DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 100 EA 011 984

AUTHOR Cook, Nancy C.
TITLE Facility Use Patterns. Research Report 79-101.
INSTITUTION Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education.
SPONS AGENCY Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 75p.; For related documents, see EA 011 985-986
AVAILABLE FROM Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, School of Education, Ruffner Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903 ($3.75; quantity discounts: 10% added for shipping on billed orders: make checks payable to "University of Virginia")

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Community Education; Community Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; *Facility Utilization Research; *Research Needs; Shared Facilities

ABSTRACT

The first part of a three-part assessment of community education research needs, this report attempted to formulate research questions and identify research needs related to facility use in community education. It begins with a glossary and a historical review of facility use as it relates to community education. Four forms of facility use (extended use, joint use, reuse, and multiple use) are identified. A review of research describes research studies on facility use patterns that relate to community education. The report concludes with a list of 28 critical questions for researchers in community education to examine. A ten-page list of sources consulted by the authors is included. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175100

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Facility Use Patterns

Nancy C. Cook

Research Report 79-101

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Decker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This research was supported by C.S. Mott Foundation Grant No. 78-084 to the Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium (M. H. Kaplan, Principal Investigator, Research and Evaluation Component).

Developed at the

Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education
School of Education
University of Virginia

1979

EA 011 951

*Cover Design by Carole H. Martinie

MID-ATLANTIC CONSORTIUM
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION BOARD

1978-79

June Bland, Assistant for Evaluation
Division of Research and Evaluation
Washington DC Public Schools

Gerald Bolick, Coordinator
Grants Planning Office
Appalachian State University

Michael Caldwell, Director
Bureau of Educational Research
School of Education
University of Virginia

Bill Grant, Chief
Program Assessment
Division of Instruction
Maryland State Department of Education

Michael Kaplan, Associate Director
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education
University of Virginia

Robert Lewis, Director
Institutional Studies and Planning Coordinator
Norfolk State College

Jon Magoon, Associate Professor
Department of Education
Foundations
University of Delaware

Terry Peterson, Research Coordinator
South Carolina Education Assoc.

Jim Ranson, Associate Dean of Education
West Virginia College of Graduate Studies

Dale Robinson
Director of Planning
Virginia Department of Education

Clark Trivett
Education Research Consultant
Assessment and Evaluation Team
NC Department of Public Instruction

Ken Underwood
Director of Field Services
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Peter Verhoven, Associate Professor
Department of Recreation
Cole Field House
University of Maryland

Marilyn Williams
Federal Grants Coordinator
The Yadkin County Board of Education

FACILITY USE TEAM MEMBERS

Larry Decker
Mid-Atlantic Center for Com. Ed.
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Barbara Foster
Com. Ed.
Durham County Public Schools
Durham, NC 27702

Bill Grant
Div. of Instruction
MD State Dept. of Education
Baltimore, MD 21240

George W. Holmes, III
Dept. of Administration and
Supervision
University of Virginia
School of Education
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Bill De Jong
Center for Com. Ed.
Facility Planning
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Floyd Parker
Continuing Ed. Services
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Steve Parson
Cooperative Extension Program
for Community Education
VPI & SU
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Joe Ringers, Jr.
Arlington Public Schools
Arlington, VA 22207

Nancy Ross
Shawnee Community Center
Dunbar, WV 25064

John Warden
The Northern Institute for
Research, Training and Dev., Inc.
Anchorage, Alaska 99502

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This document is part of a series of research reports prepared during 1978-79 in conjunction with an action plan for community education research in the Mid-Atlantic region. The research plan is one component of the 1978-83 Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium's overall effort in community education development.

The shortage of research studies on specific aspects of community education influenced the decision to develop a research agenda. Three research reports (one each on Facilities, Interagency and Citizen Participation) concluded with lists of research questions that are worthy of investigation. The questions were used to develop a prospectus on community education research, one that is expected to generate research proposals.

There is a growing recognition of the importance of research and evaluation among the ranks of community education practitioners as well as college and university faculty. Some researchers are moving toward studies that attempt to answer the difficult aspects of community education. For example, what differences are there in communities or school systems because community education has been implemented? Generating data to address this question requires many modes of inquiry, several of which are time-consuming and costly. Field studies, ethnographies, case studies and policy analysis studies require percise preparati and training.

Moreover, the investigator does not have the convenience of studying a community with a mailed survey instrument.

Most community education research to date has been quantitative; it has also been doctoral dissertation in format. Agendas for research can guide a variety of investigations, using different methodologies. The agenda serves as a springboard; it raises key questions and suggests avenues to explore.

The results of research studies a.e often unexplained. The researcher doesn't ordinarily communicate with field practitioners, and sometimes not even with fellow researchers, except through journal articles or papers presented at meetings or conferences.

An active program of research and evaluation is essential if community educators are serious about sustaining and expanding developmental efforts, nationally. Legislators and policy makers are becoming less interested in numbers counting and more interested in the qualitative factors noted earlier. A systematic, national research undertaking can be one useful strategy for gaining supporters and advocates of community education. In addition, research results can be used far more successfully in planning in-service and on-going training activities for professionals and community members.

This series of research reports represents the work of many individuals. Nancy C. Cook, an educational consultant and writer, was the primary contractor. She was assisted by Deborah Spivey, Jack Ogilvie and Rebecca Hutton who

scoured libraries, abstracted materials and helped in numberous phases of the background research. Pat McAndrew advised generously regarding the use of ERIC as did Bill Higgins of the National Institute of Education. The members of the Mid-Atlantic Consortium Research and Evaluation Board (listed in the front) deserve the credit for mapping the plan which produced the three research reports before actually doing a particular study. Teams of reviewers graciously gave of their time and knowledge to react to working drafts of each document. They, too, are listed at the beginning of each report. Ginny Alley of the Mid-Atlantic Center did her customary typing magic on both the working and final drafts. It is impossible to recall every conversation and piece of advice from friends and colleagues. So many people contributed to this enormous, year-long venture. I would like, however, to express special appreciation to two individuals. Professor Gail McCutcheon provided lengthy and penetrating comments on the revised Research Plan developed in conjunction with the Research and Evaluation Board. Professor Terry A. Schwartz also advised at several points along the way. Her advice was particularly helpful in shaping follow-up plans for 1979-80. We all await reaction from the field.

Michael H. Kaplan
Charlottesville Virginia
May 1979

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this paper is to identify and describe the literature and research, both the historical basis and current status of school facility utilization as they relate to the concept of community education, in an attempt to recommend critical research needs and raise some critical questions that relate to facility use patterns. It is not designed to be a comprehensive review of the literature and research on the vast field of public school facility use; it was not intended to be an analysis of research findings. No definitive statements are intended or presumed. This work was proposed to identify how public school buildings have been and are being used relative to the community education precepts.

The author began this study with no preconceived notions and with no questions or hypotheses posed at the outset, not with the intent of ultimately formulating a definitive statement with regard to facility utilization patterns; rather, the author attempted to sort out, identify and describe the current state of the art.

The methodology first consisted of the compilation of an exhaustive bibliography by means of a literature search.

With the assistance of Dr. William Higgins of the Educational Reference Center of the National Institute of Education and Mrs. Pat McAndrew of the Science Technology Information Center of the University of Virginia, an extensive computer search was conducted, utilizing thirty-two descriptors relating to facility use in the ERIC-CIJE system. Indices, Dissertation Abstracts and catalogues were searched, materials ordered and reviewed, personal correspondence ensued for purposes of procuring otherwise unavailable materials. Those sources found to be pertinent to this study are included in the "Sources Consulted" section of this paper.

The findings were then broken out into major categories, the first distinction being made between literature and research. In the literature some logical patterns emerged and the review took on its present form:

I. The Introduction, including 1) the historical basis for use of public school facilities, 2) a glossary of pertinent terminology, 3) the justification and rationale based upon history and evolving trends, 4) legislation and legal parameters, both past and present.

II. Emergent forms, which became apparent in the literature search, are largely of the author's devising. The four forms are operationally or conceptually defined and exemplary or representative models are listed and/or described. It should be noted that the list of models is not exhaustive,

but is offered merely to provide examples to illustrate the various forms. The four forms, also defined in the glossary of terminology are:

1) Extended use

2) Joint use

3) Re-Use

4) Multiple Use

III. The Research section is further divided into two sub-sections:

1) Review of research describes the purposes and findings of various studies facility use patterns as they relate either marginally or specifically to the community education concept. It should be noted that very few studies exist to date relative to this topic.

2) Research needs were derived from various sources. Those research questions identified by the two symposia on Research Needs for Community Education and those adduced by the former Office of Community Education Research were extrapolated and included in this section. The possible research questions that emerged from the literature and research studies were listed, as were those that evolved from the author's intuitive notions based on the community education philosophy. Finally, members of the Review Team who reacted to the various draft forms of this paper contributed a number of significant questions that merit further analysis. The paper, then, concludes with a list

of critical questions that researchers in community education should examine.

IV. Sources consulted, including all materials that were reviewed in the development of this report.

GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY

Facility - building(s) and grounds publicly financed by taxation, used totally or in part as a public school that is planned, constructed, maintained, utilized, and operated by the local school district alone, or in conjunction with other public agencies or governmental divisions for purposes of public benefit.

Community education - the concept of a unified effort of problem solving at the community level, concerned with maximization of resources to effect the provision of personal, educational, social, recreational, cultural, and health benefits for all persons of all ages within a community, incorporating the components of maximum facility utilization, citizen involvement and participation, lifelong learning, interagency articulation, culminating in a "sense of community." The programs, processes, scope, and complexity differ from one community to another.

Social Center - early 20th Century National Movement advocated by Dewey, Ward, and others, concerning the use of a public school facility as a community center for purposes of meeting the fundamental social, cultural, educational and human needs of all citizens within a community.

"Little Red Schoolhouse"- a term used to describe the function of the early schools that were the center for all activities of the community it served. Olsen (1954) calls these the first community schools.

Community school - a vehicle for delivery of community education services; a facility that is in continuous operation from morning until night, weekends, holidays, and during the summer months, providing educational, cultural, social, and recreational activities for the people.

Extended use - a form of facility utilization, in which the facility is used by the public in the evenings, weekends, and during summer months. It is characterized by the extended hours of operation.

Joint use - a coordinated and cooperative form of facility utilization in which the school and one or more agencies jointly provide needed services for the community in a shared setting. This can take the form of a shared site, shared construction, and/or shared space.

Re-use - a form of facility utilization which may be manifested in one of two ways: 1) the restoration of a vacant school building or 2) the rejuvenation of an older structure through remodeling for new purposes. In both cases re-use constitutes the regeneration

of an outdated building to specifications based upon the needs and desires of the re-users. It is sometimes referred to as recycling, reinstating, or reclaiming.

Multiple-use - a form of facility utilization designed to provide a variety of services under one roof to a large number of people, of which the school is only a part, sometimes providing "one-step shopping" for human services. This form is characterized by the Human Resource Centers, educational parks, and is sometimes referred to as parallel or shared use of facilities.

History

"The common schoolhouse is in reality the most obvious center of national unity, and . . . it is likely to stand for a long time to come as the most conspicuous mark of a common American life" (Scudder, 1896). In his article in the Atlantic Monthly, Scudder proclaimed his early advocacy for the community use of schools, harkening back to the colonial period.

The American schools of colonial days were extensions of and reflections back to the home. In the school building, town meetings and other civic activities were held. Frequently it was a place for the community to play--where social events often occurred. Often it was used as a house of worship. In time, however, the community influence of the school declined.

> With the rapid growth of urban life in the United States, the schoolhouses fell into general disuse for community purposes. There is some evidence, however, that the Lyceum and the numerous other societies for the diffusion of knowledge which sprang up during the first quarter of the nineteenth century--mercantile associations, teachers' seminaries, literacy societies, book clubs and societies of education, occasionally utilized the schoolhouse for their meetings. (Glueck, 1927, p. 13)

With the growth of urban centers came all of the accompanying problems--tenements, poverty, illiteracy,

crime, poor health, and vices that served as diversions for the people who attempted to escape, albeit temporarily, their plights. Educators, believing that education could help the people improve their situations, devised schemes for alleviating the urban problems. One result was the formation of the evening schools for workers. It was the expressed belief of these reformers that a democratic nation required an educated citizenry.

Evening schools for adults were slower in developing than were the daytime programs for children. Cubberley (1943) indicated that the first evening school was established in Providence, Rhode Island in 1810. Other writers maintain that the first evening school attempts were in New York City in 1833, or in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1834 (Knowles, 1962). The evening schools did, however, originate in the cities, and maintained their urban orientation for many years, unlike the early community schools which reflected rural needs and attitudes

In this country, community education had been, until the 1950's largely a rural endeavor, undertaken in agricultural communities. Inasmuch as this nation has a history of commitment to agrarian concerns, it seems only fitting that the movement began with the cooperative development of rural and agricultural communities. One of the first of such ventures was the Bethesda School in Georgia, opened in 1740 to instruct orphan boys in agricultural education in return for their community service.

Barnard, a prominent nineteenth-century scholar, educator and spokesman for democratic education, is credited

with being perhaps the first advocate of community education (Decker, 1972). In his "Report on the Condition and Improvement of the Public Schools of Rhode Island, 1845," he asserted:

> It is a matter of vital importance to manufacturing villages, to close the deep gulf with precipitous sides, which too often separates one set of men from their fellows, to soften and round the distinctions of society which are nowhere else so sharply defined, . . . At least the elements of earthly happiness, and of a pleasant and profitable intercourse should be brought within the reach of all by giving to all through the public schools and by other means of inquiring minds, refined tastes, and the desire and ability to be brought into communion with those who possess these qualities. (Naslund, 1953, p. 256)

By the mid-1800's a few communities had begun to see an opportunity for using the school for activities other than those for which it was primarily intended (the formal instruction of children and youth). According to Glueck (1927), Indiana, in 1859, seems to have been the first state to pass legislation relating to the extended use of public schoolhouses. Glueck noted further that by 1881 another twelve states had passed comparable legislation.

At the turn of the century another related movement was gaining momentum. The Playground Movement was an urban undertaking, incorporating many of the elements which were later considered to be components of community education. The thrust was to effect social adjustments by means of organized social activities. The City of Newark (New Jersey) was a pioneer in the Playground Movement. The Newark Education Organization, a women's group, sponsored playgrounds from 1899

through 1902, when the work was taken over by the Board of Education (Glueck, 1927). In 1901 the Detroit Council of Women, according to Edwards (1913), started a campaign to secure district funding for support of organized recreation activities; funding was secured three years later.

Ultimately, by 1906, the National Playground and Recreation Association was established for purposes of promoting recreation through the public schools and playgrounds (Decker, 1972). By 1910 records indicate that fifty-five cities had recreation projects using public schools (Glueck, 1927).

These activities culminated in what became the Social Center Movement. John Dewey, in July 1902, addressed the National Council on Education in Minneapolis; his topic was "The School as Social Center." In this address he posed the following questions:

> It is possible, . . . and conceivably useful to ask ourselves: What is the meaning of the popular demand in this direction? Why should the community in general, and those particularly interested in education in special, be so unusually sensitive at just this period to this need? Why should the lack be more felt now than a generation ago? What forces are stirring that awaken such speedy and favorable response to the notion that the school, as a place of instruction for children, is not performing its full function--that it needs also to operate as a center of life for all ages and classes? (Dewey, 1902, p. 380)

He then enumerated some of the contemporary problems affecting education:

> Now our community life has suddenly awakened; and in awakening it has found that governmental institutions and affairs represent only a small part of the important purposes and difficult problems of life, and that even that fraction

cannot be dealt with adequately except in the light of a wide range of domestic, economic, and scientific considerations quite excluded from the conception of the state of citizenship. We find that our political problems involve race questions of the assimilation of diverse types of language and custom; we find that most serious political questions grow out of underlying industrial and commercial changes and adjustments; we find that most of our pressing political problems cannot be solved by special measures of legislation or executive activity, but only by the promotion of common sympathies and a common understanding. We find, moreover, that the solution of the difficulties must go back to a more adequate scientific comprehension of the actual facts and relations involved. The isolation between state and society, between the government and the institutions of family, business life, etc., is breaking down. We realize the thin and artificial character of the separation. We begin to see that we are dealing with a complicated interaction of varied and vital forces, only a few of which can be pigeon-holed as governmental. The content of the term "citizenship" is broadening; it is coming to mean all the relationships of all sorts that are involved in membership in a community.

> This of itself would tend to develop a sense of something absent in the existing type of education, something defective in the service rendered by the school. Change the image of what constitutes citizenship and you change the image of what is the purpose of the school. Change this, and you change the picture of what the school should be doing and of how it should be doing it. The feeling that the school is not doing all that it should do in simply giving instruction during the day to a certain number of children of different ages, the demand that it shall assume a wider scope of activities having an educative effect upon the adult members of the community, has its basis just here: We are feeling everywhere the organic unity of the different modes of social life, and consequently demand that the school shall be related more widely, shall receive from more quarters, and shall give in more directions. (Dewey, 1902, pp. 382-3)

He then emphasized four new demands made upon schools in order for them to meet comtemporary needs; in so doing, he defined the emerging role of the school as a social center. They

were: 1) the need for social contacts, 2) the need for developing cultural values, and particularly human understanding, 3) the need for training in technical arts and skills, and 4) the need for continuing education (Dewey, 1902).

One of Dewey's more ardent disciples was Edward J. Ward, who demonstrated the extent to which a school could be used as a social center, in Rochester, New York from 1907-1909. In 1909 Ward was invited to the University of Wisconsin to direct the organization of centers throughout that state. Ward was a leading advocate of the community school concept. He maintained that the school as a social center or community center met fundamental social, cultural, educational and human needs. The concept was a comprehensive plan for solving community problems and meeting community needs (Ward, 1917).

Edwards (1913) contended that New York had an active program in 1888; the Rochester, New York project was operational in 1907. The Cleveland, Ohio program originated in 1908; in 1911 Prescott, Wisconsin and Pensacola, Florida reported similar activities. A model had thus been adopted and adapted for both urban and rural locations (Cook, 1977).

Ward (1917) summarized the two-fold mission of the Social Center: 1) to be the agent for preparing youth for efficient membership in society, and 2) to be the operative or administrative unit for various services of immediate benefit to the community as a whole; the culmination of education related to life. Edwards (1913) established the origin of the social center

movement and traced the development back to the 1830's:

> This movement, of course, is not an isolated one, nor unconnected with the other social and educational movements of our time. It is easily seen how it arose in response to the needs of the people, and developed after years of experiment, to its present wealth of scope and organization. It would be wrong to consider this a "new" movement. Rather it is a reinstatement of the school to the important position it held in certain sections of our country in the days of the "LITTLE RED SCHOOLHOUSE," on the hill, some seventy-five years ago, when it was the center of the community's activities. Each one then felt a personal interest in it because it was common property, the common denominator of the village, as it were.
>
> It was but natural, therefore, that they should look to the schoolhouse to satisfy the desire, deep rooted in the soul of man, for contact with his fellows. The school was often opened in the evening and the patrons would come together to spend their leisure in an old time "spell-down," to hear some wandering lecturer, or maybe a county politician. The granges and clubs met in the schoolroom, the children gave entertainments to their proud fathers and mothers, and preachers of every sect received a respectful hearing. The social life of the neighborhood was thus centered in the school. (p. 27)

Olsen reaffirmed this in 1954, when he stated that:

> reverence for the Little Red Schoolhouse is more than nostalgia--its historical position derives from another of its functions. The Little Red Schoolhouse was the center for all activities of the little community it served. It was America's first community school. (p. 401)

However, as communities grew larger and interests became more diverse, and as more and more schools were discovering the benefits of consolidation, the community spirit and unity began to dissipate. Schools became more structured, more formal, and more academic. Churches and civic organizations

were called upon to fill the gap (Edwards, 1913).

That current movement, according to Edwards, was:

> only one of a series of social movements now going on. This extended use of the school has its counterpart in the extension work of the university. A few years ago a university was thought to fulfill its mission if it put out efficient graduates. But now it is realized that the university owes a duty to the whole commonwealth. The University of Wisconsin which has been called the "Model University," touches the life of the whole State and to a considerable extent guides its policies. (Edwards, 1913, pp. 31-2)

Other promoters of the trend were the YMCA, the Settlement Workers, civic leagues, and a multitude of community-interest, community-based ideas and operations.

Dewey (1902, 1916), Perry (1913), Ward (1917), Edwards (1913), and others, endorsed the Social Center movement and delineated some of the program outcomes, which are synthesized in Table I.

Perry (1912) traced the movement across the nation. In 1911 the Massachusetts State Legislature enacted a law authorizing the use of public school property in Boston for social, civic, and other purposes. As a result of an agitation for social centers which had been waged in Washington, D.C., a bill was introduced in the United States Senate authorizing the Board of Education to use public school buildings as centers of recreation and for other supplementary educational purposes. Other cities having reported social center activities included Duluth, Minnesota; Youngstown and

Table 1: Program Outcomes of the Social Center Movement

1. Reinstated social workers to the city: The movement fostered a sense of community, countering the feelings of alienation.

2. Provided a solution to the rural problem: The rural work ethic of "sunrise-to-sundown; all-work-and-no-play" was diminished by fostering a belief in the value of recreation; it also tempered the severe problem of rural isolation.

3. Fostered better government: Schools instilled a sense of earnestness, purpose, sobriety, cleanliness and order. The social center provided for political forums and classes in citizenship.

4. Reinforced the value of play: The social center effected wholesome recreation.

5. Drove out idleness: Centers had alternative activities.

6. Rivaled the saloon: In Milwaukee the Schlitz Beer Gardens were driven out of business by the attractive social centers.

7. Made dancing a wholesome amusement: Social centers sponsored well-supervised activities.

8. Fought against social evils: Social Centers provided attractive alternatives to the diversions of the streets.

9. Expanded the educational system: Evening schools provided remedial studies and advanced work for adults.

10. Alleviated the notion of schools being forbidding institutions, fostered a sense of belonging.

11. Provided job skill training and opportunities for continuing education.

Cincinnati, Ohio; Racine, Wisconsin; Springfield, Massachusetts; Paterson, New Jersey; Alonia, Kansas; and Portland, Oregon. In addition, superintendents in fifty other cities and towns across the country reported school houses which were locally known as recreation or social centers. Furthermore, colleges and universities had taken on the responsibility of promoting the social center as part of their extension divisions beginning with the University of Wisconsin, then followed by the University of Virginia, the Universities of California, Kansas, Missouri, Texas, and Oklahoma. According to Edwards:

> This spontaneous nation-wide movement for the use of the school as a social center has gradually taken on a more tangible form. The first Social Center Conference came together at Dallas, Texas, on February 17th, 1911, at the request of Colonel Frank P. Holland. Oklahoma has organized a State Social Center Association, and many cities have social center committees. (Edwards, 1913, p. 25)

The National Education Association, at its July, 1911, meeting in San Francisco, passed a resolution of which the following is an excerpt:

> The school buildings of our land and the grounds surrounding them should be open to the pupils and to their parents and families as recreation centers outside of the regular school hours. They should become the radiating centers of social and cultural activity in the neighborhood, in a spirit of civic unity and co-operation, omitting however all activities and exercises tending to promote division or discord. (Perry, 1912, p. 132)

In 1911 the United States Bureau of Education began distributing bulletins which described the current status and programs of social centers in the nation, while religious and denominational organizations were actively promoting

the movement. The Social Service Committee of the New York Federation of Churches and Christian Organizations passed the following resolutions:

> That the community should regard the school building as its property, to be turned to every possible community use. That the sense of the community should commend the work already done and demand the further extension of the use of the school buildings, outside of school hours, until the needs of the city be more fully met as regards summer vacation schools, supervised playgrounds, and evening recreation centers for physical, social, literary, and other activities of young people and adults. That the use of school buildings for polling-places and other civic activitiesbe urged as far as practicable. (Perry, 1912, p. 132)

The Russell Sage Foundation, established in 1907 for purposes of the improvement of social and living conditions in the United States, was actively promoting the social center movement. The Foundation conducted an eighteen-month study of techniques of facility utilization, the results of which appeared in Perry's Wider Use of the School Plant (1910). The Foundation distributed pamphlets, provided technical assistance, furnished a lecture service and loaned numerous lantern slides. It also produced a film, "Charlie's Reforms" which "demonstrated the efficiency of the schoolhouse social center as an antidote to the low dance hall and the saloon" (Perry, 1912, p. 133).

On October 26, 1911, the first National Conference on Civic and Social Center Development convened in Madison, Wisconsin, for a three-day workshop to exchange ideas and discuss aspects of the program (Edwards, 1918). Then,

toward the end of 1911, the National Society for the Study of Education devoted its Tenth Yearbook to the treatment of urban and rural schools as social centers (NSSE, 1911).

In 1912 Perry reported that the Oregon State Legislature had enacted legislation pertaining to the extended use of school buildings, which made no restriction upon free discussion except that all political and religious groups be afforded equal rights and privileges (Perry, 1912).

Concurrently, in an isolated section of Missouri, a project similar to Ward's Rochester program was described by Evelyn Dewey. The Porter School in Kirksville, Missouri, and the achievements of Mrs. Marie Turner Harvey between 1910 and 1918 were described in New Schools for Old (1919).

In another isolated situation, the Penn School, separated from the mainland on St. Helena's Island, South Carolina, developed into a viable force that effected cultural change. This school, originally started in 1862, was restructured in 1907 to meet the needs of the impoverished island Blacks and subsequently became an international demonstration site. Many foreign dignitaries and educators, interested in community development and its implications, visited this school after its reorganization (Scanlon, 1959).

The thirties found the nation embroiled in a depression; the stock market crashed in 1929, businesses were closing daily, the banks failed in 1931, unemployment was at an all-time high. Like the proverbial Phoenix, it was

out of the ashes of the Depression that some of the most exemplary community education programs emerged, largely due to federal recovery programs (Cook, 1977). The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), working in the South, was a development in conservation technology, but it involved more by providing jobs, effecting maximum utilization of available resources, encouraging people to work together for a common goal. This was also true of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camps and the National Youth Administration (NYA) programs; however, the biggest impact upon the developing community education concept was the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), from 1933-35, then the Works Progress Administration from 1935.

The Highlander Folk School (1933) in Summerfield, Tennessee, was a TVA project. It began with social evenings at the residence of two teachers. From there it evolved into lectures, forums, music lessions, then classes. In a year's time a three-fold program emerged consisting of 1) community work, 2) a residence program of short courses and weekend conferences, and 3) community work. All community members participated (Everett, 1938).

In 1934 Elsie Clapp went to Arthurdale, West Virginia, where she established a second community school, which she described in her 1939 book, Community Schools in Action.

The WPA, in its 1936 policies, advocated increased utilization of existing facilities, particularly of school buildings:

> It may be desirable that the small school community have a plot of land definitely laid

> out as a recreational center. The Works Progress Administration, Washington, D.C., has suggested that such a center have at least the minimum features of picnic grounds, horseshoe pitching courts, and a small community building. (WPA, 1936)

According to Dowdy (1975), the Flint Model, the prototype of the modern community school, was born of the WPA, as were other projects, such as those in Kentucky and Tennessee established by Maurice Seay, and those described by Everett (1938) in Washington, Georgia, California, Missouri and Michigan.

Until 1936 there existed some commonalities among the programs. The salient features of the community schools until 1936 were summarized by Campbell:

1. Community schools in the early days were organized around legitimate communities, legitimate communities being defined by sociologists as those in which there is a doctor, dentist, hardward store, and other institutions that cause people to come to the common center for specialistic services.

2. Most community schools were located in rural areas.

3. A commanding purpose of the community school in the past was to shore up the community. This was done in many ways. Leaders from the school assisted with plans to attract new industries to the community. In some instances the school superintendent and his staff established or helped to establish a soils testing laboratory, a cannery, a freezer plant, an articifical breeder's association, a milk-testing laboratory,

a farm accounting system, a service bureau for business firms, and a health center. Many people from the school, pupils as well, helped to beautify the community.

4. Learning in these early community schools was identified with community living. Students learned about state, national and international problems and their solutions by drawing up analogies from life in the community (Campbell, in Hickey, 1969).

Although there is evidence of a decline in community school development during the war years, an upswing was reported in the fifties, through the sixties and into the seventies, with new support and new models being developed.

In his 1975 address to the Second Annual Conference of the International Association for Community Education, Homer Dowdy made the statement that "there was no founding philosophy or rationale . . . it is my recollection that community education was born of no grand design" (Dowdy, 1975). Or was it? Is it not the culmination of the legacy bequeathed to the 1970's by such pioneers as John Dewey, Edward J. Ward, Clarence Arthur Perry, and Elsie Clapp? Was it not their dreams of democratic education in a democratic society that provided the foundations for the modern conceptualization of community schools? (Cook, 1977).

Justification and Rationale

It is now being said that massive school construction programs are at an end. Educators, politicians, ministers, and citizens are all addressing this fact; the reason--school

enrollments are declining. Various explanations are provided for this, primarily that of declining birthrate. According to the U.S. Office of Education, school enrollments will reflect a 12% drop in the K-12 program between 1972 and 1982. Enrollment peaked in 1979, with 51.3 million students enrolled in public schools in the United States. The U.S. Office of Education predictions are that by 1980 there will be 30.9 million students in the elementary grades; by 1989 enrollment will decline to 12 million in secondary schools. Other reasons given for declining enrollments include public loss of confidence in public education, desegregation, busing, private schools, and a high degree of population mobility. These factors, coupled with skyrocketing inflation in cost of building materials, labor costs, and interest rates, create an untenable situation; additional construction is difficult to justify.

Daily, schools are closing their doors; if student enrollment is not sufficient to merit providing a program, students are bused to other locales to fill empty spaces there; however, while the school population is declining, the total population is not. This dilemma provides the basis for alternative solutions to closing the neighborhood school facilities; they assume a new function. As education has taken on other roles, familial, social, and recreational, so might the school serve in different capacities. According to Musmanno (1966),

> the public schoolhouse should be the most effective community center in town. As public property it is ideally suited for this function. It is nonsecretarian. It is nonpartisan.

> It is truly a public building, which should be used by all citizens. (p. 55)

Limited use of a school facility has been and still is a serious concern to educators and to the community.

> It seems logical for communities eager to secure more return for their capital and operational investment dollar that the single-use educational building, coupled with its curtailed specialized time, is no longer affordable or desirable. (Passantino, 1975, p. 307).

This pattern emerges throughout the literature. Met with bureaucratic inflexibility, limiting definitions, fear or lack of citizen involvement, skyrocketing taxation, vested intersts, and a shifting economy, citizens (taxpayers) are getting tough and are demanding accountability from politicians and educators. Musmanno asserts that "to deny the after-hours use of school facilities to adults and children is a waste of public money that private capital would not tolerate for a moment." (Musmanno, 1966, p. 55)

The community education concept is endorsed by numerous industrialized nations and by many third world nations. Similar problems exist, such as "rapid urbanization, accelerated lifestyles, breakdowns in family support systems, balkanization of complex social services, and rising material and labor costs" (EFL, June 1978, p. 3). The concept is an attempt to address these problems and to respond to them. It is hoped that through the community

education process "the values inherent in community life would be preserved" (Musmanno, p. 56).

The community school, located strategically within a neighborhood, would not open at 8 a.m. and close at 4 p.m.; rather, it would be in continuous operation in late afternoons, evenings, weekends, and during the summer months to provide educational, cultural, social, and recreational activities for the people of the community.

> The schools of the community need the reviving influence of the coming together of whole people. The children need to think of their schools as more than a place of torture; this can come about only as the adults of the community come to beleive in the schools, as they do not now believe. All the questions and problems of the community life, industrial, sanitary, political, educational, moral, and religious, need to be seen in the light of complete community intelligence . . . . The community social center, . . . the community's common meeting ground, shall become, if our intelligence rises to the level of our fleeting institutions, the wall of social life. . . . (Hart, 1914, pp. 137-8)

Thus did one of the early community school supporters advocate involvement in the schools. The community school should be able to meet the needs of those who will be served, moreover those served should determine those needs. The community should have input into the planning process of a facility (Clark, 1969; Essex, 1948; Engelhardt, 1940; Lewis and Wilson, 1953; Minzey and LeTarte, 1972). Community educators agree that a

facility planned for people should also be planned by them. Gores (1974) predicted that if educators and planners did not respond to community and educational needs, some other institution will replace them. We are further warned by Gores to remain flexible and be able to adapt as new needs emerge for facility utilization.

The needs of the community may be as diverse as its residents; hence, the admonishment is to remember those people with special needs--the handicapped, the very young and very old, out-of-school youth, single parents, and minorities.

Legislation and Legal Parameters

The intent in this section is to provide an overview of representative legislation pertinent to utilization of public school facilities.

The first piece of legislation directed at education in this country, the Massachusetts Act of 1642, mandated compulsory education to meet the needs of society:

> . . . in every towne ye chosen men appointed for managing the prudential affairs of the same . . . shall have power to take account from time to time of all parents and masters, and of their children, especially of their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and capital laws of the country, and to impose fines upon such as shall be required.

This and subsequent legislation in the New England colonies was representative of the early settlers' utilitarian doctrine and lifestyle.

Glueck (1927), in her study of state legislation regarding community use of schools, discovered that Indiana,

in 1859, had passed a law allowing for civic, social, and recreational activities in the schools. Wisconsin, in 1911, was the first state to specifically provide for types of activities and for financing by the school board through taxation. The California Law of 1913 became a prototype for Oregon in 1915 and Utah in 1917, providing for a civic center within every schoolhouse in the state, and providing appropriations for program operation. By 1927, thirty-two states and the District of Columbia had passed laws providing for community use of schools.

Butterworth (1948) declared that as of 1948, thirty-six states had passed legislation permitting the use of public school facilities for other than school purposes. In other states the legislation addressed more specific issues. For example, the Oregon Law stated:

> There is hereby established a civic center at each public school house within the State of Oregon where the citizens of the respective public school districts within the said State of Oregon may engage in supervised recreational activities and where they may meet and discuss, from time to time, as they may desire, any and all subjects and questions which in their judgment may assertain to the educational, political, economic, artistic and moral interest of the citizens of the respective communities in which they may reside; provided the such use of said public schoolhouse and grounds for said meetings shall in no way interfere with such use and occupancy of said schoolhouse and grounds as it now or hereafter may be required for the purpose of said public schools of the State of Oregon. (p. 194)

> In New York, the law authorizes a board of education to permit the use of the school building for such services as public libraries; social, civic, and recreational meetings and entertainments providing these are open to the general public; meetings and entertainments where admission fees are charges and the proceeds are to be expended for an educational or charitable purpose; polling places, civic forum and community centers. (p. 207)

On recommendation of a Citizens Committee on Education Legislation, the Michigan Legislature passed a law (Act 225, Public Acts of 1949) to enable the people in an area, usually a county or larger, to study educational conditions and needs and to plan for improving the educational program.

However, according to Nolte (1966),

> There are sharp differences among the courts regarding the extent to which (school) boards may go in allowing non-school use of public school buildings. These differences are due in part to state statutes, in part to the customs and philosophies of different communities. Where no person objects to such usage, and the statute does not prohibit same, boards seem to have wide discretion in the use of public school facilties by outside groups (p. 64).

Several states, including California, Colorado, New Jersey, and Massachusetts passed laws pertaining to joint usage. These laws take different forms. For example, in New Jersey, the legislation emphasizes incentives for community use of schools. Legislation which provides support categorically and specifically to community schools is a recent phenomenon. Currently, several states have duly enacted legislation for community

education: Alaska, Minnesota, Michigan, Utah, Florida, North Carolina, and Iowa, all of which have provided for state funding for community schools. Additionally, South Carolina and West Virginia have passed enabling legislation. Migocki (1977) analyzed the legislation passed by the various states with regard to such things as levels of financial support, intent, and focus of the state statutes dealing with community education.

On August 21, 1974, as one of his first official acts as President, Gerald Ford signed into law the Education Amendments of 1974; one of the seven Special Projects authorized by Title IV of this Act was the Community Schools Act. It allowed funding of 80% of new program costs, 60% for expansion or improvement of existing programs, and 40% for maintaining ongoing projects "in which a public building . . . is used as a community center operated in conjunction with other groups in the community. . . to provide educational, recreational, cultural, and other related community services . . . in accordance with the needs, interests, and concerns of that community" (Community Schools Act, 1974).

This legislation also operationally defined community education, authorized the Commissioner of Education to make grants available, called for expanded utilization of existing public facilities, provided for the establishment of an eleven-member national Advisory Committee on Community Education, authorized the establishment of a clearinghouse to gather and

disseminate community education information, and authorized the Commissioner to insure the equitable distribution of community education programs in both urban and rural settings.

The Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act of 1978 (Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1978), places strong emphasis on the use of public facilities (public elementary and secondary schools, community or junior colleges or related extension centers) as community centers by a local education agency in conjunction with other agencies in a community.

EMERGENT FORMS

The purpose of this section is to describe the current trends in school facility use in the U.S. In reviewing the literature, four forms of facility utilization were apparent: Extended Use, Joint Use, Re-Use, and Multiple Use. These will be defined and described operationally, using exemplary models (either current or historic) as examples. In analysis, it appears that the four forms follow closely a chronological pattern: Extended use, as in Social Center described earlier; Joint use, the effort to pool resources in a time of tight economy for maximum dollar efficiency; Re-Use, the recycling of older buildings due to declining enrollments; Multiple-Use, the emerging educational parks and new Human Resource Centers.

Extended Use

Operationally, the extended-use facility may be described as one that opens its doors and avails its facility to the public in the evenings, on weekends, and during the summer. Gymnasiums are available for recreation, libraries for study, classrooms for adult education activities or perhaps special seminars, auditoriums for speeches, plays, concerts, or meetings, playgrounds for basketball, softball, or just play, vocational labs for job skill training or hobbies; perhaps a community room is provided for use any time during the day, without interfering with the day-school program. Stadiums and playgrounds can be used for recreation activities. The Educational Facilities Laboratories (1973) suggested the "deconsecration" of stadiums "Whatever use is made of it, the sports facility should never become one of the traditional 'temples of sweat' operated at enormous cost for the benefit of a few talented people for a short season of the year" (p. 5). This seems as heretical as roller skating on the gym floor, yet it is being done with a large degree of acceptance from the authorities and to the joy of the vast numbers of participants. The key element in this form is availability. The extended-use facility is open from 8-3, generally, for the regular day program, then in the evenings usually until ten or eleven o'clock for community use; the hours are sometimes abbreviated on weekends.

The Extended-use facility has as historical antecedents the social center of the early 1900's, the playgournd movement of the twenties, and the "moonlight school," or lighted schoolhouse of the thirties. The school, then, can become the educational, recreational, cultural, and social center of the community, with activities, classes, sports, child care availability (with activities for the tykes), clubs, and a multitude of other areas for involvement and participation. An important key to a successful extended-use facility is flexibility. "Flexibility becomes the theme because there is no way the planner can fully anticipate all future demands on a facility" (Clark, 1969, p. 96).

Examples of Extended Use - Everett (1938) described a training or laboratory school in Ypsilanti, Michigan. The plan was designed to meet the academic, vocational, social, and recreational needs of adults, out-of-school youth, and regular students. Its features were flexible space (movable partitions), gymnasium, auditorium, shop and lab areas, large kitchen/cafeteria, plus space for creative and performing arts, homemaking and agriculture.

Joint Use

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) state, "a part of facility planning is to make effective use of existing facilities through identification and coordination. Expensive duplication is an unacceptable and potentially dangerous approach in facility planning." (p. 233). This statement gets to the heart of

Joint Use, which is coordination and cooperation to avoid duplication at one end, and the creation of need-gaps at the other. The Joint Use facility is one in which the school and one or more other agencies jointly provide needed services for the community. It should be mentioned how the concept of interagency coordination is critical to the community education philosophy -- so critical that it will be dealt with in a separate paper. For purposes of this report it is explored only as it relates to facility utilization.

There are several interfacing yet diverse dimensions to Joint Use. One is finances, another is participant advocacy (which agency is better able to provide needed services) and facilitation of referral, still another is superior service delivery, another is construction details (space arrangements, site factors, materials conducive to various uses) and, finally, synergy. De Jong (1979) has presented a 14-point descriptive plan for surplus use of schools. Some problems and advantages associated with joint-use will be mentioned.

In view of declining enrollments, energy problems, maintenance and funding, Joint Use appears to be a viable alternative (Molloy, 1973; SCPRT, 1976).

Molloy, in his 1973 report for the Educational Facilities Laboratories, maintained that the "prognosis for schools indicates that they may not be able to fulfill

their responsibilities in the years ahead without assistance from and association with other agencies" (p. 22). In view of current developments in accountability, cutbacks in funding for brick and mortar, and energy problems, his 1973 prognostication appears accurate.

The Educational Facilities Laboratories, a long-time advocate of community schools, was one of the first national organizations to support joint use. "A single facility housing a community/school can be used more efficiently than school and community services houses separately" (EFL, 1973, p. 52). Some benefits include:

1. The number of hours the facility can be used is increased.
2. Numbers of staff to operate the center (particularly support staff) is decreased.
3. Operation and maintenance costs are decreased.
4. Capital investment is decreased.
5. The number and variety of accessible funding sources is increased.

In a Joint-Use situation, client advocacy and referral is more expedient. For example, the client who is in need of social security benefits, it is found, may not be able to read or write. He/she is immediately escorted to the Adult Education Director down the hall. Joint-use, therefore, facilities agency communication which thereby enhances the goal of all agencies--to provide more efficient service. It may also lead to programming.

Finally, there is the concept of synergy the sum of the efforts is greater than the individual inputs;

in other words, all of us together can get the job done much better than each of us working individually. Again, this calls for cooperation and coordination.

In an effort to effect joint-use programs in the state of South Carolina, the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism conducted a study of ongoing cooperation arrangements. They discovered that "in a community school situation, the public school facilities are utilized during the after school hours, vacations, and holidays by the local recreation agency to carry on programs for community recreation for all age groups" (SCPRT, 1976, p. 17). In this study, various benefits, problems, and solutions to these problems were identified, and have been included in this report. The benefits of joint-use are depicted in Table 2.

*Table 2: Potential Benefits of Joint-Use

1. The local recreation commission does not have to build facilities already available on school property, therefore allowing for additional staffing and enlarged outdoor facilities and improvements.

2. Provides for maximum use of school areas and facilities by a maximum number of people thereby demonstrating to the taxpayer that school facilities, paid for by them, are truly for their benefit 365 days a year. This can be a valuable stimulant when there is need for new capital financing upon taxpayer support and approval.

3. Avoids unnecessary and costly duplication of areas, facilities, personnel, programs and services.

4. Provides the opportunity for a more comprehensive and appealing physical setting for facilities and activities.

5. Provides for the expansion and acquistion of more popular, although more costly, recreation areas and facilities not obtainable separately (i.e. indoor and outdoor swimming pools, tennis courts, ball diamonds and parks).

6. Provides for better and more economical maintenance of areas and facilities.

7. Provides for maximum return on the tax dollar.

8. Provides for a real "community curriculum" by offering a broader, more diversified program of services for more people (i.e., adult sports programs, teenage center programs, senior citizen clubs, pre-school programs).

9. Provides for more overall community organization, involvement, efficiency and development and focuses public interest on a single area in a larger, more attractive and more efficiently packaged unit.

10. Funding for recreational programs and facilities are more easily obtained. Both federal and state planning and grant-in-aid funding programs require cooperative, coordinated effort among all related community agencies, including the schools.

11. Alters the students' perception of school facilities by offering more than classroom experiences, thereby enhancing his impression of "school".

*Adapted from SCPRT, 1976.

Some problems to be considered by the school district are listed in Table 3.

*Table 3: Potential Problem Areas in Joint-Use: School District

1. Who should bear the cost of utilities and maintenance?
2. What activities can or cannot be carried on in schools?
3. What school equipment should community groups be permitted to use, and under what conditions?
4. How should damage and equipment misuse be controlled?
5. What school representative should be in attendance when the school is used by the recreation agency.
6. Should the school plant be used by groups to make a profit?

*Adapted from SCPRT, 1976

Some problem areas to be considered by the recreation organization and users are included in Table 4.

*Table 4: Potential Problem Areas in Joint-Use: Recreation

1.	Fees established by the school that may be considered excessive by recreation users.
2.	Over-protection of facilities by school officials.
3.	Lack of communication between school and user groups.
4.	Friction between custodian and user group.
5.	School design and construction which constrains adequate joint-use for recreation.
6.	Reluctance to enter into binding contracts for joint construction and development projects.

*Adapted from SCPRT, 1976

Two additional problems associated with joint-use include parking at the facility and the personal safety of participants. Solution possibilities, based on cooperation, coordination, and trust--a key factor, are included in Table 5.

*Table 5: Possible Solutions

1.	Plan regular conferences between school board members and superintendents and recreation authorities to achieve mutual planning and joint use objectives.
2.	Organize a School-City (District) Coordinating Recreation Committee to initiate and develop a continuous planning relationship.
3.	Develop formalized, written agreements to insure clear lines of understanding and avoid conflicts. This step is vital for a continuing operation.
4.	Obtain cooperation and respect through: - Employment of professional qualified personnel - Maintain proper supervision - Establish facility inspection procedures - Schedule facilities for community use as early as possible - Operate efficiently
5.	Initiate procedures directly with the top authorities with anticipation that the policies will be implemented by other echelons of the agency personnel. (p. 19-20)

*Adapted from SCPRT, 1976

The Educational Facilities Laboratories identified seven objectives of the Joint-Use facility that synthesize the concept. Those objectives are:

1. To bring together the mix of services needed by the community, and provide better coordination of services.

2. To deliver the services more efficiently, ideally at less cost, by avoiding duplication by sharing the costs of owning and, by operating the center.

3. To put services nearer the people to be served by focusing on the community neighborhood.

4. To provide a better range of services and to enrich the programs that can be offered by exchanging facilities, and staff programs among the agencies.

5. To involve the community in the decision-making process, thus making services more responsive.

6. To make resources available for general community use -- for clubs, meetings, special events -- that are of an informal ad hoc nature.

7. To decentralize major services so that each neighborhood may benefit from easier access to those services. (EFL, 1978 p. 6)

Examples of Joint-Use - Shared Site - Harry A. Conte Community School, New Haven, Conn.
- Martin Luther King, Jr. Middle School, Atlanta, Georgia

Shared Construction - Manor High School, Portsmouth, Virginia
- Wendell Williams Community School, Flint, Michigan

Shared Space - Jordan Junior High School, North Minneapolis, Coordinates with YMCA, Park Board, Red Cross for shared space.

The New York City Educational Construction Fund, which "was the first state authority empowered to finance public schools in combined occupancy buildings" (Toffler, 1968, p. 174), is involved in a joint arrangement with a school contained in a public housing project.

Re-Use

Re-use can take two forms: it can be manifested in the restoration of a vacant building or in the rejuvenation of an older structure through remodeling for new purposes. Re-use constitutes the regeneration of an outdated building to specifications based upon the needs and desires of the re-users. It may also be called recycling, or other variations on the theme, such as reinstating, reclaiming, or renewing.

Around the country, schools are closing, generally for one of three reasons: 1) the reduction in the school-aged population 2) population shifts, or 3) deterioration of buildings (or their becoming functionally obsolete and too expensive to operate).

The New York Department of City Planning provides four alternatives to meet this problem: 1) sell the structures outright for revenue, 2) demolish them, 3) retain them and use them for neighborhood programs and 4) lease the structure to the private sector.

New York, as well as other areas faced with school closings, is concerned about surplus space for several reasons.

The closing of a school subjects the neighborhood to "adverse social and phsyical changes. The school is the symbolic and physical center of the community;" therefore, the closing can catalyze an outflux migration, as well as spiraling property devaluation and loss of tax revenues. (New York Department of City Planning, 1977). Empty buildings are also the targets for vandalism and weathering. With no security safeguards, the structure can be greatly abused. After a particularly hard winter, pipes have frozen and burst, paint has peeled, and flooring has warped. There is also the phenomenon of loss of belonging or ownership--"my school was closed"--and ensuing alienation. Former students are bused to a myraid of other schools, some of which might be across town.

A community school facility does not have to be a new building. The key is recycling. Graves (1974) made a point for Re-use in that "this valuable existing real estate is too often overlooked" (p. 46). An older building can become a community school with some modifications, most of which are generally cosmetic--plaster and paint, tasteful decorating, landscaping. Often other agencies in need of space can assist in paying the renovation bill, as an alternative to their financing a new facility.

Examples of Re-Use - Fairmont Community School in New York City was renovated by the school district and the Arts Council in 1972.

The Ferry in Pautucket, Rhode Island was a joint venture in which a defunct ferry was converted into a community education facility.

Phillips Junior High School in Minneapolis was renovated, additions were added to create space for community and agency operation.

Mack Elementary School in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in which a cultural center was established, the school was revitalized, and new landscaping was provided.

Burris Laboratory School in Muncie, Indiana, was a joint restoration effort of the Teachers College of Architecture at Ball State University and the Educational Facilities Laboratories.

Shawnee Community Education Center, Dunbar, West Virginia, is an elementary school converted to a community services center in coordination with other agencies by the Kanawha County Community Education Program.

Multiple-Use

Multiple-Use facilities are a relatively new concept. The facility is designed to provide a variety of services under one roof to a large number of people. According to Decker and Pass (1974), "this concept of community education requires a comprehensive community service center of which the school is only a part" (p. 20). It usually provides for "one-stop shopping" for human services. This concept was advocated as early as 1953 by Elliot and 1954 by Olsen, but it was 1971 before the first Human Resource Center opened its doors.

A distinct advantage of the Human Resource Center is the means of financing. Decker and Pass (1974) maintain that the "major differences between financing a conventional school and a Human Resource Center, are, first, how and where the money is acquired, second, the administrative agency that manages it, and third, where the services it purchases

are deployed" (p. 22). The result so far has been less duplication and fragmentation of efforts and services. The work of Gardner and his associates provides another means of examining the multiple-use concept. They refer to these minds of relationships as "parallel" and "shared" characterized by groups of agenices planning together to use a single facility.

Examples of Multiple Use - The John F. Kennedy Junior High School and Community Center was the first of its kind in the U.S. Opened in 1971, this center is the result of a joint funding venture. The Center, located in a low-income area in Atlanta, is a "generative stimulus" for the community (Pendell, 1971, p. 30).

Dana P. Whitmer Human Resource Center in Pontiac, Michigan, is also a multi-agency, multi-use facility (1971).

Thomas Jefferson Junior High School and Community Center in Arlington, Virginia (1972), a jointly-funded, multi-use, multi-purpose facility.

Human Resources Development Center, Hamilton County, Tennessee, is a multi-use facility incorporating more than forty public and private agencies (1973).

Washington Highlands Community School Complex in Washington, D.C., completed in 1974, contains an elementary school, a health and recreation agency, welfare center, and a cultural center. This project was initiated at the grass-roots level.

RESEARCH

One of the prevailing criticisims of community education has been that it lacks an organized research effort. This dearth of research was a topic addressed by Van Voorhees in his article in the November, 1972, Phi Delta Kappan: "Several decades after its birth as an educational movement, community education is still supported not by facts but by the logic of the process." (Van Voorhees, 1972, p. 203).

Review of Research

Several studies exist, however, that are significant, historically, regarding facility utilization, as well as current research dealing with various aspects of the topic.

Early in 1927 Eleanor Glueck made a study of the extent to which public schools were being utilized for community purposes. She discovered 722 cities, towns and villages reporting such use. Of these, 67% were in communities having a population under 5,000. Forty-seven percent functioned in communities of under 2500 population (Glueck, 1927).

Boerrigter conducted a national study in 1969 upon the recommendation and sponsorship of the Nebraska Department of Education and a teacher training institution. His purpose was to identify procedures and techniques for facility utilization that would not hamper the K-12 program. He discovered five factors that affected community or adult

activity in public schools: 1) school board policy relating specifically to facility utilization, 2) regular "day school" staff used as resource people, 3) administrative staff selected for responsibility of planning a "community use program", 4) interests, needs, and desires determined by teachers and patrons working cooperatively, and 5) school working with teachers and organizations in setting up new activities, including the consideration of offering any course for which there is sufficient demand. He further delineated techniques and procedures of planning for the efficient housing of community activities, to include long-range cooperative planning for the building, provisions for the building to serve those patrons for whom it is intended, and a complement of school and community facilities to avoid duplication. Ultimately, his findings indicated that virtually no changes had occurred in the degree or extent of the utilization of public school buildings in the preceeding two decades. (Boerrigter, 1960).

In 1962 School Management sponsored a nation-wide survey to ascertain the extent to which public school facilities were being used. Each of the responding districts indicated that schools were being utilized by community groups. In this study it was found that the overwhelming majority of districts had a written policy statement pertaining to facility utilization; others had general, albeit unwritten, policies. It was also found that certain areas or rooms of a building were requested and/or used more than others.

These included kitchens, gymnasiums, auditoriums, cafeterias, multi-purpose rooms and large classrooms. In most instances fees were charged for use of public facilities (Community Use of Your Schools, 1962).

McQuarrie, in 1963, set out to determine the use of public elementary schools in the state of Washington with regard to administrative policies of local school districts concerning community use, elementary facilities available for community use and the extent to which these facilities are used. Her findings included: 1) older school buildings are not functionally designed to serve as recreational centers of the community; however, new schools were being planned and built to include those resources that would facilitate community use; 2) school boards of the cities with smaller populations are providing more adequate recreational facilities within school buildings than are cities with large populations; 3) school and recreation administrators are becoming more cognizant of the advantages that result from cooperative endeavors; 4) school boards are becoming more aware of the importance of establishing a rental fee schedule and a written policy statement defining rules and regulations pertinent to community use; 5) although fees are being charged for use of facilities, the size of the municipality does not affect the rate of rental; 6) fewer restrictions exist in cities with smaller populations; therefore, the extent of building use is greater in smaller cities than in larger ones; 7) non-school groups are

utilizing the newer elementary schools that provide recreation facilities, whereas, school organizations are using schools with which the organizations are associated; 8) very few school playgrounds are designed for community use; 9) the lack of school buildings planned for diversified recreation programs and the lack of municipal recreation funds are the greatest deterents to the use of elementary schools by departments of municipal recreation; 10) there is general agreement among principals and between principals and recreation superintendents as to the relative importance of various procedures that affect cooperative relationships between school districts and community organizations (McQuarrie, 1963).

In a 1965 study, Turner attempted to determine outdoor industrial and recreational uses being made of large rural and suburban secondary school sites in North Carolina, to ascertain the reasons that teachers and principals give for not using school sites more extensively for school and community industrial and recreational purposes, and to develop suggestions for increasing school site use. He found that site facilities were used relatively little by community groups in the schools included in his study. He further indicated that this usage by community groups does not support the need for larger school sites; rather, he recommends more extensive utilization of existing facilities.

Concurrently, in Missouri the use of public school buildings was increasing. This was determined by Holland's study in 1966, the purpose of which was to analyze school board policies and administrative practices that influence community use of public school property. Ninety-five percent of the responding districts reported having board policies relating to non-school use of school property; 75% indicated that the policy use is in writing. It is interesting to note that although half of the respondents reported that the policy had been revised between 1963 and 1965, less than 20% requested input from teachers, students, or patrons in formulating the revisions. Seventy-five percent of the respondents agreed that non-school use of facilities was increasing in their districts. Also of interest is that 82% of the districts indicated that groups and organizations had been refused permission to use school facilities for certain non-school activities with some unfavorable results (several districts mentioned the opposition to school bond elections). Holland also found that administrators believe that board policy regarding community use should be revised frequently to meet the changing needs of the community or district, that taxpayers are not opposed to school property being used for community groups, and that non-school groups generally do not object to paying a fee to use facilities.

A similar study was undertaken by Hafen in Utah in [illegible]. He concluded that although problems are found to

emerge when the community uses the facilities, many potential difficulties can be forestalled through cooperative planning and by developing and using a sound written policy related to facility use. He further suggested that the school should be meeting the needs of all citizens within a community and that agencies should cooperate in planning and program delivery to provide the best possible service. Hafen found that although no written policy could jointly be applied to all school districts, a well-written and well-conceived policy statement does effect good will on the part of citizens and agencies. Generally, he found that districts were quite liberal in the types of community activities they permitted, and that urban-area schools were used more than rural schools. Other findings included: most districts preferred having a school official on hand during community activities; the majority of the districts charged a nominal rental fee, determined by the school board; the majority did not permit use of school equipment by community groups; that proper supervision and safety precautions were more of a legal concern since the passing of the Tort Liability Law (Hafen, 1968).

A subsequent study of the availability and extent of use of school facilities in Utah was undertaken by Thorstenson (1969). He reached the following conclusions: 1) the state laws of Utah favored community use of public school facilities; 2) most districts had written policies relating to community use; 3) public school facilities were generally available

at times not conflicting with regular K-12 program operations; 4) the public was generally not aware of which facilities were available for use and the hours of availability; 5) a serious limitation to greater use of facilities was the lack of adequate leadership and supervision; 6) urban schools were utilized to a greater extent than rural schools; 7) reluctance to permit use of schools was exhibited by custodians, teaching staffs,and residents adjacent to schools; 8) liberal use of school plant was encouraged except in cases of commercial and religious groups; 9) community, school, and religious leaders were generally weak in the cooperative planning, organizing and conducting of programs in the community; 10) senior citizens and pre-school children were not as involved as other groups; 11) there was no appreciable difference between the use of indoor facilities during the school year and during the summer months; and 12) outdoor facilities were utilized much more during the summer months than during the regular school year, particularly in the case of the high schools.

In 1972 Otto replicated Thorstenson's study in the state of Wisconsin to ascertain the status of the availability and extent of use of public school facilities. The following conclusions were the result of his study: the enabling laws in Wisconsin were favorable to community use of public school facilities; large urban districts had full-time recreation departments that utilized school facilities extensively; small rural districts usually had

part-time, if any, recreation departments and used the schools in the summer only; the more common cooperative relationship existed between the board of education and the public recreation department; most districts had written policies pertaining to use of public school facilities by non-school groups; all school facilities were generally available for community use--gymnasium and athletic fields were the most commonly requested; senior citizens and pre-school children generally made no use of school facilities; religious, commercial and political groups were generally not permitted; use of facilities was comparatively low in relation to the amount of time the plant could be used; the most frequent problem in facilities use by non-school groups was inadequate supervision and leadership.

Koller (1973) surveyed the availability and extent of use of public school facilities for community use in Alabama school districts. The following conclusions were reached: 1) Alabama state laws were favorable regarding community use of public school plants; 2) almost all districts made their facilities available for community use; 3) very few cooperative efforts existed between the boards of education and public recreation departments; 4) 27% of the districts had written policy statements relative to use of school facilities, religious, commercial, and political groups were generally prohibited from using school facilities; 5) the three most frequent restrictions included allowing

no alcoholic beverages, smoking limited to certain areas (if at all), and requiring a custodian or other school personnel on site during activities; 6) the most frequently used facilities included gymnasiums, athletic fields and auditoriums; 7) school-age children constituted generally the largest population of users; 8) pre-school children and senior citizens made no use whatsoever of public school facilities; 9) in many cases the total amount of non-school use did not exceed five hours per week; and 10) inadequate leadership was cited as the most significant problem in facility use: most of the superintendents surveyed had a favorable attitude toward the use of public school facilities by non-school groups.

In 1977, Beasley conducted a study to determine the availability and extent of use of public school facilities for community education in Arkansas. He concluded that: Arkansas public schools are available for community education; Arkansas state laws were favorable to community use of public school facilities; most Arkansas school districts were too small to justify full-time community education programs; leadership for community education programs was provided by the superintendent in most districts; although most districts had written policies governing use of facilities, these policies needed updating; the use of citizen advisory committees for community education had great potential for public school administration in Arkansas; cost of duplication

of community services could be reduced as a result of more cooperation between school people and community agencies; needs assessments were valuable tools unused by Arkansas schools; districts had few restrictions for use of school facilities or for activities of groups using facilities; trained, qualified leadership for community education was not available in most Arkansas school districts; although facilities were provided, few districts provided financial support in the form of salaries for community education personnel; generally, facility availability greatly exceeded utilization; use of facility was most frequently on weekday evenings (rarely on weekends, holidays, or in the summer); the most neglected groups included pre-schoolers, senior citizens, and the handicapped; most facilities were planned primarily for traditional education, with little consideration for community use; requirements or restrictions for the use of public school facilities did not appear to limit reasonable use by non-school groups; it was apparent that school people had not been prepared to accept the responsibility of leadership in community education; the idea that the public school served the total needs of the community was gaining fast acceptance by the public.

Current research endeavors are presently being undertaken by Educational Facilities Laboratories, through a research and information program backed by the C.S. Mott Foundation. EFL has planned to prepare and disseminate

a series of six reports -- A Concerned Citizen's Guide to Community Schools Centers, Planning Community School Centers, Managing Community School Centers, Facility Issues in Community School Centers, and A Resource Book on Community School Centers. These booklets have been prepared "for people who care about community-development, human services delivery systems, and public funding, but are not necessarily professional administrators, planners, or architects." (EFL, 1978, p. 4).

Research Needs

In April, 1971, a Research Symposium in Community Education was conducted at Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana at which time 251 questions relating to community education were identified. Another symposium was held in 1974 for purposes of addressing needed research in the field. More recently, the Research Committee of the National Community Education Association has concerned itself with research needs. The following is a synthesis of research questions and/or needs that have been identified as crucial to community education development regarding facility utilization.

1. Time and usage studies of school facilities.
2. What is the cost of maintenance and operation of schools for extended program operations?
3. What schools are really involved in community education?
4. What is the role of joint or area vocational schools?

5. What is the distinction between community schools and community education?

The following research questions were derived from the existing literature and research:

6. How can we develop facilities studies in the nation's schools in terms of time, usage, and costs?

7. Does the nature of the facility affect program success?

8. What potential methods are possible for meeting the costs of utilities and maintenance in facilities used for community education?

9. What are the limitations on activities that can be conducted by community schools?

10. What limitations exist with regard to equipment? What school equipment can be used and by whom?

11. What is the current status of charging fees for use of public school facilities? Who pays, what determines rates and what are the charges?

12. Who are the personnel critical to efficient facility operations and use by community groups?

13. What is the status of contractual arrangements between school districts and other agencies with regard to facility use?

14. What are the effects of providing a larger range of services at the community level through a local school?

In recapitulation, the intent of this work was to identify and describe the state of the art of the literature and research with regard to facility utilization as it relates to the concept of community education in an attempt to recommend critical research needs and to pose some critical research needs and some critical questions that relate to facility use patterns. Several persons with

expertise in the areas of facility use and community education assisted in generating additional research questions or needs. The following list represents questions that could be used to guide researchers in investigating the concept of facility utilization patterns in community education implementation. This list is by no means exhaustive, but represents opportunities for policy-makers, agencies, critics, and practitioners to obtain answers.

15. How are restoration/renovation/operation costs met in Re-use situations?

16. What financial support patterns exist?

17. What are the results of experimental programs on usage patterns that exist, focusing on an agency such as a public library housed in a public school? Does a real or perceived problem exist?

18. What is the extent to which requests for public facility use are made by public, private, or non-profit organizations for fund-raising or profit-making ventures?

19. How does current legislation dealing with facility use and/or community education compare to legislation (state and federal) passed prior to 1970?

20. What characterizes effective and ineffective facility use patterns where community education programs are in operation?

21. If community educators intend to emphasize lifelong learning, what effect should this have on construction of facilities that will be conducive to lifelong learning programming?

22. What modes of inquiry are appropriate to community education research?

23. Do community centers make a difference or effect 1) quality of life in surrounding area? 2) property values in surrounding area? 3) vandalism and crime in surrounding area?

24. What criteria determine success or failure of centers?

25. Do multiple-use facilities save capitol/ operating costs?

26. What are the energy/environmental effects and/or factors in reference to community schools?

27. What are the legal implications of facility utilization in community education programs?

28. What are the ramifications of the emerging complexity of role changes, organization and management in a multiple use facility.

SOURCES CONSULTED

American Association of School Administrators. New York forms for community education. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1974.

American Association of School Administrators. Schools in small communities. (1939 Yearbook). Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1939.

Anderson, Homer V. & Gores, Harold B. The school as a recreative center. The School Executive, June 1948, 67(10), 45-56.

Baas, Alan M. Joint occupancy Educational Facilities Review Series, No. 22, Dec. 1973.

Baillie, Susan J., et al. The potential role of the school as a site for integrating social services. Syracuse, N.Y.: Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse University, 1972. (EDRS No. ED 081 088)

Beasley, Billy J. The availability and use of public school facilities for community education in Arkansas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1977.

Becker, John W. Architecture for adult education. A graphic guide for those who are planning physical facilities for adult education. Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Association of U.S.A., 1968. (EDRS No. ED 018 942)

Bennett, Ian C. A model for planning and operating physical education/recreation facilities based upon community education idealogy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1975.

Boerrigter, Glen C. Techniques and procedures by which community utilization of school buildings can be achieved without interference with the kindergarten through grade twelve day school program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1960.

Booth, William. School organization patterns: The educational park, the middle school. Fresno, Calif.: Fresno City Unified School District, 1969.

Boranian, Paul. Minneapolis establishes complete educational services center. The Florence M. Lehmann Multi-Educational Center. Community Education Journal, May 1973, 3(3), 37;61.

Brunner, Edmund de S. Community organization and adult education. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina, 1942.

Bush, Donald O. Planning for community education. Community Education Journal, Nov.-Dec. 1974, 4(6), 12-17;54.

Campbell, O.K. School buildings as community centers in villages and rural areas. New York: American Association of Adult Education, 1940.

Chambers, W. M. Schools suitable for non-school use. School Executive, Feb. 1940, 59(6), 30-31.

Chase, W. W. Educational facilities charette. Education Technology, June 1970, 10, 20-21.

Chase, W. W. Small school auditoriums can be adapted for educational, social, community uses. American School Board Journal, Aug. 1966, 153(2), 58-60.

Christensen, Ardis. Bibliography on community education. Las Cruces, N.M.: New Mexico State University, May 1974. (EDRS No. ED 091 092)

Citizens School Facilities Committee. Final Report. Minneapolis: ISC Publications, 1971.

Citizens' School Facilities Committee, Task force and ad hoc committee reports. Minneapolis: CSFC, 1971.

Clapp, Elsie. Community schools in action. New York: Viking Press, 1939.

Clark, Charles S. Community schools: Physical facilities. In Howard W. Hickey, (Ed.) The Role of the School in Community Education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1969.

Community Education: School-community relationship: A selected ERIC bibliography. Journal of Teacher Education, July-Aug. 1977, 28(4), 58-60.

Community school facilities. School Executive, Dec. 1946, 66(4), 41-58.

Community School: Sharing the space and the action, N.Y.: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1973.

Community use of public schools. Report of the community education and services task force, Montgomery County, Md., 1978.

Community use of your schools. School Management Magazine, March 1962, pp. 96-107.

Cook, Lloyd A. A community school. In Encylopedia of Educational Research. New York: MacMillan, 1941

Cook, Lloyd A. & Olsen, Edward G. School and Community. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: MacMillan, 1950.

Cook, Nancy C. A state of the art of community education in South Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1977.

Council of Education Facility Planners, Intl. Guide for planning educational facilities. Columbus, Ohio: Council of Educational Facility Planners, Intl., 1971.

Council of Educational Facility Planners, Intl. Surplus school space -- The problem and the possibilities. Columbus, Ohio: Council of Educational Facility Planners, Intl., 1978.

Cowan, Alton W. Public use of school properties. American School Board Journal, Apr. 1966, 152(4), 12;50.

Cubberley, Elwood P. Public education in the United States. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1934.

Decker, Larry E. Foundations of Community Education: Midland, Mich.: Pendell, 1972.

Decker, Larry E. and Pass, Barbara H. Community human resource centers. Community Education Journal, Nov.-Dec. 1974, 4(6), 20.

DeJong, William S. Surplus Schools: The double-barrel shotgun. Unpublished paper, Columbus, Ohio, CEFP.

Department of City Planning. Surplus school space: Some facts about re-use. City of New York, 1977.

Dewey, Evelyn. New schools for old. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1919.

Dewey, John. The school as a social center. In National Education Association, Journal of proceedings and addresses, 1902, pp. 373-383.

Dowdy, Homer. The past, present and future of community education. Paper presented at the International Assocation for Community Education second annual conference. El Paso, Texas: April 1975.

Dumbarton, Lloyd. College goes to the shopping center. Journal of Educational Communication, July-Aug. 1975, 1(1), 30-31.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. A concerned citizen's guide to community school centers, No. 1. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1978.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Educational facilities laboratories reports: Planning and managing the physical environment of public institutions. Report #28. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, June 1978.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Managing community school centers. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1979.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Physical recreation facilities. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1973.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Planning community school centers, No. 2. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1978.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. A resourcebook on community school centers. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1979.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. The schoolhouse in the city. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories & Praeger, 1968.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Surplus school space: Options and opportunities. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1976.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Using surplus school space for community school centers. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1979.

Edwards, George H., Jr. The school as a social center. Bulletin of the University of South Carolina, 1913, 32(II).

Elliott, Allan R. Space & facilities for physical education and community use in public schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1953.

Engelhardt, N. L. School buildings for community use. Journal of Adult Education, Apr. 1938, 10(2), 154-157.

Engelhardt, N.L. & Englehardt, N. L., Jr. Planning the community school. New York: American Book Co., 1940.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Joint occupancy. Educational Facilities Review Series No. 22. Eugene, Ore.: University of Oregon, 1974.

Essex, Don L. Planning the school building for community use. Review of Educational Research, Feb. 1948, 28(1), 28-31.

Everett, Samuel. The community school. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938.

Facilities & Plant Planning Department. A plan for planning educational facility needs for Minneapolis. Minneapolis: Special School District #1, 1975.

Finchum, R. N. Extended use of school facilities. School Plant Management, Series OE-21035. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education (D.H.E.W.), 1967.

Fink, B. H. Cooperation at the schoolhouse: Non-unified area of Delaware and Maryland. Childhood Education, Mar. 1967, 43, 393-396.

Finkel, Lawrence. The education park and its community. New York: Speech before the Annual Institute on Urban Education, July 1974. (EDRS No. ED 102 228)

Fletcher, Suzanne, et al. Community education. Community and Junior College Journal, May 1977, 47(8), 24-26.

Fulcomer, E.G. Secondary schools as community centers. New York: American Assocation for Adult Education, 1940.

Gardner, Dwayne, et al. The role of the school in the community facility implications of community education: A report from the Council on Educational Facility Planners. Columbus, Ohio: CEFP, Feb. 1979.

Ginn, Clyde N. & Rush, Gary E. Community education: Total community resource utilization. Southern Journal of Educational Research, Summer 1976, 10(3), 168-173.

Glueck, Eleanor, The community use of schools. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1927.

Gores, Harold B. Community education: Schoolhouse of the future. Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Apr. 1974, 45(4), 53-4.

Graves, Bea E. Found: Space for community education on existing facilities. Community Education Journal, Nov.-Dec. 1974, 4(6), 46-48.

Greenville County Planning Commission. Community use of school facilities. Greenville, S.C.: Greenville County Planning Commission, 1973.

Grieder, Calvin. Community use of schools: How? When? Who gets keys to what? Nation's Schools, Apr. 1962, 69(4), 79-83; 130.

Grube, Karl W. School site decisions and dollars. Ann Arbor Mich.; The University of Michigan, Nov. 1973. (EDRS No. ED 087 096)

Guizzetti, Louis R. The place that friendship built. Community Education Journal, Jan. 1973, 3(1), 14-17; 61.

Hafen, William J. Administrative guidelines for the cooperative use of public school facilities for recreation purposes by community groups in the state of Utah. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1968.

Hanifan, L. J. The community center. Boston: Silver, Burdette, 1920.

Hart, Joseph K. Educational resources of villages and rural communities. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1914.

Hawkins, Harold L. Appraisal guide for school facilities. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1973.

Holland, James E. An analysis of the board policies and administrative practices which influence community use of public school property in six director school districts in Missouri. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1966.

Holland, James E. Non-school use of public school property in Missouri. School and Community, Nov. 1967, 54, 33.

How shall our schools be used? Two points of view: Community education. Eugene, Ore.: Northwest Community Education Development Center, 1976. (EDRS No. ED 128 883)

Howerton, Everett B. Many school boards increasing their support for community education. Community Education Journal, Sept.-Oct. 1974, 4(5), 60-61.

Hughes, Frances W. Washington, D.C. builds first of seven Community School Resource Centers. Community Education Journal, Sept.-Oct. 1974, 4(5), 20-23.

Kaplan, Michael H. The junior high: An expanded community school. Community Education Journal, May 1973, 3(3), 20; 30.

Katner, Norman C. A superintendent looks at community education and facilities. Community Education Journal, 1974, 4(6), 49-50.

Koller, Ronald DeJ. The availability and extent of use of public school facilities for community recreation in Alabama. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1973.

Kullman, Nathan E., Jr. School plant facilities desirable for community use in a community school program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1950.

Leggett, Stanton. Thirteen new approaches and old problems in educational facilities planning. Paper presented at AASA annual meeting, 26 Feb. 1973. (EDRS No. ED 077 092)

Lewis, James A. & Wilson, Russell E. School-building facilties for community schools. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.). The Community School: 52nd Yearbook of NSSE, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago, Press, 1953, pp. 145-155.

Lucenko, Leonard. The availability and extent of use of public school facilities for community recreation in New Jersey. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1972.

Lynch, G. L. Roles of schools as recreation centers. American Schools and Universities, Oct. 1966, 39(2), 33-34+.

MacPeek, S. Lights are on in Flint's schools. Education Digest, Summer 1961, 27,31.

McCarthy, Joseph F. X. The education park - - What should it be? Educational specification for the Northeast Bronx Education Park. Brooklyn, N.Y.: New York City Board of Education, Aug. 1966. (EDRS No. ED 016 710)

McCoy, William J. The community/school/center: Resources and economics make it a must. Community Education Journal, Nov.-Dec. 1974, 4(6), 8-10.

McQuarrie, Agnes M. Community use of selected public elementary schools in the state of Washington. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1963.

Migocki, E. David. Community education at the state educational level, Washington, D.C.: Office of Community Education, U.S.O.E., (DHEW), 1977.

Minzey, Jack D. & LeTarte, Clyde. Community education: From program to process. Midland, Mich.: Pendell, 1972.

Molloy, Larry. Community/schools: Sharing the space and the action. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1973.

Monacel, Louis D. The effects of planning educational facilities upon curriculum experiences and related attitudes and aspirations of teachers, pupils, and parents in selected urban elementary schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1963.

Moore, William L. Community takes the good of this school. Nation's Schools June 1936, 17(6), 16-19.

Morgan, Thomas E. & Morgan, Mary Lou J. Empty schools--Myth or reality. Phi Delta Kappan, Nov. 1972, 54(3), 213.

Musmanno, Neal V. Schoolhouse can fulfill civic need. American School Board Journal, Sept. 1966, 153(3), 55-56.

Naslund, Robert A. The impact of the power age on the community school concept. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The community school: The fifty second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

National Education Association. The community school and the intermediate unit. Washington, D.C. Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association, 1936.

National School Boards Association. School facilities planning. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education (DHEW), 1974. (EDRS No. ED 135 080)

National Society for the Study of Education. The city school as a community center (Part I); The rural school as a community center (Part II). Bloomington: National Society for the Study of Education, 1911.

Nelson, Daniel Z. Does combined occupancy really work? Speech presented at CEFP Annual Conference, Oct. 1969. (EDRS No. 032 740)

Newitt, Jane & Kahn, Herman. The schools' community roles in the next ten years: An outside perspective. Community education advisory council report No. 2. Washington, D.C.: U.S Office of Education, (D.H.E.W.), 1977. (EDRS No. ED 151 969)

Nolte, M. Chester. Courts becoming more liberal in permitting non-school use of public school buildings. American School Board Journal, Feb. 1966, 152(2), 63-4.

Ogden, Jean & Ogden, Jess. Small communities in action. New York: Harper Bros., 1946.

Ogden, Jean and Ogden, Jess. These things we tried. Charlottesville, Va.: U.Va. Extension Service, 1945.

O'Leary, Linda Schluter. The school as a social service center. Notes on the future of education, Summer 1972, 3(2), 12-17.

Olsen, Edward G. Community & the school. Review of Educational Research, Feb. 1946, 16(1), 56-70.

Olsen, Edward G. The modern community school. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

Olsen, Edward G. School & community. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Otto, William O. The availability and extent of use of public school facilities for community recreation within school districts in the state of Wisconsin. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1972.

Parker District High School and the Parker District Community. A story of the work of the Parker schools and community. Greenville, S.C.: Parker District Schools, 1942.

Parker, Floyd G. New uses for vacant buildings. Threshholds in secondary education, Spring 1976, 2(1), 5-6.

Passantino, Richard J. Community/school facilities: The schoolhouse of the future. Phi Delta Kappan, Jan. 1975, 56(5), 306-309.

Peebles, Robert W. The community school: Then and now. Phylon, Summer 1970, 31(2), 157-167.

Pendell, Richard C. Atlanta pioneers a community school-center complex. Community Education Journal, May 1971, 1(2), 28-36.

Perry, Clarence A. A survey of the social center movement. The Elementary School Teacher, 1912, 13, 124-133.

Perry, Clarence A. Wider use of the school plant. New York: Survey Associates, 1910.

Pierce, M. How to organize a cultural program in an adult center. Adult Leadership, Oct. 1966, 15(4), 120-121.

Punke, Harold H. Community use of public school facilities. New York: King's Crown Press, 1951.

Rigby, Avard A. State leadership in community education. Speech given before National Congress of Parents and Teachers annual meeting, 24 May 1972. (EDRS No. ED 064 769)

Ringers, Joseph, Jr. Architects and planners need training in community education. Community Education Journal, May-June 1975, 5(3), 35; 40.

Sanchez, Bonnie. About community college community education and community services. A "brief" highlighting important literature since 1965 about community education and community services in the community college. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education (D.H.E.W.), July 1977. (EDRS No. 140 927)

Scanlon, David. Historical roots for the development of community education. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), Community education principles and practices from world-wide experience: The fifty-eighth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Schofield, Dee. Community schools. NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, Number 4. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1974. (EDRS No. ED 094 447)

Scudder, H. E. The schoolhouse as a center. Atlantic Monthly, Jan. 1896, 76(459), 103-109.

Sealy, Robert D. Declining enrollments: Implications. Paper presented at AASA Annual Convention, Dallas, February, 1975.

Seay, Maurice F. Community education: A developing concept. Midland, Mich.: Pendell, 1974.

Seay, Maurice F. & McGlothlin, William J. Elementary education in two communities of the Tennessee Valley. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, Vol. XIV, No. 3 (March 1943). Lexington, Ky: University of Kentucky, 1943.

Seidlin, Joseph. Social signficance of the school plant. Review of Educational Research, Feb. 1945, 15, 6-9.

South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism. Multiple and joint-use of public facilities. Columbia, S.C.: Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, 1976.

Steele, Marilyn. Declining Enrollments: Problem or opportunity? Dallas, Tex.: AASA, 22 Feb. 1975. (EDRS No. ED 108 392)

Sumption, Merle R. & Landes, Jack L. Planning functional school buildings. New York: Harper, 1957.

Thompson, Leslie M. After hours building use. American School Board Journal, May 1967, 154(5), 36-37.

Thorstenson, Clark T. A study of the availability and the extent of use of public school facilities for community recreation in the state of Utah. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1969.

Toffler, Alvin, Ed. The schoolhouse in the city. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.

Totten, W. Fred. The community education approach to learning. In Richard W. Saxe, (Ed.), Opening the schools: Alternative ways of learning. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1972.

Totten, W. Fred & Manley, Frank J. The community school: Basic concepts, functions, and organization. Galien, Michigan: Allied Educational Council, 1969.

Turner, Rufus Benton. Utilization of large rural and suburban secondary school sites by school and community groups in North Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1965.

U.S. Office of Education, School Plant Management Service. Extended use of school facilities. Washington, D.C.: U.S.O.E., D.H.E.W., 1967.

Van Voorhees, Curtis. The imperative of leadership. A report on community education. Denver, Col.: National Association of State Boards of Education, Nov. 1976. (EDRS No. Ed 130 447)

Van Voorhees, Curtis. Community education needs research for survival. Phi Delta Kappan, Nov. 1972, 54(3), 203-205.

Veri, Clive C. Open our schools 14 hours a day? You're nuts. Threshholds in Secondary Education, Spring 1976, 2(1), 31; 29-30.

Wallace, Whilden, Chrietzberg, James & Sims, Verner M. The story of Holtville. Holtville, Alabama: Holtville School District in cooperation with the Southern Assoiation Study Staff, 1944.

Ward, Edward J. The social center. New York: Appleton, 1917.

Warden, John W. Citizen participation: What others say... what others do. Charlottesville, Va.: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, 1977.

Weiss, Marvin W. A new role for community education in the community college through cooperation with community schools. Louisville, Ky.: Adult Education Association Commission on Adult Basic Education, Apr. 1974. (EDRS No. ED 111 486)

White, Thomas R. The area vocational school: An emerging institution. Phi Delta Kappan, Nov. 1971, 53(3), 189-191.

Wolff, Max & Rudicoff, Benjamin. Educational park developments in the United States. New York: Center for Urban Education, 1970.

Workshop: Putting an end to vandalism, turn schools into neighborhood centers. School Management, Feb. 1967, 11, 25.

Zirkel, P. W. Designer: Consider community needs. American School Board Journal, Feb. 1965, 150, 34-5.