

Section 1

Q2 & 3. Summer Daze Recreation Program Components/ Importance-Performance

An importance-performance (I-P) analysis of several components of the Summer Daze Recreation Program was conducted. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each component on a seven-point scale, from 1= not important to 7= very important. Next, members were asked to rate how satisfied they were with the program. Again, a seven-point scale was used, ranging from 1= terrible to 7= delighted. The importance and performance table of responses also included an “8= cannot comment” option. These “cannot comment” responses were excluded from the analysis.

Mean importance and performance scores were calculated for the 11 components. Gap scores were determined by subtracting the importance score from the performance score. A positive gap score indicates a good performance relative to the importance rating of the attribute. A negative gap score reveals that the performance rating was lower than the importance rating for the component. Of the 11 components listed in the questionnaire, three had positive gap scores: 1) affordability of the program fee, 2) convenient location, and 3) program schedule. The three components with the highest negative score were 1) leadership skills of staff (-0.96), 2) organization of the program activities (-0.82), and 3) supervision of children (-0.79). It is important to point out that, even though several components received a negative score, they all had a satisfaction score (mean) ranging between 5 and 7 (happy-delighted). Please see the table below for more information.

Program Components: (I-P) Means and Gap Scores

Component	Importance Mean	Performance Mean	Gap Score
Convenient Location	6.40	6.47	0.07
New recreation activities learned	5.73	5.27	-0.46
Information about special events/activities	6.16	5.79	-0.37
Leadership skills of staff	6.67	5.71	-0.96
Organization of the program activities	6.53	5.71	-0.82
Affordability of the program fee	5.99	6.35	0.36
Variety of rec. activities experienced	6.14	5.44	-0.7
Organiz. and effectiveness of check in/out	6.33	5.71	-0.62
Supervision of children (leader/particip. ratio)	6.68	5.89	-0.79
Program schedule (times and days offered)	6.10	6.12	0.02
Directors knowledge and effectiveness	6.63	5.96	-0.67

4. Overall satisfaction with the program

Following the importance-performance questions, respondents were asked overall, how satisfied they were with the Summer Daze Recreation Program, ranging from 1= not at all satisfied to 10= very satisfied. Again, the mean score was calculated, with a very positive result (mean= 8.11).

5. If offered in your town, will you register you child (ren) again next year?

Respondents were asked if they would register their child (ren) again next year. The majority of the respondents (almost 60%) stated that they ‘definitely will participate’, while 23% said they ‘probable will participate’. Only 3.2% said they ‘definitely will not participate’, and 4.8% probably will not participate. Approximately 10% didn’t know (see summary on table below).

	% (N)
Definitely will participate	58.5 (145)
Probably will participate	23.0 (57)
Probably will not participate	4.8 (12)
Definitely will not participate	3.2 (8)
Don’t know	10.5 (26)

6. Would you recommend to other parents

Respondents were asked if they would recommend that other parents sign their children up for the Summer Daze Program. The vast majority (85.2%) said they would recommend, while only about 1% said they would not. Thirteen percent said they ‘maybe’ would recommend.

	% (N)
Yes	85.2 (213)
No	1.2 (3)
Maybe	13.6 (34)

Section 2

1. Opinion about recreational issues and opportunities offered by town

Several statements were presented regarding recreational issues and opportunities offered by the town. Respondents were asked to circle the number that indicated how much they agree or disagree with each statement. Possible answers ranged from 1= strongly disagree to 4= strongly agree. Scores show that in general respondents are aware of the importance of recreation activities for their quality of life (mean= 3.55) or their community’s quality of life (mean= 3.61), but are not satisfied with the number of recreation facilities available for their use (mean 2.10). The table below provides the results.

Statements regarding recreational issues- Scale:

1= Strongly Disagree

2= Disagree

3= Agree

4= Strongly Agree

Statement	Mean
I am satisfied with the recreational opportunities offered in my community.	2.30
Park and recreation programs and facilities are important to my quality of life.	3.39
My community is responsive to the recreational needs of the community.	2.38
The city, Park Dist. and School Dist. should cooperate to maximize the use of recreational facilities in my community.	3.55
The city should increase collaborative efforts with local businesses and special interest groups to promote and/or sponsor selected activities.	3.47
Recreation activities, programs, and facilities are important for our community's quality of life.	3.61
The city (or park district if applicable) should offer more programs and activities.	3.45
I am satisfied with the number of recreation facilities available for my use	2.10
School facilities should be available for recreation activities and programs during non-school hours	3.28
I am not satisfied with the quality of the programs and activities offered by the city	2.57
There are enough safe places (such as trails and sidewalks) to walk for exercise in my community	2.36
It is important that our community have access to walking trails and parks	3.41

2. Funding Option

In order to add facilities or recreation program, sources of funding to pay for them would need to be identified by the town. Respondents were asked whether they would oppose or support a number of funding options. Answer choices ranged from 1= strongly oppose to 4= strongly support. As expected, 'increase in property tax' and 'implementation of special assessment tax' were opposed or strongly opposed by the majority of the sample (70.3% and 60.8%, respectively). The vast majority of the respondents strongly support or support 'combination of grants & local funds' (98%), 'private/corporate donations' (97%), 'community sponsored event', and user participation fees (93.7%). 'Developer's fee' also received a positive response (77%), while a 'combination of participation fees & taxes' was supported or strongly supported by 56% of the sample. See results below.

Funding Option	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support
	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)
Increase in property tax	27.6 (64)	42.7 (99)	26.7 (62)	3.0 (7)
Implement special assessment tax	20.4 (46)	40.4 (91)	35.6 (80)	3.6 (8)
Community sponsored fundraisers	1.3 (3)	2.9 (7)	51.3 (123)	44.6 (107)
Combination of grants & local funds	0.4 (1)	1.2 (3)	46.1 (112)	52.3 (127)
Developer's fees	2.4 (5)	20.5 (42)	52.7 (108)	24.4 (50)
Private/Corporate donations	-	2.1 (5)	43.1 (103)	54.8 (131)
User participation fees	1.7 (4)	4.6 (11)	66.0 (157)	27.7 (66)
Combination of particip. fees & taxes	12.4 (28)	31.1 (70)	42.7 (96)	13.8 (31)

3. Community satisfaction

Respondents were given a series of statements regarding their satisfaction with the town, with options ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 6= strongly agree. The mean score was calculated. The highest scores were 4.94 (I am satisfied with this town as a place to live), 4.67 (I am satisfied with the quality of life in this town), and 4.58 (Overall, I am satisfied with community life in this town), which are within the slightly agree to moderately agree range. The results are presented in the table below.

Statement	Mean
I am satisfied with this town as a place to live	4.94
This town is not an ideal place to live	2.31
I am satisfied with the quality of life in this town	4.67
The future of this town looks bright	3.91
People won't work together to get things done for this town	3.22
This town has good leaders	3.97
Not much can be said in favor of this town	2.03
Residents of this town continually look for new solutions to problems rather than being satisfied with the way things are	3.61
Overall, I am satisfied with community life in this town	4.58

4. Public services provided/Performance - Importance

An importance-performance (I-P) analysis regarding several public services in the community was also conducted. Mean importance and performance scores were calculated for 7 public services. Gap scores were determined by subtracting the importance score from the performance score. As indicated earlier, a positive gap score indicates a good performance relative to the importance rating of the attribute. A negative gap score reveals that the performance rating was lower than the importance rating for the component. All the services had negatives scores, with 'Parks and Recreation' being the highest negative score (-1.90), indicating that the community sees a need for improvement in this area. Please see the table provided below.

Service	Importance	Performance	Gap
Water/sewer	6.68	5.02	-1.66
Education (i.e., schools)	6.96	5.46	-1.50
Library	6.53	5.75	-0.78
Parks and recreation	6.66	4.76	-1.90
Garbage	6.28	5.66	-0.62
Police	6.75	5.49	-1.26
Fire	6.84	6.03	-0.81

Section 3

Age of Respondents

The majority of respondents were in the 35-44 age range (55.5%), followed by the 26-34 age range (28.7%).

Number of social, civic and/or voluntary organizations respondents participate in:

Respondents' answers ranged from 0 to 10 organizations, with a mean score of 2.11 organizations.

Interest to serve on community's citizens recreation and park advisory board

Nineteen percent of the sample reported they were interested in serving on their community's citizens recreation and park advisory board, while 40% said they were not interested. About the same number (40.7%) said 'maybe' they would be interested or willing to serve.

	% (N)
Yes	19.1 (47)
No	40.2 (99)
Maybe	40.7 (100)