

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

Spring Hill Community Assessment: 2001 Survey Analysis

Prepared by

Genna Hurd
Co-Director, KCCED

May 2001

Report No. 52

Charles Krider
Project Director, KCCED

Steven Maynard-Moody
Interim Director, Policy Research Institute

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) with the Policy Research Institute at the University of Kansas. The KCCED is funded by a university center grant from Denver Regional Office of the Economic Development Administration (EDA), U.S. Department of Commerce. The statement, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors 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 citizens of Spring Hill who took the time to participate in the survey. Special thanks also go to Chad Kniss and Don Haider-Markel with the Survey Research Center at the Policy Research Institute, the University of Kansas.

A copy of this report can be obtain by contacting: Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce, PO Box 15, Spring Hill, KS 66083, (913) 592-3893, e-mail: springhillcofc@sprintmail.com.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Findings.....	2
About the Respondents	2
Table 1a. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	4
Table 1b. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	5
About the Community.....	6
Areas of Emphasis for Spring Hill	6
Enforcement of Codes	6
Concern for Growth	6
Table 2. Areas of Emphasis and Concern for the Spring Hill Community.....	7
City Hall and City Council	8
Physical Improvements Needed	8
Table 3. Spring Hill City Hall and City Council Ratings	9
Like the Most about Spring Hill.....	10
Like the Least about Spring Hill.....	10
Services or Programs for the Spring Hill Civic Center	11
About the Schools	11
What the Schools Do Well.....	11
Improvement/Changes Needed in the Schools.....	12
Grading the School District.....	13
Table 4. Report Card for the Spring Hill School District.....	15
About the Businesses	16
Evaluations of Existing Businesses	16
Spending at Businesses	17
Three Most Needed New Businesses in Spring Hill	17
Table 5. Existing Business in Spring Hill: Usage and Reasons for Increased Spending at Businesses	18
Conclusion	19

Spring Hill Community Assessment 2001

Introduction

The Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce contacted the Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) at the University of Kansas in January 2001 for assistance with the Spring Hill Community Assessment. The KCCED receives federal funds to assist communities in Kansas with community and economic development efforts. Technical assistance was provided by KCCED with the survey instrument development and data entry as well as analysis of the results.

The Survey Research Center (SRC) of the Policy Research Institute (PRI) at the University of Kansas served as a survey consultant in developing the community assessment instrument. The survey was then self-administered by the Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce, who mailed the survey to 750 residences in and around the community of Spring Hill, Kansas.¹ Included in the survey was a self-addressed and stamped reply envelope, as well as a deadline to return the survey by April 16, 2001. No follow-ups or reminders were mailed to the residences that received the survey.

As of May 1, 2001, 85 surveys had been returned and these were entered into the database by SRC. The 85 returned surveys represent a response or cooperation rate of 11.3 percent. Given the limited number of completed surveys and the likely response bias, the results reported here do not fall within the generally accepted rules of scientific methodology. However, the results do allow for a review of what the responding citizens thought were the positives and negatives of the Spring Hill community.

Given the low response rate, caution must be used in interpreting these results to the general population of Spring Hill.

The following survey results will first look at who the respondents were and then what they think about Spring Hill – the community, city government, the schools, and existing businesses and services.

¹ In April 2001, 602 surveys were mailed to Spring Hill addresses and 147 surveys were mailed to Olathe addresses.

Findings

About the Respondents

The demographic characteristics of the Spring Hill Community Assessment Survey respondents are summarized in **Tables 1a** and **1b**. Where possible, the characteristics of the survey respondents are compared to data about the general Spring Hill population. These comparisons further illustrate that the survey respondents are not necessarily representative of the general Spring Hill population and therefore caution must be used in interpreting these results.

- Sixty-five percent of the survey respondents were female and 33 percent were male (**Table 1a**). According to Census 2000, 50.3 percent of the Spring Hill's population is female and 49.7 percent is male.² For the State of Kansas in 2000, 50.6 percent of the population is female and 49.4 is male.³
- While 78 percent of those responding to the survey were married (**Table 1a**), 59.7 percent of the total household's in Spring Hill are married-couple families (U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1). In Kansas, 54.7 percent of the households are married-couple family (U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1).
- The 2000 census data reports that 8.4 percent of the population for Spring Hill is over 65 and 15.5 percent of the households have individuals 65 years and over (U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1). For the State of Kansas in 2000, 13.3 percent of the population is 65 years and over and 23.3 percent of the households have individuals 65 years and over. Based on the Johnson County portion of the 66083 Zip Code, 7.8 percent of the population is over 65 years of age.⁴ Six percent of the survey respondents were over 65 (**Table 1a**).
- About one-third of the respondents indicated that they were 35 to 44 years of age (**Table 1a**). This is higher than the actual Spring Hill population, which has 17.5 percent indicating that they were 35 to 44 (U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1). In Kansas, according to Census 2000, 15.6 percent of the population is 35 to 44. The median age of the Spring Hill population is 31.3, which is younger than the state's median age of 35.2 (U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1). The median age of the 66083 Zip Code portion of Johnson County is 34.3.⁵

² "Table DP-1. Profile of General Characteristics: 2000, Geographic Area: Spring Hill city, Kansas," U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, released May 2001.

³ "Table DP-1. Profile of General Characteristics: 2000, Geographic Area: Kansas," U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, released May 2001.

⁴ From the Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce, "Spring Hill 2001 Demographics," compiled by the Johnson County Economic Research Institute, 2001. *This data includes an unincorporated area north of Spring Hill that is part of the school district.*

⁵ Johnson County Economic Research Institute, 2001.

- For those survey respondents that indicated that they were married, 40 percent said that their spouse was 35 – 44 years of age (**Table 1a**).
- The latest data on homeownership for Spring Hill shows 69.4 percent of the housing units are owner-occupied, 91 percent of the survey population indicated that they are homeowners (**Table 1a** and U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1).⁶ The State of Kansas has roughly the same percentage of homeownership as Spring Hill with 69.2 percent of the occupied housing units being owner-occupied.
- The average household income for Spring Hill area in 2001 is \$68,354, according to the Johnson County Economic Research Institute.⁷ Around 39 percent of the respondents indicated an annual household income around the average or greater (**Table 1a**).
- Around 41 percent of the respondents have at least a four-year college education (**Table 1a**). Thirty-nine percent indicated their education level as one to two years of college while eighteen percent marked they have a high school or equivalent (GED) education.
- The survey respondents are pretty evenly split between living in the city limits of Spring Hill and living outside the city limits (**Table 1b**). The respondents have lived in Spring Hill for less than a year to 49 years, with the average number of years being 13.56. Over half, or 54 percent, said that they have lived in Spring Hill for 10 years or less. In the last ten years, the Spring Hill population grew from 2,191 in 1990 to 2,727 in 2000, for a 24.5 percent increase (2000 U.S. Bureau of the Census, Public Law 94-171 data).⁸ The population for the Spring Hill area based on the Johnson County portion of the 66083 Zip Code is given as 3,677 for 2001.⁹
- Sixty percent of the people mailing in their survey said that they commute to work (**Table 2b**). Their commute ranges from three miles to 35 miles with the average commute length of 15.87 miles.
- Seventy-one percent of the survey population indicated that they have children (**Table 1b**). Thirty percent of the respondents said that their children attend Spring Hill schools. In 2000, 47.7 percent of the households in Spring Hill indicated that they include individuals less than 18 years of age compared with 35.5 percent of the households in Kansas (U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1).

⁶ 81.9% of housing is occupied by homeowners for the Johnson County portion of the Zip Code of 66083 (Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce, Johnson County Economic Research Institute, 2001).

⁷ Johnson County Economic Research Institute, 2001.

⁸ "Population of Incorporated Places in Kansas: 1980, 1990, 2000 and Percent Change 1990-2000," 2000 U.S. Bureau of the Census, Public Law 94-171 data.

⁹ Johnson County Economic Research Institute, 2001.

**Table 1a. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
Spring Hill Community Survey**

	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
MALE/FEMALE			HOUSING		
Male	28	33%	Rent	6	7%
Female	55	65%	Own	77	91%
<i>N = 85</i>			<i>N = 85</i>		
MARITAL STATUS			AGE RANGE		
Married	66	78%	18 - 24	2	2%
Single	6	7%	25 - 34	11	13%
Divorced	4	5%	35 - 44	27	32%
Widowed	3	4%	45 - 54	21	25%
Separated	1	1%	55 - 64	16	19%
No Response	5	6%	65 +	5	6%
<i>N = 85</i>			<i>N = 85</i>		
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME			<i>If Married,</i>		
less than \$15,000	3	4%	<i>Age of Spouse:</i>		
\$15,001 - \$25,000	4	5%	18 - 24	1	2%
\$25,001 - \$35,000	5	6%	25 - 34	5	9%
\$35,001 - \$45,000	9	11%	35 - 44	22	40%
\$45,001 - \$60,000	16	19%	45 - 54	13	24%
\$60,001 - \$80,000	16	19%	55 - 64	7	13%
\$80,001 - \$100,000	10	12%	65 +	7	13%
\$100,001 +	13	15%	<i>N = 55</i>		
<i>N = 85</i>					
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL					
High school or equivalent (GED)	15	18%			
1 - 2 Years College	33	39%			
4-Year College					
Degree	23	27%			
Graduate education	12	14%			
<i>N = 85</i>					

Source: Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce Community Assessment Survey 2001, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

**Table 1b. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
Spring Hill Community Survey**

	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
LIVE IN SPRING HILL CITY LIMITS			HAVE CHILDREN	60	71%
Yes	41	48%	<i>Number of Children:</i>		
No	40	47%	one	12	14%
<i>Number of Years</i>			two	22	26%
<i>Lived in Spring Hill:</i>			three	15	18%
Less than 1	1	1%	four	6	7%
1 - 2	11	13%	five or more	1	1%
3 - 5	18	21%	<i>N = 85</i>		
6 - 10	16	19%	<i>Number Live at Home:</i>		
11 - 20	12	14%	None	22	26%
21 - 30	13	15%	One	17	20%
31 - 40	5	6%	Two	16	19%
More than 40	4	5%	Three	9	11%
<i>N = 85</i>			<i>N = 64</i>		
Range:	0 to 49 years		<i>Attend Spring Hill</i>		
Mean:	13.56 years		<i>Schools:</i>		
COMMUTE TO WORK			Yes	30	35%
Yes	51	60%	No	40	47%
No	24	28%	<i>N = 85</i>		
<i>Miles Commute (One Way):</i>					
Less than 10	7	14%			
10 - 20	31	61%			
21 - 30	10	20%			
More than 30	3	6%			
<i>N = 51</i>					
Range:	3 to 35 miles				
Mean:	15.87 miles				

Source: Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce Community Assessment Survey 2001, Policy Research Institute KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

About the Community

Areas of Emphasis for Spring Hill

The Community Assessment Survey gave respondents an opportunity to indicate how much emphasis the community needs to place on several items – from no emphasis to moderate emphasis to significantly greater emphasis (**Table 2**). Well over half of the respondents (from 56 to 67 percent) would like to see a greater to significantly greater emphasis placed on all the areas – planning and zoning, retaining existing business, attracting new business, and growth and development issues. Few respondents indicated that these areas were of no or little concern.

The majority of the respondents would like to see a greater emphasis on planning and zoning, retaining existing business, attracting new business, and growth and development issues.

Large majority would like to see greater enforcement of codes pertaining to beautification issues.

Enforcement of Codes. Eighty-four percent of those surveyed said that they would like to see greater enforcement of codes pertaining to beautification issues, such as junk vehicles, yard maintenance and trash (**Table 2**). Seventy-three percent felt that the codes should be enforced by the city staff compared to 25 percent who felt that enforcement should occur just when someone files a formal complaint.

Sixty-two of the 85 survey respondents prefer to obtain information about city issues and events from a city-sponsored newsletter (**Table 2**). Among the survey respondents there was little interest in obtaining information from the web, community cable, or city council meetings.

Concern for Growth. The survey asked respondents to indicate their primary concern about the city's growth. Forty-five percent of the respondents said they are concerned with retaining the sense of community (**Table 2**).¹⁰ The respondents are also very concerned about maintaining a low crime rate and infrastructure expenses with 36 and 30 percent, respectively, indicating these two areas in their responses. Twelve percent of the respondents said that "all of the above" – sense of community, low crime rate, infrastructure, activities for youths, and new jobs – was of primary concern.

Respondents are most concerned with retaining the sense of community.

¹⁰ Combines the "retaining sense of community" and the "all of the above" responses.

Table 2. Areas of Emphasis and Concern for the Spring Hill Community

Area	<u>Degree of Emphasis Community Needs to Place</u>				
	None	Some/Little	Moderate	Greater	Significantly Greater
Planning and Zoning	1%	6%	27%	36%	20%
Retaining Existing Business	1%	4%	22%	42%	21%
Attracting New Business	-	2%	22%	34%	33%
Growth and Development Issues	2%	5%	20%	32%	32%

N = 85

Greater enforcement of codes pertaining to beautification issues is needed.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	71	84%
No	11	13%

These code should be enforced by:

City Staff	62	73%
Citizen complaint only	21	25%

Preference for information about city issues and events:

City-sponsored Newsletter	62	73%
Web Page	8	9%
Community Cable	5	6%
City Council Meetings	2	2%

Primary concern about city growth:

Retaining Sense of Community	33	39%
Maintaining Low Crime Rate	24	28%
Infrastructure*	18	21%
All of the Above	12	14%
Providing Activities for Youth	9	11%
Creating New Jobs	7	8%
Other**	5	6%

Note: Some respondents indicated more than one primary concern. Therefore, percent column does not total 100%.

*Infrastructure includes streets, waterlines, and sewer lines.

**Other includes school system, lower taxes, and less government involvement.

Source: Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce Community Assessment Survey 2001, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

City Hall and City Council

The survey asked people to rate City Hall and the City Council on a four-point scale from “Poor” to “Very Good” in a number of areas.

The results of their responses can be found in **Table 3**. Only five percent of those responding to the survey rated City Hall’s appearance as very good. Thirteen percent said that the appearance was poor. With regards to the quality of service received, the ratings for City Hall staff and other related personnel were mostly good to very good. Seventy-one percent of the respondents rated City Hall staff as good or very good. Sixty-three percent rated the Public Works and Maintenance staff as good or very good and 57 percent rated the Policy Department’s personnel favorably.

City staff and other related personnel received high ratings but the appearance of City Hall needs work.

The City Council received their lowest ratings on community planning issues.

The ratings for the City Council were not quite so favorable with few of the respondents rating the Council as very good in the areas – fair and equal representation, knowledge of the issues, meeting presentations, and community planning issues

(**Table 3**). The area with the highest ratings was fair and equal representation with 42 percent indicating a good rating. The area with the lowest ratings was community planning issues with 41 percent giving the City Council a fair or poor rating.

Physical Improvements Needed

The survey contained an open-ended question regarding physical improvements needed. Twenty respondents said infrastructure improvements were needed with curb and guttering as the most frequently mentioned specific area of concern. If roads (highway and Webster Street) are included under infrastructure, the number of surveys mentioning infrastructure increases by eight.

Beautification is another area of improvement needed in Spring Hill with 24 respondents mentioning improvements that could be classified under beautification. While some of the surveys talked in general about beautification, other surveys mentioned specific areas such as trash, junk, yards, buildings, and sidewalks that needed to be cleaned up. The appearance of several buildings was also specifically mentioned, such as City Hall, the grocery store, and the Post Office.

It has become a “dirty little town”. There needs to be more effort in keeping our community clean.

Eleven surveys talked about improvements needed under recreation. Eight respondents specifically mentioned that a new and better park was needed. One survey talked about “more parks and walk/bicycle trail, possibly with a wildlife area and landscaping.”

“Downtown has such potential and is totally ignored and under utilized.”

Seven respondents specifically mentioned the downtown as an area that physical improvements were needed the most. One surveyed summed up the situation in downtown as “Downtown has such potential and is totally ignored and under utilized.”

Table 3. Spring Hill City Hall and City Council Ratings

	<u>Ratings</u>			
	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
CITY HALL				
Appearance of City Hall	5%	36%	39%	13%
<i>Quality of Service Received from:</i>				
City Hall staff	19%	52%	15%	2%
Public Works and Maintenance staff	14%	49%	19%	4%
Police Department's personnel	22%	45%	16%	6%
<i>N = 85</i>				
CITY COUNCIL				
Fair and equal representation	2%	42%	25%	6%
Knowledge of the issues	2%	40%	24%	8%
Meeting presentations	2%	36%	29%	5%
Community planning issues	-	33%	33%	8%
<i>N = 85</i>				

Source: Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce Community Assessment Survey 2001, Policy Research Insti KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Like the Most About Spring Hill

The majority of those responding to the survey most like the quiet, small town atmosphere of Spring Hill with 69 of the 85 surveys mentioning words or phrases that fit this category. They appreciate the sense of community and the friendly people and they believe that Spring Hill is a good place to raise a family. They also describe the community as personal and neighborly. An additional eight respondents mentioned that they liked the low crime rate and feeling safe in Spring Hill. Respondents like the location – being away from the big city.

“Small town friendliness and safe feeling...”

The survey respondents also like the convenience, closeness, and easy accessibility of businesses and services in Spring Hill with 13 respondents mentioning this. Three respondents specifically mentioned the library services as what they liked most. Another five respondents specifically mentioned the schools as what they liked most.

Like the Least About Spring Hill

“not being able to take care of business in town...”

While 13 respondents most liked the businesses and services, 23 respondents least liked the availability of businesses and services. Specifically they mentioned the choices, entertainment, town activities, doctors, grocery stores, restaurants, and pharmacy.

The appearance of housing and streets is also an area that is least liked. Twenty-one surveys contained responses that fit this category. The general maintenance of housing and streets including trash, clutter, and dirtiness was mentioned. Webster Street and the downtown were mentioned specifically as needing improvement.

“homes not kept up, yards cluttered with trash”

“Obviously about 51% of the population has no vision for the future...”

A number of respondents (12) are also concerned with growth from the sprawl of new housing developments to the new people with “big city ideas.” Several surveys mentioned concern that the people of Spring Hill were “negative,” “redneck”, and “too small town.” One respondent wrote “Obviously about 51% of the population has no vision for the future (hints failure of school bond).” Several mentioned the lack of support for the schools while others mentioned that the schools “want more, too much.” A few complained about taxes mostly associated with supporting the schools.

Six surveys contained responses that indicated they were not happy with city government – mostly having to do with infrastructure associated with streets and roads. Several complained that utilities were too high while others mentioned facilities/activities for youth (and special needs children) were lacking.

Services or Programs for the Spring Hill Civic Center

Sixteen surveys contained responses that could be categorized at children’s activities/youth programs when asked to name two services or programs that they would like to see offered at the Spring Hill Civic Center. They particularly emphasized evening programs, programs for older children, and family activity programs. Seven respondents would like to see exercise programs and services, such as aerobics for over 50, evening, and flexible hours for fitness area and weight room. Three surveys mentioned day care that was drop in, affordable, and pre-school.

The respondents would like to see a wide range of classes and no clear consensus emerged from their responses. Classes that were mentioned include art (painting, ceramics), Red Cross classes, music instruction (piano, guitar), sewing/quilting, gardening, foreign language, sign language, computer, and health information.

About the Schools

The survey contained two open-ended questions about the schools (what they do well and what to improve or change) along with the opportunity to grade the schools overall for their effectiveness and quality in a number of areas.

What the Schools Do Well

“Small enough to include children in many different activities and principals are very accessible.”

Eighteen of the returned surveys mentioned that the Spring Hill schools do a good job of teaching and educating the children. These respondents are pleased with the small class size, the low student to teacher ratio. Two departments specifically mentioned were technology and the music department. An additional nine respondents felt that the schools are meeting the needs of the students and do a good job of caring for the children.

Another 10 surveys contained responses having to do with extracurricular activities – these respondents felt that the schools do a good job involving the students whether it is in sports or volunteer work.

The Spring Hill schools do a good job with educating, teaching, and caring for the children.

"The schools are very organized, ran well. They keep parents informed about school matters."

Nine respondents believe that the schools overall are well run. Included in this category are hiring good staff, accessibility of the principals, communicating well with the parents, enforcement of moral/ethical code, getting grants, and making do.

Six surveys specifically mentioned encouraging parent involvement and communicating with parents.

Even though this was an opportunity to talk about what the schools do well, several respondents still talked about the negatives aspects of the schools. They indicated that the schools did a good job with consuming taxes and spending money.

Improvement/Changes Needed in the Schools

Twenty-two surveys talked about improvements needed with regards to teachers and staff. Included in this category are hiring better staff, retaining quality staff, and more training for staff. Five respondents

"Programs to hire and keep effective and dedicated teachers."

specifically mentioned increased compensation and merit pay for teachers. Another five mentioned hiring more teachers to keep the small class size. Five respondents mentioned that improvements are needed in the administration – from trimming bureaucracy and putting funds elsewhere to replacing certain administrators with people who know the district. Several respondents would like to see improved communication with residents/patrons.

Curriculum improvement and changes needed from kindergarten to high school.

Fourteen respondents talked about curriculum improvement and changes that are needed. Three surveys specifically referred to full-time kindergarten. Several surveys also mentioned curriculum changes needed at the high school

with more college prep courses and a concern with the block scheduling. Respondents would like to see more variety in the subjects taught as well as more practical courses. Three respondents talked about concentrating on academics and rewarding it as much as sports.

A number of surveys also dealt with funding and the bond issue for the district. This category includes those who talked about lower taxes, spending money wisely, and cutting bureaucracy as well as those who would like to see a bond issue pass, principally in conjunction with a new elementary school.

Grading the School District

The respondents were given the opportunity to grade the Spring Hill School District from an overall grade for the District to grades for effectiveness of teachers, principals, administrators, School Board, and support staff. The respondents also had the opportunity to grade the overall quality of programs and efforts of the schools and the District's management of property and planning.

A large number of respondents were reluctant to assign letter grades to the School District.

The opportunities for parents to be involved and the accessibility of school personnel were graded as well. The grades for all these areas are listed in **Table 4**.

Please note that the respondents were reluctant to give out grades as seen by the number of "Unknown/Blank" responses as well as the smaller number choosing to answer this section (**Table 4**). The number of surveys tabulated for this section ranged from 50 to 57. And, the percent of "Unknown/Blank" responses ranged from 16 percent to 49 percent of "N =".

In general, the Spring Hill School District received passing grades with few respondents giving the various areas "D's" or "F's" (**Table 4**). The area where work is most needed appears to be long-range facility planning, with 17 percent of those responding to this question

In general, the Spring Hill School District received passing grades – but no area received above a 3.27 GPA.

grading the overall quality as an "F" and giving it a GPA of 1.96. The opportunity for involvement at the elementary (K-5) level received the highest marks with a 3.27 GPA. Overall, the School District passed with 16 percent giving the District an "A", 30 percent giving it a "B" and 19 percent giving a "C" for a GPA of 2.90.

The overall effectiveness of teachers held steady around a "B" average.

With regards to the overall effectiveness of teachers, teachers received high marks in all areas with well over half (58 to 64 percent) giving teachers "A's" or "B's" (**Table 4**).

Knowledge of the subject matter received the highest grades (no F's) and concern for student welfare and individual needs received the most "A's."

The School Board is considered the least effective of the three management groups – School Board, Principals and Assistant Principals, and District Administrators and Staff – as seen by the number of “A’s” and “F’s” received and its GPA of 2.24 (Table 4). Principals and Assistant Principals received the highest marks of this grouping with a 2.82 GPA.

The School Board received the lowest grades of the three management groups.

With regards to support staff, the respondents graded all groups fairly high with custodial/maintenance personnel receiving the greatest number of “A’s” and “B’s” and a GPA of 3.26 (Table 4). Secretaries, paraprofessionals, and aids received a 3.10 GPA and food service personnel received a 3.03 GPA.

The respondents knew the least about the overall quality of service from First Student Transportation with 49 percent leaving this area “Unknown/Blank” (Table 4). For those that did grade this area, they gave it a 2.83 GPA.

The overall quality of programs at the three school levels – elementary (K-5), middle (6-8) and high school (9-12) – were graded (Table 4). The elementary level received the highest GPA at 3.09 and the high school received the lowest marks at a 2.48 GPA.

The opportunities for parents and other patrons to be involved in the elementary schools received the highest grades for the School District with a 3.27 GPA.

The respondents were asked to grade the schools (elementary, middle, and high school), district activities, and advisory groups for their opportunities for parents and other patrons to be involved in them. The elementary schools were graded the highest, with a 3.27 GPA, for opportunities

for involvement (Table 4). Advisory groups received the lowest marks with a 2.55 GPA.

With regards to accessibility of school personnel, teachers were graded the most accessible with a straight 3.00 GPA (Table 4). School board members, with a 2.29 GPA, were considered the least accessible school personnel.

**Table 4. Report Card for
the Spring Hill School District**

Area	Grade					Unknown/ Blank	N=	GPA
	A	B	C	D	F			
Overall Grade for the School District	16%	30%	19%	2%	-	33%	57	2.90
<i>Overall Effectiveness of Teachers:</i>								
knowledge of subject matter	27%	37%	12%	4%	-	21%	52	3.10
concern for student welfare and individual needs	31%	33%	6%	12%	2%	17%	52	2.97
concern for student accomplishment	29%	29%	14%	10%	2%	17%	52	2.89
instructional skills	29%	31%	17%	2%	2%	19%	52	3.03
<i>Overall Effectiveness of:</i>								
Principals and Assist. Principals	17%	42%	15%	6%	2%	17%	52	2.82
District Administrators and Staff	14%	27%	19%	12%	6%	23%	52	2.41
School Board's Effectiveness	6%	30%	11%	11%	8%	34%	53	2.24
<i>Effectiveness of Support Staff:</i>								
Secretaries, Paraprofessionals, Aids	23%	44%	12%	2%	-	19%	52	3.10
Food Service Personnel	23%	39%	17%	2%	-	19%	52	3.03
Custodial/Maintenance Personnel	33%	42%	4%	4%	-	17%	52	3.26
Overall Quality of Service from First Student Transportation	15%	17%	13%	6%	-	49%	53	2.83
<i>Overall Quality of Programs at the:</i>								
Elementary (K-5) Level	27%	23%	15%	-	2%	33%	52	3.09
Middle School (6-8) Level	17%	25%	10%	2%	2%	44%	52	2.97
High School (9-12) Level	8%	25%	15%	6%	4%	42%	52	2.48
<i>Overall Quality of the School District's:</i>								
Maintenance of Exterior Grounds	32%	35%	20%	2%	2%	9%	54	3.03
Long-range Facility Planning	9%	21%	21%	9%	17%	23%	53	1.96
<i>Opportunities for Parents and Other Patrons to be Involved in:</i>								
Elementary Schools	41%	20%	8%	4%	2%	26%	51	3.27
Middle School	16%	29%	2%	8%	2%	43%	51	2.88
High School	16%	29%	6%	10%	2%	37%	51	2.77
District Activities	22%	28%	12%	6%	-	33%	51	2.98
Advisory Groups	14%	20%	24%	4%	4%	35%	51	2.55
<i>Accessibility of School Personnel:</i>								
Teachers	32%	30%	16%	2%	4%	16%	50	3.00
Counselors	22%	32%	8%	8%	6%	24%	50	2.75
Principals and Assist. Principals	18%	32%	18%	2%	4%	26%	50	2.79
District Administrators	10%	30%	8%	12%	6%	34%	50	2.42
School Board Members	12%	22%	6%	14%	8%	38%	50	2.29

Source: Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce Community Assessment Survey 2001, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

About the Businesses

Evaluation of Existing Businesses

The Spring Hill Community Assessment Survey contained a series of questions about the businesses and asked respondents to evaluate 32 businesses on frequency of use as well as select a reason that would increase shopping at that business more often. The businesses ranged from accountants to video and liquor store. The results of their responses are displayed in **Table 5**.

The top five existing businesses in Spring Hill as indicated by an “always” response on frequency of use are (**Table 5**):

1. Banks (40%),
2. Veterinarians (37%),
3. Grocers (34%),
4. Convenience Store (31%), and
5. Utilities (19%).

More than half of the respondents report using the grocers, the convenience store, restaurants, auto parts, veterinarians, banks, florists, and video and liquor store in Spring Hill.

Add in the “sometimes” use and the most frequented businesses in Spring Hill are:

1. Grocers (85%),
2. Convenience Store (83%),
3. Restaurants (80%),
4. Auto Parts (66%), and
5. Veterinarians (65%).

The businesses that more than 70 percent of the respondents indicated that they never use are (**Table 5**):

1. Accountants and Spa Service (79%, tie);
2. Long-term Nursing Care (78%);
3. Mini-Storage and Travel Agency (77%, tie);
4. Carpeting and Sign Shop and Design (75%, tie);
5. Attorneys (73%); and,
6. Printing (71%).

Spending at Businesses

More variety and better prices would increase spending at local businesses, particularly at the grocers and restaurants.

The Survey also asked people to select a reason that would increase spending at existing businesses. The results of the responses are listed in **Table 5**. It is interesting to note the percentage of “5” responses, which is “no need for service.” It can be assumed that these people

will only use the service if a future need arises. After the reason “5”, the most frequently mentioned reason to increase shopping at existing businesses is reason “4” – more variety. This is a particularly relevant reason for the grocers and restaurants. More variety would also increase spending at the automobile dealer. Another reason to increase spending at the grocers is to have better prices (reason “3”).

Three Most Needed New Businesses in Spring Hill

The three most needed new businesses in Spring Hill, according to the respondents, are 1) Restaurant, 2) Grocery Store, and 3) Drug Store/Pharmacy.¹¹ Thirty-six surveys, or 42 percent, mentioned needing a new restaurant and/or eating place from fast food to an upscale bar and grill restaurant. Thirty-one surveys, or 36 percent, talked about a grocery store that is bigger, better, cheaper, and has more variety. Twenty-five surveys, or 29 percent, mentioned the need for a new drug store/pharmacy.

Most Needed New Businesses

- 1. Restaurant*
- 2. Grocery Store*
- 3. Drug Store/Pharmacy*

¹¹ Other businesses also mentioned include: hardware store (16), discount store (11), doctors (9), dry cleaners (6), shopping – specialty shops, downtown (5), gas station/convenience store (4), something for the youth to do – swimming pool, roller rink, entertainment, movie theatre, bowling alley (4), drive-thru car wash (3), dentist (2), day care facility (2), video store (2), book store, fabric store, print shop, major bank branch, cable service, telephone options, and a business that pays taxes.

**Table 5. Existing Business in Spring Hill
Usage and Reasons for Increased Spending at Businesses**

Business	Frequency of Use				Reasons that Would Increase Spending*					
	Always	Sometimes	Never	Emergencies	1	2	3	4	5	6
Accountants	1%	4%	79%	-	-	4%	1%	-	40%	6%
Attorneys	-	11%	73%	-	-	5%	1%	2%	37%	2%
Auto Repair	5%	42%	32%	4%	2%	8%	7%	6%	13%	5%
Auto Parts	7%	59%	14%	2%	5%	4%	9%	9%	6%	6%
Automobile Dealer	-	11%	67%	-	-	4%	4%	13%	15%	4%
Banks	40%	20%	24%	-	5%	6%	1%	2%	6%	7%
Barber Shop	12%	13%	57%	-	5%	1%	1%	5%	22%	2%
Beauty Salon	15%	13%	53%	-	7%	2%	1%	2%	14%	5%
Carpeting	2%	4%	75%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	26%	6%
Chiropractor	1%	15%	66%	1%	1%	2%	4%	1%	26%	5%
Convenience Store	31%	52%	4%	-	5%	4%	8%	9%	2%	2%
Florists	12%	47%	24%	1%	2%	4%	9%	2%	7%	2%
Furniture Store	-	20%	58%	-	-	4%	7%	5%	14%	4%
Golf Course	2%	19%	59%	1%	-	-	7%	-	27%	9%
Grocers	34%	51%	2%	2%	6%	7%	25%	22%	1%	2%
Heating and Air										
Conditioning	7%	20%	51%	5%	-	2%	5%	-	12%	4%
Insurance	9%	12%	65%	-	-	1%	8%	-	14%	7%
Lawn and Garden	2%	12%	67%	1%	-	-	2%	4%	19%	5%
Long-term Nursing										
Care	1%	2%	78%	1%	-	2%	-	1%	27%	2%
Mini-Storage	2%	4%	77%	-	-	-	1%	-	31%	2%
Newspapers	12%	32%	37%	-	-	5%	1%	5%	7%	4%
Optometrist	9%	19%	57%	-	2%	5%	6%	-	11%	4%
Printing	2%	9%	71%	1%	-	1%	5%	1%	25%	1%
Real Estate	4%	22%	54%	-	1%	-	-	-	25%	1%
Restaurants	14%	66%	7%	-	4%	7%	5%	22%	1%	4%
Sign Shop and										
Design	1%	8%	75%	-	-	-	-	1%	26%	2%
Spa Service	-	4%	79%	-	-	1%	4%	4%	22%	4%
Tools	2%	20%	58%	1%	-	-	7%	4%	13%	2%
Travel Agency	-	5%	77%	-	-	-	1%	2%	20%	4%
Utilities	19%	17%	38%	-	-	-	5%	2%	8%	4%
Veterinarians	37%	28%	19%	2%	2%	1%	2%	-	12%	5%
Video and Liquor										
Store	8%	51%	25%	-	2%	1%	7%	11%	8%	6%

N=85

*Reasons: 1 = More Flexible Hours; 2 = Better Service; 3 = Better Prices; 4 = More Variety; 5 = No Need for Service; and 6 = Other.

Source: Spring Hill Chamber of Commerce Community Assessment Survey 2001, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2001.

Conclusion

The Community Assessment Survey gave respondents one last chance to comment on Spring Hill. Many of those comments pertained to issues already raised with previous questions and responses, from maintaining the sense of community and small town atmosphere to the need for beautification and maintenance of existing buildings and infrastructure. Several responses reflect the general, and often contradictory, sentiments expressed by the respondents and this report will end with them. It is now the responsibility of the leadership to take these survey results and apply them as appropriate for the community of Spring Hill.

ABOUT THE PEOPLE

"SH is a good town. I have lived here all my life. Good leadership – someone we can be proud and respect – is a must. We seem to be going in a more positive direction – I hope."

"Love our friendly post office with no lines! Love our friendly people. Would like to see our town cleaned up more."

"SH is a friendly place to live. I love the nature around us and would like to see its potential enhanced along with making our community a place where others want to visit. We love it here."

ABOUT THE COMMUNITY

"Clean the town up so that people can be proud of where they live."

"There needs to be some pride in how our town looks..."

"City codes need to be enforced! Commercial vehicles parked in residential areas. Trashy houses and yards. Junk vehicles need to be removed. This is a major problem in SH."

"We need housing for families that are nice but not huge and expensive."

"Roads are bad, and we doubt they will ever improve."

"I moved to Spring Hill because of property value and the schools. I enjoy SH, but I wish it had more to offer."

"The reason people move to SH is to live in a small community. I do not want to see SH to grow even as big as Gardner. As soon as a stoplight goes in, SH will have changed too much. I love SH as is."

ABOUT THE BUSINESSES

"I believe that many enjoy the small town environment here but new businesses and growth will keep S.H. a desirable community to live in for the future."

"Unless we start getting a viable business area going, we are going to fade away to only a bedroom community. The businesses need to stay open a little later for working people."

"We really believe in shopping in the town in which we live. We would love to see more businesses dealing with everyday living so we do not have to go to Olathe for drugs or hardware."

"We also need a full-time doctor in town."

ABOUT THE SCHOOLS

"Retain community interest and support of our school system and our children."

"Small town politics have been embarrassing in the past. School Board must find a way to present approvable bond issue."

"Board of Education needs to listen to the people of SH."