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ABSTRACT

It was the purpose of this study to determine the nature of the policies governing community use of school facilities for recreational purposes in a selected sample of communities; and, further, to identify the problems relating thereto. The sample was composed of four urban communities situated in "the lower mainland area of British Columbia". All were within a twenty-mile radius of the University of British Columbia campus. The communities themselves were Coquitlam, North Vancouver, Richmond, and Vancouver as defined by their respective school district boundaries.

The required data were obtained as a result of interviews conducted with both education and community recreation personnel. In addition, copies of the actual written policy statements of the respective school boards were acquired.

The relevant data for each community were separately analyzed, classified, and discussed on the basis of ten principal topics. These were: philosophies held; obstacles encountered in implementing or promoting community use; administrative methods used; use of written policies; facilities used and restrictions or priorities therein involved; supervision; liability; financial aspects; and a summary of progress attained to date as well as proposed plans for the future.

Interviews were also conducted with the officials of several provincial organizations having possible interest,
or influence, in the problem area. These interviews indicated a general consensus of agreement with the policies presently in effect in the sample communities.

The results of the study indicated that a number of factors were hampering the attainment of an optimal degree of community use of school facilities for recreational purposes. These factors were evidenced in various restrictions and limitations incorporated into the school boards' policies. One of the most important factors was the lack of communication evident between educators and recreators. This was based primarily on the failure of educators to recognize both the place of recreation in today's society, and its relationships with education. Additional factors were: (1) the need for increased provincial financial aid; (2) the need for more reciprocal sharing of available community educational and recreational facilities; and (3) a need for a broader basis than local experience only from which to derive school board policies in this area.

Progress towards the solution of these problems was evident in all four communities. There was, nevertheless, also evidence that plans, for future community use of school facilities for recreational purposes, would continue to be relatively limited and narrow in scope. This was particularly true when such plans were viewed with anticipated future community needs and desires in recreation in mind.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There is a growing recognition that we are entering an "age of leisure", and that for the first time in history such leisure belongs to the masses and not just to a privileged few (1,2). Fifty years ago the employment of leisure was no problem for any but the well-to-do, who mostly wasted it (3).

This anticipated increase in leisure time as a result of both technological and social change, suggests that in the future a greater amount of time will be devoted to both education and recreation. It is possible that our present concepts of suitable areas for recreation in particular will become obsolete (4). The provision of suitable recreation areas will undoubtedly require the optimal use of all available facilities. The maximum use of public school facilities would seem to be one possible way of providing at least a portion of the required areas.

When one considers that both school facilities and community recreation programmes are financed by the taxpayers, it seems reasonable to assume that efforts should be made to obtain optimal value in each area. Would not the utilization of otherwise idle school facilities, for community recreation purposes, seem an appropriate goal to be strived for? The attainment of such a goal will necessarily be governed by the policies of the two organizations most directly involved, namely the school board and the community recreation authority.
It was the purpose of this study to investigate policies governing community use of school facilities for recreational purposes. More specifically, the objectives of the investigation were twofold: to determine the policies presently in force in the four communities of Coquitlam, North Vancouver, Richmond and Vancouver; and to identify and comment on problems pertaining thereto.

It is hypothesized that some variations in policy will be evident and that these will basically be attributable to differences in philosophies within the individual communities.

Definitions of Terms Used

(1) **School** — A public school which is a subsisting school established and maintained under the provisions of the Province of British Columbia's "Public Schools Act" of 1958.

(2) **School Board** — The trustees elected or appointed under the "Public Schools Act" for each school district, who determine local policy in conformity with the Act for the effective and efficient operation of the schools in the school district.

(3) **Recreation** — Any activity which: (a) is not consciously performed for the sake of any reward beyond itself, (b) is usually engaged in during leisure, (c) offers man an outlet for his physical, mental, or creative powers, and (d) is engaged in
because of inner desire and not because of outer compulsion. In short, recreation is any form of experience or activity in which an individual engages from choice because of the personal enjoyment and satisfaction it brings directly to him (5).

(4) **Community Recreation** - Organized recreation services in a given locality which derive their financial support from public and/or voluntary funds (6,7).

(5) **Recreation Board, Commission or Department** - The agency, supported by public funds, which provides community recreation services.

**Delimitations**

(1) The selected communities were Coquitlam, North Vancouver, Richmond, and Vancouver (see Appendix A).

(2) All four communities were urban population centres ranging from 41,000 to 389,000 in total population and their boundaries were based upon those of the particular school districts involved as outlined in Appendix A.

(3) The choice of communities was based upon their public reputations with regard to community use of their school facilities for recreational purposes. The results obtained were therefore specific to this biased sample, and it is not possible to generalize to other communities.
(4) No endeavours were made to assess the manner in which the policies investigated were actually being implemented in the communities.

(5) No attempt was made to propose solutions or alternative methods of operation, as it was felt that such a procedure would more logically be the subject of a further study.
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CHAPTER II

JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

It has long been argued that increased means and leisure would be the two main civilizers of man. Science, technology, and free education in our democratic society are now bringing these ever more to the fore. Whether or not man will thereby be more civilized is dependent upon what he chooses to do with his leisure (1).

In a democracy one can exercise choice in the use of leisure. There are, however, many forces in our society today which are pressing to propagandize, coerce, and cajole man to sell his free time for trivialities. Such forces appear to be more powerful than those encouraging the thought that leisure is the freedom of opportunity for the enrichment of life, and consequently of society (2).

Jay B. Nash has written:

"On all sides there are glaring indications that, given leisure, man will become a listener, a watcher, or sitter. He will become a victim of spectatoritis, a blanket description to cover all kinds of passive amusement entered into merely to escape boredom" (3).

The problem of the use of leisure time has been one of concern to many throughout the ages. Aristotle (4) advised that people must be educated to "use leisure rightly". As early as 1910 educators in the United States had listed the "worthy use of leisure time" as one of the cardinal principles of education (5). Indeed, it has been postulated that cultures
are largely conditioned by man's use of leisure time. During leisure, ideas are formulated about government and social orders, family associations, personal needs, purposes for existence, and our relationships to the universe (6).

These dire warnings about the evils of "spectatoritis" are reported to have been silenced in the United States by a transition from a watching to a doing population. Although attendance has increased at certain spectator amusements such as football and basketball, it has not increased in the same proportion as the upsurge in individual recreation and do-it-yourself activities (7).

This increase in leisure activities will put a growing burden on available facilities. Up to the present, the patterns of development of leisure programmes and facilities have been based upon a plentiful supply of land and other resources in North America. Thus many separate programmes and duplicate facilities have emerged. While the future may be based on much wealth, it is apparent that land will become scarcer as the population increases. In turn, the many demands of individuals will compete with the social service demands for financial support. Large urban communities will require much more in space and facilities than before. Under these conditions it seems unlikely that any community can afford to have several recreation centres, each operated by different agencies serving a select few, and idle much of the time (8).
Chase (9) has raised the long-range question of whether or not we are capable of developing a culture that does not depend upon work to give meaning to our lives. This is a question education must also face. Practically everyone will need training to live with a degree of leisure previously unknown to any human culture. Man is not by nature a loafing organism. Without something to engage his mind and muscle he rapidly degenerates. Indeed, automation, after its introductory period, may well mean more leisure than the human organism is by nature able to tolerate (10).

The solution of problems related to leisure can be assisted to the greatest extent in many communities by education in general, and the public schools in particular. More and more the schools belong to all the people. They have become the central nerve and blood supply for the cultural, aesthetic, social, physical, and civic growth of individuals and groups (11).

There is an increasing interest being displayed by parents, and other citizens, in the role of the school today. Some evidence of this, in the form of elicited comments, was reported by McKeag (12). One comment, repeated with great frequency, was that greater utilization should be made of school facilities for the provision of educational, social, and cultural experiences for children, youth, and adults.

The attitude that school property is a community resource to be used by the people whenever it is not required for
school purposes, is becoming more generally accepted by both school authorities (13) and an enlightened public (14). School facilities needed for the school curriculum are also needed for the community recreation programme. They serve this dual purpose when school authorities make them available for the recreational use of young people and adults outside regular school hours (15).

Dr. K. F. Argue, of the Faculty of Education, The University of British Columbia, has stated that we must give up the idea, strongly vested with tradition, that schools are for children only and must be vacated and locked every night at 4 o'clock.

"Present practices of operating schools for children only and community halls for adults only would be merely a harmless whim of school boards and municipal councils were it not that these particular separate according to age level, rather than integrate a community and lead to one of the worst kinds of social stratification. When youth and maturity become segregated on a large scale, as they did perhaps in pre-war Germany, everyone loses thereby. Nor, apparently, can our communities afford to build two sets of public buildings, one for children and the other for adults. In all too many Canadian towns youths are denied the auditorium, gymnasium, music, dramatics, and library facilities they need, while these very facilities lie idle most of the time in some distant corner of the town. Unfortunately, the converse is also true. The school's reference library, its projection machine, its facilities for gatherings, its facilities for considering social and economic problems, its equipment for studying manual arts, homemaking, dramatics, and the fine arts, are denied to adults apparently because these facilities are located in the schoolhouse and that traditionally has been reserved for children" (16).
In the United States, the President's Council on Physical Fitness has commenced a campaign in 1967 aimed at promoting a wider use of school facilities for recreational purposes. The slogan "Don't Fence Me Out" is being used in advertisements in an effort to get the public to "... help (their) school officials open recreation areas nights, weekends and during the summer (because) nobody else will" (17).

It has been said (18) that school facilities do not come strictly within the purview of community recreation, as the primary function of the schools is to provide general academic and vocational training. However, both physical education and recreation have long been recognized as an indispensable part of this function. The location, development, and use of school facilities are therefore of major public interest and concern. Thus one of the roles of the school in recreation is making its facilities available for community use (19). Needless to say, the taxpayers need little reminding that they are the ones who are paying for both public services - education and recreation.

In the long run it is less costly to use the schools as public community centres. The school, which is usually convenient to the centre of the neighbourhood it serves, is increasingly being looked upon to provide the facilities which are needed for the planning and conduct of activities important to neighbourhood living (20,21). In this respect the Community Chest and Welfare Council of Greater Vancouver stated twenty years ago that "... the schools of Vancouver and adjacent
municipalities are inevitably headed in this direction" (22). By making its facilities and areas available to local agencies the school more fully attains its position as an educational institution interested in the over-all welfare of the community (23). McKeag (24) has pointed out that the school is the logical centre of community life. It has many fine facilities including an auditorium, gymnasium, library, shops, social rooms etc., with which to serve the community. It is the one institution which has the power to draw all persons regardless of racial, ethnic, or religious backgrounds, into a common experience of community enrichment.

Yukić (25) recently stated that since the inception of the organized community recreation movement, it has been recognized that the schools are better distributed over an entire community than are any other types of recreation facilities. In turn, the vital dependency of community recreation programmes upon the schools for functional uses has been proven. "Nearly every major guide on recreation facility planning in the last several decades has explicitly recommended that the school site be included in the neighbourhood, community, city-wide or district recreation supply or plans" (26).

The need for studies being made of the opportunities already available in specific areas, when attempting to furnish a particular type of recreation, has been advocated by The Athletic Institute (27). Several other authorities have also recommended that an inventory should be made of the resources
a community offers in the way of areas and facilities that could contribute to proposed recreation programmes (28,29,30). The possibility of future changes in the demands for recreational space points in particular to the necessity for continuous research and observation in the area of facility usage (31).

This study is an endeavour to obtain factual information regarding the current policies governing community use of school facilities for recreational purposes in four urban communities. It is hoped that further light will be shed upon the manner in which this problem is being approached as a result of the study's findings and conclusions. The problem is of particular interest as, to the writer's knowledge, no similar survey has been reported in British Columbia or Western Canada.
REFERENCES


2. Loc.cit.


5. Loc.cit.


10. Loc.cit.


15. International City Manager's Association, Municipal Recreation Administration, Chicago, Brock and Lankin, 1945, p. 22.


29. McDonald, *loc. cit.*


CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An extensive review of the available literature has revealed a vast number of articles, books, and reports relating to the use of school facilities for community recreation purposes. Those selected for this review encompass the past twenty years and are primarily related, wherever possible, to Canada and the western areas of the United States.

Philosophy of Use. The primary concern of all governmental agencies in the social service field could be described as "public need". It is therefore essential that the public schools, and all other appropriate governmental agencies, be linked in a creative effort to provide the highest level of community recreation service at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer (1). Rodney (2) stressed that cooperation between local government and school districts must be effected. Such cooperation he maintained could be the medium through which cooperative action in the planning of facilities, programmes, and operating policies might be determined. The acquisition and development of both park and school areas, the recreational facilities of the future, by park and school boards will require such cooperation to the fullest possible degree (3,4). Recent reports by planning boards and commissions in Pendleton, Oregon (5), and Richmond, British Columbia (6), have outlined the need for cooperation involving municipal officials in addition to school and park boards. Indeed, it has been pointed out that few, if any, cities will ever be able to provide a
complete and functional leisure-related programme without solid and continuing cooperation from the public schools (7).

Hjelte (8) and Miller (9) both reported an increasing movement towards the wider use of schools in terms of both time and type of activity. Ostrander (10) suggested that boards of education should give greater consideration to community recreation needs. Meyer and Brightbill (11), and Fitzgerald (12) listed one of the major functions of the school, with respect to leisure and recreation, as being the making available of school areas and facilities for community recreation use. This was also the recommendation of the International City Manager's Association (13) which noted that the facilities needed for the school curriculum were also needed for the community recreation programme. According to the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (14):

"The school authorities should recognize their responsibility in light of their avowed educational principles and objectives. The long existing controversy between the school and other community recreation agencies over such factors as the use of school facilities and conflicting program schedules can be eliminated through cooperative efforts of both groups".

Several writers (15,16,17) have provided illustrations of benefit-wise and dollar-wise savings that have resulted from the optimum use of school facilities for community activities. Amazing savings in building, heating, supervision, and maintenance costs are reported possible if multiple-use is
planned for from the beginning (18). In Roanoke, Virginia, both the school and department of parks and recreation administrators were made aware that, in the final analysis, they were both responsible to the taxpayers (19). Not only are facilities expensive, but the tax dollar is limited. "The maximum benefit from each dollar that goes into facilities must be obtained by thinking in terms of buildings designed for multiple use for most of the day and evening hours, Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, and vacation periods" (20). Rodney (21) stressed the fact that school areas and facilities represent a major capital investment and that present-day needs point to the urgency of using and planning such facilities for community recreation purposes. Indeed, as Kraus (22) wrote, the school authorities undoubtedly control the most useful sites, buildings, and special recreation facilities available in most communities. The maximum use of school facilities and other existing community resources will yield the maximum returns to the taxpayer's or philanthropist's dollars, and also might decrease the expensive duplication of physical developments (23).

Nord (24) cited improved relationships between local groups and school personnel as a result of the use of school facilities for community recreation purposes. Soso (25) also noted that schools can in this way aid a community to really be a community. By making its facilities and areas available to local agencies, the school more fully attains its position as an educational institution interested in the over-all welfare of the community (26).
History of Community Use. The American Association of School Administrators, and the Educational Policies Commission, have long advocated that public school properties should be kept open for public use during the after-school hours (27). The actual use of schools for community recreation began in the United States near the close of the nineteenth century. In the 1890's there was a generally negative attitude, on the part of most educators, towards such use. Regardless of this some progress was made. By 1900 several states had passed general legislation permitting schools to be used as civic or social centers - but such use was meagre and sporadic. As the "play movement" gained momentum, the attitude of educators began to change. In 1898 several New York city schools were opened for evening recreation programmes. By 1907, twenty-six of these schools were in use. In that year the movement towards such use received perhaps its greatest impetus when Rochester, New York, appropriated money to establish a "school-centre". This was an attempt to establish a civic centre in a school for the purposes of encouraging better citizenship and training for democracy. This action stimulated other cities to make wider use of their schools. Some states then passed legislation which in effect declared that the schools were civic centres. In 1911, Wisconsin passed legislation authorizing educational authorities to levy a tax for community recreation purposes. Milwaukee then established its school recreation-centre programme which has since become nationally known (28).
Rodney (29) has summarized the factors influencing the movement towards the use of the schools for community recreation. The evident economy of full-time use rather than the duplication of facilities was a prime factor. World War I, which brought about the use of schools for community service, established a pattern since generally followed. The National Education Association's adoption, in 1918, of "worthy use of leisure time" as one of the seven cardinal principles of education, indicated a change in educators' thinking. This broader thinking was continued by an increasing emphasis on the development of the child, and the stressing of the need for the school to develop extracurricular activities. In turn, the trend towards urban living and changing family patterns placed more responsibility upon the school for the supervision of both the child and recreation. Finally, there was the gradual acceptance of the need for "education for leisure", and the belief that individual maturity could only be achieved by giving attention to the individual's leisure and recreational needs.

Hjelte and Shivers (30) have reported recently that, since 1900, all states have passed legislation permitting school buildings and grounds to be utilized for cultural, educational, recreational, civic, and - in some instances - religious and political activities. They note that legislative enactments of this kind have generally inferred that the school board might assume no more responsibility than to tolerate such uses under
regulatory provisions. Some did, however, authorize the assumption of more complete responsibility for the promotion, organization, and supervision of recreational activities on school premises. Virtually all of these acts provided that recreational uses must not interfere with the primary educational purposes of the schools.

Several distinct historical steps in recreation's endeavours to gain the use of school property have been outlined by Fitzgerald (31). The first of these was the period of original requests by municipal recreation departments for the use of school facilities. At that time limited use was allowed by school boards in order to test the reliability of municipally employed leadership. The second step was the use of school faculty personnel as paid leaders, or supervisors, of the programmes conducted on school properties. The drawing up of written agreements between school boards and community recreation authorities followed. This invariably led to the payment of compensation to school custodians for additional work resulting from community use of schools. Next came the interpretation to the school board of its responsibilities regarding community use of its facilities. Following this was the inclusion of school board representatives on community recreation boards. The final step has customarily been the joint planning of school building programmes by school boards and community recreation agencies.

In Ontario the problem of shared facilities became
evident in the early years of community recreation. Barbour (32) reported that it was only through constant effort on the part of recreation personnel that school boards finally opened their school doors for community use after school hours.

**Obstacles Encountered.** Numerous obstacles may be encountered during attempts to utilize school facilities for community recreation purposes. Argue (33) wrote twenty years ago that we must give up the idea, strongly vested with tradition, that the schools are for children only and must be vacated and locked every night at 4 o'clock. A survey completed in Vancouver at about that same time, outlined the Vancouver school board's operation of school playgrounds. Such facilities were not then being continuously operated during holiday periods as they were throughout the school year. It was stated that even then no rigid rule was in order that the schools should be used only by children regularly enrolled in school (34).

Hutchins (35) stated that school buildings were often so designed that it might in fact be physically difficult to use them for the purposes of community recreation. Rodney (36) also pointed out that most school buildings were indeed not planned so that a portion of the plant could be used separately. One immediate problem arising out of this was the costs involved in heating an entire structure. Even when practicable use could be made of a school plant, the resultant wear and tear was cited by Whitcomb (37) as a possible deterrent to school officials.
Problems which have often arisen as a result of agencies other than the school using school facilities were documented by Ostrander (38) as recurring sources of "headaches". Butler (39) referred to the problems of fixing responsibility, and the difficulties presented by dual use of facilities such as locker rooms, as having hindered the wider use of schools in many communities. Hutchin's study (40) of 105 communities in 32 states, pointed up the fact that many types of school facilities were available despite possible "headaches", if recreational departments only had the necessary personnel. This conclusion was also reached by a 1945 Vancouver Community Chest survey which stated that schools were not being used to the optimal degree, partly because of the fact that community groups had not learned how to use them effectively (41).

Kraus (42) has listed some additional problems as presenting obstacles to effective use. These included scheduling difficulties, time limitations, cancellations, supervision, vandalism, maintenance, excessively high charges, and a lack of cooperation on the part of school administrators and/or custodians.

The overcoming of the above mentioned obstacles can be facilitated by the cooperation of all concerned (43,44). Hutchin's study (45) concluded that a mutual desire to cooperate, an understanding of common objectives, and an effort to cultivate good personal relationships on the part of both school and recreation personnel were the factors which contributed most
to cooperation. Patience, friendliness, and diplomacy also proved of value in reaching acceptable solutions. Greater rapport between school and park boards was recommended as desirable in the Vancouver survey noted above (46).

A report dealing with the parks and schools of Richmond, B.C., indicated a need for close cooperation between the reeve, and municipal council, which controlled the recreation department, and the school board (47). Wiltse (48) has suggested that one should begin slowly, have written approval for all intended use, and watch for difficulties as they arise so that solutions may be arrived at as soon as possible.

The reluctance of the schools, and other agencies, to throw off the restraining hand of tradition has led to much confusion and a considerable lag in the acceptance of the feasibility of asking for community use of the schools. The American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation recently reported that, even today, the professional people most directly involved were still being trained in the past, not for the future. Indeed, the imagination, creativity, and selflessness so essential for cooperation in this area were regarded as being of rare occurrence among individuals in any society (49).

Administrative Methods. Similar administrative methods used to facilitate community use of school facilities for recreation have been reported as occurring in widely divergent
communities (50,51,52,53). Hutchins (54) reported that as an administrative device for cooperation, one-half of the cities in his study had a school board member on the recreation board. In addition, joint meetings between school and recreation staff members were held, school personnel were assigned to the recreation staff, and a joint administrative body supervised both school and recreation programmes. A similar form of interlocking administration has been used in Milwaukee where the director of the department of municipal recreation was an assistant to the superintendent of schools and responsible solely to him (55). A Wisconsin state law also stipulated that the Milwaukee school board could cooperate with any other municipal board or commission that had facilities usable for recreation. Under this arrangement the school board was to provide the instruction and supervision, while the outside board furnished the facilities. Public parks were used for athletics and playground activities while the swimming pools, under the jurisdiction of the board of public works, were used for swimming and aquatic meets (56).

Dallas, Texas, was reported to have had a recreation programme jointly sponsored by both the school system and the parks department. The programme was jointly headed by the coordinator of school physical education, health instruction and recreation, and the city recreation director (57). Corbin (58) reported that New York City has divided the control of public recreation services between the board of education and the department of parks.
The American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation suggested that a community recreation council might be the medium through which greater inter-agency cooperation could be realized; "... the school should be a participating member of the recreation council and should assist in every way possible to promote further the recreational aspirations of the various agencies responsible for the programme" (59). Communities which have achieved true partnerships between various agencies include Chicago; Cleveland; Flint, Michigan; Newark, New Jersey; Rochester, New York; Madison, Wisconsin; Fresno, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Pasadena, Richmond, and San Francisco, California (60).

Barbour (61) recommended that if a recreation association or commission was formed in an Ontario community, then the board of education should be represented on it. In addition, school teachers should be asked to act as consultants on recreation advisory committees or boards.

**Written Policies.** It has generally been agreed that some form of written policy should be in effect (62,63,64). Written policies have been reported to be in effect in numerous communities (65,66,67).

Legislation at the state level which permits community use of schools has been endorsed by Ezell (68). An example of this was the California Civic Centre Act of 1913, and its subsequent amendments. This Act provided that each school should
be a civic centre in which citizens might engage in supervised recreational activities (69).

Despite the many recommendations in favour of written policies, some communities have successfully operated recreation programmes utilizing school facilities without any such provisions. Reading, Pennsylvania, has developed such a programme over a period of twenty-nine years (70). The form of policy in effect was reported to vary greatly in Colorado, but in general to be governed by state provisions which did not require written agreements to be in effect (71).

Facilities Used. Nearly every type of school facility has been, and is being, utilized for varying periods and amounts of time. Hutchins' study (72) revealed that all types of indoor facilities were being used, with gymnasiums, auditoriums, and their attendant service rooms being utilized most frequently. Numerous studies have indicated that virtually no facility has been excluded from use (73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80). Other facilities suited to community needs are the shop, kitchen, home economics room, multi-purpose room, arts and crafts room, music room, classroom, swimming pool, and a full range of outdoor play areas (81, 82, 83).

The use of the above facilities was reported as taking place after school hours, in the evenings, during weekends, and in the summer months. The actual period of use varied widely but in general was dependent upon the design of the school plant
itself. Two Vancouver reports published in the 1940's noted that there was a need for auditoriums, gymnasiums, and meeting rooms in the city's schools. It was stressed in both reports that these areas should be so located that they could be used freely during hours when the schools were not regularly in session, and without opening up the entire school plant (84,85). Barbour has recently reemphasized this point (86).

Butler (87) and Rodney (88) were of the opinion that most school buildings were not in fact designed for dual use, and thus gave rise to problems when school buildings were utilized for community recreation purposes. Butler did note, however, that these problems were not insurmountable. Corbin (89) wrote that modern school construction plans now often called for the placement of suitable facilities in a separate wing of the school plant thus simplifying their use by the community.

In no instance has it been reported that a recreation programme was permitted to take precedence over that of the school. All recreation programmes were reported as occurring after school session time requirements had been met (90,91,92, 93,94,95,96,97,98,99). The American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (100) stated that "without question", regularly scheduled classes and traditionally school-sponsored programmes should receive priority in the use of school facilities. However, once these needs have been met, the remaining time should then be scheduled as equitably as possible
among community groups seeking the use of school facilities.

It has recently been reported that the Vancouver park board had proposed the undertaking of a community recreation programme in cooperation with the Vancouver School Board. The proposal called for "making school buildings, gymnasium and auditoriums available for public recreation and for new facilities to be constructed so that community use can be made of them" (101).

**Supervision.** Proper supervision of recreation programmes utilizing school facilities has been a recurring problem (102). Carlson (103) suggested that good leadership was an essential requirement for the successful operation of recreation programmes. Trained leaders have been provided by both recreation departments and school boards (104,105,106). The National Recreation Association has stated that recreation supervisors are responsible for the proper care of the school facilities they utilize (107). This has, in some cases, been best accomplished by using school staff members, such as librarians, in the recreation programme. Fitzgerald (108) has listed the use of school personnel, as paid leaders or supervisors, as being one of several distinct historical steps in the use of school property.

Butler (109) wrote that one reason for the construction of special recreation buildings has been that the use of full-time, trained leadership, has proven more satisfactory than
part-time leaders employed on an interrupted basis. Because of the afternoon and evening programmes involved, the majority of leaders have tended to be part-time leaders. Nevertheless, recreation programmes should be in the charge of well-qualified and professionally-prepared recreation personnel. The American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (11) has advocated that leaders should be sought who know how to work with children and adults, and who have sound viewpoints concerning the value of leisure education.

Custodians. One problem periodically encountered has been the involvement of school custodial staffs in community use of school facilities (111). It has been recommended that written policies governing both custodial responsibilities, and compensation for extra services, be formulated (112,113,114). Soso (115) felt that the custodian's job might be important to the success of a recreation programme, and he should thus be kept well informed about the community's use of school facilities. The Community Chest and Welfare Council of Greater Vancouver also recommended some years ago that (116):

"... in standardizing the responsibilities of custodial employees of schools, it is desirable that duties related to community use of schools shall be an integral part of the assigned and accepted job, and not regarded as an appendage of questionable standing. Cultivate an hospitable attitude in the schools toward the "outside" groups which use them so that the latter may feel more at home when using school facilities".
Liability. Carlson (117) has suggested that one factor which could aid in the successful use of school facilities was an insistence, on the part of the users, on leaving the former in as good, if not better, condition than it was found in. Nevertheless, the problem of damages still arises at times (118). An example is the use of drama, craft, or art rooms. Such use has raised problems as to the care and use of tools and equipment, storage of materials, and the protection of articles in the process of construction (119).

This problem has been overcome, in many instances, by an insistence upon written policies stating who is to pay for what (120). In Richmond, Virginia, damages related to a special activity were paid for by the organization in charge at the time. All other damages not directly attributable to a particular programme were paid for by the department responsible for the area in use. This might be either the school or park board (121).

A director of the Milwaukee recreation department has been quoted as saying, with respect to damages to school facilities:

"Sure a few windows may be broken because of playground activities, but would fewer be broken if the area were unsupervised? As for wear and tear on buildings, some of our schools have been in use continuously for recreational purposes for thirty years or more and show no appreciable signs of deterioration resulting specifically from the recreational programs" (122).
Finances. Provision of the finances required to cover the expenses resulting from community use of school facilities has been reported as being derived from several sources. The use of a special tax in the states of California, Michigan, and Wisconsin has proven useful in this respect (123,124,125). The sharing of costs by both school board and recreation department has often been utilized (126,127,128,129). Butler stated that a small addition to the school budget, for operating it as an indoor recreation centre, added greatly to the service rendered by the school plant. He wrote: "In one city it was found that by adding only $10,000 for community recreation to the school budget of $500,000, the total use of the school plant was increased 30 per cent" (130). Brown (131) has reported that, in Victoria, B.C., the school board was providing recreational swimming lessons at their own expense. The Vancouver school board agreed, in July, 1966, to support a park board application, then before the city council, for $10,000 in order to begin a project to open schools as after-hours recreation centres (132).

The use of fees as a source of finances was believed by Kraus (133) to be a possible source of friction. A Vancouver survey reported that, at one time, the schools had in fact been allowing outside groups to use their premises for nominal charges (134). Barbour (135) has suggested, with particular reference to Ontario, that recreation commissions should be permitted to use school facilities at special low rental rates. Indeed, he asserted that rental rates should not be allowed to
become barriers to the operation of worthwhile recreational activities. Grieder (136) has cited incidents of use where rental fees were used to cover only the major portions of involved costs. The balance required was paid by the school board, and these practices had worked very satisfactorily.
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CHAPTER IV

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

The four communities selected for study, namely, Coquitlam, North Vancouver, Richmond, and Vancouver were all of an urban nature. They were all centered within a twenty-mile radius of the University of British Columbia campus. Their respective geographical locations and populations are described in Appendix A.

The choice of these four communities was based upon their generally accepted public reputations with respect to the problem being investigated (1). Coquitlam enjoyed a reputation of having attained a high degree of cooperation between its recreation department and board of school trustees. North Vancouver, including both City and District, was reportedly just beginning to utilize its available school facilities. Richmond was reputed to have a history of cooperative planning for both schools and parks which was promoting the attainment of optimal benefits from both (2). Finally, Vancouver, the largest urban centre of population in British Columbia, was chosen not only because of its size but also because there appeared to be no available consensus of opinion as to what its policy actually involved.

It was postulated that this study of the above communities, with each reportedly having achieved varying degrees of success in the promotion of community use of school facilities, would nevertheless reveal that their governing policies would be very similar in nature.
Descriptive Survey. The research method utilized was that of a descriptive survey. This involved both personal interviews and the analysis of relevant documents. Interviewees (see Appendix B) were selected on the basis of both their relationship with either the concerned school boards or recreation departments, and their direct involvement with the problem being investigated. The list of interviewees was initially drawn up in consultation with the writer's thesis committee (3). The relevant documents were to be acquired from the concerned school boards, and this was done during the process of a number of particular interviews. These documents are discussed in Chapter V, and can be referred to (in an edited form) in Appendix D.

Interviews. The interview method employed required both preliminary research and some practical interviewing experience prior to the commencement of the actual interviews. As a result of interviews with faculty members of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, The University of British Columbia (4), a number of reference texts dealing with the techniques of interviewing were obtained and studied (5). The major purpose of the interviews was to obtain accurate information so that the obtained written policies could be more clearly and adequately interpreted. In addition, it was postulated that ideas and opinions regarding future changes and/or improvements in policies might also be elicited.

The interview itself has been described as a unique method of research in that it involves the collection of data
through direct verbal interaction between individuals (6). Because interviewing takes place between human beings, who are much too individualized to be reduced to a formula, it has proven impossible to enumerate a complete list of infallible rules for all interviewing, or even for any one particular type of interview (7).

Although it was not possible to obtain a set of rules to serve as a guide in the development of the required interviews, it was possible to follow a general basic pattern. It was known, however, that the well-contrived interview should not be dull, dreary, too talky, aimless or vague, but should have one or two dramatic high points, a summary to tie up loose ends, and a natural and reasonable ending (8). This knowledge provided a basis for interview design.

The form of interview adopted was of an unstructured nature utilizing open-ended questions. A structured interview allows for no deviation from standardized procedures. This is assured by the use of an interview schedule which is essentially an abbreviated questionnaire, and which is often planned to the last detail. The unstructured interview uses a more conversational approach. This allows the interviewee greater freedom in discussing any aspect of the topic which is of significance to him. An interview guide, consisting of a number of open-ended questions was used. The questions (see Appendix C) were prepared on the basis of information derived from the sub-problems as outlined in the "Review of the Literature".
The type of questions selected had to be either of an open or closed nature. The closed form of question would have required the interviewee to select his reply from a series of preassigned categories, with his selection being the best approximation of his own position. The open form of question simply established the topics for the interviewee, and left him to structure his answers as he saw fit.

This latter form was chosen as being the most appropriate for several reasons. Firstly, it was anticipated that the prospective interviewees, because of their particular administrative positions, would have a high degree of knowledge and/or information about the topic, and that this could best be elicited in their own words. Secondly it was reasoned that the interviewees would have previously so thought through the topic that their ideas and opinions would already be well formulated. Thirdly, it was anticipated that all interviewees would encounter little, if any, difficulty in being motivated to communicate and in actually communicating their knowledge on the topic. This anticipation proved to be justified during the interviews, and had been based on two preliminary interviews (9). Finally, the writer's information regarding the interviewees themselves, that is their professional positions held and general areas of responsibility, indicated that open-ended questions would be the most suitable type to use (10).

It has been said that the wording of the questions themselves if often of less importance than the manner and tone
of voice in which they are put (11). Nevertheless, the accepted theories appear to indicate that it is usually best to proceed from the general to the specific (12). This "funnel" sequence was followed when deriving the questions used. One of the major purposes of this sequence was to prevent earlier questions from conditioning or biasing later responses (13). Realization that the sequence of questions might do much to influence the success of the interviews also led to consideration of the following. There was a necessity for: (1) providing an introductory phase to the interview; (2) making easy and reasonable transitions from one topic to another, and (3) formulating an appropriate conclusion.

The problem of recording information obtained during interviews was met by note-taking in as unobtrusive a manner as possible. Although there was some question as to the advisability of the interviewer's attention being distracted when dynamic material was forthcoming, note-taking was considered desirable in order to preclude misrepresentation due to memory failures (14). Note-taking was effected through the use of a clip-board held on the interviewer's knees. In no case were any notations made without prior consent of the interviewee having been sought and obtained.

These research interviews, like other measurement techniques, had both great value and unique advantages. However, they also possessed many possibilities for inaccuracies (15). The primary sources of inaccuracy were anticipated to be
subjectivity and bias. Psychological factors such as the content of the interview, initial perceptions of the person's attributes, or his behaviour, could be potentially biasing. An awareness of these factors, plus the utilization of the advantage of great adaptability which allowed for the following-up of leads so as to obtain more data and greater clarity, was used in endeavouring to produce maximum accuracies during the interviews.

The very validity of the interview appeared to be directly proportional to the competence of the interviewer (16). The writer endeavoured to raise his personal competence to an acceptable level by attempting to avoid the mistakes often made by graduate students utilizing the research interview method. These mistakes include inadequate planning of the interview, failure to develop practise interviews, using language not understood by the interviewers, and asking for information that the interviewee cannot be expected to have (17).

A lack of specific, formal preparation in interviewing techniques on the writer's part was not considered an insurmountable obstacle. This conclusion was substantiated to some degree by Fenalson's remarks (13). He stated that for such an interviewer, an attitude of friendliness compounded of warmth and acceptance is a sound and safe approach. This approach tends to insure that the necessary objectivity will be attained, and retained, throughout an interview. "Objectivity is the capacity to regard a situation or event without personal emotional involvement; it is self-discipline which enables one to withhold
and restrain one's own emotional reactions while viewing the predicament of another" (19).

Other Canadian Communities. In addition to the review of literature, a small survey of school board policies governing community use of school facilities for recreational purposes in Canadian communities outside of British Columbia, was undertaken. As a result, some indications as to policies presently in effect across Canada as a whole were obtained. A total of eighteen urban school boards, in all ten provinces, were contacted by mail. Selection was on the basis of the community concerned being a provincial capital, a large urban centre, or being located in the western provinces. In all, seventeen school boards responded to the initial request (see Appendix E). The following chapter presents a summary of these replies.
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POLICIES IN SELECTED CANADIAN COMMUNITIES

The policies of the sixteen responding school boards (see Appendix H) are summarized and analyzed in Table 1. Of the eleven policies which could be dated, nine were found to have been established since 1961 thus indicating the relative recency of their adoption. Nine school boards indicated that they possessed a definite philosophy governing the development of their policies. All but one required that their policies in general be written, and more specifically that each agency using school facilities enter into a written agreement with the school board.

A majority of boards stipulated the purposes for which the facilities were to be used. These were varied in nature, and included educational, cultural, recreational, patriotic, and philanthropic purposes. Several policies stressed that facilities were not to be made available where personal gain was involved.

All boards but one placed various restrictions upon the manner in which their facilities were to be used. The most often named restrictions involved smoking, alcoholic beverages, games of chance, proper footwear in areas such as gymnasiums, and leaving involved areas in reasonable condition after use.

Only one board had established a definite schedule for priority of use among potential users of its facilities. Although several policies made concessions to various
### TABLE I

**ANALYSIS OF POLICIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Policy Date</th>
<th>Phil. Stated</th>
<th>Written Policy</th>
<th>Facilities Restricted</th>
<th>Super. Req.</th>
<th>Cust. Req.</th>
<th>Liability Coverage</th>
<th>Rates Reduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal (Catholic)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal (Protestant)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etobicoke</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North York</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Signifies no information or no requirement

Y Signifies "yes"
organizations in other ways, it was evident that the assignment of facilities was generally based upon the chronological order of receipt of applications. In all policies the needs of the school were given first priority. These needs, in many cases, could supersede an outside organization's previously allocated use.

The actual facilities and equipment available for use were, in all but five policies, also restricted in some manner. These restrictions included not only no use of certain rooms but also of such expendable equipment as balls, nets and racquets. Nevertheless, the total range of useable facilities covered every conceivable area. In general, it was apparent that no one area, or type of equipment, had been banned from use by a majority of the boards.

All policies but two included clauses specifying that the organization, or group, using the facilities must provide supervision. In the majority of policies this was required in the form of the attendance of an adult. One policy required only that "responsible persons" be in charge. Only three required evidence of specific competencies on the part of these supervisors. Thus, the majority required no specific qualifications other than age and "responsibility" as evidence of supervisory capabilities.

The cost of custodial services was either included in the rental fees charged, charged for separately, or charged
for on the basis of involved overtime only. In eight policies, the duties of custodial staff with respect to such use of school facilities were referred to in some detail. In particular, several policies stressed the role of the custodian as being of importance in the successful use of the schools outside regular school hours by the community.

Only two policies did not include comprehensive clauses outlining the user's responsibility for public liability coverage and/or damages to facilities used. In no policy was there any indication given that a school board would accept responsibility in this area.

Of the sixteen policies reviewed, only one offered all facilities free of charge. However, even this board made a charge for required custodial services. Four boards gave no concessions to any community organizations, while eleven boards did offer free use or reduced rates to certain organizations.

In conclusion, the policies analyzed indicated general agreement as to the manner in which school boards were prepared to allow their facilities to be used by community groups. Although the groups referred to in these policies were not solely of a community recreational nature, the majority did fall into this general category. Generalizations can not be made with reference to other similar communities as a result of this sample. Nevertheless, it does indicate that these particular school boards were willing, with some reservations,
to allow at least limited community use of their school facilities for recreational purposes.
CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

The following analysis of data is based upon information received as the result of personal interviews with representatives of both school boards and recreation departments in each of the four communities surveyed. These interviews (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17) were essentially used to elicit more detailed information so as to clarify, or elaborate upon, the various written policy statements obtained from the school boards (see Appendices C, D, E, F). These policies have also been incorporated into the analysis. No attempts have been made to cite the exact sources of each statement. Only general indications as to the original source(s) have been noted.

I. COQUITLAM

Philosophy. The "Policy Statement-Regulations" (see Appendix C) dated May 27, 1964, did not contain a statement of philosophy as such. A philosophy regarding such use was, however, expressed by the school board's representatives. It was stated that the schools should aid the community by being made available for recreational as well as educational purposes. This recommendation would be aided by a refusal to look upon schools as being for daytime use only. The recreation director also decried the "education only" attitude towards school facilities. Recreation was seen as very much of an educational requirement and thus was a justifiable part of the
school programme. Both organizations stressed that great care should be taken, on the part of those granted such use, to ensure that all programmes were run on a high level. There should also be a reciprocal arrangement for allowing schools to use other community facilities for their programmes.

Obstacles Encountered. Several obstacles were encountered by both educators and recreators in their endeavours to promote community use of school facilities for recreational purposes. The school authorities were concerned with costs involved with respect to light, heat, maintenance, and custodial services. This problem was resolved by the school board's absorption of all but custodial service costs. However, custodian's duty hours had also been so scheduled that a staff member was normally in attendance during any community use of the schools. Costs thus no longer present a serious obstacle.

A second obstacle had been an area of conflict between the local recreation and adult education departments. This conflict involved the courses, or programmes, offered by both departments. At one time the adult education department was offering fitness and recreation programmes in the evening, while similar programmes were also being offered by the recreation department. At the suggestion of the school authorities the two departments met and reached agreement as to which courses should, and would, be offered by each. This proved to be a workable solution to the problem. Thirdly, there was the question as to which community organizations, in addition
to the recreation department, should be allowed access to the schools. This problem was resolved by directing all enquiries from such groups to the recreation department which took over the scheduling of community activities in available school facilities. Three groups, namely the Cubs, Boy Scouts, and Girl Guides, were, however, dealt with directly by the school board.

The final problem, which had not to date been adequately resolved, involved the administrative problems of after-school-hours use. Optimal use during these periods was considered, by the school officials, to require the same form of administrative organization as that provided during the day. It was noted that this would require additional staff, plus a larger degree of flexibility on the part of school administrators if community desires for use were to be adequately met.

The major obstacle encountered by the recreation department was in its endeavours to assure the school board that it could provide proper supervision during its programmes. The most appropriate way in which this could be achieved was by attempting to develop a recreation programme of such a calibre that school officials would be unable to differentiate between it and regular school programmes in this respect. This goal was achieved by the provision of part-time supervisors paid by the recreation department for all of its programmes utilizing school facilities.

**Administrative Methods.** The form of organization serving to promote community use of school facilities had been a parks
and Recreation Commission which operated as a committee of the Municipality of Coquitlam Council. This commission also served as an Intermunicipal Coordinating Committee for the cities of Port Coquitlam and Port Moody. The commission, as such, had no legal authority to enter into contracts, and thus served only as a guiding influence upon the decisions of the council. The recreation director was employed directly by the council, and also by the cities of Port Coquitlam and Port Moody. The latter two had entered into an agreement with the Municipality for his services. This agreement was formulated so as to enable all three communities to combine their individual Provincial recreation grants and thus utilize them more efficiently. The Intermunicipal Coordinating Committee had, as one of its main purposes, undertaken to investigate the value of setting up a Regional Parks and Recreation Commission which would serve all three communities as a whole.

The school board dealt with the recreation director only as an employee of the Municipality of Coquitlam. In its opinion, as expressed by its representatives, the lack of authority vested in the Commission itself was a distinct disadvantage. Such authority was deemed desirable, but would necessitate removal of the Commission from the authority of the Municipality of Coquitlam Council. This was noted as being unlikely to happen because of the Council's apparent conservatism in this respect. The Commission itself was considered to be very progressive, as exemplified by its promotion and sales of
local debentures so as to raise funds for its programmes. Despite this progressiveness, there was an expressed belief that people who became members of the Commission did not tend to be individuals in positions of authority within the community and hence were not as effective as was desirable.

At the level of the individual school, it was stated that principals should be directly involved with the recreation director in all plans for use of their school plants. In addition, it was extremely desirable that principals have attitudes that their administrative staffs should both help and serve the Commission during any problems encountered in this use.

**Written Policies.** Initially, there were no written policies governing the use of school facilities by the recreation department. All agreements were of a verbal nature. This situation had proved acceptable because of a lack of personality clashes between involved administrative personnel. The school board dealt with individual requests for use of its facilities as they were received. From about 1946 this began to be a time-consuming and irritating process. This situation prompted the school board to seek some other approach to the problem. The present policy (see Appendix C) was formulated on a basis of the board's own experiences and also as a result of the study of policies from several other Canadian communities. The board was now of the opinion that a written policy had become essential for a clear understanding between itself and
users of the schools as to what was entailed in such use.

The regulations, as set out in this policy, were always to be subject to the approval of the individual principals concerned. The school board's philosophy was that each principal was in charge of his school, and any restrictions he might personally place upon its use by the community, would be backed up by the board.

The recreation department concurred with the present use of a written policy. It provided all concerned with both predictability and a continuity of policy. This was of particular importance when senior administrative staff changes occurred. In addition, a written policy greatly facilitated periodic reviews as experience revealed the need for adjustments. It was pointed out that during the initial stages of community use of school facilities, the recreation department was not in favour of a written policy statement. Rather, it was considered that proof of ability, on its part, to properly utilize the schools was necessary if the school board was to realistically be able to derive a sound, workable policy.

Facilities Used. The only facilities which were not available for community use were the office and other administrative areas. The use of woodworking shop areas had also been discouraged by the school board. The lack of proper supervision in these areas was a major factor contributing to this decision.
Periods of use were limited to the hours between 6 and 10:30 p.m. during week-days. Although Saturday and Sunday use was permitted, very little actual use was made of school facilities on these days. The school board attributed this situation to charges made to cover custodial overtime pay, and also to a reluctance on the part of custodians to work on these days, particularly on Sundays. The recreation department itself did not operate programmes on Sunday which could have utilized school facilities.

No use was permitted during vacation periods, or other holidays throughout the year. Exceptions were made during inclement weather if the recreation department requested special use of a facility. The need for maintenance, particularly during the summer months, was the main reason advanced by the school board for these restrictive practices. The recreation department concurred with this need and accepted the school board's position.

Restrictions were also placed upon the manner in which school facilities were to be used. These included: (1) smoking in permitted areas only; (2) no public dances; (3) no Sunday school, church services, or dissemination of religious instruction; (4) no gambling in any form; and (5) no improper footwear in areas used for athletic purposes.

No written priorities of use were outlined, other than to the school itself. However, there was an unwritten agreement that the recreation department would have first choice
in its requests for facilities after school needs had been met. Although all other community organizations came after the recreation department in this respect, the department did every­thing possible to adjust its programme schedule so as to accommodate such organization's requests for facilities.

A new Senior secondary school, under construction at the time of writing, will give preferential treatment to adult education requests for the use of its facilities.

**Supervision.** The school board's regulations stipulated that a "Janitor, Janitor Engineer, or a substitute" had to be present at the opening of all schools. He was held responsible for the school plant and was required to remain in it for the duration of its use. It was further stated that commissionaires were required to be in attendance at all public dances, with the cost of their employment to be born by the renting organization. These were the only stipulations set forth regarding supervision during use.

The school board held the recreation director responsible for proper supervision during use by his department. The recreation director, for his part, had made it a policy to meet these expectations by providing part-time, paid supervisors who were aided by volunteer helpers. In some cases school staff members such as teachers were employed as supervisors. Every effort was made to schedule any programmes conducted by teacher supervisors in schools other than the ones in which they
normally taught. This procedure was based on the belief that
many participants in various recreational programmes might also
be students in the schools being used. They would therefore be
more adequately supervised, because of the informal nature of
the programmes, by teachers unfamiliar to themselves. The
recreation department also employed a night supervisor who
regularly visited all programmes in progress each evening.

The use of custodians to, in essence, oversee
community recreational programmes and to act as school
administrators in the principals' absence, was regarded as a
particularly weak procedure by a school official. This problem
was likely to be perpetuated, particularly in the smaller
schools, as the possibilities of having school administrative
staff on duty after school hours appeared to be very dim. In
larger schools, such as the Centennial High School presently
under construction, it was hoped that the principal and the
recreation director would be able to reach a more adequate
solution to this difficulty.

Custodians. In addition to the custodial functions out-
lined above, the question of custodial hours of employment had
been carefully considered. These had been so scheduled that
there was very rarely any necessity for the payment of over-
time wages during week-day evenings. As previously noted,
such charges were required for week-end duties and this had
tended to keep the use of school facilities during these periods
to a minimum.
The school board's written policy statement carefully stipulated that no custodian, or any other board employee, was to receive any form of gratuity for services rendered.

**Liability.** Each rental approval issued by the school board was required to have inserted in it a form of liability clause. This stated that the board required the lessee to indemnify it for any loss or damage to its property resulting from the lessee's occupation of said property. In addition, the lessee accepted the particular school's premises at his own risk.

The problem of liability had, up to the time of this report, been quite negligible. Both the school board and the recreation department reported that no disputes of note had ever arisen in this area.

**Finances.** The school board's schedule of rates varied according to the type of activity for which school facilities were to be used. Three basic types of activities were defined as "subsidized activities, basic charge activities, and other activities".

Subsidized activities received free use of all facilities except for overtime custodial charges and costs incurred during the movement of furniture and equipment within, or between, schools. Such charges and costs applied to all three types of activities. Basic charge activities paid rates ranging from forty cents per time for the use of an elementary
school kitchen, to twenty-three dollars for a gymnasium. Rates for activities not classified under these two headings varied from one dollar and sixty cents per time for an elementary school kitchen, to ninety-two dollars for a gymnasium.

In general, the school board's attitude was one of placing recreational use in the same category as free education. At the same time, rates were charged for other types of activities so as to ensure that the school board would not be involved in any incurred expenses.

**Summary.** Interviewee opinions generally indicated that the school board's policy was working quite well, and, in most cases, was satisfactory to all concerned. The consensus was that the people directly involved were primarily responsible for this success. Their personal philosophies, with regard to both education and recreation, had provided the major points of agreement. Without such agreement the degree of progress attained would not have been possible.

**II. NORTH VANCOUVER**

**Philosophy.** The regulations of School District No 44 (North Vancouver) governing "Community Use of School Facilities" (see Appendix D) did not contain a statement of philosophy guiding this policy. However, a majority of school board members were reported to be definitely in favour of such use.

The administrator of the North Vancouver Recreation
Centre was of the opinion that, as schools were in general centrally located in neighbourhoods, they provided excellent sources of recreational facilities. It was pointed out that the same taxpayers were supporting both educational and recreational programmes. This made it imperative that the most effective, and efficient, use be obtained from such expensive facilities as school plants. At variance with this, to a degree, were the views of the recreation centre board chairman. His expressed view was that the excellent facilities offered by the recently opened Recreation Centre (March, 1966) would not necessitate the use of school facilities for community recreation programmes in the present, or in the foreseeable future.

Obstacles Encountered. The only basic obstacle detailed by the school board’s representative was that of complaints by the public about the scale of rental charges. These charges had, however, been quite drastically reduced during the 1965-66 school year. For example, the rate for a gymnasium in both secondary and elementary schools had been one-hundred dollars per four hour sessions. This subsequently was reduced to fifty dollars in the secondary schools, and twelve dollars and fifty cents in the elementary schools. This reduction in rental charges, aided by the reportedly open-minded attitude of the present school board, was said to have removed all major obstacles to community use of school facilities.
The public tax-supported recreation centre programmes had been extensively utilizing school facilities prior to the opening of the new centre's facilities. No obstacles had been encountered, particularly since reduced rental charges had always been in effect for these activities and thus no financial problems had been present.

**Administrative Methods.** The school board did not have a committee which met with other community organizations in order to discuss community use of school facilities. It did have, however, a committee which formulated the present regulations. This committee was made up of the Superintendent of Schools, Secretary-Treasurer, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Directors of Secondary and Elementary Instruction, and the Director of Adult Education. The policy formulated by this committee was then adopted by the school board. All requests for use of school facilities were thereafter received and scheduled by an employee of the school board.

The recreation centre board was composed of nine members. Five of these represented the District of North Vancouver, three the City of North Vancouver, and one the Board of School Trustees. The school board was thus represented on the community recreation body. This representation did enable both organizations to be more aware of problems encountered in community use of school facilities.

**Written Policies.** The present school board policy was
originally adopted in September, 1961. Prior to this there had been no formal regulations governing community use of school facilities. Groups, or individuals, desiring to use school facilities were required to phone the school board offices and make their request. The allocation of facilities was then verified by letter from the school board to the enquiring party. The present written policy was considered desirable by the school board because of the increasing frequency of requests for use. The legal aspects involved in such use further prompted the adoption of a written policy so as to provide the school board with liability protection. Finally, the increasing amount of use increased the possible areas of misunderstanding, as well as their complexity. The written policy itself was considered to have been a result of verbal agreements which had been derived from the results of mutual discussions of pertinent factors.

The recreation centre board had no specific written agreement with the school board, but was governed by the same policy as were other community organizations. A desire for some form of special policy was expressed by the centre's administrator.

Facilities Used. All school facilities were available for community use with the following exceptions. Classrooms were to be used by adults only. Endeavours were made to avoid having younger children using secondary school facilities. No use of woodworking or similar areas was permitted. Finally, no
expendable equipment such as ropes, vaulting boxes, or mats could be used. This restriction did not apply to permanently installed equipment in the nature of basketball hoops or badminton posts. These equipment restrictions had been imposed because of anticipated wear and tear possibly adding to the cost of use and hence necessitating increased rental fees.

Those facilities which were available could be used daily after 6:30 p.m., and all day on week-ends. One group, the Brownies, was allowed to commence using required areas at 3:30 p.m. This concession was based upon the youth of the members as well as the fact that younger girls participating in the activities were often enrolled as students at the very school being used. School plants were kept open until midnight as the custodial staff was normally on duty until that hour. The school board reported very little demand for use after 11:00 p.m.

During summer vacation periods very little demand for community use was reported. It was during these periods that annual maintenance was undertaken in the daytime, while at night the buildings were closed. If use of a facility was requested, as in the case of the West Vancouver Young Men's Christian Association, special arrangements were made to accommodate the organization. The schools were available for use during Christmas and other such vacation periods. The recreation centre administrator noted that his organization had little need for school facilities during these periods.
In addition to the above restrictions, others of a more specific nature were adopted by the school board. No alcoholic beverages could be brought to, or consumed in school buildings or on school grounds. Smoking was allowed in certain designated areas only. Improper footwear that would mark or damage floors anywhere in a building, not just in the gymnasium or activity rooms, was not allowed. Use of grassed playgrounds was to be done with "discretion", and then generally only for conventional games. If probable damage to fields might result, they could not be used. In any case, use of any such field was to be limited until its durability had been determined. Debris, such as paper, had to be cleaned up at the end of each period of use. Finally, the movement of equipment or the putting up of decorations etc., required prior approval in writing from the secretary-treasurer of the school board.

Priority in the assignment of facilities was on the basis of first priority in the use of grounds being given to the particular school itself, or to other district schools. Activities sponsored by the recreation centre were given second priority. No priorities were stated, orally or written, with regard to school buildings themselves.

**Supervision.** Users of school facilities were held responsible for the preservation of order. It was presumed by the school board that such supervision would be provided by adults, and this was stressed during applications for use by large groups. When any supervisory problems did arise, the
responsible applicant was contacted by telephone. If the problem was not equitably settled, the school board then forwarded a relevant letter to the involved individual. In all cases two or three opportunities were extended by the school board for rectification. If this proved unsuccessful, further applications for use would be refused. This procedure had usually proved suitable and few such problems had been encountered.

Recreation centre programmes conducted in school facilities were under the direction of paid leaders. These in turn were supervised by the recreation centre administrator, and also received fringe supervision from school custodians.

Custodians. The custodial staff, as noted above were authorized to check on the use of any school facilities by outside organizations. This responsibility was in addition to their normal maintenance duties. In this respect they were acting as the school board's representatives.

The school board endeavoured to accommodate community desires for use of its facilities by making adjustments in custodial working schedules. Custodians normally worked until midnight. When one was not scheduled to be on duty, the school board could, and would, arrange for one to be present at its own expense, if this arrangement would accommodate an organization wishing to use a school. This situation had arisen more frequently in the smaller schools where the major portion
of daily cleaning and maintenance took place during the day. In this respect the school board would even go so far as to draw upon its available spare custodial staff members for such special duties.

With these efforts upon the school board's part, it requested that applicants, or users of its facilities, notify it when cancellations of scheduled activities were necessary. Only in this way could the costs of custodial services be kept to a minimum and thus allow minimal rental rates to be maintained.

**Liability.** Users of school board property were held responsible for all damages or incurred liabilities. This was clearly stated in the board's rental regulations. The board's policy had been one of absorbing minimal accidental damages. All facilities were required to be examined carefully after use and any loss or damage occurring during such use had to be promptly made good. The most frequent damage requiring repair, at the expense of the user, had been window breakage. Even this was reported as being of rare occurrence, and such items had usually been settled quite amicably on a personal basis.

**Finances.** The school board's "Schedule of Rental Charges" was calculated on the estimated costs involved when the community used school facilities. These charges were based on two rates termed standard and special. Standard rates for various facilities were in turn based upon whether the groups using them were composed of adults or youths. Depending on the
facility being used, charges for a youth group could be as little as one-third of those for an adult group. Charges could also be identical, as in the case of gymnasium rentals where no concessions were made to either group.

A special concession was made in the case of elementary school facilities being used by youth groups composed of children attending school within the North Vancouver school district. These groups were allowed one session of up to two hours per week, during the school term, at specially reduced rates.

The "special" rates involved the use of dressing rooms and showers by youth groups using a playing field. Charges for required overtime custodial services, and for rentals on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, were also considered to be "special" rates. In the last instance, these charges were double the standard rates.

As previously noted, complaints by groups and organizations desiring to use school facilities had, at one time, been expressed over rental charges. These complaints had indicated community dissatisfaction over what were considered to be excessive rates. The present rates were adopted in April, 1965, and such complaints were rarely received thereafter.

**Summary.** The interviewees generally indicated that although progress had been made, particularly on the part of the school board and its evident willingness to permit community
use of school facilities, further utilization of these areas was desirable. Several problems, however, continued to confront and impede the attainment of this goal.

The recreation centre administrator noted that greater reciprocity in the use of both school and community recreational facilities, such as parks, was needed. A local governmental financial administrator pointed out that mutual use of the schools would require the establishment of an adequate fiscal basis. The primary question was thus whether or not the provincial government could ever be persuaded to accept a cost-sharing basis. This situation had existed not only with regard to school facilities, but also with regard to the incorporation of school facilities into community recreation plans. As the provincial government was presently providing grants to local governments in both fields, this question could not be disregarded.

The question of appointing a recreation commission to be responsible for the two combined areas in North Vancouver, was held to be a logical follow-up to the acquisition and utilization of the new recreation centre. This opinion was also being promoted by editorials in the local news media of the community (17). Despite such urgings, political misgivings and various relationships between the City and District councils were tending to discourage such an approach. A recreation commission, or even an over-all director, was nevertheless looked upon as an obvious financial benefit for both City and District. The anticipated benefits accruing from mutual
planning guided by one central authority would offer excellent returns for the monetary investments necessitated by salaries, etc.

Planning of both park and school facilities had been integrated into the Municipal Planner's Office. Efforts were being made to provide park and school facilities in close conjunction so as to encourage the use of schools as community centres. Despite such plans, it was stated that the role of the school in community recreation had not been looked into in any great depth as yet, although there was an awareness of its potentialities in this respect.

III. RICHMOND

Philosophy. The school board approved of, and generally encouraged, community use of its school facilities. This approval was not stated in written form in the board's "Rental Regulations" (see Appendix E), but was stated verbally by its secretary-treasurer.

Community use of school facilities was also advocated firmly by the recreation director. She viewed recreation as a definite aspect of education, and hence entitled to such use.

The need for taxation to pay for the building of schools was noted by a municipal official as a sound reason for using them for as many hours per day as was feasible. Such use should include both educational and recreational programmes.
There was thus general agreement amongst school, recreation, and municipal officials that the optimal use of school facilities should be both sought after and encouraged.

**Obstacles Encountered.** Inadequate supervision during community use of school facilities was the major obstacle encountered to such use by the school board. This had led, in the past, to abuses of both equipment and facilities. Inadequate supervision had been most obvious at public dances held in a particular gymnasium made available for such purposes. It was hoped that this type of problem would be eliminated as a result of the formulation and adoption of the present policy.

The lack of adequate levels of communication with school authorities was reported by the recreation director to have been a major obstacle to the attainment of an optimal level of use of school facilities. School authorities were regarded as failing to look upon recreation with any great favour or enthusiasm. The fact that each principal was in a position to veto the use of his particular school had led to the necessity of having to deal with many of them on an individual basis. This situation had not been conducive to the smooth functioning of community recreation programmes.

This situation was stressed further by a municipal government official. He stated that principals, since they were held responsible for their school plants by the school
board, tended to have an academic viewpoint only. This was reinforced by the fact that they, the principals, had authority over their students but not over outside organizations using their school's facilities. It was felt that principals should not, in fact, be so held responsible. Indeed, a change in that attitude would undoubtedly lead to freer community access to the schools.

In addition, the fact that elected officials, of both the school board and the recreation commission, were felt jealous of their authority was seen as a definite obstacle to be overcome. This situation had led to a reluctance to cooperate and had hindered progress in attempts to achieve optimal community use of the schools.

**Administrative Methods.** The Council of the Corporation of the Township of Richmond established a "Parks and Recreation Commission" in May, 1964. This commission consisted of three councillors appointed by the council, and two school trustees nominated by the school board. Its functions were to:

"... consider and recommend to the Council, or to the School Board, as is applicable, on any matter relating to

(i) design, development, maintenance and use of any ... school playfield, or any building used or intended to be used for recreational purposes.

(ii) recreational policy, programs, or projects for public recreation as operated by the Municipality, the School Board, or any organization" (18).
Also established was a "Recreation Advisory Council ... comprised of a representative from each society, group, club, or league which is registered with the Municipal Recreation Department as being engaged in voluntary public recreation ..." (19). This advisory council acted as a liaison body between the parks and recreation commission and the community at large.

These two administrative bodies provided the means by which the community could express its views to its elected representatives with reference to the use of school facilities. Parks and recreation commission recommendations to the council of the corporation were usually followed. One reason advanced for this tendency was that the total number of councillors, including the three appointed to the parks and recreation commission, was six. This strong representation of councillors appointed to the parks and recreation commission virtually assured the council's acceptance of any of its recommendations.

The "Rental Regulations" of the school board (see Appendix E) effective as of September 1, 1966, were thus drawn up with some awareness of community desires and recommendations as forwarded through these two bodies.

**Written Policies.** A written policy statement was considered to be essential by the school board. Previous verbal agreements were no longer proving satisfactory, and a written policy
enabled the school board to clarify its regulations to all concerned. In order to ensure this clarification, a written "Application to Rent School Facilities" was required of all applicants for use, including the recreation department.

A written policy statement also aided in the avoidance of services, such as lawnmowing, being duplicated when both the schools and the community utilized the same facilities as, for example, grassed playing areas.

**Facilities.** No staffrooms, special classrooms such as science laboratories, or elementary school classrooms were available for community use. In essence, only gymnasiums and outdoor playing fields could be used. The school board had formulated this policy on the basis of several premises. Staff rooms were an area for the use of school staffs only and as such no public intrusions were to be permitted. Special classrooms contained too much equipment to warrant community use. Elementary schools were not equipped with lockers and classroom desks thus contained books and other personal belongings of pupils. The only means of safeguarding these areas therefore, had been the restrictions imposed upon their use.

Despite these reasons, the recreation department wished to use special areas, such as music and art rooms, for its programmes.

The only items of equipment normally included in rentals were the posts used for various games. Any other
equipment, such as gymnasium apparatus, could only be used with the prior approval of the school principal. The school board allowed principals a free hand in this matter, and this had resulted in variations of policy from school to school.

The earliest rental times available during weekdays were 5:00 p.m. in elementary schools, and 6:00 p.m. in secondary schools. Closing times in both were 10:30 p.m. when the rental was being supervised by the regular custodian during his normal shift, and up to 1:00 a.m. where a special "rental" custodian had been hired. All schools were available from 8:00 a.m. to midnight on Saturdays, while on Sundays the hours were from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Sunday rental times were subject to extension by the school board's secretary-treasurer upon request.

Rentals on statutory and school holidays were discouraged and, although not banned, would be allowed only on the authority of the secretary-treasurer. This policy had been adopted because of the necessity for required maintenance and cleaning programmes during these periods. In addition, one day per week was set aside for maintenance purposes by each school. The particular day was selected by the individual school and no rentals were allowed on these days.

Restrictions were also imposed with reference to facilities which were either not to be rented out, or which required special authorization for this to be done. Sunday
recreational activities were permitted only when sponsored by local community organizations. With the exception of one particular gymnasium, no intoxicating beverages or public dances were allowed.

An order of priority had been established with respect to potential users of school facilities. This order was as follows: school, night school, adult education classes, parent-teacher's associations, Cubs, Brownies, Guides, Scouts, organizations renting through the Recreation Commission, other local community organizations, and finally all others. This priority list was only applied, with the exception of the school, night school, and adult education classes, when two or more applications were received at the same time. It was also applied during the summer months prior to a stipulated rental deadline date. Once a reservation had been accepted by the school board, cancellations were made only when the particular facilities involved were required by the school, the adult education department, or for some special function such as a civic election.

Supervision. All renters were required to ensure that adequate adult supervision would be provided during the entire rental period. The school board stipulated that this "adult" supervision must not involve any person under twenty-one years of age. If parking services were also required, the renter was to provide similar supervision in that area. A school board "employee" was required to be on hand to cover each rental.
The renter was obligated to follow all "reasonable" requests and directions as given by this employee.

The recreation department's policy was to facilitate the provision of basic facilities, as required by recognized community organizations. The department acted, in essence, as a booking agent for school facilities. It did not provide professional recreation leaders, but rather utilized the services of approximately seven hundred volunteers. These volunteers, such as dance instructors, were paid fees from the finances provided from charges made for participation in the various activities. They were thus responsible for the supervision required by school board policy.

Custodians. As noted above, a school board employee was required to be on duty for the duration of each rental event. These employees were normally members of the custodial staff. The school board stipulated that regular custodial staff members were to take care of those rentals which occurred during their normal working hours. Other rentals were to be covered by casual employees as arranged for by the school board's rental clerk. The school board absorbed the cost of such arrangements, and made no additional charges for this special service.

Liability. Organizations using school facilities were required to assume full responsibility for any damage to buildings or equipment, and also for any lost or stolen
equipment. In addition, accident insurance was the personal responsibility of every person using school board property. The board itself carried liability insurance to indemnify it against the negligence of its employees.

Renters were required to have their supervising agent sign a "Rental Report" both before and after each rental. This report stated the condition of the facilities, and was also signed by the school custodian. To date, the school board had had only negligible amounts of damage or loss reported, and had absorbed minor damages itself.

**Finances.** The school board's "Schedule of Rental Charges" classified organizations desiring to use school facilities into five categories. These categories were used when determining rental rate charges. They consisted of charitable groups, youth groups, organizations booking through the recreation commission, religious organizations, and commercial organizations. Hourly rates were charged for use of gymnasium, activity rooms, changing and shower rooms, classrooms, and kitchens. Rates ranged from free use of a gymnasium for charities, civic meetings, and parent-teacher associations, to a maximum of twenty dollars for a commercial organization.

A minimum charge of seven dollars was made for the rental of any of the above five facilities on a Sunday. One facility, classrooms, could normally be rented for as little as twenty-five cents per hour during week-days. Additional
charges were made when the setting up of chairs was required.

The rental fees collected were placed into a special fund known as a "General Capital Surplus Fund". These monies could then be used for the replacement of equipment, as well as for payment of any additional costs for heat and light incurred during rentals.

The recreation department pointed out that the school board was given free use of any available recreation facilities whenever they were required. However, the recreation department was charged for similar use of school facilities.

Summary. New rental regulations were put into effect as of September 1, 1966. These regulations incorporated no major changes in school board philosophy from those policies previously in force.

The recreation department felt that educators as yet had failed to recognize the importance of recreation, and were thus failing to utilize adequately community resources in this area. Provincial legislation authorizing greater community use of school facilities for recreational purposes was regarded as highly desirable and necessary. The seeking of solutions to these basic problems without further delay was firmly advocated.

The Town Planning Department was, in general, following a 1957 report entitled "Parks and Schools for Richmond" (20). Endeavours were being made to select both school and
park sites so as to eliminate any unnecessary physical separation between them. Community parks were being oriented around high schools, while neighbourhood parks were confined to junior play areas. As a British Columbia centenary project, a central recreation complex consisting of a swimming pool, ice arena, and arts building was under construction. It was anticipated that, in spite of the new complex, there would be a continuing demand for the use of school facilities in neighbourhood areas.

The planning and provision of recreation facilities were regarded as much more economical when done in conjunction with the school board. Such cooperative planning had not as yet been attained by the town planning commission, despite efforts along that line. Great collaboration was considered essential if progress was to be made in this area.

IV. VANCOUVER

**Philosophy.** The school board voiced approval of community use of school facilities, so long as no expenses were incurred by itself as a result. This approval was publicly reaffirmed when the school board agreed on July 11, 1966, to cooperate with the board of parks and public recreation in a project to open schools as after-hours recreation centres (21). The school board's basic philosophy, as stated in its "General Rental Regulations Governing all Rentals" (see Appendix F), was to avoid competition with private halls, gymnasiums etc.
Rentals were, except to approved non-profit organizations, refused when suitable commercial accommodation was available in a particular area. Rates for these rentals were set so as to cover all estimated "average" expenses involved. Certain specified youth training organizations, such as Scouts or Guides, were excepted from these rates.

The board of parks and public recreation were in favour of the fullest possible use of school facilities. Indeed, since they were the property of the taxpayers these citizens should have free access to them. Any damages incurred during such use would, however, be the user's responsibility. This board recently had a report on this problem prepared by its "Director of Supervised Recreation". The report called for making school buildings, gymnasiums, and auditoriums available for community recreation, and for new facilities to be so constructed that community use could be made of them (22,23). It was also urged that schools be used both as "satellites" of large community centres, and where no centres themselves existed, as actual centres. No desire for school facilities to take the place of community recreational facilities entirely, as has been the case in some cities such as Milwaukee, was expressed. There was a specific proposal within the report that community centres be established in each of fifteen designated areas in Vancouver. Schools on the perimeters of these areas were to be utilized as "satellites" of the community centres.
Obstacles Encountered. Improper supervision, and the desire, on the part of some community organizations, to use school facilities during periods of school need, were cited as the only significant obstacles encountered by the school board. Both of these complaints were considered to have been of a relatively infrequent nature when compared to the total volume of community use.

The board of parks and public recreation reported financial difficulties as having been its major obstacle. Despite some concessions on the part of the school board, it was found very difficult to rent sufficient school facilities for the recreation programmes underway. The 1963 budget for the rental of school facilities was fifty-five hundred dollars. The problem was not with the school board's willingness to make school facilities available, but with the board of parks and public recreation's ability to pay for such use. Because the school board was permitted free use of over one hundred recreation areas, mainly playing fields, the need for some form of agreement regarding reciprocal use of each other's facilities was seen as very desirable. If the board of parks and public recreation could achieve such an agreement, it would be able to utilize more school facilities without increasing its operating expenses.

Administrative Methods. There was no specific committee functioning so as to further promote community use of school facilities. In the school board's opinion, there was no need
for such a committee as it considered that the schools were being well utilized by the community at large.

The board of parks and public recreation dealt with the rental department of the school board when seeking use of school facilities. It also arranged for the booking of school facilities for various community organizations which requested its aid in doing this.

Although no specific committee had been formed, there was a "Joint School-Parks Committee" which endeavoured to discuss joint problems. The committee was composed of two park commissioners, two school trustees, and senior staff personnel from both boards. It did not hold regularly scheduled meetings, but the use of school facilities had been on the agenda of various meetings. The use of both park and school playing areas by outside organizations had been a fairly easy problem to resolve. The committee had been formed for the purpose of making recommendations only, and it had been vested with no authority to initiate any of these.

Written Policies. The school board's present policy (see Appendix F) was adopted in 1959, and has undergone only minor alterations since that date. The rental of school facilities required the use of a written "Rental Notice" which was forwarded to successful applicants requesting the use of various areas.

Periodic changes in both school and park board
Facilities Used. The main areas available for indoor rentals were auditoriums and gymnasiums. Classrooms were also available, in an unheated condition, for purposes of "other than an instructional nature requiring the use of blackboards". Elementary school classrooms were not generally included because of the storage of pupil possessions in desks. Blackboard use by school staff, in preparation for the next day's instruction, necessitated the protection of this material also. These factors, plus the design of the school plants themselves, which permitted access to most areas when the classrooms were used, had resulted in a reluctance to make such areas available to the public. The use of art, music, and vocational instruction areas was not permitted for the same basic reasons.

The board of parks and public recreation's programmes were essentially of a physical activity nature. This had resulted in no serious enquiries being made as to the availability of school facilities other than auditoriums and gymnasiums.

School facilities, other than playing fields, were normally not available prior to 6:00 p.m. on school days, and were to be vacated by 11:30 p.m. Special authority, granted only under very exceptional circumstances, had to be obtained.
for any extensions beyond this time. Rentals were also permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, and statutory holidays, contingent upon the availability of custodial staff. All facilities were also available during school vacation periods so long as maintenance schedules were not interfered with.

A number of specific restrictions were stipulated in the school board's "General Rental Regulations Governing All Rentals" (see Appendix F). The consumption of liquor on any portion of school board premises was prohibited. Smoking was permitted only in designated areas adjacent to auditoriums and gymnasiums. No school accommodation was to be rented out for religious services or activities. The use of street shoes, or other footwear which might damage the floors of auditoriums, gymnasiums, or other areas, was forbidden. While all outside school grounds were available for use, no grassed playing fields could be used during the summer months. This stipulation was made so that the fields were be allowed to recover, from previous use, in time for the following winter's use during the school year. Physical education supplies and equipment, with the exception of basketball backboards, and badminton or volleyball nets, were made available only upon special approval from the school board. Rentals where extra facilities were required for the storage of equipment, where entry was required during school hours, or where the rental would interfere with the school's operation in anyway, were not to be considered.

No written statement with reference to priority of
use had been issued. However, the principle of first priority for the school itself was followed in all cases. Applications for rentals were considered as received, and, other than for a specific deadline date for several types of rentals, no method of priority of assignment was utilized.

Supervision. The school board had a representative on hand during every rental. This was most frequently a member of the school custodial staff. Every person on the property in question was required to comply with the instructions of these representatives. Failure to so comply could result in the immediate cancellation of that particular lease.

The lessee was also bound, by the terms of his rental permit, to provide adequate supervision. In the case of functions for adults only, sufficient ushers to direct traffic, maintain order, and to prevent unauthorized persons from entering rooms or hallways not authorized on the permit, had to be provided. Where accommodation for a function with juveniles in attendance was rented, the lessee had to provide adequate adult supervision. The school board reserved the right to require of a lessee a plan indicating the number and qualifications of the ushers and supervisors to be provided.

The board of parks and public recreation provided full-time professional staff members and volunteer leaders for all of its programmes. These were in turn supervised by senior personnel of the recreation department.
Custodians. A member of the school custodial staff was required to be on duty during all rentals. If no other school board representative was present, the custodian acted as this representative and had full authority over all persons present during that particular rental period.

If the custodian was normally on duty, no additional charge was made for his services. However, all overtime was charged to the lessee. The school board reasoned that in this way the rates charged would average out so that, in the end, all incurred costs for custodial services would be covered by the income derived from rental rates. There had in fact been some rescheduling of custodial hours of work so as to facilitate rental periods. Nevertheless, the regulation of working hours by custodial unions had had to be taken into account and often rigidly adhered to.

Liability. "Rental Notices" provided to all lessees stated as "General Conditions", that no warranty was expressed or implied on the part of the school board as to the safety, suitability, or the condition of the premises rented. Thus the lessee accepted the rented facilities at his own risk.

The lessee was also held responsible for any damage whether to persons or property, including the exterior of all school buildings, grounds, fences, or any adjoining property, which might arise as a consequence, directly or indirectly, of the granting of the lease. The school board also reserved the
right to require the lessee to provide adequate insurance coverage in a form satisfactory to the board.

Reasonable wear and tear was absorbed by the school board, with only blatant damage being charged to lessees.

**Finances.** The school board's policy had been to set rental rates which would cover at least "estimated average expenses". These rates were not available for study as the school board's policy was not to make them public. Rates of one and one-half the regular rate were charged for time used after 10:30 p.m. The regular rental rate for the facility, plus custodial overtime wages, was charged for Saturday rentals. This regular rate was based on what was termed "Limited Service". This meant no heat, hot water, or use of showers. These services could be provided by special arrangement, but only at additional cost to the lessee. Additional charges were also made to cover the cost of extra cleaning services required after confections etc. had been sold during a rental period.

It was stressed that the rates charged were calculated so as to conform to the "Public Schools Act". This Act stated:

"A Board of School Trustees may, by agreement, permit a municipality to construct and operate facilities for community use on a schoolsite if ... no expenditure required for the construction, operation of the facilities shall form part of the expenses of the Board" (24).

This reason for charging rental rates was supported
in principle by the chairman of the board of parks and public recreation. The fact that school facilities were owned by the citizens, who desired to use them for both educational and recreational purposes, was stressed as being an equally important factor upon which to base the derivation of acceptable rates. The need to keep rates as minimal as possible was considered essential if the average citizen was to be afforded easy access to the schools for recreational purposes.

Summary. The school board's insistence upon following the letter of the law with regard to the allocation of its finances was attributed, by its representatives, to the large urban area involved. The large population served often resulted in a careful scrutiny of its budget by various concerned taxpayers. This had necessitated a close adherence to those sections of the "Public Schools Act" pertaining to the expenditures of funds in relation to community use of school facilities (25). The school board stated, in this context, that close cooperation with all interested organizations was most essential at all times.

The department of parks and public recreation reported that more such cooperation had been, and would continue to be, forthcoming. It was noted that this often came down to a question of the personalities of those directly involved. Thus many obstacles could, and possibly would, continue to be encountered before a really acceptable solution was found to the intricate question of finances in this area.
No doubts were expressed that school trustees and park commissioners were generally in agreement that school facilities should be fully utilized. Nevertheless, the school board's reluctance to adjust its financial requirements, without provincial enabling legislation, was seen as the major obstacle that had to be surmounted.

The city planner indicated that his department was only very minimally involved in the design and construction of school plants. He could thus offer no indications as to future planning for multi-purpose design or utilization of these facilities.

V. PROVINCIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The philosophies of several selected provincial organizations, with reference to community use of school facilities for recreational purposes, were also determined. These organizations were all directly involved in either education or community recreation, and their philosophies were considered to be of value in providing further indications as to public attitudes towards the problem being investigated.

British Columbia Department of Education. The department was bound by the regulations as stated in the "Public Schools Act" of the province. This act stated that municipalities would be permitted to construct and operate facilities for community use on a school site, subject to certain conditions. One of these conditions, as previously noted, was that no
expenditure required by the construction, operation, or maintenance of these facilities could form any part of the expenses of the school boards (26). These "facilities" have been interpreted, as in Vancouver, to include the school plants themselves.

The "Community Programmes Branch" of the department endeavoured to promote community recreation programmes. One of its criteria for such a programme was that; "... it mobilizes and utilizes all available community facilities, such as parks, playgrounds, schools, churches, community centres, and homes" (27). The department was thus endeavouring to promote community use of school facilities through this particular branch.

**British Columbia School Trustees Association.** The association had no official policy, as such, with reference to community use of school facilities for recreational purposes (28,29). It was, however, postulated that all school trustees would generally be in favour of the fullest possible use of school facilities by the community, but only so long as such use did not interfere with school classes and related activities.

Two major obstacles to the attainment of such a full degree of use had been cost and supervision. Involved costs, such as rental rates, had often appeared onerous to prospective users. The association definitely did support the principle that school boards should not be expected to raise funds to
cover community use of their facilities. The administrative philosophy of some school boards had often been, and possibly would continue to be, that taxpayers should not have to support minority groups wishing to use school facilities. Education authorities had also often believed that supervision provided during community recreation programmes had been below the level of that considered desirable by the schools. Students were understood to have often carried over these experiences with "poor" discipline into their school activities.

The association further observed that the schools were probably now being used to a far greater extent than the public often realized. It was pointed out that, in many communities, it was often difficult to rent a gymnasium because of a nonavailability of suitable rental periods.

Although the association did not have an official policy as such, it did refer to the entire question in its "Reference Manual" (30). With reference to rental policies, this manual stated:

"Many requests by the community for the use of schools plus the increase in leisure time and interest in Adult Education result in many school buildings being occupied evenings and weekends. Policies and rates for such use should be established by the Board of School Trustees" (31).

It went on to say that:

"... in the past some Boards have restricted the use of schools for other than regularly
prescribed classes for children. The citizens of the community have provided the buildings and full use should be made of them for educational services to all groups and at all hours possible. (the) cooperative use of facilities should be encouraged, it is simply a matter of good community organization and a positive attitude on the part of trustees towards the need ..." (32).

**British Columbia Teachers' Federation.** In past years the federation actively urged and promoted the multiple-use of school facilities. It believed, and still does believe, that the community should derive full value from its schools. This was essential, particularly in rural areas where the schools invariably acted as community centres. With this aim in mind, the federation used to urge the adoption of school plant designs which would allow portions to be utilized after hours by the community. The opinion was advanced that such urging was no longer necessary as this type of design was postulated to have now been generally accepted. The federation in no case intervened in any disputes arising over community use of school facilities (33).

**British Columbia Parent-Teachers' Federation.** The federation assumed that all of its members would no doubt agree that schools should be used by the community. Such use would very definitely entail the payment of rental fees so as to cover the expense of such use. Fees for use by children should be abolished, while only minimal charges covering involved expenses should be made for adult use. The limited budgets of school boards restricted their funds to educational purposes,
hence the necessity for rental fees. In spite of this, the federation saw the need for a freer use of school facilities by the community. How this was to be achieved remained an unsolved problem.

The federation had adopted no official policy, nor made any recommendations, nor passed any resolutions with respect to community use of school facilities (34).

**British Columbia Recreation Association.** The association had no written policy statement referring to community use of school facilities. Although the problem had been discussed at various conferences and meetings, no strenuous efforts had been made to promote such use. Members of the association dealt with the problem as it arose in their own communities.

It was recommended that the construction of school plants involve much more joint planning between school boards and recreation departments than had been the case in the past. School facilities should be constructed with multiple-use as a prime consideration for the maximum benefit of the entire community (35).
REFERENCES


3. Smith, R.C., Secretary-Treasurer, Coquitlam School District No. 43, Interview with the writer, 11 March, 1966.

4. Chadwick, J., Chairman, North Vancouver Recreation Centre Board. Interview with the writer, 29 March, 1966.

5. Chesworth, Martin, Municipal Planner, District of North Vancouver, Interview with the writer, 12 April, 1966.

6. Floyd, S., Business Manager and Administrator, North Vancouver Recreation Centre. Interview with the writer, 7 March, 1966.

7. Posener, Mrs. C., Secretary to the Secretary-Treasurer, North Vancouver School District No. 44. Interview with the writer 6 April, 1966.

8. Woodward, N., Treasurer, North Vancouver Recreation Centre Board. Interview with the writer, 12 April, 1966.

9. Gibson, Mrs. E., Municipal Programme Director, Richmond. Interview with the writer, 7 March, 1966.

10. Kerr, W., Town Planner, Richmond. Interview with the writer, 13 April, 1966.


15. Robertson, J., Secretary-Treasurer, Vancouver School Board. Interview with the writer, 25 March, 1966.


19. Ibid., p. 3.


22. Loc.cit.

23. "Schools Urged as Centres". The Vancouver Sun, 7 June, 1966.


25. Loc.cit.


27. The Queen's Printer, The Community Programmes Branch, Victoria, undated, p. 2.


31. Ibid., p. 106.

33. Ovans, C., General Secretary, B.C. Teachers' Federation. Interview with the writer, 10 March, 1966.

34. Steves, Mrs. H.L., President, B.C. Parent-Teachers' Federation. Interview with the writer, 18 March, 1966.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

The foregoing results indicated that all four communities advocated community use of school facilities for recreational purposes. The foremost reason advanced for this was public ownership. In addition, the need for greater derived values from the tax payers' dollars was stressed in three of the communities. Attaining the maximum benefits from each dollar invested in school facilities, through the promotion of multiple-use, has been stressed by the American Association For Health, Physical Education and Recreation on many occasions (1).

The most frequently cited obstacle encountered was improper supervision. The school officials of three communities considered this to have been too often inadequate. Financing community use was considered by both school and recreation personnel of three communities as another major obstacle yet to be surmounted. Other minor obstacles outlined were basically in the nature of conflicting philosophies held by involved officials. Similar problems have been met, and overcome, in other communities according to Kraus (2). He also cited several other types of difficulties which were not revealed in this study. These were previously noted in the review of the literature.

Coquitlam was the only community which did not have some form of committee, or commission, which involved both
school and recreation personnel in discussions regarding community use of school facilities. This fact did not appear to be hampering such use, which would seem to be explained by the close personal cooperation attained by the recreation director with school officials. The other three communities did have some organization actively endeavouring to promote cooperative use of community recreational facilities, including the schools. Having a school board representative on community recreation commissions or associations, so as to further the promotion of community use of school facilities has also been suggested by Barbour (3).

The use of some form of written policy statement has advocated by all interviewees, with three primary reasons being put forth. There was a need for a continuity of policy despite personnel changes in, perhaps, both school and recreation boards, or departments. Second was the necessity for policy clarification to all concerned parties. Last, was the need for liability coverage. All four school boards reserved the right to cancel any agreements entered into for use of their facilities, if the need for such action was deemed necessary.

The formulation of school board policies was, with the exception of North Vancouver, left in the hands of the boards' secretary-treasurers. These policies were arrived at basically as a result of local experiences only. Coquitlam's secretary-treasurer was an exception to the rule as he examined the policies of several Canadian urban school boards in order
to obtain more information on the formation of such policies. This information was then used during the derivation of Coquitlam's policy. North Vancouver, in turn, was the only one of the four communities which utilized a committee composed of senior school board personnel, in addition to its secretary-treasurer, when formulating its policy.

Written policy statements have been advocated for many years in the literature. One recent statement to this effect was made by Signell (4). Despite this general advocacy, community recreation programmes utilizing school facilities have been successfully operated for periods of as long as twenty-nine years, without any formal written declarations of policy, as in Reading, Pennsylvania (5).

School facilities actually available for community use were limited in some sense by all four school boards. In general, only administrative and special classroom areas were not available to the public. However, only North Vancouver made all of its rentable facilities available on a year-round basis. Coquitlam, Richmond, and Vancouver did not facilitate community use during school vacation periods. Such rentals were not unheard of, but were discouraged as much as possible. The problems of school design not allowing for multipurpose use during school vacation periods have been confronted, and solved, in many other communities. Corbin (6) has described how the placement of suitable recreational facilities in separate wings of school plants has provided one such possible solution.
In all, nine major categories of restrictions were placed upon the use of the schools in all four communities. The consumption of alcohol, smoking, and improper footwear, ranked highest in frequency of limitation, or prohibition, with three out of four communities citing them. Next in frequency were religious use, public dances, and injudicious use of grassed playing areas. Discouragement of statutory holiday rentals, refusal to rent elementary school classrooms, and the prohibition of gambling were each listed by one community. The review of the literature revealed no great stress on imposed restrictions. It is therefore probably safe to postulate that these will vary from community to community, and be of a similar nature as those imposed by the four communities in this study.

All four school boards gave first priority to their schools before any facilities were made available for use by outside organizations. Coquitlam gave second priority to the local recreation department, while Richmond placed its recreation commission fourth after the schools, educationally related groups, and youth groups. In addition, Richmond placed certain conditions on these priorities which were related to the time of year when applications for use were received. North Vancouver gave second priority to the needs of the community centre for the use of outside playing areas only. No priority, other than school needs coming first, had been established for the use of school buildings and their related
facilities. Vancouver rented facilities on a "first come, first served" basis other than seasonal rentals. McDonald (7) recently agreed with this general attitude. He pointed out that, as the primary function of the school is to provide general academic and vocational training, its programme must always have precedence. No disagreement with this viewpoint was encountered in the remainder of the literature reviewed.

Some form of supervision over recreation activities engaged in, had to be supplied by the concerned organization in all four communities. Richmond, North Vancouver, and Vancouver stipulate that this service must be provided by "adults". The recreation director was held responsible for supervision in Coquitlam, with no stipulation being made as to whom he should employ in this capacity. Ostrander (8) concurred with this view that recreation supervisors were responsible for the proper care of school facilities being utilized for their programmes.

The school custodian had to be present during any community use of school facilities in each of the four communities surveyed. In North Vancouver and Vancouver he was designated as the supreme authority present during rental periods. Coquitlam, North Vancouver, and Richmond adjust working hours or schedules in order to provide custodial services free of charge to the users of their facilities. Vancouver had no such arrangements in effect. This use of custodians for duties related to community use of schools was supported by the Community Chest and Welfare Council of Greater Vancouver a
Liability for damages, or injuries, sustained during the use of school facilities by community organizations was the responsibility of these organizations in all four communities. Each school board required lessees to sign some form of liability statement freeing the school board from any responsibilities in this regard. The payment of damages by the organization in charge at the time, was also reported by Butler to be the normal procedure in a number of large United States communities (10).

Only Coquitlam's school authorities gave the use of their facilities to the community recreation department free of charge. In their view, recreation was a part of education and hence was budgeted for in this sense. Other organizations were charged for the use of facilities as in the case in North Vancouver, Richmond, and Vancouver. North Vancouver and Richmond had varying rates which were dependent upon the type of renting organization. Such rates were calculated to cover the costs of community use. Vancouver also determined its schedule of rates so as to cover all costs of use and it was based fundamentally upon provincial legislation. This legislation did not allow education funds to be used for community-recreation purposes. Rental fees have been acknowledged as possible sources of friction by Kraus (11), while Barbour (12) has suggested that recreation commissions should be permitted to use school facilities at special low rental
rates. Such was the case to some degree in each of these four communities.

In summary, each of the four school boards had adopted a philosophy, and in turn developed a governing policy, with respect to community use of its school facilities for recreational purposes.

In Coquitlam the general consensus of interviewee opinion was that all involved parties were pleased with the manner in which the school board's policy was functioning. The most important factor in this success was repeatedly stated to be "the people directly involved and their abilities to function well together".

North Vancouver interviewees essentially agreed that progress was being made, with the school board in particular displaying an increasing willingness to permit more community use of its facilities. Despite this progress, there was still a predominant opinion present that much more use could be made of presently available school plants and related areas. Plans were being made to locate future parks and schools near one another so as to encourage a higher degree of mutual use. There were some indications of conflict between the City and District, however. This was particularly evident in the difficulties being experienced in attempts to share satisfactorily both the costs and use of educational and recreational facilities throughout the combined area, on a
proportional basis. These, predominantly monetary, difficulties were impeding the optimal use of school facilities by the community at large. Provincial legislation was considered necessary if a solution to this problem was to be achieved.

Although the Richmond school board was satisfied with its present governing policy, this feeling was not completely shared by several recreational and municipal officials. They maintained that educational professionals were failing to recognize community recreation as an essential part of education. Again, it was proposed that provincial legislation was necessary for the attainment of a more successful level of community use of school facilities. Such legislation could accomplish this through the provision of funds to offset involved costs. Further attempts to facilitate multi-use were underway in the form of planning to locate future parks and schools in close proximity, as in North Vancouver. It was again postulated that mere physical proximity would tend to promote more multi-purpose use of both types of facilities.

Vancouver's policy was admitted, by both educational and recreational personnel, to be governed by existing provincial legislation regulating the expenditure of educational funds. Nevertheless, plans to encourage wider use were being promoted through a joint school and park board committee. This committee had initiated a new pilot programme of community recreation activities. The programme utilized
several selected schools as either community centres themselves, or as "satellites" to already established community centres.

On a provincial scale, the Department of Education did not make any provision for educational monies to be used in aid of community recreation programmes using school facilities. It did promote this form of multiple-use through its Community Programmes Branch, however. Its policy was supported by the B.C. School Trustees' Association which was in favour of allowing community use of school facilities so long as it entailed no expense to the school board. A similar position was taken by the B.C. Parent Teachers' Federation which also stressed the monetary aspects as related to school boards. It nevertheless felt there was a distinct need for much freer community use of school facilities. No active part in the promotion of this use was played by the B.C. Teachers' Federation, although it too supported the principle of multiple-use of all available community resources. Finally, the B.C. Recreation Association also made no efforts in this area, other than advocating the construction of facilities with present and future multiple-purpose use possibilities kept in mind.

The results of this study, as discussed above, pertain only to the four communities surveyed. It is therefore not possible to generalize as to the policies to be found
in other communities despite their proximity to those herein involved. The determination of such policies must remain a problem for further study.
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CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the policies governing community use of school facilities for recreational purposes in four selected communities. The communities were all urban areas within a twenty-mile radius of the University of British Columbia campus. The required data were collected by personal interviews conducted with both school board and community recreation personnel, as well as by the analysis of the actual written policy statements of the four respective school boards.

The data obtained with reference to each community were separately analyzed and discussed on the basis of ten factors. These were: the philosophies held, obstacles encountered in implementing or promoting community use, administrative methods used, use of written policies, facilities used with restrictions and priorities therein involved, supervision, liability, finances, and a summary of progress to date and plans for the future.

In drawing conclusions from this study, one must recognize that they can only be related to the four communities involved. On the basis of the data obtained, the following statements appear to be justifiable.

1. Both education and recreation authorities are generally in favour of community use of school facilities for recreational purposes.
There is a need for more and improved communications between educators and recreation personnel. Educators are generally considered, by recreation personnel, to be failing to comprehend the role of recreation in society.

There is a need for the provision of more reciprocal sharing of use of both school and community recreational facilities.

The major obstacle to optimal community use is the question of finances. The need for provincial enabling legislation in this area is very apparent.

Supervision and custodial responsibilities are problems which have not been solved to the satisfaction of all concerned.

The freest use of school facilities is permitted in Coquitlam. This may be partially explained by the shared philosophy of educators and recreators that recreation is a vital part of education.

Limitations and restrictions are more severe in the policies of North Vancouver, Richmond, and Vancouver which were developed only as a result of local experience and philosophy.

Conflicts between the municipal governments of the City and the District of North Vancouver are impeding progress towards the cooperative use of all available school facilities throughout the combined area.
(9) Increasing present community use, as well as plans for more such use in the future, is evident to some degree in all four communities.

(10) No indications are to be found that future planning is to be based upon "multi-purpose designs" rather than just a "multi-purpose philosophy".

(11) It is apparent that communities, intending to develop policies of this nature, would find a comparative survey of policies presently in effect to be of great usefulness. Such a survey could provide guidelines for the development of both a sound philosophy and basic operating principles.

It is suggested that further studies in this area might investigate the following problems.

(1) The extent, availability, and actual use made of suitable facilities presently in existence throughout a community.

(2) The promotion of optimal use of school facilities by the community.

(3) School maintenance, its requirements and effects upon community use.

(4) The role of school custodians with respect to community use.

(5) Reciprocal use of community educational and recreational facilities.
(6) The financial problems involved in community use of school facilities for recreational purposes.
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APPENDIX A

GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS OF COMMUNITIES

Coquitlam 43,600
North Vancouver 62,200
Richmond 41,000
Vancouver 389,000

Scale: 1" = 6 miles

Total Populations (1966)

Coquitlam 43,600
North Vancouver 62,200
Richmond 41,000
Vancouver 389,000
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTION GUIDE LIST

1. What is your philosophy regarding community use of school facilities for recreational purposes?

2. What basic obstacles have been encountered in endeavouring to facilitate such use?

3. What administrative methods are being used to promote community use?

4. Is a written policy statement considered necessary, and if so, why?

5. Which school facilities are available for use, when, in what manner, and by whom?

6. In what manner, and by whom, is supervision to be provided?

7. What relationships do school custodians have to community use of school facilities?

8. How has the question of liability been approached?

9. How have the financial aspects of this form of use been resolved?

10. Do you have any further comments, or points you would like to make?

11. Would you be kind enough to provide copies of relevant documents?
1. School use has first priority on all facilities and no charge will be made for such use.

2. All groups using school facilities will be required to obey school regulations as set out by the Principal and the Board.

3. Smoking is permitted only in areas designated by the Principal of each school.

4. Reservations are for the current school year and must be renewed annually in September of each year.

5. A Janitor or Janitor Engineer from the school must be present at the opening of all schools and remain in the building for the duration of the use of the building. He will therefore be responsible for the building and see that the building is properly locked following its use. Where it is not practical to follow this procedure, a substitute for the Janitor may be chosen from the Maintenance or District-Janitorial Staff. (This will be arranged by the Superintendent of Maintenance).

6. The movement of furniture and equipment within a school must be under the supervision and/or direction of the Principal but costs involved are to be covered by the group using the facilities. In the event that furniture and equipment is to be transported between schools the arrangements and the expenses incurred shall be the liability of the renting group.

7. Public dances shall not be allowed. (May Day excluded)

8. Any use of school facilities on Sundays or statutory holidays must receive prior approval of the Board.

9. All Saturday use and any use approved under "3" above, shall be surcharged at the rate of $6.00 for each hour the facility is used - minimum charge - $12.00.
10. Facilities shall not be made available to church groups for Sunday School, Church Services or the dissemination of religious instruction.

11. Games of chance, lottery, or gambling in any form, are strictly forbidden.

12. No caretaker or any other employee of the Board is to receive any form of gratuity for services rendered.

13. The Board of School Trustees and the school will not accept any responsibility for equipment, furniture, supplies, or private property of any description left in any school. Such material may only be left in a school with the approval of the Principal of the school, and at the risk of the owners thereof.

14. Commissionaires shall be in attendance at all public dances and the cost to employ them is to be born by the group renting.

15. If kitchen facilities, in a secondary school, are to be used, special arrangements for cafeteria staff must be made. Lessee must contact the Principal of the school at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the time of use.

16. If the gymnasium or activity room is used under this agreement for athletic purposes, only running shoes with natural rubber soles and heels, or socks only will be worn.

17. Each rental approval shall have the following clause inserted:

"The Lessee agrees that there is no warranty expressed or implied on the part of the Board as to the suitability or condition of the school premises hereby demised and that the Lessee accepts the said premises at his own risk and that the Lessee covenants to indemnify and save harmless the Board from all loss, costs, and damages which may arise as a consequence either directly or indirectly of the granting of this lease. The Lessee agrees to indemnify the Board for any loss or damage to the Board's property or any adjoining property due to the occupancy of the Board's premises to which this lease relates. The Lessee understands and agrees that this lease may be revoked or cancelled at any time with or without cause and that in the event of such revocation or cancellation there shall be no claim or right to damages, or reimbursement on account of any loss, damage or expense whatsoever."
18. All Agreements shall be entered into between the Board and either a "Body Corporate" or an individual.

BUILDING RENTAL POLICY, EFFECTIVE SEPT. 1, 1963. V.4, P. 223

SCHEDULE OF RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidized Activities</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Gym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for instru-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ctional and recreational classes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meetings of</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adults or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the following groups -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubs, Scouts,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownies, Guides, P.T.A., Rate-payers, Community Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund raising purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All overtime paid for Janitor service shall be recovered from the May Day Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All-Candidate</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subsidized Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Gym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7. Municipal Councils
- For meetings regarding by-laws, referendums, stewardship, and also for voting purposes.

#### 8. Banquets, Fashion Shows, Dance Reviews, Money-Raising Projects of local groups including service clubs and those organizations listed as Recreation Commission, Ratepayers and Community Associations.

### Basic Charge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Gym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 1. Banquets, Fashion Shows, Dance Reviews, Money-Raising Projects of local groups including service clubs and those organizations listed as Recreation Commission, Ratepayers and Community Associations.

#### 2. To any group for competitive games to which admission can or may be charged:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Charge Activities</th>
<th>Class room</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Gym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. When 50% or more gross ticket sales income is returned to school as donation.</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. All cases</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other than &quot;a&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Local Clubs such as garden clubs, sport and athletic clubs, drama and music clubs, badminton, and volleyball ball clubs (Gym Dressing Rooms only - $2.30 per time and any group listed under &quot;2&quot;) Schedule of Rates, using facilities for instruction or recreation purposes and not supervised by the Recreation Commission)</td>
<td>(1.15</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Church Groups for recreation and athletic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Charge Activities</td>
<td>Class room</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rate set 2.30 out for "a" and "b" above applies for each of four or more successive uses; otherwise the following rates apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Activities</th>
<th>Class room</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Square Dance</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamboree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Political</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Professional Entertainers

| a. If 50% or more of gross ticket sales income is returned to school as donation. | 12.40 |           |          | 12.40    |
|                                                                              |       |           |          | 20.70    |
|                                                                              |       |           |          | 46.00    |
| b. All cases other than "a"                                                  | 24.80 |           |          | 24.80    |
|                                                                              |       |           |          | 41.40    |
|                                                                              |       |           |          | 92.00    |
Community Use of School Facilities

All requests for the use of facilities by any outside organization wishing to use grounds or buildings shall be made through the Secretary-Treasurer who will clear all requests with the principal of the school concerned.

There shall be no warranty expressed or implied on the part of the Board as to the suitability or condition of the school premises granted, and the users must accept the said premises at their own risk and covenant to indemnify and save harmless the Board from all loss, costs, and damages which may arise as a consequence either directly or indirectly of the granting of their use. The users shall agree to indemnify the Board for any loss or damage to the Board's property or any adjoining property due to the occupancy of the Board's premises to which use may have been granted.

I. GENERAL

1. The applicant for the use of school facilities shall be responsible for the preservation of order.

2. There shall be no alcoholic beverages brought to or consumed in the buildings or on the grounds.

3. It is understood that the right to suspend the use of any grounds or building is reserved by the Board.

4. Facilities shall be leased on the terms stated in the standard lease agreement form, at rates according to currently approved schedule.
5. Employee groups of the Board of School Trustees may use schools for approved recreational purposes on school-day evenings free of charge on written application to the Secretary-Treasurer provided the accommodation is not required for a revenue rental or for school activities on the same evening, and providing that no extra costs result to the School Board.

II. GROUNDS

Grassed playgrounds shall be used with discretion and generally for conventional games. Such fields shall not be used when probable damage to the field will result. In case of doubt, the Principal of the school must contact the Superintendent of Works who will decide whether or not the field may be used.

1. First priority in the use of grounds shall be to the school itself or to other District Schools. Activities sponsored by the Community Centre shall have second priority.

2. Any grassed field shall receive limited use until its durability has been determined.

3. Activities on school grounds which might constitute a public nuisance shall be subject to the restrictions of City or District Bylaws.

4. No automobile shall be driven or parked on school grounds except in places specifically assigned for such use.

5. The Board of School Trustees shall be reimbursed for damage to school property by users at the time of damage. Debris, such as paper, shall be cleaned up at the end of each period of use.

6. Equipment shall not be brought in or removed from school grounds without prior knowledge and consent in writing from the Secretary-Treasurer.

7. Any proposed schedule of use shall be submitted to the Secretary-Treasurer in writing prior to the opening of a league or season showing separately the use of each grounds.
III. BUILDINGS

1. Smoking shall be limited to such section or sections of the building as designated by the school authorities.

2. Decorations, stage properties, or scenery may be put up only with the permission of, and in a manner acceptable to the School Principal, and all such decorations and scenery shall conform to the requirements of the Fire Warden. The School Board will assume no responsibility for properties left on the premises by individuals or groups using school facilities.

3. Pianos or furniture shall be moved only with permission of and in a manner acceptable to the school authorities.

4. Seating in auditoriums or activity rooms shall be arranged as authorized by school authorities, and shall conform with the requirements of the Fire Warden.

5. School authorities shall have access to all rooms at all times.

6. The auditorium, activity room, classroom or any other room used by an outside organization or group shall be examined carefully after use, and the user shall agree to make good promptly any loss or damage occurring during its use of said room or rooms.

SCHEDULE OF RENTAL CHARGES

1. STANDARD RATES

Gymnasium or Activity Room
Adult Youth
fully serviced - per session - up to 4 hours $50.00 $50.00 $12.50 $12.50

Gymnasium or Activity Room
Athletic & Youth Groups
Minimum charge - up to 2 hrs. $6.00 $2.00 $3.00 $1.00
Charge for each additional hour or part thereof $3.00 $1.00 $1.50 $0.50
STANDARD RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunchrooms &amp; Cafeterias not including kitchen facilities - Charge per session - up to 2 hours</th>
<th>Sec. Schools</th>
<th>Elem. Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Youth</td>
<td>Adult Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Classrooms - Charge per session - up to 2 hours | $2.00 | $2.00 | $2.00 | $2.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Charges for Gymnasium or Activity Room - Athletic &amp; Youth Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth groups composed of children attending school within the North Vancouver School District. Charges for 1 session per week of up to 2 hours:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other groups

Above charges times the estimated number of uses, payable in advance

2. SPECIAL RATES

Charge or use of dressing rooms and showers by properly supervised youth groups using the field for an organized activity $5.00

Charge for janitorial service where overtime is required - per hour per employee $5.00

Charges for rentals on Saturdays, Sundays and Holidays Double Standard Rates (Minimum charge $25.00)

3. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(i) Payment for rentals shall be made at the time the Lease Agreement is returned to the School Board Office, and in any event not later than seven days before the facilities are required. Where payment is not made as specified, use of the facilities may be withheld until payment is received.
(ii) No refunds or credits shall be given for cancellations of rentals by the lessee unless written notice of cancellation is given to the Secretary-Treasurer at least seven days before the facilities are required.
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APPENDIX E

RICHMOND (SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 38) POLICY STATEMENT

RENTAL REGULATIONS

Effective Sept. 1, 1966

1. Restrictions

(a) No staffroom, special classroom or elementary school classroom is to be rented out.
(b) New gymnasiums and activity rooms are not to be rented until authorized by the Secretary-Treasurer.
(c) Recreational activities are allowed on Sundays only when booked by a local community organization.
(d) Rentals on statutory holidays and during school holidays are to be discouraged and will only be allowed on the authority of the Secretary-Treasurer.
(e) No gymnasium or other equipment other than posts is to be rented out without the prior approval of the Principal.
(f) Intoxicating beverages are not allowed on School Board premises except in the Cambie School old gymnasium.
(g) Public dances are allowed in the Cambie School old gymnasium only.

2. Gymnasiums and Activity Rooms

The "Rules and Regulations for rental of Gymnasiums and Activity Rooms" form part of these rental regulations.

3. Notice of Reservation

Two weeks notice is required for all reservations.

4. Notice of Cancellation

Seven days notice of cancellation is required for all rentals. The regular full fee is to be charged for any rental which is cancelled with less than seven days notice.

5. Priority

The following order of priority is to be adhered to:

I. School - without exception, the school itself has first claim on its own facilities.
II. Night School and Adult Education Classes.

III. Parent-Teacher Associations.

IV. Cubs, Brownies, Guides and Scouts.

V. Organizations renting through the Richmond Recreation Commission.

VI. Other local community organizations.

VII. Other

With the exception of the first two, the order of priority will only be applied when two or more applications are received at the same time or are received during the summer months prior to the deadline date for rentals (see No. 7 below). Thus, once a reservation is accepted by the Board, a cancellation will only be made by the Board when the facilities are required by the school or by the Director of Adult Education or for some special function such as an election. However, no guarantee is to be given to any renter that his reservation will not be cancelled.

6. Rental Year

For seasonal and annual rentals, the rental year is the same as the School year, i.e. September to June.

7. Seasonal, Annual and Regularly Recurring Rental Reservations

(a) In June of each year, schools will be required to submit before School closing, their schedule of reservations (to include P.T.A. meetings) for the following school year.

(b) The Director of Adult Education will be asked to submit his requirements before August 15th.

(c) The deadline date for receipt of rental applications is August 15th. Applications received by this date will be accepted in accordance with the priorities listed above (No. 5). Applications received after this date will lose their priority as against rentals received before August 15th.

(d) Individuals and organizations renting on a seasonal, annual or regularly - recurring basis, will be billed on December 31st and June 30th.

(e) Advice of the deadline date of August 15th will be sent out with all June 30 billings. An advertisement will also be placed in the local newspaper(s).

(f) Facilities are not to be reserved for an indefinite period. Unless a definite terminal date is quoted by seasonal, annual or regularly recurring renters, reservations will be made one at a time so that future dates will be available for other renters.
3. **Rental Reservation Application**

Every request for a rental reservation is to be submitted on a rental application form in duplicate, one copy of which will be returned to the renter with the rental rate inserted and signed by the Rentals Clerk to signify acceptance of the reservation.

9. **Rental Charges**

A charge for the use of school facilities will be made in accordance with the rental schedule.

10. **Rental Times**

Sundays - All schools - 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
    (subject to extension by Secretary-Treasurer)
Saturdays - All schools - 8:00 a.m. to midnight
Weekdays - Earliest commencing times:
    Secondary Schools ...... 6:00 p.m.
    Elementary Schools ...... 5:00 p.m.
Latest closing times:
    Schools where a special Rental Custodian has been hired ........ 1:00 a.m.
    Schools where the rental is being supervised by the regular Janitor during his normal shift ........ 10:30 p.m.

11. **Supervision of Rentals**

A School Board employee is to be on duty for every event. Regular janitorial staff are to take care of those rentals which occur during their normal working hours. Other rentals will be looked after by casual employees as arranged by the Rentals Clerk.

12. **Additional Help for Large Gatherings**

When large public gatherings are expected, the renter is to arrange for additional help to control parking of cars.

13. **Public Address Systems**

This equipment is under the direct control of the Principal and it is not normally rented out. Renters requiring the use of this equipment should be advised to direct their request to the Principal.
14. **Rental Reports**

A rental report is to be submitted for each rental by the employee supervising the rental. The form is to be properly completed and signed by both the renter and the Board employee both before and after the rental period.

15. **Cost of Repairing Damage**

The cost of repairing any damage caused during a rental period is to be borne by the renter.

16. **Lost or Stolen Equipment**

The cost of replacing any equipment lost or stolen during a rental period is to be borne by the renter.

17. **Failure to Pay for Rentals or Damages**

Any renter failing to pay rental or repair charges is to be reported to the Board with a recommendation that rental privileges be withdrawn.

18. **Teen Dances**

The "Rules and Regulations Governing the Operation of Teen Club Dances", which apply to all teen dances form part of these rental regulations.

**RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR RENTAL OF GYMNASIUMS AND ACTIVITY ROOMS**

1. Smoking is not permitted.

2. All refreshments are banned unless kitchen is rented.

3. Running shoes or equivalent must be worn for all athletic activities.

4. Only authorized equipment is to be used.

5. Light switches and other controls are to be operated only by the Custodian.

6. Supervisors of juvenile activities must be present to admit the juveniles and must remain until all juveniles have departed.

7. All activities to be supervised by an adult.

8. No one to be allowed to enter the building until the supervisor arrives.
9. The supervisor to see that all participants are off the premises and that all windows are locked at the conclusion of the activities.

10. Damages or breakages of school property are to be reported by the supervisor to the Custodian.

11. Fire exits are not to be obstructed.

12. No one is to sit on the edge of the stage.

13. Shower facilities and washrooms must be closely supervised.

14. Use of the building to be limited to the gymnasium or activity room and immediate entrances.

15. The basket rooms, the equipment rooms, the stage, any area under the stage or beside the stage are out of bounds.

16. The agency using the facilities to assume full responsibility for any damage to buildings or equipment and for any lost or stolen equipment.

INSTRUCTIONS TO SCHOOL BOARD EMPLOYEES IN CHARGE OF RENTALS

1. Remain on premises during the whole of the rental and make periodic checks at not more then ten (10) minute intervals.

2. No unauthorized persons to be allowed in part of building not specified in Rental Agreement.

3. Report for duty in sufficient time to ensure that all facilities requested by renter are properly provided and doors are opened at time stated on Rental Agreement.

4. Before doors are opened to the public, ensure renter or other responsible adult checks and signs Rental Report to ensure rooms and facilities provided are in good order.

5. At close of rental ensure that the person who checked and signed list at commencement of rental now checks and signs Rental Report indicating that building and facilities provided have been left in good order; otherwise, all loss and damage to be recorded.
6. If kitchen facilities are used by renter, it is the responsibility of the renter to ensure kitchen and equipment is left in a clean condition.

7. Remain on duty until all rooms used (including washrooms) have been left in the same condition as before rental, and if equipment has been used, ensure that this is properly stored.

8. Check outside of building.

9. Ensure all doors and windows are secured before leaving premises.

10. When the rental is for a juvenile activity, do not allow the juveniles into the building until the adult supervisor arrives.

11. Do not accept additional rentals, cancellation of rentals, or change in rentals - refer renter to School Board Office.

12. It is your responsibility to report, on the Rental Report form, any misuse of School Board property, whether or not any damage has resulted.

13. In the event of the following circumstances, telephone persons indicated:
   
   A. Failure in heating system, power, etc. - J. Macaulay 277-7555

   B. If disturbance takes place, report immediately to supervisor of rental and co-operate in rectifying the situation. In the event of the disturbance developing beyond the control of the supervisor, telephone R.C.M.P. - 278-2121 if requested to do so.

**SPECIAL NOTE REGARDING TEEN CLUB DANCES**

NO SMOKING in main body of gym.
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 38 (RICHMOND)

RENTAL REPORT

NAME OF SCHOOL __________________________ DATE __________________________

NAME OF RENTER __________________________ RENTAL NO. __________________________

This form to be completed in triplicate to ensure all
accommodation and equipment has been checked by both Renter
and Custodian before and after each rental.

1 copy to Renter
1 copy to Administration Office
1 copy to Principal of School

CHECK BEFORE RENTAL

1. Was all accommodation and equipment provided found to be
   satisfactory? YES/NO

2. Was damage found? YES/NO
   (a) Give details: ____________________________________________

   Signature of Renter __________________________
   Signature of Custodian __________________________

CHECK AFTER RENTAL

1. Was all accommodation and equipment provided found to
   be satisfactory? YES/NO

2. Was damage found? YES/NO
   (a) Give details: ____________________________________________

   Signature of Renter __________________________
   Signature of Custodian __________________________

General Comments (Indicate general attitude of Renter and
condition in which school facilities left)

Time Renter Arrived: __________________________
Time Renter Left: __________________________
SCHEDULE OF RENTAL CHARGES

CLASSIFICATION OR ORGANIZATIONS

1. Charities, Civic Meetings, P.T.A.'s (see note 1).

2. Cubs, Brownies, Scouts and Guides booking directly through the School Board.

3. All organizations booking through Recreation Commission, P.T.A.'s (see note 1); Ratepayers' Associations, Community and Youth Groups booking directly through School Board.

4. Religious and Service Organizations.

5. Commercial organizations, banquets, parties and dances.

B. CHARGE PER HOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Gymnasium</th>
<th>Activity Room</th>
<th>Changing Rooms &amp; Showers</th>
<th>Class Room</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>75¢</td>
<td>75¢</td>
<td>25¢</td>
<td>50¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

1. P.T.A. general and executive meetings and one annual fund-raising event are Class 1. Any further fund-raising events are Class 3.

2. A charge of 1¢ each for setting up chairs will be made where appropriate.

3. Wedding receptions booked at the Old Cambie Gym are to be charged a flat rate of $85.00.

4. The minimum charge for renting any facility on a Sunday is $7.00 per hour.
5. Facilities will be provided free of charge to the School Board Employees' Union for:
(a) Union's Children's Christmas Party
(b) Union's Children's Picnic
(c) Union's Hallowe'en Dance
(d) Union's Christmas Dance
provided that all custodial services are provided by the Union.
APPENDIX F

VANCOUVER (SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 39) POLICY STATEMENT

GENERAL RENTAL REGULATIONS GOVERNING ALL RENTALS
(Revised and Approved by Board 10/3/59)

1. Rental Rates - How Established: It is against the Board's policy to compete with private halls, gymnasiums, etc.; therefore rentals, except to approved non-profit organizations, are to be refused when suitable commercial accommodation is available in the district.

For the same reason, except in the case of certain specified youth training organizations - such as Scouts and Guides - it is the Board's policy to set rental rates which will cover at least estimated average expenses.

A rental rate of one and one-half the regular rate will be charged for time after 10:30 p.m.

2. "As Is": All premises are to be rented "as is" no changes or additional facilities to be granted. Where extra facilities are demanded for storage of extra properties, or entry to the school is required during school hours, or where the rental would interfere with the school operation in any way, such rental is not to be considered. Stage properties and/or other equipment necessary for the production of rental function may be placed in the school on the day of the rental after 3:30 p.m. by arrangement with the Engineer-Custodian and subject to the approval of the Principal. The Board does not accept responsibility for safe custody of such properties and equipment.

3. Condition of Accommodation: The Lessee agrees that there is no warranty expressed or implied on the part of the Board as to the safety, suitability or condition of the premises rented, and that the Lessee accepts the said premises at his own risk.

4. The following provision is to be included in all leases on a seasonal basis:

"This rental rate is based on LIMITED SERVICE (which means no heat, no hot water or use of showers, and no special attendance). Arrangements can be made to provide these services at an additional cost. The services granted will be enumerated in the lease."
5. **Premises to be vacated:** Unless special authority is obtained, which will be granted only under very exceptional circumstances, rented premises must be vacated by 11:30 p.m. at the latest.

6. **Capacity of the Accommodation:** The Lessee will be advised, at the time of arranging the rental, of the capacity of accommodation. The capacity must not on any account be exceeded.

7. **Supervision:**

   (a) Where the accommodation is rented for a function with adults only in attendance the Lessee must provide sufficient ushers to direct traffic, maintain order, and to prevent unauthorized persons from entering rooms or hallways not authorized on the permit.

   (b) Where the accommodation is rented for a function with juveniles in attendance the Lessee must provide adequate adult supervision.

   The Board reserves the right to require of the Lessee a plan indicating the number and qualifications of the above ushers and supervisors to be provided.

8. **Financial Responsibility:** The Lessee will be held responsible for any damage, whether to persons or to property including the exterior of all school buildings, grounds and fences. The Board reserves the right to require the Lessee to provide adequate insurance in the form satisfactory to the Board.

9. **Consumption of Liquor:** Consumption of liquor on any portion of School Board premises is prohibited.

10. **Smoking:** Policy of prohibiting smoking during rentals is relaxed to permit smoking in suitable designated places adjacent to auditoriums and/or gymnasiums where ash receptacles will be provided for use by the public. These receptacles will be put out after school hours by the Engineer-Custodian and removed by the following morning, as smoking is not permitted when school is in session.

11. **Afternoon Rentals:** All rental reservations will be made through the Rental's Department in the Secretary-Treasurer's Office, but requests for use of school accommodation prior to 6:00 p.m. on a school day should be referred to the Superintendent of Schools. In general, no rentals which will interfere with school instructional time will be permitted, with the exception of elections.
12. **Saturday Rentals**: Saturday rentals will be contingent upon the availability of Custodial staff. The regular rental rate for the accommodation plus Custodial Staff overtime wages will be charged for Saturday rentals.

13. **Sundays and Legal Holidays**: No school accommodation shall be rented for any purpose on Sunday or a Legal Holiday.

14. **Polling**: Application for school accommodation will be favourably considered if sufficient notice is received.

15. **Religious Meetings**: It is the policy of the Board not to rent school accommodation for religious services or activities.

16. **Classroom Rentals**:

   (a) **Cafeteria and Home Economic Rooms**: No cafeteria or Home Economic equipment is to be loaned or used by any Association except with the approval of the Board.

   (b) **Individual Classroom Rentals**: Owing to the fact that most individual classroom rentals necessitate heating the whole school building, such rentals are not to be made to organizations requiring heat (other than Parent-Teacher Associations). However, if it can be conveniently arranged, classrooms may be rented unheated, provided a School Service Employee is on regular duty. These rentals to be made at the current rental rates. Generally speaking, classrooms in Elementary Schools are not rented because pupils' possessions are stored in the desks.

17. **Calisthenic Purposes**: Rentals for calisthenic purposes to be limited to recognized physical education groups.

   **Note**: Accommodation will not be granted to organizations practising outdoor team sports such as football, soccer, baseball, lacrosse, etc.

18. **Sale of Candy, Soft Drinks, Ice Cream, etc.**: The sale of candy, soft drinks, ice cream, etc. during evening rentals permitted with the following additional charges to cover cost of extra cleaning:

   - **Gymnasiums or auditoriums with accommodation up to 750 persons**: $3.00 per evening
   - **Gymnasiums or auditoriums with accommodation over 750 persons**: $5.00 per evening
19. **Grand Pianos:** Groups using grand pianos in school auditoriums are to be charged $3.00 per evening for the use of same. This charge is to be collected by the School Board. No charge for upright pianos.

20. **Associations and Organizations:**

(a) **Ratepayers:** Ratepayers' Associations and meetings of other similar groups will be permitted the use of school premises at the current rental rate. For rate see R.A. 6 (e), Item 4.

(b) **Scouts and Guides:** Organizations recognized by the Board as youth educational movements to be granted available accommodation subject to satisfactory tenancy at a nominal cost.

21. **Setting Up Of Chairs For Evening Rentals:** Chief Engineer to be advised when chairs are required and cases to be dealt with individually by him as to the responsibility for the setting up of the chairs.

22. **Footwear:** The use of street shoes or other footwear, which would damage the floors of the auditoriums and gymnasiums or other areas specified in the lease, is strictly forbidden where the accommodation is rented for sports, square dancing and other activities of a like nature.

23. **Assembly Room – Administration Building:**

(a) Rental of the Assembly Room in the Administration Building may be granted to selected approved organizations engaged in work of value to education in the City of Vancouver for evening meetings.

(b) Such rentals shall be subject to cancellation when necessary by the Board or by the Administration.

(c) A rate of $7.50 will be charged per evening session.

(d) No rentals permitted when admission charge is made.

24. **Use of Grounds:**

(a) Grounds are allotted to organizations for athletic purposes, each organization signing a contract that it will be responsible for any damage to school property during their occupation of the grounds.
(b) Recognized and properly organized patriotic groups are to be granted the privilege of using school grounds for drill, etc., on the same terms as athletic organizations.

(c) No grass playing fields are to be used during the summer months to permit the fields to recover in time for the winter season.

(d) No charge is made for use of the grounds.

25. **Instructions of Board Representative:** Every person on School Board property as a result of a rental thereof, shall obey the instructions of the Principal, Vice-Principal, Custodial Staff or other representative of the Board, and in the event of being requested by such representative to leave the premises shall do so immediately.

26. **Cancellation of Lease:** Failure to comply with Rental Regulations and Instructions of Board Representatives could result in immediate cancellation of the lease.

The Lessee understands and agrees that this lease may be revoked or cancelled at any time with or without cause, and that in event of such revocation or cancellation there would be no claim or right to damages, or reimbursement on account of any loss, damage, or expense whatsoever.

27. **Change of Regulations:** All rental regulations are subject to change from time to time without notice.

**REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE USE OF AUDITORIUMS AND GYMNASIUMS IN THE SCHOOLS**

(The following regulations, in addition to the "General Rental Regulations Governing All Rentals", apply to the use of Auditoriums and Gymnasiums).

1. The use of the accommodation is limited to the time shown on the permit except that performers will be admitted one hour before the starting time of the rehearsal or the programme. The building must be vacated by the termination time as stated on the permit.

2. Chairs may not be removed or re-arranged, or additional chairs brought in, unless with the permission and under the supervision of the Engineer-Custodian.
3. The P.A. system, floodlights, movie projectors and other special equipment are not included in rentals, and if required must be requested at the time of arranging the rental. The necessary arrangements will be made with the Principal of the school concerned.

4. When arrangements are made for the use of the equipment referred to in #3 above, the equipment must be operated by, or the use supervised by, a person or persons appointed by the Principal, at an extra cost to the Lessee. Verbal permission of the Board's Chief Engineer is to be obtained before connecting any additional electrical equipment.

5. Stage or property fixtures which require nailing to the floor, bracing to walls, or pinning to stage curtains may not be used without permission. The Principal and Vice-Principal, and the Engineer or other Custodian are fully empowered to act as the Board's representatives in directing the conduct of the rental to ensure that these regulations are followed and that no damage is caused to Board property.

6. The stage and its approaches must be left clear during school hours for the regular school programme to proceed.

7. The use of classrooms as extra dressing rooms must be requested when application for the rental is made; otherwise, no other accommodation except the stage and regular dressing room will be granted.

8. No advertising in connection with any production is to be displayed on or affixed to any part of school grounds or premises.

9. The school staff and student body are not allowed to engage in ticket sales, except for student functions.

10. There is no public telephone available to parties renting an auditorium or gymnasium, except where a telephone is provided in the foyer of the auditorium and/or gymnasium.

11. Smoking is permitted only in the space which may be set aside for this purpose adjacent to the auditorium or gymnasium. Except at tables, where ash trays must be provided, SMOKING IN THE AUDITORIUM OR GYMNASIUM IS POSITIVELY PROHIBITED. Breach of this regulation may debar a Lessee from further rental.
12. Copyright material may not be used without satisfactory evidence of payment of the requisite fee having been produced.

13. School Board physical education supplies and equipment will not be made available to any Lessee with the exception of basketball backboards, and badminton and volleyball nets. Any deviation from this regulation would be subject to the approval of the Board.

14. Rental of double gymnasiums will be rigidly controlled. When rented for social type assemblies, attendance will be limited to a maximum of 500 or in accordance with the rated capacity as permitted by fire regulations, whichever is the lesser.
APPENDIX G

LETTER SENT TO OTHER CANADIAN COMMUNITIES

Permit and Rental Department,
School District of Winnipeg No. 1,
William and Ellen,
Winnipeg 2, Manitoba.

Dear Sirs:

As a graduate student in the School of Physical Education and Recreation, The University of British Columbia, I would like to request your assistance with regard to the following.

The topic of my Master's thesis involves the problem of; "Policies Governing The Use of School Facilities For Public Recreation Programs". In connection with this study, I would be most grateful if you could forward to me a copy of your present regulations governing the use of your school building, grounds, and equipment for public recreation programs. A copy, or notation, of your scale of rental charges, if not included in the above mentioned list of regulations, would also be most valuable.

Your information will be incorporated into a chapter of the thesis describing policies presently in effect in various Canadian centers. A case study of four communities in the Greater Vancouver area will form the major portion of the study.

Thanking you for your anticipated interest and reply, I remain;

Yours sincerely,

W. T. Lorenzen.
SELECTED CANADIAN COMMUNITIES

Secretary-Treasurer,
Brandon School Division No. 40,
603 Eleventh Street,
Brandon, Manitoba.

Secretary-Treasurer,
Calgary School Board,
412 - 7th Street South West,
Calgary, Alberta.

Deputy Secretary,
Edmonton Public School Board,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Assisting Secretary-Treasurer,
The Board of Education For
the Township of Etobicoke,
Etobicoke, Ontario.

Director,
Department of Physical Education,
Board of School Commissioners,
Cor. Brunswick and Jackville Sts.,
Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Secretary-Treasurer,
The Board of Education For the City of Hamilton,
P. O. Box 553,
Hamilton, Ontario.

Secretary-Treasurer,
Medicine Hat School District No. 76,
601 First Avenue S. W.,
Medicine Hat, Alberta.

The Montreal Catholic School Commission,
3737 Sherbrooke Street East,
Montreal 39, Quebec.

District Superintendent,
The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal,
6000 Fielding Avenue,
Montreal 29, Quebec.

Director of Education,
The Board of Education For the Township of North York,
15 Oakburn Crescent,
Willowdale, Ontario.
The Secretary,
City of Ottawa Public School Board,
330 Gilmour Street,
Ottawa 4, Ontario.

Chief Clerk,
The Board of Education,
1235 College Avenue,
Regina, Saskatchewan.

Secretary,
The Board of School Trustees of Saint John,
Saint John, New Brunswick.

Department of Education,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

Director of Education,
Saskatoon Public School Board,
211 Fourth Avenue South,
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Director of Education,
Board of Education,
P. O. Box 210,
Windsor, Ontario.

Permit and Rental Department,
The Winnipeg School Division No. 1,
1577 Wall Street East,
Winnipeg 3, Manitoba.