

COMMUNITY UTILIZATION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES: A STUDY OF THE
POLICIES, PROGRAMS, PERSONNEL AND PROBLEMS IN SELECTED
AREAS OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

without
Author's Permission)

WILLIAM CARTARETT LEE



COMMUNITY UTILIZATION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES: A STUDY OF THE POLICIES,
PROGRAMS, PERSONNEL AND PROBLEMS IN SELECTED AREAS
OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

by



William Cartaret Lee, B.A., B.Ed.

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

Department of Educational Administration
Memorial University of Newfoundland

August 1975

St. John's

Newfoundland

AN ABSTRACT

Traditionally, the schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador were used to a great extent by the communities which they served. However, with the increase in the number of other facilities available for community use and the consolidation of school boards and schools into larger units, non-school use by the community seemed to decline. Now we are seeing a resurgence of interest in this concept.

From a review of related literature on community use in the United States and Canada, new ideas and approaches have developed. A philosophy of community education has emerged, suggesting that people of the community should make the greatest use possible of their schools to further develop the community as a whole. Community schools have been established as the vehicle by which the philosophy is implemented.

This study has attempted to ascertain the extent to which specific schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador were used by the community. Five aspects of community use were researched: the policies developed, the programs in operation, the personnel using the schools, the problems being experienced, and the prospects for future use. To determine this, three separate instruments were used. A province-wide questionnaire was used to examine policies, programs, personnel, problems, and prospects of one hundred thirty-four (134) schools judged to be used to a great extent. A structured interview was administered to a sample of community leaders, principals and/or coordinators of after-school programs in eight (8) schools chosen for in

depth study. Besides this, a sample of the clientele using these eight (8) schools were questioned to determine their attitude toward the present program and the prospects for future expansion. Finally, a sample of heads of households or their spouses were questioned in one specific community. The purpose here was to obtain views concerning present and future demands for school use by the community.

Some of the major findings of the study include the following:

- (1) considerable use is being made of many schools by the community,
- (2) most extensive use is made for Education, Religious, Recreational and Social purposes, (3) some school board policies do not appear to be clearly understood by school principals and others who responded to the questionnaire and structured interviews, (4) the basic problems being experienced relate to supervision, cleaning, cost and lack of storage space, (5) there are demands for greater use, particularly for physical fitness, general interest and job upgrading course, and (6) the Provincial Government should accept much of the financial responsibility for community use.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is impossible to name all the individuals who have helped in the preparation and completion of this thesis and whose help I deeply appreciate. Dr. P. J. Warren, my supervisor, was always ready with constructive criticism and continued encouragement. The Superintendent, principals and teachers of The Avalon North Integrated School District with whom I had contact in the compilation of material were extremely co-operative and helpful. This attitude of co-operation and helpfulness was also displayed by the leaders of groups and other individuals in the nine communities in which I conducted surveys. And finally, appreciation must be expressed to my wife, Beverly, for her patience and encouragement during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. THE PROBLEM.	1
INTRODUCTION	1
THE PURPOSES OF THE STUDY.	3
IMPORTANCE OF AND NEED FOR THE STUDY	4
DEFINITION OF TERMS.	8
ASSUMPTIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	9
LIMITATIONS.	10
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY.	11
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
INTRODUCTION	13
COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES.	13
COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS IN CANADA	21
PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION	26
SUMMARY	36
III. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN.	38
INTRODUCTION	38
THE LOCALE AND POPULATION FOR THE STUDY.	38
THE SAMPLES SELECTED	39
METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION.	43

CHAPTER	Page
CONSTRUCTION AND NATURE OF THE INSTRUMENTS USED.	46
TREATMENT OF THE DATA.	47
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: THE PROVINCIAL STUDY	49
INTRODUCTION	49
SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES REGARDING COMMUNITY USE.	50
THE PROGRAMS	61
VIEWS OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING POLICIES AND PROBLEMS	72
PROBLEMS	87
SUMMARY.	91
V. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: SELECTED COMMUNITIES	93
INTRODUCTION	93
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES IN EIGHT SELECTED COMMUNITIES.	93
SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION	98
PROBLEMS	100
THE CLIENTELE.	104
COMMUNITY STUDY.	109
SUMMARY.	117
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	122
INTRODUCTION	122
SUMMARY OF PURPOSES AND PROCEDURES	122
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.	125
CONCLUSIONS.	129
RECOMMENDATIONS.	130
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY.	132
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	133

APPENDICES

	Page
A. INTRODUCTION LETTER	141
LETTER FROM THE DEPUTY MINISTER	142
QUESTIONNAIRE TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS	143
FOLLOW UP LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS	150
FOLLOW UP LETTER TO PRINCIPALS	151
LIST OF GROUPS AND ACTIVITIES AS CLASSIFIED BY BROAD CATEGORY	152
B. STRUCTURED INTERVIEW	155
CLIENTELE QUESTIONNAIRE	163
LIST OF GROUPS USING THE EIGHT (8) SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IN-DEPTH STUDY	166
LIST OF GROUPS, THE LEADERS AND CLIENTELE WHO PARTICIPATED IN PHASE TWO OF THE STUDY	167
C. QUESTIONNAIRE TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR SPOUSE	169

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
3-1	Number of schools by type and religious denomination	40
3-2	Total number of schools in population by district and type	41
4-1	Distribution of school districts by response to written policy, application form, and signed agreement re: community use of schools	52
4-2	The number of schools identified as used to a great extent, classified by size and type.	63
4-3	Total number, percentage and ranking of 'person contact hours' for each broad category.	64
4-4	Total number, percentage and ranking of 'person contact hours' for each broad category by type of school	66
4-5	Total number and ranking of 'person contact hours' for each broad category of community use by size of school for the Roman Catholic schools	69
4-6	Total number and ranking of 'person contact hours' for each broad category of community use by size of school for the Integrated schools	71
4-7	Responses of principals on school board statement of policy concerning community use.	73
4-8	Responses of principals concerning regulator of community use of schools	75
4-9	Responses of principals on method of application	77
4-10	Responses of principals on official contract for community use.	78
4-11	Responses of principals concerning responsibility for cleaning and restoration of school after community use.	80

TABLE

Page

4-12 Responses of principals concerning the group responsible for damages and injuries during community use	81
4-13 Responses of principals concerning supervision of school by school board employee during community use	82
4-14 Responses of principals concerning charge of rents for community use of the school.	84
4-15 Responses of principals concerning whether fees are fixed or variable.	85
4-16 Principals' views on the use made of fees collected for community use.	86
4-17 Principals' views on problems encountered when schools are used by the community.	88
4-18 Principals' views on the major problem resulting from community use of schools.	90
5-1 Total number, ranking, and percentage of person contact hours by category of community use.	95
5-2 Views of community leaders toward problems arising from community use of schools.	102
5-3 Main reason given for participation by sex	105
5-4 Adequacy of program by sex.	107
5-5 How schools can be better used to help community	108
5-6 Who should pay the extra cost.	110
5-7 Participation in after hours program and activities.	111
5-8 Main reason for participation.	113
5-9 Main reason for non-participation.	115
5-10 How school can be better used.	116
5-11 Who should pay the extra cost for community use.	118

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Community use of schools is not a new phenomenon. In many parts of the world, the school has long been the center of the community; particularly in rural areas. The idea has recently taken on increased significance, however, with demands that schools relate more to the community, that they serve the needs of people of all ages in the community, that they make better use of the human and material resources of the community in their regular program, and that more efficient use be made of expensive school facilities. Jack Minzey, one of America's foremost supporters of community use, makes the following comments concerning these demands:

The new and expanded role of the school makes economic, educational, and social sense. Greater use of public buildings which, despite their enormous cost, sit idle for long periods of time is certainly logical. Providing for educational needs of community members, other than the typical school-age child, finds a great deal of support from other members of the community. Co-ordinating the activities of the many social and governmental resources within the community is a task which many of us feel is long overdue.¹

In the United States, community use of schools in many areas has taken the form of the community school. In other words, "the school is

¹ Jack Minzey, "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54, No. 3 (November, 1972), pp. 150-151.

2

the agent by which the philosophy of community education is implemented.² While the concept has not received as much attention in Canada, most provinces have initiated studies of it and taken preliminary steps to develop community schools. Leading the way are: British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. Information regarding developments in these provinces will be considered in a later chapter.

In the early days in Newfoundland the school was usually the center of the community. It was the only place outside of the home where people could gather and discuss their common problems and hold meetings to raise money for church and/or school activities. With the coming of the centralized high school and the consolidation of school boards, however, citizen contact with their schools often decreased. Besides this, other community facilities were constructed in some communities and these were used to help meet community needs.

Some schools in Newfoundland are still used for certain non-school purposes. They are used for fund raising events, special meetings, Sunday School, and various youth activities. Within the past few years, schools have been increasingly used for recreation and government-sponsored adult-education classes. Nolan supported these views in his 1971 survey.³

²Larry E. Decker, Foundations of Community Education (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972), p. 22.

³Brian F. Nolan, "Community Use of School Facilities in a Selection of Newfoundland and Labrador Schools" (unpublished Master's thesis, Memorial University, St. John's, 1973).

II. THE PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

General Purposes

The present study had three major purposes. First, it provided a general overview of the community use of those schools in the Province that were judged by principals to be used extensively. This resulted in an updating of a portion of Nolan's findings. Second, it provided a detailed analysis of the nature of the programs offered, clientele served, and the individuals and groups promoting or opposing community use in a sample of eight schools in The Avalon North Integrated School District. This aspect of the study was of central concern. The third purpose was to examine the views of a sample of residents in a selected community concerning present and future use of their school to serve community needs.

Questions to be Answered

More specifically these purposes may be stated in the form of questions as follows:

1. What policies have boards formulated concerning the community use of their educational facilities after the regular school program is completed?
2. What community education programs or activities were offered in the one-hundred thirty-four (134) schools judged by principals to be used to a great extent?
3. What were the views of the principals of these schools regarding community use?
4. What specific community programs and activities were available in the eight (8) schools chosen for detailed analysis?

4

5. What individuals and groups have promoted or opposed community use in the eight (8) communities studied?

6. What problems were being encountered in these eight (8) schools as a result of community use?

7. Who were the clientele making use of these schools and what were their views of the programs and activities offered in these schools over the past year?

8. What were the views of a sample of the public in a selected community concerning present and future use of schools for educational, cultural, and recreational purposes?

III. IMPORTANCE OF AND NEED FOR THE STUDY

General Considerations

Writers commenting on the use of school facilities by the community lament the isolation which seems to exist between the school and the people it is supposed to serve. This isolation is seen to be very illogical when large modern facilities are constructed and left idle for long periods of time throughout the year. In an age of escalating costs, people are attempting to find solutions to this type of situation. The literature in the past few years points to the new and developing concept of total community education and its many benefits to any community which attempts to implement it.

A parent writing in The Educational Courier points out the potential use to which schools could be put today. He states that:

The school today could become the focal point of the community as was the church in the past. With this possibility in mind, thought should be given to using the building as a meeting place after school hours for interest groups, choir, senior citizens, scouts, guides and so on. In a community

composed of large numbers of non-English speaking immigrants, evening classes in language could be useful and could be carried on through the school. Parents and neighbours should have use of the school facilities for school gatherings, fund raising activities and the like.⁴

Harry Paikin, a school trustee with the Hamilton Board and an ex-chairman of the Ontario Urban and Rural School Trustees Association, points out the inconsistency in building huge expensive school buildings and only using them for short periods of the year. He feels that with the high inflationary rate and the overbuilding of school facilities, people are not receiving the full benefit for their tax dollar. He suggests that:

In a society struggling with inflation and faced with a declining school population, it is a crime to keep school classrooms, gymnasiums and auditoriums idle and empty. We undoubtedly have overbuilt and we undoubtedly under utilize. Schools should serve as meeting halls for all types of organizations both youth and adult. Classrooms should not remain idle in the evenings but should serve the working population in adult education programs. Schools with empty classrooms should not be closed off but should invite senior citizens to participate in adult day school classes. Available school auditoriums and gymnasiums should also be used for senior citizens recreational and physical culture programs as well as for youth programs.⁵

The isolation of the school and the community from each other and the importance of the schools' opening their doors and turning on their lights is also emphasized by another writer. Russell W. Ramsey, Principal of The Lincoln Vocational Center in The Alachua County (Florida), makes the following statement about schools and the communi-

⁴ E. M. Heasell, "Not So Great Expectations," The Educational Courier, Vol. 45, No. 3 (January, 1975), p. 10.

⁵ Harry Paikin, "School is Everybody's Business," The Educational Courier, Vol. 45, No. 3 (January, 1975), p. 13.

ties they serve:

Several years of social turmoil during the 1960's have caused educators to look at a hard fact of life about the public schools. Community ties between neighbourhood and classroom, between family and school, have been broken down. An old concept has been pulled kicking and screaming into the present, the idea of using the school as a social, recreational and educational center for all the people who live near it.⁶

The concept spoken of by Ramsey is community education. This is a concept which must first begin by getting schools to open their doors and turn on their lights and permit the people of the community to use their facilities. It is a concept which can bring enormous benefits to the whole community.

As mentioned earlier, the community school is a vehicle through which community education may be implemented. Purdy expresses this view in the following statement:

Community school is the name given a new institution having ties to public primary and secondary schools. Claiming new and expanded responsibility for Community Education for residents of all ages the literature reviews the community school to be an educational, recreational and cultural neighbourhood center, where adults and young people may use its facilities or join its program. All members of the community should be involved in its decision-making process. Thus, the school buildings themselves become a community center to be used twenty-four hours a day and all year around if such need exists.⁷

Provincial Considerations

Schools in the Province of Newfoundland have traditionally been

⁶ Russell W. Ramsey, "A Community School -- Without Special Funding," Community Education Journal, Vol. 4, No. 1 (January-February, 1974), p. 30.

⁷ Leslie Purdy, "Serving the Community: Community Colleges and Community Schools -- A Literature Review," Community Education Journal, Vol. 5, No. 1 (January-February, 1975), p. 13.

used by the community. This resulted mainly from the fact that they were church schools. Usually people from a particular denomination built a school to educate their children, and because it was often the only building in their community for which they could receive a subsidy from the Government, it received a great deal of community use. However, with the coming of large centralized schools and the consolidation of school boards, people did not relate as directly to the school and community use declined. Another factor which may have contributed to this decline was the availability of money to build churches and community halls. The construction of large vocational schools in some areas has also contributed to the decline in the use of the local school by the community.

Within the past five years or so, however, people have begun to attach greater importance to having a school building to which the whole community can turn to obtain education for their children as well as other benefits for the community. The result of this attitude has been that several community schools in different parts of the Province have been planned. Such areas as Plum Point, Nain, St. Brendans, and Sunnyside have seen these schools either planned or put into full operation. The latest event to focus on this issue was a one-day seminar on "The Community Use of School Facilities," sponsored by the Government in Gander on May 15, 1974, attended by representatives of the Provincial Government, the University, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, the Denominational Education Committees, and the School Boards. One of its major recommendations was: "That comprehensive data be gathered concerning this whole question of the joint use of school and community facilities --

present practice and policies, present and future needs. . . .⁸

This study will attempt to provide some of the data requested by this recommendation. Such data should be of benefit not only to the Provincial Government and other authorities but also to specific communities wishing to make greater use of school facilities.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

After School Hours

These occur after the regular school program of K-11 is completed, that is, the hours after school is dismissed in the afternoon, weekends, and holidays during the calendar year.

Community

Any geographical area served by a school.

Community Use

Use by persons or groups in the community for outside the community for functions considered to be outside the normal school closing time and voluntary in nature.⁹

Regular School Hours

The five hours of teaching during a five-day week and a one hundred eighty-seven (187) day year as stated in the School Act of 1968.

⁸Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, One Day Seminar on the Community Use of School Facilities (Gander, 1974), p. 11.

⁹Agnes McQuarrie, "Community Use of Selected Public Elementary Schools in the State of Washington" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1972), p. 2.

School Facilities

Any building, property or equipment which is administered and maintained by the local school district.¹⁰

V. ASSUMPTIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Assumptions

1. The principals, leaders of the community, clientele and citizens responded to the questionnaire and interviews accurately, honestly and objectively.
2. The sample of principals, leaders of the communities, clientele and citizens was adequate to reflect the opinions of the respective populations.
3. The survey techniques used represented an adequate basis for achieving the purposes of the study.
4. The principals of the schools were familiar with the policy of their respective school boards as they pertained to community use of schools.
5. Differences in perception between principals and what they considered to be extensive use occurred because of factors such as size of school and size of community served.
6. Perceptual differences occurred between people when asked their views on events or situations.

Delimitations

This study was delimited in the following ways:

¹⁰ Nolan, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

1. It was devoted to an analysis of the programs and activities that were outside of the regular school hours. This resulted in the elimination of extra-curricular activities conducted by the regular school teachers.

2. The first phase of the study was concerned with schools judged to be used extensively at the present time.

3. In depth study of the programs, problems, and clientele was conducted in eight (8) schools in one district only. These schools were also schools judged to be used extensively by the community.

4. A study of community needs was conducted in one community only.

VI. LIMITATIONS

Problems of Perception

It would be naive indeed on the part of the researcher to believe that the information received from the people questioned was totally objective. Many of the answers received depended on the interpretation which people put on the questions asked, as well as what they perceived the situation to be at that time. This really means that the problems of perception must be recognized. Zalkind and Costello reviewed the literature on perception and cited some of the variables of the perceptual process:

(1) The perceiver may be influenced by considerations that he may not be able to identify; he responds to cues which are below the threshold, as it is called, of his awareness.

(2) When required to form difficult perceptual judgments, he may respond to irrelevant cues to arrive at a judgment.

(3) In making abstract or intelligent judgments he may be influenced by emotional factors.

(4) He will weigh perceptual evidence coming from respected (or favored sources) more heavily than that coming from other sources.

(5) A perceiver may not be able to identify all the factors on which his judgments are based. Even if he is aware of these factors he is unlikely to realize how much weight he gives to them.¹¹

After conducting a review similar to Zalkind and Costello on the perceptual process, Enns stated that: "The difficulty of avoiding distortion in perception has been stressed . . . and the probability of different members of an organization perceiving the same event or behavior differently has been implied."¹²

Although these studies pointed out the limitations of the perceptual process, this study has assumed that the respondents answered all questions accurately, honestly and objectively. Keeping these things in mind the study attempted to identify the programs and policies which the respondents knew to be offered, and their opinions or views on these, as well as the problems which they felt arose from the use of the school by the community.

Besides the problems of perception, this study recognized the limitations inherent in the instruments used (i.e. the questionnaires and the structured interviews).

¹¹Sheldon S. Zalkind and Timothy W. Costello, "Perception: Some Recent Research and Implications for Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 7 (September, 1963), pp. 218-235.

¹²F. Enns, "Perception in the Study of Administration," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 5 (March, 1966), p. 25.

VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study of Community Utilization of School Facilities in Newfoundland was divided into six chapters. A brief summary of the contents of each chapter follows.

Chapter One provided the background to the study and a statement of the purpose of the study and the questions to be answered. A list of terms and their definitions was presented to help avoid any misunderstandings that might otherwise occur. The assumptions on which the study was based as well as the delimitations and the limitations of the study were also outlined in this chapter.

Chapter Two presents a review of selected and related literature. This also helps to provide a background for the study.

The design and the methodology of the study is included in Chapter Three. Here, an explanation of methods used in the selection of the samples, the instruments used, and the methods used in collecting and classifying the data is presented.

Chapter Four is concerned with the presentation and analysis of responses received from the one hundred thirty-four (134) principals who identified their schools as being used to a great extent. Besides this, a review of school board policies throughout the Province as they pertain to community use of the school facilities are presented.

In Chapter Five the responses to the structured interview, the clientele questionnaire, and the questionnaire to the citizens of one selected community are presented and analyzed.

A summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations are presented in the final chapter, Chapter Six.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present chapter is to provide a brief overview of some of the literature related to community utilization of school facilities. More specifically, the section will review recent developments in community use of school facilities in the United States and Canada and the problems which have been encountered as a result of such use.

II. COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

Speaking of the relationship between the school and the community, James B. Conant remarked that:

The nature of the community largely determines what goes on in the school. Therefore to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking, which might lead to policies that could wreak havoc with the school and the lives of the children. The community and the school are inseparable.¹

Attitudes like this over the past several decades have led, in many parts of North America, to a desire to see schools used to a greater extent, not only by every-day occupants, but also by community or non-school groups.

¹Merle R. Sumption and Yvonne Engstrom, School-Community Relations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. iii.

In the early days of America's development, the school was usually among the first buildings to be erected. It served in more than one area as the center of the community. Whitt supports this position in the following statement:

In early America the people moved into a community, built a church, a school, and a saloon. The school became a symbol of the progress of civilization and the ability of the people to plan their own life style. The school became the town meeting house. It served to draw the people together in good times and in times of travail. The "little red school house" is more than just a quaint way of expressing a concept, it is a concept in and of itself.²

However, with the increased affluence which has hit North America in the last two centuries, and with the great advancements in the field of industry and technology, there seems to have developed a loss of the idea of community. This could possibly be attributed to the fact that people have horded to the city and have little if any time to spend with their neighbours. As a result of this, the huge schools which have developed have lost their identity with the community. With the increase in the establishment of other types of buildings, the schools have adopted the position of educator of the youth.

This generally has been the case in most of the larger centers of North America. However, farsighted and concerned educators have seen more to education and schools than use for five hours a day for a specified period of time during the year. They also saw that if schools were used properly, they could help to heal the many social wounds which have developed as a result of the increased affluence (e.g. lack of identity,

²Robert L. Whitt, The Community School Director (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1971), p. 46.

loss of feeling of community, development of ghettos, etc.).

Educators who have been advocating greater use of schools in the past are now being joined by cries from the general public. People see that their governments are placing huge sums of money into the area of education. Fancy and well-equipped buildings are erected but in many cases they are never used after the regular school children have gone home. Many educators have developed the attitude that their school is exactly that -- "their's." However, when people, especially the more educated, see that their taxes are being increased to help build these huge structures and that these buildings are closed about 80 to 85 percent of the time, they begin to question whether they are receiving full value for their investment. In her study McQuarrie came to the following conclusion with regard to the use of the schools:

School administrators should be made cognizant of the fact that letting their school remain unused seventy to eighty percent of the time is an incomplete utilization of tax funds and that only when there is maximum use of school facilities is the school achieving its function as the education-recreation center of its community.³

Besides the view that non-use of schools is inefficient, there is also the fact that in many communities the school is really the only building which has the equipment which can be used by the people of the community. To duplicate this building by erecting a recreation center would be an unnecessary waste of money. McQuarrie agrees with this position as follows:

³ Agnes McQuarrie, "Community Use of Selected Public Elementary Schools in the State of Washington" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1962), p. 264.

In many communities the school is the only public building that has all, or even a few of the facilities that will serve the cultural and recreational interests of its people. To duplicate the facilities of the school when they are adequate to serve these interests would be an uneconomical and unjustifiable expenditure of public money. Separate recreational buildings can be justified when adequate school facilities do not exist or when school scheduling does not allow time for the facilities to be available to the community organizations. Rather, there should be fuller and wider use made of existing school facilities.⁴

In addition to the above people generally are becoming more aware of their rights as citizens. Consequently, they are beginning to look more critically at school systems and other related institutions and are beginning to demand a more active role in the development of society in general. In a study on "School District Participation in Community Recreation Programs in California," Stichter reached the following conclusion concerning the people and their desire to be involved in the school system:

There has developed in the last two decades a recognition that the schools do belong to the people and should be used for their benefit. The development of this community-school concept is closely related to the expanded use of the school for community purposes.⁵

The use that communities make of their schools after the regular day program is completed has taken different forms. Some areas just open their schools to the public and make no effort to co-ordinate the program or the activities. Others, besides attempting to make their facilities available to the public, try to co-ordinate the program by hiring a part-

⁴ Ibid., p. 6.

⁵ C. R. Stichter, "School District Participation in Community Recreation Programs in California" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1961), p. 186.

time co-ordinator. Still others appoint a full-time co-ordinator, hire extra teachers, survey the needs of the local residents, put on courses which are requested, and make every attempt not only to involve the whole community but also to integrate the after-school program with the regular-day-school program.

An area which has made excellent strides in the community use of schools and the development of community education in the United States is Flint, Michigan. During the 1930's, a physical education director, Frank Manley, with the help of a General Motors' director, C. S. Mott, began what eventually became better known as community schools. At the time, Mott wanted more boys' clubs built to help alleviate the growing juvenile delinquency problem in the area. Manley, however, contended that there was a greater need for other facilities. He felt that there were enough boys' clubs available in the city

... if school buildings could be opened in the evenings. Manley kept beating the table until he won his point that public schools should be utilized around the clock and in every month of the year. This was the beginning of Flint's famous lighted-schoolhouse activities.⁶

From this idea, community education has grown and spread in the United States. Many other areas are beginning to see the relevance and the importance of opening their schools to the public. They are also realizing that it is not enough to just open the school; there must also be a plan. It may begin with a program which is geared to get people interested but once they are interested and making use of the facilities,

⁶Clyde C. Campbell, "Contributions of the Mott Foundation to the Community Education Movement," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54, No. 3 (November, 1972), p. 195.

there must be a further effort to get the whole community involved. From this, people develop a feeling for their community and begin to realize their responsibility for others. The concept has now caught on to the extent, in the United States at least, that: "in 1971 there were 1920 community schools. These schools involved 1,733,972 people in programs yearly (a weekly average of 645,462 persons). They spent \$32,189,473 on community education."⁷

A mistake often made by people when speaking of community education is to confuse it with the idea of the community schools. Larry E. Decker makes the distinction quite clear in his book, Foundations of Community Education, when he writes that: "the term community education will be used to mean the philosophy and the term community school to mean the agent by which the philosophy is implemented."⁸

The concept of community education is said to have two basic elements, process and program. Most areas that make use of their schools after regular school hours offer a program but know very little about the ~~process~~ aspect of the philosophy. In Michigan and other areas where the concept is well advanced both of these elements are said to exist, at least to a fair degree. Minzey and LeTarte define the two elements in the following manner: "the term program will be used to describe specific activities. The term process will be used to deal with extensive

⁷ Jack Minzey, "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54, No. 3 (November, 1972), pp. 150-151.

⁸ Larry E. Decker, Foundation of Community Education (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972), p. 22.

community involvement and action."⁹

In the specific areas of the United States where community education has been implemented, the process aspect takes the form of community involvement in determining the needs and the resources of the area. Also the community is involved later on in the administration and teaching of classes and, of course, in participating in classes as students. In the more advanced areas of community education parents may participate in the regular program as teacher-aides. If a welfare office, an unemployment office, and a health care office exist, parents may also volunteer their services here. The whole point behind the concept is to make people more aware of their potential as individuals and citizens in a community. This type of involvement on the part of the community is considered by community educators to be an important part of the process aspect of community education. According to Minzey and LeTarte there are four basic processes:

1. Adequate communication between citizens and community institutions.
2. A problem-solving process that assures a relationship between program planning and existing community problems.
3. A co-ordinated and comprehensive planning effort that assures recognition of the needs and concerns of all segments of the community.
4. A means of evaluating the effectiveness of programs designed to assist a community.¹⁰

This type of process and involvement in community education has

⁹ Clyde E. LeTarte and Jack Minzey, Community Education: From Program to Process (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973), p. 32.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 64.

led some areas of the United States to the building of multi-purpose schools. Those schools have been built in areas where most of the resources of the community are available to the school and most of the resources of the school are available to the community. These schools are considered to be an off-shoot of the community education movement. As a result of a grant from the Mott Foundation, the Whitmer Human Resources Center was opened in Pontiac, Michigan in 1966. In 1971, in Nash, Washington, The John F. Kennedy School and Community Center was opened. Then in 1972, in Arlington, Virginia, the Thomas Jefferson Junior High School and Community Center was opened.¹¹

Community schools in the United States, besides attempting to get people involved, have offered a wide variety of programs. These have not always been credit courses to help a person further his academic education qualifications. As a general categorization, Minzey and LeTarte list the following seven areas into which courses could be broken down:

1. Programs for the aging.
2. Programs in economics and money management.
3. Programs providing recreational activities and learning opportunities.
4. Programs in public affairs and community development.
5. Programs to support and improve the home and family.
6. Programs in the arts.
7. Programs for providing and expanding vocational competency.¹²

¹¹ Larry Molloy, "Community Schools: Share the Space and the Action," Nations Schools, Vol. 93, No. 3 (March, 1974), p. 29.

¹² LeTarte and Minzey, op. cit., p. 109.

Most, if not all, of these programs would really lend themselves to the special interest and avocational types of courses. This, in the opinion of Robert Berridge, is not only a good thing but could very easily lead to more important things. This, he feels, is what community education is all about. He states that:

The switch from avocational, recreational or hobby courses (which often are the magnet courses) to self-improvement courses is the spin-off effect. The magnet gets people in initially as participants and then they spin-off. The opportunity for the spin-off effect usually does not occur in traditional programs which are designed only to meet the (academic) needs of the people.¹³

III. COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS IN CANADA

The concept of community education as it has been defined above and developed in the United States is the means by which several areas are beginning to make greater use of their schools and so help the people and the community grow and develop. This idea, however, is not restricted to the United States. There have been many Canadian educators, who, after studying the concept in that country, have attempted to make the idea operate in their particular area or province. For example, the community schools which were begun in the province of British Columbia were initiated by two graduates of the Flint project, Jack Stevens and David Allen. On his return from Flint in 1971, Stevens was appointed Community School Co-ordinator and began a community school in North Vancouver at Queen Mary Elementary School. Allen, in 1973, headed up

¹³ R. I. Berridge, The Community Education Handbook (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973), p. 9.

the James Bay Community School Project in Victoria.¹⁴

Besides British Columbia, other provinces of Canada are also advocating greater use of their school facilities. Some, like British Columbia and Ontario, are experimenting with the idea of the community school as developed in Flint, while others are content to just let their schools be used for adult education, physical fitness, or whatever is requested. Alberta, in particular, has been advocating joint use of community facilities. Here the government is encouraging municipalities and local school board authorities to get together and make greater use of each other's facilities. The attitude of the Alberta Government toward greater use of school and community facilities is best summarized in their Policy Statement.

Re: Joint Use of Community Facilities.

The high cost of providing adequate educational and recreational facilities in each community and the mounting tax burden associated with these facilities, is a matter of concern to all.

One of the ways of minimizing these costs is for education and recreation to share facilities. Existing educational and recreational facilities can be jointly planned in ways which will benefit the community at large.

We commend those local authorities who have successfully completed agreements which implement the joint use of such facilities; we encourage those municipal and educational authorities who have not, to consider carefully the benefits to be gained through the principle of sharing.

We stand ready to assist in every way possible local authorities and agencies wishing to plan and develop school/community facilities and programs.¹⁵

¹⁴ Jack Stevens, Introducing the Community School Concept; Provincial Community School Team Working Paper Number 1 (Vancouver, British Columbia: British Columbia Trustee Association, October, 1973), pp. 1-2.

¹⁵ Alberta Government, Share it! Share it! Share it! Some Approaches to the Joint Use of Community Facilities (Calgary, Alberta: Department of Education and Culture, Youth and Recreation, 1972), p. 3.

In the province of Ontario, the Government is also concerned about the school facilities which are presently built and those which will be built. This province, like others in Canada, is looking at the possibility of greater use of these buildings not only because of the cost of duplication but also from the point of view of their use to the immediate community. In 1971, the Government established a commission to do an in depth study into the utilization of their educational facilities. In the commission's first interim report, the following important recommendation was included:

Recommendation 5

The province of Ontario through the Provincial Secretary of Social Development should adopt a system of community education which will integrate school and community resources including facilities to meet a wider range of community needs than just formal education.¹⁶

In the final report submitted by the commission, recommendations concerning many aspects of community utilization of schools in the province of Ontario were made. Such important aspects as: who pays; planning and design of buildings; accessibility for physically handicapped; falling enrollment/surplus space; municipal recreation; child care and development; community learning resources; were dealt with. One important recommendation concerned itself with the idea that the use of the school should be a right, not a privilege. Recommendation 19 stated that: "The Minister of Education should incorporate into The Education Act the principle that access to and use of schools as community facilities is a right for every person in the community and not just a privi-

¹⁶ Government of Ontario, The Select Committee on the Utilization of Educational Facilities: Interim Report Number 1 (Toronto, Ontario: Department of Education, July, 1974), p. 5.

lege.¹⁷

Another aspect of community use of schools dealt with in the final report was the involvement of the community in the decision-making process. This was stated in Recommendation 20 as follows:

The Minister of Education should recognize, allow, encourage and support the development of alternative frameworks for decision-making that provide for local community participation and involvement in:

- a. the planning and development of school facilities and resources.
- b. the development and implementation of community school programs.
- c. the allocation and utilization of school facilities and resources.
- d. the design, organization and implementation of the school curriculum.¹⁸

The Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education is one of the boards in Ontario which has initiated what it considers to be a community education program. From the internship report of Beaton Tulk conducted in this area, the program seems to be working out very well. The philosophy of the board is expressed in the following statement from a special report prepared in 1972:

That part-time continuing education should not be developed as a small brother to institutionalized formal education, but rather as a full partner in the satisfaction of the educational needs of the citizens of Leeds and Grenville.¹⁹

¹⁷ Government of Ontario, The Select Committee on the Utilization of Educational Facilities: Final Report (Toronto, Ontario: Department of Education, February, 1975), p. 5.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁹ Ray Smith, Continuing Education Council Survey '72 (Brockville, Ontario: Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education, 1972), p. 118.

Besides Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario, which are usually considered to be the 'have' provinces, the small province of New Brunswick, one of the 'have not' provinces, is also advocating greater use of its school facilities. In a report on the use of school facilities submitted to the Minister of Education in June, 1973, it was recommended, "that all schools (public and trade) be made available for use by groups other than regularly scheduled classes."²⁰

A province in which the community has taken a slightly different approach is Prince Edward Island. Evidently, after the fishing and farming season is over, the people have been using their schools to a fair extent. This is also greatly encouraged by local religious denominations, as well as Rural Development Councils. Initially the Councils visited the different communities and promoted the idea of setting up community schools as a place for the citizens either to get together for a social evening or to benefit from each other's skills. This met with the approval of the people and even led to the point where citizens were asked to contribute their knowledge on special occasions and special topics. As the people gained confidence, Development Councils gradually withdrew until now the people are organizing and operating the schools on their own with the help of some paid clerical staff.

To determine what the citizens need in the form of a program, a questionnaire is circulated and collected. From this, the program for the following semester is determined. In each group one member is desig-

²⁰ Government of New Brunswick, Report of the Committee on the Community Use of School Facilities (Fredericton, New Brunswick: Department of Education, June, 1973), p. 29.

nated as the liaison between the group and the organizers. This individual is responsible for collecting any fees and passing information on to the organizers or the class. This program, evidently, is still operating and has experienced what Berridge considers to be "spin-off." Some of the participants have gone on from the community school and their positive experience to continue with upgrading their education. Evidence of the growing popularity of these schools on Prince Edward Island is the fact that in the first year of operation there were only three (3) schools in operation. In the second year the number had increased to seven (7) schools and in the third year there were thirteen (13) schools operating. By 1969 there were twenty-seven (27) schools opened as community schools, serving 2,954 students. All of this was done at a very minimum cost. There was a lot of voluntary help and the schools were offered free of charge. This is an excellent example of community co-operation.²¹

These examples indicate that the concept of community use of schools is receiving increasing attention in Canada. Projects have been initiated in other provinces as well as British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. There is widespread agreement across the nation that this is an idea "whose time has come."

IV. PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION

From the review of the material presented above, it should now

²¹ George Billard and Martin Lowe, Study into the Community School at Prince Edward Island (St. John's, Newfoundland: The Extension Service of Memorial University, July, 1969), pp. 2-12.

be obvious that the degree of community use of schools in both the United States and Canada is more easily understood when seen as existing on a continuum. None of the areas referred to above would be at either end. However, the Flint area would be further along the continuum than most if not all of the others, including those in Canada.

It must be realized that even though community education does exist in varying degrees in both the United States and Canada, it is not without its problems. Whenever a new concept is implemented, problems are sure to emerge.

Lack of Co-operation and Co-ordination

As stated earlier, one of the important purposes of the greater use of schools is to cut back on duplication of services and foster greater co-operation between the groups in the community and the school. This, however, is not easily achieved. Hancock, who did an internship report on his experiences in the Flint area in 1973, made the following statement about the process: "It is apparent from the meeting attended in Flint that co-operation and communication between agencies was inadequate. Rather, most agencies tended to be totally concerned with their own aims and objectives."²² Another criticism which Hancock made was that "most of the directors in Flint are over concerned with providing programs to the community."²³ From the material already presented, this should not be the main aim of community education, at least not when it

²² Russel B. Hancock, "An Investigation into the Community Schools Affiliated with the National Center for Community Education, Flint, Michigan, U. S. A." (unpublished Master's internship report, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1974), p. 15.

²³ Ibid., p. 21.

has reached the stage of development that Flint has. If these directors first attempted to get the people involved and help initiate the "process" aspect of the concept, the "program" aspect could easily follow. Hancock and most of the experts on the concept seem to be saying this.

In the report of his internship with the Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education, Tulk pointed out some of the problems being encountered. He felt that the main problem was the lack of "co-ordination and co-operation in the use of resources and the supplying of services."²⁴

In areas where community use is relatively new and probably only now being considered, there are more basic problems. There are problems related to the cost of operation, the lack of proper supervision and the fear of vandalism, and the lack of proper plant planning. Each of these will now be dealt with individually.

Cost

To open schools to the public after the regular hours must cost extra money. If a school board wishes to provide its citizens with a program in the school, it obviously must make some attempt to obtain financial help. If the Mott Foundation had not contributed the huge sums of money that it did to the Flint Board of Education, it would not have been able to do what it did. However, what must be realized by educators and communities that wish to use the schools after regular hours is that they must not give up just because money is lacking. The benefits that accrue from the greater use of the school facilities will probably far

²⁴ Reginald Beaton Tulk, "Report of an Internship in the Community School Program of the Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education" (unpublished Master's Internship report, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1974), p. 85.

outweigh any monetary loss. According to Minzey and LeTarte, the lack of funds or the thought that more money will be needed to make greater use of the schools has caused too many schools to remain closed. They say that:

Probably the most frequent excuse for failure of communities to begin Community Education relates to financing. School districts hard pressed for operating and building funds, are reluctant to take on additional financial obligations when their source of funds for traditional programs are already diminished.²⁵

This is definitely a fear felt by people who not only want to begin a community education program but also by those responsible for education in the less affluent parts of the United States and Canada. From studies conducted in Washington, California, Ontario, and Montreal, it is clear that the cost of the greater use of schools for any in depth program is a problem. Each of the studies by McQuarrie, Stichter, Benson, the Ontario Government, and the New Brunswick Government recommends that the government get involved in supporting financially the greater use of schools by the public.

Besides the government, Minzey and LeTarte recommend a wide variety of sources from which revenue for community education may be forthcoming. These include:

- 1) Federal Government, 2) Provincial Government, 3) Business and Industry, 4) Philanthropy, 5) Local Service Clubs, 6) Other Government Agencies, 7) Social Agencies, 8) Fund Raising, 9) Class Fees, 10) In-Kind Service, 11) Local Taxes, 12) Free or Inexpensive Programs, 13) Voluntary Help, 14) Donated Items, 15) Paraprofessional Employment Opportunities, 16) Reassignment of Personnel.²⁶

²⁵ LeTarte and Minzey, op. cit., p. 203.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 205-206.

Some places have been helped a great deal by different service clubs and organizations in the community. These service clubs have asked to go into the schools and sponsor a particular club. Such an example occurred in a school in California where the students decided that they would like to see their school grounds cleaned up. A local club, the Kiwanis Club, recognized this and through the school sponsored a city-wide "Clean Campus Campaign."

The interesting thing to note here was that this was a group of men, some without a formal education, interested in doing something for Community Education. They were encouraged by the school and allowed to move in any direction that they felt necessary. The only thing that the school provided was leadership and the opportunity to serve. This is Community Education at its best.²⁷

If the communities are able to encourage their service organizations to respond not only in this manner but also by financially sponsoring courses the problems of money should very easily be eliminated.

Lack of Supervision and the Fear of Vandalism

Lack of supervision of the school after the regular school hours is also a common problem. In Nolan's study of "Community Use of School Facilities in a Selection of Newfoundland and Labrador Schools," it was found that the lack of adequate supervision was the greatest problem identified by the principals whose schools were used in the evening.²⁸ Also S. L. G. Chapman, Director of Education for North York County,

²⁷ Whitt, op. cit., p. 36.

²⁸ Brian F. Nolan, "Community Use of School Facilities in a Selection of Newfoundland and Labrador Schools" (unpublished Master's thesis, Memorial University, 1973), p. 73.

Ontario, felt that lack of proper supervision was a serious problem. In an article in Ontario Education (1972), he points to the fact that teachers run into the problem of untidy rooms resulting from the use of the school the night before. He points also to the fact that: "Gymnastics have a large amount of equipment which is used and abused by the people who come into them in the evenings, if access is given to them."²⁹

In his study, "Community Utilization of Protestant Public School Facilities for Recreational Purposes in Metropolitan Montreal," Benson made the following observation related to supervision as he perceived it in the use of the schools in this specific area:

Another point to be mentioned is that most school boards have experienced undesirable incidents such as damage and misuses of facilities. However, these incidents have been kept to a minimum due to the tenant-landlord relationship that has existed between the school boards and the groups utilizing these facilities and also due to the fact that the school boards have insisted that a caretaker had to be on duty, and have required the groups utilizing the facilities to maintain proper supervision.³⁰

Although problems do exist in some areas as a result of poor supervision, these, like the cost problems, are not impossible to overcome. Further evidence to prove this is given by Mitchell in his study of "Administration and Utilization of School Facilities by School and Non-School Groups in Iowa" (1968). He observed the following procedure with regard to building security and supervision:

²⁹ S. L. G. Chapman, "Community Use of Schools," Ontario Education, Vol. 4, No. 3 (May/June, 1972).

³⁰ Ralph Benson, "Community Utilization of Protestant Public School Facilities for Recreational Purposes in Metropolitan Montreal" (unpublished Master's thesis, McGill University, 1968), p. 34.

When buildings were used by non-school groups the building custodian was responsible for opening, closing and locking the buildings. The non-school organization must designate a person who was responsible for supervising the activities of the groups and a professional employee of the district (principal or teacher) had to be on duty. If school equipment was used that required a competent operator, a school employee had to be hired for this purpose.³¹

Lack of Planning

Another important problem which many boards have experienced revolves around the fact that schools are not adequately equipped in some instances to provide for extensive usage. In his study, Nolan concluded that: "School principals ranked the lack of appropriate equipment as being the next (second) most important problem in order of importance."³²

There is no doubt that many schools are not planned with community use in mind. In her study of the elementary schools in Washington, McQuarrie came to this conclusion regarding the planning of schools:

New schools should be planned and designed through co-operative community effort to serve as the education-recreation centre of the community. They should be provided with adequate facilities to meet the curricular needs of the school and the recreational needs of the community. Consideration should be given to the inclusion and location of sufficient sanitary, storage, locker, shower, and other service facilities so that they can be utilized for community recreation programs.³³

Boerrigter, in his research entitled "Techniques and Procedures by which Community Utilization of School Buildings Can be Achieved.

³¹ James E. Mitchell, "Administration and Utilization of School Facilities by School and Non-School Groups in Iowa" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 1968), p. 48.

³² Nolan, op. cit., p. 26.

³³ McQuarrie, op. cit., p. 26.

Without Interference With Kindergarten to Grade Twelve" (1960), made a similar recommendation. He suggested that:

It is desirable when any building program is planned that consideration be given to the possible use by the adult groups. Designers should take this into account and it should be remembered that school facilities and community facilities should complement not duplicate each other.³⁴

Benson goes a little further than the others in his conclusions and recommendations. He believes that "school facilities should be planned with consideration given to their being utilized by non-school groups."³⁵ However, he does not finish there; he goes on and suggests practices to be followed in planning a school for community use.

Lack of Information Re: Use of Schools

A problem encountered by many people who wish to use schools is the lack of available information pertaining to such use. Boards are very guilty of not advertising the availability of their schools and the evidence points to a great dearth of information in this area. Benson concluded that: "The school boards did very little to make their policies regarding community utilization of school facilities for recreational purposes known to the general public."³⁶ He feels that the boards would have performed their educational duty much better and would have received a better response if they had followed this recommendation. He argues

³⁴ G. C. Boerrichter, "Techniques and Procedures by which Community Utilization of School Buildings Can be Achieved Without Interference with Kindergarten to Grade Twelve" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Teachers College, 1960), p. 153.

³⁵ Benson, op. cit., p. 40.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

that: "To further the concept that the school should serve as an integral part of its community encouragement of and opportunity for greater utilization of school facilities by the community organizations should be promoted."³⁷

Nolan found a similar situation existing in the Province of Newfoundland. His recommendation was that: "The school boards concerned make public the fact that their school facilities are available after normal hours, on weekends, during holiday periods and throughout summer vacation."³⁸

Apathy on the Part of the Community

Robert Berridge stresses the importance of actively promoting community education. He feels that:

The involvement of people is the goal of Community Education (and the greater use of schools by the community) but this just doesn't happen by opening the school-house doors. It also doesn't happen by starting some programs and hoping that people will become involved.³⁹

The point being made is that many people, including some who probably need to become involved, do not have the courage, the drive or whatever it takes to do so. They find it easier to stay at home and watch television. Maybe these people lack the motivation or the confidence because they are the lower income earners, or are on welfare, or are unemployed. Minzey and LeTarte feel that this is definitely true and that before the greater use of the schools can truly serve a worthwhile purpose in the

³⁷ Ibid., p. 34.

³⁸ Nolan, op. cit., p. 9.

³⁹ Berridge, op. cit., p. 109.

community a recognition of these facts is necessary. In their book,

Community Education: From Program to Process, they state that:

First of all people are not equally motivated to attend programs. Through timidity, suspicion, antagonism, unawareness, lethargy or for other reasons, all community members will not attend programs which they may want or need. In fact, many times community members are not aware of these things which may be of most benefit to them and often those most in need of services are least willing to avail themselves of existing opportunities.⁴⁰

A Full-Time Co-ordinator

Most of the research which has been conducted on the idea of greater utilization of school facilities ends up recommending that boards of education or the Provincial Government appoint a full-time co-ordinator to organize and implement the after-hours program. In areas where the use of schools is not extensive, many research reports recommend that the government set up a few pilot projects making use of this idea. Nolan recommended that: "Government establish the position of co-ordinator of school utilization on a regional basis to facilitate community use of schools."⁴¹

In the study conducted by Mitchell in Iowa, a similar recommendation was also made. He suggested that:

A school official should be designated to administer the use of school facilities. This official should direct and co-ordinate the after-school scheduling of facilities by developing a system that is efficient and encourages widespread use.⁴²

⁴⁰ LeTarte and Minzey, op. cit., p. 32.

⁴¹ Nolan, op. cit., p. 93.

⁴² Mitchell, op. cit., p. 148.

These researchers seem to feel that the appointment of this person would facilitate the operation of such a program. Some areas, however, appoint one of the teachers already on the regular staff of a school as the co-ordinator. His duties then are split. Experts in the area feel that this is a mistake because if the idea is to be implemented fully, a person appointed half-time will be really overworked. Berridge, in fact, feels that: "The lack of a full-time person results in a disjointed program. To implement the community education concept, then, a professional person, a full fledged and adequately recognized encourager must be employed."⁴³

From what has been said and from the materials studied it seems that the appointment of the full-time co-ordinator will help the program develop. From a study of the areas where this practice exists, it seems that the problems discussed earlier are better handled and more easily and quickly solved if a co-ordinator has been appointed.

V. SUMMARY

This chapter has concentrated on a review of the literature related to the use of schools in the United States and Canada. The use seems to be growing rapidly in the United States, especially with the initiative shown by philanthropic organizations such as the Mott Foundation. In Canada, through the energy and enthusiasm of particular educators and more forward-thinking boards of education and Departments of Education, the schools are being used more extensively for and by the community. Besides this, there seems to be a growing awareness on the

⁴³ Berridge, op. cit., p. 65.

part of the ordinary citizens that the schools are there for the benefit of the whole community and not only for one age group.

From the use of the school facilities in the United States, a concept known as community education has developed. This concept was briefly reviewed in this chapter. Its two most important elements, "program" and "process," were explained. From this section a fair understanding of what is involved in this concept can be obtained. Attempts to implement the concept in specific areas of the United States and Canada were also examined.

Included in the chapter was a very brief review of the major problems identified by people who have attempted to use school facilities. The problems identified were seen to exist in most, if not all, of the areas studied and were also being solved with varying degrees of success in the different areas.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

I. INTRODUCTION

Chapter Three will describe the locale and population for the study, the samples selected, the method of data collection, the construction and nature of the instruments used, and finally the treatment of the data to answer the questions developed in accordance with the purposes of the study.

II. THE LOCALE AND POPULATION FOR THE STUDY

This study dealt with the use of schools by the community after regular school hours. More specifically, it attempted to determine the policies governing community use, the programs that have been developed, the nature of the personnel who used the school after regular school hours, the problems experienced as a result of community use, and prospects for future use of schools by the community.

The study was divided into three phases. The first examined community use in a selection of schools in the Province of Newfoundland as a whole. The second concentrated on the use of schools in one particular school district, while the third studied the attitudes and views of a sample of citizens in one community within that district.

The population base for phase one was all the schools judged by principals to be used to a great extent by the community. From the

questionnaires sent to the principals of all schools in the Province (Table 3-1), five hundred eighty-one (581) were returned, and from that number one hundred thirty-four (134) were judged to be used to a great extent. The population base was, therefore, these one hundred thirty-four (134) schools. Examination of Table 3-2 indicates that the population was representative of the whole province by district and type of school. Besides this, a review of the one hundred thirty-four (134) schools in the population pointed out that of the twenty-one (21) Integrated school districts, only two (2) were not represented. Of the twelve (12) Roman Catholic districts, only one (1) was not represented in the population.

Phase two of the study had as its population base all of the schools in The Avalon North Integrated School District which were identified by their principals as being used to a great extent by the community. From the questionnaire (Appendix A) sent to all principals in the Province, sixteen (16) of the fifty (50) schools in this district were so designated. During this phase of the study contact was made with as many leaders in the area of community education as possible. Besides this many of the clientele using the selected schools were also contacted.

Phase three of the study used as its population base all the householders in one specific community encompassed by the school district. From a review of the voters list compiled in November, 1974, three hundred ninety-seven (397) householders were identified as residents in the community.

III. THE SAMPLES SELECTED

As was mentioned earlier, questionnaires from all one hundred thirty-four (134) schools judged to be used extensively were used for

TABLE 3-1
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY TYPE AND
RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION

Religious Denomination	All Grade	Primary	Elementary	Junior High	Central High	Senior High	Total
Integrated	35	22	298	21	62	27	465
Roman Catholic	8	16	138	11	40	14	227
Pentecostal	4	1	39	0	8	0	52
Private	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
Total	47	39	476	32	110	43	747

TABLE 3-2
TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN POPULATION BY
DISTRICT AND TYPE

District	Elementary or Primary	All Grade	Junior High	Central High	Senior High	Total
Integrated	39	7	8	23	5	82
Roman Catholic	18	6	2	15	5	46
Pentecostal	0	0	0	1	0	1
Private	0	0	0	0	2	2
Other	1	0	0	2	0	3
Total	58	13	10	41	12	134

analysis in phase one of the study.

Phase two of the study used as its sample eight (8) of the sixteen (16) schools in The Avalon North Integrated School District judged to be used extensively. This sample was chosen randomly and stratified by type of school and geographical location. The schools chosen consisted of one (1) primary, three (3) elementary, one (1) junior high, two (2) central high schools and one (1) senior high school.

The Avalon North Integrated School District was chosen for a number of reasons. First, the district has had a long history of community use of facilities, having developed policies regarding such use several years ago. Second, the District has large and small schools in both urban and rural areas and schools in communities where other facilities that may be used for educational, social and cultural activities do and do not exist. A third reason for the selection of The Avalon North Integrated School District was its accessibility from St. John's, while a fourth reason was that administrators from this District have co-operated fully with research projects of this nature in the past.

Approval to conduct the study and visit the eight (8) schools was obtained from the District Superintendent. All principals agreed to participate. They, in turn, supplied the names of individuals in the community who had given leadership in the development of community programs. When these leaders were contacted, they were also asked to supply the names of people whom the researcher could contact to solicit further information and views on the use of the school by the community.

In all of the eight (8) communities, the people most consistently identified as leaders were contacted. The following list of people shows the different types of people with whom contact was made and from whom

information was obtained: housewives, labourers, social workers, leaders of youth clubs, local board members, teachers and principals.

Besides contacting these people directly, indirect contact was made with many individuals using the school after hours. Nearly one thousand (1,000) questionnaires attempting to obtain information about these individuals were distributed. Only 40 percent were returned. This was felt to be a good return, considering the number of people absent when questionnaires were administered. Here, also, it must be remembered that the researcher had to work through the leaders of groups and not directly with the clientele. This meant that in some cases people just did not do what they promised they would. A list of the groups from whom information about participants was sought is contained in Appendix B.

The sample for phase three of the study consisted of one hundred (100) households randomly selected from the total of three hundred ninety-seven (397) households in the selected community. The head of the household or the spouse was interviewed in each of the one hundred (100) households.

The community chosen for this aspect of the study was selected for a number of reasons. These include the following:

1. It had a history of extensive community use.
2. It was a relatively cohesive community, predominantly of one religious denomination.
3. The school was the only major facility available for community use.

IV. METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

Initial contact was made with all district superintendents in

the Province by Dr. P. J. Warren on September 16, 1974, seeking their co-operation in a study of community use of school facilities. Superintendents were asked to furnish a copy of school board policies regarding the use of schools by non-school groups. Information concerning such policies was subsequently received. From that information summaries were prepared for presentation in Chapter Four.

In his letter to superintendents, Warren asked them to encourage principals to complete a questionnaire which was to be distributed later. On November 29th, the questionnaire, along with a letter of endorsement from the Deputy Minister of Education, was mailed to each principal in the Province together with a self-addressed pre-stamped envelope to facilitate questionnaire returns (Appendix A).

On January 9, 1975, a follow-up letter to the questionnaire was mailed to the superintendents informing them of the returns received to that point and asking them to further encourage principals who had not yet completed the questionnaire to do so. This, in turn, was followed on January 13th, 1975, by a follow-up letter to the principals. This informed them that to date sixty (60) percent of the questionnaires had been returned. It also requested that questionnaires not yet completed be returned as soon as possible. By the cut-off date of January 31st, 1975, the number of returns had reached seventy-eight (78) percent.

On April 17th and 18th, an initial contact was made with the eight (8) school principals involved in the study. During the next two weeks these principals and some of the leaders of the communities in each area were interviewed. Many of these interviews involved an explanation of the questions on the structured interview form (Appendix B). These were then left with the person to be filled out after each had a period

of time to think about the questions. Besides this, the leader of the groups, who in a large number of cases were the people identified to be interviewed, were asked to have the participants of their groups complete a questionnaire so that more information about the clientele could be obtained (Appendix B). On subsequent visits to the eight (8) schools, the completed interview forms and clientele questionnaires were collected. By May 5th, thirty-three (33) of the fifty (50) structured interviews and three hundred (300) of the clientele questionnaires were collected. By May 23rd, the cut-off date, forty-two (42) structured interviews and three hundred ninety-seven (397) clientele questionnaires were returned.

On May 5th, a visit to the council office in the community selected for in depth study revealed that there were three hundred ninety-seven (397) householders. From this population one hundred (100) householders were randomly selected for the sample.¹ Two senior university students agreed to administer the questionnaire for the researcher. A meeting was held with these students on May 11th and they were briefed on the citizen questionnaire (Appendix C) and the procedure involved in conducting the survey. On May 12th another meeting was held with these students after both had completed five (5) of the questionnaires by carrying them to five of the householders of the fifty which each had to interview. At this meeting any problems that they encountered were ironed out. These questionnaires were completed and collected by May 23rd, 1975.

¹ V. G. Glass and J. C. Stanley, Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970), p. 511.

V. CONSTRUCTION AND NATURE OF THE INSTRUMENTS USED

The questionnaire for phase one of the study was developed in co-operation with Dr. P. J. Warren who was also conducting a survey of the use of schools in the Province by non-school groups. As indicated above, this study had the approval of the Department of Education. The questionnaire (Appendix A) which was eventually developed, was begun by reviewing the questionnaire used by Brian Nolan in his 1971 survey of the use of schools in selected areas of the Province. As a result of Nolan's experience, certain questions were deleted, others modified, and some new ones added. The new form of the questionnaire was further examined by certain officials of the Department of Education and a selection of school principals before it was finally approved.

Although the questionnaire was not divided into specific sections it was geared to acquire information on the principals' knowledge of and attitude toward school board policies concerning community use of schools. Besides this, principals were asked for information concerning facilities available for community use, programs offered, and the problems encountered in the use of the school by the community.

The structured interview for phase two contained specific questions pertaining to the eight schools in The Avalon North Integrated School District. When originally presented in a thesis proposal seminar, this instrument was rather lengthy. After the proposal presentation, however, it was revised and shortened. A further revision and shortening took place after consultation with the researcher's committee. At this time it was divided into two separate instruments: one for principals and community education leaders and one for clientele participating in

community programs. The former instrument contained the following four sections: programs and activities, supporting and inhibiting factors, problems encountered, and other pertinent information. The second instrument, distributed to participants in after-hour programs, gathered information concerning sex, age, employment status, occupation, level of formal education, programs involved in, reasons for participation, and general reactions to present involvement (Appendix B).

The third phase of the study involved the preparation of a questionnaire to be completed by a sample of heads of householders or spouses living in one community. While this questionnaire was designed originally so that it could be distributed through the schools, it was finally delivered to the sample of homes and either picked up immediately or after a short period of time. This questionnaire attempted to collect background information from respondents (such as sex, age, occupation, level of education, etc.), reasons for participation or non-participation, and views concerning future expansion of programs to meet community needs. All of the questionnaires delivered were completed.

VI. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

As this study is primarily of a descriptive nature, it does not involve any sophisticated statistical analysis. The questions identified in Chapter One are answered by computing percentages and rankings from the responses and placing them in tables for comparison.

The data collected for phase one of the study were coded and tabulated using the computer. Only a limited number of analyses could be included. Tabulations of the results of other questionnaires and

structured interviews were completed by hand. The researcher has included in his findings a cross-section of the views of respondents contained in open-ended questions.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA: THE PROVINCIAL STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this chapter is to analyze the policy statements of the different school districts in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador regarding community use of school facilities. It also presents information related to the programs and/or activities which are presently offered in the one hundred thirty-four (134) schools identified in the questionnaire (Appendix A) as being used extensively. And finally, the chapter presents a brief review of the views of principals in these one hundred thirty-four (134) schools toward the greater use of their schools by the community. More specifically, the views of the principals concerning the programs, policies, and problems encountered in their schools as a result of greater community use are presented. In short, answers to the first three questions identified for solution in the first chapter are presented.

1. What policies have boards formulated concerning the community use of their educational facilities after the regular school program is completed?
2. What community education programs or activities are being offered in the one hundred thirty-four (134) schools judged by principals to be used to a great extent?

3. What are the views of the principals of these schools regarding community use?

II. SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES REGARDING COMMUNITY USE

The legal right of boards to make their facilities available to the community is based on one main document, The Newfoundland and Labrador Schools Act, Number 68, 1969. Section 13(b) states that:

Every school board may:

permit any school building under its control to be used outside school hours on such terms as are deemed expedient by the school board, provided, however, that the exercise of this power causes no interference with the normal regular conduct of the school, and provided further that no responsible request by an appropriate denominational authority shall be refused.

Although this grants the right to the school boards to make facilities available, it does not require them to do so. This statement, however, has in many instances, in Newfoundland and Labrador, formed the basis of a policy developed by the boards that do have written policies concerning this matter.

There is another legal document, applying only to the Integrated Denominations, which school boards have also made use of in formulating their district's policy on the use of the school by the community. The Document of Integration, signed in 1969, between the three denominations, Anglican, United Church and Salvation Army, makes the following statement concerning this matter:

The constitution of each district board shall provide:

(a) that no board school, church, or other organization shall use school property formerly owned by an integrating denomination for any purpose that is objectionable to such denomination; and

(b) that, subject to paragraph (a), a church or other organization may use property provided such use

- (i) is adequately supervised and
- (ii) does not interfere with the normal operation of the school.

From a survey of the district superintendents with the Roman Catholic, Integrated and Pentecostal Assemblies School Boards, data pertaining to the policies of these various boards, concerning the use of their school facilities by the community, were obtained. Of the twelve (12) Roman Catholic Districts, only four (4) indicated that they had a written policy, two (2) had a written application form and two (2) had a formal permit or signed agreement between the school board and the group making use of the building (Table 4-1). In the Integrated Districts, fourteen (14) of the eighteen (18) districts had formulated a written policy, six (6) had a formal written application, and five (5) had an official permit or signed agreement. The only Pentecostal Assemblies District, which encompasses the whole Province, indicated that it had no formal written policy (Table 4-1).

Although there appears to be a lack of formalized written policies on this matter, it must not be inferred that school boards are totally lax in their approach to community use. Every district seems to have a method of dealing with the situation when it arises; however, some have a more formalized approach than others. The districts which have not yet formalized their policy rely either on the informal approach used earlier where the principal made the decision himself or with the help of the parish priest or a local board member, or the superintendent deals with each case as it arises.

It should also be pointed out that many superintendents indicated

TABLE 4-1

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY RESPONSE TO WRITTEN
POLICY, APPLICATION FORM AND SIGNED AGREEMENT RE:
USE OF SCHOOLS

School District	No. of Districts	Written Policy	Written Application	Written Permit
Roman Catholic	12	4	2	2
Integrated	18	14	6	5
Pentecostal	1	—	—	—
Total	31	18	8	7

that, because of the increased demands for the use of the schools, their boards are now in the process of preparing formal policies on this matter or are revising what policies already exist.

The school districts which indicated that they have a formal written policy concerning use by the community seem to have developed these policies under similar headings. Obviously, some districts have more detailed policies than others. However, they all seem to consider the following: procedures for requesting use, responsibilities of groups, fees charged, and use made of fees collected.

Procedures

Some of the school boards throughout the Province have local education committees. The members of these local committees may or may not be a member of the main board for the whole district. In some cases these local committees, in consultation with the principal, decide whether the facilities are to be used by specific groups. It is also to this group that one must apply to obtain permission to use the facilities. Other districts which also have local committees require that the application be first made to the principal; he will then in unusual cases consult the local committee. If, however, it is a well-organized group such as a church group, the Guides, the Scouts, and so on, he will make the decision himself.

One specific district, which is fairly large from the point of view of geography and population, has divided its district into several systems corresponding to the number of co-ordinating principals it has. There is a local education committee for each system. The board has a general policy on the use of its facilities for the whole district and

each system has prepared its own policy within the bounds of the board policy for the whole district. One of the local systems uses the following rule for application: "All requests must be made to the Coordinating Principal or to the Principal." Another local system under the same board uses this approach:

All requests for use of the school property are to be made at least two weeks in advance to the principal of the school concerned . . .

. . . When an unusual request is made the principal will normally bring such requests to the attention of the Property Committee or the Local School Committee.

Another district, which is smaller and does not lend itself to the divisions mentioned above, has a different method of application and review. The decision to grant permission is made by a committee consisting of the superintendent, the principal of the school concerned and the business manager. This was the only district which indicated that the business manager was included on the decision-making committee. The policy of this board was stated as follows:

Requests for use should be made at the School Board office as early as possible in order to enable proper scheduling.

The decision to permit use of buildings can be made by a committee consisting of the Superintendent, principal of the school involved and the business manager.

Another unique situation arose in one district. Here, the policy specifically included the parish priest in the decision-making group, along with the principal and the local committee. This was the only district that specifically included this person.

It seems from a review of district policies concerning the use of the schools by the community that a request to obtain the use of the board's facilities must be made directly to the board, the superintendent or the principal. When this is done, it must then go before a review

committee, which seems, in most cases, to include the principal concerned, and a group which could consist of one, several or all of the following people: Parish Priest, Superintendent, Co-ordinating Principal, Business Manager, and the local education committee or its representative.

Of the eighteen (18) school districts in the Province identified as having a written policy on the use of the school by the community, only twelve (12) have included information on the procedures to follow when requesting such use. These include two (2) Roman Catholic districts and ten (10) Integrated districts.

Responsibilities of Groups Using Facilities

The policies which most boards have prepared seem to be similar in their statement concerning the responsibilities to be accepted by the groups using the facility. Every board states that the groups using their facilities are responsible for any damages which occur during the period of use. However, some boards do make arrangements for grievances to be heard. One board in particular states in its policy that: "If any party is aggrieved, a meeting is arranged between the community group representative and the board committee as soon as possible thereafter to reach a settlement."

Most, if not all, of the boards which have written policies say that only "responsible groups" will be permitted to use the school facilities but fail to define clearly what is meant by "responsible groups." However, they also say that a responsible person must be present when the school is being used. They further state that this person could be the janitor, a member of the teaching staff, the principal, a member of the school board or a member of the local education committee.

Boards also place restrictions on users of their facilities in relation to what facilities are to be used. The following examples of restrictions will provide evidence of this attitude of boards to the use of specific facilities:

Equipment and furniture shall not be removed from school except for school purposes. It can be used within the school building if permission is granted by the principal.

A group should only use the part of the school that is necessary for their purposes.

The club (must) provide and be responsible for its own gymnastic equipment. The board will not be responsible for lost articles or storing equipment.

Shower rooms may not be used.

Permission to use specifically equipped rooms such as those for Art, Home Economics, etc., may only be granted after the Superintendent has approved the appointment of the instructor(s) who will be in charge of such room(s).

Besides these responsibilities placed on the users of educational facilities by different school boards, the groups must, in nearly all cases, see that proper supervision of the facility is maintained. The school boards, without exception, also require that any group using its facilities must not in any way interfere with the regular school program. If students who attend the school during the day wish to use the school in the evening, the group from outside must be willing to relinquish its use to them.

One board gives very detailed and specific rules concerning supervision, liability and emergency clearance of the building, during its use by outside groups. The school board places total responsibility for all of these items clearly in the hands of the users of the building.

Another interesting restriction placed on participants in any program or activity sponsored by community groups is the one pertaining to the use of alcoholic beverages and tobacco. All boards, without

exception, restrict the use of these drugs in total or to designated areas. Very few boards permit their use at all in their facilities.

Of the school districts which were identified as having written policies only fifteen (15) specifically stated the responsibilities which users of their facilities had to accept. This consisted of four (4) Roman Catholic districts and eleven (11) Integrated districts.

Fees Charged

All school districts permit the use of their school facilities for religious and educational purposes free of charge. If, however, any of these groups use the school for fund-raising purposes, a small fee is charged in some areas. Most boards seem to consider groups such as the Cubs, the Scouts, the Guides, the Anglican Church Women's Association, the United Church Women, the Cadets, the Church Lads' Brigade, 4-H Clubs, and similar organizations to be of a religious or educational nature, as each is usually sponsored by a specific denomination or an educational institution. Consequently, such groups are permitted to use the schools free of charge after the regular school program is completed. The following statement of one school board which is typical of most boards, will illustrate the point:

The schools heretofore designated as Amalgamated schools are available without cost to Church groups to carry on either cultural or religious exercises. However, if such groups use the facilities for monetary gain they are subject to the same cost as private or moderate socials.

Another district states its policy on this matter in this manner: "Rent shall not be charged for direct church concern in the community or church groups in the district. Rent shall not be charged for community groups such as Guides, Brownies, Scouts, 4-H, etc."

School boards, however, have requests for the use of their facilities from other groups besides those mentioned above. Such service groups as the Lions Club, the Kiwanis, the Women's Institute, and the Kinsmen request schools frequently. Athletic groups, recreation commissions and local people ask for the use of the school gymnasium for their physical fitness programs or for tournaments. Besides these, political organizations also request the use of the buildings for rallies and meetings. Groups of private citizens request the use of educational facilities for social functions such as private parties, showers and wedding receptions. The Provincial Government and the University also request the use of the schools for adult and continuing education. As these requests are not from either educational or religious groups from within the community, the school boards have developed a scale of fees to charge the different groups. The policy of one board concerning such fees for the above-mentioned groups follows this format:

Activities sponsored by Adult Education Division of the
Department of Education and Memorial University --

Classroom	\$ 5.00 per night
Gymnasium	\$15.00 per night
Public Meetings	\$10.00 per night
(schools shall be made available for public meetings only when other public meeting places are not available)	
Political Meetings	\$25.00 per night
Other groups -- Depending on ability to pay and nature of activities but in no case at a cost less than \$3.00 per evening	

This type of statement is typical of most of the boards' policies related to groups who use their facilities from within the community and from outside the community. However, the fees may either be a little higher or lower depending on the school district. It seems that the fee

for the use of the gymnasium varies throughout the Province from \$25.00 to \$100.00 per evening session and the fee for the use of each classroom varies from \$3.00 to \$5.00 for one session.

There were only fifteen (15) districts in the Province which specified and spelled out the fees to be charged by different groups who ask permission to use their facilities after the regular school program is completed. Of these, four (4) were Roman Catholic and eleven (11) were Integrated districts.

Most of the school boards also specify, in their policy statement, what the fee collected for the use of the school was to be used for. If the group is not required to pay the janitor themselves, the fee collected from them or a part thereof is used for this purpose. The rest of the money, depending on the district, is either channeled into the local school fund or into the board fund where it may be used to help defray the extra cost of cleaning, light, heat and so on. Typical of the use made of this money is the following:

... if any group from outside the school requires the use of a facility which results in maintenance or custodial costs, that group will be charged a fee to cover such costs. From the rental fee (for the auditorium) twelve dollars (\$12.00) will be paid a custodian (appointed by the board office) for half day or evening session and twenty dollars (\$20.00) for a full day session.

However, if a group is in a position to produce a revenue a rental fee of ten dollars (\$10.00) (per classroom) will be charged. A portion of this amount may be used for cleaning.

Another Superintendent states the following opinion concerning the use of fees charged and collected: "The fees charged are nominal and are intended to cover the cost of heat and light and supervisory services."

Information specifically related to this point was contained in only eight (8) of the policies formulated by the school districts in the

Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Three (3) of these districts were Roman Catholic and the other five (5) were Integrated districts.

Problems

In a letter to the superintendents requesting a copy of board policy related to the use of the schools by the community, information concerning what each perceived as the major problem arising from such use was also requested. Most of the superintendents felt that lack of supervision and inability of groups to provide for proper cleaning and maintenance were definitely the major problems arising from use of the school by outside groups. Some of the superintendents made suggestions that could be followed to help alleviate these problems. An example of the suggested solution to these problems was given by one superintendent:

We would have no objection to the community use of the schools if the Government supplied us with enough finances:

- a) to hire an adequate caretaking staff, and
- b) to offset the extra expenses incurred for fuel, light and other maintenance costs.

Another very interesting problem posing a delicate situation for several areas is the use of the school facilities during the summer by students who apply for Opportunities For Youth (O.F.Y.) grants. One superintendent made the following statement concerning this:

The Board receives many requests from school students for the use of facilities during the summer months to carry out O.F.Y. projects. Sometimes the granting of such projects by the Federal Agency depends on the facilities being available. This puts a great burden on School Boards because if the students are refused access they lose the summer jobs and the money they may need for University etc. On the other hand, if they are given access there may be little or no supervision. Teachers are gone, cleaning personnel take holidays in turn and usually have skeleton staffs during much of the summer. Also, it is the time when painting and other maintenance jobs are carried out as well as a complete scouring of

the buildings. Some requests are granted but others, where the care of the building is a concern, pose a dilemma for the Board.

III. THE PROGRAMS

In an attempt to clarify the data pertaining to the programs and activities offered in the one hundred thirty-four (134) schools which principals identified as used to a great extent, certain basic decisions were made. The data, as they were obtained from the questionnaires, presented the first major problem. Because of the multiplicity of groups using the schools, classification into workable and valid categories was difficult and still left itself open to bias. However, the following broad categories were taken as a basis for analysis: Religious (subdivided into Youth and Adult), Recreational, Special, Cultural, Educational, Financial and Political. (Appendix A contains a list of groups and/or activities included in each of the broad categories.) It should be pointed out, however, that groups and activities placed in some of these categories could very easily be considered to belong to another. For example, the Girl Guides and the Boy Scouts programs are no doubt highly educational, but, as they are usually sponsored by various religious denominations, they were grouped with the Religious Youth category.

After the classification was decided, the data were then tabulated in terms of "person contact hours." This was calculated using the following formula: the number of persons (P), times the number of uses per year (U), times the number of hours per use (H). For example, if a group of Boy Scouts consisting of fifty (50) participants used the school one (1) hour each week for thirty-six (36) weeks a year, the number of "person contact hours" for this group was $50 \times 36 \times 1 = 1800$. After the

classification and the "person contact hours" were tabulated, these data were then analyzed separately for schools of different sizes. And the last analysis was completed for the different types of schools, for example the Roman Catholic, the Integrated and the Pentecostal Assemblies schools identified in the one hundred thirty-four (134).

Table 4-2 presents the information concerning the number of schools which belong to the different religious groups, as well as the enrollment of each school. There were forty-six (46) Roman Catholic schools, eighty-four (84) Integrated schools, one (1) Pentecostal school and three (3) others. Of these, twelve (12) had an enrollment of 1-99, fifty-five (55) had an enrollment of 100-299, thirty-two (32) had a student population of 300-499, twenty-four (24) had 500-699 students, seven (7) had 700-999 students, and there were only four (4) schools, all Roman Catholic, which had a student enrollment of 1000 plus. The three (3) schools classified as "other" were three which did not identify themselves according to religious affiliation.

From the tabulation of "person contact hours" for each broad category, the category of Education ranked first (Table 4-3). It accumulated a total of nearly one and one-half million "person contact hours" or 35.7 percent of the overall total hours. This category was followed by Recreation programs with approximately six hundred and eighty thousand (680,000) or 16.2 percent of the total and then by Religious Youth programs with nearly six hundred and thirty-seven thousand (637,000) or 15.2 percent of the total. When the category of Religious Youth and Adult were combined they totalled nearly nine hundred and fifty-seven thousand (957,000) hours or 22.8 percent of the total. If this were done, then the broad category of Religious activities would easily rank

TABLE 4-2

THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED AS USED TO A GREAT
EXTENT CLASSIFIED BY SIZE AND TYPE

Enrollment	Roman Catholic	Integrated	Pentecostal	Other	Total
1 - 99	3	9	—	—	12
100 - 299	12	43	—	—	55
300 - 499	11	17	1	3	32
500 - 699	14	10	—	—	24
700 - 999	2	5	—	—	7
1000 plus	4	0	—	—	4
Total	46	84	1	3	134

TABLE 4-3

TOTAL NUMBER, PERCENTAGE AND RANKING OF "PERSON CONTACT HOURS"
FOR EACH BROAD CATEGORY

Person Contact Hours	Religious		Recreation	Social	Cultural	Education	Financial	Political	Total
	Youth	Adult							
Total	637,476	319,368	679,446	617,510	243,830	1,499,218	177,539	21,687	4,196,074
Rank	3	5	2	4	6	1	7	8	
Percent	15.2	7.6	16.2	14.7	5.8	35.7	4.2	.5	99.9

Notes: Does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

second behind Education.

As illustrated in Table 4-3, the total accumulated "person contact hours" for the one hundred thirty-four (134) schools was nearly four million two hundred thousand (4,200,000). Of this total, the programs offered in the Roman Catholic Schools accounted for nearly one million four hundred six thousand (1,406,000) or 34.6 percent of the total accumulated "person contact hours" (Table 4-4). The programs offered in the Integrated schools totalled approximately two million six hundred ninety-five thousand (2,695,000) or 64.2 percent of the overall total hours accumulated. The other two types of schools, the Pentecostal Assemblies and the "other" group, offered programs which totalled nearly fifty thousand three hundred hours (50,300) or 1.2 percent of the total overall figure.

Of the categories of programs offered in the Roman Catholic schools, the Education programs ranked first with the categories of Recreation and Social being second and third respectively (Table 4-4). This showed a slight variation from the overall ranking where Education, Recreation and Religious Youth followed each other in rank. The ranking of the programs in the Integrated schools were: Education first, Religious Youth second, and Social third. Again a variation is shown not with the ranking of Education but with the ranking of Religious Youth and the Social categories. Religious Youth, which ranked third in the overall ranking, ranked second in the Integrated schools program but fourth in the Roman Catholic schools program. Recreation, which ranked second overall, ranked fourth in the programs offered in the Integrated schools but second in the programs offered in the Roman Catholic schools. And the Social category, which ranked fourth overall, was ranked third in the Integrated schools program and third in the Roman Catholic schools

TABLE 4-4.

TOTAL NUMBER, PERCENTAGE AND RANKING OF "PERSON CONTACT HOURS"
FOR EACH BROAD CATEGORY BY TYPE OF SCHOOL

Type of School	Religious		Recreation	Social	Cultural	Education	Financial	Political	Total
	Youth	Adult							
Roman Catholic	153,222	127,674	300,618	210,863	79,340	431,489	139,285	8,457	1,405,948
Rank	4	6	2	3	7	1	5	8	2
Percent	4	3	7	5	2	10	3.3	.2	34.6
Integrated	464,732	191,214	377,428	378,857	164,490	1,066,609	38,254	13,230	2,694,834
Rank	2	5	4	3	6	1	7	8	1
Percent	11	5	9	9	4	25	9	.3	64.2
Pentecostal	13,742								13,742
Rank	1								4
Percent	.3								.3
Other	5,760	480	1,400	27,790	1,120				36,550
Rank	2	5	3	1	4				3
Percent	.14	.01	.06	.66	.03				.9

program. The category of Finance which ranked seventh overall did not change in the ranking for the programs offered in the Integrated schools. However, it ranked fifth in the programs offered in the Roman Catholic schools. From a review of the activities offered in the Roman Catholic schools it was obvious that these schools were used for B.I.N.C.O. more than any other schools. This accounts for the jump in rank for the Financial category in the Roman Catholic schools (Table 4-4).

Another interesting aspect of the total overall program was the percentage of time devoted to each of the broad categories according to the type of school. Twenty-five (25) percent of the total time was spent in the Integrated schools on the Education programs and ten (10) percent in the Roman Catholic schools. Education, therefore, accumulated thirty-five (35) percent of the total overall "person contact hours." Also, if the Religious Youth and Adult categories were combined, they would total twenty-three (23) percent of the total hours, seven (7) percent for the Roman Catholic schools and sixteen (16) percent for the Integrated schools. Therefore, it is easily seen that fifty-eight (58) percent of the total "person contact hours" were devoted to Education and Religious associated programs and/or activities.

Program According to Size of School

As a community was defined in Chapter 1 as "that group of people served by a school," the enrollment of a school should be a fair indicator of the size of the community served. As stated above, the data obtained pertaining to programs were also analyzed from the point of view of school enrollment. Because the data related to the Pentecostal and the "other" group were only 1.2 percent of the total "person contact

hours," no attempt was made to analyze the programs of these schools according to enrollment. The data related to the type of programs offered in the different size schools for the Roman Catholic and the Integrated groups are presented in the following tables.

Table 4-5 indicates the "person contact hours" and the ranking by enrollment and each broad category, for the Roman Catholic schools identified by principals to be used to a great extent. It is clear that the schools with an enrollment of 500-699 ranked first, that schools with an enrollment of 100-299 ranked second, schools with an enrollment of 300-499 ranked third, and schools with an enrollment of 1000 plus, 1-99 and 700-999, ranked fourth, fifth, and sixth, respectively.

In schools with an enrollment of 1-99 pupils, the Education program easily ranked first, as it did in all but three other enrollment groups. In the schools with an enrollment of 100-299 pupils, Education ranked third behind the Recreation and Social programs. In schools with an enrollment of 700-999, Education ranked second behind Religious Youth. And in schools with an enrollment of 1000 plus, it ranked fifth behind Recreation, Cultural, Social and Religious Youth.

Some very interesting aspects of the programs offered in the Roman Catholic schools were brought to light in Table 4-5. First of all, in the schools with an enrollment of 500-699 students, the Financial category ranked second. This resulted from the extensive use made of one specific school by the community for fund-raising endeavors (B.I.N.G.O., card games, dances, etc.). Another interesting aspect was the ranking of the Cultural category in schools with an enrollment of 1000 plus. Here it ranked second. This could possibly be accounted for because of the large population served and either the lack of other facilities or the

TABLE 4-5

TOTAL NUMBER AND RANKING OF "PERSON CONTACT HOURS" FOR EACH BROAD
CATEGORY OF COMMUNITY USE BY SIZE OF SCHOOL FOR
ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

School Size	Religious		Recreation	Social	Cultural	Education	Financial	Political	Total
	Youth	Adult							
1-99	—	36,500	12,600	96	—	42,000	600	489	92,285
Rank	—	2	3	6	—	1	4	5	5
100-299	30,770	41,394	82,520	73,325	—	67,341	1,920	7,969	305,238
Rank	5	4	1	2	—	3	7	6	2
300-499	14,500	23,025	66,827	37,139	17,640	73,392	34,215	—	285,738
Rank	7	5	2	4	6	1	3	—	3
500-699	48,630	19,880	52,911	55,340	5,200	213,123	65,750	—	460,834
Rank	5	6	4	3	7	1	2	—	1
700-999	25,770	3,400	12,000	10,000	—	23,200	14,400	—	88,770
Rank	1	6	4	5	—	2	3	—	6
1000 plus	33,552	3,472	73,760	34,936	56,500	13,433	2,400	—	218,083
Rank	4	—	1	3	2	5	7	—	4
Total	153,222	127,674	300,618	210,683	79,340	431,489	139,285	8,457	1,450,948
Rank	4	5	2	3	6	1	7	8	—

over-use of existing facilities.

The ranking of the total "person contact hours" for the Integrated schools according to enrollment was very similar to that for Roman Catholic schools. The only difference occurred with the ranking of the schools with an enrollment of 700-999 pupils and 1000 plus students. As there were no schools in the Integrated group with an enrollment of 1000 plus students, it ranked sixth. This same group ranked fourth in the Roman Catholic group. The schools with an enrollment of 700-999 pupils ranked sixth in the Roman Catholic group and fourth in the Integrated group (Table 4-6).

A number of interesting observations can be made about the Integrated schools when they are classified according to size. Education, which seemed to be the dominating category overall as far as "person contact hours" were concerned, ranked first only in two sizes of schools, those with enrollments of 300-499 and 500-699. In the schools with an enrollment of 1-99, Education ranked fourth behind Religious Youth and Adult and the Social categories. In schools with an enrollment of 100-299, Education ranked second behind the Social activities. And in the schools with an enrollment of 700-999, Education ranked third behind Religious Youth and Recreation. Another interesting aspect of the programs offered in the Integrated schools was the large use made of all schools for Religious Youth activities. The schools with an enrollment of 700-999 pupils were used most extensively for these activities. It seemed that the Integrated schools were used to a much greater extent for such programs as Boy Scouts, Girl Guides and other such groups than were the Roman Catholic schools. Cultural activities also played a large part in the overall programs offered in the schools with an enrollment

TABLE 4-6.

TOTAL NUMBER AND RANKING OF "PERSON CONTACT HOURS" FOR EACH BROAD
CATEGORY OF COMMUNITY USE BY SIZE OF SCHOOL FOR
INTEGRATED SCHOOLS

School Size	Religious		Recreation	Social	Cultural	Education	Financial	Political	Total
	Youth	Adult							
1-99	23,385	31,260	7,675	12,460	—	8,010	2,700	—	85,490
Rank	2	1	5	3	—	4	6	—	5
100-299	130,751	98,569	113,020	226,717	29,540	199,140	24,054	12,030	833,823
Rank	3	5	4	1	6	2	7	8	2
300-499	62,190	48,260	173,350	23,300	121,700	245,547	11,500	1,200	687,047
Rank	4	5	2	6	3	1	7	8	3
500-699	75,033	11,925	62,473	112,555	7,250	602,310	—	—	871,546
Rank	3	5	4	2	6	1	—	—	1
700-999	173,393	1,200	20,910	3,825	6,000	11,600	—	—	216,928
Rank	1	6	2	5	4	3	—	—	4
1000 plus	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rank	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	462,752	191,214	377,428	378,857	164,490	1,066,609	38,254	13,230	2,694,834
Rank	2	5	4	3	6	1	7	8	

of 300-499. This resulted from the use made of one specific school where the music program was very extensive. This involved a music program which encompassed students of the district who were still attending school as well as those who had recently graduated.

Interesting also were the schools with an enrollment of 1-99 pupils. The Roman Catholic schools offered programs which seemed to be dominated by activities in the Education category. There were no activities in these schools of the Religious Youth category. However, the programs offered in the Integrated schools showed the activities in the Education category to be very low, while the Religious Youth category offered activities which were very extensively patronized.

IV. VIEWS OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING POLICIES AND PROBLEMS

The principals of the one hundred thirty-four (134) schools were also questioned to determine their views on the policy which their boards had formulated concerning the use of the schools by the community. Information about what these principals perceived as the problems arising from such use was also solicited.

Of the one hundred thirty-four (134) principals, seventy-two (72) said that their board had a written policy (Table 4-7). This was 53.7 percent of the total number of principals questioned. Twenty-nine (29) principals stated that the policy of their board concerning use by the community was a verbal one. This accounted for 21.6 percent of the principals. Twenty-seven (27) principals or 20.1 percent stated that their board had no policy on the use of the school by the community. And six (6) principals or 4.5 percent did not respond to the question. It

TABLE 4-7
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS ON SCHOOL BOARD STATEMENT OF
POLICY CONCERNING COMMUNITY USE

Type of Policy	Frequency of Response	Percentage of Total
Written	72	53.7
Verbal	29	21.6
No policy	27	20.1
No response	6	4.5
Total	134	99.9

Note: Does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

is interesting to note that nearly twenty-five (25) percent of the principals either did not respond to the question or stated that their board did not have a policy on this matter. Superintendents, on the other hand, indicated that all boards had either an informal or a formalized policy concerning the use of the school by the community.

When school boards permit the use of their educational facilities by outside groups they usually designate a regulator. This person or group is given the responsibility of deciding who will or will not be given permission to use the school. When questioned on this point, principals reported that in forty-three (43) or 32.1 percent of the cases they themselves were the regulator (Table 4-8). Twenty-three (23) principals stated that the district or local education committee was responsible. This was 17.2 percent of the total possible. In only five (5) cases or 3.7 percent of the schools was a school board employee at central office considered by principals to be the regulator of community use of the school. Seventeen (17) or 12.7 percent of the principals stated that the school board was the regulator. Nine (9) principals said that some other person or group was the regulator, accounting for 6.7 percent of the principals and schools. Thirty-seven (37) or 27.6 percent of the principals did not respond to the question. From a review of the policies of the boards at the beginning of this chapter, it seemed that principals and/or the local education committee were considered to be the regulator of community use of schools in most of the cases. According to the principals, however, these two groups would account for only sixty-six (66) of the one hundred thirty-four (134) or only 49 percent of the cases. This seems to point out a lack of knowledge on the part of principals concerning this important aspect of community use

TABLE 4-8

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING REGULATOR OF
COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS

Regulator	Frequency of Response	Percentage
School Principal	43	32.1
District or Local Committee	23	17.2
School Board employee at Central Office	5	3.7
School Board	17	12.7
Other	9	6.7
No response	37	27.6
Total	134	100.0

of their schools. Also, the fact that 27.6 percent of the principals did not respond seems to suggest a lack of familiarity with their school board's policy on community use of the school.

Principals were also questioned concerning the method of application which their board used (Table 4-9). Fourteen (14) or only 10.4 percent of the principals stated that their board had a standard application form. Twenty-three (23) or 17.2 percent of the principals stated that their board accepted other written forms as applications for the use of the school by the community, while the largest group of principals, fifty-eight (58) or 43.3 percent, said that their board accepted an oral communication as an application and five (5) principals said that other, unspecified methods were used as application forms. This last group accounted for only 3.7 percent of the one hundred thirty-four (134) principals. Again, an interesting feature of the question was that thirty-four (34) principals or 25.4 percent failed to respond. This again could possibly be attributed to the misunderstanding of the board's policy by the principals or their lack of knowledge of this specific item of the policy.

Another question related to the availability of a written contract. Twenty-five (25) principals or 18.7 percent stated that their school board did have an official contract (Table 4-10). However, one hundred seven (107) or 79.9 percent said that their board did not have an official contract. Only two (2) or 1.5 percent of the principals failed to respond to this question. The information here seems to correspond fairly accurately with that given by the superintendents in their review of board policy statements on community use.

The policies which boards have formulated also contain infor-

TABLE 4-9
RESPONSE OF PRINCIPALS ON METHOD OF APPLICATION

Type	Frequency of Response	Percentage
Standard application form	14	10.4
Other written form	23	17.2
Oral	58	43.3
Other ways	5	3.7
No response	34	25.4
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 4-10
RESPONSE OF PRINCIPALS ON OFFICIAL CONTRACT
FOR COMMUNITY USE

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	25	18.7
No	107	79.9
No response	2	1.5
Total	134	100.0

Note: Does not equal 100 percent because
of rounding.

mation on what groups are responsible for when they use the schools. Of the one hundred thirty-four (134) principals questioned on this issue, fifty-four (54) principals or 40.3 percent said that the group was responsible for cleaning the school when they were finished with it (Table 4-11). Fifty (50) or 37.5 percent of the principals stated that the group was not responsible for cleaning and thirty (30) or 22.4 percent again did not respond to this question. Again, there seems to be a slight discrepancy between what the policies of the boards say and what the principals feel the policies indicate.

Another important aspect of any school board policy on the use of its facilities by the community relates to who is responsible for damages to school property or to individuals while the school is used by outside groups. On this important issue, only three (3) principals or 2.2 percent stated that the school board accepted this responsibility. One hundred five (105) or 78.4 percent stated that their board held the group responsible for these injuries or damages. Only nine (9) or 6.7 percent of the principals said that the damages or injuries were settled by agreement between the board and the group (Table 4-12). Here, again there was considerable agreement between what the principals said and what the policy statements seem to suggest.

The supervision of school facilities, when used by the community, has been a contentious issue. Superintendents feel that supervision is very inadequate. When questioned on this issue, forty-one (41) principals or 30.6 percent stated that a school board employee was required by the board to supervise the school facility used (Table 4-13). Some seventy (70) principals or 52.2 percent stated that the presence of a school board employee was not required. It is also important to note that

TABLE 4-11
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING RESPONSIBILITY
FOR CLEANING AND RESTORATION OF SCHOOL AFTER
COMMUNITY USE

Type of Responsibility	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No Response	Percent
Cleaning	54	40.3	50	37.5	30	22.4
Restoration	118	88.1	5	3.7	11	8.2
No policy			6	4.5	128	95.5

N = 134 for each type.

TABLE 4-12
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING THE GROUP
RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES AND INJURIES
DURING COMMUNITY USE

Group	Frequency of Response	Percentage
School Board	3	2.2
Group using the school	105	78.4
Decision by agreement	9	6.7
No policy	9	6.7
No response	8	6.0
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 4-13

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING SUPERVISION OF
SCHOOL BY SCHOOL BOARD EMPLOYEE DURING
COMMUNITY USE

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	41	30.6
No	70	52.2
No policy	17	12.7
No response	6	4.5
Total	134	100.0

seventeen (17) or 12.7 percent of the principals stated that their board did not have a policy on this issue.

As pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, all school boards in the Province charge a fee for the use of their school facilities. Also, as indicated earlier, this may vary from district to district as well as from group to group. Of the one hundred thirty-four (134) principals questioned in the schools identified as being used to a great extent, only nine (9) said that their boards always charged a fee (Table 4-14). This was only 6.7 percent of the schools identified. Forty-three (43) principals or 32.1 percent stated that their school board policy did not require the charging of a fee for use of the school by outside groups. However, seventy-nine (79) or 59 percent of the principals stated that a fee was charged sometimes.

In the cases where a fee was charged according to the policies, most if not all of the boards had fixed amounts for different groups. The principals, however, did not seem to agree with this (Table 4-15). Fifty-eight (58) or 43.3 percent of the principals said that their board had a fixed rate for their rental fee. However, thirty-two (32) or 23.9 percent stated that the fee charged varied. But what is interesting about this is that forty-four (44) or 32.8 percent of the principals did not answer the question. Again, this could possibly indicate a misunderstanding of their board's policy or a lack of knowledge of this issue as contained in their board's policy.

Policy statements obtained from the superintendents indicated that in many cases monies collected from the fees were used primarily to help defray the extra cost of the use of the utilities and the cleaning personnel. Table 4-16 shows that principals felt that the fees collected

TABLE 4-14
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING CHARGE OF RENT
FOR COMMUNITY USE OF THE SCHOOL

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	6.7
No	43	32.1
Sometimes	79	59.0
No response	3	2.2
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 4-15

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING WHETHER FEES
ARE FIXED OR VARIABLE

Type	Frequency of Response	Percentage
Fixed	58	43.3
Variable	32	23.5
No response	44	32.8
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 4-16

PRINCIPALS' VIEWS ON THE USE MADE OF FEES COLLECTED
FOR COMMUNITY USE

Use Made of Fees	Yes	Percentage
Pay personnel	24	17.9
Cover cost of utilities	17	12.7
Used for improvements	17	12.7
Added to district fund	47	35.1
Added to school fund	17	12.7
Used to cover cost of damage	5	3.7
Other	6	4.5

for the extra use of the schools were added to the district fund and were used to pay the extra personnel. However, forty-seven (47) or 35.1 percent felt that the extra money was just added to the district fund. And only seventeen (17) or 12.7 percent of the principals said that the fees were used to cover the cost of the use of the utilities.

V. PROBLEMS

The problems associated with the use of school facilities by the community or outside groups can be many and varied. The superintendents when questioned on this issue felt that the two major problems that have arisen as a result of community use of the schools are the lack of adequate supervision and the failure of groups to provide proper cleaning personnel to put the school back in the condition in which they found it. When questioned on this issue of problems arising from the use of the schools by outside groups, principals gave some very interesting answers (Table 4-17).

Only five (5) or 3.7 percent of the principals stated that prohibitive costs were a problem. However, fifty-six (56) or 41.8 percent of the principals felt that lack of adequate supervision posed a problem. Here, the principals and the superintendents agreed. As far as groups from the community interfering with the regular school program were concerned, only eighteen (18) or 13.4 percent of the principals saw this as a problem. Vandalism was considered to be a problem resulting from community use of the school by thirty-two (32) or 23.9 percent of the principals. Forty-one (41) or 30.6 percent of the principals felt that lack of storage space was a problem. Lack of equipment was a problem for only nineteen (19) or 14.2 percent of the principals, whereas thirty-

TABLE 4-17

PRINCIPALS' VIEWS ON PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED WHEN
SCHOOLS ARE USED BY THE COMMUNITY

Type of Problem	Yes	Percentage
Prohibitive costs	5	3.7
Lack of supervision	56	41.8
Interference with regular program	18	13.4
Vandalism	32	23.9
Lack of storage space	41	30.6
Lack of equipment	19	14.2
Lack of cleaning personnel	33	24.6

N = 134 for each type of problem.

three (33) or 24.6 percent of the principals stated that lack of cleaning personnel was a problem (Table 4-17).

Principals were also asked to identify what they perceived to be the major problem resulting from the use of the school by the community. Of the one hundred thirty-four (134) principals who identified their schools as being used extensively, fifty-six (56) or 41.8 percent did not respond to this question (Table 4-18). Of those who did respond, twenty-nine (29) or 21.6 percent cited lack of adequate supervision as the major problem. The second greatest problem identified by sixteen (16) or 11.9 percent of the principals was the lack of adequate cleaning personnel. And nine (9) principals or 6.7 percent indicated that lack of storage space was the most serious problem.

VI. SUMMARY

This chapter has presented information pertaining to the policies, programs, and problems related to the use of the schools in Newfoundland and Labrador after the regular school program is completed. First of all, a review of the policies of school boards in the Province was presented. Of the thirty-four (34) school districts in this Province contacted, thirty-one (31) responded to the request for a copy of their policy. Of these thirty-one (31) districts only eighteen (18) had a written policy on the use of the school by the community. Most of these district policies covered such important aspects as: procedures to follow when requesting the use of the facilities, responsibilities of users, fees to be charged groups using facilities and allocation of fees collected.

Next data pertaining to the programs offered in the one hundred

TABLE 4-18
 PRINCIPALS' VIEWS ON THE MAJOR PROBLEM RESULTING
 FROM COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS

Problem	Frequency of Response	Percentage
No response	56	41.8
Prohibitive costs	4	3.0
Lack of supervision	29	21.6
Interference with regular program	4	3.0
Vandalism	7	5.2
Lack of storage	9	6.7
Lack of equipment	4	3.0
Lack of cleaning personnel	16	11.9
Other	5	3.7
Total	134	99.9

Note: Does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

thirty-four (134) schools identified as used to a great extent were analyzed. This analysis indicated that in all schools, whether they were Roman Catholic or Integrated, four specific categories of programs dominated the activities offered after regular school hours. Education, Religious, Recreational and Social activities are by far the greatest contributors to the use of the schools. Which of these categories is dominant seems to depend not only on the type of school but also on the size of the school. Some specific schools seem to be used for one activity more than others. This seems to occur in places which are either outports or in specific parts of large towns where other facilities are not available.

Finally, the chapter presented data concerning the views of the principals pertaining to the boards' policies on the use of the schools by the public. This analysis seemed to indicate a lack of communication between school boards and principals. The principals did not seem to have a thorough knowledge of board policy on the use of the school by the community. On some issues such as the availability of an official contract and responsibility for damages and injury, there was a high degree of agreement between what principals said and what school board policy indicated. However, on issues such as who regulates community use, when fees will be charged, and if they are fixed or variable, agreement between stated board policy and principal interpretation was not so high.

Besides the principals' views on board policy, their views on the problems associated with community use of the schools were also presented. From these analyses, it was clear that principals did agree with the superintendents on existing problems. The problems mentioned

most often by superintendents and principals were the lack of supervision and inadequate cleaning personnel.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSES OF THE DATA: SELECTED COMMUNITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will survey various aspects of the programs and activities provided in the eight (8) schools of The Avalon North Integrated School District chosen for in depth study. More specifically, answers to the following questions will be presented:

1. What specific community programs and activities were available in the eight (8) schools chosen for detailed analysis?
2. What individuals and groups have promoted or opposed community use of the school in the eight (8) communities studied?
3. What problems were being encountered in these eight (8) schools as a result of community use?
4. Who were the clientele making use of these schools and what were their views of the programs and activities offered in these schools over the past year?
5. What were the views of a sample of the public in a selected community concerning present and future use of schools for educational, cultural, and recreational purposes?

II. PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES IN EIGHT SELECTED COMMUNITIES

The programs and activities offered in the eight (8) schools of

The Avalon North Integrated School District chosen for in depth study were determined initially through the questionnaire sent to all principals (Appendix A). Table 5-1 presents the categories of programs and activities offered and the number of "person contact hours" accumulated for each category and school.

Table 5-1 indicates that the Social category ranked first, with the categories of Religious Youth and Education following second and third, respectively. But if the categories of Religious Youth and Adult were combined, they would easily rank first.

As noted above, the data contained in this table were those derived from questionnaires to principals. From the structured interviews (Appendix B) conducted in the communities served by these eight (8) schools, it was clear, however, that the "person contact hours" were underestimated by the principals. Reasons for the conservative estimates include the following:

1. In every school the principal was not as sure of the total number of participants and the hours accumulated per year as the leader of the group was. Usually, the only contact that the principal had with the group was when the group applied for use. After this initial contact, most groups grew in number of participants.

2. Besides this, socials and use by youth groups for dances, meetings, etc., varied greatly. This, again, the principal was unable to be accurate about.

3. Some of the schools were used during the summer for a community day. Attendance was difficult to estimate.

4. Accurate usage by recreation commissions was very difficult to describe, again because of the wide variation in numbers.

TABLE 5-1

TOTAL NUMBER, RANKING AND PERCENTAGE OF "PERSON CONTACT HOURS"
BY CATEGORY OF COMMUNITY USE

School	Religious		Recreation	Social	Culture	Education	Financial	Political	Total
	Youth	Adult							
Primary	7,700	4,200	—	—	—	—	—	—	11,900
Elementary	4,200	9,600	3,600	—	—	9,300	—	—	26,700
Elementary	10,240	900	1,200	6,000	—	—	—	—	18,340
Elementary	—	—	932	—	—	4,776	1,074	135	6,817
Junior High	—	900	—	1,520	—	2,225	—	4,315	8,960
Central High	2,512	—	1,755	—	—	1,800	—	—	6,067
Central High	9,000	—	—	4,600	—	—	—	—	13,600
Senior High	—	—	—	30,270	—	8,800	—	—	39,070
Total	33,652	15,600	7,487	42,390	—	26,901	1,074	4,450	131,554
Ranking	2	4	5	1	—	3	7	6	—
Percent	26	12	6	32	—	20	1	3	—

Data from structured interviews indicated that schools were used for a wide variety of meetings. These meetings, however, took various forms. The Adult Education classes varied from purely academic subjects to instruction in such things as sewing, typing, physical education and any other activity which was requested and which the Department of Education was willing to sponsor financially. Most of the youth groups such as the Guides, the Scouts, the Brownies, the Cubs, and the Tyro groups, besides providing a social meeting atmosphere for young people, attempted to instill in their participants some of the Christian values. The Boys' and Girls' Clubs also provided a social meeting place, usually for older teenagers. Besides this, these groups provided a place where these people could participate in any recreational activities which were available and plan their own dances and other social functions. Most service groups, besides using schools to provide a meeting place for their members, also made use of the schools for fund-raising events. These events usually raised money which was channeled back into the same community in one form or another. These fund-raising events included catering to weddings and parties, B.I.N.G.O., card games, and dances. In some communities, local municipal councils made use of school facilities for meetings. Local recreation commissions used the school's facilities for meetings, tournaments and fund-raising events such as those mentioned above.

Most if not all of the programs and activities provided in these eight (8) schools are of the type described above.

From the structured interview (Appendix B), it was learned that most, if not all, of the programs and activities available in these eight (8) schools were initiated by one or more of the following: the church,

teachers, some local interested person, and an outside affiliated group. The church or a member of the church such as a minister or a local church member initiated most of the Guides, Scouts, Brownies, Cubs, Junior Auxiliary, and Tyro groups. Teachers in most cases initiated such groups as adult education classes, Sea Cadets and so on. Local people with the help of outside groups usually initiated such groups as Lion's Club, Women's Institute, Leo Club and others. The interesting thing about the local people who initiated programs is that they were usually newcomers to the community.

Information was also sought concerning those individuals and groups who were refused use of the school. It was found that refusals were few, but when they did occur they were usually to groups of young people which had been identified as being "irresponsible" earlier or a group which had failed earlier to comply with the principal's instructions.

The structured interviews also provided information pertaining to the attitude of principals as well as citizens toward the use of their school. The following quotations are indicative of the range of views concerning community use:

In earlier years the school belonged to the United Church and was used by them for all public functions.

The following groups use the school: United Church Women, Sea Cadets, Meetings such as local school board, Sports Association, etc. Adult Education Classes (e.g.) Sewing, Typing, Physical Education, Youth Groups, e.g. 4H, etc.

The schools are the only buildings in the community that can accommodate the programs initiated by the public.

The school was the only thing we had to use in the past and it is the only thing we have to use now.

It [the school] has always been the building for times (dances), church meetings, group meetings (community) etc.

[The school is used for] dances, socials, community and church groups, meetings, concerts, almost any community social activity or when the need arose for large group meetings -- political meeting also.

An indication of the number and types of groups using these eight (8) schools is provided in Appendix B.

III. SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION

Support from Within the Community

From the data received from the structured interviews conducted in the eight (8) communities, it was clear that support for the use of the school by the public came from many groups. This support, however, took the following forms: vocal support, financial support to the regular program, and giving permission to use the school. From within the community, every group which used the school obviously supported its use and in many cases groups would make further suggestions as to the ways the school could be better used to help the community. Groups such as the Women's Institute, Church Groups, Lion's Clubs, the Teachers, and Youth groups were among those identified as supporting greater use of the schools by the community. The Women's Institute supported the use of the school by donations to the regular school scholarship fund and by helping to pay for field trips. Youth leaders helped to organize and prepare new programs. Other groups would support the use of the school by the public by voicing their ideas and opinions in local public meetings and privately to principals. Also, the principals of the schools supported greater use of the schools by sending any overload on their school to a nearby school in the community or to a nearby community.

Support from Outside the Community

Support for the use of the schools by the public from outside groups came mainly from the School Board, the Department of Education, the Federal Government, and outside affiliated groups. All of the eight (8) communities studied had a local education committee and so considered the main School Board as an outside agency in relation to their particular community. Most of the people interviewed in these eight (8) communities felt that the School Board was supporting greater use of the schools by permitting each local committee to decide on the community use to which their school would be put. Besides the School Board, the Department of Education was seen as an outside group supporting the greater use of the school by the public. The Department provided the money to pay teachers for adult education classes and also to pay the hire of the buildings. This was seen as financial support from outside.

Another outside group considered to be supporting the use of the schools by the public, again financially, was the Federal Government. The people interviewed identified this group because of their sponsoring and funding Opportunities For Youth programs during the summer which made use of school buildings.

Opposition

Few people or groups were identified as opposing community use of school facilities. Teachers in one school were identified as an opposition group. This resulted from the untidy condition in which some rooms were left after a group of the public used the school. Certain principals also voiced opposition. Their complaint, however, related to

certain frustrations in administering community use rather than opposition to the idea itself. They felt that as they were expected to schedule the groups, decide who should get the use of the school when too many requests were received, make connections with other schools when an overflow occurred, and reschedule when a problem arose, their work load was too great and in some cases interfered with their regular school work. In short, the use of the school by the public became a real problem for some principals. Besides these two groups, one or two local committee members expressed a genuine fear that too much damage might occur to the buildings and equipment. This usually led to the implementation of a fee which groups again saw as an obstacle. Most groups felt that as they already provided financial funds for scholarships, field trips, and other regular school programs, the use of a fee was not warranted.

IV. PROBLEMS

An important aspect of the structured interview was the attempt made to ascertain the problems being encountered with the use of the schools by the people in the eight (8) communities identified for extensive study. Two of the main problems identified by superintendents and principals in an earlier chapter were cost and supervision. The people interviewed were asked to give an estimate of the cost incurred with their use of the school during the past year. Only five (5) of the forty-two (42) individuals interviewed could give any answer at all to this question. Most felt that it was impossible for them to estimate the amount it cost in heat, light, and maintenance as a result of their use of the school. Also, as most of the groups were voluntary in nature,

there was no cost for salaries.

As for the problem of supervision, most groups felt that the leader of the group was the person who was responsible and that he or she should supervise the school when their group was present. However, in most of the schools, the janitor or the cook (e.g. the cafeteria lady) was responsible and had to be present when the building was used for catering, fund-raising events, or large socials. This proved that all of the groups were aware of this aspect of the school board policy and adhered to it very strictly.

Table 5-2 presents the problems identified by the people interviewed and the degree to which each is seen to be a real problem. It seems that the greatest problem identified by the people was the lack of storage space. It was considered to be a large problem by 76 percent of those interviewed. It also seems that the next greatest problem was the cost. This can be seen by combining the responses of the first two categories. Some 23 percent of the people saw it as a problem. Another interesting feature revealed in Table 5-2 is that parking, lack of teaching personnel, and inadequate supervision were not really seen as problems. Some of the comments made regarding the problems of space were:

The very fact that most groups have their equipment and materials and no place to store them created a problem.

There is no place to store materials belonging to any one group. Usually they are kicked around from place to place.

This school is ill-equipped to handle storage for any group.

The Sea Cadets had no storage space for their equipment.

During workshops there is no place to store material and equipment and we don't have the use of the school in the afternoon for craft training.

TABLE 5-2
VIEWS OF COMMUNITY LEADERS TOWARD PROBLEMS ARISING FROM
COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS

Problem	Large Extent	%	Some Extent	%	Very Little Extent	%	Not at all	%	No Response	%
Cost	1	2	9	21	7	17	10	24	15	36
Inadequate supervision	4	10	3	7	8	19	18	43	9	21
Lack of storage space	11	26	4	10	4	10	15	36	8	19
Lack of teaching personnel	2	5	7	17	3	7	17	40	13	31
Lack of parking space	3	7	1	2	4	10	30	71	4	10
Vandalism	1	2	8	14	14	33	15	36	6	14

N = 42.

Availability of Other Facilities

In most of the communities studied, there were other facilities available for community use. These buildings were either other schools belonging to the same or a different religious denomination, halls or lodges belonging to different religious denominations, a recreation center designated as a youth center or a building belonging to one of the local service clubs. These buildings in most cases were used to serve the needs of the specific group which owned it. The tendency of most groups contacted was to use the school rather than ask permission to use these other buildings. In some cases for specific activities, groups which had their own building were also using the school facilities. This occurred in one community where the Boys' and Girls' Club used the school for specific recreational purposes.

Although these other facilities were not providing the same type of program and activities as the school, there seemed to be a lot of duplication of facilities in some places. Also, where groups did have their own facilities and were using them for recreation and social purposes, no attempt was made to co-ordinate the programs. In every community there seemed to be a lack of planning and programs were provided in a very haphazard manner.

Another interesting fact which was uncovered by the structured interview was the total lack of any study of community needs. Not one community had ever attempted to determine the recreational, social and educational needs of its people. One community had recently, under the leadership of the Parent Teacher Association, conducted a survey of the school-age students to determine their needs. This resulted in the preparation and implementation of a program for these people, using three

local schools on weekends. Another important aspect of this program is that the most mature students have been given the responsibility of operating these programs under the direction of several adults. However, no attempt was ever made to determine the needs of the rest of the people so that a program geared to satisfying these needs could be planned and hopefully implemented.

V. THE CLIENTELE

A sample of the clientele using the eight (8) schools identified for intensive study was also surveyed. Their views were sought on such items as the following: their main reason for participating in the program or activity; their judgment concerning the adequacy of the current adult education program; how the school could be better used to help them, their family and their community; and who should pay the extra cost of using the school.

Table 5-3 presents a breakdown of the responses by sex to the question of what motivated these people to participate in the program. The table points out that a desire to make better use of their leisure time motivated 43 percent of the participants, 34 percent female and 9 percent male. The next greatest motivation came from a desire to keep fit. Nineteen percent of the people wished to develop their physical health. Of this percentage, 7 percent were female while 12 percent were male. Another interesting point was that 11 percent of the male participants felt that they could be better citizens as a result of participating in the program or activity but only 4 percent of the females felt this to be a great desire.

The participants were also questioned to determine their opinion

TABLE 5-3
MAIN REASON GIVEN FOR PARTICIPATION BY SEX

Reason	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
Will help my career/ vocational development	7	2	22	6	29	8
Will help me to achieve another educational level	11	3	28	8	39	11
Will help me to spend my leisure time better	31	9	119	34	150	43
Will help my physical health	42	12	26	7	68	19
Will help me to be a better citizen	37	11	14	4	51	15
Other	7	2	5	1	12	3
Total	135	39	214	60	349	99*

Total number of responses = 349.

*Does not equal 100% due to rounding.

on the adequacy of the program being offered at the school. Table 5-4 points out that 56 percent of the participants felt that the adult education program was adequate. Only 18 percent felt that it was very adequate. Twenty-six percent, however, felt that the program was inadequate. Nineteen percent of the responses indicating that the program was inadequate were female and only 7 percent were male. It seems that women were more concerned about improving the adult education program than were the men.

According to the responses in Table 5-4, more can be done by schools to help the people. At least one quarter of the responses indicated a desire for a better program. When the clientele were questioned as to what was needed most to help them, their families and their communities, 36 percent of their responses indicated that the people would like more courses which would help them with their physical development (Table 5-5). Twenty-one percent of the responses were from females and 15 percent were from males. The next category of courses which people expressed a desire for were general interest courses such as art and music. Thirty percent of the responses were in favor of these types of courses. The females were much more interested in the general interest courses than were the males: 21 percent as compared with 6 percent. The next category of courses which people expressed a desire for were the adult education courses. Eighteen percent of the responses favored an increase in these types of courses. The training courses for jobs and upgrading courses for present jobs were the courses which people already using the schools expressed the least desire for.

If the schools are to be used more and if the present programs are to be expanded to help satisfy the needs of the community, more money

TABLE 5-4
ADEQUACY OF PROGRAM BY SEX

Adequacy	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
Very adequate	31	11	21	7	52	18
Adequate	56	19	108	37	164	56
Inadequate	20	7	56	19	76	26
Total	107	37	185	63	292	100

N = 292.

TABLE 5-5
HOW SCHOOLS CAN BE BETTER USED TO HELP COMMUNITY

Program	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
By offering:						
Adult education classes	39	7	59	11	98	18
Training courses and upgrading	25	5	47	9	72	14
General interest courses	35	6	130	24	165	30
Physical fitness courses	83	15	112	21	195	36
Other	0	0	11	2	11	2
Total	182	33	359	67	541	100

Total number of responses = 541.

must be made available. Table 5-6 presents the data obtained from the clientele presently using the schools pertaining to who should bear the burden of the extra costs. Sixty-one percent of the responses indicated that the Provincial Government should shoulder this financial burden. The people using the school were identified as the group who should pay this extra cost by only 18 percent of the responses and the school board was designated as the responsible group by only 12 percent. Only 9 percent of the responses indicated that the burden should be shared by a combination of the Provincial Government, the people using the school, and the school board.

VI. COMMUNITY STUDY

A study of the use of the school facilities in one specific community was also conducted. A sample of one hundred (100) of the three hundred ninety-seven (397) householders was chosen randomly. The heads of these households or the spouse was questioned to obtain information about their views and attitude toward the use of the school by the community both now and in the future (Appendix C). Table 5-7 indicates the number of people interviewed who participated in the programs and activities offered at the local school.

According to Table 5-7, only fifteen (15) of the people interviewed were also participants. Of these people, eleven (11) were women and only four (4) were men. It seems from this sample and the sample of clientele surveyed that females tended to participate more than the males. A possible explanation for this could be that there were more activities and programs offered which appealed to females than to the males. In fact, in the community studied, the men did complain that this

TABLE 5-6
WHO SHOULD PAY THE EXTRA COST

Group	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
School Board	13	4	30	8	43	12
People using facility	19	5	44	13	63	18
Government	83	24	128	37	211	61
Combination of some or all of the above	17	5	14	4	31	9
Total	132	38	216	62	348	100

N = 348.

TABLE 5-7
PARTICIPATION IN AFTER HOURS PROGRAM
AND ACTIVITIES

Response	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
Yes	4	4	11	11	15	15
No	47	47	38	38	85	85
Total	51	51	49	49	100	100

N = 100.

was the case.

Of the women who did participate, it is interesting to note that one (1) was under the age of 20 years, four (4) were between 20-29 years, four (4) were between 30-39 years, one (1) was between 40-49 years, and one (1) was over sixty. In other words, programs served women of all ages. However, the men who participated were of only two age groups: one (1) between 20-29 years and the other three (3) were between 40-49 years.

Besides the people participating, another twenty-one (21) people living in these households were also identified as participants in the programs and activities offered. These included ten (10) males and eleven (11) females. The programs and activities engaged in included: meetings of various kinds, typing classes, sewing classes, and adult education classes.

The people who were chosen for the sample were also asked to indicate their main reasons for participating in the program or activities during the past year. This information is presented in Table 5-8. This table indicates that of the males who did participate, three (3) of the four (4) felt that such participation would help them to be better citizens. Nine (9) of the eleven (11) females said that they participated mainly because it helped them to spend their leisure time better. These responses, although small, show a very close similarity to the responses to the same question put to the sample of clientele already using the schools in the eight (8) communities chosen for in depth study.

Besides information on the people who participated in the programs and activities at the school, data were collected and analyzed on the non-participants who were interviewed. According to Table 5-7, there

TABLE 5-8
MAIN REASON FOR PARTICIPATION

Reason	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
Will help my career/ vocational development	1	7	0	0	1	7
Will help me to achieve another educational level (i.e. grade level)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Will help me to spend my leisure time better	0	0	9	60	9	60
Will help my physical health	0	0	2	13	2	13
Will help me to be a better citizen	3	20	0	0	3	20
Total	4	27	11	73	15	100

N = 15.

were eighty-five (85) people interviewed who did not participate. Table 5-9 presents the data pertaining to the reasons these people gave for not participating.

From this table (Table 5-9), it can be seen that forty-eight (48) percent of the non-participants' responses indicated that they had no time to participate in such programs and activities. Thirty-four percent of the responses showed that there were no courses offered which interested these people. On these two reasons both the males and females seem to agree. The next most important reason given for non-participation was apprehension about continuing their education. This was identified by 14 percent of the responses of those not participating. Here the males seemed to be more apprehensive than the females. What is also interesting is that only two (2) people felt that the cost to them of participating would be too great.

The sample of people chosen for questioning were also asked their opinion on how the school could be better used to help the people and the community. Table 5-10 provides a summary of the data resulting from this question: The largest percentage of the responses, 36 percent, suggested that the school should provide training and upgrading courses for jobs. However, when the clientele presently using the eight (8) schools studied in depth were asked the same question, they expressed a desire for more physical fitness courses. Besides the desire for training and job upgrading courses, 33 percent of the responses indicated that there was an interest in more adult education classes. Again, a variation is seen with the desire of the clientele. Their second desire was for more general interest courses. Only 17 percent of the responses of the householders indicated an interest in general interest courses.

TABLE 5-9
MAIN REASON FOR NON-PARTICIPATION

Reason	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
I did not have the time	22	25	20	23	20	48
There were no courses or activities offered that interested me	16	18	14	16	30	34
I could not afford the cost of the courses or activities	0	0	2	2	2	2
I have been dissatisfied in previous attempts at furthering my education	0	0	0	0	0	0
I have not taken a course for so long that I would hesitate about continuing my education at this point	8	9	4	4	12	14
I did not know that courses were being offered or who was offering them	1	1	0	0	1	1
Total	47	53	40	46	87	100

Total number of responses = 87.

TABLE 5-10
HOW SCHOOL CAN BE BETTER USED

Type of Use	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
By offering:						
Adult education classes	39	17	37	16	76	33
Upgrading for present job	45	19	41	17	86	36
General interest courses (e.g. art, music, dance, sewing, etc.)	20	8	21	9	41	17
Physical fitness courses	13	5	6	3	19	8
Other	6	3	7	3	13	6
Total	123	52	112	48	235	100

Total number of responses = 235.

The householders saw the provision of more physical fitness classes as being least important of all.

People who were interviewed also indicated some of the programs that should be provided and for whom these should be organized. Most of the people providing suggestions indicated that more socials should be organized in the school for the older people of the community. At present, there were no such activities organized for these people.

The householders were also asked their opinion concerning who should shoulder the financial burden which would be incurred as a result of an expanded program for the community. Table 5-11 summarizes the responses received. It shows that 66 percent of the people interviewed felt that the Provincial Government should pay for this extra program. The householders and the clientele were in very close agreement on this point. Nobody in the community study felt that the people using the school should be responsible for the extra cost and only 2 percent of the people felt that the school board should accept the extra cost as their responsibility. However, 32 percent of the sample interviewed in the community study felt that a combination of the people using the school, the Government and School Board should pay the extra cost. This attitude concerning provincial responsibility probably reflects a more widespread belief by many Newfoundlanders that the government should give them what they want. Another possible explanation is that people are beginning to believe that the government should be totally responsible for the financing of education in this Province.

VII. SUMMARY

This chapter has provided a review of the programs and activities.

TABLE 5-11

WHO SHOULD PAY THE EXTRA COST FOR COMMUNITY USE

Group	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
School Board	2	2	0	0	2	2
People or group(s) using the school	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government	33	33	33	33	66	66
Combination of two or all of above	16	16	16	16	32	32
Total	51	51	49	49	100	100

N = 100.

which are presently being offered in the eight (8) schools of The Avalon North Integrated School District identified for in depth study. From the structured interviews conducted in the communities served by these schools, it was found that the programs and activities offered were more extensive than was indicated by principals in the province-wide questionnaire (Appendix A). Many factors were identified as militating against an accurate assessment. Such factors as the variation of participants from week to week and season to season, use by large groups of youth for dances, socials, and recreation purposes, and use during the summer for Opportunity for Youth programs, as well as community days sponsored by individual communities and their local council, were identified as making difficult a true and accurate assessment by any one individual.

Besides studying the programs and activities available in these schools, attempts were made to determine the individuals and groups supporting and opposing greater use by the community. Groups and individuals from within the community such as church groups, certain teachers and principals, service clubs, and so on were identified as supporting such use. From outside the communities, such groups as the School Board, the Department of Education, the Federal Government, and Affiliated Groups were identified as supporting the use of the school by the local community. These groups supported the use by using the school, offering financial help, giving donations to specific school programs, voluntary help, moral support, and offering advice and ideas.

Opposition occurred from only a few groups. From within communities, certain teachers and principals, and certain local education committees opposed extensive use of the school. Their opposition,

however, occurred because of frustration or fear of damage. The main outside groups identified by a small number of people as opposing the use of the school by the community was the School Board. It was felt that the Board feared that damage might occur and that the cost of this and the upkeep would be too great.

The problems encountered by these eight (8) schools were similar to those identified by most principals in the Province-wide questionnaire. However, the lack of storage space seemed to be the most pressing problem, not the cost or the lack of supervision, although these were still identified as problems.

The clientele generally indicated that they saw a need for an expanded program to help satisfy the needs of the community. The programs which seemed most popular were those which were geared to helping people make better use of their leisure time and improve their physical fitness. The clientele were also in agreement that any expanded program should be the financial responsibility of the Provincial Government.

From the survey conducted in the one community, women were identified as being participants in the after-school hours program to a greater extent than men. This was also the case with the clientele questioned in the eight (8) communities. The reason put forth for this was that there were more programs available which appealed to the females.

The citizens of the community studied also indicated agreement with the clientele when questioned as to why they participated in programs and activities after the regular school program was completed. The males in both groups felt that such participation would help them to be

better citizens. The females felt a desire to use their leisure time better.

In the community studied, respondents were asked why they did not participate in the after-hours program. Three main reasons were identified. First of all, people generally felt that they had little time. Secondly, they felt that there were no courses offered which interested them. And thirdly, people were apprehensive about continuing their education.

A fair amount of disagreement was seen to exist between the citizens questioned in one community and the clientele questioned in the eight (8) communities on the issue of how the school could be best used to help the people and their community. The citizens expressed a great desire for more training courses and upgrading for present jobs as well as more adult education classes. The clientele using the eight (8) schools were desirous of more physical fitness courses as well as general interest courses.

However, on the question of who should pay the extra cost of providing such programs the citizens and the clientele agreed that it should be the Provincial Government.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a brief summary of the purposes of the study, the procedures followed in conducting the research, a listing of findings and conclusions, and the author's recommendations based on the findings and conclusions presented. The final section contains certain recommendations for further study.

II. SUMMARY OF PURPOSES AND PROCEDURES

The general purpose of this study was to survey the community use of schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. More specifically, it focused on five aspects: policies, programs, personnel, problems, and prospects for future use. The following eight questions helped to focus on these aspects of the problem:

1. What policies have boards formulated concerning the community use of their educational facilities after the regular school program is completed?
2. What community education programs or activities were offered in the one hundred thirty-four (134) schools judged by principals to be used to a great extent?
3. What were the views of the principals of these schools regarding community use?

4. What specific community education programs and activities were available in the eight (8) schools chosen for detailed analysis?
5. What individuals and groups have promoted or opposed community use in the eight (8) communities studied?
6. What problems were being encountered in these eight (8) schools as a result of community use?
7. Who were the clientele making use of these schools and what were their views of the programs and activities offered in these schools over the past year?
8. What were the views of a sample of the public in a selected community concerning present and future use of the schools for educational, cultural and recreational purposes?

For purposes of organization, the study was divided into three phases. The first phase concentrated on the one hundred thirty-four (134) schools identified by their principals as being used to a great extent. This identification was made on a questionnaire (Appendix A) sent to all principals in the Province. From this questionnaire the views and opinions of principals regarding the policies formulated by their school boards were also obtained. Besides this, the questionnaire identified the problems which these principals felt existed as a result of their school being used by the community. The views and opinions of principals were compared to the actual policy statements of all the school boards in the Province, which were received from the superintendents, and the views of the superintendents as to what they perceived as the problems arising from the use of the schools by the public.

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was also used to identify the programs and activities offered in the one hundred thirty-four (134)

schools judged to be used to a great extent. Data pertaining to these programs and activities were analyzed by type of school, enrollment of school, and type of programs and activities offered. Information received from this questionnaire was tabulated by the computer.

Phase two of the study was more specific and concentrated on eight (8) schools in one school district — The Avalon North Integrated School District. A structured interview (Appendix B) was prepared to obtain more in depth information on the programs, activities and the problems encountered in the use of schools by the community. This structured interview was administered to: (1) the principal and/or the co-ordinator of after-hours programs in each of the eight (8) schools, and (2) other community leaders identified in each of the communities served.

Along with this, another questionnaire (Appendix E) was prepared and administered to a sample of clientele already using these schools. This clientele questionnaire was used to obtain information on the views of these people toward (1) the present use of the schools, and (2) what they felt could be done in the future to use the school to better serve the people and the community.

Phase three of the study was made even more specific. Here, a questionnaire (Appendix C) was prepared and administered to a random sample of citizens in one community to ascertain their views concerning community use. Information was obtained from the heads of households or their spouses concerning the use they made of the school after regular school hours and their views as to how the school could be better used to help them and their community.

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In attempting to answer question one it was found that most, approximately 60 percent, of the school districts had formulated policies related to the use of the schools by the public. These policies, however, varied in degree of comprehensiveness from one district to another. But in most policies, information on the following aspects was included to a lesser or a greater degree: procedures to follow in requesting use of the facilities, responsibilities of the users, fees charged, and use to be made of fees collected.

What seemed to be greatly lacking in a large number of school districts was a formalized or standard application form and a written agreement which could be signed by both parties.

The answer to question two showed that in schools judged to be used to a great extent in the Province, whether they were Roman Catholic or Integrated, four categories of programs or activities were most extensively patronized: Education, Religious, Recreation and Social. In some schools, one or two specific activities or programs seemed to dominate. This occurred in areas where either interest was generally high in these programs or where an individual or group was very active in promoting such programs or activities. Also interesting was the fact that some schools of specific sizes were really extensively used. This usually occurred in outports or in larger towns where other facilities were not available.

In answering question three, it was very obvious that the principals were not totally aware of the policies which their school boards had formulated concerning community use. On certain aspects of the

policy, principals seemed to be fairly knowledgeable, for example on the availability of an official contract and who is responsible for damages and injury. However, on issues such as who regulates the use of the school and when fees are charged and if they are fixed or varied there was less agreement.

Agreement did occur to a fair degree between principals and superintendents on the issue of problems resulting from community use. The main problems identified by these two groups were: (1) cost, (2) lack of supervision, and (3) lack of adequate cleaning personnel.

Answers to question four contained information related to the specific community programs and activities offered in the eight (8) schools identified for in depth study. Of the programs and activities offered in these schools, those categorized as Social, Religious, and Education were the ones most frequented by participants. When these eight (8) schools were visited, it was found that the programs offered were more extensive than was initially indicated on the questionnaire sent to principals (Appendix A). Several factors were identified as militating against the presentation of an accurate picture by any one individual, factors such as the increase in number of participants from week to week and from season to season; and use of the school by youth groups, recreation commissions and so on; and use for activities in which large numbers participated.

Question five dealt with support for and opposition to the use of the school by the public. Many groups from within the community were identified as supporting the use of the school in many ways, groups such as the actual participants, the local education committee, service clubs, women's associations, churches, teachers, and principals. Support took

the form of financial contributions, the provision of voluntary help, and proposals for new programs and activities.

From outside the community, the Provincial and Federal Governments, and affiliated groups such as the Lion's Club, the Women's Institute, and the Red Cross were identified as supporters. These groups demonstrated their support by financial contributions, by paying leaders and/or teachers, and by the giving of their time and ideas.

Very few groups were identified as opposing the use of the school. Some teachers and principals were concerned because of the lack of supervision and co-ordination and the interference with the regular school program. Also, certain board members expressed a concern for the possibility of damage occurring as a result of the use of the school by the community.

The answer to question six revealed the types of problems which the people interviewed in the eight (8) communities saw as existing as a result of the community use of the school. They indicated the lack of storage space as being a major problem. This was also a problem identified by a fair number of principals in the initial questionnaire sent to all principals in the Province. Besides this, the people interviewed indicated that the cost factor was another big problem; again agreement seemed to exist between these people and the principals and superintendents.

Another interesting aspect of this question was that in nearly every community other facilities existed but no attempt was being made or had ever been made to co-ordinate the use of all existing and available facilities by the communities. Also interesting was the fact that no community had ever attempted to conduct a needs study of its people

to determine their educational, cultural and recreational needs or a study of overall human and physical resources available to help meet these needs.

The information received from the clientele questionnaire (Appendix B) provided answers to question seven. The answers obtained here pointed out that females of all ages were participating in programs to a greater extent than were males. When asked their reason for participating, the females expressed a desire to spend their leisure time better, while the males felt that participation would help them be better citizens. However, on the types of programs which they felt should be offered, both male and female seemed to agree that physical fitness and general interest courses were the most needed. And when questioned on who should pay the extra cost for these expanded programs, both sexes were in total agreement that it should be the Provincial Government.

Question eight was answered from the data obtained from the citizen questionnaire (Appendix C). Again in this survey, females were identified as the greater participants. Also, the reasons given by the males and females of this community for participating were the same as those cited by the males and females of the clientele group. As for the people in this community who indicated that they were non-participants, three main reasons were given for non-participation. The largest group said that they had no time. The next group indicated that there were no courses offered that interested them. And the last group were apprehensive about continuing their education.

When asked about how the school could be better used to help them and their community, the largest group stated that there should be more upgrading and job-training courses, as well as more adult education

courses. However, these people, like the majority of the clientele in the eight (8) communities, felt that any extra cost for such programs should be borne by the Provincial Government.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. There is no doubt that many schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are used very extensively by the community. Some 23 percent of the total number of five hundred eighty-one (581) schools replying to the provincial questionnaire were judged to be used to a great extent, while another 38 percent were judged to be used to some extent. Only 10 percent, or fifty-seven (57) schools, were reported as not being used at all. Of those used extensively, major categories of use were Education, Recreation, Religious and Social.

2. The evidence gathered in this study strongly suggests that some school principals are either not fully aware of or do not fully understand the policies formulated by their respective school boards regarding the use of schools by the community.

3. Of the thirty-four (34) school districts in the Province contacted, only eighteen (18) had a written policy on the use of the school by the community. These written policies also varied greatly in their comprehensiveness.

4. The evidence gathered suggests that people are generally very favorable toward greater use of the school facilities. However, very few attempts have been made to co-ordinate the programs and facilities which exist in any of the communities studied. Some programs available were offered in a very haphazard manner.

5. From the information obtained in the clientele and citizen

questionnaire, it was clear that females were participating more than males. This, it was suggested, could be because of the many programs and activities which were offered for females.

6. There is evidence to suggest that the needs of many people are not being satisfied by present programs and activities.

7. Those questioned and interviewed believed that with more financial help from the Provincial Government, programs could be offered which would increase the benefits to the community and its people.

8. Many of the people interviewed during this study appeared to have widely different concepts concerning those programs and activities which should be included in a community education program.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study suggest that consideration should be given to the following courses of action:

1. School Boards who have not yet formalized policies related to the use of their schools by the public should immediately initiate the preparation of such policies.

2. School Boards who have formulated policies related to the use of the school by the public should review them with the express purpose of making them more detailed and comprehensive.

3. School Board policies on the use of the school by the public should contain rules and regulations covering the following aspects:

a) Written application form.

- b) Official signed contract.
- c) Procedures to follow when requesting the use of the facilities.
- d) Responsibilities of groups using the schools.
- e) Procedures to follow when aggrieved.
- f) Fees to be charged for all groups.
- g) Emergency exit procedures.

4. Each school board should initiate a study to determine the extent to which its schools are presently used, what programs are available, and what programs or activities could be offered with existing facilities. The findings of such a study should be communicated fully to the public.

5. The Provincial Government should encourage local municipalities and school districts to initiate need studies in their districts to determine the educational, cultural, and recreational needs and resources. This encouragement should be in the form of financial assistance and resource personnel.

6. Several communities in the Province, where the need studies have been conducted, should be chosen and community schools established using available facilities. These community schools would be pilot projects, operating for an initial period of three years. They should be financed by the Provincial Government.

7. The Department of Education should appoint a community education co-ordinator to promote community education and oversee the pilot projects.

8. A program for the preparation of community school educators should be developed at Memorial University's Faculty of Education. All teachers prepared at the University should be provided with a general

understanding of the philosophy of community education and the proposal for community schools.

9. School boards, Denominational Education Committees, and the Department of Education should give greater consideration to community use when planning new schools or extensions.

VI: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

It is felt that this study has presented a fairly accurate picture of the extent to which certain schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are utilized by the public. The study, however, has revealed some other areas where research should be conducted to make the picture even more precise. Research suggested by this study includes:

- (1) A study of areas which are not using their schools to a great extent.
- (2) A repetition of phase two of this study in several other school districts in the Province.
- (3) More in depth studies to determine the needs and resources in other communities in the Province which do and do not have facilities other than the school available for community education programs and activities.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Berridge, R. I. The Community Education Handbook. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973.
- Campbell, William G. Form and Style in Thesis Writing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974.
- Decker, Larry E. Foundations of Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.
- Fantini, M., Cittel, M. and Magat, R. Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970, (pp. 77-100).
- Fincham, R. N. Extended Use of School Facilities. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, School Plant Management Series OE-21035, 1962.
- Glass, V. G. and Stanley, J. C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970.
- Hickey, Howard W., Van Voorhees, C. and Associates (ed). The Role of the School in Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1969.
- Hienstra, Roger. The Educative Community: Linking the Community, School and Family. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972.
- LeTarte, E. Clyde and Minzey, Jack D. Community Education: From Program to Process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.
- Levin, H. Community Control of Schools. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1970.
- Manley, Frank J., Reed, Bernard W. and Burns, Robert K. The Community School in Action: The Flint Program. Chicago: Industrial Relations Center, Education-Industry Service, University of Chicago, 1961.
- Melby, E. Administering Community Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1955.
- Oddie, Guy. School Building Resources and Their Effective Use. Organization for Economic and Cultural Development, 1964.

- Olsen, E. G. School and Community. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1961.
- Olsen, E. G. (ed). The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective. New York: Macmillan Company, 1963.
- Poster, C. The School and Community. London: Macmillan Education Ltd., 1971.
- Seay, Maurice and Associates. Community Education: A Developing Concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1974.
- Sumption, Merle R. and Engstrom, Yvonne. School-Community Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Totten, Fred W. The Power of Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1970.
- Totten, Fred W. and Manley, Frank J. The Community School. Goleen, Michigan: Allied Education Council, 1969.
- Warren, P. J. Quality and Equality: In Secondary Education. St. John's, Newfoundland: Committee on Publications, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1973.
- Whitt, Robert L. The Community School Director. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1971.
- Whitt, Robert L. and Burden, Larry. The Community School Principal: New Horizons. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973.

B. PERIODICALS

- Anderson, Jackson M. "The Action Fronts in Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 160-62.
- Brokman, E. H. "The School as a Community Centre," Ontario Education, Vol. 2 (July-August), 24.
- Campbell, Clyde M. "Contributions of the Mott Foundation to the Community Education Movement," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 195-97.
- Chapman, S. L. G. "Community Use of Schools," Ontario Education, Vol. 4 (May-June, 1972), 32-36.
- Carmichael, Benjamin E. and Nardo, Nita. "Emerging Patterns in Community-Centered Schools," Childhood Education, Vol. 43 (February, 1967), 319-23.

- Carrillo, Tony S. and Heaton, Israel C. "Strategies for Establishing Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 165-67.
- Cowan, C. W. "Public Use of School Properties," American School Board Journal, Vol. 152 (April, 1966), 12.
- Dresher, Betty and Erlich, John L. "Citizen Involvement: Evaluation in the Revolution," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 173-75.
- Enns, F. "Perception in the Study of Administration," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 5 (March, 1966), 25.
- Heasell, E. M. "Not So Great Expectations," The Educational Courier, Vol. 45, No. 3 (January, 1975), 10.
- Heel, L. J. "How to Plan Your Schools for Community Use," American School Board Journal, Vol. 140 (February, 1960), 52-54.
- Herman, Barry E. "Winchester Community School: A Laboratory of Ideas," Educational Leadership, Vol. 25 (January, 1968), 341-44.
- Holland, J. E. "Non-School Use of Public School Property in Missouri," School and Community, Vol. 54 (November, 1967), 33.
- Johnson, Valerie Miner. "Bringing Schools and People Together," Saturday Night, Vol. 88, No. 22 (November, 1973), 25-27.
- Keleher, Alice V. "Community Schools," Childhood Education, Vol. 43 (February, 1967), 314-15.
- Kerensky, V. M. "Correcting Some Misconceptions about Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 158-59.
- Lynch, G. L. "Roles of Schools as Recreation Centres," American School and University, Vol. 38 (July, 1966), 33-34.
- Melby, Ernest O. "The Community Centered School," Childhood Education, Vol. 43 (February, 1967), 316-18.
- Miller, G. H. "School as a Community Centre," Ontario Education, Vol. 32 (July/August, 1970), 25-26.
- Minzey, Jack. "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 150-53.
- Molloy, Larry. "Community Schools, Share the Space and the Action," Nations Schools, Vol. 93, No. 3 (March, 1974), 29.
- Moore, Harold E. "Organizational and Administrative Problems and Practices," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 168-71.

Mulavka, E. J. "The School Belongs to the Whole Community," A. L. A. Magazine, Vol. 51 (March-April, 1971), 17-20.

Myers, Spenser W. and Totten, Fred W. "Role of the School in Community Development," The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 5 (1967), 132-42.

Paiken, Harry. "School is Everybody's Business," The Educational Courier, Vol. 45, No. 3 (January, 1975), 13.

Pappadakis, Nick and Totten, Fred W. "Financing the New Dimensions of Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 192-94.

Purdy, Leslie. "Serving the Community: Community Colleges and Community Schools - A Literature Review," Community Education Journal, Vol. 5, No. 1 (January-February, 1975), 13.

Ramsey, R. W. "A Community School - Without Special Funding," Community Education Journal, Vol. 4, No. 1 (January-February, 1974), 30.

Rist, R. G. "Community Use of Schools," Ontario Education, Vol. 4 (July-August, 1972), 20-24.

Stahl, L. "Community Use of Schools," Alberta School Trustees, Vol. 44 (April, 1971), 16-17.

"The Education Park in New York: Archtype of the School of the Future," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 50 (February, 1969), 331.

Thompson, L. N. "After-Hours Building Use," American School Board Journal, Vol. 154 (May, 1967), 36-37.

Totten, Fred W. "Community Education: The Feasible Reform," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November, 1972), 148-49.

Warren, P. J. "Community School: New Thrust in Education," The Evening Telegram (April 6, 1974), St. John's, Newfoundland.

Zalkind, Sheldon S. and Costello, Timothy W. "Perception: Some Recent Research and Implications for Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 7 (September, 1963), 218-35.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Allen, David. Relevance of Community Education in Contemporary Society, Provincial Community School Team Working Paper Number 2. Vancouver, British Columbia: British Columbia Trustee Association, July, 1973.

Allen, David. Schools: A Case for Community Education, Provincial Community School Team Working Paper Number 3. Vancouver, British Columbia: British Columbia Trustee Association, August, 1973.

Billard, George and Lowe, Martin. Study into the Community Schools at Prince Edward Island. St. John's, Newfoundland: The Extension Service of Memorial University, July, 1969.

Glendinning, Roland H. Report of the Community School Programs - 1972. Brockville, Ontario: Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education, 1972.

Government of Alberta. Share it! Share it! Share it! Some Approaches to the Joint Use of Community Facilities. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Department of Education and Culture; Youth and Recreation, 1972.

Government of New Brunswick. Report of the Committee on Community Use of School Facilities. Fredericton, New Brunswick: Department of Education, June, 1973.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. One Day Seminar on the Community Use of School Facilities. Gander, Newfoundland: Department of Education, 1974.

Government of Ontario. The Select Committee on the Utilization of Educational Facilities: Interim Report Number 1. Toronto, Ontario: Department of Education, June, 1973.

Smith, Roy. Continuing Education Survey '72'. Brockville, Ontario: Leeds and Grenville Board of Education, 1972.

Stevens, Jack. Introducing the Community School Concept, Provincial Community School Team Working Paper Number 1. Vancouver, British Columbia: British Columbia Trustee Association, October, 1973.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Benson, Ralph. "Community Utilization of Protestant Public School Facilities for Recreational Purposes in Metropolitan Montreal." Unpublished Master's thesis, McGill University, Montreal, 1968.

Boerrichter, G. C. "Techniques and Procedures by which Community Utilization of School Buildings Can be Achieved Without Interference With Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1960.

Covert, S. E. "An Appraisal of the Community Use of the School." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1958.

- Folk, Chris E. "A Program for the Charlotte-Mecklenberg Schools in Working With Organized Groups in the Community." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, Michigan, 1962.
- Hancock, Russell B. "An Investigation of the Community Schools Affiliated With the National Center for Community Education, Flint; Michigan U.S.A." Unpublished Master's internship report, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1974.
- McQuarrie, A. M. "Community Use of Selected Public Elementary Schools in the State of Washington." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1962.
- Mitchell, James E. "Administration and Utilization of School Facilities by School and Non-School Groups in Iowa." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 1968.
- Nolan, Brian F. "Community Use of School Facilities in a Selection of Newfoundland and Labrador Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1973.
- Parker, C. A. "Legality of the Use of Public School Facilities by Non-School Groups." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Drake University, 1965.
- Stichter, C. R. "School District Participation in Community Recreation Programs in California." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1961.
- Tulk, Reginald B. "Report on the Internship in the Community School Program of the Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education." Unpublished Master's internship report, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1974.

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTION LETTER
LETTER FROM THE DEPUTY MINISTER
QUESTIONNAIRE TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
FOLLOW UP LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS
FOLLOW UP LETTER TO PRINCIPALS
LIST OF GROUPS AND ACTIVITIES AS CLASSIFIED
BY BROAD CATEGORY

September 16, 1974

Dear

We have heard a great deal recently about community use of school facilities. While schools in many parts of Newfoundland have long been used as community centers, it seems appropriate now to focus directly on this issue and gather data concerning such use. More specifically, we need up-to-date information concerning (a) the school facilities available for community use, (b) the extent to which the available facilities are used by community groups and organizations, (c) the problems that school boards and schools are experiencing in this regard, (d) the policies that have been developed to govern such use, and (e) the views of educational groups regarding the future use of school facilities in Newfoundland by non-school groups.

I have undertaken to conduct such a study, with the full cooperation and support of officials of the Department of Education, the Denominational Education Committees, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and the Federation of School Boards. I need your support as well. Would you kindly send me a copy of any policies that your board has developed about community use and any data you have collected describing such use. I would also appreciate your encouraging school principals to complete the questionnaire that will be distributed shortly.

I shall be contacting you again before this study has been completed to solicit your views concerning certain specific matters related to this topic.

I thank you for your help.

Yours sincerely,

P. J. Warren

November 25, 1974

Dear Principal,

-As you know, there has been an increasing interest in the community use of school facilities in the province in the last two or three years. Last spring the Department arranged a meeting of representatives from School Boards, Municipal Authorities, and a number of community groups interested in the matter. One of the recommendations arising from that meeting called for more study and research of the problem before any general guidelines or policies could be formulated.

Dr. P. J. Warren of Memorial University is presently conducting a study in this area, and it represents an excellent follow-up to our spring meeting. We at the Department are pleased, therefore, to participate in this study and we encourage you to become involved by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Dr. Warren would very much appreciate your answering as many questions as possible and returning the questionnaire in the envelope provided.

We appreciate your cooperation in this important matter.

Yours sincerely,

C. Roebathan,
Deputy Minister

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

— ON THE
COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

PURPOSE: This study will attempt to determine:

- (a) the extent of present community use of school facilities;
- (b) the administrative policies regulating community use of school facilities.
- (c) the feasibility of extending or introducing use of school facilities to the community.
- (d) the problems encountered or anticipated by extending use to interested groups.

DEFINITIONS: In this questionnaire community use is defined as use by persons or groups in the community for functions considered to be outside the normal school day.

Facilities are considered to be all the buildings, equipment, and property classified as belonging to the school.

INSTRUCTIONS: It is important that you answer as many questions as possible. Most questions may be answered with a check mark (✓). After some questions, a space is provided for any comments you may wish to make. Please mail the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible.

This study has the support of officials of the Department of Education, the Denominational Education Committees, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and the Federation of School Boards. Superintendents have also offered full co-operation.

Thank you for your help.

P. J. Warren
Faculty of Education
Memorial University

Name of School Board: _____

Name of School: _____

Address of School: _____

Type of School: Elementary or primary _____ 1.
 All-grade _____ 2.
 Junior High _____ 3.
 Central High _____ 4.
 Regional High _____ 5.
 Other _____ 6.

Enrollment of School: _____
 1 - 99 pupils _____ 1.
 100 - 299 " _____ 2.
 300 - 499 " _____ 3.
 500 - 699 " _____ 4.
 700 - 999 " _____ 5.
 1000 plus " _____ 6.

1. Is your school used by individuals or groups in the community for functions outside the normal school day?

Yes, a great deal _____ 1.
 Yes, to some extent _____ 2.
 Yes, but very little _____ 3.
 No, not at all _____ 4.

2. Which of the following facilities do you have in your school and which ones are used by the community?

	Have	Is/Are Used
Gymnasium	_____ 1.	_____ 1.
Gymnasium equipment	_____ 2.	_____ 2.
Classrooms	_____ 3.	_____ 3.
Cafeteria	_____ 4.	_____ 4.
Library	_____ 5.	_____ 5.
Music Room	_____ 6.	_____ 6.
Art Room	_____ 7.	_____ 7.
Industrial Arts Room	_____ 8.	_____ 8.
Home Economics Room	_____ 9.	_____ 9.
Please specify others below:	_____ 10.	_____ 10.
_____	_____ 11.	_____ 11.

3. Is your school used regularly by the people of the community during the following:

Evenings	Yes	_____ 1.	No	_____ 1.
Saturdays	Yes	_____ 2.	No	_____ 2.
Sundays	Yes	_____ 3.	No	_____ 3.
Summer Vacation	Yes	_____ 4.	No	_____ 4.

4. Please name the persons or groups using your school after school hours and indicate (a) the number of persons generally involved, (b) the number of uses per year for each group, and (c) the average number of hours per use for each group. For example: Girl Guides - 30 per use - 35 uses per year - 3 hours per use. (Please include use for religious, recreational, social, cultural, educational, financial, and political activities.)

Group	Average Number of Persons Involved Per Use	Approx. Number of Uses Per Year	Approx. Number of Hours Per Use
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

5. Have you received a statement from the school board outlining its policy on the after-school use of school facilities?

Yes, written	_____ 1.
Yes, verbal	_____ 2.
No	_____ 3.

6. Is the community use of your school regulated by:

- (a) the school principal? _____ 1.
 (b) a district or local committee? _____ 2.
 (c) a school board employee at the central office? _____ 3.
 (d) the school board? _____ 4.
 (e) other? _____ 5.

7. How do community groups make application to use school facilities?

- Standard application form _____ 1.
 Other written form _____ 2.
 Orally _____ 3.
 Please specify other ways below: _____ 4.
 _____ 5.

8. Do you have an official contract with is signed by those intending to use school facilities?

Yes _____ 1. No _____ 2.

9. Is the group using your school after normal school hours responsible for:

- (a) cleaning of facilities that have been used? Yes _____ 1. No _____ 1.
 (b) restoring facilities that have been used to their original order? Yes _____ 2. No _____ 2.
 (c) no policy on these matters _____ 3.

10. Who is responsible for damages or injuries incurred during use of your school?

- School Board _____ 1.
 Individual school _____ 2.
 Group using the school _____ 3.
 Usually decided by mutual agreement _____ 4.
 Please specify others below: _____ 5.
 _____ 6.
 No policy on this matter _____ 7.

11. Must community use of school facilities be supervised by an employee or designate of the school or school board?

Yes _____ 1.
 No _____ 2.
 No policy on this matter _____ 3.

12. Indicate who has the responsibility for opening and closing the building when it is used after normal school hours.

Member of group using facility _____ 1.
 Custodian or janitor _____ 2.
 Teacher or principal _____ 3.
 Designated person _____ 4.
 Please specify other persons below: _____ 5.
 _____ 6.
 No policy on this matter _____ 7.

13. When the school is used by community groups, smoking is:

permitted only in designated areas _____ 1.
 not permitted _____ 2.
 permitted if the group is mature _____ 3.
 always permitted _____ 4.
 No policy on this matter _____ 5.

14. When the school is used by community groups, alcohol is:

permitted only in designated areas _____ 1.
 not permitted _____ 2.
 permitted if the group is mature _____ 3.
 always permitted _____ 4.
 No policy on this matter _____ 5.

15. Do you charge rent for community use of your school?

Yes, always _____ 1.
 No _____ 2.
 Sometimes _____ 3.

If "sometimes," please specify the groups charged and those not charged

16. If you charge a fee, is it fixed or variable?

Fixed _____ 1.
 Variable _____ 2.

If the fee is variable, please indicate the factors that are used to determine the fee _____

17. Check the statement(s) which indicates the use made of the money collected from rentals of school facilities.

To pay personnel	_____ 1.
To pay cost of utilities	_____ 2.
To improve school facilities	_____ 3.
Added to school district funds	_____ 4.
Added to school funds	_____ 5.
To cover costs of possible damage	_____ 6.
Other (please specify): _____	_____ 7.

18. Was consideration given to possible community use of school facilities in the planning of your school building?

Yes _____ 1. No _____ 2.

If "yes," please explain _____

19. If your school is used by the community, please indicate by a check mark the main problems which have occurred.

Prohibitive costs	_____ 1.
Lack of adequate supervision	_____ 2.
Interference with normal school operation	_____ 3.
Damage to facilities or fear of vandalism	_____ 4.
Lack of storage space	_____ 5.
Lack of appropriate equipment	_____ 6.
Lack of personnel to perform extra cleaning	_____ 7.
Please specify other problems below: _____	_____ 8.
_____	_____ 9.

20. Which of the above problems do you feel is the major one? Indicate your answer by placing the number of the appropriate response in the blank in the space to the right. _____ 1.

Comments, if any _____

21. Are there facilities other than the school in the community which could be used to meet community needs?

Yes _____ 1. No _____ 2.

If "yes," please specify _____

22. Do you believe that your school should be open to the community for use after normal school hours?

Yes _____ 1. No _____ 2.

Comments, if any _____

23. Are there increasing requests being made by members of the community to have the school available for use after normal school hours?

Yes _____ 1. No _____ 2.

Comments, if any _____

24. If the school is not now available, would the people of your community use the school, if they were given the opportunity?

Yes _____ 1. No _____ 2.

Comments, if any _____

25. If the school is not available for use after normal school hours, is it possible to make it available under present circumstances?

Yes _____ 1. No _____ 2.

Comments, if any _____

26. Are there persons or groups who object to having the school open after normal school hours for community use?

In the school concerned	Yes _____ 1.	No _____ 2.
On the School Board	Yes _____ 1.	No _____ 2.
In the community	Yes _____ 1.	No _____ 2.

Comments, if any _____

27. Any additional comments? _____

THANK YOU

January 9, 1975

Dear

Thank you very much for your recent letter providing information concerning community use of schools in your district. That information will be most helpful to me in my study.

I am pleased to report that nearly sixty percent of the principals of the Province have already returned questionnaires. Very shortly, I shall be sending a follow-up to those who have not as yet had an opportunity to reply. I would very much appreciate it if you would encourage any such principals in your district to complete the questionnaire at their earliest convenience.

May I add that preliminary results indicate that many schools are used very extensively by the community.

Best wishes for 1975.

Yours sincerely,

P. J. Warren

January 13, 1975

Dear Principal:

This letter is a follow-up to the questionnaire gathering data on the community use of school facilities in the Province.

I am pleased to report that nearly sixty percent of the questionnaires have already been returned. If you have submitted yours, please accept my sincere thanks. If you have not as yet had the opportunity to respond, I would very much appreciate it if you would do so at an early date.

A second questionnaire is enclosed for your convenience. May I add that I would like to have your views on certain matters in the questionnaire even if your school is not used at all by the community.

Best wishes for 1975.

Yours sincerely,

P. J. Warren

LIST OF GROUPS AND ACTIVITIES AS CLASSIFIED
BY BROAD CATEGORY

RELIGIOUS YOUTH

Cubs
Boy Scouts
Girls Auxiliary
Rangers
Junior Miss
S.A.Y.G.
Junior Explorers
S. A. Sunday School
Girl Guides
Brownies
C.L.B.
Tyros
Junior Auxiliary
C.Y.C. Drop-in
Crusaders
Sigma C.
Rovers
Seneca

CULTURAL

Drama Club
Variety Concerts
Bands
Music School
Ballet Dancing
M.U.N. Glee Club
Arts and Crafts
Performing Arts Council
Drama Groups
Town Choir
Glee Club

RELIGIOUS ADULT

Men's Service
Church group
S. A. Men's Club
Church Services
A.C.W.A.
Ba'hai
U.C.W.
Pentecostal Church
Jehovah Witness Convention
Church Vestry
Choir Practice
Board of Stewards
Holy Name Society
St. Anne's Society
Knights of Columbus
Ladies Altar
R. C. Men's Society
Liturgy Committee
U. C. Trustees
Anglican Church Council
Holy Cross Association
A.O.T.S.
Ladies Auxiliary
S.U.F.
Ladies Aid

FINANCIAL

B.I.N.G.O.
Church Society Sales
Fund Raising Committee
Adult Income Tax

SOCIAL

Tops
 Civic Holiday Committee
 Wedding Receptions
 Ad Hoc Groups
 Youth Groups
 Teen Age Dances
 Lion's Club
 Women's Institute
 Ski Club
 Weight Watchers
 Women's Association
 Movies
 Boy's Club
 Red Cross
 A. A.
 Diabetic Association

EDUCATION

Sewing Classes
 4-H
 Sea Cadets
 Adult Education Classes
 M.U.N. Credit Courses
 M.U.N. Non-Credit Courses
 M.U.N. Summer School
 Adult Handicraft
 P.T.A.
 Local Education Committee
 Air Cadets
 Vocational School Student Council
 E.T.V. (M.U.N.)
 A. Y.
 Guitar Lessons
 Typing Classes

RECREATION

Broomball
 Hockey League
 Recreation Commission
 Floor Hockey
 Athletic Association
 Vocational School Sports
 Teachers Sports
 Karate
 Church Physical Fitness
 Bowling
 Rifle Range
 Sports Tournaments
 Wheel Chair Association
 Parks and Recreation
 Dart League

POLITICAL

Union Meetings
 Political Meetings
 Development Association
 Town Council
 Public Meetings
 Improvement Committee
 Council Public Meetings

EDUCATION (cont.)

St. John Ambulance
 French Conversation
 School Board
 Education Seminars
 Navy League
 N.T.A.
 Driver Education

APPENDIX B

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW/
CLIENTELE QUESTIONNAIRE

LIST OF GROUPS USING THE EIGHT (8) SCHOOLS
IDENTIFIED FOR IN DEPTH STUDY

LIST OF GROUPS, THE LEADERS AND CLIENTELE WHO
PARTICIPATED IN PHASE TWO OF THE STUDY

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

This interview will gather information concerning community use of school facilities in selected schools operated by The Avalon North Integrated School Board. Community use is defined as use by persons or groups in the community for functions considered to be outside the normal school day and voluntary in nature.

A. COMMUNITY PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

1. Does your school have a history of community use?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments, if any _____

2. For what purpose(s) was the school used by the community in earlier years?

3. For what purpose(s) is the school now being used after regular school hours?

GROUP	NATURE OF PROGRAM OR ACTIVITY	BY WHOM PROGRAM INITIATED	APPROX. NO. OF USES THIS YEAR	APPROX. NO. OF HOURS PER USE	AVERAGE NO. OF PERSONS PER USE

4. Are there community groups who requested use of the school facilities during the past year but were refused?

Yes _____ No _____

Which ones and why? _____

B. SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION

5. What individual(s) or group(s), if any, from within the community support greater community use of the school facilities?

Individual or Group	Type of Support

6. What individual(s) or group(s), if any, from outside the community support greater community use of the school facilities?

Individual or Group	Type of Support

7. What individual(s) or group(s), if any, from within the community oppose greater community use of the school facilities?

Individual or group

Type of opposition

8. What individual(s) or group(s), if any, from outside the community oppose greater community use of the school facilities?

Individual or group

Type of opposition

C. PROBLEMS

9. Do you have an estimate of the extra cost incurred this past year as a result of community use of the schools?

Yes _____ No _____

Amount: Salaries _____
 Maintenance _____
 Other _____

Comments, if any _____

10. To what extent has increased cost been a problem as a result of school use after the regular school hours?

1. Large extent _____
 2. Some extent _____
 3. Very little extent _____
 4. Not at all _____

Comments, if any _____

11. Has any attempt been made to obtain financial help from the community specifically for this purpose?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments, if any _____

12. Do you have a person who is responsible for supervising the school during community use?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments, if any _____

13. To what extent is inadequate supervision a problem resulting from use of the school by the community?

1. Large extent _____
2. Some extent _____
3. Very little extent _____
4. Not at all _____

Comments, if any _____

14. To what extent is lack of storage a problem resulting from use of the school by the community?

1. Large extent _____
2. Some extent _____
3. Very little extent _____
4. Not at all _____

Comments, if any _____

15. To what extent is a lack of adequate teaching personnel a problem preventing community use of the school?

1. Large extent _____
2. Some extent _____
3. Very little extent _____
4. Not at all _____

Comments, if any _____

16. To what extent is parking a problem resulting from use of the school by the community?

1. Large extent _____
2. Some extent _____
3. Very little extent _____
4. Not at all _____

Comments, if any _____

17. To what extent is vandalism, both inside and outside of the school, a problem as a result of community use?

1. Large extent _____
 2. Some extent _____
 3. Very little extent _____
 4. Not at all _____

Comments, if any _____

D. OTHER QUESTIONS

18. Are there other facilities available in the community for community use?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments, if any _____

19. Has any attempt been made to co-ordinate the program of the school with that of other agencies or institutions in the community?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments, if any _____

20. Are programs or activities offered in other community facilities similar to those being offered in the school?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments, if any _____

21. Has the regular school program made greater use of the community resources as a result of greater use of the school by the community?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments, if any _____

22. Has any survey of educational, social, and recreational needs of the community been conducted?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments, if any _____

CLIENTELE QUESTIONNAIRE

COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

As part of a study of community use of school facilities in Newfoundland, I am gathering data concerning the people now using the school after regular school hours. Would you please complete as many of the questions presented below as you can. I very much appreciate your help.

William Lee

1. Sex: (a) Male _____ (b) Female _____
2. Age: (a) Under 15 _____ (e) 40-49 _____
 (b) 15-19 _____ (f) 50-59 _____
 (c) 20-29 _____ (g) 60 and over _____
 (d) 30-39 _____
3. What is your current employment status?
 (a) Still attending day school _____
 (b) Attending a post-secondary institution _____
 (c) Working full-time (include housewife) _____
 (d) Working part-time _____
 (e) Unemployed _____
 (f) Other (retired, etc.) _____
4. What is your present occupation? (if working)
 (a) Housewife _____
 (b) Managerial or administration _____
 (c) Teacher _____
 (d) Other professional (engineer, lawyer, nurse, etc.) _____
 (e) Technician or semi-professional _____
 (f) Secretarial or clerical _____
 (g) Maintenance, repairs, and other servicing _____
 (h) Labourers (include farmers, fishermen) _____
 (i) Others _____

5. What was the highest level of formal education you completed?

- (a) Some elementary school _____
- (b) Completed elementary school _____
- (c) Some high school _____
- (d) Completed high school _____
- (e) Some university or college (Vocational School, College of Trades, Fisheries College, etc.) _____
- (f) University or college diploma or certificate _____
- (g) University degree(s) _____

6. Please describe the educational programs or activities that you are now involved in at the school.

7. What is the main reason for participating in the above programs or activities?

- (a) Will help my career/vocational development _____
 - (b) Will help me to achieve another educational level (i.e. grade level, etc.) _____
 - (c) Will help me spend my leisure time better _____
 - (d) Will help my physical health _____
 - (e) Will help me to be a better citizen _____
 - (f) Other (please specify): _____
- _____

8. How adequate do you believe the present adult education program is to serve the community needs?

- (a) Very adequate _____
- (b) Adequate _____
- (c) Inadequate _____

9. How can the school be better used after the regular school hours to help you, your family, and your community? By offering:

- (a) Adult education classes _____
 - (b) Training courses and upgrading for your present job _____
 - (c) General interest courses (e.g., art, music, dance, sewing, etc.) _____
 - (d) Physical fitness courses _____
 - (e) Specify others: _____
- _____

10. Who in your opinion should pay the extra cost involved with the use of the school by the community?

(a) The School Board

(b) The people or group(s) using the school

(c) The Government

(d) Please specify others:

GROUPS USING THE EIGHT (8) SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED
FOR IN DEPTH STUDY

A.C.A.A.

SEA CADETS

JUNIOR AUXILIARY

GIRL GUIDES

BOY SCOUTS

A.C.W.A.

SUNDAY SCHOOL

CHURCH SERVICE AND MEETINGS

U.C.W.

WOMEN'S INSTITUTE

RED CROSS

4-H CLUB

POLITICAL MEETINGS

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

LION'S CLUB

ADULT EDUCATION CLASSES

TOWN COUNCIL

RECREATION COMMISSION

DART LEAGUE

SOFT-BALL ASSOCIATION

B.I.N.G.O.

CUBS

HI-C

LEO CLUB

C.G.I.T.

SIGMA C.

TYROS

EXPLORERS

HOCKEY TEAMS

SCHOOL DANCES

BROWNIES

BASKETBALL LEAGUE

P.T.A.

THE LEADERS OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS WERE INTERVIEWED AND
THE PARTICIPANTS OF THESE GROUPS WERE ALSO ASKED TO
FILL OUT THE CLIENTELE QUESTIONNAIRE

BASKETBALL LEAGUE

ADULT EDUCATION CLASSES

4-H CLUB

WOMEN'S INSTITUTE

C.G.I.T.

RECREATION COMMISSION

TYROS

U.C.W.

GIRL GUIDES, BROWNIES

BOY SCOUTS, CUBS, VENTURES

A.C.W.A.

RED CROSS

BOY'S AND GIRL'S CLUB

DART LEAGUE

P.T.A.

SEA CADETS

JUNIOR AUXILIARY

SEWING CLASSES

LEO CLUB

GIRL'S CLUB

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR SPOUSE

QUESTIONNAIRE TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD
OR SPOUSE

PURPOSE

TO DETERMINE THE NEED FOR A COMMUNITY EDUCATION
PROGRAM IN A SELECTED COMMUNITY ENCOMPASSED BY
THE AVALON NORTH INTEGRATED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

Dear Sir/Madam:

In some parts of Newfoundland, schools are being used after regular school hours for a wide variety of adult and community activities. I have undertaken a study of how a selection of schools are being used and the views of citizens concerning such use. I need your help. Would you please complete the attached questionnaire and place it in the envelope provided. Your name is not required and therefore your views will be confidential.

Thank you very much for your help.

William C. Lee

Direction: Please check the appropriate blank(s).

1. Sex: (a) Male _____ (b) Female _____
2. Age: (a) Under 20 _____ (d) 40-49 _____
 (b) 20-29 _____ (e) 50-59 _____
 (c) 30-39 _____ (f) 60 and over _____
3. Marital Status:
 (a) Married _____ (b) Single _____ (c) Other _____
4. Number of members living in this household:
 (Include husband, wife, children, other relatives) _____
5. What is your current employment status?
 (a) Working full-time (including housewife) _____
 (b) Working part-time _____
 (c) Unemployed _____
 (d) Other (retired, etc.) _____
6. What is your present occupation?
 (a) Housewife _____
 (b) Managerial or administration _____
 (c) Teacher _____
 (d) Other professional (engineer, lawyer, etc.) _____
 (e) Technician or semi-professional (registered nurse, civil technology) _____
 (f) Secretarial or clerical _____
 (g) Maintenance, repairs, and other servicing _____
 (h) Labourers, (include farmers, fishermen) _____
 (i) Others _____
7. What was the highest level of formal education you completed?
 (a) Some elementary school _____
 (b) Completed elementary school _____
 (c) Some high school _____
 (d) Completed high school _____
 (e) Some university or college (Vocational school, College of Trades, Fisheries College, etc.) _____
 (f) University or college diploma or certificate _____
 (g) University degree(s) _____

8. In the period, September 30th, 1974 to the present, did you participate in any activity at the school? (e.g. attend adult education classes, sewing classes, physical education activities, etc.)

Yes _____ No _____

9. If yes, what were the activities?

10. If yes, what was the main reason for participating in a course or activity?

- (a) Will help my career/vocational development _____
- (b) Will help me to achieve another educational level (i.e. grade level, etc.) _____
- (c) Will help me spend my leisure time better _____
- (d) Will help my physical health _____
- (e) Will help me to be a better citizen _____
- (f) Other, please specify: _____
- _____
- _____

11. If you did not participate, what was the main reason?

- (a) I did not have the time _____
- (b) There were no courses or activities offered that interested me _____
- (c) I could not afford the cost of the courses or activities _____
- (d) I have been dissatisfied in previous attempts at furthering my education _____
- (e) I have not taken a course for so long that I would hesitate about continuing my education at this point _____
- (f) I did not know that courses were being offered or who was offering them _____

12. Please fill in the following chart related to other members of your family participating in programs or activities at the school.

Individual,
(Father, Son,
Mother, etc.)

Occupation
of Individual

Activity or
Program

13. How adequate do you believe the present adult education program is to serve the community needs?

- (a) Very adequate _____
(b) Adequate _____
(c) Inadequate _____

14. How can the school be better used after the regular school hours to help you, your family and your community? (Check one or more)
By offering:

- (a) Adult education classes _____
(b) Training courses and upgrading for your present job _____
(c) General interest courses (e.g. art, music, dance, sewing, etc.) _____
(d) Physical fitness courses _____
(e) Specify others: _____

15. Who in your opinion should pay the extra cost involved with the use of the school by the community?

- (a) The School Board _____
(b) The people or group(s) using the school _____
(c) The Government _____
(d) Please specify others: _____



