of these clients could also use help on loans and credit cards, although not one client is receiving these services.
- Lyon County has the smallest gaps in service for use of income with their two main areas of unmet needs being help establishing credit and work on homes to reduce

Lyon County had the smallest gaps in service provision for use of income, ranging from six percent to 20 percent.

heating and cooling costs. Twenty-six percent said they need help establishing credit compared to six percent that said they have received help; 33 percent said they needed work on homes to reducing heating and cooling costs while 15 percent indicated they had received this kind of assistance.

- More than 10 percent of Miami County’s clients need assistance in all the use of income services mentioned with the main areas of concern being reducing heating and cooling costs and help establishing credit. The largest gap is in instruction on reducing heating and cooling costs with 42 percent saying they need it and only eight percent saying they receive it.
- For Osage County, clients also see a need for more help with establishing credit and reducing heating and cooling costs. Around 24 percent of these clients also indicated that they could use help with preparing a household budget with only 4 percent indicating that they have received this kind of assistance.

Table 12
Use of Income: Service Needs and Provision

Service	Receiving Service				Need for Service			
	Yes	Yes, Need More	No	N=	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
Help/advice preparing household budget	4.5%	1.1%	94.4%	531	8.3%	14.2%	77.5%	493
Help/advice on loans and credit cards	1.9	1.1	97.0	531	13.5	7.2	79.4	475
Help/advice preparing income taxes	16.3	1.7	82.0	527	24.6	8.4	67.0	500
Instructions on reducing heating and cooling costs	9.2	2.1	88.7	523	24.7	14.0	61.2	485
Work on home to reduce heating and cooling costs	9.1	2.3	88.6	526	28.1	13.8	58.0	491
How to make good shopping choices	4.1	1.7	94.2	518	9.4	10.0	80.5	488
Help establishing credit	2.9	1.7	95.4	523	22.8	7.6	69.6	487
<i>Interested in setting up a savings account</i>	<u>Yes</u> 22.8%	<u>No</u> 77.2%	<u>N=</u> 504					
<i>Total Surveys=576</i>								

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Medical Services Needs and Provision

Tables 13, 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 listed below.

Family Health Care Needs (Table 13)

- Almost 90 percent of the clients do not have dental insurance and 60 percent of the clients have skipped dental visits in the past year because there was not enough money.
- Around two-thirds of the clients have someone in their family that needs an eye exam (63%) and needs glasses (65%).
- Six percent of the clients know someone who has AIDS.
- Only two percent of the clients responding said that their family has a need for sex education while almost 38 percent said that teenage pregnancy is a problem in their area. Only two percent of the clients indicated that they had teens in their family with an alcohol abuse problem.
- Twenty-eight percent of clients are currently receiving Health Wave Insurance for their children and 44 percent of the clients said they are aware of the program.
- Clients indicated that they would like education on Health Wave Insurance, adult health insurance, dental assistance and insurance programs, and all kinds of medical assistance available.

More dental and optometry assistance is needed for ECKAN’s clients.

Familiarity, Satisfaction, and Convenience of Medical Services (Table 14)

- Most clients (62 percent) are “not at all familiar” with the Hill/Burton Act with says that you cannot be turned away from treatment at an emergency room.
- Around 79 percent of the clients are “somewhat” to “very satisfied” with the health services in their area. Fifty-six percent, however, travel to another town for health services; and, for those who indicated that they travel, the majority travel more than 20 miles.

Most clients are not at all familiar with the Hill/Burton Act.

Table 13
Medical Services: Family Health Care Needs

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>
Have dental insurance	10.8%	89.2%	530
During the past year, skip dental visits because there was not enough money	56.9%	43.1%	522
Anyone in family need an eye exam	62.6%	37.4%	532
Anyone in family need glasses	64.9%	35.1%	527
Any teens with an alcohol abuse problem	2.1%	97.9%	517
	<u>Yes, one person</u>	<u>Yes, 2 or more</u>	<u>No, no one</u>
Anyone in family had a sexually transmitted disease	3.0%	0.9%	96.0%
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>
Know anyone with AIDS	6.2%	93.8%	534
Need for sex education in your family	1.9%	98.1%	528
In your area, is teenage pregnancy a problem	38.1%	61.9%	475
Currently receiving Health Wave Insurance for your children	28.7%	71.3%	488
Aware of Health Wave Insurance Program	43.8%	56.2%	500

Would like education on:

Health Wave insurance (9), adult health insurance (7), dental assistance/insurance programs (5), all kinds of medical assistance available (4), depression (2), children with disabilities (2), diabetes (2), eye programs, hearing aids, raising healthy children, brain injury, and tobacco usage.

Total Surveys=576

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 14
Medical Services: Familiarity, Satisfaction, Convenience

<i>Familiarity with:</i>				
Hill/Burton Act, which says you can't be turned away from emergency room treatment	Very Familiar	Somewhat	Not at All	N=
	16.3%	21.6%	62.1%	541
 <i>Satisfaction with:</i>				
Health services in your area	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not at All	N=
	34.7%	44.4%	20.9%	527
 <i>Travel for Health Care:</i>				
Travel to another town for health services	Yes	No	N=	
	55.5%	44.5%	535	
 <i>If so, how far do you have to travel:</i>				
Less than 10 miles	20.7%			
10 - 19 miles	17.9%			
20 - 39 miles	31.7%			
40 - 60 miles	17.9%			
More than 60 miles	11.8%			
N=	363			

Total Surveys=576

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Insurance Options and Doctor's Visits (Table 15)

- Around 15 percent of the clients surveyed have NO health insurance. Medicaid and Medicare supply the majority of health insurance needs for those who do have insurance. Only four percent work for employers who provide health insurance.
- In the past year, while the range of clients' doctor visits has been 0 to 200 visits, the majority of clients who responded to this question has visited a doctor five times or less (53 percent). Clients have taken a family member to a doctor from 0 to 365 times with a large number of clients (43 percent) having taken NO family members. Visits to the emergency room have been few (2 visits or less) for most clients (77 percent), with one client having 223 visits.

Almost 15 percent of the clients surveyed have NO health insurance.

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

<i>Types of health insurance family presently has:</i>			<i>In the past year, number of times taken a family member to a doctor:*</i>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Employer furnished	24	4.2%	Range = 0 to 365 times		
Private health insurance	71	12.3%			
Medicare	292	50.7%	0 times	207	43.3%
Medicaid	252	43.8%	1 - 2 times	49	10.3%
Veteran's	14	2.4%	3 - 5 times	86	18.0%
No health insurance	87	15.1%	6 - 10 times	53	11.1%
			11 - 20 times	48	10.0%
			21 - 30 times	10	2.1%
			more than 30 times***	13	2.7%
			N=	478	
<i>In the past year, number of times visited a doctor:*</i>			<i>In the past year, number of visits to an emergency room:*</i>		
			Range = 0 to 200 visits	Range = 0 to 223 visits	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0 visits	50	9.4%	0 visits	205	39.5%
1 - 2 visits	100	18.9%	1 - 2 visits	194	37.4%
3 - 5 visits	129	24.3%	3 - 5 visits	78	15.0%
6 - 10 visits	110	20.8%	6 - 10 visits	29	5.6%
11 - 20 visits	77	14.5%	11 - 20 visits	4	0.8%
21 - 30 visits	26	4.9%	21 - 30 visits	3	0.6%
more than 30 visits**	38	7.2%	more than 30 visits****	6	1.2%
			N=	519	

*Non-numerical responses such as "few," "several," "many", or "numerous" were converted to numerical ranges. "Few"=1-2 visits/times, "Several"=3-5 visits/times, and "Many," "Numerous," and "A Lot"=more than 30 visits/times.

**Includes 20 non-numerical responses of "Many," "Too Many," "Numerous," etc.

***Includes 5 non-numerical responses of "Many" or "Often."

****Includes 3 non-numerical responses of "A Lot" or "Many."

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

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.

- Few clients in the ECKAN service area have dental insurance with the range of seven percent in Anderson County to 14 percent in Franklin County. Over half of the clients in all the counties except Anderson County (48 percent) have skipped a dental visit because they did not have enough money. (Table 13, Appendix A)
- The majority of clients in all the ECKAN counties (from 50 to 78 percent) have someone in their family that needs an eye exam as well as someone that needs glasses. (Table 13, Appendix A)
- Nine percent of the clients in Miami County and seven percent in Douglas County indicated that someone in their family had a sexually transmitted disease. (Table 13, Appendix A)
- Fourteen percent of the clients in Coffey County know someone who has AIDS (Table 13, Appendix A). Around eight percent of the clients in Franklin and Douglas counties also know someone who has AIDS.
- Few clients in the ECKAN service area see a need for sex education in their family. (Table 13, Appendix A)
- Clients that see teenage pregnancy as a problem in their area ranges from 47 percent in Franklin County to 33 percent for Osage, Douglas, and Coffey counties. (Table 13, Appendix A)
- Less than 30 percent of clients have Health Wave Insurance for their children, except for Miami County with 44 percent. Awareness of the program is highest in Miami and Franklin counties, where over half (55 and 51 percent, respectively) indicated that they were aware. (Table 13, Appendix A)
- Awareness of the Hill/Burton Act regarding access to emergency room treatment was highest in Franklin and Anderson counties with 48 and 46 percent, respectively, aware of the act. (Table 14, Appendix A)
- The majority of clients are satisfied with the health services in their area with the fewest percent of clients satisfied in Osage County at 67 percent. (Table 14, Appendix A)

Few clients work for employers that provide health insurance and can afford dental and eye care.

Most clients are satisfied with health services in their area ranging from 67 percent in Osage County to over 90 percent in Anderson and Douglas counties.

- Not surprising, given the level of satisfaction in Osage County with health service, 97 percent of the clients in Osage County travel to another town for health services. Douglas County has the lowest percentage of clients that must travel to another town for health services at 29 percent. (Table 14, Appendix A)
- Few employers furnish health insurance for the clients in the ECKAN service area with NO clients in Coffey County indicating that the employer provides health insurance. Twenty-two percent of the clients in Coffey County and 21 percent in Anderson County have NO health insurance. (Table 15, Appendix A)
- In the past year, clients in Douglas, Franklin, and Coffey counties, on average, have visited the doctor more than clients in the other counties. Clients in Franklin County, on average, have taken family members to a doctor more times in the past year than other counties. Clients living in Anderson County have averaged the fewest number of visits to the doctor and fewest times taking a family member to visit the doctor. On average, clients from Miami County have more emergency room visits than clients in the other counties. Clients in Osage County average the least number of emergency room visits. (Table 15, Appendix A)⁴

Section IV. Family Profile

Demographic Characteristics

Tables 16a, 16b, and 16c provide a family profile of the clients that completed ECKAN's Client Survey. The residents in a county vary from one response in Johnson County to 107 responses from Franklin County (Table 16a). Twenty-seven respondents did not indicate a county of residence. Fifty-nine percent of the surveys returned indicated that their family had at least one male family member while 89 percent of the surveys indicated at least one female family member. The majority of respondents (71 percent) have an income below \$10,000.

Each county's clients are 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. Twenty-nine percent of the clients have family members with school age children (age 5 to 19). Thirty-four percent of the clients responding have family members in the 45 to 64 age

⁴ While an average was calculated using SPSS for number of doctor visits, number of times taking a family member to the doctor, and number of emergency room visits, these averages were not listed in the tables. Because numeric ranges were assigned for non-numeric responses (such as "few", "many", "numerous," "several," etc.), the averages are questionable although they do give an idea of degree and allow for comparisons among the counties.

range and in the over 65 age range. More than half of the clients surveyed (67 percent) are families with adults only and 13 percent are single parent families with school-aged children. About an equal number of clients are married, divorced, or widowed. Eighty-four 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; some highlights follow.

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

- Fifty-six percent of the clients completing the survey indicated that the head of the household or spouse is disabled or handicapped. Of those households, 28 percent indicated they have special housing needs. Those special needs dealt mostly with accessibility and mobility, such as wheelchair accessibility, handicapped accessible bathroom/showering facilities, and mobility issues with stairs.
- While five percent of the clients said that there has been domestic violence in their home in the past year, only one percent said that there currently is domestic violence in their home.
- In 93 percent of the clients' homes everyone speaks English.
- Three percent of the clients indicated that they knew someone from another country who needs assistance.

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, Gender of Family Members, Income)

<u>County of Residence</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Income Range</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Anderson	63	10.9%	Below \$6,500	177	33.9%
Coffey	60	10.4%	\$6,500 - \$9,999	195	37.4%
Douglas	95	16.5%	\$10,000 - \$13,499	80	15.3%
Franklin	107	18.6%	\$13,500 - \$16,999	22	4.2%
Johnson	1	0.2%	\$17,000 - \$20,499	15	2.9%
Lyon	67	11.6%	\$20,500 - \$23,999	16	3.1%
Miami	62	10.8%	\$24,000 - \$27,499	5	1.0%
Osage	94	16.3%	\$27,500 - \$30,999	4	0.8%
Missing	27	4.7%	\$31,000 - \$34,500	4	0.8%
N=	576		over \$34,500	4	0.8%
			N=	522	

<u>Gender of Family Members</u>					
<u>Male</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0 males	236	41.0%	0 females	61	10.6%
1	181	31.4%	1	314	54.5%
2	77	13.4%	2	89	15.5%
3	26	4.5%	3	45	7.8%
4	8	1.4%	4	20	3.5%
5	3	0.5%	5	4	0.7%
6	2	0.3%	6	1	0.2%
7	1	0.2%	7	1	0.2%
Missing	42	7.3%	Missing	41	7.1%
N=	576		N=	576	

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

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

<u>Family Ages</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0 to 4	49	8.5%	Married	126	21.5%
5 to 19	168	29.2%	Single	87	14.8%
20 to 24	37	6.4%	Separated	26	4.4%
25 to 34	72	12.5%	Divorced	139	23.7%
35 to 44	120	20.8%	Widowed	144	24.6%
45 to 64	193	33.5%	Partnered, but not married	28	4.8%
over 65	194	33.7%			
<i>N</i> =	576		<i>N</i> =	586	

<u>Living Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Adults only	365	67.1%	African American/ Black	21	3.6%
Adults with school- aged children	110	20.2%	American Indian/Alaskan Native	23	4.0%
Single parent with school-aged children	69	12.7%	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	0.2%
<i>N</i> =	544		Caucasian/White	484	84.0%
			Other	15	2.6%
			Hispanic/Latino	14	2.7%
			<i>N</i> =	576	

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

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

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N=</u>
Head of household or spouse disabled or handicapped	56.3%	43.7%	535
If so, have special housing needs*	28.3%	71.7%	361
Head of household or spouse is a student	5.1%	94.9%	532
Currently, domestic violence is in the home	1.3%	98.7%	532
Domestic violence has been in the home in the past year	5.3%	94.7%	533
Everyone speaks English**	92.6%	7.4%	543
Know someone from another country who needs assistance***	2.9%	97.1%	522

<u>*Special Needs:</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>*Special Needs</u>	<u>Number</u>
Wheelchair accessibility (ramps, wide doors, no stairs, etc.)	28	Walker/Assistance with Walking	4
Bathroom/Bathing/Showering (handicapped accessible)	17	Oxygen/Breathing Equipment	4
Problems with Stairs/Mobility	14	Air Conditioning	3
Affordability (housing, general)	7	Emergency Alert Mechanism	2
Housekeeping	6	Medicine	2
Other	6	Hearing and Speech	2
		Home Repair/Maintenance	2

Other (one each): back problems, blindness, children with asthma, stroke, washer/dryer, and yard work.

**Seven responses indicated Spanish spoken in the home.

***The kinds of assistance needed included housing/rent (4), medical (2), all (2), food, immigration, legal, and employment.

Total Surveys=586

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Conclusion

In general, 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. 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.⁵ A review of the results from the 2000 assessment shows that clients have changed as well as their needs.⁶ Therefore, it is important to continue to ask the clients what they need and if they are able to get the services needed; and, then adjust the programs and policies accordingly to their needs.

⁵ Clients were also given the opportunity to describe other issues and/or services that are important. Due to the confidential nature of those responses, they are not included in this report although they have been shared with ECKAN.

⁶ *ECKAN Needs Assessment Survey of Service Providers and Clients*, PRI Technical Report No. 50, Policy Research Institute, the University of Kansas, May 2001.

Appendix A
Client Survey Results
by County

SECTION I. Housing

Table 1. Housing: Service Needs and Provision by County

<i>Need for and receiving*:</i>	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need
Information on available houses or apartments	17.5%	28.5%	11.7%	28.4%	19.0%	31.6%	18.7%	37.4%	25.4%	38.8%	17.7%	50.0%	17.0%	28.8%
Help with completing forms	8.0%	19.0%	8.4%	16.6%	12.7%	24.2%	14.9%	27.1%	11.9%	26.9%	11.3%	30.6%	10.7%	23.4%
Ongoing assistance with paying rent	11.1%	23.8%	18.4%	35.0%	27.4%	44.2%	27.1%	48.6%	28.4%	44.8%	24.2%	57.7%	19.1%	37.2%
Counseling on housing options	9.5%	20.6%	5.2%	18.8%	9.5%	19.0%	6.5%	28.0%	13.5%	32.8%	6.4%	21.0%	6.4%	23.3%
Help with landlords	6.4%	11.1%	10.0%	16.7%	7.4%	17.9%	10.3%	20.5%	9.0%	22.3%	11.3%	24.2%	6.4%	27.0%
Home repair and upkeep assistance	12.7%	26.9%	26.7%	60.0%	15.8%	37.9%	17.7%	39.2%	29.9%	55.3%	16.2%	43.5%	11.7%	44.7%
Help paying electric and gas bills	34.9%	54.0%	51.7%	65.0%	49.4%	65.2%	26.1%	63.6%	41.8%	68.6%	27.4%	59.6%	39.4%	59.6%
Deposit assistance for renting	4.8%	15.8%	10.0%	18.4%	14.7%	26.3%	7.5%	27.1%	10.5%	29.8%	12.9%	41.9%	7.5%	24.5%
Occasional help with paying rent	6.3%	25.4%	13.3%	28.3%	16.8%	34.7%	17.7%	43.0%	12.0%	34.3%	9.7%	41.9%	10.6%	31.9%
N=	63	63	60	60	95	95	107	107	67	67	62	62	94	94
*Receiving="Yes" + "Yes, Need More" responses. Need = "Very Much" + "Somewhat" responses.														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: N varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the N for total surveys from the county is used.

Table 2. Housing: Issues in Service Area by County

	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=
Familiar with Section 8 program, which provides rental assistance	31.0%	58	50.0%	58	67.0%	94	59.2%	103	36.9%	65	53.4%	58	41.2%	95
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>
Interest in Section 8 if more units available	37.5%	56	51.7%	60	48.9%	90	53.5%	101	55.6%	63	67.3%	55	45.2%	84
Know someone who is homeless	6.9%	58	16.7%	60	30.5%	95	18.4%	103	6.1%	66	24.6%	61	19.3%	88
Ever felt discriminated against	8.3%	60	18.3%	60	15.8%	95	14.6%	103	11.9%	59	13.6%	59	18.4%	87
Interest in a first-time homebuyers program	33.3%	57	33.9%	59	36.2%	94	47.0%	100	24.2%	66	50.8%	59	33.3%	87
Awareness of a minimum housing code	21.1%	57	12.3%	57	26.1%	92	25.7%	101	33.3%	66	17.2%	58	15.7%	83
<i>In your community are there enough safe and affordable:</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>
Apartments or homes for rent	20.4%	54	29.1%	55	46.5%	86	14.9%	94	32.8%	61	25.0%	52	29.8%	84
Housing units for low-income families	14.8%	54	17.0%	53	27.1%	85	8.7%	92	27.4%	62	11.8%	51	20.0%	85
<i>Know anyone who is/was**:</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>
Unable to find housing	40.7%	54	57.9%	57	49.0%	94	50.0%	102	40.6%	64	41.4%	58	43.0%	86
<p>*Familiar="Very Familiar" + "Somewhat" responses. **Yes="Yes, many" + "Yes, one or two" responses.</p>														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 3. Housing: Status of Client's Housing by County

	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Rent/Own	N=												
HOUSING STATUS														
Rent	52.7%	55	53.4%	58	78.7%	89	79.6%	98	56.7%	60	84.6%	52	54.1%	85
Own	47.3%		46.6%		21.3%		20.4%		43.3%		15.4%		45.9%	
<i>Rent/Monthly Payment</i>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>												
Under \$200	47.5%	40	41.3%	46	41.8%	79	34.0%	90	40.8%	49	36.7%	49	37.7%	77
\$200 - \$299	25.0%		30.4%		11.4%		16.7%		28.6%		14.3%		14.3%	
\$300 - \$399	22.5%		17.4%		6.3%		17.8%		20.4%		10.2%		18.2%	
\$400 - \$499	2.5%		6.5%		16.5%		17.8%		10.2%		18.4%		9.1%	
\$500 - \$599	0.0%		2.2%		12.7%		6.7%		0.0%		10.2%		11.7%	
Over \$600	2.5%		2.2%		11.4%		6.6%		0.0%		10.2%		9.1%	
<i>Kind of Housing:</i>	<u>Apartment or House</u>	<u>N=</u>												
Apartment	44.2%	43	20.0%	40	69.6%	79	41.6%	89	48.9%	47	48.9%	47	50.0%	66
House	55.8%		80.0%		30.4%		58.4%		51.1%		51.1%		50.0%	
<i>Number of bedrooms:</i>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>												
One	39.6%	48	17.6%	51	42.7%	89	33.0%	100	31.6%	57	26.4%	53	30.2%	86
Two	33.3%		45.1%		27.0%		34.0%		50.9%		43.4%		30.2%	
Three	25.0%		29.4%		23.6%		26.0%		14.0%		22.6%		31.4%	
Four	2.1%		3.9%		5.6%		5.0%		3.5%		7.5%		7.0%	
Five or more	0.0%		3.9%		1.1%		4.0%		0.0%		0.0%		1.2%	
Mean	1.9		2.3		2.0									
<i>Statement which best applies to your family:</i>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>												
<i>We pay... of our gross income for rent.</i>														
less than one-third	50.0%	40	47.5%	40	55.8%	77	45.9%	85	51.0%	51	44.2%	43	49.3%	67
between one third and one half	25.0%		35.0%		24.7%		42.4%		27.5%		25.6%		32.8%	
more than one half	25.0%		17.5%		19.5%		11.8%		21.6%		30.2%		17.9%	

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 4. Housing: Condition of Property by County

<i>Condition of*:</i>	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Needs Work	N=	Needs Work	N=	Needs Work	N=	Needs Work	N=	Needs Work	N=	Needs Work	N=	Needs Work	N=
Roof	19.1%	63	25.0%	60	15.8%	95	30.8%	107	22.4%	67	20.9%	62	28.7%	94
Walls	17.5%		28.4%		28.4%		26.2%		17.9%		17.7%		22.4%	
Door	28.6%		28.3%		33.7%		29.9%		23.9%		27.4%		30.9%	
Insulation	25.4%		30.1%		18.0%		22.4%		16.9%		21.0%		27.7%	
Electrical	14.3%		26.6%		17.9%		22.4%		19.5%		16.2%		18.1%	
Plumbing	15.9%		28.3%		16.9%		24.3%		23.9%		16.1%		26.5%	
Heating	12.7%		16.7%		11.6%		13.0%		19.5%		14.4%		17.0%	
Cooling	17.4%		35.0%		17.9%		20.5%		23.9%		22.6%		20.2%	
Foundation	23.9%		31.6%		24.2%		30.9%		17.9%		16.1%		25.5%	
<i>Appliances in the home:</i>	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=
Own all	53.2%	62	64.9%	57	31.6%	95	39.3%	101	47.6%	63	42.1%	57	55.6%	90
Own some	14.5%		14.0%		22.1%		22.4%		19.0%		28.1%		7.8%	
Provided	32.3%		15.8%		44.2%		30.8%		30.2%		19.3%		33.3%	
Other	0.0%		5.3%		2.1%		1.9%		3.2%		10.5%		3.3%	
*Needs Work="Needs Repair" + "Needs Replacement" + "Needs to be Installed"														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: N varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the N for total surveys from the county is used.

SECTION II. Employment

Table 5. Employment: Service Needs and Provision by County

Need for and receiving*:	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need
Information on job openings/opportunities	6.4%	27.0%	6.7%	26.7%	5.3%	16.8%	4.6%	23.4%	6.0%	17.9%	14.5%	25.8%	2.2%	18.1%
Help with completing job applications, resumes and other forms	4.8%	19.1%	6.6%	21.7%	3.2%	16.9%	4.7%	14.0%	4.5%	13.5%	8.1%	17.8%	3.2%	16.0%
Help/advice with job hunting skills	3.2%	9.5%	6.7%	18.4%	2.1%	16.9%	3.7%	14.0%	3.0%	13.5%	6.4%	16.1%	1.1%	17.0%
Matching your skills and needs with job openings	4.8%	19.0%	5.0%	23.3%	4.2%	20.0%	2.8%	18.7%	7.5%	19.4%	8.0%	17.7%	3.2%	18.1%
Job training classes	3.2%	14.2%	0.0%	20.0%	1.1%	19.0%	1.9%	18.7%	3.0%	22.3%	11.3%	19.4%	0.0%	17.0%
Help/advice about career goals	3.2%	11.1%	6.7%	16.7%	4.3%	18.9%	1.9%	16.8%	3.0%	15.0%	8.1%	21.0%	0.0%	14.9%
Work experience projects	4.8%	20.4%	3.4%	11.6%	1.1%	11.6%	2.8%	12.1%	1.5%	13.5%	0.0%	14.6%	1.1%	13.8%
<i>N</i> =	63	63	60	60	95	95	107	107	67	67	62	62	94	94
*Receiving="Yes" + "Yes, Need More" responses. Need = "Very Much" + "Somewhat" responses.														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: *N* varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the *N* for total surveys from the county is used.

Table 6. Employment: Issues in Service Area by County

	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=
<i>Familiarity with:</i> the Job Training Partnership Act	16.4%	55	32.7%	55	16.9%	89	16.7%	96	17.5%	57	22.8%	57	10.7%	75
<i>Felt Discriminated against:</i> while attempting to gain employment	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=
	10.2%	59	21.1%	57	18.5%	92	11.9%	101	13.1%	61	6.9%	58	14.8%	81
<i>Familiarity with:</i> the American with Disabilities Act (ADA)	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=
	40.7%	59	43.1%	58	45.6%	90	43.1%	102	37.3%	59	42.1%	57	44.7%	85
Currently Employed	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=
	20.3%	59	8.6%	58	17.6%	91	23.3%	103	18.6%	59	23.7%	59	20.9%	86
*Familiar="Very Familiar" + "Somewhat" responses.														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

SECTION III. Other Services

Table 7. Other Services - Childcare: Service Needs and Provision by County

<i>Need for and receiving*:</i>	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need
Head Start	1.8%	8.0%	1.7%	1.7%	6.3%	6.3%	1.8%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%	16.1%	1.3%	6.4%
Head Start (0-3 years)	0.0%	6.0%	3.3%	6.7%	3.2%	5.3%	0.0%	2.8%	3.0%	3.0%	1.6%	9.7%	1.1%	5.4%
Help in finding childcare while working	0.0%	8.0%	1.7%	6.7%	1.1%	6.4%	3.7%	8.4%	1.5%	4.5%	12.9%	20.9%	1.1%	10.6%
Help in finding childcare while in school	0.0%	8.0%	1.7%	5.0%	1.1%	5.3%	0.9%	4.7%	1.5%	4.5%	9.7%	12.9%	0.0%	5.3%
Emergency childcare	0.0%	9.6%	1.7%	8.3%	1.1%	6.4%	0.9%	4.7%	0.0%	4.5%	3.2%	16.2%	2.2%	11.7%
Help in budgeting for childcare	0.0%	9.6%	1.7%	3.4%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	4.7%	1.5%	6.0%	1.6%	6.4%	1.1%	5.4%
<i>N=</i>	63	63	60	60	95	95	107	107	67	67	62	62	94	94
<i>Felt discriminated against:</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>
while trying to find childcare	0.0%	50	0.0%	48	1.3%	77	0.0%	91	2.2%	46	0.0%	48	5.6%	72
<i>*Receiving="Yes" + "Yes, Need More" responses. Need = "Very Much" + "Somewhat" responses.</i>														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: N varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the N for total surveys from the county is used for "Receiving" and "Need" responses.

Table 8. Other Services - Education: Service Needs and Provision by County

<i>Need for and receiving*:</i>	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need
Education for pre-school children	1.6%	4.8%	1.7%	5.0%	6.3%	10.6%	3.8%	6.5%	0.0%	3.0%	8.0%	17.8%	4.3%	7.4%
Information on Head Start for pre-school children	1.6%	4.8%	3.3%	5.0%	7.4%	9.5%	2.8%	4.6%	1.5%	1.5%	6.5%	16.1%	2.2%	8.5%
Help and advise about educational goals	1.6%	7.9%	3.3%	8.4%	8.4%	17.9%	4.6%	14.9%	1.5%	6.0%	6.4%	26.1%	2.1%	11.7%
Help in completing forms and applications	3.2%	9.5%	5.0%	11.6%	11.6%	23.1%	6.5%	15.9%	3.0%	9.0%	6.5%	20.9%	4.3%	17.0%
Instruction on improving reading skills	3.2%	8.0%	0.0%	3.3%	5.3%	13.7%	2.8%	9.3%	3.0%	9.0%	6.4%	14.6%	0.0%	9.6%
Help in completing requirements for GED or High School diploma	0.0%	4.8%	1.7%	8.4%	1.1%	7.4%	2.8%	12.1%	3.0%	9.0%	3.2%	11.3%	2.1%	5.3%
Information on vocational/technical school	1.6%	15.8%	0.0%	18.3%	4.2%	21.1%	0.9%	12.1%	6.0%	10.5%	8.0%	12.9%	3.2%	14.9%
Information about 2 and 4 year colleges	4.8%	14.2%	0.0%	16.6%	3.2%	16.9%	2.1%	16.8%	1.5%	9.0%	6.4%	22.6%	1.1%	11.7%
Information on technical/computer/internet training	1.6%	14.2%	0.0%	30.0%	6.4%	27.4%	1.9%	23.4%	1.5%	17.9%	1.6%	14.5%	2.1%	22.3%
Contacting schools for special needs help	1.6%	6.4%	0.0%	13.4%	3.2%	12.7%	3.7%	12.1%	1.5%	10.5%	1.6%	9.6%	1.1%	11.7%
<i>N</i> =	63	63	60	60	95	95	107	107	67	67	62	62	94	94
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>
My child could use a tutor	10.2%	49	6.1%	49	17.3%	75	20.9%	86	8.9%	45	15.4%	52	19.7%	71
<i>*Receiving="Yes" + "Yes, Need More" responses. Need = "Very Much" + "Somewhat" responses.</i>														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: *N* varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the *N* for total surveys from the county is used for "Receiving" and "Need" responses.

Table 9. Other Services - Transportation: Service Needs and Provision by County

Need for and receiving*:	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need
Transportation provided on a regular basis	11.1%	15.9%	13.4%	35.0%	22.1%	40.0%	14.0%	26.1%	14.9%	25.4%	9.7%	25.8%	13.9%	35.1%
Transportation provided as needed	11.1%	15.9%	16.7%	41.6%	29.5%	46.3%	21.5%	31.7%	20.9%	29.9%	11.3%	29.0%	13.8%	36.1%
Assistance with auto repair payments	3.3%	27.0%	5.0%	48.3%	0.0%	33.7%	3.7%	43.9%	3.0%	31.3%	9.6%	48.4%	3.2%	48.9%
Assistance with needed gas and oil costs	6.4%	28.6%	13.3%	55.0%	5.3%	35.8%	9.3%	39.3%	12.0%	31.4%	8.0%	45.2%	5.3%	48.9%
N=	63	63	60	60	95	95	107	107	67	67	62	62	94	94
	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=
Access to public transportation in your area	57.6%	59	67.2%	58	82.6%	92	52.0%	100	77.8%	63	67.3%	55	17.6%	85
If so, is it affordable?	81.6%	38	69.4%	36	86.3%	73	78.8%	52	80.0%	45	72.7%	33	40.9%	22
Ever stay home from work because did not have enough money for transportation	16.9%	59	15.8%	57	18.2%	88	20.0%	100	11.7%	60	17.9%	56	27.3%	77
*Receiving="Yes" + "Yes, Need More" responses. Need = "Very Much" + "Somewhat" responses.														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: N varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the N for total surveys from the county is used for "Receiving" and "Need" responses.

Table 10. Other Services - Emergency Services/Intervention: Service Needs and Provision by County

Need for and receiving*:	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need
Assistance paying Medical/Dental bills	44.4%	72.4%	50.0%	73.3%	41.1%	70.5%	39.2%	65.4%	34.3%	67.2%	42.0%	69.4%	35.1%	73.4%
Short term loans for emergencies	3.2%	30.1%	6.7%	55.0%	5.3%	41.0%	8.4%	50.5%	6.0%	40.3%	9.6%	41.9%	10.7%	48.9%
Help in resolving family conflicts or abuse of family members	4.8%	11.1%	1.7%	11.7%	5.3%	8.4%	3.7%	15.0%	4.5%	9.0%	4.8%	16.2%	6.4%	19.1%
Help with alcohol or drug abuse problems	0.0%	4.8%	1.7%	3.3%	2.2%	6.4%	0.9%	5.6%	4.5%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%
Counseling during unemployment	3.2%	6.4%	5.0%	18.4%	3.2%	12.7%	6.6%	11.2%	6.0%	9.0%	4.8%	16.2%	2.1%	17.0%
Temporary shelter to escape abuse	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	5.0%	2.1%	5.3%	0.0%	3.7%	3.0%	3.0%	0.0%	3.2%	1.1%	6.4%
Donated clothing	36.5%	38.1%	41.6%	55.0%	7.4%	29.4%	32.7%	44.9%	10.5%	22.4%	9.7%	24.2%	47.8%	55.3%
Donated household goods	23.8%	34.9%	36.7%	53.3%	12.6%	33.7%	23.3%	41.1%	9.0%	29.9%	11.3%	30.6%	40.4%	54.2%
Legal assistance	6.3%	12.7%	6.7%	33.3%	13.7%	36.9%	9.4%	33.6%	12.0%	37.3%	4.8%	30.6%	9.6%	32.9%
Mentor programs like Big Brothers/Sisters	3.2%	11.1%	1.7%	11.7%	2.2%	13.7%	5.6%	21.5%	3.0%	13.4%	4.8%	11.3%	4.3%	10.7%
Counseling for gang related activities	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	3.8%	1.5%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	3.2%
N=	63	63	60	60	95	95	107	107	67	67	62	62	94	94
*Receiving="Yes" + "Yes, Need More" responses. Need = "Very Much" + "Somewhat" responses.														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: N varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the N for total surveys from the county is used.

Table 11. Other Services - Health Nutrition: Service Needs and Provision by County

<i>Need for and receiving*:</i>	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need
Counseling or classes on nutrition, diet and food preparation	11.1%	12.6%	11.7%	28.3%	5.3%	26.3%	9.4%	21.5%	4.5%	15.0%	4.8%	13.0%	6.4%	22.3%
Surplus government food	76.2%	74.6%	83.3%	88.3%	69.5%	87.3%	68.2%	75.7%	74.7%	88.0%	48.4%	66.1%	79.7%	86.1%
Donated produce and groceries	57.2%	65.1%	26.6%	61.7%	43.1%	72.6%	44.9%	70.1%	29.9%	55.7%	33.9%	56.5%	41.4%	71.2%
Hot meals	12.6%	11.1%	11.6%	28.4%	15.8%	32.7%	16.8%	31.8%	10.4%	35.9%	8.1%	21.0%	8.5%	19.4%
Free or reduced price school meals for kids	22.2%	23.8%	23.3%	23.3%	20.0%	25.3%	30.9%	33.6%	10.4%	13.4%	29.0%	32.2%	26.6%	30.9%
Vouchers or cash for food purchases	20.6%	31.7%	16.7%	51.6%	29.5%	55.8%	23.4%	55.2%	26.9%	56.7%	19.3%	51.6%	24.4%	49.0%
Produce from community gardens	22.2%	38.1%	1.7%	40.0%	12.6%	47.3%	9.3%	41.1%	4.5%	40.8%	11.3%	33.9%	5.3%	35.1%
Seeds for a garden	6.3%	20.6%	0.0%	25.0%	1.1%	20.0%	0.0%	17.7%	3.0%	22.4%	8.0%	21.0%	2.2%	21.3%
WIC (assistance for mothers and their infant children)	7.9%	11.1%	5.0%	5.0%	7.4%	13.7%	8.4%	10.3%	3.0%	4.5%	17.7%	19.3%	8.5%	12.7%
Tips about shopping wisely	11.1%	19.0%	8.3%	8.3%	5.3%	22.1%	4.7%	16.8%	4.5%	16.5%	3.2%	21.0%	5.4%	17.0%
Summer Feeding Program	3.2%	8.0%	0.0%	11.6%	3.2%	22.1%	6.3%	14.0%	3.0%	12.0%	1.6%	16.2%	2.1%	16.0%
<i>N=</i>	63	63	60	60	95	95	107	107	67	67	62	62	94	94
<i>Skip any meals during the last month because did not have enough food or money to buy food</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N=</u>
	18.3%	60	28.8%	59	31.5%	92	33.3%	102	27.4%	62	22.8%	57	29.9%	87

*Receiving="Yes" + "Yes, Need More" responses. Need = "Very Much" + "Somewhat" responses.

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: N varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the N for total surveys from the county is used for "Receiving" and "Need" responses.

Table 12. Other Services - Use of Income: Service Needs and Provision by County

<i>Need for and receiving*</i> :	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need	Receiving	Need
Help/advise preparing household budget	1.6%	19.1%	6.6%	16.7%	5.3%	22.1%	6.3%	20.6%	7.5%	13.5%	4.8%	22.6%	4.3%	24.4%
Help/advise on loans and credit cards	1.6%	12.6%	0.0%	15.0%	5.3%	14.7%	0.0%	19.6%	1.5%	13.5%	6.4%	25.9%	5.4%	21.2%
Help/advise preparing income taxes	11.1%	22.2%	8.3%	23.4%	22.1%	32.7%	11.2%	25.3%	22.4%	31.4%	12.9%	27.5%	25.5%	38.3%
Instruction on reducing heating/cooling costs	4.8%	22.2%	6.7%	40.0%	12.6%	38.9%	12.1%	37.4%	13.4%	20.9%	8.0%	42.0%	9.5%	29.7%
Work on homes to reduce heating and cooling costs	6.4%	25.4%	13.4%	53.3%	9.5%	42.1%	10.2%	37.4%	14.9%	32.9%	11.3%	33.9%	10.6%	35.1%
How to make good shopping decisions	4.8%	11.1%	3.4%	8.3%	7.4%	25.3%	2.8%	16.8%	9.0%	16.5%	4.8%	17.8%	5.3%	19.2%
Help in establishing credit	4.8%	23.8%	3.3%	26.6%	3.2%	24.3%	4.6%	29.0%	6.0%	26.4%	4.8%	33.9%	3.2%	29.5%
N=	63	63	60	60	95	95	107	107	67	67	62	62	94	94
Interested in setting up a savings account	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=
	22.0%	59	21.8%	55	14.9%	87	30.0%	100	25.0%	60	25.9%	54	21.0%	81
*Receiving="Yes" + "Yes, Need More" responses. Need = "Very Much" + "Somewhat" responses.														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Note: N varies among the questions for the table. To maintain consistency, the N for total surveys from the county is used for "Receiving" and "Need" responses.

Table 13. Other Services - Medical Services (Family Health Care Needs) by County

	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=
<i>Health Care Needs:</i> Have dental insurance	6.6%	61	12.1%	58	10.8%	93	13.5%	104	12.7%	63	10.7%	56	7.9%	89
During the past year, skip dental visits because there wasn't enough money	48.4%	62	68.4%	57	54.8%	93	53.9%	102	55.7%	61	58.6%	58	62.7%	83
Anyone in family need of an eye exam	53.2%	62	75.9%	58	58.7%	92	60.0%	105	65.1%	63	57.6%	59	67.8%	87
Anyone in family need glasses	53.2%	62	78.0%	59	71.0%	93	67.0%	103	62.5%	64	50.0%	56	66.7%	84
Any teens in family with an alcohol abuse problem	1.8%	57	5.2%	58	2.2%	90	0.0%	103	3.2%	62	0.0%	58	3.6%	83
Anyone in family had a sexually transmitted disease*	4.8%	62	3.3%	60	6.5%	92	2.0%	102	3.1%	64	8.5%	59	1.2%	85
Know anyone who has AIDS	3.2%	62	13.6%	59	7.7%	91	7.8%	103	3.1%	65	5.1%	59	1.1%	89
Need for sex education in your family	0.0%	62	1.7%	59	3.3%	91	1.0%	102	3.1%	65	1.7%	58	2.4%	85
In your area, teenage pregnancy is a problem	42.6%	54	33.3%	54	32.9%	82	47.3%	91	36.8%	57	38.5%	52	32.5%	80
Currently receiving Health Wave Insurance for your children	28.6%	56	26.8%	56	27.7%	83	28.1%	96	22.4%	58	44.4%	54	27.2%	81
Aware of the Health Wave Insurance Program	35.6%	59	44.6%	56	37.2%	86	51.0%	100	42.4%	59	54.5%	55	40.7%	81
*Yes="Yes, one person" + "Yes, 2 or more" responses.														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 14. Other Services - Medical Services (Familiarity, Satisfaction, Convenience) by County

	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
<i>Familiarity with the Hill/Burton Act which:</i>	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=	Familiar	N=
says you can't be turned away from treatment at an emergency room	45.8%	59	30.0%	42	14.7%	95	48.1%	104	27.7%	65	39.0%	59	37.8%	90
<i>Satisfaction with**:</i>	Satisfied	N=	Satisfied	N=	Satisfied	N=	Satisfied	N=	Satisfied	N=	Satisfied	N=	Satisfied	N=
Health services in your area	91.5%	59	81.7%	60	90.2%	92	73.5%	102	71.9%	64	80.4%	56	67.1%	85
Travel to another town for health services	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=
If so, how far do you have to travel?	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=
Less than 10 miles	13.6%	44	22.7%	44	48.7%	39	16.2%	68	26.3%	38	29.7%	37	7.9%	89
10 - 19 miles	11.4%		15.9%		17.9%		10.3%		10.5%		18.9%		30.3%	
20 - 39 miles	29.5%		31.8%		25.6%		38.2%		7.9%		29.7%		41.6%	
40 - 60 miles	13.6%		11.4%		5.1%		30.9%		21.1%		21.6%		16.9%	
More than 60 miles	31.8%		18.2%		2.6%		4.4%		34.2%		0.0%		3.4%	
<p>*Familiar="Very Familiar" + "Somewhat" responses. **Satisfied="Very Satisfied" + "Somewhat Satisfied" responses. n.a.=not applicable</p>														

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 15. Other Services - Medical (Insurance Options and Doctor's Visits) by County

<i>Health insurance family presently has:</i>	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N=</i>
Employer furnished	1.6%	63	0.0%	60	5.3%	95	7.7%	107	3.0%	67	4.8%	62	5.3%	94
Private health insurance	6.3%		15.0%		11.6%		10.3%		6.0%		11.3%		24.5%	
Medicare	63.5%		56.7%		57.9%		44.9%		52.2%		43.5%		50.0%	
Medicaid	38.1%		45.0%		46.3%		49.5%		47.8%		54.8%		37.4%	
Veteran's	4.8%		3.3%		0.0%		2.8%		3.0%		1.6%		3.2%	
No health insurance	20.6%		21.7%		14.7%		14.0%		11.9%		16.1%		14.9%	
<i>In the past year, number of times visited a doctor:</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>
Range	0 to 40	61	0 to 50	57	0 to 200	92	0 to 200	102	0 to 150	62	0 to 50	57	0 to 40	92
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
None	6	9.8%	3	5.3%	7	7.6%	11	10.8%	4	6.5%	10	17.5%	9	9.8%
1 - 5 visits	30	49.2%	22	38.6%	38	41.3%	38	37.3%	29	46.8%	24	42.1%	43	46.7%
6 - 10 visits	15	24.6%	14	24.6%	18	19.6%	24	23.5%	17	27.4%	9	15.8%	11	12.0%
11 - 20 visits	7	11.5%	7	12.3%	14	15.2%	13	12.7%	7	11.3%	7	12.3%	19	20.7%
More than 20 visits	3	4.9%	8	14.0%	15	16.3%	16	15.7%	5	8.1%	7	12.3%	10	10.9%
N=	61		57		92		102		62		57		92	
<i>In the past year, number of times taken a family member to a doctor:</i>	<i>Times</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Times</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Times</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Times</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Times</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Times</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Times</i>	<i>N=</i>
Range	0 to 30	53	0 to 60	98	0 to 30	84	0 to 365	97	0 to 30	55	0 to 40	53	0 to 200	80
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
None	22	41.5%	20	40.0%	45	53.6%	39	40.2%	29	52.7%	18	34.0%	31	38.8%
1 - 5 times	20	37.7%	14	28.0%	20	23.8%	29	29.9%	10	18.2%	14	26.4%	27	33.8%
6 - 10 times	6	11.3%	10	20.0%	8	9.5%	12	12.4%	7	12.7%	14	26.4%	7	8.8%
11 - 20 times	3	5.7%	3	6.0%	6	7.1%	10	10.3%	6	10.9%	6	11.3%	12	15.0%
More than 20 times	2	3.8%	3	6.0%	5	6.0%	7	7.2%	3	5.5%	1	1.9%	3	3.8%
N=	53		50		84		97		55		53		80	
<i>In the past year, number of visits to an emergency room:</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Visits</i>	<i>N=</i>
Range	0 to 30	60	0 to 7	99	0 to 12	91	0 to 120	104	0 to 75	59	0 to 60	58	0 to 20	83
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
None	24	40.0%	21	36.2%	38	41.8%	35	33.7%	27	45.8%	19	32.8%	40	48.2%
1 - 5 visits	33	55.0%	29	50.0%	48	52.7%	65	62.5%	29	49.2%	30	51.7%	37	44.6%
6 - 10 visits	2	3.3%	6	10.3%	4	4.4%	2	1.9%	5	8.5%	5	8.6%	5	6.0%
11 - 20 visits	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.4%	1	1.2%
More than 20 visits	1	1.7%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%	2	3.4%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%
N=	60		58		91		104		59		58		83	

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

SECTION IV. Family Profile

Table 16a. Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics by County

	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
Family Members:														
MALE	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>
Range	0 to 6	61	0 to 5	58	0 to 4	90	0 to 3	104	0 to 6	66	0 to 7	60	0 to 5	90
<i>Responses with:</i>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>
0 male	49.2%	61	44.8%	58	52.2%	90	43.3%	104	43.9%	66	43.3%	60	35.6%	90
1 male	34.4%		34.5%		28.9%		28.8%		37.9%		26.7%		43.3%	
2 males	4.9%		13.8%		8.9%		25.0%		12.1%		20.0%		13.3%	
3 males	6.6%		3.4%		7.8%		2.9%		3.0%		8.3%		3.3%	
4 males or over	4.9%		3.4%		2.2%		0.0%		3.0%		1.7%		4.4%	
FEMALE	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>N=</u>
Range	0 to 6	61	0 to 5	59	0 to 7	90	0 to 5	104	0 to 4	66	0 to 4	60	0 to 4	90
<i>Responses with:</i>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>
0 female	11.5%	61	11.9%	59	11.1%	90	6.7%	104	19.7%	66	6.7%	60	12.2%	90
1 female	68.9%		59.3%		58.9%		59.6%		60.6%		50.0%		54.4%	
2 females	8.2%		16.9%		15.6%		21.2%		10.6%		25.0%		17.8%	
3 females	9.8%		5.1%		11.1%		4.8%		6.1%		11.7%		11.1%	
4 females or over	1.6%		6.8%		3.3%		7.7%		3.0%		6.7%		4.4%	
INCOME RANGE	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N=</u>
below \$6,500	37.7%	61	28.1%	57	34.1%	91	34.7%	101	38.7%	62	28.1%	57	35.2%	88
\$6,500 - \$9,999	32.8%		50.9%		44.0%		26.7%		43.5%		36.8%		33.0%	
\$10,000 - \$13,499	18.0%		14.0%		11.0%		21.8%		8.1%		1.0%		15.9%	
\$13,500 - \$16,999	4.9%		1.8%		1.1%		4.0%		4.8%		5.3%		8.0%	
\$17,000 - \$20,499	3.3%		1.8%		2.2%		4.0%		0.0%		7.0%		2.3%	
over \$20,500	3.2%		3.6%		7.7%		9.0%		4.8%		8.8%		5.6%	

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 16b. Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics by County (continued)

Ages of Family Members: <i>Percentage with at least one person in the age range:</i>	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=	Percent	N=
AGE RANGE														
0-4 years old	8.0%	63	5.0%	60	8.4%	95	10.3%	107	3.0%	67	22.6%	62	6.4%	94
5-19 years	30.2%		25.0%		30.5%		36.4%		20.9%		35.5%		31.9%	
20-24 years	4.8%		10.0%		4.2%		7.5%		6.0%		9.7%		6.4%	
25-34 years	14.3%		8.3%		9.5%		15.0%		7.5%		22.6%		14.9%	
35-44 years	14.3%		21.7%		16.8%		29.0%		17.9%		22.6%		26.6%	
45-64 years	23.2%		48.3%		35.8%		37.4%		37.3%		27.4%		34.0%	
over 65 years old	47.6%		30.0%		35.8%		29.0%		44.8%		22.6%		36.2%	
LIVING STATUS														
Adult only	71.4%	63	71.2%	59	68.1%	94	59.4%	106	81.8%	66	54.2%	59	65.2%	92
Adults with school-aged children	12.7%		16.9%		18.1%		26.4%		13.6%		22.0%		27.2%	
Single parent with school-aged children	15.9%		11.9%		13.8%		14.2%		4.5%		23.7%		7.6%	
MARITAL STATUS														
Married	22.2%	63	25.0%	60	14.7%	95	28.0%	107	20.9%	67	12.9%	62	31.9%	94
Single	15.9%		11.7%		20.0%		11.2%		17.9%		19.4%		12.8%	
Separated	1.6%		1.7%		1.1%		5.6%		11.9%		9.7%		3.2%	
Divorced	22.2%		31.7%		29.5%		27.1%		16.4%		27.4%		22.3%	
Widowed	31.7%		30.0%		25.3%		24.3%		25.4%		19.4%		27.7%	
Partnered, but not married	4.8%		6.7%		4.2%		4.7%		1.5%		9.7%		5.3%	
RACE														
African American/Black	1.7%	60	1.7%	59	9.7%	93	1.9%	107	6.1%	66	6.7%	60	0.0%	93
Native American/ Alaskan Eskimo	1.7%		1.7%		4.3%		7.5%		3.0%		3.3%		4.3%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.0%		0.0%		1.1%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	
European American/ Caucasian	93.3%		93.2%		81.7%		89.7%		86.4%		86.7%		93.5%	
Other	3.3%		3.4%		3.2%		0.9%		4.5%		3.3%		2.2%	
Hispanic/Latino	3.4%	58	0.0%	60	3.3%	90	0.0%	107	7.8%	64	3.4%	59	2.4%	84

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 16c. Family Profile: Demographic Characteristics by County (continued)

	Anderson County		Coffey County		Douglas County		Franklin County		Lyon County		Miami County		Osage County	
	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=	Yes	N=
Head of household or spouse disabled or handicapped	44.3%	61	64.9%	57	54.8%	93	61.0%	105	61.5%	65	42.4%	59	60.7%	89
If so, have special housing needs*?	12.8%	39	32.6%	46	32.2%	59	37.7%	69	31.4%	51	13.8%	29	23.8%	63
Head of household or spouse is a student	3.3%	61	5.0%	57	4.3%	92	5.8%	104	1.5%	66	14.3%	56	3.4%	87
Currently, domestic violence is in the home	1.6%	62	1.7%	59	1.1%	93	0.0%	102	0.0%	65	3.7%	54	2.2%	89
Domestic violence has been in the home in the past year	6.5%	62	1.7%	59	2.2%	93	6.7%	104	3.1%	65	8.9%	56	8.0%	87
Everyone speaks English**	88.7%	62	90.0%	60	92.5%	93	96.2%	104	91.0%	67	91.4%	58	94.6%	92
Know someone from another country who needs assistance***	0.0%	59	5.2%	58	2.2%	91	1.9%	103	3.2%	62	3.6%	56	4.7%	86

Source: ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003, Client Survey, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Appendix B

ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003

Client Survey

ECKAN Community Assessment Survey 2003: Client Survey

The Policy Research Institute at the University of Kansas is conducting a survey of ECKAN clients in Kansas so that ECKAN can better serve the needs of its clients. Because you are a current ECKAN client, you have been selected to voluntarily participate in this survey. The information from this survey will be used for statistical reports, which will not identify the individual responding to the questionnaire. Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary and you may refrain from answering any question you do not wish to answer.

Please select the answers that BEST FIT your situation.

Contact: For further information contact Kenneth Woods, Deputy Director, East Central Kansas Economic Opportunity Corporation (ECKAN), 602 S. Maples Street, PO Box 100, Ottawa KS 66067-0100. Phone: 785-242-7450 email: eckan@swbell.net.

Section I. Housing Profile

Please circle the appropriate answer

For each of the following services we would like to know whether you are receiving each service *and how* much you need of each service.

Are you receiving this service?	Yes 1	Yes, but need more 2	No 3
How much do you need this service?	Very Much 1	Somewhat 2	Not at all 3
H1.) Information on available houses or apartments			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
H2.) Help with completing forms such as rental agreements or loan applications			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
H3.) Ongoing assistance with paying rent			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
H4.) Counseling on your housing options			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
H5.) Help in dealing with your landlord			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
H6.) Assistance in Home Repair or upkeep			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
H7.) Help paying electric and gas bills			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

- H8.) Help with making a deposit when renting a house or apartment
- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Are you receiving this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| How much do you need this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
- H9.) Occasional help paying rent
- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Are you receiving this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| How much do you need this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
- H10.) How familiar are you with the Section 8 program, which provides rental assistance in the form of certificates and vouchers?
- | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|------------|
| | Very much | Somewhat | Not at all |
|--|-----------|----------|------------|
- H11.) Would you be interested in this program if there were more units available?
- Yes No
- H12.) Do you know someone who is homeless?
- Yes No
- H13.) Have you ever felt discriminated against because of your race, religion, national origin, or because you have children while attempting to find housing?
- Yes No
- H14.) Would you be interested in a first-time homebuyers program?
- Yes No
- H15.) Are you aware if your city/town has a minimum housing code?
- Yes No
- H16.) In your community, are there enough safe and suitable apartments or homes for rent?
- | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Yes, there are enough | No, need a few more | No, need many more |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
- H17.) In your community, are there enough safe and suitable housing units for low-income families?
- | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Yes, there are enough | No, need a few more | No, need many more |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
- H18.) Do you know anyone who is/was unable to find housing?
- | | | |
|------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Yes, many people | Yes, one or two people | No, no one |
|------------------|------------------------|------------|
- H19.) Do you own or rent?
- Own Rent

H20.) How much is the Gross Rent/Monthly Payment? (check the appropriate answer)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> under \$200 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$500-\$599 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$200-\$299 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$600-\$699 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$300-\$399 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$700 or more |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$400-\$499 | |

H21.) Do you rent an apartment or a house?

- Apartment House

H22.) Number of bedrooms?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> One | <input type="checkbox"/> Four |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Two | <input type="checkbox"/> Five or more |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Three | |

H23.) Which of the following Statements best applies to your family?

- We pay less than one third (1/3) of our gross income for rent
 We pay between one third (1/3) and one half (1/2) of our gross income for rent
 We pay more than one half (1/2) of our gross income for rent

For each of the following items, please circle the *condition* of you property:

	Satisfactory	Needs Repair	Needs Replacement	Needs to be installed
H24.) Roof	1	2	3	4
H25.) Walls	1	2	3	4
H26.) Door	1	2	3	4
H27.) Insulation	1	2	3	4
H28.) Electrical	1	2	3	4
H29.) Plumbing	1	2	3	4
H30.) Heating	1	2	3	4
H31.) Cooling	1	2	3	4
H32.) Foundation	1	2	3	4

H33.) Concerning the appliances you might have in your home, such as an refrigerator, oven, washer, dryer, and the like, do you own all of these, some of these, or are they provided by someone else, such as a landlord?

- We own all of these appliances
 We own some of these appliances
 These are provided by someone else
 Other situation please describe: _____

Section II. Other Services

Please circle the appropriate answer

For each of the following services we would like to know whether you are receiving each service *and how* much you need of each service.

Are you receiving this service?	Yes 1	Yes, but need more 2	No 3
How much do you need this service?	Very Much 1	Somewhat 2	Not at all 3

EMERGENCY SERVICES/INTERVENTION

S1.) Assistance paying Medical/Dental bills			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S2.) Short-term loans for emergencies			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S3.) Help in resolving family conflicts or abuse of family members			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S4.) Help with alcohol or drug abuse problems			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S5.) Counseling during unemployment			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S6.) Temporary shelter to escape abuse			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S7.) Donated clothing			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S8.) Donated household goods			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S9.) Legal assistance			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S10.) Mentor programs like Big Brothers/5isters or Breakfast Buddies or 5upper Buddies			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
S11.) Counseling for gang related activities			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

EMPLOYMENT (use the same scale as above)

E1.) Information on job openings/opportunities			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

E2.) Help with completing job applications resumes or other forms (W-4, unemployment, health insurance)

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

E3.) Help or advice with job hunting skills

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

E4.) Matching your skills and needs (wage, full-time, part-time) with job openings

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

E5.) Job training classes

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

E6.) Help and advice about career goals

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

E7.) Work experience projects

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

E8.) How familiar are you with the Job Training Partnership Act?

Very familiar	Somewhat familiar	Not at all familiar
---------------	-------------------	---------------------

E9.) Have you ever felt discriminated against because of your race, religion or national origin while attempting to gain employment?

Yes	No
-----	----

E10.) How familiar are you with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)?

Very familiar	Somewhat familiar	Not at all familiar
---------------	-------------------	---------------------

E11.) Are you currently employed?

Yes	No
-----	----

CHILDCARE (use the same scale as above)

C1.) Head Start

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

C2.) Early Head Start (0-3 years)

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

C3.) Helping finding child care while working

Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

C4.) Help in finding child care while in school			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

C5.) Emergency child care			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

C6.) Help in budgeting for child care			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

C7.) Have you ever felt discriminated against because of your race, religion or national origin while trying to find child care?

Yes	No
-----	----

TRANSPORTATION (use the same scale as above)

T1.) Transportation provided on regular basis			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

T2.) Transportation provided as needed			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

T3.) Assistance with auto repair payments			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

T4.) Assistance with needed gas and oil costs (
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

T5.) Do you have access to public transportation in your area?

Yes	No
-----	----

If so, is it affordable?

Yes	No
-----	----

T6.) Have you ever stayed at home from work because you did not have enough money for transportation?

Yes	No
-----	----

EDUCATION (use the same scale as above)

B1.) Education for preschool children			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B2.) Information on Head5tart Early Education Program for pre-school children			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B3.) Help and advice about educational goals			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B4.) Help in completing forms and applications (financial aid, work-study, admission)			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B5.) Instruction on improving your reading skills			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B6.) Help in completing the requirements for GED or High School diploma			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B7.) Information on Vocational/Technical school			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B8.) Information about 2 or 4 year colleges			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B9.) Information on technical/computer/internet training			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B10.) Contacting schools for special needs help			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
B11.) My child could use a tutor			
Yes			
No			

HEALTH/NUTRITION (use the same scale as above)

N1.) Individual counseling or classes on nutrition, diet and food preparation			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N2.) Surplus government food (commodities)			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

N3.) Donated produce and groceries			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N4.) Hot meals			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N5.) Free or reduced price for school meals for kids			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N6.) Vouchers or cash for food purchases			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N7.) Produce from community gardens			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N8.) Seeds for a garden			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N9.) WIC (assistance for mothers and their infant children)			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N10.) Tips about shopping wisely			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N11.) Summer Feeding Program			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
N12.) Did you skip any meals during the last month because you did not have enough food or money to buy food?			

Yes No

USE OF INCOME (use the same scale as above)

I1.) Help/advise preparing a household budget			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
I2.) Help/advise on loans and credit cards			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3
I3.) Help/advise preparing income taxes			
Are you receiving this service?	1	2	3
How much do you need this service?	1	2	3

- 14.) Instructions on reducing heating and cooling costs
- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Are you receiving this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| How much do you need this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
- 15.) Work on your home to reduce heating and cooling costs
- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Are you receiving this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| How much do you need this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
- 16.) How to make good shopping decisions
- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Are you receiving this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| How much do you need this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
- 17.) Help establishing credit
- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Are you receiving this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| How much do you need this service? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
- 18.) Would you be interested in setting up a savings account?
- | | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

MEDICAL SERVICES

M1.) How familiar are you with the Hill/Burton Act which says you cannot be turned away from treatment at an emergency room?

Very familiar	Somewhat familiar	Not at all familiar
---------------	-------------------	---------------------

M2.) Are you satisfied with health services in your area?

Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not at all satisfied
----------------	--------------------	----------------------

M3.) Do you have to travel to another town for health services?

Yes	No
-----	----

M4.) If so, how far do you have to travel for health services? (check the most appropriate answer)

<input type="checkbox"/> less than 10 miles	<input type="checkbox"/> 40-60miles
<input type="checkbox"/> 10-19 miles	<input type="checkbox"/> more than 60 miles
<input type="checkbox"/> 20-39 miles	

M5.) Which of the following types of health insurance do you or your family presently have? Please check all the apply to you or your family.

<input type="checkbox"/> Employer furnished	<input type="checkbox"/> Medicaid
<input type="checkbox"/> Private Health Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/> Veteran's
<input type="checkbox"/> Medicare	<input type="checkbox"/> No Health Insurance

M6.) How often have you yourself been to visit a doctor in the past year? ____ times

M7.) How often have you taken a family member to a doctor in the past year? ____ times

M8.) How many emergency room visits have you had during the past year? ____ visits

M9.) Do you have dental insurance?

Yes No

M10.) During the past year did you or a family member skip dental visits because there wasn't enough money?

Yes No

M11.) Does anyone in your family need an eye exam?

Yes No

M12.) Does anyone in your family need glasses?

Yes No

M13.) Do any teens in your family have an alcohol abuse problem?

Yes No

M14.) Has anyone in your family had a sexually transmitted disease?

Yes, one person Yes, 2 or more people No, no one

M15.) Do you know anyone who has AIDS?

Yes No

M16.) Is there a need for sex education in your family?

Yes No

M17.) In your area, is teenage pregnancy a problem?

Yes No

M18.) Are you currently receiving Health Wave Insurance for your children?

Yes No

M19.) Are you aware of the Health Wave Insurance Program?

Yes No

M20.) I would like education on (fill in the subject)_____

SECTION III. Family Profile

Please check the appropriate response.

F1.) Your county of residence?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Anderson | <input type="checkbox"/> Johnson |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coffey | <input type="checkbox"/> Lyon |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Douglas | <input type="checkbox"/> Miami |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Franklin | <input type="checkbox"/> Osage |

F2.) Number of family members (fill in the total for each gender):

Male _____ Female _____

F3.) Family Ages (fill in the total number for each age group):

0-4 _____	5-19 _____	20-24 _____	25-34 _____
35-44 _____	45-64 _____	65 + _____	

F4.) Your living status:

- Adults only
- Adults with school-aged children
- Single Parent with school-aged children

F5.) Marital Status:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Married | <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single | <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Separated | <input type="checkbox"/> Partnered, but not married |

F6.) Your race (please answer both questions F6 and F7):

- African American / Black
- American Indian / Alaskan Native
- Asian / Pacific Islander
- Caucasian / White
- Other

F7.) Are you Hispanic /Latino

Yes No

F8.) Is the head of your household or spouse disabled or handicapped?

Yes No

F9.) If so, do you have special housing needs?

Yes No

If so, please describe: _____

F10.) Is the head of your household or spouse a student?

Yes No

F11.) Is there currently domestic violence in the home?

Yes No

F12.) Has there been domestic violence in the home in the past year?

Yes No

F13.) Does everyone speak English in your home?

Yes No

F14.) What language is spoken in your home? _____

F15.) Do you know anyone from another country who needs assistance?

Yes No

If so, what kind of assistance? _____

F16.) Please check the category that best describes your family's yearly income:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> below \$6,500 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,500 - \$23,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$6,500- \$9,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$24,000 - \$27,499 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 - \$13,499 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$27,500 - \$30,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$13,500 -\$16,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$31,000- \$34,500 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$17,000- \$20,499 | <input type="checkbox"/> over \$34,500 |

That concludes all of the questions. Thank you for your time and Information. If you believe that there are other issues and/or services that are important for this study please describe them below.

Case ID: _____