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ABSTRACT

A Senior Centre serves as a community focal point on aging where older adults, either individually or in groups, come together for various services and activities. Most early Senior Centres were initiated, planned, and administered by bodies such as Recreation Departments or welfare agencies as a means of meeting the identified needs of a community's older citizens. In recent years, however, older people have become increasingly vocal in identifying their own needs and have come to play a more active role in the planning and administration of their Senior Centres. The literature provides little information for those interested in the changes that have taken place in the planning and administration of Senior Centres. It focuses mainly on what is planned (programs) rather than how planning is conducted (process) or who participates in the process. This thesis is exploratory in nature, seeking both to make an initial attempt at filling the gap that exists in the literature and to provide assistance to those engaged in planning at Senior Centres.

The thesis begins with a background chapter, which provides an overview of the history and present situations of the Senior Centre movements in the United States and Canada. It then briefly reviews the relevant literature in an effort to answer three questions:

1) What is involved in the planning process at Senior Centres?

2) Why should a Senior Centre's members have the opportunity to become involved in the process?

3) In what planning areas should members be involved?
On the assumption that Centre members should have the opportunity to become involved in their Centre's planning process, the main body of the thesis seeks to discover what opportunities exist for their involvement and to determine the factors that encourage members to become involved. The research is based upon case studies of three Senior Centres in the Greater Vancouver area: Silver Harbour Centre in North Vancouver, 411 Centre in Vancouver, and Murdoch Centre in Richmond. The data for the case studies is provided by Centre documents, personal observations, casual conversations, and open-ended interviews. The interviews were conducted with three groups involved in or affected by, planning at the Senior Centres: Executive Directors, Board members, and general members.

Chapter 4 provides background on the three Centres. It reveals the distinct histories, programs, physical environments and administrative structures of the Centres and underscores the fact that no one planning model would be appropriate for all three Centres. Chapter 5 analyses the "structural" opportunities that each Centre provides for its members to become involved in planning.

Two distinct planning models emerge from the analysis: the predominately member-planned (autonomous) model, as represented by the Silver Harbour and 411 Centres, and the mainly agency-planned (semi-autonomous) model found at Murdoch. The "autonomous" Centres provide the greatest opportunities, as their members exercise control over policy, budget, program, staffing, and building matters. Members of the semi-autonomous Centre exercise less control, as they act only in an advisory capacity.

In Chapter 6, the factors which potentially encourage or discourage members' involvement in planning are identified. Their identification
emerges from a post facto analysis of the case study data. The factors are separated into four categories for analysis: 1) administrative structures, 2) characteristics of planning members (Board and Committee members), 3) characteristics of Centre Directors and staff, and 4) buildings. The most encouraging factors for members' involvement in planning appeared to be a relatively autonomous administrative structure, skilled and experienced Board and Committee members, Directors, and staff, a building owned by members and designed for use as a Centre, and an adequate level of funding and staffing.

The conclusions of the research which are presented in Chapter 7, stem from the analysis of factors which encourage or discourage members' involvement in a Senior Centre's planning. The main conclusion is that, generally speaking, if the factors identified in Chapter 6 are in place, a Senior Centre should be more successful in encouraging members to become involved in its planning. However, three problematic aspects of establishing an "encouraging" planning framework were identified and explored. The first two were some planning members' apparent lack of understanding of the planning process and a possible lack of continuity in the planning network (i.e. high staff turnover and difficulties in recruiting new members to assume planning roles). The conclusion drawn was that the provision of training sessions, which focus on aspects of the planning process and on "human" skills, such as, communications, leadership, and how to motivate others, could result in staff and members becoming more adept at planning and encouraging other members to become involved in the process.

The third problematic aspect identified related to the somewhat surprising finding that an optimum level of resources (funding and
staffing) appears to exist, below or above which factors discouraging to members' involvement in planning set in. The thesis concluded that if this optimum level could be ascertained, it would result in significant benefits to the members, staff, and administrative and funding bodies of Senior Centres. An ascertainable optimum level would provide a basis for governments and other funding bodies to determine a more equitable allocation of resources amongst Centres. And if acted upon, it would encourage the maximum involvement of members in their Centre's planning process.

In closing the thesis, the implications that the research has for other planning groups and for society as a whole are discussed and a number of questions which might be pursued by other researchers are presented.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Although a variety of definitions of Senior Centres have been proposed over the past thirty years, none have gained universal acceptance. The first widely quoted definition appeared in 1959:

The Senior Centre may be a single purpose (e.g. a recreation, education, drop-in, or information and referral centre) or multi-purpose agency (i.e. a centre which offers more than one service and stresses the maintenance or enhancement of the older person's physical, social and emotional well-being) established as a result of community planning based on the unmet needs of older people in any given community.

The basic purpose of such centres is to provide older people with socially enriching experiences which would help preserve their dignity as human beings and enhance their feelings of self-worth (Maxwell, 1962, p. 7).

One of the most complete definitions of a Senior Centre was presented by a leading figure in the Senior Centre movement in the United States:

A Senior Centre is a facility for older adults, well staffed, housed, and financed which enjoys broad community support; which is readily accessible to the older people in the community and which is open often enough to fulfill its objectives; which offers a wide-ranging program of activities and services designed with a knowledge and understanding of the interests, needs and desires of the older people of its community; and, which provides for the real involvement and participation of its members in the planning, conducting, and evaluation of its program and in the determination of its policies and goals (Monro, 1972, p. 26).

The increase in the number and popularity of Senior Centres has been phenomenal. Since the introduction of the first Senior Centre in
1943, over 5,000 Senior Centres have been established throughout North America (Demko, 1979). Senior Centres came into being as society gradually began to realize that increasing numbers of older people were lonely and living out their lives in fear of being unable to meet their economic and health needs unassisted.

Senior Centres were regarded as "a means by which society could recognize the contributions made by older people, and an innovative way in which (society could) fulfill its responsibility to give dignity and meaning to the later years of older adults" (Monro, 1972, p. 27). Some writers contend that in time, Senior Centres "may come to hold a place in the older person's life equivalent to the role now played by the school in the lives of...children" (Cull and Hardy, 1975, p. 10).

There are now an estimated 2.1 million people aged sixty-five years and over in Canada, and this figure is expected to rise to 3.4 million by 2001 (Senate of Canada, Croll Commission, 1979). Not only will the number of older citizens increase, but their levels of education, health and expectations will rise as well. If Senior Centres are as crucial as some observers believe, more Centres will be needed to serve the growing senior adult population. Indeed, the "trend towards expansion of Senior Centres may continue to gain momentum, for it may be an expedient way (for society) to demonstrate that something tangible is being done for the aged" (Estes, 1979, p. 134).

Despite the importance of Senior Centres, literature on the Centres is sparse. As McIntyre (1979) observes, the literature that does exist can basically be divided into two groups. The first group consists of books, manuals, conference proceedings, and other publications by such
organizations as the U.S. National Council on the Aging (NCOA) and the Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD). These publications are aimed at professionals working in Senior Centres and they cover most facets of Centre operation. The second group consists of research studies and articles which for the most part appear in gerontological and sociological journals. These writings are addressed both to an academic audience and persons who are actively associated with older adults.

The implicit questions asked in both bodies of literature are "What are the needs of the elderly?" and "How can the Senior Centre best meet these needs?" Either directly or indirectly, the focus of the literature is on the Centre's program. For example, a number of studies have compared the characteristics of users and non-users of Senior Centres in order to identify ways in which more senior may be persuaded to join the Centres (Trela and Simmons, 1971; Trelà, 1971; Carp, 1976; Toseland and Sykes, 1977; Demko, 1979).

With few exceptions, the means identified involve the introduction of new programs, such as recreational activities or information and referral, outreach, or health services.

The type of study just described yields valuable information about Senior Centre clientele and can serve as a useful guide for programming; however, it does not meet the most urgent needs of Senior Centre Directors or others who plan at the Centres. Planners need an understanding of how to plan before they consider what to plan. Or to paraphrase Harris, we have a great need of a science of planning in order to determine what is science in planning (Harris, 1967).
I believe that there are three essential reasons for studying the planning process at Senior Centres. First, efforts to attain a better understanding of the planning process should lead to more effective practice. Until the mid 1960's theories of planning generally followed a linear model, conceiving of plans as a system of blueprints for a desired future state. In their simplest form, these theories presented planning as involving a survey, to gather information, an analysis, to interpret the information, and a plan, or strategy to act upon the information (Hall, 1975, p. 12). These theories also tended to follow a rational decision making model, which separated the means and ends of planning and postulated that an ideal or "optimum" end could be achieved. However, as Friedmann and Hudson point out, there are three major flaws in such simple conceptualizations of reality:

1) **Knowledge** - they assume that decisions precede action, when in fact it is often impossible to obtain the information needed for making decisions until after a decision is made.

2) **Equity** - they assume that the "rational" decision will be equitable; however, economists have presented elegant proofs which reveal that an equitable calculation of trade-offs amongst various alternatives (a "community welfare function") cannot be logically derived, and

3) **Coordination** - they assume that a plan will be implemented with a minimum of difficulty, ignoring the problem of coordinating the various groups of actors who will be called upon to put the plan into effect (Friedmann and Hudson, 1974, pp. 7-9).
As will be explained in Chapter 2, a "new wave" of planning theory has emerged as a reaction to the simplistic assumptions of the rationalist school. In a parallel fashion, a "new wave" of Senior Centre planning approaches have been suggested as alternatives to the approaches of the first Centre practitioners. Senior Centres are smaller and less complex than the social organizations dealt with in most planning theory literature; however, they are dynamic and complex just the same. Senior Centre Directors have been urged "to see the Centre as a process which involves the interaction of people, purpose, and program -- a process which translates goals, philosophy, and resources into action" (Monro, 1972, p. 27). The rationale of studying planning theory is the belief that the more that is understood of the process, the greater will be the improvements that can be made in it. Understanding should thus lead to more effective planning and more successful Senior Centres.

The second reason for studying the planning process at Senior Centres is the changing role that Centre members have played in the process over the years. When the earliest Centres began, social welfare agencies, church and community groups, or recreation departments often did the planning, determining what the older adults needed and introducing what they considered to be appropriate programs for meeting these needs. While these bodies generally sought some input from Centre members, they often did so in a patronising manner. Over the years, older adults have come to show resentment of the younger "providers" and to demand a greater voice in the planning of their own affairs. The emerging viewpoint of many older adults is well expressed in a recent publication for B.C. Seniors: "Why do the professionals and bureaucrats bug us?...They seem
to decide what's good for us as if we are children...They make life difficult for us with their complicated forms, terrible printing goody-good pamphlets, and phone--here, phone--there to get help. They don't ask us what we think" (The Elder Statesman, February, 1980).

Many older people hold the view that Senior Centres, and other organizations or programs which affect their lives, should be planned "for seniors, by seniors." As will be revealed in Chapter two and in the case studies, seniors can and do play a variety of roles in the planning process at Senior Centres. They can be active and become involved at a variety of levels throughout all stages of a Centre's development: from the initiation, when they select a site, hire an architect, and seek community and government finances for building the facility; to the ongoing operation of the Centre, when they may serve on the Board or committees, vote for members to represent them on the Board or committees, or make suggestions to staff or board members about changes they would like to see introduced in their Centre.

The third reason for studying the planning process at Senior Centres is the changing role that Senior Centre Directors and other "professional" Senior Centre planners have come to play. As recently as 1972, the Coordinator of the first Training Institute for Directors of Senior Centres in Canada admitted "some Directors may...view themselves as persons responsible for planning a schedule of activities, with or without the involvement of members, to help accomplish this purpose" (Wilson, 1972, p. ix). In light of the preceding arguments, such an approach appears doomed to failure.
One of the leading figures in the development of Senior Centres in the United States argued that while the Centre is the "agency through which opportunities, services, and programs are offered, the true realization of partnership in action represents the dynamic means through which purpose is accomplished" (Monro, 1972, p. 28). The philosophic approach that he favours is

Firstly, that (the Centre professional's role is not to do for people but rather to work with people for the achievement of common objectives; secondly, a belief that senior citizens...are individuals, adults, and people; thirdly, a commitment to the right of people to be part of the decision making process in matters in which they have a vital interest.

In short, let's stop being patronizing to older adults -- which only reinforces their feelings of incompetence and powerlessness -- and let's start trusting them and expecting them to be competent, concerned, and creative (Monro, 1972, pp. 28-29).

The preceding arguments for studying the planning process at Senior Centres reveal that the effort would not only be of interest to an academic audience, but would also have important practical implications for Senior Centre Directors, staff board and committee members, general members, and others involved in the planning process at a Centre. In order for these various groups to achieve the most effective planning process, they require an understanding of how the planning process at the Centre works, advantages and disadvantages of involving members in the process, how they can encourage members to become involved in the process, and how they can assist members to contribute more effectively.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

The thesis involves case studies, which examine the planning process at three Senior Centres in the lower mainland: the Silver Harbour Centre in North Vancouver, the 411 Centre in Vancouver, and Murdoch Centre in Richmond.

Before presenting the case studies, an attempt is made to define what is involved in the planning process at Senior Centres. Also, two assumptions for the research are presented and substantiated: 1) members should have the opportunity to become involved in their Senior Centre's planning process, and 2) no easy formula exists for determining the "appropriate" extent and nature of members' involvement in a Centre's planning process. The literature from a variety of fields, including Senior Centre publications, planning theory, gerontology, and citizen participation is used in this section on definitions and assumptions.

Next, the thesis turns to the case studies. The case studies rely upon newsletters and other Centre documents, personal observations, and interviews with Centre Directors, board members, and general members to seek answers for the following questions:

1) What "structural" opportunities exist for members to become involved in the planning process at the selected Centres?

2) What are the factors which encourage or discourage members in becoming involved in their Centre's planning process?

The main objective of this thesis is to make an initial attempt to fill the gap that exists in research on Senior Centres, choosing not to focus on the outcome of a Centre's planning (i.e. programs or services), but rather to consider the process of its planning (i.e. how the
outcomes are achieved). In particular, the thesis considers the role that Senior Centre members play in the planning processes of the Centres. Rather than viewing how seniors can be planned for, it seeks to determine how seniors can be encouraged to plan for themselves. The study is exploratory, and as it does not involve formal tests of hypotheses, its findings and conclusions are suggestive, rather than definitive. The test of any study ultimately must be the utility and replicability of its findings. Efforts are made in this thesis to facilitate future research by suggesting relevant questions and interesting avenues of investigation.

As indicated earlier, the thesis should also serve as a resource for Centre Directors, members, and others who are involved in, or are interested in, the planning process at Senior Centres. Much research on the elderly has been criticized for its failure to contribute to improving the well-being of older adults. One gerontologist commented that research "can all-too-easily find (itself) preoccupied with 'counting the wrinkles of old age' while the really crucial issues remain unattended" (in Schwartz and Proppe, 1970, p. 228). This study aims to avoid this tendency by focusing on the achievements of older adults in the planning of their Senior Centres. If successful, it could stimulate a dialogue between members and staff from various Centres who wish to learn how their counterparts at other Centres conduct their planning. It should also be of interest to planners or other individuals who are, or will be, planning with the elderly.
STATEMENT ON RESEARCH METHODS

As mentioned in the preceding section, the study is exploratory. The distinguishing features of exploratory studies are that they contain no formal hypotheses and they are usually performed on subjects about which little is previously known (Bailey, 1978). The reason I chose to employ an exploratory research design is that no empirical studies of the planning process at Senior Centres have, to my knowledge, been conducted. By following this approach, I sought to generate hypotheses rather than scientifically test them. I concur with other researchers: "elaborate hypotheses developed out of sketchy information can quickly become a Procrustean bed into which the researcher forces his findings no matter how ill they fit" (Needleman and Needleman, 1974, p. 6).

A lucid defence of the exploratory study is contained in a recent study of community planning in the United States (Needleman and Needleman, 1974). The authors argue that until recently, the exploratory study was widely regarded as inferior research, "an informal and sloppy preliminary stage of investigation, interesting because it paves the way for 'real' research on previously unfamiliar subjects (needleman, 1974, p. 5). However, the authors point out that a number of exploratory studies have gained wide recognition as classics in the Social Sciences, giving the field some of its more useful concepts and theories.

This thesis contains a number of limitations common to other exploratory studies, most notably that the conduct of the interviews and presentation of the results are open to manipulation, and that its findings cannot be generalized to all Centre Directors and members in all Senior
Centres. However, in Chapter 3, I present an argument which attempts to show that the advantages of the chosen research method far outweigh its disadvantages.

ORGANIZATION OF STUDY

This thesis opens in Chapter 2 with a discussion of the history of Senior Centres in the United States and Canada. It continues with a theoretical literature review which lends support to the previously stated definitions and assumptions of the research and serves to identify the "state of the art" in literature for Senior Centre practitioners.

Chapter 3 briefly discusses the reasons for the selection of the three Centres under study, and then explains the sampling procedures and methods of data collection and analysis.

Chapter 4 is devoted to case studies of the Silver Harbour, 411, and Murdoch Centres. Based on Centre newsletters and documents, personal observations, and interviews with Centre Directors, board members, and representatives from the general memberships, the chapter attempts to provide background information and insight into how planning is conducted at each Centre. It then seeks to identify "structural" opportunities that exist for members to become involved in the Centres' planning processes.

Using the case study data as a basis, Chapter 5 provides an analysis of factors which encourage and discourage members in becoming involved in planning at Senior Centres. The four types of factors considered relate to the Centres' administrative structures, the characteristics of planning members (Board and Committee members), the characteristics of the Directors and staff, and aspects of the Centres' buildings.
Finally, in Chapter 6, the summary and conclusions are presented. The conclusions do not attempt to provide a simple guide to successful Senior Centre planning; however, they offer insights and suggestions as to how more effective planning at Senior Centres might be encouraged.
Chapter 2

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND THEORETICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides the historical framework and theoretical literature foundation for the study. The historical framework traces the evolution of the Senior Centre movement in the United States and Canada. The theoretical literature foundation relies upon the literature from a variety of fields in an effort to identify the "state of the art" for Senior Centre practice. It begins with an attempt to determine what is involved in the planning process at Senior Centres and continues with the statement and substantiation of the research assumptions: 1) members should have the opportunity to become involved in their Senior Centre's planning process; and 2) the "appropriate" extent and nature of members' involvement varies from Centre to Centre and from individual to individual.

HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

United States

The first Senior Centre, the Hodson Centre in New York City, was initiated by a group of Social Workers in the New York City Department of Welfare in 1944. At the time, it was regarded as a "wholly new experiment in social welfare" (Kubie and Landau, 1943, p. 9). As other communities learned of the Hodson Centre, Centres were gradually established throughout the United States.

Maxwell (1962) observed that two distinct concepts of the Centres
emerged during the early years. The first was the "welfare" model, typified by the Hodson Centre, whose clients generally had low incomes, little education, and were often born outside the United States. The other was the "recreation" or "retirement centre" model, which served the more financially secure, well-educated, and socially active older person.

For the first fifteen years of their existence, Senior Centres were characterized by great variation in the scope and quality of their programs. In order to establish guidelines for existing projects and to set minimum standards to assist communities that were contemplating having their own Centres, the National Council on the Aging (NCOA) appointed a committee to undertake a major research study of American Senior Centres. The study began in 1959 and was completed in 1961. The project report, *Centres for Older People: Guide for Programs and Facilities* (Maxwell, 1962), served as a valuable resource for Centre practitioners, not only providing them with practical information about all facets of Senior Centre operation, but also articulating the philosophical foundation of the Senior Centre movement.

As Centres continued to increase in number and scope throughout the 1960's, the NCOA received widespread demands from Senior Centre practitioners for technical assistance for their planning and programming. The NCOA responded in 1970 by establishing the National Institute of Senior Centres (NISC) to help meet these demands. The NISC has issued numerous publications on Senior Centre operations. Its constituency contains not only Senior Centre personnel, but also "social workers, recreational personnel, educators, public health nurses and other specialists, nutritionists, community and social planners, housing administrators, nursing home directors, retirement planners, and students" (Jacobs, 1975, viii).
American Senior Centres were given a major boost in the mid-1960's with the passage of the Older Americans Act (OAA). Multi-purpose Senior Centres were the only social agencies mentioned in the Act. Centres were also given impetus by Office of Economic Opportunity Community Action Programs.

Senior Centres have been progressively moving away from their emphasis on recreation towards more comprehensive programming, which includes health, nutrition, counselling, and other services. In 1971, the White House Conference on Aging adopted a recommendation which stated, "in every community and neighbourhood...there should be a multipurpose Senior Centre to provide basic social services, as well as link all older people to appropriate sources of help" (in Monro, 1972, pp. 27-28). The U.S. Federal government showed its support for this recommendation in 1973, when it amended The Older Americans Act (OAA), and under Title V, authorized the provision of funding for the acquisition, renovation, or alteration of facilities that would serve as multipurpose Senior Centres.

Further amendments to the OAA were made in 1978, which gave area agencies the discretion to designate Senior Centres as focal points for comprehensive services in their communities. The full implications of this 1978 amendment are not yet clear; however, they reveal the desire of Congress to support Senior Centres as "appropriate settings for a comprehensive single-entry service system" (Estes, 1979, p. 133).

Carol Estes, who is a vocal critic of United States government policies for the aged, conceded (though somewhat cynically) that "the trend toward expansion of Senior Centers may continue to gain momentum, for it may be an expedient way to demonstrate that something tangible is being done for the aged" (Estes, 1979), p. 134).
Canada

Senior Centres first appeared in Canada in the mid 1950's, over a decade after the American Centres began. Canada's first Senior Centre, the Age and Opportunity Centre, was initiated in Winnipeg in 1954. The first B.C. Centre, Silver Threads, began operation in Victoria in 1957. Although these, and other early operations were not called "Senior Centres", they were very similar to the American models (Davis, 1978).

The Canadian Senior Centre movement has been smaller and slower in gaining momentum than the American movement. Canadian Centres have developed along less consistent lines than their American counterparts. Generally speaking, they have been local, grass-roots organizations, established to meet the unique needs of each community. They have been funded and initiated by Municipal Parks and Recreation departments, Social planning agencies, church and community groups, senior citizen groups, and various other organizations.

In British Columbia, the major sources of funding for Senior Centres comes from

1) Municipal Parks and Recreation departments -- e.g. Murdoch Centre in Richmond and Century House in New Westminster.

2) The Provincial Ministry of Human Resources -- the 411 Senior Centre in Vancouver, Silver Harbour Centre in North Vancouver, Silver Threads in Victoria, and the Penticton Retirement Centre in Penticton are the only Centres to receive the bulk of their operational funding from the Provincial Government.

3) The Federal Government -- Brock House in Vancouver and Silver Harbour Centre received Federal grants to assist them in paying their capital costs when they were first being started.
Centres also rely on grants from the Federal Government's New Horizon Program (which is designed exclusively to provide "seed" money for projects planned for and by senior citizens), private and group donations, and earnings from Centre events and programs.

The first major step towards establishing a coordinated Canadian Senior Centre movement came in 1972, when the Canadian Council on Social Development and the Welfare Grants Division of the Department of National Health and Welfare jointly sponsored a conference for individuals involved in giving leadership to Senior Centres in Canada. After this initial gathering, the Senior Centres Organization of Canada (SCOC) was formed and has since held annual conferences. The Organization is currently working on a set of standards for Canadian Senior Centres, similar to a set published for American Centres by the NCOA (1978). These standards should assist Senior Centre practitioners in their quest to improve their operations as well as facilitate more consistent development of Centres in Canada in the future.

It is impossible to say exactly how many Senior Centres exist in Canada (or the United States, for that matter), as no national survey of Canadian Centres has been conducted. Although Provincial surveys exist, one must use caution when comparing their figures. For example, according to the Social Planning and Review Council (SPARC) of B.C.'s publication, Senior Citizens' Guide to Services in British Columbia thirty-one Senior Centres existed in the province early in 1979. However, this list included single purpose drop-in Centres, while it excluded one of the best known multipurpose Senior Centres in Canada, the Penticton
Retirement Centre. The information base on Canadian Centres will likely improve when the SCOC becomes more established and researchers gain awareness of the emerging Senior Centre phenomenon.

As is the case in the United States, more Senior Centres are expected to be established in Canada in the future. The trend will likely be away from the single purpose "recreation centre" model to the multipurpose model, which serves the "total" person -- physical, emotional and, in some cases, spiritual.

THEORETICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

The brief review of the history of the Senior Centre movements in the United States and Canada has shown the tremendous growth in the number and complexity of Senior Centres over the years. It has highlighted the dynamic nature of Centres, and the need for flexibility in planning. Certainly, what was considered an adequate Centre in the 1950's would hardly meet the needs of today's seniors. If individuals involved in the planning process at Senior Centres are to meet the challenges of the future, they must at a minimum have an effective basis for their planning. The following section seeks to contribute to such a basis by exploring the relevant literature to provide understanding of current thinking on the planning process at Senior Centres.

What is Involved in the Planning Process at Senior Centres?

Before considering what is involved in a Senior Centre's planning process, it is useful to examine what planning itself is.

Planning has been defined as "an action centrally concerned with the linkage between knowledge and organized action" (Friedmann and Hudson, 1974, p. 2). It has also been said to represent "an action-producing
activity which combines investigation, thought, design, communication, and other components...a special kind of pre-action action" (Fagin, in Horowitz, 1978, p. 45).

These definitions may seem vague, and indeed, they may be guilty of what some critics describe as "a form of generalization that we might designate as indeterminate abstraction...not so much incorrect as it is simply trivially true" (Scott and Roweis, 1977, p. 39). However, planning is a complex phenomenon and no single definition could possibly encompass all of its attributes.

The complexity of planning was hinted at in the discussion of the rational decision making model in the introductory chapter. To expand on that discussion, critics argued that the model's simplistic assumptions failed to deal with the flux and turmoil of the "real" world. They charged that the model's greatest failure was its neglect of the "human side of planning" (Friedmann and Hudson, 1974, p. 13). One theorist noted, "as long as we remain with the economists' simplistic model of rational 'economic man,' we can expect to plan with great naivete and with little effect" (Bolan, 1974, p. 32).

In an effort to devise a more effective and realistic planning model, a "new wave" (Friedmann and Hudson, 1974) or "new paradigm" (Bolan, 1974) of planning theory has emerged. This "new wave" places greater emphasis on the "unrationality" of planning and it abandons the premise that planning can proceed along the value-free lines of science. Rather, it acknowledges the essential political nature of planning decisions and accepts the central role played by ethics and values in planning. The more recent theorists see planning as a thinking and social process. They recognize behaviour as being a central concept for
planning and argue that effective planning can only occur if the planner interacts with his client in a spirit of mutual learning (Friedmann, 1973, Bolan, 1974).

It is impossible to do justice to planning theory in this brief space; however, good reviews of the literature are contained in Friedmann and Hudson (1974), Faludi (1973), and Bolan (1974). The discussion should alert the reader to the complexities inherent in studying planning, and that efforts to understand it will never produce a panacea for all the ills of a Senior Centre (or any other operation, for that matter).

Turning now to planning at Senior Centres, both the method (process) and subject matter (substance) of planning at Senior Centres varies from Centre to Centre. Conceptually, planning at Senior Centres may be seen as occurring at two stages, 1) before the Centre is established, when the activities and decisions regarding initiation are conducted, (i.e. conducting needs studies, selecting a site for the facility, raising funds, hiring staff, etc.), and 2) after the centre is established, when activities and decisions related to the ongoing operation of the Centre are made (i.e. selecting activities and services to be offered, setting annual budgets, establishing membership requirements, and monitoring, evaluating, maintaining, and modifying plans, etc.)

The focus of this thesis is on planning done after the Centres have been established. It is particularly concerned with program planning, although other aspects of the planning process are also discussed. According to Maxwell, "program is the sum total of all that individuals do in the Centre and in the name of the Centre. Program cannot be viewed, discussed or planned as a separate entity" (Maxwell, 1962, p. 59). Another
The author asserts that "programs are not only events, but also experiences with individual meanings for each member who participates" (Vickery, 1972, p. 199).

The NCOA published a brief guide for Senior Centre practitioners, identifying eight components of program planning:

1) Establishing program goals
2) Determining priorities
3) Allocating resources
4) Monitoring programs and services
5) Producing information for constituents (boards, funding sources, and community)
6) Evaluating performance
7) Updating programs
8) Allowing for change

(McGovern and Jacobs, 1975, p. 2)

The premise of this publication is that program planning should aim to provide accountability, credibility, and trust. The authors argued that in order to reach this goal, "Senior Centres need accurate management information on goals and objectives, costs and resources, program implementation, and evaluation" (McGovern and Jacobs, 1975, p. 2). The necessity for such information has become more crucial in recent years, due to fiscal restraint by all levels of Government and competition for funds with other sectors of society.

As the "new wave" planning theorists stress, planning is both a thinking and social process. It involves not only understanding and acting upon objective data, but also dealing with the complexity of needs, desires, personalities, and emotions of Centre members, and satisfying
representatives of the community and government that the outcomes of a Centre's planning decisions are effective and worthwhile. Thus, planners at Senior Centres not only need good management skills, but also to be highly skilled in the human services, public relations, and in dealing with governments.

First Assumption: Members Should Have the Opportunity to Become In a Centre's Planning Process

Virtually all literature on Senior Centres stresses the importance of involving members in the planning process. Most of the arguments fit into one of four themes.

1) Gerontology - Gerontological studies have dispelled a number of the myths about old people that have prevailed in our society. They reveal that age is a relative concept and people to not suddenly deteriorate when they reach 65 years of age. The ability of artists such as Pablo Picasso, Goethe, and Michelangelo to produce great works in their 80's, the continued political activity of world leaders such as Mao Tse Tung, Marshall Tito, and Ronald Reagan, the the perseverance of numerous "lesser known" older adults long past the standard retirement age reveal the danger of prejudging a person's potential on the basis of chronological age alone.

Research findings show that many of the so-called negative aspects of aging result from environmental factors, rather than from biological changes or chronological age. For example, recent studies involving elderly subjects in care facilities discovered that when the subjects were given the opportunity and incentive to have a greater say in the decisions which affected them, their memories improved and they became much more sociable and satisfied with life (Langer and Rodin, 1976).
These findings cannot be indiscriminately applied to Senior Centre members; however, they suggest that treating older people in a humane way, showing respect for their decision-making abilities, and acknowledging their right to have a voice in the planning of their own affairs can be beneficial.

Studies such as the above lend support to arguments for ensuring that Senior Centre members have the opportunity to become involved in their Centre's planning process. They not only suggest that opportunities for involvement may be beneficial to the older person's mental well-being, but that the lack of opportunities may have major detrimental effects.

2) Professional's role - As noted in the introductory chapter, the role of the Senior Centre Director or planner, like that of social and community planners, has been more closely analysed in recent years. With the growing recognition that rational, value-free planning is unattainable, the Senior Centre professional can no longer claim legitimacy from his technical expertise alone. The recent emphasis that planning theory literature places on the social aspects of the planning process is reflected in the publications for Senior Centre practitioners.

Today's Senior Centre Director is called upon to serve as an enabler, catalyst, and motivator who plans with, but never for Centre members (Wilson, 1972; Jacobs, 1975). In effect, this call to engage in a process of "mutual learning" or "dialogue" with their clients echoes the calls of many "new wave" planning theorists who advocate that the planner's role should be to engage in a process of mutual learning (Friedmann and Hudson, 1974; Bolan, 1974).
In considering the Senior Centre Director's or planner's "search for legitimacy" (Rein, 1969), two additional reasons for including Centre members in the Centre's planning process emerge. First, planning is a major responsibility. What may seem like a minor decision to a Centre Director, may have far-reaching effects on the members. For example, the cancellation of a bus trip might be a serious blow to an older person who has been looking forward to the excursion for a number of weeks. The effect would be most severe for the older adult who lives alone and has no prospect of going on another journey. Unless the Centre members are given the opportunity to participate in the decision making at their Senior Centre, the Centre Director can be held responsible for any negative consequences that result.

The second reason that Centre Directors should include members in the planning process relates to their own professional survival. As a leading figure in the Senior Centre movement suggested, unless the Centre professional changes with the times (i.e. adopts a catalyst-facilitator role and includes members in planning) he "could find himself displaced very quickly" (Schreiber, in Wilson, 1972, p. 62).

3) **Democratic principles** - The Greek Historian, Heroditus, coined the term "democracy" and posited its essential features as:

1. equality before the law
2. popular deliberation and development of a consensus
3. public accountability of officials
4. equality of speech

(cited in Fagence, 1977, 0. 23)

The central principle underlying Athenian "direct democracy" was the
"equal rights of every citizen to participate in the process of government..." (Fagence, 1977, p. 23). Democratic principles have been cited to justify the numerous citizen participation programs in community planning in the United States and Canada in the 1960's and 1970's. Some cynics exist, such as Fagence, who describes citizen participation as a "mere palliative to the ills of the planning profession" (Fagence, 1977, p. 1), and argues that the best citizen participation may, indeed, be equated with the least citizen participation (p. 356). However, confessed non-believers like Fagence are rare.

In fact, "it is very difficult to avoid the view that writers and politicians alike are afraid to oppose either the notion or the specific implementation of citizen participation" (Rose, 1974, p. 66). Perhaps Arnstein is correct, "the idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you" (Arnstein, 1968, p. 216). Despite the general acceptance of the "goodness" of citizen participation, no entirely satisfactory method of measuring or evaluating the effectiveness of citizen participation has yet been devised. According to one writer,

"Many social scientists, planners, social workers, and elected officials persist in appraising what they term to be citizen participation without always realizing or admitting that what they report or infer is primarily a judgment - often a value judgment" (Rose, 1974, p. 214).

A major problem facing participatory planning in general, and at Senior Centres in particular, is determining the "representativeness" of participants in the process. The first staff workers at the Hodson Centre had to deal with a select few domineering, autocratic, elderly board members who sought to run the Centre their way and by so doing, threatened to drive the other members from the Centre (Kubie and Landau, 1953).
This problem is certainly not unique to the Hodson Centre, and it emphasizes the fact that self-interest, disagreeable tendencies, and incompetence will not necessarily be eliminated by having representation from the users of any facility, service, or institution.

The fact that potential problems may occur with involving Centre members in planning, however, is not an excuse for excluding them from the process. The Centre Director or planner who has successfully adopted the enabler-catalyst role should be able to find tactful (albeit time consuming) ways to remedy unproductive situations and work towards getting the planning process back on course. Also, unless all citizen participation programs could be scientifically proven to be ineffective or detrimental to the well-being of the individual, the exclusion of Senior Centre members from participation in the planning process at their Centres could not be justified.

If society values democracy, and the right of its citizens to participate in the process of their own government, any attempt to exclude older people from this right, for reasons of age alone, would be blatant "ageism" (a term introduced by Butler (1969) to describe social practices, including prejudices and stereotypes which are negative in their appraisals of older persons and their role in society).

4) Political expediency - If members are involved in all aspects of a Senior Centre's planning, they will presumably become more committed to their Centre and work harder to make it run successfully. This belief was expressed by a leading spokesman in the American Senior Centre movement, who said, "You'll be a smash Director if you have the members running the Centre..." (Schreiber, 1972, p. 37). Certainly, if members think they are running their Centre, the Director should be a "smash!"
Involving members in a Centre's planning process is important, not only for "winning over" the members, but for gaining outside support as well. If Centre members take responsibility for organizing fund raising drives, applying for grants, and holding special events, they are much more likely to gain assistance from both community and government sources. As the amount of funding obtained is a major factor determining the amount and type of programming a Centre can offer, it is a key issue facing virtually all Senior Centres. If Centre members' participation in planning can attract more money to the Centre, this participation is certainly desirable.

Second Assumption: The "Appropriate" Extent and Nature of Members' Involvement Varies from Centre to Centre and from Individual to Individual

An American Senior Centre publication argued that the number of persons who carry responsibilities for self-government and committee leadership is a reliable index of effective Centre programs...To be meaningful, group programs must involve (members) in the entire process, from decision making to implementation" (Jacobs and Magann, 1974, p. 3). The ideal of heavy senior involvement was far from being achieved in the United States in 1969. A national survey of over 1,000 American Senior Centres taken at that time, discovered that only 5.7% of the surveyed Centres had member representatives on their boards (Anderson, 1969).

Although the figure is decidedly low and would likely be much higher today, numbers alone should not be the criteria of successful self government. Also, no formula exists for determining the "appropriate" number of members who should be involved in planning at a Centre of a given size. "The self government roles in which members are involved
will differ in different settings, depending on the size of the membership, the responsibilities assigned to staff, and the physical and emotional health of group members" (Vickery, 1972, p. 168).

A point which deserves emphasis is that members should have the opportunity to become involved in a Centre's planning, not required to become involved. An older person may have a number of perfectly legitimate reasons for choosing not to become involved in his Centre's planning process. Attempting to reassure such a person to take an active role in planning would likely trigger resentment, anger, or feelings of inadequacy. Rather than gaining the person's support, the pressure tactics could well drive him from the Centre.

The question of how much members should be involved in a Centre's planning process can only partly be answered by examining the literature. A more complete answer will emerge when the case studies are considered.

SUMMARY

This chapter has provided a brief history of the Senior Centre movements in Canada and the United States and it has presented a theoretical literature foundation for the thesis:

The historical review traced the evolution of Senior Centres from the early single-purpose recreation or welfare Centres in the 1940's and 1950's to the later multipurpose Centres that have emerged and gained increasing popularity since the 1960's.

The theoretical literature review began by examining what is involved in the planning process at Senior Centres. For the purposes of this thesis, planning was defined as a thinking and social process, centrally concerned with "the linkage between knowledge and organized action"
(Friedmann and Hudson, 1974, p. 2). The various issues that may be involved in planning for Senior Centres were also discussed.

The remainder of the literature review substantiated the assumption underlying the research. First, it explored the question of why members should have the opportunity to become involved in a Centre's planning process. Four themes or justifications were presented: gerontological, the professional's role, democratic principles, and political expediency.

Second, it examined the degree to which members should be involved in their Centre's planning process. No conclusive answer was found, as the degree of desired member involvement was revealed to be dependent upon many variables and to vary from individual to individual and from Centre to Centre.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methods used in the case study research. It begins with a brief statement on why the three Senior Centres under study were chosen and then discusses the research instruments used, the sampling procedure, and methods of analysis.

RESEARCH SETTING

The three Senior Centres examined in the study are Silver Harbour Centre in North Vancouver, the 411 Centre in Vancouver, and Murdoch Centre in Richmond. These Centres were chosen for two reasons. First, they were chosen because they were reasonably accessible. I had to make frequent visits to each Centre. If I had decided to study less accessible Centres, the time and cost involved in the travelling would have necessitated my doing less thorough research. Second, and more importantly from a research perspective, I chose to study the Centres because they provide an interesting contrast in planning models. The Centres vary according to their time of establishment, clientele, funding and administrative bases, programming, and building and physical facility characteristics.

Background information on the Centres is provided in the case studies in Chapter four.

METHODS

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, this study is exploratory. The distinguishing features of exploratory studies are that they have no
formal hypotheses and that they are ideally suited to investigation of
groups or phenomena about which little is known (Bailey, 1978). I have
alerted the reader to the limitations of my methodology and advised him
to exercise caution in interpreting or generalizing from the findings.
However, as I shall explain, I believe that the methodological advantages
outweigh its disadvantages.

The data sources for the study consist of 1) newsletters, Constitu­
tutions and By-laws, and other documents from the Centres, 2) personal
observations, and 3) formal interviews and informal conversations with
interview subjects and other Centre members and staff.

SAMPLE

I identified three groups of actors that I expected to play different
roles and have different perceptions of the planning processes at the
Centres: 1) Centre Directors, 2) board members, and 3) general members.

I began by interviewing the Directors of the three Centres and
asked them to set up interviews for me with board members. Although the
Silver Harbour and 411 Centres have younger "community members"* serving
on their boards, I restricted my interviews to board members who were
also Centre members. This decision was made because of time constraints
and because of difficulties I anticipated in setting up appointments
with the community members.

*Adults who may or may not be Centre members who are invited to serve
by the Board rather than elected to serve by the general membership.
Although the community members may have provided some interesting insights into the planning process at the Centres, I do not believe that the omission of their comments seriously affects the value of the study. Community members are chosen for their influence in the community and with governments and for their expertise in such fields as law and accounting. Unlike the Centre members who serve on the board, community members are not heavily involved in the Centres outside of their 'Board' duty and they do not have the same understanding of the membership or of the day to day issues facing the Centres. I thus decided that their contribution to the study would be less valuable than that of the other board members.

I attempted to interview all board members (excluding community members) at the Centres. I had one refusal and avoided asking another member, as I was informed that he was experiencing illness in his family. I conducted six interviews of board members at Silver Harbour, seven at 411, and six at Murdoch Centre, for a total of nineteen interviews. As the Centre Directors and board members were the active people, the "do-ers," I saw a potential danger of having "one-sided" response by interviewing them exclusively. These individuals would not necessarily have the same perceptions about the Centre and the planning process in which they were directly involved as would other Centre members.

To gain a wider range of responses, I sought to interview a small sample of subjects from the general membership. I obtained my sample by requesting the Centre Directors to set up "on the spot" interviews. They obliged by asking members who happened to be at the Centres when I was there if they would agree to be interviewed. I was able to conduct a
total of nineteen such interviews. Because none of the interviews were arranged beforehand, the sampling procedure helped to ensure that others, in addition to the Directors' "favourites," were selected.

I told the Directors that I did not want to speak only with active, outgoing members, but desired to speak with a cross-section of the membership. A total of six members from all Centres refused to be interviewed; therefore, I may inadvertently have interviewed the more affable and outgoing members. Due to the small sample size and the possible bias in the selection procedure, care must be taken in generalizing the subjects' responses to the overall membership. However, as will be revealed in the case studies, the opinions of the general members, as well as being interesting in their own right, serve as an effective balance to the comments of the Directors and board members.

All interviews were conducted in private rooms or offices at the Centres within a six weeks period between May and June, 1980. Some interviews with general members were completed in twenty minutes, while interviews with the Directors spanned several hours and involved frequent follow-up questioning. The average length of time for an interview, however, was an hour.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

I designed separate interview schedules for the Centre Directors, board members, and subjects from the general membership (See Appendix). As noted, I expected the three groups of actors to play different roles and have different perceptions of the Centres' planning processes. I therefore designed the interview schedules with the aim of eliciting the most complete responses from each group.
The questions were open-ended, probing into the following areas:

1) Roles of the Director, staff, board, committee and general membership in the Centre's planning process ("official" roles as spelled out in written job descriptions or the Centre's Constitution and By-laws, perceived roles, and favoured roles).

2) Desirable characteristics or qualifications of individuals involved in "planning" at the Centres (i.e. the Director, staff, board and committee members).

3) Perceived opportunities and encouraging and discouraging factors for members' involvement in the Centre's planning.

4) Advantages and disadvantages of the Centre's administrative model (e.g. funded, staffed, and operated by a Municipal Parks Department or run independently by members).

5) Planning issues facing the Centres.

6) Overall attitudes towards the respondent's Centre, its program, and Senior Centres in general.

One advantage of using an exploratory research design, as opposed to a more controlled design, is that it allowed for considerable flexibility in the interviews. It enabled me to ask respondents questions which were specifically related to their Centres, as well as to allow them to elaborate on points which were of particular interest to them. Each interview consisted of two types of questions: general questions related to the planning process at all Senior Centres, and Centre-specific questions related to aspects of the planning process peculiar to the respondent's Centre. I determined the general interview question after reading literature on Senior Centres, planning theory, citizen participation, organizational science, and gerontology. I determined most of
the Centre-specific questions after taking a tour of the Centres and reviewing their Constitutions and By-laws, newsletters, staff's written job-descriptions, and other pertinent Centre documents. I added more questions related to the individual Centres when interview subjects raised issues that I had not foreseen. Also, once I began interviewing, I immediately eliminated questions from the schedule that appeared offensive, irrelevant, or generally ineffective. Because of the flexibility of my approach, I was able to pursue the issues in subsequent interviews with other respondents and re-interview some earlier respondents on pertinent points.

Although other researchers have noted that the described method of interviewing is open to manipulation, both in terms of the questions asked and in the responses analysed and presented (Needleman and Needleman, 1974; Daneluzzi, 1978), I made efforts to control for bias. First, I sought this control in my research design. I did not perform formal pretests; however, I consulted three experts in the field of aging during the preparation of the interview schedules and I made major revisions to the schedules as a result of their comments. And, as noted, I conducted follow-up interviews with some early respondents to ensure that all interviews covered the most important questions and that the analyses were based on responses from the total sample, rather than a select few.

I also attempted to control for bias in my analysis. I presented excerpts from interviews, both in order to shed light on complex issues and to permit the reader to judge whether my interpretation of the comments was valid. By making frequent visits to each Centre, I gained a strong "feel" for the atmospheres of the Centres. The personal observations I
made at the Centres, "off-the-record" comments I obtained during interviews, and casual conversations I had with respondents and others enabled me to gain insight into the characteristics and behaviour of people at the Centres. Witnessing interactions between the Directors, board members, and other members enabled me to put myself in the position of the various actors and speculate how I would feel about participating in the Centres' planning.

Finally, I attended the annual general meetings of two of the Centres, and a board meeting at the other Centre, and thereby gained a greater understanding of the participatory planning process by observing it in action.

ANALYSIS

I used the "Shotgun" method of recording (Needleman and Needleman, 1974), taking down notes on everything no matter how peripheral it seemed to the study at the time. My experience with the method was similar to that of others who have used it; bits of data which at first seemed unrelated often fell into a seemingly obvious pattern as the research progressed. Had I used a more rigorous research design and recorded only information that I considered to be directly related to "my conception" of the planning process at Senior Centres, I would have eliminated some of the most significant data from the study (the findings on staffing, funding levels, and Centre buildings are the main examples).

The data for the study is descriptive, and requires qualitative, rather than quantitative analysis. Although some social scientists generally prefer quantitative measures, believing that they can somehow reveal a more accurate picture of "the truth," such social scientists
have been compared to "a drunk who searches for a lost wallet under a street light because the light is better there" (Hampden-Turner, cited in Bolan, 1974, p. 20).

As leading writers on Senior Centres observe, "It is not always possible in evaluating programs in a Senior Centre to establish objective criteria. Subjective judgments may be called for and may be appropriate" (Leanse, et al., 1977, p. 38).

This reasoning is also applicable to studies of the planning process at a Senior Centre.

By choosing to use qualitative rather than quantitative analysis, the study faces two potential hazards: 1) presenting findings as "patterns" when in fact, no patterns exist, and 2) generalizing the findings to a larger population, in cases where they only apply to the sample.

The hazards are worth risking, especially when the hazards of alternative research designs are considered. For example, Estes has complained that "the dominance of...positivistic research methodologies inherited from the initial discipline in social gerontology (Psychology) has limited the legitimacy accorded to in-depth observational approaches and has discouraged trust in, and researcher reliance upon, the perspectives and meanings generated and expressed by older people themselves" (Estes, 1979, p. 12).

I have described the efforts I have taken to check and recheck the validity of my data and to control for bias. I have confidence that the patterns I describe are important in providing an understanding of the planning process at Senior Centres; however, "the ultimate test of any method must be the utility and replicability of its findings" (Needleman and Needleman, 1974, p. 15). I believe that the conceptualization and execution of this study is sound and that the analyses and research
findings are valid. I have sought to be clear and explicit in my presenta-
tion in order to facilitate the understanding and invite the scrutiny
of all readers, as well as to assist researchers who may be interested in
doing follow-up studies.

SUMMARY

This chapter has described the methodology used in the case studies. It contains a rationale for selecting the three Senior Centres examined in this thesis, a description of data sources, sampling procedure, inter-
view schedule construction, and methods of analysis. Having provided this necessary background information, the case studies and analyses of factors which encourage and discourage members' involvement in a Senior Centre's planning process are presented in the following two chapters.
This chapter presents case studies of three Senior Centres in Greater Vancouver. Each Centre is examined separately in an effort to provide a brief overview of the Centres' histories, buildings and physical environments, memberships, programs and administrative structures. The purpose of the chapter is not solely to provide elaborate descriptions of each Centre, but rather to present information which will be pertinent to the analysis of factors which encourage or discourage members in becoming involved in a Centre's planning process. In addition, the chapter aims to give the reader a "feel" for the Centres under study, thereby revealing the uniqueness of each Centre and underscoring the assertion made in previous chapters that extreme care must be exercised so that generalizations about Senior Centre programs, clients, or physical facilities may be recognized as such.

SILVER HARBOUR CENTRE

A. Historical Overview

The Silver Harbour Centre in North Vancouver opened in September, 1973, as the result of approximately five years of effort by a dedicated group of older citizens and interested younger individuals from North Vancouver. The first meeting to discuss the establishment of Silver Harbour was held in February, 1968 at the home of one of the Centre's current officers. At this meeting, a small group of older adults met
with the Mayor of the City of North Vancouver, who made a commitment of
a land grant for the site upon which the Centre is now located. The group
appointed a committee to draft a Constitution and By-laws for a non-profit
society. In December, 1968, the society was duly registered in Victoria
as The Silver Harbour Manor Society. Meetings were held regularly in the
years that followed, and increasing numbers of both older and younger
adults supported efforts to get the Senior Centre established. Between
1968 and 1973, 165 meetings (excluding committee meetings) were held by
the society.

In order to raise funds, the Silver Harbour Society held bazaars,
luncheons, and other events, and launched a door to door canvass in the
community. Society members also sought assistance by meeting with and
writing to politicians in the Provincial and Municipal levels of
Government. The Society received grants from both the Federal and Provin­
cial governments, which were used for the construction of the Centre.
And as noted, the land upon which the Centre is now located was donated
by the City of North Vancouver.

B. Building and Physical Environment

North Vancouver, where Silver Harbour Centre is located, is a suburb
of Vancouver which has a population of approximately 100,000. Silver
Harbour Centre is located immediately adjacent to a recreation centre.
It is less than a block away from a major thoroughfare which has frequent
bus service, and a variety of shops and services. The Centre is situated
on a slightly sloping site, which may create some difficulties for people
who have difficulty with walking. The design of the Centre, however, min­
imizes access barriers. For example, a ramp with railing leads into
the Centre. Within the building, an elevator, wall railings, and wash­
rooms for handicapped persons are provided. These design features enable
members who would otherwise be unable to attend the Centre to make use of
its facilities with as little inconvenience as possible.

The Centre's building is two stories high and has a basement, which
is also used for programs. While agreeing that its basic structure
should be compatible with the Recreation Centre next door, members of the
society were able to specify features which they desired to have incorpor­
ated into the design of the Centre. Silver Harbour is well furnished and
equipped. For example, it contains a kitchen and dining area, a large
crafts area with pottery kilns, weaving looms, and various other equipment,
a billiard room with three full sized slate tables and a three-quarters
size table, and a woodwork shop equipped with an array of quality hand
and power tools. Equipment and funds for the purchase of equipment came
from private and group donations and from grants from the Federal New
Horizons program. Service Clubs were "especially eager" to donate
equipment for men's activities, such as pool tables and power tools.

One member described Silver Harbour members' resourcefulness in
gaining grants and donations this way: "We're very good at begging."

Photographs of members participating in on-going Centre programs and
special events are arranged on the walls of the Centre. Examples of mem­
bers' paintings, ceramics, and weaving are on display in the upstairs
crafts rooms. Such 'personal' touches give the Centre a distinctive
character, clearly accentuating the fact that it is people who give life
to any Centre.
C. Membership and Social Environment

In July, 1980 the membership at Silver Harbour totalled approximately 2,600. Membership is available to individuals 60 years and over and to their spouses. Younger adults with handicaps have been granted memberships upon the recommendation of their Physicians. A wide age-span is represented at the Centre.

Although some members use canes and appear to be slightly shaky in their movements, the majority are reasonably mobile. The Executive Director of Silver Harbour observed,

"We cater mainly to the well elderly."

A member said:

"We don't have facilities to serve those in wheelchairs. Two or three other organizations look after them, so we haven't cut in. We'd need extra staff and facilities if we tried."

The membership appears to be predominantly from a middle-class background. On my visits to the Centre, I did not observe any members who were visibly impoverished. Appearances may have been deceiving, for I was informed that many members have no income aside from their Old Age pensions. One member suggested that if members' incomes are modest, they may compensate by paying special attention to good grooming, in order to keep up a "good front."

Most members appear active and involved. They seem to have a purpose in being at the Centre (for example, to take part in organized activities such as dance classes, bingo, or crafts, chatting with friends, enjoying eating a meal, or reading a book in the Centre's library). Although not all members are involved in organized activity, the Centre has a purposeful atmosphere, which distinguishes it from a drop-in Centre.
Many of the members are "regulars" who visit the Centre daily. I was frequently told in interviews that the Centre is "a way of life" for many members. The pool players, for example, arrive at the Centre before it is unlocked in the morning and they are the last to leave in the afternoon. A member observed:

Many members are absolutely lost on Saturday and holidays when the Centre is closed. All your friends are members.

Another said,

I've heard some members say 'coming here is a way to get through the day.' That's rather sad.

D. Purpose and Program

The purpose of Silver Harbour, as specified in Article 2 of the Centre's Constitution is:

a) To endeavour to provide such services and activities as may be deemed beneficial to the welfare of elderly people.

b) To own, operate, lease or manage such lands and premises as may be in the control of the Society from time to time.

(Silver Harbour Manor Society Constitution, Article 2, (1973)).

Silver Harbour is open from 9:00 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. from Monday to Friday and from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m., on a drop-in basis, on Sunday.

Silver Harbour is a multipurpose Centre, offering a broad spectrum of activities and services. Examples include:

organized activities - such as dance classes, crafts, bingo, and keep-fit classes,

educational experiences - such as French and Spanish lessons, visits to the theatre, and lectures by guest speakers,
trips - day trips as well as longer excursions, to places such as Reno,

services - such as counselling, income tax assistance, housing registry, legal advice, and community health services,

nutrition - snacks, refreshments, and a hot, nutritional noon meal can be purchased at modest prices in the Centre's cafeteria,

special events - such as sales, bazaars, dances, a Hawaiian Luau, an annual Mother's Day Pancake Breakfast, and Christmas dinner.

The Centre is also affiliated with the Federated Legislative Council of Senior Citizens of B.C. (F.L.C.), an umbrella group for Senior Citizens organizations that seek various benefits for Senior Citizens from Governments.

All of the members whom I spoke to supported a broad base for programming. As one of them said, with evident satisfaction,

"We serve the whole person here—physical and emotional. The only need we don't serve is spiritual. But there are lots of churches near here to look after that."

E. Administration

Silver Harbour is administered by its own Non-Profit Society. It has thirteen member Board of Directors, which is responsible for the Centre's policy, major financial decisions, and the management of the facility. Seven of the Board positions, those of the Society officers, are open to Centre members only. These officers are elected to office by the Centre's general membership. The remaining six Board positions, those of the community members, are filled by younger adults from the community. As noted previously, community members are not Centre members and are not elected by the general membership. Rather, they are invited
to serve by the Board. They are chosen mainly for their knowledge and
capacity for expertise and for their potential influence within the community and with
Governments. Silver Harbour presently has the services of the Comptroller
of the P.N.E., who serves as Treasurer, and a North Vancouver Alderman,
who besides having political influence, is also a lawyer and can assist
the Centre in legal matters. Virtually all publications on Senior Cen­
tres recommend that younger community members be included on a Centre's
governing Board. Although Silver Harbour operates under the philosophy
that the Centre should be "for seniors, by seniors," the Executive
Director and older Board members at Silver Harbour express gratitude for
having community members. One member said:

Our community members are very busy people. We don't
usually get all of them out for a meeting, but we
appreciate their dedication and all the help they
give us.

Another member, who supported the right of older adults to have a
say in the planning of their affairs, had this to say of community Board
members:

I shudder to think what we'd do without them.
There's a lot of money involved in this oper­
ation. We may have the odd retired accountant
here, but most people are unaware of money mat­
ters. We need community members to help us run
the Centre in a businesslike way.

The high value placed on community members is attested to by the fact
that when Silver Harbour first began, it had six Centre members (Society
officers) and seven community members on its Board. Centre members were
satisfied with this arrangement. It was a community member, not a Centre
member who suggested that the Constitution and By-laws be changed to
provide more member representation on the Board.
The Silver Harbour Society employs an Executive Director who is responsible to the Board at all times. The Executive Director's responsibilities are mainly administrative, and cover such areas as supervising staff, assisting with program planning, maintaining liaison with other community groups, and doing budgeting and purchasing.

In addition to the Executive Director, the Centre employs five other full-time and two half-time staff (excluding maintenance personnel). The staff assists with the Centre's activity programs, office and administrative duties, and kitchen services.

The Centre relies heavily upon the efforts of member volunteers for its operation. Each volunteer is part of a program committee. Program committees are headed by "convenors" who are elected by the general membership at the Centre's Annual General Meeting. Provided that a committee does not contravene Centre policy or attempt to use more than its share of the Centre's resources, it is virtually free to do its own planning. Convenors meet monthly to report on earnings their programs have generated and to discuss matters relating to the Centre and its programming.

At present, Silver Harbour has approximately two hundred active volunteers. The Executive Director proudly states,

We suffer from the opposite problem of most Centres. Rather than having too few volunteers, we have (in some program areas) too many.

The Centre's policy is to use member instructors for its programs, whenever possible. If qualified and willing members cannot be found, the services of outside instructors from Community Colleges and other organizations are sought. Unless outside instructors are funded from
other sources, the Silver Harbour Society is not able to pay instructors for their services.

The Executive Director observes,

We couldn't pay some instructors and not pay others. That would be a situation inviting problems.

The bulk of operational funding for the Centre is provided by a Grant from the Provincial Ministry of Human Resources. While the Grant has been increased each year, it has not kept pace with the rise in the cost of living. As will be noted later in the thesis, this situation creates some problems for planning; however, it challenges the resourcefulness of members in raising funds. In addition to receiving the Provincial Grant, Silver Harbour members also contribute to the Centre's operational revenue with proceeds from special events, program fees, and other activities. The proportion of the member-raised funds has risen from less than a third of the Centre's annual operating revenue in 1974, to over 45% in 1980.

411 SENIOR CENTRE

A. Historical Overview

Like Silver Harbour, the 411 Senior Centre was initiated by a dedicated group of senior citizens; however, it had to go through a "growing phase" before it became a self-governing organization. The first efforts to get the Centre established occurred in 1971, when members of the Senior Citizens Association of B.C. became concerned that there was no place in downtown Vancouver where a senior from out-of-town could go to rest and have light refreshments while on a visit to the city. Three members of the Association formed a committee to petition the Provincial Government for assistance in establishing a small downtown senior drop-in Centre.
The Government met their request and provided a small space for the Centre on the ground floor of what was then a Provincial Government office building at 411 Dunsmuir Street. Renovations for the Centre were started in the summer of 1972 and the facility was opened in December of that year.

From its modest beginnings, the Centre had a slow, but steady growth. It was originally coordinated by an employee of the Provincial Division on Aging and staffed by older volunteers. It functioned as a place where "any senior who dropped in" could purchase tea and snacks. Requests for more substantial and nutritious fare became frequent and in 1973, a full-time cook was hired to provide the Centre's patrons with sandwiches, soup, and an inexpensive hot noon meal. Shortly after, the Centre began offering a limited range of activities, such as carpet bowling, bingo, discussion groups, and crafts.

The number of staff, the range of programming, the size of the membership, and the physical space available for use by the Centre have increased steadily ever since. A major change in the Centre's administrative structure occurred in 1977, when the Centre was registered as a non-profit Society. Following this change, the Centre was no longer under the administration of a Provincial Government Department, but became a self-governing organization.

B. Building and Physical Environment

The 411 facility provides a sharp contrast to that of Silver Harbour. Rather than occupying a new building, specially designed and constructed as a Centre, it is housed in an old four-story building which was constructed in 1914 by a labour organization. The building served as a technical school in the 1920's, a centre for unemployment relief in the
1930's, and then as the home of various Municipal and Provincial Government agencies from the 1940's to the 1970's. When the Centre was established in 1972, the building contained a number of Provincial Government Agencies, with the most important for seniors and the development of the 411 Centre being the Division on Aging. These agencies slowly began to move out after 1972, and by 1978, the 411 Senior Centre was the sole occupant of the building.

The 411 building is owned by the Provincial Government and managed by the BC Building Management Corporation. The 411 Society is granted free use of the basement and first two floors. It is also provided with free building maintenance services.

As the 411 building was not specifically designed to serve as a Senior Centre, it is not as attractive or appropriate for its purpose as the Silver Harbour facility. Like Silver Harbour's facility, however, the 411 building is reasonably accessible to seniors who have problems with walking, and climbing stairs. Its entrance is at street level and it contains an elevator and washrooms for handicapped people. In addition, a number of renovations have been carried out which have helped to make the building more suitable for use as a Centre. The major renovations include the establishment of a men's woodworking shop, a large institutional-type kitchen, a dining area, and a medical centre.

Members of the Centre's Board and operating committee kept the Government informed about the need for an adequate Centre for seniors, and were thus instrumental in gaining Provincial Government funds to undertake the recent renovations. They also made suggestions as to what form the renovations should take. In addition, they and other Centre
members were successful in acquiring Grants from such sources as the New Horizons Program, which enabled the Centre to purchase a printing press and other equipment for its programs.

The downtown location of 411 contrasts with the suburban settings of Silver Harbour and Murdoch Centres. The location has a number of advantages. First, it is central, making it convenient for older adults who live in the downtown area and for other seniors who are downtown to shop or to keep appointments. Second, it is on a city bus route (Dunsmuir Street) and is only a block away from the bus station. It is therefore easily reached by local seniors, as well as by those from out of town. Third, the building itself is familiar to many older people, as it has contained agencies and services for seniors since 1947. As noted earlier, the most recent of these agencies was the Division on Aging. Older adults had visited the Division on Aging for information on pension benefits, for bus passes, to see a counsellor, and for various other services. Older adults appreciate familiar environments. Thus when the 411 Centre was established, it had, in effect, a "built-in" clientele.

Despite these advantages, the Centre's location has drawbacks as well. Perhaps the greatest drawback is its close proximity to numerous rooming houses, hostels, "seedy" hotels, and beer parlours. Based on my conversations with Centre members and my personal observations at the Centre, I suspect some older people may feel nervous about coming to 411. For example, one member who resides in the area noted,

This is a rough part of town. Four people have been killed in the hotel around the corner in the past two months.

Another said,

Some of the people from around here use pretty foul
language. Old people don't like that.*

Also, during one of my visits a large, inebriated man who appeared to be in his 20's entered the lobby of the Centre and began verbally abusing and physically threatening the members present. A Centre member calmly reasoned with the man and persuaded him to leave without incident. The experience was clearly upsetting to some members, however, and it illustrates a type of problem for planning a successful, enjoyable program not faced at suburban centres, such as Silver Harbour and Murdoch.

C. Membership and Social Environment

The 411 Centre has the same membership policy as Silver Harbour, admitting individuals sixty years and over, and their spouses. Younger people with handicaps have also been admitted upon the recommendation of a social worker or doctor. In mid-1980, the Centre's membership was approximately 1,600.

411's clientele is much more diverse than that of Silver Harbour, coming from a variety of residential locations, income brackets, and educational and social backgrounds. Although the Centre was originally established to serve out-of-town seniors visiting downtown Vancouver, it has attracted a large number of older adults (predominantly male) who reside in hostels, old hotels, and rooming houses near the Centre. I found that some people I interviewed at Silver Harbour and Murdoch had an image of the 411 members as "those poor old souls who need a place to come out of the rain." The members and staff at 411 are conscious of the concept others have of the Centre and its clientele. The former Program ***

*Judging from the vocabulary of some of the members I spoke with and overheard at 411, not all old people would object to "foul language".*
Assistant, for example, told me a standing joke regarding the Centre's image:

Brock House (a Senior Centre in Vancouver's affluent Point Grey area, which has many well-educated and prosperous members) is the Cadillac, Silver Harbour is the Thunderbird, and we're the Volkswagen.

Despite the many members who live in the downtown area, 411's membership is drawn from throughout the Greater Vancouver region. Some reside in affluent neighbourhoods, such as Shaughnessy and Kerrisdale; and the Centre's oldest member, a ninety-six-year-old man, travels to 411 every day by bus from his home in New Westminster. In the past two years, an increasing number of East Indians have joined the Centre. Whereas in 1978, the Centre had five members from the East Indian community, it presently has over 200. A prominent person in the East Indian community told me that he expects that over 500 members of his community soon will be attending at the Centre.

One Centre member said,

We're a real melting pot here.

Another said,

The only ones who might not come here are those too darned snooty to come. We wouldn't want them, anyway.

The atmosphere at 411 resembles that of a drop-in Centre more than an activity Centre. Many members at 411 come to sit, not to engage in organized activities or other programs. The fact that people "sit" does not mean they are inactive in all respects. For example, "people watching" can be an active pastime in its own right, although it may be annoying to those who are watched. This annoying aspect was revealed in a study of members' attitudes at a large American Senior Centre. The study found the presence of "lobby sitters" and "gossips" to be among the
major complaints voiced by members (Carp, 1976).

The Past President of 411 is concerned that the Centre's "seemingly" passive members aren't experiencing the "full benefits" of the Centre. He thus offered students working at the Centre on a summer project a dollar for every "sitter" they could encourage to participate in a walking tour. After six weeks, he had only parted with one dollar.

While 411 has a number of conspicuously passive members, it also has many active and energetic members. Not only are many members involved in organized activities, but they also engage in spontaneous activities. For example, on three of my visits to the Centre, a member started playing the piano, thereby sparking impromptu sing-alongs. During a monthly Birthday Party for members, an older woman got up and did an energetic jig, receiving hoots and applause from those in attendance.

Although I observed some instances of racial prejudice (which I will discuss in a later chapter), the main impression of members' attitudes I got from my visits to 411 was one of acceptance. The clientele was diverse in terms of age, lifestyle, social class, and interests; however, they generally appeared to accept other members and what those others chose to do or not to do, at the Centre.

D. Purpose and Program

The objects of the 411 Society are very similar to those of Silver Harbour:

a) The Society is a non-profit organization.

b) To endeavour to provide such recreational, cultural, and counselling services and activities as may be deemed necessary for the welfare or enjoyment of elderly people.
c) To own, or operate, or manage such lands and premises as may be in the control of the Society from time to time.

(411 Society Constitution, Article 2. (1977)).

The Society has also published a position paper, which states:

The purpose and goals of a Centre should be based on the belief that programs and services are meant to enrich lives; that associations and activities are to help older citizens fulfill their basic needs.

Like Silver Harbour, the 411 Centre is a multipurpose Centre, offering a broad program of activities and services. It is open seven days a week from 8:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. It offers:

- **organized activities** - such as sewing classes, chess and cards,
- **trips** - free monthly bus trips - Longer excursions are available at a modest price,
- **educational experiences** - such as discussion groups and English for New Canadians classes,
- **personal services** - such as counselling, legal advice, assistance with pension forms, income tax assistance, and medical services.

Unlike Silver Harbour, the 411 Centre is not affiliated with the Federated Legislative Council of Senior Citizens of B.C., or any other organization directly involved in seeking social action for senior citizens. Members and staff with whom I spoke at 411 were adamant that the Centre must be non-political. They argued that as the 411 Society relies upon the Provincial Government for its operating budget and building, it would be neither appropriate nor wise for the Centre to get involved in political issues. One member said,

*It's important for people to fight to ensure that seniors get the benefits they deserve. I'm all for it, as long as they don't bring the Centre into it.*
The program at the 411 Centre places greater emphasis on services than the activity-oriented Silver Harbour Centre's program. Much of its program is open to all seniors, not only to Centre members. For example, the Information and Referral Services, which are located on the second floor of the building, received nearly 10,000 telephone enquiries and over 4,000 office visits from B.C. seniors in its first seven months of existence. The Talkfest, a weekly program which features guests speaking on a variety of topics, is also open to any senior who cares to attend. It is given weekly publicity in a local newspaper, and though it got off to a slow start, it has attracted increasing numbers of older adults as the sessions have progressed. Interested members are presently working with the Community Education Division of the Vancouver School Board to establish a Downtown Learning Centre at 411, which will offer educational programs to seniors. Other plans for the Centre include securing the services of a Podiatrist and a Dentist in the near future.

The staff and Centre members I interviewed at 411 all spoke proudly of the program offered at the Centre. A Board member who might have had a "bigger is better" philosophy, said,

We're the largest multiservice Centre in B.C. (in terms of services offered and numbers using them). We aim to be the biggest in Canada.

E. Administration

As noted, the 411 Centre was originally administered by the Provincial Government's Division on Aging and then by the Vancouver Resources Board under the Ministry of Human Resources. Upon becoming a non-profit Society in 1977, the Centre adopted an administrative structure similar to that of Silver Harbour. The Centre is administered by a Board of
Directors, consisting of fifteen members. Four officers and three members-at-large are elected by the Centre's membership and are members of the Centre. Eight community members are invited to serve by the Board. As with the Silver Harbour Board, the responsibilities of 411's Board consist mainly of setting policy and making decisions on major expenditures by the Society.

The day to day decisions which affect the Centre and its programming are handled by the Operating Committee. The Operating Committee is composed of the seven elected Board members and the Coordinators of program activities. Unlike the Convenors of program committees at Silver Harbour, 411's activity Coordinators are not elected by the Centre's general membership; they are chosen by the members of each program activity group. The Operating Committee meets monthly to hear reports from the Coordinators on their programs and to discuss issues affecting the Centre and its programming. I was repeatedly told by staff and members that "it's the Operating Committee that runs 411, not the Board."

The Centre's paid staff includes an Executive Director, a Program Assistant, a Bookkeeper-Receptionist, and four kitchen employees. In addition, two full-time and two part-time staff are employed to operate 411's Information and Referral Services.

The Centre's Executive Director is responsible to the Board and is entrusted with the general management of the Centre's business, programs, and services.

The Program Assistant, under the direction of the Executive Director, is responsible for the development and operation of the Centre's program.

All staff at 411 must comply with the Centre's philosophy that the
Centre's planning should be done: "for seniors, by seniors, with staff assistance." The job description of the Program Assistant articulates this philosophy:

Members are encouraged to provide leadership and volunteer help. Staff are employed as facilitators rather than teachers.

The 411 Centre is similar to Silver Harbour in the reliance it places upon member volunteers and the "facilitator" role it assigns to its staff. Whenever possible, the 411 Centre uses members to lead programs, rather than looking to outside instructors to do the job. It also relies upon volunteers to do "bull work" such as wiping tables and stacking chairs. In March, 1980, 113 members served as volunteers at the Centre, devoting 2,101 hours to the planning and operation of 411. Staff and members were proud of these statistics. One member said,

We operate as a team here. That's what makes the Centre work.

The bulk of operational funding for the 411 Centre comes from a Grant from the Ministry of Human Resources. It would be misleading to compare the size of the Silver Harbour and 411 Grants on the basis of a member-dollar ratio, as the Centres' circumstances and the purpose, scope, and nature of their programs differ. Therefore, no comparison is offered. More will be said about the funding adequacy and its effects on programming and planning in a later chapter.

In addition to its operating Grant, the 411 Centre holds special fund-raising events, such as bazaars and White Elephant sales. However, it relies upon them for operating funds to a lesser degree than Silver Harbour. Members and staff expressed gratitude for the financial support given to them by the Ministry of Human Resources. They regarded it as a
key factor in enabling 411 to carry out its program as it does.

A Board member acknowledged,

We wouldn't be able to offer the services we do without MHR funding.

Another said:

The money frees us. Directors at some other Centres spend half their time in search of funds. We can devote all our energies to doing work for the Centre.

MURDOCH CENTRE

A. Historical Overview

Unlike the Silver Harbour and 411 Centres, Murdoch Centre in Richmond was not initiated or planned by Senior Citizens. Rather, it was established by the Richmond Municipal Council and the Department of Leisure Services.

Prior to 1975, Richmond's elderly population had limited opportunities to participate in organized activities. Although they could take part in some programs for seniors in community centres, such as carpet bowling and bingo, these programs were only scheduled for a few hours each week. Some older adults, of course, were able to participate in programs with younger adults, and many have probably continued to do so. However, roughly two-thirds of the older people I interviewed claimed that older adults generally prefer to participate in programs or activities with people in their own age group. I was also told that, either due to poor health or for psychological reasons, many seniors would feel intimidated joining in activities with younger adults. If these statements are indicative of most older people's viewpoints, the needs of Richmond's seniors for recreational and social opportunities were not being
Richmond's Municipal Council and Department of Leisure Services were sensitive to these unmet needs and they realized that as the older adult population was steadily increasing, the problem would only become greater. In the words of a Department of Leisure Services employee, the Department and Council realized that they had "a moral obligation to do something for seniors." Thus, the Leisure Services Department, with Council's support, was spurred on to establishing a separate facility with its own program for Richmond seniors.

The facility that the Department chose was a two-story Church Hall, which was under construction at the time by the Brighouse United Church. The Department helped secure a grant for the Church to assist with construction costs and it was able to lease the building for five days per week for use by Murdoch Centre. The Centre began operation in October, 1975.

During Murdoch Centre's first years of operation, its program expanded and the membership increased steadily. Initially, the Centre offered a small range of "traditional" activities for seniors, such as carpet bowling and bingo. By 1979, however, it was offering a much larger program, providing a wide variety of activities for its members. And while its membership stood at 40 after six months of operation, the figure had increased to over 700 by mid-1979.

These growth factors made the management of Murdoch Centre a demanding and difficult job. In 1979, therefore, the Assistant Director* of

*A staff person hired by the Department of Leisure Services to work "on site" at the Centre and perform managerial duties.
the Centre endeavoured to initiate a change in the operational guidelines of the Centre which, she hoped, would help her both to do her job more effectively and to be responsive to the needs of the increasingly complex Centre organization. She brought together twelve senior citizens from the community and with their assistance, drafted a set of operational guidelines which were to serve as a "trial" Constitution and By-laws for Murdoch Centre.

The guidelines called for the formation of an Executive Advisory Board composed of seven Centre members. Centre members approved the Constitution and By-laws on a one-year trial basis at Murdoch's 1979 Annual General Meeting. At the same meeting, they approved the slate of seven inaugural Board members presented by the Assistant Director. The effectiveness of the new operational guidelines will be assessed and, if necessary, revised later this year. The Centre plans to apply for non-profit status in the near future, but will continue to be administered by the Department of Leisure Services.

B. Building and Physical Environment

Richmond, the municipality in which Murdoch Centre is located, is a suburb of Vancouver which has experienced dramatic growth since the Second World War. It is roughly the same size as North Vancouver, with a population of nearly 100,000.

The building in which Murdoch Centre operates is situated off a small side street, roughly half a block from Number Three Road (a major four-lane thoroughfare) and over two blocks from the large Richmond Centre shopping complex. Murdoch is less accessible to members who use public transportation than are Silver Harbour and 411, as the nearest bus stop
is a block away on Number Three Road. However, the Centre is convenient for those members who live nearby and can walk to the Centre, as it is situated on a flat site and has an entrance at ground level. It is also convenient for members with cars, as it has a small parking lot within thirty feet of the Centre's entrance. Parking spaces were available in the lot each time I visited the Centre (six times during the course of my research and twice on previous occasions); however, I was told that the lot sometimes becomes full when the pre-school or church adjacent to the Centre holds an event simultaneously with a Centre program. Parking was more of a problem at Silver Harbour and 411 than it was at Murdoch.

Like the Silver Harbour building, Murdoch's facility is a modern structure, built in 1975. However, it is not as ideally suited to function as a Senior Centre as is the Silver Harbour facility, since it was secured by Leisure Services after construction had begun on it and Centre members did not have input into its design. In addition, it was intended for use by all age groups, not only senior citizens.

The most obvious difference between Murdoch's building and the Silver Harbour facility (and even the renovated 411 facility) is that it does not have a proper lounge or dining area where members can sit and casually socialize. The closest thing to a lounge that Murdoch has is a makeshift meeting area in the Centre's main lobby consisting of a grouping of a couch and comfortable chairs. Another difference between Murdoch's facility and those of Silver Harbour and 411 is that it does not contain special design features for senior or the handicapped. As the building contains no elevators and most programs are held on the second floor, older adults who experience problems with walking and climbing stairs
probably have difficulty in participating in the Centre's activities.

The fact that the facility is leased, rather than owned by the Municipality or Murdoch's sponsoring agency, places restrictions on what can be planned at the Centre. The building policy is set by its owners, the Brighouse United Church, and Murdoch Centre must accommodate its program to this policy. For example, the Centre's Assistant Director and a number of members complained that Murdoch's dances weren't satisfactory, as church policy prohibits the use of dance wax on the floor and the consumption of alcohol on the premises. Members stressed the first point, while the latter seemed particularly important to the Assistant Director:

The problem with our dances is that we get so few men turning out. The 'no drinking' policy hurts. Some men want a drink before dancing. The Centre shouldn't encourage drinking, but it should at least treat members as adults and let them make up their own minds about whether they drink or not.

Another complaint about the leasing arrangement is that other groups use the building on weekends, when the Centre is not in operation. With the consequent lack of security, the Centre cannot install expensive equipment, such as power tools. Also, members must clean up after programs to make way for the groups that follow. They cannot leave paintings, macrame, and other crafts out for display, as can members at Silver Harbour and 411 Centres. This requirement that members clean up after themselves is not only inconvenient, but it helps to give Murdoch an atmosphere of anonymity, sharply contrasting with the distinctive, "lived-in" character of the Silver Harbour and 411 Centres.

The Department of Leisure Services is aware of the limitations of the Murdoch facility. It has plans to bring Richmond Senior Citizens together to examine their needs and to come up with an alternative to the current
arrangement. The alternative may or may not be a Senior Centre. A pensioners' group in Richmond, (the O.A.P.A.), which terminated in 1979, left $1,300. to Leisure Services to be used to carry out preliminary studies for the planning of a suitable resource for seniors.

Assuming that the resource will be a Senior Centre, the Assistant Director has taken Board members to visit other Senior Centres in Greater Vancouver in order to help them gather ideas for features they would like to incorporate in their new Centre. Further action will likely be taken in late 1980.

C. Membership and Social Environment

As noted earlier, Murdoch Centre has experienced dramatic growth in its membership in recent years. By July, 1980, it had over 950 members. Planning Department population projections predict that Richmond's over-55 population will have increased by 69% between 1976 and 1986 (Richmond Planning Department, 1977). Combined with trends toward earlier retirements and a greater over-all "leisure consciousness" in society, these population projections suggest that Murdoch's membership will continue to rise for years to come.

Two types of membership are available at Murdoch Centre. The first is Associate membership, which is available to retired individuals 55 years and over who live outside of Richmond. No voting privileges are granted with this form of membership. The second is Active membership, which carries voting privileges, and is open to retired Richmond residents, 55 years and over. Younger adults may become members upon the discretion of the Assistant Director. For example, two women in their early 40's, with slight mental handicaps, were permitted to join, as
their parents had died and the women had been accustomed to associating with people of their parents' age.

Bearing in mind that no group of older adults is homogeneous, and that individual differences always exist, Murdoch members resemble those of Silver Harbour Centre. Most are generally well-groomed and appear to come from white middle-class backgrounds. And while they represent a wide age range, members seem to be reasonably mobile and healthy. As noted earlier, however, handicapped and less mobile seniors would experience difficulties in using the Murdoch facility. The apparent health and mobility of members is therefore not surprising.

From my observations, most members appear to be at the Centre to attend specific programs. Once their programs are over, they do not linger long before leaving. Carp's (1976) study of a Senior Centre in a large Texas Senior Citizen Housing complex found that over half the member respondents used the Centre as a place for informal sociability, much as they would use their own living room, and over a quarter enjoyed going to the Centre and "just sitting." Due to the interior layout of the Murdoch facility, Murdoch members do not have the opportunity to informally socialize or "just sit", as the members of this Texas Senior Centre or Silver Harbour or 411 have. This factor may help to explain the marked "purposiveness" of Murdoch's members.

A feature about Murdoch's membership, which the Assistant Director and many of the members I spoke with at the Centre identified as being positive, is that it includes some members in their late fifties. The Assistant Director and all the Centre members interviewed expressed the opinion that fifty-five is a preferable minimum age for membership to
sixty. For example, the Assistant Director observed,

Fifty-five to sixty-five are the good volunteer years. People seventy and over deserve to sit down and take a rest. (Mind you, we have some excellent volunteers in their 70's and 80's).

A member stated,

When the cut off age is fifty-five you get a younger, more active membership. It gives the Centre more life.

Another member noted a benefit accruing to the younger members themselves:

A big problem with many people is that they build their lives around their jobs. When they retire, it's major shock. They realize their friends were all from work and they don't know how to use their time. If they can join Murdoch, they can meet new people and gain new interests. It helps them ease into retirement.

Thus, while Murdoch's membership is not visibly younger than that of Silver Harbour and 411, its inclusion of individuals between fifty-five and sixty years of age seems to be beneficial both to the "pre-senior" members and to the overall Centre operation.

D. Purpose and Program

The objective of Murdoch Centre is:

To promote within the limitation of allocated resources year round opportunities for satisfying the leisure needs of senior adults in Richmond over the age of fifty-five. As well, to provide information services for senior adults whenever possible.

To provide settings in which members may experience acceptance by others, the feelings of belonging and recognition as individuals of positive worth.

(Article 1, Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre Advisory Executive Board Constitution, (1979))
Although some services are available at Murdoch Centre, such as Income Tax assistance, legal advice, and counselling, the Centre places far greater emphasis on organized activities than do Silver Harbour and 411. The activities at Murdoch are varied and meant to appeal to a wide range of people. Those seeking physical activity can attend keep-fit classes at the Centre or play tennis and golf at other locations in Richmond. Those wanting to engage in creative pursuits can take painting, ceramics, or macramé lessons. Those seeking education and entertainment can attend plays, listen to guests speak on a variety of topics, take French lessons, or go on bus trips lasting a few hours or several days.

Despite the fact that Murdoch has a games room with a three-quarter size pool table, a shuffleboard and dart board, it does not have the programs or facilities for men that Silver Harbour and 411 have. In addition to demographic factors, this may help to explain the predominance of women members at the Centre. Two of the men I interviewed at Murdoch spoke enviously of the fully equipped woodworking shops at other Centres. A woman I interviewed stated bluntly,

> It's important for the Centre to provide things for men to do. They don't want to come here and talk to a bunch of old biddies.

Apart from comments about the lack of men's programming and certain "building related" complaints, most people I spoke with at Murdoch were very satisfied with the Centre's program. They saw it as making a marked improvement in the lives of many older people.

In the words of one member,

> Half the problem with getting old is that you don't have ongoing goals. For some, just getting through the day is a goal. This Centre has done wonders for people, giving them interests and a chance to be with others. We're treated as human beings, not old fossils. We've got a lot to be grateful for.
E. Administration

As noted earlier, Murdoch Centre is not an autonomous organization like Silver Harbour or 411. It is administered by the Municipal Department of Leisure Services, which is responsible for determining policy, allocating funds, and preparing the annual budget. The staff person ultimately responsible for seeing that Departmental policy is carried out at Murdoch Centre, and that expenditures fall within the budget guidelines, is the Leisure Education and Special Groups Coordinator. The Coordinator works out of the Municipal Hall and 'Seniors' are only one of many special groups with which he must deal.

The staff person employed to actually look after the day to day management of the Centre is the Assistant Director. She is assisted by a paid, part-time Secretary. The Assistant Director is primarily responsible for administering the Centre's budget, for supervising activities, staff, and volunteers, and for managing the Centre's premises and revenue. Working within the policy guidelines of the Leisure Services Department, she and her superior, the Leisure Education and Special Groups Coordinator, prepare the Centre's budget.

Although her title is "Assistant Director", she performs the duties of a Director. Technically she could be required to consult with the Special Groups Coordinator on every major issue. She has been granted considerable powers of discretion by the Coordinator, however, and is only required to consult with him on policy and money matters.

As indicated previously, a change in the organizational structure at Murdoch occurred in September, 1979 when the new "policy guidelines" and the Centre's first Executive Advisory Board were approved. The Board consists of seven Centre members, who are elected (or will be, starting
in 1981) by the active membership (Richmond residents). The Assistant Director is appointed to the eighth position \textit{ex officio}.

Murdoch's Board differs from those of Silver Harbour and 411 both in its responsibilities and composition. First, in terms of its responsibilities, it is an advisory Board, not a governing Board. Its main function is to advise the Assistant Director on the program direction for the Centre. It is also responsible for assisting in finding, hiring and paying program instructors for the Centre (preferably older adults). It does not have authority to make policy decisions and any of its decisions which contravene Departmental policy are subject to the veto power of the Assistant Director.

The composition of Murdoch's Board differs from those of the Silver Harbour and 411 Boards in that it contains no "community" representatives. Community members are primarily sought for their potential influence and their expertise. While they play an important role at Silver Harbour and 411, they are not as necessary at Murdoch. Being a part of a Municipal agency, Murdoch already has a channel to elected and Departmental decision makers, and the "expert" services, such as legal advice and accounting, are supplied by Leisure Services or another Municipal Department.

Two Board members sit on the Leisure Services Advisory Committee, a group of representatives from all the clubs, societies, groups and leagues in Richmond registered with the Leisure Services Department. These members are able to make the concerns of Murdoch Centre known to other committee members and to the Leisure Services Department representatives. Thus, while members of Murdoch Centre cannot determine Centre policy, they at least have an opportunity to communicate with and
possibly influence those who do set policy.

Each Board member heads a committee (e.g. public relations, program, and social committees). At present, Murdoch does not have standing Program Activities Committees for all Centre activities. However, four activity groups effectively function as committees, planning their own programs and finding and coordinating their own volunteers. Provisions for the establishment of formal standing committees for other activities have been included in the Centre's operational guidelines. These committees will be established later in 1980, and their leaders will meet jointly on a regular basis, much as the committee leaders of Silver Harbour and 411 meet.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented case studies of three Greater Vancouver Senior Centres: the Silver Harbour, 411, and Murdoch Centres. It revealed the distinctiveness of each Centre's historical background, building and location, membership, program, and administrative structure.

Having presented these case studies, the next chapter examines the "structural" opportunities that members of the three Centres have to become involved in their Centres' planning.
Chapter 5

STRUCTURAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR MEMBERS TO BECOME INVOLVED IN THE PLANNING PROCESS AT THREE CENTRES

In this chapter, the "structural" opportunities for members to become involved in the planning processes of the three Senior Centres are examined. Structural opportunities refer to opportunities that are provided within the administrative structures of the Centres. The examination is brief and does not purport to be an evaluation. Its primary purpose is to provide the foundation for the analysis of encouraging and discouraging factors for members' involvement in Senior Centre planning, which is presented in the following chapter.

Five areas of a Senior Centre's planning concern have been identified for the analysis. The structural opportunities for members to become involved in these planning areas at the three Centres are summarized in Table 1. By examining the table, two distinct planning models emerge: the "member-planned" model, in which members have control over each of the five identified areas of planning concern, and the "agency-planned" model, in which most of the Centre's major planning decisions are the responsibility of a parent Department or agency. The Silver Harbour and 411 Centres exemplify the "member-planned" model, while Murdoch Centre is closer to the "agency-planned" model.

MEMBER-PLANNED MODEL

Structural opportunities are available to members of Silver Harbour and 411 for becoming involved in all identified areas of planning at their
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SILVER HARBOUR CENTRE</th>
<th>411 CENTRE</th>
<th>MURDOCH CENTRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY</strong></td>
<td>7 Centre members &amp; 6 Community members serve on Executive Board. Implement and effect</td>
<td>7 Centre members &amp; 8 Community members serve on Executive Board. Implement</td>
<td>7 Centre members &amp; Assistant Director serve on Executive Advisory Board and can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changes in policy</td>
<td>and effect changes in policy</td>
<td>advise on program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote on special resolutions to alter Constitution and By-laws (66% of all members</td>
<td>Vote on special resolutions to alter Constitution and By-laws (75% of</td>
<td>Vote on special resolution to alter Const. &amp; By-laws (75% of all members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present at meeting must approve change)</td>
<td>all members present must approve change)</td>
<td>present must approve change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCE</strong></td>
<td>Executive Board can make major financial decisions relating to Centre policy (within</td>
<td>Executive Board can make major financial decisions relating to Centre</td>
<td>Exec. Advisory Board responsible for allocating funds received from membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>constraints imposed by the Provincial Govt. funding body)</td>
<td>policy (within constraints imposed by the Provincial Govt. funding body)</td>
<td>dues, program fees, profits from special events and other monies raised by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre. No control over Budget supplied by Leisure Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILVER HARBOUR CENTRE</td>
<td>411 CENTRE</td>
<td>MURDOCH CENTRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>Program Committee (35 Program &quot;Convenors&quot; at present. Number of Convenors geared to number of programs)</td>
<td>Operating Committee (7 Board Officers and at present 22 Program Coordinators. Number of Coordinators geared to number of activity groups)</td>
<td>Executive Advisory Board suggests programs and hires and pays instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Activities Committees each plan their own programs and coordinate own volunteers</td>
<td>Program Activities Committees each plan their own programs and coordinate own volunteers</td>
<td>Member suggestions to the Assistant Director; the Program Coordinator or other Board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members suggestions to: Exec. Director; Program Coordinator; Convenors, Suggestion Box</td>
<td>Member suggestions to: Exec. Director; Program Assistant; Committee leaders</td>
<td>Program evaluation forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest sheet (to indicate interest in proposed programs)</td>
<td>Interest surveys of members</td>
<td>No member input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFF</strong></td>
<td>Responsibility of Exec. Board</td>
<td>Exec. Board's responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibility of Leisure Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Exec. Director is hired by and responsible to Board at all times. She may be entrusted to hire and supervise additional staff as authorized by Board</td>
<td>The Exec. Director is hired by and responsible to Board; He is authorized to hire and supervise additional staff</td>
<td>No member input on existing facility as building is leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Board</td>
<td>Executive Board</td>
<td>Executive Advisory Board will be involved in planning for new Murdoch facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING</strong></td>
<td>Executive Board</td>
<td>Operating Committee</td>
<td>No member input</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Centres. Board members at the Centres are responsible for setting policy, hiring and firing paid staff, and making decisions regarding major expenditures. At 411 the Operating Committee has considerable input into these areas as well. Seven of its members also serve on the Board; therefore they can voice the concerns of other Operating Committee members at Board meetings. Proposals to alter the Societies' Constitutions and By-laws must be put to the membership at a general or special meeting. Approval must be gained from 66% of the Silver Harbour and 75% of the 411 members present at the meetings. At present, programs at Silver Harbour and 411 Centres are planned by the leaders of the programs ("Convenors" at Silver Harbour and "Coordinators" at 411), in consultation with program participants or volunteers. Staff play a "facilitator" role, assisting members in the planning. Convenors and Coordinators of activities meet monthly to report on their particular program areas and to discuss general matters concerning the Centres' programming.

The Centres' memberships have an opportunity to participate in program planning by making suggestions to the Executive Directors or other staff, and to program Convenors or Coordinators. At Silver Harbour, members can participate in program planning by signing an "interest sheet," which is posted on the Centre's bulletin board, to indicate their interest in proposed new programs. If enough members sign the sheet, the new program will be established. Silver Harbour members can also contribute anonymously by placing suggestions in a suggestion box (411 also had a Suggestion Box in 1979, but it was removed after six months as only two suggestions were received).

Surveys of members have been conducted at both Silver Harbour and 411, as well. New members at Silver Harbour are given a questionnaire
in which they are able to indicate their interests. At the 411 Centre two students, who were hired on a grant this summer, surveyed members on the type of educational programs they might like to participate in. By indicating their interests, members have an opportunity to affect the future programming at their Centres.

AGENCY-PLANNED MODEL

Members of Murdoch Centre have fewer opportunities than those at Silver Harbour and 411 for direct involvement in the planning process. They can advise on policy, staffing and major financial decisions affecting Murdoch. They can also make recommendations on these matters through the Assistant Director to the Administrator of the Department. Ultimate responsibility for them, however, rests with the Leisure Services Department. In addition, two members of the Executive Advisory Board sit on the Leisure Services Advisory Council and they are able to directly channel the membership's concerns about Murdoch Centre to the Department.

Although Murdoch's Executive Advisory Board does not have control over funds allocated to the Centre by the Department of Leisure Services, it is credited with funds raised by the Centre (membership fees, program dues, profits from special events and fund raising events, and other miscellaneous funds received by the Centre). The Advisory Board is responsible for the allocation of these funds. With them, for example, it pays for program instructors, makes expenditures for special events and buys incidental program supplies not provided for by the Centre's annual budget.
Members of Murdoch have their greatest degree of autonomy in the area of programming. The Executive Advisory Board is responsible for making recommendations on new programs for the Centre and for hiring and paying program instructors. As noted in the preceding chapter, no formal Program Activity Committees presently exist at Murdoch. However, plans are under way for the establishment of formal Program Committees for all activity groups.

The general membership have an opportunity to become involved in program planning by making suggestions to the Assistant Director, the Program Committee Coordinator, or other Board members. In addition, they may indicate their interests on membership application forms and on program evaluation forms. The information is considered by the Assistant Director and the Board when they meet to plan programs for the Centre.
Chapter 6

ENCOURAGING AND DISCOURAGING FACTORS FOR MEMBER PARTICIPATION IN A SENIOR CENTRE'S PLANNING PROCESS

The preceding chapter examined the structural opportunities that exist for members at the three Senior Centres to become involved in their Centres' planning processes. However, the fact that members have the opportunity to participate in a Centre's planning process does not necessarily mean that members will participate. A member's decision to participate is dependent on his concern for the planning issues, available time, and many other interrelated factors. In addition, some individuals prefer to have as little responsibility as possible for the carrying out of an activity, while others prefer to be an integral part of the planning and implementation process. Therefore, while members must be permitted to participate in their Centre's planning process, they must not be compelled to participate. A basic assumption upon which this thesis rests is that both structural opportunities and encouragement to take advantage of the opportunities are required if a Centre is to be successful in engaging members in its planning process.

Based upon the foregoing assumption, this chapter seeks to identify some of the major factors which have the potential to encourage or discourage members in becoming involved in their Centre's planning process.

As noted in Chapter 3, I began this research with no preconceived hypotheses of what the encouraging or discouraging factors for member involvement would be. Rather, I asked Senior Centre Directors, Board,
and general members a series of open-ended questions about their Centre and its planning process. Instead of assuming that I understood all the complexities of their Centre and its planning, I let the respondents identify the factors that they felt were important. After analyzing the data thus secured, the factors which emerged as those having the greatest potential for encouraging or discouraging members in becoming involved in their Centres' planning processes related to 1) the Centres' administrative structures, 2) the characteristics of "planning" members (i.e., Board and Committee members), 3) the characteristics of Directors and staff, and 4) the Centres' buildings. A section is devoted to each set of factors. Table 2 provides a summary of the main points covered in the analysis.

The first set of factors examined relate to the administrative structures of the Centres. I considered this to be the logical point at which to start as the administrative structure determines, to a large degree, the roles that the Senior Centre members and Directors can play in a Centre's planning process. To quote Simon:

We cannot understand the 'input' or the 'output' of the executive (Senior Centre planners and Directors) without understanding the organization in which (they) work. (Their) behavior and its effects on others are functions of the organizational situation in which (they are) placed (Simon, 1961, p. xv).

The section on administrative structures distinguishes between the autonomous administrative model as found at the Silver Harbour and all Centres, and the semi-autonomous model as found at Murdoch Centre. It draws upon planning theory and other literature to argue that the autonomous structure provides greater encouragement for members to become involved in a Senior Centre's planning process than the semi-autonomous
structure. The literature is used to provide a conceptual framework for the analysis. Following this analysis, the section briefly examines the role that funding plays and how the administrative structure affects the ability of staff to facilitate member involvement in planning.

The second set of factors examined is concerned with the roles and characteristics of "planning" members. While many members at the Centres may plan, the planning members considered in this examination are the members who serve on Boards and Committees. They are the members with the most obvious influence and authority in a Centre's planning process. And, as will be seen, their skills and experience, personalities, and attitudes can have a major influence on whether or not other Centre members choose to become involved in the process.

The third set of factors examined relate to the role and characteristics of the Centre Director.* The research data suggest that the personality, skills and experience, and attitude of the Director perhaps play an even more important role than those of the Board and Committee members in facilitating members to become involved in a Centre's planning process. Also, while the characteristics of program staff and other paid personnel are not dealt with explicitly, the characteristics identified as being important for Centre Directors are implicitly important for other staff, as well.

The fourth and final set of factors examined relate to the Centre's physical facility. The literature generally downplays the importance of a Centre's facility, arguing "Centres should be people oriented not

---

*The Assistant Director of Murdoch Centre is included in this, and other references to "Directors" in this thesis.
building oriented" (Monro, 1972, p. 39). Nonetheless, such factors as the physical layout, available space, and tenure of a Centre's building have an important bearing upon the Centre's ability to offer a comprehensive program and satisfy the needs of members. Using the case study data, the effect that the building has on the program planning and other kinds of planning at Senior Centres will be examined. It will be shown that, paradoxically, while an unsatisfactory building may discourage members from becoming involved in a Centre's program planning, it may be a strong incentive for them to participate in "facility planning" (i.e. planning to renovate an existing structure or selecting a site, contributing to the design, and securing funds for a new facility).

As the three Centres studied have distinct organizational structures and planning concerns, it is not always possible to disguise their identities in the analysis. In fact, the first and fourth sections make no attempt to do so, as their focus is precisely on the potential effect that the different organizational structures and facilities have on members' willingness to participate in a Centre's planning process. However, except in cases where a particular aspect of a Centre has a bearing on the analysis, I have refrained from mentioning the Centres by name. Also, I have tried to minimize comments which might lead to the personal identification of interview respondents.

Before presenting the research findings, I believe it is necessary to reassert that my intentions are not to provide a prescription for a foolproof Senior Centre planning process. Nor are they to evaluate the planning processes at the three Centres under study. To borrow Altshuler's words,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENCOURAGING</th>
<th>DISCOURAGING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I) ADMINISTRATIVE FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (&quot;normative&quot; planning)</td>
<td>Semi or non-Autonomous (&quot;functional&quot; planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-control and responsibility</td>
<td>-less control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sense of achievement</td>
<td>-less sense of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant funding</td>
<td>Exceptions: 1) those who want limited responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(can hire staff, plan programs, plan for building repairs, etc.)</td>
<td>2) those who need strong staff person to ensure their opportunities to become involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Challenge&quot; of slightly low funding. Might be dynamic for social action.</td>
<td>Excessively low funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good staffing policy</td>
<td>Poor staffing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Freedom to operate. Roles well defined. Adequate salaries and enough staff positions).</td>
<td>(Staff hampered in operation by employer. Roles poorly defined or not defined. Salaries too low or work load too heavy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) PLANNING MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and skills</td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- leadership skills</td>
<td>Unable or unwilling to learn (e.g., inexperienced members with low socio-economic background may lack experience in administrative matters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ability to communicate</td>
<td>Social isolate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-motivation</td>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm and outgoing personality</td>
<td>Bigoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic value system</td>
<td>Autocratic value system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(accept right of all members to plan).</td>
<td>-Cliqués (only accept right of some members to plan).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENCOURAGING</th>
<th>DISCOURAGING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) DIRECTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lacking skills in business management and/or human relations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills in management (Business and working with individuals and groups).</td>
<td>Leadership style not appropriate to particular Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual leadership styles adapted to individual Centres</td>
<td>Unapproachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Approachable&quot;</td>
<td>Cool manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm, friendly</td>
<td>Patronizing, domineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>too effusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>Impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and patient</td>
<td>Not understanding or sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of problems of aged</td>
<td>with problems of the aged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept philosophy of members' right to plan</td>
<td>Favours staff planning for seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks ego gratification on the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to forego satisfaction of personal ego needs on the job</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inaccessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) BUILDING</strong></td>
<td>Poorly designed and equipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member owned, Sole occupancy</td>
<td>(Frustrates involvement in program planning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible. Good design features and well equipped to facilitate range of programs (Encourages involvement in program planning)</td>
<td>&quot;Ideal&quot; building negates need of &quot;facility&quot; planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Challenging&quot; building or environment stimulates &quot;facility&quot; planning (i.e. planning to remedy ills of present building by improving it or seeking a new facility).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have not endeavoured to pass judgment on either men or plans, a task which would have required both wisdom and skill of a far higher order than I have been able to employ (Altshuler, 1965, p. 13).

I have merely attempted to provide insight into factors which may encourage or discourage members in becoming involved in their Centre's planning process.

**ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

**A. Two Models**

The Centres examined in the case studies represent two basic administrative structures. These structures correspond with the planning models identified in the preceding chapter. First, Silver Harbour and 411 Centres exemplify the autonomous* structure, being independent of any outside agency's administration and having policy set by their own Board of Directors. Murdoch Centre provides an example of a semi-autonomous structure, being administered and funded by the Municipal Department of Leisure Services. While its Executive Advisory Board can identify policy issues, the sole responsibility for determining policy rests with Leisure Services.

1) **Conceptual Framework.** The autonomous administrative structure of Silver Harbour and 411 and the semi-autonomous structure of Murdoch Centre offer the potential for two different modes of planning. The autonomous structure offers the potential for "normative planning". Adopting Faludi's definition, normative planning is "a mode of planning whereby

---

*The term autonomous is used in this thesis to indicate an administrative structure with a relatively high degree of autonomy. Neither Silver Harbour nor 411 are totally autonomous. They both rely upon Provincial Government Grants for the bulk of their funding, and this funding is provided upon the condition that they offer a certain level of services and include a range of people in their programs.*
the goals and objectives defining, inter alia, the limits of a planning agency are themselves the objects of rational choice and whereby that choice is reviewed as and when the need arises" (Faludi, 1973, p. 175).

In simple terms, it is a mode of planning which allows planners to not only select the means they will adopt to meet a given end, but to question the desirability of the end itself. Silver Harbour and 411, with their autonomous organizational structures, can engage in this type of planning; their Boards are not only able to select strategies for achieving the Centres' goals and objectives, but they also have the authority to determine, monitor, and if necessary, alter the goals and objectives.

Due to the low degree of autonomy offered by the organizational structure of Murdoch Centre, members there are not authorized to question the Centre's goals or objectives. They have only limited authority over the Centre's program planning. A Senior Centre's programs "are tools designed to accomplish the Centre's expressed purpose and goals; they are not ends in themselves" (Leanse, et al., 1977, p. 129). Therefore, Murdoch's Board and informal activities committees control the means of their planning, not the ends. Faludi distinguishes such a form of planning as "functional planning," and defines it as a "mode of planning whereby the goals and objectives defining, inter alia, the limits of the action space are not questioned (Faludi, 1973, p. 175).

The functional mode of planning is considered to be appropriate for the bureaucratic form of organization. Bureaucracies, in Max Weber's conception, are "an hierarchical non adaptive form of organization whose internal relations are characterized by the authority of superior positions over all dependent inferior positions" (Friedmann, 1973, p. 243).
In a bureaucracy, the politician or superior sets the goals and the planner seeks to determine the best means for meeting them.

Faludi concedes that bureaucracies are "extremely useful organizations for the rational, impartial, speedy solutions of well-defined problems" (Faludi, 1973, p. 226), but argues that they are inadequate for solving problems requiring creativity and innovation. He proposes that rather than being structured hierarchically, organizations "ought to be of a collegiate, self-directing type... (and) work as teams in the real of the word" (Faludi, 1973, p. 250).

As noted in Chapter 2, "new wave" planning theorists have rejected the simplifying assumptions of the rational decision making model and have redefined the relationship that planners should have with their clients. They see normative planning as the ideal form of planning to be pursued. Klosterman argues that planning cannot be value-free; therefore, "a complete justification for an action must consider not only the means chosen for achieving ends, but also the ends themselves" (Klosterman, 1968, p. 42). Another writer asserts that "for any agency to plan comprehensively, it must be able to influence most of the factors which have a bearing on its problems, and it must have the powers of using its resources in alternative ways..." (Faludi, 1973, p. 166).

Faludi has developed a model which seeks to explain how normative planning may be achieved. The model proposes that the greater the relative autonomy of an organization, the greater the likelihood that it will engage in normative planning. The control or "constraining" variable in this model is the role concept held by the planner. "Bureaucratic" planners act as a constraint upon normative planning in an organization.
with high relative autonomy and "political" planners act as a constraint upon functional planning in an organization with low relative autonomy. For example, in a relatively autonomous organization, if normative planning is to occur, the planner must be able to set new ends or goals. If a planner sees himself as a bureaucrat, with the "vital but...limited role that (the) system assigns to the public employee" (Beckmann, 1964, p. 324), he will not likely risk generating opposition by challenging organizational goals and advocating innovative ends. He will likely accept the status quo and thus act as a constraint upon the normative planning process. If, on the other hand, he sees his role as political and is willing to attempt to gain enough support to overrule entrenched forces, he is likely to be more successful than the bureaucratic planner in achieving normative planning. In an organization with low relative autonomy, therefore, the "political" planner acts as a constraint upon the functional planning process.

Neither normative planning nor functional planning exist in their pure forms in the real world. The purpose of introducing Faludi's model is to provide a conceptual framework for the examination which follows.

2) Autonomous Centres. The data from the three Senior Centres studied suggests that the autonomous Silver Harbour and 411 Centres generally offer more encouragement for members to become involved in planning than the semi-autonomous Murdoch Centre. Without exception, the Directors and all of the members interviewed at Silver Harbour and 411 favoured the autonomous structure. When the Director of the 411 Centre was asked what the advantages or disadvantages of the autonomous model were, he looked incredulous and stated, "There are no disadvantages, only
advantages." He continued, "Seniors don't feel that the Centre is a business operation. They feel that they belong. It's theirs."

There are two reasons why the autonomous Centres might encourage members to become involved in their Centre's planning. First an autonomous administrative structure offers members the satisfaction of being in control of their Centre and second, it provides them with an opportunity to maintain personal pride and dignity.

The satisfaction of members at Silver Harbour and 411 was apparent in their comments on their Centres' administrations. Members were unanimous in saying they they should have the right to plan for themselves. In addition, their comments expressed a belief that planning done by seniors would be of better quality than that done by younger professionals.

Centres should be run by seniors to a large extent. If they're run by paid professionals, they tend to take on an institutional character. We know what we want better than they do. When we reach 65 years of age, we don't automatically turn senile. We still know what we want.

Many members voiced the fear that young professionals would try to plan for them:

Often those with a recreation background have good ideas, but they can't understand that seniors don't want to be done for.

It's a fixation of seniors that they know what they want. They can become outright hostile if they have young people tell them what to do.

Members reiterated their satisfaction with their own administrative structures when they spoke of Parks Department Senior Centres. Roughly half of the twenty-five members I spoke with at Silver Harbour and 411
had either visited Parks Department Senior Centres or had friends who attended them. They all preferred their own Centres and five spoke almost pityingly of members of the Parks-run Centres. A sample of their comments follows:

I much prefer a seniors-run Centre. If the Centre's run by a Parks Department, you have to go by their policy. Seniors know what's best for seniors.

You're not free if you're under the Parks Department.

We don't need any Government help. We do fine on our own.*

These members listed examples of problems faced by semi and non-autonomous Centres in Greater Vancouver, such as having operating hours curtailed or being required to share space with other age groups. Therefore, their preference for their own member-planned Centres was based on more than pride and loyalty.

The personal pride and dignity that members may gain by becoming involved in the planning process at an autonomous Senior Centre serves as a second factor for encouraging members to participate in planning. As discussed in Chapter 2, when individuals approach their later years, they begin to lose control over many aspects of their lives: health, employment, housing, and transportation. They become dependent on Government for income, rent supplements, prescription drugs, bus passes, and various services.

*(Obviously this member didn't feel the heavy hand of Government interfering with the Centre's planning, even though its operation was Government funded.)
Having an opportunity to become involved in planning at a Senior Centre is one way an older adult can make decisions which affect his life and those of others. One Director noted,

I really resent the set-up at Extended Care Institutions. Staff there are so patronizing. They treat the older people like little children. That approach might be all right for the 10 percent who need it. But for the other 90 percent, it's surely not the way to go.

The Director continued,

The decisions members make at the Centre may be the only ones that have any effect in their lives. If staff imposed the Centre's program, members probably would be less satisfied with it.

All but two of the thirteen Board members I interviewed at Silver Harbour and 411 had served on other boards or committees, or been active doing other voluntary work before joining the Centres. Having the opportunity to participate in planning at their Senior Centre enabled them to capitalize on skills and experience from their pre-retirement years. Participating in planning also afforded some Centre members opportunities to discover new abilities and interests. At 411, especially, many members who might not otherwise have had an opportunity to do so, held positions of responsibility.

For example, the person who chairs 411's Library Committee suffers from a neurological disorder which prevents him from holding a paying job. He is in his 50's, but has been permitted to join the Centre upon the recommendation of a Social Worker. He lives at the nearby Salvation Army hostel for men and comes to the Centre daily. Although he receives a supplement to his Social Assistance allowance for doing a minimum of 20 hours of volunteer work in a month, he estimates that his work takes
up approximately 120 hours a month. This man proudly described how he
tries to get "good dependable volunteers" to work with him in the
library. He says,

   Even though I head the Committee, I don't act
like the "Master." We all work as partners,
like a team.

3) Semi-Autonomous Centres. While an autonomous administrative struc-
ture appears to encourage members to become involved in a Senior Centre's
planning process, a semi-autonomous structure generally has a more con-
straining effect. This assertion is borne out by the research findings
from Murdoch Centre. The members interviewed at Murdoch spoke positively
of the Centre and its program. They also exhibited pride in the voluntary
contributions that they and other members made to the Centre. However,
their pride related to the functional or program aspects of their Cen-
tre's planning process. Murdoch's members do not control the Centre's
policy, budget, or staffing, thus they are unable to experience the satis-
faction that such control affords members of Silver Harbour and 411.

   Members on the Executive Advisory Board acknowledge their limited
role:

   The introduction of the Advisory Board hasn't
changed things much. (The Assistant Director)
is still the mainstay.

   Members can suggest things, but they can't
make decisions. (The Assistant Director) runs
the Centre and has the final word on any
thing that's implemented.

   (The Assistant Director) brings things to us
for approval. We usually go along with her
decisions. She's been here for years and she
knows what she's doing.
One Board member reluctantly agreed to hold office out of loyalty to the Centre and to the Assistant Director. She stated, "No one really wants to serve on the Board."

One might argue that Murdoch's Board is merely a "rubber stamp" for Leisure Services policy and that its establishment is an example of "formal cooption." Formal cooption is a process identified by Philip Selznick for:

absorbing new elements into the organization...
(Its) use...does not envision the transfer of actual power. The form of participation is emphasized but action is channeled so as to fulfill the administrative functions while preserving the locus of significant decision in the hands of the initiating group (in Estes, 1979, p. 215).

The establishment of Murdoch's Executive Advisory Board fits this description. Prior to its formation, Centre members had no formal representation in the administrative structure. The Board was initiated by the Assistant Director to serve as an assisting body and to provide members with a greater voice in the running of the Centre. Members did not demand this voice. In fact, I was told that some members even opposed the introduction of the Board, fearing that it would alter the character of the Centre or program.

Arnstein charges,

Participation without the redistribution of power is an empty and frustrating process for the powerless. It allows the power holders to claim that all sides were considered, but makes it possible for only some of those sides to benefit. It maintains the status quo (Arnstein, 1969, p. 216).

Although Murdoch's Board, Committee, and general members have less control over their Centre's planning than members of an autonomous
Centre, they do have opportunities to have some say in decisions affecting the Centre. As Senior Centre experts observe, "while the legal authority of advisory committees may be limited, (advisory committees') influence can be substantial, particularly when members are well informed, have a deep commitment to the Senior Centre concept and (possess) special expertise related to the program..." (Leanse, et al., 1977, p. 7). Actually, some members may find even greater encouragement to become involved in planning of an agency-administered Senior Centre, than at a less restricted autonomous Centre. This may be true for two reasons.

First, as mentioned in the introduction of this Chapter, some members do not want major planning responsibilities at Senior Centres. Murdoch Centre may provide the types of planning opportunities that such members desire. For example, a Board member admitted that he was content to have advisory powers and not to have the additional responsibilities he would have if he served on a governing Board. He said, "If I wanted to work all the time, I would have kept my job for $28,000.00 a year."

Another member indicated his satisfaction with the "planned for" structure of Murdoch:

I like it here at Murdoch. It's a loose knit organization. You don't feel you're obligated to do anything.

All but one of the thirteen members interviewed at Murdoch expressed appreciation of Leisure Services' administration. For example, a relatively new member of Murdoch who had recently moved to Richmond from the United States said,

Leisure Services is marvelous. They do so much for all age groups, not only seniors. The Senior
Centres I know in the States are mainly Welfare places. My friends and I wouldn't dream of going to them. Murdoch's fabulous. Here, we're treated as people, not charity cases.

Another member noted,

The odd person on the Board and in the Centre feels that Leisure Services has too much control. I don't think so, though. Some people complain about anything.

Even one of the Board members who favoured the Board's gaining greater powers in the future said, "When we get our own building, I hope Leisure Services still carries us."

The second reason why a semi-autonomous Senior Centre might encourage members to become involved in planning is that being under a parent agency's administration helps protect against special interest groups or domineering members "taking over." A member who has been active on numerous Government and voluntary Committees and Boards, observed,

Citizen participation is balderdash. Often those with the loudest voice have the least to offer.

A Board member said,

A Centre should belong to some Municipal body. From my experience in working in Trade Unions, I'd bet that cliques would form at an independently operated Senior Centre. The Centre would quickly fall apart.

He spoke of the advantages of having a strong Director or staff person,

It's good to have a person to settle arguments and bring order to our meetings.

The Directors of autonomous Senior Centres can perform this arbitrator role; however, they may have difficulties in exercising the necessary authority to curtail the actions of offending members,
especially Board members. Being employed by, and responsible to, the Board they would, in effect, be disciplining their employer.

At the time of this writing, Murdoch's Advisory Board has been in operation for less than a year. Two of the six Board members interviewed said that they might like to have wider powers in the future. However, they and the other Board members expressed satisfaction with the amount of authority which they presently have:

We're just getting our feet wet now.

We're like infants growing here.

We've got to learn to crawl before we can walk. Maybe when we get our own building, we'll be able to take on more responsibilities. We're okay for now, though.

Two Board members revealed a growing political awareness gained from serving on the Board. One complained,

At the Leisure Services Advisory Committee meetings (attended by representatives from various Community groups), the screamers are the only ones who are listened to...They're the only ones who get anything from the Department. Maybe we'll have to start screaming too, if we want results.

Another, who was familiar with Silver Harbour Centre, said,

They had lots of Government help and influential people behind them at Silver Harbour. Sooner or later we'll get big shots in Richmond to join Murdoch. When we do, we'll be able to take a more active role.

These comments suggest that while the functional planning process, as practiced at Murdoch, is satisfactory for the time being, it could be challenged in the near future. Thus, while the Assistant Director may have "coopted" members by establishing the Advisory Board, she has provided them with learning opportunities and experience which could lead
them eventually to demand greater control over their Centre's planning and operation.

The preceding discussion reveals that while the autonomous Centres generally offer the greatest encouragement for members to become involved in their Centres' planning processes, semi autonomous or agency-administered Senior Centres offer their own distinct forms of encouragement. The analysis now turns to examine how funding levels and staffing affect members' decisions to participate in their Senior Centre's planning process.

B. Funding Level

An important factor in the planning and administration of any Senior Centre is its level of funding. Funding level determines, to a large degree, the programs a Centre can offer, staff it can hire, and goals it can realistically expect to achieve. A brief prepared for submission to the Provincial Government by an ad hoc committee composed of representatives from Senior Centres and other senior citizens organizations stressed the importance of funding to a Senior Centre:

Without adequate operating funds, on an ongoing basis, (Seniors') Activity Centre/Groups have little hope of surviving or being established where the need has been identified (Ad Hoc Committee, 1979, p. 4).

The sources and levels of funding for the three Centres under study vary, with the Silver Harbour and 411 Centres receiving their operating grants from the Provincial Ministry of Human Resources and Murdoch Centre receiving its funds from the Richmond Municipality. The 1980 funding allocations for the Centres are included in the "Background Fact Sheets" in the Appendix. Attempting to determine the "relative adequacy" of the
Centres' funding levels by using a simple technique, such as a membership-funding dollar ratio, would not yield reliable results. In fact, due to the different programs, staff positions, clientele, and goals of the Centres, the comparisons would be meaningless and possibly misleading.

Based on interview statements of the Centre Directors, however, the autonomous Centres appear to experience the greatest difficulties in managing within the limits of their allocated funds. The increase in Silver Harbour's operating grant from 1979 to 1980, for example, was 5%, a rate below the rise in the cost of living for the same period. The 411 Centre received a larger percentage increase in its most recent grant from the Provincial Government; however, the Centre's program had major expansions during the year, which makes comparisons of the 1979 and 1980 funding allocations problematic. The Assistant Director of Murdoch Centre claims that that Centre's funds have increased at a sufficient rate to meet with rises in the cost of living and expansions in the Centre's programs. As will be noted later, however, the fact that Murdoch Centre has staff shortages indicates that the funding is below the ideal level.

Problems with funding can have a dual effect, both discouraging and encouraging members' involvement in planning. Two potential funding problems emerged from the case studies. The first problem related to funding levels. If funding levels are perceived to be too low, they can discourage members' involvement in planning. Members will obviously not engage in planning programs that, in their estimation, can never be implemented, due to prohibitive instructor fees, or material or equipment costs. The second problem is related to the insecurity in the level and
source of funding. This problem was most apparent at the Silver Harbour and 411 Centres. The Centres' Treasurers, in consultation with the Executive Directors and Board members, prepare annual budget proposals for submission to the Government; however, they do not know from year to year whether they will receive the amounts requested. Conceivably, the Government could even discontinue their funding.

The insecurity regarding funding at Silver Harbour and 411 promotes pragmatic planning and creates difficulties for conducting long range, comprehensive planning. It also frustrates members who are involved in the Centres' planning processes. One long standing Board member replied with a voice of experience when she was asked whether her Centre would receive the funding it requested: "Who knows? The Government likes to keep us guessing."

Paradoxically, while problems of funding can discourage members from becoming involved in their Centre's planning, these same problems can be encouraging factors. First, funding inadequacies can encourage those members who are skilled in money matters. Having to cope with limited funding necessitates planning members to exercise considerable responsibility in the management and allocation of funds. While not all members would be encouraged by this requirement, a Board member and former bank employee at one Centre obviously was. She said,

The reason I'm serving on the Board is that I'm good with figures. We take in a lot of money here, but we can't afford to lose track of any of it. I make sure our records and accounts are properly kept.

Funding inadequacies could also lead planning members to redefine their Centre's goals in order to make them more "attainable." A second effect of funding inadequacies is that they can act as an incentive, challenging
individual members to take the initiative in seeking ways to remedy their Centre's funding deficiencies.

Members at the three Centres under study were engaged in at least some of the following fund-raising endeavours:

a) writing proposals for grants, e.g. to the Federal New Horizons Program, to the Secretary of State, the Provincial Government Lottery Fund.

b) planning special fund-raising events for the Centre, e.g. bazaars, teas, dances, and fashion shows.

c) charging members registration fees to cover the costs of instruction and materials for activities.

d) charging for services such as repairs to clothing; selling good used books.

e) seeking donations from private groups or individuals - e.g. members of Silver Harbour have obtained gifts from a number of Service Clubs and businesses in North Vancouver and all Centres have books in their libraries which were donated to them.

f) applying for Youth Employment or Local Initiative projects (Provincial and Federal) to secure temporary staff to meet identified needs of members, e.g. a group of workers to initiate an exercise and dance program.

Being able to make a tangible contribution to their Centre's operation and having a degree of control over the spending of the funds they raised appeared to be an incentive for members to become involved in the planning and conducting of fund raising activities. Being given an
opportunity to use previous skills or learn new ones may also have been an incentive.

The enthusiasm of members involved in fund-raising was evident at the three Centres studied. It was most apparent at Silver Harbour and 411, however, where members are granted the greatest degree of autonomy in their planning.

For example, the leader of the Sewing Committee at one of the autonomous Centres mends members' clothing for a nominal fee in order to buy equipment and materials for her sewing class. She said,

I'm surprised at how much work I've gotten.
I've been able to use the money to buy scissors, thread, and other things the "girls" in the sewing class need.

This Committee leader gained obvious satisfaction from the fact that starting the repair service was her idea, and that the Director merely said, "Fine," when she approached him with her suggestion.

Perhaps due to the semi-autonomous administrative structure of Murdoch Centre, its members have shown less personal initiative in raising funds for the Centre. However, within the past year, they have applied for and received a Federal Government New Horizons Grant. And, with the assistance of the Assistant Director, they have generated funds for the Centre's activities through membership and program fees, proceeds from special events, and other sources from within the Centre. When Murdoch becomes established as a Non-Profit Society, it will be classified as a charitable organization. It will then be in a position to attract donations from Service Clubs and other groups as it will be able to issue tax-deductible receipts to the donors. With the addition of these potential sources of revenue, members will have greater
opportunities and encouragement to seek funding for their Centre.

C. Staffing

"A Senior Centre's effectiveness bears a direct relation to the quality of its staff" (Leanse, et al., 1979, p. 79). As will be revealed in a later section, Centre Directors and Staff play a major role in facilitating member participation in a Senior Centre's planning process. Unfortunately, insufficient funding has made it impossible for two of the Centres to hire and adequately compensate the Staff required for the successful carrying out of the "facilitator" role.

The main problem at 411 is that although a number of staff positions have been established, the Centre's operating Grant does not permit the Centre to pay its Staff adequate salaries. Employees at 411 receive roughly two-thirds of what they would receive for doing comparable work at another agency. This situation has caused the Centre considerable difficulty in hiring and maintaining qualified and dedicated staff. For example, two staff members who had been employed at 411 for approximately a year quit while the research for this thesis was being conducted. They both left to take jobs that offered them greater pay.

As will be brought out later, the rapport that Directors and Staff are able to develop with members may be crucial in determining whether or not members will be encouraged to become involved in a Centre's planning process. Turnover of staff breaks the bonds which have been established and thus works as a deterrent to member involvement in planning.

The difficulty of making the decision to resign was expressed by
one of the two employees who left 411:

I like the people here and I want the Centre to be a success. But I'm young. I'm only 25. I've been driving an old car that's badly in need of repairs and have been doing without nice clothes, concerts, and other things I've wanted and needed for over a year. I just couldn't hold out any longer.

A Board member at 411 who appeared sympathetic to the dilemma faced by the staff members who had left, thoughtfully assessed the Centre's staffing situation:

Some staff use 411 as a stepping stone before moving on to another job. Because of the current employment and economic situation, we get lots of applicants for any vacancy that's created. But we hesitate to hire people with extensive education or work experience because we know they'll likely go on to something better within six months.

Although salaries of the Silver Harbour employees may be below what would be paid at other agencies, the Centre has not experienced high staff turnover. The Director of Silver Harbour acknowledged that the Centre is fortunate to have such capable and dedicated staff in light of the salaries they receive. She praised the staff, saying that "working at the Centre is more than just a job for them."

The staffing problem at Murdoch Centre does not relate to salary scale, but to insufficient staff positions. Despite the rapid increase in the membership from 40 to nearly 1,000 within four years, the only staff person hired to work with the Assistant Director has been a part-time Secretary. Due to the increased demands made upon the Assistant Director by the growing membership, she must devote considerable time to "front line" duty, rather than to working with members in planning. She admits,
I would like to be able to find out the skills and interests of members and try to channel them into appropriate areas. I just don't have the time.

A Senior Centre Operational Manual stresses that "securing and retaining a competent and qualified staff requires careful attention to the factors which make for good working conditions, thus promoting good employee morale, efficiency, and a sense of security and well being" (Leanse, et al., 1977, p. 79). The foregoing discussion reveals that both the autonomous and semi-autonomous Senior Centres may experience difficulties in measuring up to the ideal set out in the Operational Manual. More will be said of staff's role in encouraging members to plan in a later section.

CHARACTERISTICS OF "PLANNING" MEMBERS

This section examines the role that a Centre's active "planning" members play in encouraging other members to become involved in planning. The "planning" members considered are the Board and Committee members as they are the most "visible" members involved in a Centre's planning process and possibly have the greatest potential to influence other members to become involved.

The analysis distinguishes two sets of factors or qualifications that Board and Committee members should possess in order to encourage other members to become involved in planning: 1) skills and experience and 2) personality and attitude.

A. Skills and Experience

The first qualifications Board and Committee members should possess relate to their experience and skills. The "ideal" planning member
would have had previous experience on Boards or Committees or have been active in Community organizations. In addition, he would be skilled in working with others in groups.

The importance of having Board and Committee members who are experienced is that they know how to organize planning tasks in ways which permit and encourage other members to become involved. Experienced members can also perform an educational function and, either directly or by example, help other members who lack experience to understand and participate in the planning process.

The value of having experienced, knowledgeable people at the Board and Committee level can be seen in the initiation processes of the Silver Harbour and 411 Centres. At Silver Harbour, older adults from a variety of Senior Citizens groups in North Vancouver gained the cooperation of influential people, organized volunteers, petitioned three levels of Government for grants and land, and eventually brought about the construction of Silver Harbour Centre.

The 411 Centre was also initiated by experienced older adults (members of the Senior Citizens' Association of B.C.). 411's Advisory Boards contained a number of experienced and influential older adults, including members of Seniors' organizations and a former Mayor of Vancouver. The 411 Advisory Board, with the assistance of Human Resources staff, worked to effect the transition of 411 from being Government administered to a Centre which is operated by its own Non-Profit Society.

In addition to having experience on Boards and Committees or in Community organizations, a Centre's "planning members" should also be skilled in working with groups. In particular, they should have communication and leadership skills. Writers on Senior Centres assert that the
value of effective communication "cannot be overemphasized;... (it) increases the capacity of Centre staff, board members, participants and supporters to carry out their roles more effectively..." (Leanse, et al. 1977, p. 43). Leadership skills are also valuable; at least one writer claims that "the quality and skill of leadership is the most important single factor in the success or failure of creative and recreational projects for older people" (Maxwell, 1962, p. 40).

An example of how a skilled communicator and leader may encourage other members to become involved in a Centre’s planning process is provided by reference to a Program meeting and an Annual General Meeting at one of the Centres under study. At both meetings, the Centre’s Past President made presentations to members. He used visual aids, boldly writing the main points he was going to cover on large sheets of newsprint, which were attached to a "flip chart." He slowly and carefully explained each point, entertaining questions and making sure that the members understood him before moving on to his next point.

This gentleman had been employed professionally in education and public relations prior to his retirement and had been active for years in Community organizations. His past experience enabled him to communicate in a simple, effective, non-patronizing manner with his audience who were drawn from varied socio-economic backgrounds.

In addition to encouraging the general membership to become involved in a Centre's planning process, experienced planning members can also have an encouraging effect on other planning members. Those who are skilled in running meetings can ensure that Board and Committee meetings proceed in an efficient, businesslike manner and do not deteriorate into
gossip sessions. They can also prevent domineering members from "taking over" the meetings. The latter skill was identified as being very important by all Centre Directors and over half of the Board members interviewed. One member said,

When I first sat on the Board, the President spoke to us and didn't care to hear what we had to say. Meetings are run much better now. The new President makes sure we all get a chance to speak. We feel we're all participating. We aren't treated like a bunch of stupid housewives any more.

Despite the importance of having Board and Committee members with skills and experience, none of the Directors or Board members interviewed considered skills and experience to be essential for all planning members.

On the Silver Harbour and 411 Boards, responsibilities requiring technical expertise in areas such as Law or Accounting are performed by Community Board members (although there is no reason why Board members drawn from the Centre's membership could not perform these tasks if they had the necessary expertise). At Murdoch Centre, the Executive Advisory Board can refer technical concerns to the Leisure Services Department. The duties Centre members perform on the Board can be learned. The three Directors and all Board members emphasized the "inclusive" nature of their Boards, and argued that inexperienced members need not feel excluded from serving:

A willingness to serve and an interest in the Centre are all that's required. Experience helps, but it's not essential.

Common sense is the main thing. Most people who have lived to be our age have some modicum of that.

Competence is all that is required.
Of the three Centres studied, only Murdoch provided training sessions for its Board members. The literature on Boards and Senior Centres stresses that orientation and training sessions are essential for preparing new Board members for their duties. Two of the Board members interviewed at Murdoch found the training sessions helpful. However, none of those interviewed at Silver Harbour or 411 considered training to be necessary. Their attitude is summed up in the quote of a Board member who received "on the job" training:

You can soon learn what to do on the Board by sitting in and listening.

Of the nineteen Board members interviewed, all but four had previously served on Boards or Committees or had been active in Community organizations. What distinguished these Board members from the rest of the membership was not so much their skills or special abilities, but rather, in the words of one Director, the fact that "they are doers by nature."

As will be seen in the following discussion, however, skills and experience in themselves provide no guaranty that planning members will encourage others to become involved in a Senior Centre's planning process. Personality and attitudes also play a vital role.

B. Personality and Attitudes

The personality traits and attitudes of Board and Committee members are crucial factors in determining whether or not other members will become involved in a Senior Centre's planning process. In this and the following section, the term personality is used to refer to "the integrated and dynamic organization of the physical, mental, moral, and social qualities of the individual, as that manifests itself to other
people, in the give and take of social life" (Drever, 1964, p. 208).
Attitudes are conceived to be "a more or less stable set or disposition
of opinion, interest or purpose, involving expectancy of a certain kind
of experience, and readiness with a certain kind of response..." (Drever,
1964, p. 23).

The distinction between personality and attitudinal characteristics
is not clear cut. Therefore, rather than make an arbitrary distinction,
these qualities will be dealt with simultaneously.

All Directors, Board and general members interviewed claimed that
the personalities and attitudes of "planning members" were more important
than their skills and experience. In the words of one member who has
served for many years on the executive of a Senior Citizens' organiza-
tion,

Skills and experience help in any Board work
you do. But those with skills and experience
aren't necessarily the best.

The personality traits interview respondents most frequently cited
as being important for a planning member were an outgoing nature and
personal warmth. Outgoing and warm Board and Committee members can
courage other Centre members to become involved in a Centre's planning
process through what Simon calls the "informal communication system,"
which is a system "built around the social relations of members in an
organization" (Simon, 1961, p. 160). The informal communication system
is distinct from the formal system of communication, which is the
"channel and media of communication which have been consciously and
deliberately established" (Simon, 1961, p. 157). Some examples of chan-
nels in a Senior Centre's formal communication system include voting for
Board officers, placing suggestions in suggestion boxes, and making "official" requests to the Director or Board officers.

Planning members can best make use of the informal communication system if they are outgoing individuals and active in their Centre's program. If they are outgoing and active, they will likely know many of their Centre's members. Thus they will have the opportunity to pick up on the wishes individual members may have regarding the Centre. They can also discover, without seeming to probe, the concerns, interests, skills, and needs of the membership. By showing warmth and interest, planning members may help to encourage members who are ordinarily inarticulate to express their views.

An example of how the informal communication system can be used is provided by one very active Board member who also heads a committee, instructs a class, and volunteers "wherever she's needed" at the Centre. This person describes her method of finding out what members want:

I hear them talking in my classes or in the cafeteria, over a coffee. When I go to the Board or Operating Committee meeting, I try to clip their ideas in somewhere.

The Presidents of the three Centres are outgoing and active in their Centres' programs. They make use of both formal and informal communication channels in efforts to involve members in their Centres' planning processes. For example, Silver Harbour's President is one of the Centre's founding members and is well known and respected by the members. She chairs the Program Committee meetings; thus she is knowledgeable about the Centre's programs and is able to hear the concerns of committee leaders. If necessary, she takes these concerns to the Board.

The President of 411 began her association with the Centre in 1972,
as one of the original volunteers in the kitchen. She is able to call most of the Centre's 1,600 members by their first names. She was praised by staff and members interviewed for her warm "personal touch" and her ability to learn what members want. She is able to take members' concerns to the Operating Committee, and when necessary, to the Board.

The President of Murdoch Centre has belonged to the Centre for five years, instructing a painting class and participating in programs. She personally telephones to congratulate each Centre member on his or her birthday. During these calls, she is able to receive suggestions or complaints regarding the Centre, which she can mention at the monthly Executive Advisory Board meetings.

In addition to being warm and outgoing, planning members would ideally be selfless, dedicated, understanding and compassionate, with a genuine desire to see their Centres achieve success—in other words, a band of Angels! A number of these angelic qualities were mentioned by interview respondents. For example, the respondents described the ideal planning member as being caring:

You've got to have a love for people to serve on the Board. If you didn't, you'd be crazy to serve. Board work surely isn't glamorous.

It doesn't cost anything to smile, but it can do a world of good. Smiles have healing powers.

They also described the ideal planning member as having a democratic value system:

We (the Board) try to do all we can to involve members.

As long as we have the money, members' ideas are implemented.
We don't allow one-man committees here. We're a very democratic organization.

We treat everyone as equals here. We don't have any cliques.

Being a good listener is better than being a good talker any time. You can learn by listening. You won't learn if you're always talking.

Thirteen of the nineteen Board members interviewed expressed the opinion that the Board meetings ran very smoothly and that members got along well:

We're a compatible group. There are never any conflicts in our meetings.

We work well together because we have the same goal of seeing the Centre move ahead. Problems sometimes occur at the Committee level, but not with the Board.

The remaining third of the Board members (two from each Centre) suggested that all Board meetings did not run so smoothly:

We get arguments at times over procedures, rules... that sort of thing.

Whenever you get a group of people together, you're bound to get conflicts. It's no different for us, just because we're old.

We don't have too many major conflicts on the Board. When we get them, I'm afraid I'm the one who's usually to blame. I'm a stubborn old woman.

In the words of one Board member, "the only thing distinguishing us (the Board) from the rest of the membership is that we're willing to stick with things and see them through." Another said, "We're just people." Thus being "just people," a Centre's planning members are
bound to have some negative characteristics which serve to discourage other Centre members from becoming involved in the Centre's planning process.

I observed three of these negative characteristics in some of the planning members at the Centres under study. First, some of the planning members were frustrated by the disinterest and lack of involvement shown by the membership towards the planning and operation of the Centre. They claimed that they put time and effort into serving on Board and Committees and received little assistance or recognition in return. One Board member stated,

Most of these people wouldn't lift a finger to help. They're the ones who are the loudest complainers, too.

Another said,

Some people only come here for a meal or to take part in the activities. They let you know it, too.

And another noted,

Only 10 per cent of the membership do anything for the Centre. Most people seem quite content to let things drift along as long as someone else does the worrying.

A factor which emerged as being particularly frustrating was that those most qualified to assist the planning members often chose not to participate. Referring to this factor, some planning members said that they would like to have a rest, but they feared that no one would be willing to replace them. One Director, sympathetic to their dilemma, stated:

Frankly, I'm amazed at how few people run for office each year. We have members here
with years of experience who wouldn't touch a Board position with a ten foot pole.

Regardless of the validity of planning members' frustration, it can be a negative factor if it creates a "We--They" atmosphere which causes planning members to be resentful and intolerant of the non-planning members. If planning members do not respect the right of those members who merely want to come to enjoy the Centre activities and try to involve them in planning against their will, they will only alienate the members and work against the goals of the Centre. An understanding of how to motivate members is essential if planning members are to succeed in their efforts to enlist support. For example, a particularly pushy committee leader at one Centre tried to "shame" members into serving on her committee. Her method of recruiting met with no success. The Director, who was requested to offer assistance, described the incident:

I went in and asked a group of members if they would be willing to lend a hand. They were more than willing. Twenty-five volunteered. The key is in how you approach people.

The second characteristic of some of the planning and general members which may discourage other members from becoming involved in the Centre's planning process is racial prejudice.

This problem was evident at the 411 Centre, where a large number of East Indians have recently become members. Although the East Indian member I interviewed and the five I spoke with informally at 411 assured me that everyone at the Centre was "very nice...very helpful," and that "no problems of bigotry exist," I observed and was told of a number of incidents of intolerance displayed by Board, Committee, and general members towards East Indian members. For example, I overheard a Board
member, who had earlier claimed that a key reason for the success of 411 was that "all members are considered as equals," complain to another member:

They may as well put a sign up outside saying, 'Only Card Players and Blacks Welcome.'

Such an attitude hardly creates an atmosphere conducive to democratic participation by all members in the Centre's planning process.

The Director, Staff and four Board members acknowledged that incidents of prejudice occur at 411. They said that they try to quell them when they arise, but admitted that they can't instantaneously change attitudes which people have built up over their lifetimes.

The third characteristic of planning members which may serve to discourage other members from becoming involved in their Centre's planning process is cliquishness. Cliques are "groups that build up an informal network of communications...(which they use) as a means of securing power in the organization" (Simon, 1961, p. 161). Members of a clique do not necessarily have "evil" motives. For example, the Director at one of the Centres under study claimed some committees at the Centre became cliques because of the pride that leaders took in their programs. As a result, those leaders sought to include only their friends on their committees. The Director said,

A problem with some committee members is that they are jealous about sharing their responsibilities. The staff and I have to look out to be sure that the less aggressive members who would benefit from participating are given a chance.

Despite the negative characteristics of some planning members, most Board and Committee members interviewed appeared sincere in their stated
desire to involve other members in the planning process. The fact that some did not measure up to the ideal is hardly surprising, for as a leading writer on Senior Centres observes, "The skill of democratic group participation is a learned skill. People aren't born with it" (Maxwell, 1962, p. 59).

Ensuring that planning members do not exclude other members from their Centre's planning process is one of the many responsibilities of the Centre Director. In the following section, the characteristics of Centre Directors are examined in an effort to determine the role they may play in encouraging or discouraging member involvement in a Centre's planning process.

CHARACTERISTICS OF DIRECTORS

A Senior Centre Director can be instrumental in encouraging members to become involved in a Senior Centre's planning process. In fact, the Director's role may be more important than that of the planning members. Those who write about Boards of Voluntary organizations argue that motivating the Board is one of the most important functions of staff executive:

> Board members are only as effective as Staff wishes them to be; rarely do Board volunteers take over and actually 'lead' a voluntary organization (Conrad and Glenn, 1976, p. 25).

In analyzing the impact of the three Centre Directors on members' involvement in the Centres' planning processes an effort is made to protect the Directors' anonymity. I have used the masculine personal pronoun in referring to all Directors as use of the masculine and feminine pronouns would divulge the identity of the sole male Director under
study and increase the likelihood of the women Directors being recognized.

The analysis of Directors' characteristics employs the same format as the analysis of characteristics of planning members. It examines the effect that a Director's 1) skills and experience and 2) personality and attitudes have in the encouragement and discouragement of members in planning.

A. Skills and Experience

No formal "professional" standards exist for Senior Centre Directors. However, the NCOA Manual, Senior Centre Operation, says that,

usually the Senior Centre Administrator is a graduate professional in such fields as adult education, recreation, therapeutic recreation, social work or ministry, often with special training in gerontology. He/she should have a background of experience or training in public administration or administration of voluntary organizations (Leanse, et al., 1977, p. 14).

Perhaps, because the Senior Centre movement in Canada has not been in existence for as long as its American counterpart, and because Canadian Centres have tended to emerge as grass roots organizations, the qualifications for Centre Directors in Canada have until recently been less formal. For example, in 1971, the Coordinator of the Training Institute for Senior Centre Directors acknowledged that in addition to professionally trained personnel, some Directors in Canada had "been 'active community workers,' but...(had) no formal specialized training..." (Wilson, 1972, p. ix). This Coordinator stressed that "whatever (the Directors') background of training and experience before accepting responsibility in directing a Senior Centre, none had specific training for the special and peculiar roles when directing a Senior Centre since
such training (had) not been available" (Wilson, 1972, p. ix). In the past decade, however, Schools of Social Work, Physical Education, and Recreation in Canadian Universities have begun to offer programs which train students to perform many of the duties required of a Senior Centre Director.

None of the Directors of the Centres under study had formal professional training related to working with the aged. However, based on my personal observations and the comments of interview respondents, the skills and experience possessed by the three Directors appear to have prepared them for carrying out their responsibilities.

The first skill which was identified by the three Directors and the majority of members interviewed was skill in business and management. One Director said, "I regard myself as a manager in a company." Three Board members used the same analogy in describing their Directors. Managerial skills are often thought of in terms of fiscal responsibility, hiring and firing, and running a successful business operation. These skills are important, especially at the autonomous Centres, where increases in operating grants have not kept pace with rise in the cost of living.

As one Director observed,

A Director needs experience in business.
We operate on a shoestring here and a minor oversight could lead to a major problem.

At the outset, a Director's business skills, or lack of them, might appear to have little to do with member involvement in planning. However, the three Directors interviewed expressed the belief that by successfully looking after the business and administrative aspects of their Centres they can inspire confidence in their Boards and memberships
that the Centres are being run efficiently. The Director can thus create an atmosphere conducive to member involvement in planning.

In addition to skills in business administration, the Director must also effectively "manage" the human relations aspect of the Centre. The ways in which the individual Directors carry out this aspect of their managerial duties are manifest in their individual leadership styles. One Director operates in an efficient, but somewhat detached manner. He delegates responsibilities to members and treats them as members of a team. He contends, "We have surprisingly few problems at this Centre, as we are all striving to meet the same goals."

Another Director is more casual and "laid-back" in his leadership style. He says, "I don't impose myself on the members. But I am here if they need me." Interviews and casual conversations with members made it evident that this message gets through to the members. One active Committee member praised the Director: "He's always willing to help. He's not stuck up."

The other Director tends to become more directly involved in all aspects of the Centre's planning process. Part of his reason for becoming so involved is his belief that if he didn't pitch in and help those on committees with planning and other activities, they would become resentful. He reasons, "I've done lots of volunteer work myself. If I saw a paid staff person sitting on his butt while I worked, I'd quit."

Each of these leadership styles has its advantages and disadvantages. The adequacy of any style can be measured against a requirement set out by Maxwell for paid professional Centre staff:

They should bring to their positions... ability to create the kind of relationships and environment in which each individual
and group has equal opportunity for recognition, respect and attention (Maxwell, 1962, p. 42).

It can be quickly seen that a "cluster" of skills is involved in leadership style—the ability to communicate, to listen, to consult, and to know when and how to act and when to delegate. Personality and attitudinal characteristics are closely linked with skills and with them, they can affect the involvement of members in a Centre's planning process. These characteristics and their potential effects are considered below.

B. Personality and Attitudes

Directors should ideally possess the personality and attitudinal characteristics identified as being desirable for planning members (a warm, outgoing personality, and a selfless dedication to the Centre and its members). And obviously, they should not possess the negative characteristics identified (cliquishness, prejudicial views regarding ethnic or religious groups within the membership, or intolerance towards non-planning members).

The three personality and attitudinal characteristics most frequently identified in the interviews as being essential for Directors to possess were 1) diplomacy and tact, 2) an understanding and accepting attitude, and 3) commitment to the Centre and its members.

First, Directors need to be diplomatic. In facilitating a Centre's members in planning, a Director must ensure that all members are given opportunity to participate, not only the most skilled or aggressive members. Also, Directors must be certain that members will be able to participate in planning in the areas that interest them. One Director noted the challenge which the latter requirement sometimes presents:
Some of our program Committees are very popular. Frankly, we get too many people volunteering to serve on them. We have trouble getting members interested in other committees, though...especially on those that require a regular commitment, such as the kitchen committee.

In such cases, the Director tries not to categorically refuse a specific opportunity to one person while granting it to another. He tries to persuade members to participate in the areas where they are needed most. One Director stated,

People resent being told what to do.
It's always better to ask.

One of the most trying tests of a Director's diplomatic abilities comes when planning members need to be admonished. An incident mentioned previously, in which some cliquish committee leaders sought to include only their friends on their committees, provides an example of such a case. Another example is provided by a situation which arose in planning a bazaar at one of the Centres. A member of the Baking Committee with her own "hidden agenda," endeavoured to save the Centre money by reducing the amount of sugar in a baking recipe. She did not consult other committee members or the Director before proceeding with her plan. The result, according to the Director, was "inedible baked goods, as hard as rock."

The Director felt that she had to tell the offending member to either follow procedures accepted by the committee or cease to serve. She explained, "For the good of the majority, you have to be able to fire as well as hire volunteers."

The second important characteristics for a Centre Director are understanding and acceptance. To be successful in encouraging members to become involved in the Centre's planning process, Directors need to
have a general knowledge of the aging process and an understanding of how the process affects what members can and want to do.

A general knowledge of the aging process involves an understanding of the physical limitations common to the aging population. For example, one Director stated,

I'd estimate that roughly 40% of members here have hearing problems. The majority of difficulties at the Centre result from misunderstandings due to members hearing things incorrectly. Most occur among the members themselves, not between staff and members. The staff and I are very careful to communicate with members.

It is also important for the Directors to understand some factors which influence the learning process of older people. Gerontological studies reveal that older adults are as intelligent and capable of learning as younger people. However, older adults must be given more time to receive, record and respond to information. Some physiological factors are involved, but a psychological aspect also exists; older adults have more stored information to check the new material against, and this process is said to delay their response time (Birren, et al., 1977).

In order for Directors to be successful in planning with Centre members, it is imperative that they understand and are sensitive to the implications of the aging process. For example, if they are understanding, they will know enough to allow planning members to have adequate time in which to reach decisions. They will arrange for meetings to take place where extraneous noise is at a minimum and, if necessary, will repeat for the benefit of others what one Board or Committee member has said so that all can hear. Also, they will not "spring" ideas on the members without allowing them time for preparation.
One member expressed pleasure in the fact that "our present Director is the first one we've had who doesn't make snap judgments."

In their interview responses, the Directors under study gave evidence of having deep understanding of the changed circumstances that increasing age has caused members. One said,

> You've got to remember that many members don't have a family to go home to when they leave the Centre. They have no one to speak to and they have lots of time to dwell on what happened to them here during the day. What would be a minor incident to you or me might be a major problem to an older person.

The members stressed the importance of having a patient Director. The following quote is representative of statements made by many:

> A Director needs lots of patience. She needs to know how to deal with Seniors, because they get awful funny sometimes.

As noted earlier, people begin to lose control over many aspects of their lives as they age. Participating in the planning process at a Senior Centre provides older people with an opportunity to exercise some degree of control over their lives, and to regain a sense of dignity and self-respect. One of the ways a patient and understanding Centre Director can encourage members to become involved in planning and help them to derive the benefits associated with control is by providing recognition.

The importance of recognition was noted by all Directors. They acknowledged that merely needing and wanting members to be involved in planning at the Centres is not sufficient. In order to encourage new planning members to become involved and to maintain the commitment of old ones, members must be made to feel needed and wanted. Directors provide overt forms of recognition, such as issuing formal "thank-you's" in
Newsletters and at meetings or holding annual Recognition parties in honour of planning members and other volunteers. Directors who have a special understanding of the individual member's needs, expectations, and personality are also able to provide subtle forms of recognition.

As one Director observed,

> You've got to have feelings for people. I call some of the men who come here "old bastards." They love it. It lets them know I care. If I called other members that, they'd take offense and never come back.

In providing recognition, the Directors must be aware that there is a fine line between recognizing and patronizing. A member was quick to point out, "One thing a Director has to understand is that old people don't see themselves as old. It's always the other person who's old."

The three Directors appeared to have been successful in recognizing, but not patronizing, their Centres' members. For example, they all had "open door" policies, inviting members to come to them at any time with complaints or suggestions. At least some members were responsive to their Directors' "openness," as each of the interviews with the Directors was interrupted by members telephoning or entering the office. Also, all members interviewed claimed that their Directors were approachable and listened to their ideas. For example, one member said,

> Anytime we want something or have a complaint, we can go to (our Director).

Another stated,

> I've gone to (our Director) many times with suggestions. He hasn't always agreed with me. But I know he's listened.
The third important characteristic for Centre Directors to have is a proven dedication to the Centre and its members. Directors must accept the philosophy that, in the main, Centres should be planned "for seniors by seniors." Obviously a Director cannot be an effective facilitator if he doesn't believe members should be involved in the Centre's planning process. As one Director noted,

The Board and members are committed to the philosophy that the Centre should be planned by members, as much as possible. If a Director didn't accept this philosophy, he'd be working against the Centre and its goals.

(The Director might have added that any Director of an autonomous Centre blatantly opposing the Centre's philosophy would experience difficulty in securing the support of the Board and membership and would risk losing his job.)

The three Directors under study accepted the "plan for seniors by seniors" philosophy. The Directors of the Silver Harbour and 411 Centres were required to accept the philosophy under their terms of employment. The Assistant Director of Murdoch Centre has no such formal requirement; however, she chooses to accept the philosophy just the same. The establishment of the Executive Advisory Board and the proposed operational guidelines at Murdoch reveal her commitment to providing members with greater autonomy in planning at the Centre.

Although all of the Directors subscribed to the basic philosophy of members planning for their own Centre, they have to use some judgment in acting on the philosophy. It is essential for Directors to know how much and in what areas members want to plan. While many members want to be involved in planning, they do not want to be responsible for all
planning at a Centre. For example, a committee was formed at one Centre to plan, design, and build a float for a parade. The Director offered to help members get materials for the project but stayed totally out of the planning and designing of the project. Without the Director's direct support, the Committee leader experienced a number of difficulties in recruiting and coordinating volunteers and eventually had to give up on the project. The Director admitted, "looking back on it, I should have done more to help."

The preceding example reveals the difficulties a Director encounters in trying to strike a delicate balance between doing too much and doing too little for members. One Director and four Board members described the Director's role as providing "continuity." In providing continuity, a Director or other staff attend to the planning tasks and other duties that members do not want to take on. For example, one Director claimed, "By and large, members aren't interested in administration." Therefore, he and his staff look after the administrative aspects of the Centre's planning, thus freeing members to engage in planning in areas of interest to them.

In some cases, the Directors' practice of providing continuity might possibly be viewed as planning for Centre members. For example, a staff person stated,

Officially, we aren't supposed to do any planning. In actual fact, though, we often do.

In reference to program planning, a Director stated,

Members are free to bring program ideas to the staff or myself. But if we had to wait for members' suggestions, we'd have pretty sparse programming.
At the Centre in question, programs were usually introduced because of an availability of willing and qualified member-instructors, rather than an expressed demand for particular programs from the membership.

The important distinction between the "facilitator" and "provider" Directors is that the facilitator always lets members know they have the opportunity and right to suggest programs. In addition, he assures them that they can implement most programs they desire, provided they are willing to do the planning and organizing and the proposed program is "feasible" (i.e. it does not contravene Centre policy, it is not too costly to implement, sufficient space is available in which to hold it, and enough members are interested in it to make the program worthwhile). Because members know they may plan, they do not appear to resent the Director or staff doing so when they choose not to exercise their right.

In order for a Director to accept the "plan for senior by seniors" philosophy, he must be willing to forego personal recognition of his work on behalf of the members and the Centre. The difficulty in abiding by this requirement was explained by the former Program Director at one Centre:

My job is easy in one way. I'm not supposed to suggest things and I'm not expected to come up with dynamic ideas. But my job is hard in that I've got to resist putting forward what I know are good ideas.

Even when the Director subtly plans at a Centre by providing "continuity" to the members' planning efforts, he cannot take direct credit. If a Director or staff person requires personal recognition for his involvement in a Centre's planning process, his glory will come at the expense of Centre members and members will be discouraged from becoming involved in planning.
This brief investigation of the characteristics of Centre Directors completes the third section in the analysis of the factors which may encourage or discourage members' involvement in a Senior Centre's planning process. It is followed by the final section in the analysis, factors related to the Centre's building.

BUILDING

The final set of factors which emerged as potentially encouraging or discouraging to member involvement in a Senior Centre's planning process relate to the Centre's building. The literature warns that Senior Centre practitioners should not become preoccupied with considerations of the Centre's building, to the exclusion of all else. One writer stated that he would "rather have top notch staff conducting a program in a barn than have a castle available without competent staff or without a complete program" (Jones, undated, p. 4). Also, none of the Centres in this study confined their programs to their building. For example, they held such "off-site" programming as bus trips, swimming, tennis, and excursions to theatres or restaurants. Buildings and physical environments deserve some consideration nonetheless, as they have a major influence on the ability of a Senior Centre to meet the needs of its members.

An excellent design manual for the planning of Senior Centre facilities has been published by the NCOA, which aims "to offer technical guidance for anyone involved in providing the physical facility in which a senior group program is accommodated" (Jordan, 1978, p. 6). Rather than survey the contents of that manual, or other literature on environments for older adults, this section focuses on the implications that
the Centres' buildings have for members' involvement in planning at the Centres.

The case studies in Chapter 4 contain descriptions of the buildings and surrounding environments of the three Centres. To review briefly, the Silver Harbour building is owned by a Non-Profit Society and is designed specifically to accommodate the Centre's program. The 411 building is managed by the B.C. Building Management Corporation, and is made available to the 411 Centre Society at no cost. It was a Labour Temple when it was built in 1914, and it served a variety of purposes before a large portion of it was renovated in the 1970's to accommodate the 411 Senior Centre. Murdoch Centre is housed in a building which is owned by, and leased from, a United Church. It was originally designed to function as a Church Hall for use by all age groups, not only senior citizens.

With respect to member involvement in planning, the factors which distinguish the three buildings are related to their tenure and design. These factors affect members' involvement in two types of planning at their Senior Centres. Their effect on the first type, program planning, is considered below. Their influence on the second type, facility planning, is considered in the subsequent section.

A. Program Planning*

1) Silver Harbour. Silver Harbour's building is the most conducive of the three Centres under study to member involvement in program planning.

*In this section, the term "program planning" is used to refer to building-related program planning, such as crafts and exercise classes, dances, etc. The term does not refer to off-site programming, such as outreach, swimming sessions, or bus trips.
As the Silver Harbour Society owns its building, its members have a relatively high degree of autonomy. They set their own policy regarding use of the building, thus they are free to choose their hours of operation and the programs they wish to offer (as space and other considerations permit).

The Director and five members at Silver Harbour claimed that owning their building was a major factor distinguishing their operation from those of other Centres. The Director claimed,

Members have the pride of ownership. It's the same difference as between renting and owning a home. Members feel that the Centre is theirs.

She also indicated that ownership might encourage members to become involved in the Centre's program planning, speculating "maybe (ownership) is part of the reason we have so many volunteers."

The fact that Silver Harbour's building is specifically designed to function as a Senior Centre also serves to encourage members to become involved in that Centre's program planning. Quite simply, as the building can accommodate a broad range of programs, the Centre can offer a greater range of programs, thus increasing the potential for members' involvement in planning. In addition, the building allows members to derive satisfaction from their planning efforts, as it is relatively free of architectural barriers which might jeopardize the success of their efforts.

2) The 411 Centre. The 411 Centre's building provides less encouragement for members of that Centre to become involved in program planning, as it is not owned by the 411 Society and was not originally designed to serve as a Senior Centre. Members of 411 have less autonomy in their program planning than their counterparts at Silver Harbour, as
they must comply with regulations set out by the building's managers, the B.C. Building Management Corporation. They could not, for example, close off the main lobby to non-members and hold organized activities there. The 411 facility is in a public building and no person may be prevented from entering. As indicated in the previous chapter, in reference to the inebriated stranger who wandered into the Centre and intimidated members, the "public access" requirement may pose problems for programming and planning at the Centre.

The Provincial Government and the B.C. Building Management Corporation are accommodating landlords, however. Despite certain restrictions placed on the use of the building, members have a relatively high degree of autonomy in their program planning. Like Silver Harbour's members, those at 411 can set the Centre's operating hours and implement the programs they desire (provided they have adequate space, funds, member-interest, etc.)

To a degree, the fact that the 411 Society does not own its building may actually be an encouraging factor for member involvement in program planning. Unlike the Silver Harbour Society, the 411 Society is not responsible for the maintenance and renovations to its building. Being freed of the responsibility (and possible anxiety) of having to plan for building-related problems, members are able to devote their energies to program planning.

The physical characteristics or design aspects of the 411 building also affect members' involvement in program planning at the Centre. In general, 411's design offers less encouragement for member involvement than that of Silver Harbour. Although renovations have made the building
much more appropriate for the Centre's programs than it had been previously, the building still has an "old office building" feel to it and lacks the amenities of Silver Harbour. The building fits in well with the surrounding architecture and members and staff agreed that it provides a familiar and comfortable environment for many of its inner city members. However, the Director and members acknowledged that the building limits the programs that can be offered at the Centre. Five members expressed awareness that Silver Harbour owned their building and had a facility specifically designed for use as a Senior Centre. They spoke with respect, but not with envy.

We're more casual here. We don't need everything as fancy as they've got it at Silver Harbour.

I'll give credit where credit's due. Silver Harbour is a very polished affair. But we serve a different function here. This Centre's more a place to come and relax. Over there, people are more interested in organized activities.*

3) Murdoch Centre. Of the three Centre buildings being examined, Murdoch Centre's building provides the least encouragement for member involvement in program planning. The factors which discourage member involvement in planning at Murdoch relate to its leasing arrangement and the design of the building. First, the leasing arrangement reduces the autonomy that Murdoch's members may have in their program planning. The problems posed by this leasing arrangement are twofold: having to comply with the United Church's building-use policies and being required to

*(Note: The fact that 411 is more a place to "come and relax" is largely due to the type of clientele the Centre draws; however, it may also be due, in part, to the building's design characteristics. The 411 building is non-stimulating and possibly contributes to the passivity of many members)
share the facility with other groups. These problems and the frus-
trations they have caused the Assistant Director and members were dis-
cussed in Chapter 4. Members are unable to set their operating hours,
serve alcoholic beverages at special events, install expensive equipment,
leave their program materials out, or display their creative works. The
Assistant Director and all Board members interviewed expressed frus-
tration with the present leasing arrangement. One member who belongs to
other Senior Centres in Greater Vancouver stated,

Maybe I'm more critical than the others
because I've been to other Centres. I
know what they have to offer. We can't
even set our own hours here. We can't
hold Sunday concerts. We can't serve
drinks at dances or use dance wax on the
door...There are many restrictions with
this rented facility.

In addition to being discouraged from becoming involved in programs
planning due to the leasing arrangement, members are also discouraged
because of the building's design. As the building was not designed to
function as a Senior Centre, and has not undergone structural renovations,
it is not as ideal for Senior Centre programming as a building specifi-
cally designed or renovated for use as a Centre. Like the members of
411, members at Murdoch are discouraged from participating in programs
planning simply because they have fewer possible programs to plan for.
They are further discouraged by the access barriers of their building.
A major problem indicated in Chapter 4 is that most of the Centre's
programming must be held on the second floor. The building does not
contain an elevator, therefore members who experience difficulties with
walking or climbing stairs are probably unable to participate in the
programs. If the less ambulatory members are unable to participate in
the programs, it is unlikely that they would become involved in planning for them. Three very versatile and dedicated planning members interviewed at the other Centres had health problems which reduced their mobility. In view of Murdoch's architectural barriers, it is possible that the Centre may be being denied the contributions and talents of similar potential planning members.

B. Facility Planning

The preceding overview of the buildings of the three Senior Centres reveals that the tenure and design of the building can have an influence on members' involvement in program planning. Paradoxically, the factors which make a Centre's building "inadequate" and discourage member involvement in program planning (i.e. a leased building, shared with other groups, and designed for uses other than a Senior Centre) can encourage member involvement in another kind of planning—facility planning. The term "facility planning," as used in this thesis, refers to all planning which relates to the building or site of a Senior Centre. It includes, for example, planning to improve an existing facility or planning to acquire a new facility for a Centre.

The incentive for members to become involved in facility planning is the prospect of minimizing or eliminating the inadequacies of their Centre's building. By overcoming or eliminating these inadequacies, members will not only acquire an improved Centre building, but they will also attain greater autonomy in their program planning. This phenomenon can be seen at the three Centres under study. Each Centre has some dissatisfaction with its building which is causing members to become
involved in facility planning.

1) **Silver Harbour.** Although Silver Harbour has the most "ideal" building of the three Centres, it is designed for a membership smaller than the Centre's present total. The Director and all but one of the members interviewed at Silver Harbour identified the shortage of space as a concern for the Centre. A Board member stated,

> On occasion, all of our meeting rooms have been booked. We've had to hold meetings on the auditorium stage and in the hallways.

A Committee member noted,

> We offered our Christmas dinner at three sittings last year. The demand for seats was overwhelming.

In order to accommodate the increasing membership at Silver Harbour, a major facility planning effort will have to be launched. The planning task is complicated by the facts that the present building cannot support any structural additions and that no land is available for further construction on the site. If the members decide to acquire another site and undertake the construction of a satellite facility, members will have the opportunity to participate in a planning process similar to that engaged in by the founding members of the Centre (i.e. selecting a site, raising funds in the community, writing proposals to governments and other bodies, making suggestions regarding the new building's design, etc.). As a consequence they may be like the founding members in the degree of control they exercise and the resulting sense of satisfaction they experience.

2) **The 411 Centre.** Limitations of the 411 building also provide encouragement for members to become involved in facility planning. As
noted, the effort of members was instrumental in persuading the Government to undertake renovations of the building. At present, members are requesting that the Provincial Government turn over the top two floors of the four-story structure to the Centre. They are also attempting to create a park adjacent to the Centre on a site presently occupied by a parking lot. Members spoke proudly of the plans they have for the building:

We have plans to extend the cafeteria. We may put in a 'ladies only' area then. It should enable us to attract more women members and help to alter 411's reputation as a "men's Centre."

If we are granted the top floors, we may put in an auditorium and a large medical centre, with a waiting room.

One enthusiastic member described the plans currently being worked on for the 411 building and listed the major renovations that have already been made. He observed,

We've achieved what we have because we dreamed. We've always tried to keep moving ahead. If we stood still, we never would have improved. The Centre would have stagnated long ago.

3) Murdoch Centre. Of the three Centres, Murdoch's building has the most serious inadequacies and provides the strongest encouragement for member involvement in facility planning. As noted, members at Murdoch are presently engaged in the early stages of a planning process which will probably see the Centre being housed in a new facility. The most obvious reason why members at Murdoch may be encouraged to become involved in this facility planning process is the prospect of finding a facility which is more suitable than their present location. A less
obvious reason is that they may find inducement in the autonomy they gain by becoming involved in the process. Under the present administrative structure at Murdoch, members have advisory powers, but have relatively little real control over the planning that goes on at the Centre. By becoming involved in facility planning and seeking a new building, Murdoch's members may experience control during the planning, launching appeals to raise funds in the community, applying for grants, selecting a site, and presenting suggestions regarding the design of the new building. They may also exercise control after the new building has been completed, as the Centre's members will be the sole occupants of the building and they will be able to set their own policy regarding its use. Many of the factors which discourage member involvement in program planning in Murdoch's present building should thus be eliminated when the Centre is relocated.

All Board members interviewed regarded the establishment of a new facility as a cure for many of the "ills" presently being experienced at Murdoch. For example, referring to the relatively small proportion of men who belong to the Centre, one member asserted,

We'll be able to install a good woodwork shop and get more pool tables when the new Centre is opened. That should help us attract more men.

Another who felt that nutritional needs of the elderly should be a major concern of the Centre observed,

The new Centre should have a kitchen and serve inexpensive, balanced noon meals. Maybe a wheels-to-meals program can be implemented, in which those old people who don't get out much are brought to the Centre for lunch. People need emotional nourishment as well as physical nourishment.
The new Murdoch building may not be as ideal as some members expect it to be; however, the interview responses reveal that the prospect of establishing it and moving from the present location serves as strong encouragement for at least some members to become involved in facility planning.

Before closing this section, it should be noted that despite the possible influence that a Centre's building can have on member involvement in planning, factors associated with the building are probably the least important of the four sets of factors examined in this chapter. A building should never be seen as an end in itself. In the words of one of the Directors,

It's possible to go to great pains in establishing a new Senior Centre, but if the staff and programs aren't satisfactory, you'll wind up with a 'lovely empty building.'

SUMMARY

In this Chapter, factors have been examined which may act to encourage or discourage member involvement in planning at Senior Centres. The four main factors which emerged from casual conversations and interviews with Centre staff and members and from personal observations at the Centres related to 1) the administrative structure of the Centres, 2) characteristics of "planning members" (Board and Committee members), 3) characteristics of Centre Directors, and 4) the Centre buildings.

Having examined these factors, the following Chapter provides the conclusions and implications of the research plus recommendations for future research.
Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined the planning processes at three Senior Centres in the Greater Vancouver area. In particular it focused on the role that members played in the processes and factors which encouraged them to become involved. This chapter presents the major conclusions of the research, followed by their implications and questions for future study.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions stem from the analysis of factors which encourage and discourage members' involvement in a Senior Centre's planning process. To review, the main "encouraging" factors identified were:

1) Autonomous Administrative Structures

These structures provide members with more "structural opportunities to participate and the research at the Silver Harbour and 411 Centres suggests that they allow them to experience a greater sense of control and satisfaction in their planning. Centres with less autonomous structures offer fewer structural opportunities and less encouragement to members to become involved in their Centre's planning process. However, the research at Murdoch Centre suggests that the less autonomous Centres may provide encouragement to members who do not want a great deal of responsibility for planning and to those who require the security of a strong staff person in order to participate.
2) **An Adequate Level of Funding and Staffing**

The research suggests that if the Centre's level of funding is too low, members will become frustrated and will not get involved in planning. This is because members do not want to plan for programs or other concerns if they see little hope of having their plans implemented. Some members at the three Centres appeared to gain encouragement from the challenge of making plans to raise funds for their Centres. Others complained, however, that having to write grant proposals and seek donations from businesses and organizations was tiring and tedious and it could prevent members from engaging in other aspects of their Centres' planning process. The staffing problems at the studied Centres were also related to funding levels. As found at the 411 Centre, when low funding levels present a Centre from paying its staff adequate salaries, difficulties will arise in hiring and maintaining qualified staff. High staff turnover can discourage members from becoming involved in their Centre's planning process, as it prevents them from forming bonds with employees who are hired to facilitate them in their planning efforts. And as found at Murdoch Centre, if low funding levels result in too few staff being hired, the paid employees will have difficulty finding time to facilitate and encourage members in planning.

3) **Skilled and Experienced Planning Members**

As seen at Silver Harbour and 411 Centres, Board and Committee members with leadership and communication skills can be particularly effective in encouraging other members to become involved in planning. Outgoing and agreeable personalities, receptiveness to members' ideas, and value positions that support the participation of members in the
Centre's planning process also emerged as being important characteristics for planning members.

4) Skilled and Experienced Executive Directors

To be effective in encouraging members to plan, Directors require the skills, experience, and "positive" personality and attitudinal characteristics identified for effective planning members. A somewhat surprising finding of the research was that the three Directors and many of the members interviewed also indicated skills in business management to be an important qualification for a Director. They argued that a Director with good business management skills could ensure that the Centre was being run successfully, gaining the members' confidence and freeing them to become involved in the non-business aspects of the Centre's planning. The interview subjects also indicated that a Director needed to accept the right of members to plan, have a sound understanding of group dynamics and of the needs and circumstances of the aged, and know how much and in what areas members want to assume responsibility for their Centre's planning.

5) Accessible, Well Designed Buildings

The research suggests that a building specifically designed to function as a Senior Centre and owned and solely occupied by members potentially offers the greatest encouragement to members to become involved in their Centre's planning. Silver Harbour Centre's building, for example, which meets the preceding criteria, could accommodate a greater range of programs and was more congenial and accessible to members than the leased, shared, general purpose building of Murdoch Centre. Due to the design and ownership of Silver Harbour's building,
the Centre's members had a greater range of programs that they could plan for and they were able to exercise considerable control over their planning and programming. Despite the overall desirability of a specially designed member-owned building, costly maintenance, repairs, or expansions will inevitably be required for such a building. Members' energies and the Centre's resources will have to be transferred from the "pleasant" planning at the Centre and be devoted to attending to building-related matters. For this reason, an older building, such as 411's, which is renovated for use as a Senior Centre and managed by a "benevolent" landlord may offer a comparatively high degree of encouragement to member involvement in planning.

The three Senior Centres studied in this thesis had distinctive programs, administrative structures, buildings, and memberships. Obviously, no one planning model would be appropriate for meeting the varied needs and circumstances of the three Centres (or any other Centres, for that matter). Whatever planning model a Centre adopts, those making use of the model must recognize it as being dynamic, and they must be prepared to alter it as time and circumstances necessitate. Generally speaking, however, ensuring that the identified "encouraging" factors are in place should create an environment conducive to member involvement in a Centre's planning.

Admittedly, a number of difficulties would emerge in attempting to establish a planning framework which would encourage member involvement. Three of the more problematic aspects are discussed below.

The first problematic aspect relates to ensuring that continuity is built into the planning process. Some members and staff at the
three Centres under study expressed concern about maintaining continuity within their Centres' processes. A few planning members, for example, indicated a fear that if they ceased to serve, no other members would replace them. These planning members placed most of the blame for the potential lack of continuity on the new, more recent Centre members, who had shown little interest in becoming involved in planning. However, some of the responsibility must rest with the planning members. If they regard themselves as indispensable, they could become "entrenched," clinging to their planning positions while at the same time, feeling overburdened. In such an instance, problems could occur. When the "entrenched" members finally have to retire from duty, the newer members might lack the necessary skills or confidence to assume the vacated planning positions.

The problem of ensuring that continuity is maintained within the planning process may be compounded by planning members' attitudes toward the value and necessity of training. For example, two of the three Centres studied offered no formal training to their Board or Committee members. All Board members interviewed at those Centres claimed that training was unnecessary for preparing members for Board duties. In fact, some appeared almost insulted when the question was raised, as if the very suggestion that they might require training inferred that they were not competent to perform their duties. By resisting the introduction of training sessions, planning members might unwittingly be discouraging the less skilled or confident members from participating in planning.

The research suggests that continuity within the planning process
would be more assured if planning members had a better understanding of how to motivate other members and if they made a sincere effort to include those others in their planning.

The second problematic aspect of establishing a successful member-planning process relates to the lack of understanding that some members showed regarding the planning process. An example of this lack of understanding was revealed in the efforts of members at one of the Centres studied to acquire a new building for their Centre. The Centre's Board members tended to speak of the building as an end in itself, not as a means of fulfilling the Centre's purpose or goals. One of the main reasons for wanting the new building seemed to be the fact that Centre members in adjacent municipalities had their own buildings. Little evidence emerged that members had considered alternative means of meeting their needs, such as hiring additional staff or coordinating programs with Community Centres or other groups. One could conclude that unless members (and staff) give more careful thought to determining the reason for the proposed building's construction and the purposes it is to serve, they may find they have engaged in an expensive planning exercise, not only retaining their Centre's existing problems, but also acquiring fresh ones with the new building.

The third problematic aspect of establishing an effective planning model relates to resources (financial, staff, building, and equipment). Seriously inadequate resources can not only discourage members' involvement in planning; they can also create difficulties in programming and staffing, and ultimately jeopardize the very existence of the Centre. Despite these negative aspects, the research revealed that slight
resource inadequacies could have a positive effect, encouraging members to become involved in planning efforts to redress the inadequacies. This phenomenon was apparent at the three Centres with respect to planning for fund raising and building matters. Such activity could be regarded as mere "busy work" which causes members to transfer their energies from planning in the areas they enjoy to planning for the survival needs of their Centres. Indeed, some of the members interviewed held this opinion. Others, however, seemed to derive satisfaction from making a direct contribution to and being in control of their Centre's resources. The research suggests that an optimum principle may be present.

The optimum principle can be depicted graphically as follows:

![Graph](image)

The graph suggests that below the optimum where resources are too low, members may curtail their involvement, as they become tired and frustrated and feel that they have less power to effect change. Beyond the optimum, where too high a level of resources is supplied, members may decrease involvement, as they have less need to take initiative in planning for themselves. Indeed, this possibility was suggested by
long-standing Board members at two of the studied Centres. They indicated that a possible reason why the "young" seniors do not seem eager to become involved in their Senior Centre's planning process is the fact that they did not have to fight to gain improved financial and social benefits for seniors as the older adults before them had. It would be difficult to test the hypothesized relationship between the level of resources and members' involvement in planning for at present no cases exist (to my knowledge) where governments or other funding bodies have over endowed a Senior Centre.

IMPLICATIONS

The research has a number of important implications for Senior Centres, other planning groups, and for society at large.

First, the main implication for Senior Centres has already been noted: attempting to implement the identified "encouraging" factors in a Senior Centre's planning process should generally create an atmosphere more conducive to member involvement in planning. However, the preceding discussion revealed that difficulties may arise in attempting to ensure that continuity is built into the planning process and that the individuals involved have a sound understanding of the process. A conclusion that can be drawn is that the planning members could help to minimize these difficulties.

The defensiveness shown by some planning members when questioned about training sessions suggests that initial attempts to introduce such sessions might meet with resistance. One way of overcoming possible resistance might be to carefully explain the purpose and importance of
the sessions, so that members do not feel that they are being requested to accept training because they are incompetent. Also, the sessions would likely meet with a more favourable response if they were "fun" to attend and they had a degree of "prestige" attached to them. For example, if the sessions included members and staff from a number of Centres in a region, those attending the sessions would likely enjoy meeting and being with others who share their interests. They could also achieve status in their own and others' estimation.

The training sessions could address such planning issues as setting, prioritizing, and modifying goals, developing, monitoring and evaluating programs, and preparing budgets. They could also deal with human relations or group dynamics. Particular attention could be paid to training members and staff in how to communicate with and motivate other Centre members. By involving members and staff from a number of Centres in workshops, an exchange of information could be facilitated. Channels could possibly be established through which information was exchanged on a fairly regular basis after the training sessions had ended.

In order for the sessions to be a success, the person giving them would not only require sound knowledge of planning and working with groups, he would also need to have an understanding of and sensitivity to the special needs of the aged. The members interviewed made it clear that they do not appreciate young "know-alls" trying to tell them what to do.

Another implication of the research relates to the hypothesized principle of "optimum support levels." The principle suggests on one hand that the level of resources that governments and other agencies
provide to Senior Centres could potentially be excessive. If members had everything provided for them, they would probably not feel the same need of planning fund-raising events (which may, or may not, be a negative factor) and they would not be compelled to exercise as much responsibility in managing their resources as members of Centres that had been given less. More importantly, they would not have the same degree of opportunity to exercise their abilities and to experience the satisfaction of having a degree of control over their own and their Centre's destiny.

On the other hand, the optimum principle suggests that if the level of resources supplied to a Senior Centre were too low, members might be discouraged from participating in their Centre's planning process. If this were the case, members would thus be prevented from deriving the maximum benefits from attending their Centre.

If the principle of "optimum support levels" were taken into account, and an optimum point could be determined, governments and other agencies would likely find that they were funding Senior Centres at a point well below the optimum. By using the "optimum support level" principle as a basis for the allocation of funds, funding bodies could ensure maximum participation of Centre members in their planning and the equitable distribution of resources amongst various Senior Centres.

Although the research investigated the planning process at Senior Centres, its implications extend to other planning groups. It is true that planning with members of Senior Centres requires special knowledge and expertise (for example, Senior Centre Directors need to be knowledgeable and sympathetic to the social, physical, and economic losses that older adults experience). However, members of Senior Centres tend to be
the "well elderly," and once certain factors associated with the aging process are taken into account, planning with Senior Centre members is not significantly different from planning with any heterogeneous group. For example, many of the problematic aspects of planning with Senior Centre members identified in this thesis, such as cliques, bigoted attitudes, and entrenchment of members, would be found in almost any planning group. Thus, if the establishment of "encouraging" factors helps Senior Centres to increase member involvement in their planning processes, it should also assist bodies composed of younger members.

In addition the provision of training sessions for the planning members of other groups should help those groups to involve more members and to improve the quality of their planning. For example, citizen participation programs in the United States and Canada have frequently been criticized for providing a soapbox for members of the most vocal interest groups, while being unresponsive to those less able to verbalize their concerns. If the less articulate individuals could be taught how the planning process works and the means of expressing themselves through it, more citizen participation programs would be successful in involving a wider range of the citizenry. The chances of success would be increased if the vocal or articulate members were trained in how to motivate their peers to become involved.

The concept of optimality might also apply to other planning groups besides Senior Centres. If so, planning groups and funding bodies should take a genuine interest in determining roughly where the optimum point lies. Such knowledge would assist planning groups to realistically define their needs. In addition, it would enable funding bodies to determine equitable allocation of resources. If funding bodies used an optimality
concept as a basis for determining their allocations to community groups, they could reduce one of the major anxieties plaguing the groups -- insecurity over the level and continuity of funding.

In its broadest sense, the research has implications for society as a whole. As the number of older adults continues to increase, more Senior Centres will likely be built to meet their needs. The establishment of these Centres will require a considerable amount of society's resources. If Centre members are encouraged, facilitated, and trained in planning they will become more adept at planning for their Senior Centres. Recognizing that active, self-directing adults are generally healthier and more satisfied than their more passive peers, older adults who take advantage of opportunities to plan at Senior Centres have much to gain. Funding bodies and taxpayers will also gain, for they can be confident of the ability of Seniors to plan for themselves, and thus be assured that public monies are being used efficiently.

While the thesis did not attempt to evaluate the ability of Senior Centre members in planning, the examples it presented should reveal that the planning members under consideration were capable of planning for their Centres by implication. If older adults can plan effectively at Senior Centres, they can also contribute to other participatory planning programs. If society recognized the ability of many of its older members, rather than dwelling on their supposed disabilities, it could reap enormous benefits. For example, representatives of community planning programs, organizations, or other planning bodies might consider visiting Senior Centres and personally appealing to the members to contribute to their endeavours. If they were successful in their appeals they, their
organizations, and their constituents could benefit from the years of experience and expertise that many older adults can offer. Thus the community would be utilizing a valuable resource and the older adults would regain some of their lost self esteem.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Due to the exploratory nature of this thesis, it has raised more questions than it has answered. Further research is required to:

1) Refine and expand upon the categories of encouraging and discouraging factors for members' involvement in a Senior Centre's planning process.

2) Explore the principle of "optimum support levels" - Does it apply at Senior Centres. Is it a universal concept applicable to other planning groups? Can governments, other funding bodies, and planners use the concept to determine a measurable "optimum" level of resources to be provided?

3) Determine whether the encouraging and discouraging factors identified in this thesis are applicable to Adult Day Care Centres, Residents' Councils, or other planning bodies composed of older adults. - How far can the plan "for Seniors by Seniors" concept be taken?

4) Determine whether the encouraging and discouraging factors are applicable to groups which include a range of age groups. - What are the differences between planning with younger and older adults?

5) Survey a broader sample on their attitude towards Senior Centres and "Seniors planning for Seniors" at the Centres. - What is
the attitude of Seniors who don't belong to a Senior Centre? What is the attitude of Seniors involved in Community Centre programs with a range of age groups? What is the attitude of those who ceased to belong? Are there any planning members who ceased to serve? If so, why did they cease to serve? Are non-planning members aware of structural opportunities to participate in planning? Do they care that these opportunities exist, or are they only concerned with the activities and services available at the Centre?

6) Determine whether member planned Senior Centres are more efficient and effective in terms of meeting needs, than those planned by paid professionals. What other factors need to be considered besides resources? Are there hidden costs involved in employing either model?

The economic and social implications of the projected increase in the over 65 years population will be enormous. Governments and planners have a responsibility both to Seniors and to society at large, to encourage and facilitate older adults to assist in meeting these future challenges. Therefore, it is essential that researchers contribute to the effort by seeking to fill the vacuum that presently exists in the literature on planning with Seniors.
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APPENDIX I

DIRECTOR'S INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. I would like to begin by asking you some general background questions about the Centre...
   - when was it started?
   - who was involved in initiating it?
   - why was it started?
   - who funds the Centre?
   - who administers the Centre?
   - who owns the building?
   - how many paid staff are there

2. What are some of your main duties at the Centre?

3. What would you say are some of the most important qualifications for a Director to have?
   - education
   - work and/or community experience
   - attitude
   - stamina
   - leadership skills

4. What is the composition of the Board of Directors?
   - numbers
   - elderly/non-elderly
   - offices

5. Have Centre members always served on the Board?
6. How are the Board members chosen?
   -elected/appointed
   -nominating committee

7. Do you think a Director or the Nominating Committee should look for people with special qualifications for Board membership?
   -why, or why not?
   -what characteristics?
   -how can they attract them?

8. What are the main functions of the Board?

9. Does the Centre rely on standing committees? ad hoc committees?
   -what are some of the most important standing committees?
   -what is their function?
   -how many members?
   -same people on many committees?
   -do committee members have to be members of the Centre?

10. What is your relationship with the Board?
    -full member?
    -ex officio?
    -administrative?
    -carry out policies and Board decisions?

11. Do you think this is a good relationship for a Director and Board to have?

12. Do you feel any of your duties or responsibilities, or those of the Board should be changed?
    -which ones?
    -why?
    -easy to do?
13. Do you do anything specific to help to prepare new Board or Committee members for their duties?

- orientation/training sessions?
- Board manual?
- discuss time commitment

14. Are there any routines which you follow to help ensure that Board and committee meetings run smoothly?

- send out Minutes and Notice of meetings?
- help prepare Agenda?
- assist with correspondence?
- prepare written report each month?
- offer praise and constructive criticism?

15. Do you notice any differences in working with senior adults as opposed to younger adults?

- slower pace?
- short run goals?
- hearing problems?
- memory loss?
- social event rather than business meeting?
- motivational needs for affiliation rather than achievement?

16. Do these differences make your job more demanding?

17. What would you say are some of the main advantages and disadvantages of a Centre controlled by members as opposed to one controlled by an outside agency?
18. What would you say are some of the main advantages and disadvantages of a Board composed entirely of Centre members, and one that has representatives from the community?
   - Pro's?
   - Con's?

19. Would you say that the characteristics of Board or committee members vary in any way from those of the general membership?
   - s.e.s.?
   - age?
   - general activity level (in Centre and in other organizations)?
   - health/energy level?
   - education?
   - skills?
   - attitudes

20. How can you ensure that Board and committee members represent the interests of the general membership?
   - avenues for membership's input?
   - issue opinionaires?
   - task frequently with members?
   - reports to the membership through newsletters, etc.?
   - have Board members drawn from cross-section of membership?

21. Are you satisfied with the level of involvement of members in the Centre's planning process?

22. Are Board meetings open to ALL Centre members? If so, do many attend?
23. Can the head of an activity basically plan his program as he likes, or must he first go through staff or an operating committee?

24. How do you ensure that the Board and committees get fresh ideas?

- limit term of office?
- recommend that the members speak with Boards at other Centres?
- suggest that they attend workshops and conferences?

25. Could you describe how one of your recent programs was planned?

- determine needs.
- objective and goal setting?
- monitoring process?
- who did what?

26. How do you evaluate how successful a program has been?

- criteria?
- statistical quality?
- who performs the evaluation?
- is it standard practice to conduct such evaluations?

27. Do you receive many suggestions or complaints from members regarding programs, activities, or Centre policy?

28. Are there any groups that you would like the Centre to reach that it is currently not reaching?

- affluent or impoverished?
- handicapped (mentally or physically)?
- males?
- ethnic?
- people without cars?
- shy or reclusive?
29. What efforts, if any, have been made to help acceptance of these people?
   -how successful were they?

30. Is there consensus amongst the Board members about involving these people? If not, what are some of the objections?

31. Do you find that some members of the Centre tend to be joiners by nature and others seem never to get involved?
   -committee or volunteer work?
   -activities or programs?

32. What methods do you use to overcome this problem?
   -how successful are they?
   -is it worth the bother?

33. Apart from serving on the Board or committees, are there any other ways in which Centre members may participate in planning at the Centre?
   -channels available?
   -examples of plans resulting from member input?
   -level of interest?

34. Is the Centre involved in any programming or activities with other Centres, community organizations, or agencies?
   -what are they?
   -what is the nature of involvement?
   -what is the reason for involvement (e.g. avoid duplication of services, share facilities or resources, etc.)?
35. How successful has this involvement been? 
   -do you expect that it will continue? 
   -will it be stressed - the same, less, or more in the future? 

36. What do you perceive to be the main purpose or role of the Centre? 
   -providing social opportunities? 
   -being a place for recreation? 
   -being an information/service Centre? 
   -advocacy (e.g. social action/community awareness)? 

37. Do you expect that the Centre will play this role for the foreseeable future? 
   -why? 

38. Could you speculate on what the outcome of removing the age criteria for membership might be? 

39. Do non-members ever visit or use the facilities of the Centre? 
   -who 
   -under what conditions? 
   -what are the feelings of the Board and general membership on this subject? 

40. Are many non-members in the community aware of the Centre or its activities? 
   -elderly 
   -younger people 
   -evidence (press notices, volunteers, donations of services and funds) 

41. Are you basically satisfied with this recognition/support?
42. Your job sounds very demanding and challenging. Has the Administration and/or Board been supportive?
   - in what way?
   - staff
   - morale boost

43. What are the major sources of funding for the Centre?

44. Has the level of funding been sufficient to meet programming, staffing, and other needs of the Centre?

45. When staff quit, are members understanding, or do they feel hurt or resentful?

46. Do you feel comfortable in delegating some responsibilities to the Board and committees?
   - reasons
   - examples of support or non-support

47. Do the general membership appreciate the time demands and responsibilities of your job?
   - reasons
   - examples

48. What are the main priorities in planning that face the Centre?
   - strategy for meeting them

49. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank you very much.
APPENDIX II

BOARD MEMBER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. How are Board and committee members chosen?
   - nominating committee and elections
   - appointed
   - terms of office (fixed or indefinite)

2. Do you think it is important for members of Boards and committees to have special skills and experience?
   - what kinds? (e.g. education, occupation, voluntary work, etc.)

3. What made you decide to serve?

4. Has serving on the Board met with your expectations?

5. Should efforts be made to get people with special skills or experience to serve on the Board, or should anyone who wishes to serve have equal opportunity?
   - why?

6. What kind of support should a new Board or committee member be given by the Board and Director?
   - written job description
   - Board manual
   - constitution and by-laws
   - terms of reference of committee
   - orientation and training sessions
   - morale boosts - e.g. praise and constructive criticism
   - clear indication of expected time commitment
7. Were you given any of these supports?

8. What are the main duties of the Board?

9. What is the relationship of the Board to the Executive Director?
   - are there any overlaps in your duties or responsibilities?

10. Do you think this division of duties and responsibilities is about right?

11. What would you say is the ideal Board composition?
   - senior adults only
   - senior and younger adults
   - special qualifications

12. What are the main advantages and disadvantages of a Senior Centre that is planned by the members as opposed to one planned by a Director or community group?
   a) Con's
      - age-specific problems
      - inefficiency
      - short-term, personal goals
      - dominant members, cliques
      - "yes-men"
      - more work for members
      - insecurity
   b) Pro's
      - representative of members
      - democratic ideal
      - have communication network; can tap resources from many sources
      - therapeutic; preserves dignity and self respect
13. Would you say that members of the Board are different from the overall membership in any way?

- activity level (in Centre and other organizations)
- s.e.s.
- education
- health/energy level
- experience

14%. How can a Board get fresh ideas? How can it be sure that it is representing the interests of the Centre members?

- attend conferences
- fixed term of office for Board members
- consult other groups
- seek membership's input
- form research committee to keep abreast of studies done in the field
- visit other Senior Centres and meet with their members and staff

15. Do people who aren't on the Board ever offer you advice or make suggestions about programs, activities, or services?

- what kinds of suggestions
- who makes them?
- are they acted upon?
- are suggestions encouraged?
- small or great interest from membership in planning
- attitudes of the Board about sharing power
16. Beside serving on the Board or a committee, are there other ways that members can participate in planning at the Centre?
   - in what ways?
   - who takes advantage of them?

17. What are the main functions served by committees?

18. What is the relationship between the Board and committees? Who serve on committees?

19. Can you tell me some things that make Board or committee meetings run smoothly?
   - length of meeting
   - committee reports printed in bold type on light coloured paper; mailed or handed out before meetings
   - members allowed to add items to agenda before meeting begins
   - Roberts Rules of Order followed
   - strong chairperson who keeps meeting on track
   - all members given opportunity to speak

20. Are there any differences in planning with a Board or committee of Senior adults as opposed to a Board or committee composed of younger adults?
   - hearing loss, therefore necessary to speak louder - much repeating
   - slower movements - hard to take Minutes, generally slower pace
   - time perspective (short goals as death nears)
   - memory loss
21. Can you give me an example of how a recent program or activity was planned?

- need studies or surveys of members
- goal setting
- who was involved, and at what stage of process?
- was written constitution containing Centre's objectives consulted or considered?

22. What do you think the main role or purpose of the Centre should be?

- multiservice Centre, with services and activities
- activity Centre only
- cultural-activity Centre
- cultural-activity-social service
- social club

23. Has funding for the Centre been sufficient for it to meet its goals?

24. What type of members should the Centre try to attract?

- all seniors?
- well-elderly?
- all but the confused?
- locals?

25. Are there any groups you would like to see reached by the Centre that it is currently not reaching?

- males
- handicapped
- seniors without cars
- recluses
- institutionalized elderly
- ethnic groups
26. Do you find that some people seem to be joiners by nature, and others seem to never get involved?

- non-joiners in programs
- committee and volunteer work done by the same few all the time
- whether problem can be minimized, and whether attempts to minimize it are worth the effort.

27. Do you ever try to involve non-members in the Centre?

- children's Easter egg hunt
- host luncheon for busload of seniors on day trip
- rummage sale/afternoon tea/public bingo

28. What do you think would be the outcome if people of all ages were permitted to join the Centre?

- younger adults wouldn't join
- younger adults would try to dictate to seniors

29. Do many people in the community, aside from members, know about the Centre or its activities?

- mention in press
- volunteers
- favourable or non-favourable attention (e.g. visits from schools, incidents of discrimination, etc.)
- donations

30. Do you think efforts should be made to improve community recognition of the Centre?

- methods (P.R., open house, joint planning)
31. What do you consider to be the major accomplishments of your Board and the Centre?

32. What are the main priorities currently facing the Board and Centre? -what will be done about them?

33. Is there anything you would like to add?

Thank you very much.
APPENDIX III

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I would like to begin by asking for your ideas about how decisions are made regarding programs, activities, and other matters at the Centre.

1. Who decides what activities and programs are to take place at the Centre?
   - program committee?
   - the Director?
   - an outside Department?
   - the Board?

2. Do you think it's a good idea to have only Centre members on the Board?
   - Why?
   - What are the alternatives?

3. Do you come to the Centre often? What things do you do here?

4. Have you ever considered serving on the Board or Committees?

5. What are some important qualifications for a Centre Director to have?
   - education
   - social skills
   - experience
   - active in Centre or community
   - attitude
   - understanding of the aging process
   - leadership
6. What are some of the important qualifications for Board members to have?
   - education
   - experience
   - attitude
   - leadership

7. What do you think the duties and responsibilities of the Board should be? What do you think the role of the Director should be?

8. Who do you think should have the final say about what goes on at the Centre, the Board or the Director?
   - Why?

9. If you didn't like a program or activity at the Centre, could you do anything to get it changed?
   - what? (e.g. complain to Director or Board)
   - have any members done this?
   - with what effect?

10. Have Board or committee members, or the Director, ever asked your opinion about a program or activity?
    - is this/would this be a good idea?

11. If there were something you wanted changed at the Centre, would Board members be approachable? The Director approachable? Do you think that they would seriously consider your ideas?
12. Besides serving on the Board or Committees, are there other ways that members can have a say about what goes on at the Centre?
   - examples: suggestion box, opinion-aires, newsletters
   - speak with activity instructors
   - speak with other members to decide on a group solution

13. Are there any changes you would like to see in the Centre, such as new activities or programs?

14. Are there some older people who may have difficulty getting out to the Centre and might benefit from it?
   - frail elderly
   - low income without autos
   - ethnic
   - disabled (physically & mentally)
   - how could they be encouraged?

15. What do you think would be the consequences of letting younger adults join the Centre?

16. In your opinion, should people who aren't members be allowed to use the Centre?
   - does this happen?
   - attitudes and justifications
   - children, e.g. Easter egg hunt
   - busloads of institutionalized elderly
17. Do many people in the community who aren't members know about the Centre?

- elderly
- all ages
- newspaper releases
- volunteers
- donations (money, goods, services)

18. What are the main reasons for having a Centre?

- social club; combat loneliness
- activity Centre
- cultural enrichment
- service Centre
- community development/social action

19. What are some of the most important functions which the Centre should be serving now?

- e.g. activities, services, etc.

20. Do you think that the Centre is doing a good job?

21. What do you consider to be the main priorities facing the Centre?

22. Is there anything you would like to add?

Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENIOR CENTRE</th>
<th>SILVER HARBOUR</th>
<th>411</th>
<th>MURDOCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>North Vancouver</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENING DATE</td>
<td>September, 1973</td>
<td>December, 1972</td>
<td>October, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR FUNDING SOURCE</td>
<td>Ministry of Human Resources</td>
<td>Ministry of Human Resources</td>
<td>Municipality of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING GRANT OR DEPT. FUNDING</td>
<td>$85,000. (1979-80)</td>
<td>$107,300. (1979-80)</td>
<td>$35,000. (approximately) (excluding rent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE OF PROGRAM</td>
<td>SILVER HARBOUR</td>
<td>MURDOCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Bingo, crafts,</td>
<td>Bingo, crafts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>billiards,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services - counselling</td>
<td>counselling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comm, Health Nurse,</td>
<td>Information,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Medical clinic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Action - affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with F.L.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF PAID STAFF</th>
<th>SILVER HARBOUR</th>
<th>MURDOCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Full-time and</td>
<td>1 Full-time and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Half-time</td>
<td>1 Half-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROXIMATE MEMBERSHIP (June, 1980)</th>
<th>SILVER HARBOUR</th>
<th>MURDOCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTICLE 1 - MEMBERSHIP

(a) Membership of the Society shall be those persons sixty (60) years of age and over, and any spouse of such person, who subscribe to the Constitution and By-laws of the Society, and who support the aims and purposes of the Society having paid such Annual Membership dues as shall be determined through Resolutions passed by a simple majority at the Annual Meetings of the Society.

(b) Honourary Membership shall be granted to those persons who have been chosen to serve on the Board of Directors as Community Members, by virtue of their acts of contribution in community affairs and professional life but do not fall into the general definition of membership.

ARTICLE 2 - CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH MEMBERSHIP CEASES

Members may terminate their membership by notice in writing to the Secretary. The Board of Directors may terminate any membership for just and sufficient cause. The membership year in the Society shall be based on the fiscal year of the Society, and members shall pay the annual dues on or before the first day of April of each year or upon the member joining the Society. A member who has failed to pay the current annual membership fee ceases to be a member in good standing.

ARTICLE 3 - MEETINGS

(a) The Annual General Meeting of the Society shall be held during the month of June, in each and every year, at such time and place as the Board of Directors shall decide and notice of such meeting shall be available to the members of the Society, providing not less than fourteen (14) days written notice thereof.
(b) Notice of all Special and General Meetings shall be available to all members of the Society, providing not less than fourteen (14) days written notice thereof.

(c) A quorum for Special and any General Meeting of the Society shall be seventy-five (75) members in good standing.

ARTICLE 4 - OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

The Officers of the Society shall consist of the following officers: Past President, President, 1st Vice-President, 2nd Vice-President, Secretary, Member-at-Large, Member-at-Large.

ARTICLE 5 - ELECTION OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

The Society shall elect, at the Annual General Meeting, Officers to serve on the Board of Directors. A nominating committee, composed of a chairman, elected by the Board, and three (3) Society members, elected by the membership, shall prepare a list of candidates from the membership, willing and eligible to stand for office. Written nominations on forms approved by the Board of Directors shall be received by the Nominating Committee up to fourteen (14) days prior to the date of the Annual General Meeting, at which time the list of candidates and written nominations shall be posted. Nominations from the floor shall be accepted at the Annual General Meeting. The members wishing to stand for office shall be present at the Annual General Meeting or state in writing their willingness to stand. Voting shall be conducted by secret ballot at the Annual General Meeting. Only those who have valid membership cards in the Society shall be entitled to vote. Absentee ballots shall be accepted by the Annual General Meeting, but proxy voting shall not be allowed.

ARTICLE 6 - BOARD OF DIRECTORS, POWERS AND TERM OF DIRECTORS

(a) The general policy of the Society, and the operation of the facilities, shall be in the hands of a Board of Directors, consisting of thirteen (13) members of the Society.
(b) The Board of Directors shall be constituted and made up of six (6) community members and the officers of the Society, who shall serve without remuneration.

(c) A nominating committee of the Board shall prepare and provide the names of candidates from the community willing and eligible to stand for Board membership as needed to complete the required number. These names shall be submitted to the Board for consideration at the next scheduled meeting after the conclusion of the Annual General Meeting.

(d) The Community Members on the Board shall serve a two (2) year term, one-half of whom shall be elected in the even numbered years, and one-half of whom shall be elected in the odd numbered years.

(e) Upon a vacancy occurring on the Board of Directors, the Board shall be empowered to fill such vacancy by the appointment of an appropriate person who shall serve the unexpired term of the person so replaced.

(f) The Board of Directors, by an affirmative vote of at least two thirds of all the members thereof, may remove any Director or Officer from the Society for just and sufficient cause.

(g) The Board of Directors shall meet not less than four (4) times a year, such meetings to be held on the call of the Chairman of the Board. A quorum for a Board of Directors meeting shall be forty (40%) per cent of the members of the Board.

ARTICLE 7 - BOARD OFFICERS AND SOCIETY OFFICERS

At the first scheduled Board meeting after the conclusion of the Annual Meeting of the Society, the Board of Directors shall, by Special Resolution, choose from amongst their own members, the Officers of the Board. The Officers for the Board shall consist of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary, Treasurer, and the President of the Society.
The President of the Society may, if selected, hold any position except that of Treasurer. The Officers of the Board shall constitute the Executive Committee.

**ARTICLE 8 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

The Board of Directors may entrust the general management of the business and affairs, programs and services of the Society to a salaried official, named the Executive Director, who shall be responsible to the Board of Directors at all times.

**ARTICLE 9 - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

(a) The Executive Committee of the Board and the Executive Director shall be responsible for implementing the policies of the Board of Directors.

(b) In the event of a vacancy occurring on the Executive Committee, then the Board of Directors shall appoint a member from the Board to fill the vacancy for the balance of the unexpired term.

**ARTICLE 10 - AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS**

The Auditor shall be selected by the Board of Directors but subject to the approval of all membership at the Annual General Meeting. The Auditor shall carry out an audit of the books of the Society annually and present to the Annual General Meeting, a duly certified financial statement.

**ARTICLE 11 - SEAL**

The Seal of the Society shall be in the custody of the President of the Society or such other person as the Board of Directors may from time to time appoint, and shall only be affixed to documents by a Resolution of the Board of Directors and in the presence of two (2) of the Officers of the Society.
ARTICLE 12 - BANKING

(a) All funds of the Society shall be deposited in the name of the Society at the bank or banks or such approved financial institution to be selected by the Board of Directors.

(b) The Board of Directors may from time to time by Resolution, authorize such Director or Directors, Officer or Officers, Clerk or Cashier or such employee of the Society as the Directors may appoint, to transact daily banking business with the said bank or banks or other approved financial institution, and to sign and execute on behalf of the Society, all such documentation as may be required for daily banking purposes.

ARTICLE 13 - CUSTODY

The Secretary of the Society shall prepare and maintain the Minutes of proceedings of meetings of the Society and of the Directors. These shall be kept in the custody of the Society, along with all other books and records of the Society at the Society's offices at 144 East 22nd Street, North Vancouver, British Columbia, and shall be available to members for inspection upon five (5) business days written notification at the Society's offices.

ARTICLE 14 - ALTERATION OF BY-LAWS

Amendments to these By-laws shall be by Special Resolution and passed by three-quarters (3/4) of such members as are present and entitled to vote at any Annual General or Special meeting. Notice of proposed amendments shall be available to the membership, providing not less than fourteen (14) days written notice thereof.

ARTICLE 15 - APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Special Committees may be appointed by the Board and shall be discharged upon completion of their tasks.
ARTICLE 16 - POWER TO BORROW

The Board of Directors may, by a Special Resolution adopted by an affirmative vote of at least three-quarters (3/4) of all the members thereof, borrow or raise money when necessary for an on behalf of the Society for the operation and maintenance of the Silver Harbour Manor Society Building at 144 East 22nd Street, North Vancouver, British Columbia, and to secure the repayment thereof, and for the said purposes may, on behalf of the Society, make, draw, accept or endorse promissory notes and other negotiable instruments, chattel or other mortgages and all instruments creating indebtedness or collateral security subject to the Societies Act.

ARTICLE 17 - FISCAL YEAR

The fiscal year of the Society shall be from April 1st to March 31st of each and every year.

ARTICLE 18 - RULES OF COURT

Meetings of the Society and of the Board of Directors shall be conducted in accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws, and any question not so covered shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE 19 - REGISTERED OFFICE

The Registered Office of the Society shall be the Silver Harbour Centre at 144 East 22nd Street, in the City of North Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia or at such other addresses as may be designated and passed by Resolution of the Board of Directors as made from time to time.
ARTICLE 5 - DISSOLUTION OF THE SOCIETY

In the event of winding up or dissolution of the society, funds and assets of the society remaining after the satisfaction of its debts and liabilities, shall be given or transferred to such organization or organizations concerned with the social problems or organizations promoting the same object of this society, as may be determined by the members of the society at the time of winding up or dissolution, and if effect cannot be given to the aforesaid provisions, then such funds shall be given or transferred to some other organization; provided that any such organization referred to in this paragraph shall be a charitable organization, a charitable corporation, or a charitable trust recognized by the Department of National Revenue of Canada as being qualified as such under the provisions of the Income Tax Act of Canada from time to time in effect.

ARTICLE 6 - PROVISIONS UNALTERABLE

In accordance with the provisions of the Societies Act, Articles 4 and 5 of this Constitution are unalterable.

BY LAWS

ARTICLE 1 - MEMBERSHIP

(a) Membership of the Society shall be those persons Sixty (60) years of age and over, and any spouse of such person, who subscribe to the Constitution and By-Laws of the Society, and who support the aims and objects of the Society having paid such annual membership dues as shall be determined through resolutions passed by a simple majority at the Annual Meetings of the Society. Every such member shall have the right to speak and vote at any special or general meeting of the Society.

(b) Honorary membership shall be granted to those persons who have been chosen to serve on the Board of Directors, as Community Members, by virtue
of their acts of contribution in community affairs and professional life but who are not active members of the Society and may not fall into the general definition of membership. Such Community Members shall have the right to speak and vote at any and all Board and General meetings of the Society, and to hold office on the Board.

(c) Community Members of the Board to be issued with membership cards stamped "HONORARY"

ARTICLE 2.

Any member may terminate his membership by notice in writing to the Secretary. The Board of Directors may terminate any membership for just and sufficient cause, on recommendation of the Operating Committee. Any member who has been suspended may appeal to the Board of Directors, in writing. The membership year of the Society shall be based on the fiscal year of the Society, and members shall pay the annual dues on or before the first day of April of each year, or upon the member joining the Society. Any member who fails to pay the annual membership dues of the Society when they become due will forfeit all rights and privileges of membership in the Society.

ARTICLE 3. MEETINGS

(a) The Annual General Meeting of the Society shall be held at least once in every calendar year and not more than 15 months after the adjournment of the previous annual meeting, at such time and place as the Board of Directors shall decide and notice of such meeting shall be available to the members of the Society by posting such notice in the Society's premises 21 days before the meeting and/or shall be publicized in a newspaper circulating in the Vancouver area, providing 14 days notice thereof.

(b) Notice of all Special and General Meetings shall be available to all members of the Society and/or shall be publicized in a newspaper circulating in the Vancouver Area, providing 14 days notice.

(c) A quorum for special and any general meeting of the Society shall be Sixty Members in good standing.
(a) The Society shall elect, at the Annual General Meeting a Committee to operate the activities of the Centre, and a nominating committee shall prepare a list of candidates from the membership, willing and eligible to stand for office. Additional nominations may be made from the floor. The members wishing to stand for office shall be present at the Annual General Meeting, or shall state, in writing, their willingness to stand.

(b) The Operating Committee of the Centre shall consist of the following Officers:

- Past President
- President
- Vice-President
- Secretary
- Member-at-Large
- Member-at-Large
- Member-at-Large

The Operating Committee may add to their numbers, co-ordinators of Programme activities, who will have voice and vote at Operating Committee Meetings, but who are not ex-officio members of the Board of Directors.

(c) Upon a vacancy occurring on the Operating Committee, the Operating Committee shall be empowered to fill such vacancy by the appointment of an appropriate person, such person shall be willing and eligible to stand for office.

ARTICLE 5 BOARD OF DIRECTORS, POWERS AND TERM OF DIRECTORS

(a) The general policy of the Society, and the operation of the facilities, shall be in the hands of the Board of Directors, consisting of Fifteen (15) members of the Society.

(b) The Board of Directors shall be constituted and made up of eight (8) Community members, and the Seven (7) Officers of the Operating Committee.

(c) A nominating committee of the Board shall prepare and provide a list of candidates from the Community willing and eligible to stand for Board Membership, and these candidates shall be elected and approved by the Board at a meeting immediately after the conclusion of the Annual General Meeting.
(d) The Community members on the Board shall serve a Two (2) year term, one-half of whom shall be elected in the odd numbered years.

(e) Upon a vacancy occurring on the Board of Directors, the Board shall be empowered to fill such vacancy by the appointment of an appropriate person who shall serve the unexpired term of the person so replaced.

(f) The Board of Directors shall meet not less than Four (4) times a year, such meeting to be held on the call of the Chairman of the Board. A quorum for a Board of Directors Meeting shall be Forty Per Cent (40%) of the members of the Board.

(g) The Board of Directors may set up standing committees, and may set up ad hoc committees when necessary to further the achievement of the objectives of the Society. Ad hoc committees shall be discharged on completion of their tasks.

(h) No Director shall receive remuneration for his or her duties as Director.

ARTICLE 6 BORROWING POWERS

The society shall have the power to borrow or raise or secure the payment of money in such a manner as the society thinks fit, and without limiting the foregoing the society may issue debentures or debenture stock, perpetual or otherwise, charged upon all the society's present or future property, and to purchase, redeem or pay off any such security; but in no event shall the society borrow or secure the payment of money, without the sanction of a resolution of the board of directors, passed by a three-quarters majority vote of those present and entitled to vote.

ARTICLE 7 BOARD OFFICERS AND SOCIETY OFFICERS

The Board of Directors shall meet immediately after the conclusion of the Annual Meeting of the Society, and by Special Resolution, shall choose from amongst their own members, the Officers of the Board. The Officers for the Board shall consist of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary, Treasurer, and the President of the Operating Committee.

The President of the Operating Committee shall also serve as President of the Society, the Officers of the Board shall be the Executive of the Society.
(a) The secretary shall be responsible for the recording, custody and
distribution of all minutes of the general meetings, and all minutes of the
meetings of the Board of Directors and Operating Committee meetings of the
society. The secretary shall also maintain all other books and records of the
society, save and except those records required to be kept by the treasurer.
The secretary shall also perform all other secretarial duties assigned by the
board of directors. The secretary shall maintain a register of all officers
and all directors of the society and shall notify all eligible members of all
meetings of the society.

(b) The treasurer shall be responsible for keeping an accurate account of all
monies received and disbursed on behalf of the society.

ARTICLE 8 CENTRE DIRECTOR

The Board of Directors may entrust the general management of the business
and affairs, programs and services of the All Seniors Centre Society to a
salaried official, named the Centre Director, who shall be responsible to the
Board of Directors at all times. The Centre Director will hire and supervise
such additional staff as the board may from time to time authorize.

ARTICLE 9 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(a) The Executive of the Society shall be responsible for the day-to-day
management of the Society, and shall be responsible for implementing the policies
of the Board of Directors.

(b) In the event of a vacancy occurring on the Executive Committee, then the
Executive Committee shall appoint a member from the Board of Directors, to fill
the vacancy for the balance of the unexpired term.

ARTICLE 10 AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS

The Auditor shall be selected by the Board of Directors but subject to the
approval by the membership at the Annual General Meeting. The auditor shall carry
out an audit of the books of the Society annually and present to the Annual
General Meeting a duly certified financial statement.

ARTICLE 11 SEAL

The Seal of the Society shall be in the custody of the President of the
Society or such other person as the Board of Directors may from time to time
appoint, and shall only be affixed to documents by a Resolution of the Board of Directors and in the presence of Two (2) of the Officers of the Society.

ARTICLE 12 BANKING

(a) All funds of the Society shall be deposited in the name of the Society at the bank or banks, or other financial institutions, to be selected by the Board of Directors.

(b) The Board of Directors may from time to time by resolution authorize such Director or Directors, Auditor or Auditors, Officer or Officers, Clerk or Cashier or such employee of the Society as the Directors may appoint to transact its banking business with the said bank or banks, and to sign and execute on behalf of the Society all such documentation, security agreements, promises and pledges as aforesaid, and to delegate in any resolution of the Society the power hereby conferred upon the Directors.

ARTICLE 13 CUSTODY

The books and records of the Society shall be available to members for inspection upon ten (10) days written notification at the Society's offices at 411 Dunsmuir Street, Vancouver, British Columbia.

ARTICLE 14 ALTERATION OF BY-LAWS

Amendments to these By-Laws shall be by Special Resolution and passed by 75% (³⁄₄) of such members as are entitled to vote and are present at any general or special meeting. Notice of proposed amendments shall be available to the membership in writing and/or publication in a newspaper circulating the Vancouver Area, providing not less than Fourteen (14) days notice.

ARTICLE 15 FISCAL YEAR

The fiscal year of the Society shall be from April 1st to March 31st of each and every year.

ARTICLE 16 REGISTERED OFFICE

The Registered Office of the Society shall be at 411 Dunsmuir Street, in the city of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, or at such other addresses as may be designated and passed by Resolution of the Board of Directors as made from time to time.
APPENDIX VII
"SOCIETIES ACT"
MURDOCH SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRE
ADVISORY EXECUTIVE BOARD
CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I

OBJECTIVE OF MURDOCH SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRE
EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

To promote within the limitations of allocated resources year round opportunities for satisfying the leisure needs of senior adults in Richmond over the age of fifty-five. As well, to provide information services for senior adults whenever possible.

To provide settings in which members may experience acceptance by others, the feelings of belonging and recognition as individuals of positive worth.

ARTICLE II

GUIDELINE RE: ELECTIONS

1) The annual meeting will be held in September of each year.
2) The purpose of the meeting will be threefold:
   (a) to give statements regarding leisure time services provided during the previous year.
   (b) to announce the financial statement of the previous year.
   (c) to conduct the elections of officers for the executive board.
3) The Assistant director of Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre will conduct the election of officers.
4) All elected officers must be members of Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre.
5) Positions - The advisory executive board shall consist of eight members. They shall be seven elected officers plus the assistant director of Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre.
6) The officers of the advisory executive board will be:
   ELECTED: President
              President Elect
              Secretary
              Treasurer
              Social Co-Ordinator
              Programme Co-Ordinator
              Membership and Publicity Co-Ordinator
   APPOINTED: Assistant Director of Murdoch
              Senior Citizen Centre

All positions shall be for a two year term only except President only one year as President and one year as Past President.

ARTICLE III

MEETINGS

1) The Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre advisory executive board shall meet once per month.
2) A quorum shall consist of four members.
ARTICLE IV  VOTING

1) The election of officers at the annual meeting shall be by secret ballot. Other voting may be by show of hands or by ballot at the discretion of the president. In case of amendments to the guidelines, the voting whether by show of hands or by ballot, shall be tabulated to ensure a three-fourths majority as required under Article IX Sec. 1.

2) A scrutineer will be appointed by the executive advisory board with the assistant director assisting.

3) At monthly meetings, the assistant director shall retain the determining vote on matters related to the Department of Leisure Services policy.

4) The president shall have the deciding vote in event of a tie.

ARTICLE V  MEMBERSHIP

1) Membership in Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre shall be of a dual nature and shall be designated by appropriate membership cards, namely:
   (a) Associate Membership: Available to retired citizens 55 or over not residing in Richmond at $5.00 per annum this is a non voting membership privilege.
   (b) Active Membership: Available to any retired citizen 55 or over of Richmond for a membership fee of $3.00 per annum and renewable of September 1st of each year.

2) Nominees for election to office shall be restricted to active members.

3) Voting privileges shall be restricted to Active members.

4) Denial of membership or revoking a membership is the decision of the advisory executive board. A serious breach of social, ethical or moral standards could provoke such action.

5) Any person from outside the Municipality of the Township of Richmond may attend Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre as a guest; however on or before their third visit they must take out a associate membership.

ARTICLE VI  COMMITTEES

1) Committees shall be formed as deemed necessary by the executive advisory board and the assistant director.

2) Each standing activity committee shall name a chairperson who shall report to it on their particular activity. Such chairpersons shall also prepare and present a written report of the Activity's operation at the annual meeting.
ARTICLE VII  
FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS

1) The President and Treasurer and the Assistant director of Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre advisory executive board are responsible for establishing an account at a financial institution. This account shall be a non-personal account in the name of the Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre executive advisory board.

2) Funds collected and disbursed shall be channelled through the Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre records. A ledger folio shall be maintained to show its financial situation.

3) For all established bank accounts there shall be three signing officers with a minimum of two signatures required to validate a cheque one at all times must be the assistant director.

4) The executive advisory board is responsible to ensure that all accounting books are kept up to date. These books are open to inspection and financial statements shall be presented monthly at an executive advisory board meeting.

5) Once a year, accounting books will be subject to audit by an outside source.

ARTICLE VIII  
ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

1) Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre is a private building leased by the Corporation of the Township of Richmond for use of members of the Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre and therefore must comply with policies of the Corporation of the Township of Richmond.

2) Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre is allocated on an annual budget covering administration maintenance and programme supplies.

3) The Assistant director is responsible to the Department of Leisure Services administrator for all decisions regarding the expenditure of the budget.

ARTICLE IX  
AMENDMENT OF GUIDELINES

1) The guidelines may be amended by a resolution passed by a three-fourths majority of the members present at an annual meeting.

2) A notice of motion will be posted at Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre thirty (30) days prior to the annual meeting.
PRESIDENT

1) Be responsible for and chair monthly executive advisory board meetings.
2) Work with assistant director to assure that all other executives are functioning according to their positions.
3) Work with assistant director to oversee all functions and activities during the year.
4) Act as or designate a welcoming person at all functions.
5) See that all new members are made welcome and become involved in activities.
6) In co-operation with assistant director appoint committees for special events.

VICE-PRESIDENT

1) Be prepared to accept responsibilities of president pro term in the president's absence.
2) To assist president in all his/her functions.
3) Work with assistant director in fund raising events - all special community events and activities.

SECRETARY

1) Draw up agenda of monthly executive advisory board meetings.
2) To read, take and post on bulletin board the minutes of the monthly board meetings, through assistant director provide Department of Leisure Services with copy of the minutes.
3) To see that board members are notified of upcoming meetings.
4) Prepare an agenda and co-ordinate annual general election.

TREASURER

1) Keep accurate accounting records of the Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre books.
2) To present financial records at monthly board meetings.
3) Work with the assistant director in preparation of annual financial report for the annual general meeting.
4) Work with assistant director to prepare an annual budget for the Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre.
MEMBERSHIP and PUBLICITY CO-ORDINATOR

1) To ensure that annual membership cards and badges and all new members are registered.
2) To make quarterly attendance checks for missing members.
3) To stimulate membership worth
4) To work with assistant director in the assisting of publicizing activities and events in local news agencies.

SOCIAL CO-ORDINATOR

1) To work with assistant director at all Centre social events.
2) To assist with monthly birthday parties.
3) To acknowledge illness and deaths of members
4) To handle daily coffee and tea roster.

PROGRAMME CO-ORDINATOR

1) Assist in finding resources for Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre, preferably members themselves to lead or instruct programmes.
2) Act as a liason to the board on programme opportunities and new ideas.
3) Encourage involvement and attendance of all senior adults in Richmond
4) Act as a sounding person for suggested ideas and new programmes from the membership and the assistant director.
OBJECT OF THE CENTRE

To promote within the limitations of allocated resources year round opportunities for satisfying the leisure needs of senior adults in this community over the age of 55. As well, to provide information services for senior adults whenever possible.

To provide settings in which members may experience acceptance by others, the feeling of belonging and recognition as individuals of positive worth.

ADMINISTRATION

Murdoch Centre is leased by the Corporation of the Township of Richmond and must comply with the policies of the Richmond Department of Leisure Services.

Budget

Murdoch Centre has an annual budget covering: advertising, power, heat, telephone, water, maintenance and general centre supplies, administration salaries and benefits and major capital supplies.

The advisory executive board will be credited with funds from the following sources:

1) Annual membership dues
2) Programme fees
3) Special event programme profits
4) Fund raising events
5) And any other miscellaneous revenue directed for use of Senior Citizens in Murdoch Centre.

The advisory executive board will be responsible for the following types of expenses:

1) Instructor fees for programmes
2) Expenses incurred for special events and functions
3) Necessary casual help as deemed necessary by the assistant director
4) To make donations or contributions to appropriate requests.
5) To issue honourariums and allocate funds in recognition to volunteers and other contributors of Murdoch Centre.
6) To purchase any capital expenditures that do not fall within the municipal budget (and purchase of those items that the municipality do not have funds for at the needed time)
7) To purchase necessary supplies expendable items -
Authority

The assistant director will be the liaison with the executive advisory board and the Richmond Department of Leisure Services.

The executive advisory board work co-operatively with the assistant director to make decisions about the operation and programmes at Murdoch Centre. However, the assistant director in accordance to her responsibilities has the right to veto any decisions that are not in agreement with the Corporation of the Township of Richmond, Department of Leisure Services.

The assistant director will administrate budget funds and exercise supervisory responsibilities for all facility activities, staff and volunteers, and security of premises and revenue.

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

The board is a representative group of senior adults to voluntarily assist and advise the assistant director regarding programme direction for Murdoch Centre.

Terms of Reference

(a) Assist in identification and assessment of the needs and desires of senior adults
(b) Act as a sounding board for suggested ideas and new programme from the membership and the assistant director
(c) Make recommendations relative to programme development
(d) Promote Murdoch Centre's programme throughout the community and develop support for the Centre.
(e) Encourage involvement and attendance of all senior adults in Richmond.
(f) Assist in finding resources for Murdoch Centre, preferably from members themselves to lead or instruct programmes and aid in the functioning of the Centre and recommend these to the assistant director
(g) Report back concerns and considerations of Murdoch Senior Citizen Centre members to the assistant director for action.

MEETING AND VOTING

The executive advisory board shall preferably meet once per month on a regular basis, this however, is at the boards discretion. The assistant director may call a board meeting at anytime urgent business arise. General meetings will be held in September of each calendar year. Each active member in good standing shall have one vote.