USE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION FACILITIES BY COMMUNITY GROUPS IN ARIZONA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

William Brown Watkins

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
WITH A MAJOR IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 5

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my direction by William Brown Watkins

entitled Use of Physical Education Facilities by Community Groups in Arizona Community Colleges

be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the degree of Doctor of Education

Dissertation Director — Date 10/13/75

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in its approval and recommend its acceptance:*

	Oct. 13, 1975
	October 13, 1975
	October 14, 1975
	October 14, 1975

*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: William Brown Watkins

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study could not have been completed without the cooperation of the Arizona Community College Districts and municipal Parks and Recreation Departments who participated in the survey. I would like to express my gratitude for their assistance.

Sincere appreciation is extended to the members of my committee: Dr. Boyd B. Baker, Dr. Emil S. Gavlak, Dr. Howard T. Roberts, Dr. Darrell G. Simko, and especially Dr. Roy F. Blake, dissertation director, whose patience and perservance saw the study through to completion.

Appreciation is also due to Dr. Robert T. Grant for his encouragement, to Dr. Fred B. Roby and Dr. Donna Mae Miller for continued support throughout the work.

The unselfish assistance of Mrs. Rita Mikula was indispensable and to her I express my deepest thanks.

Certainly loving gratitude is due my wife, Arleigh, for her tolerance and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to produce a set of guidelines to aid Arizona community college administrators to develop policies, regulations, and practices for community use of their physical education facilities.

The study identified and classified (1) existing Arizona community college physical education facilities by inventory and (2) legal opinions, statutes, and court cases related to community use of physical education facilities. Policy characteristics examined in this study were: applications and permits, charges and fees, use and supervision, records, and legal matters.

The major conclusions of the study were:

1. Only one Arizona community college district has written policies and regulations concerning community use of physical education facilities.
2. The Arizona legal system treats community college physical education facilities and their regulation in the same manner as elementary and secondary facilities.
3. A re-ordering of policy characteristics by priority was developed.
4. No significance was noted among sizes of schools and facility availability or sizes of community and availability of community college facilities for recreational use.

5. In Arizona, the larger the community population base, the more likely the need for written cooperative-use policies between community colleges and public recreation agencies.
6. The majority of Arizona community college physical education facilities are constructed for life-long, carry-over activities.
7. Liability insurance is the major requirement for permission to use Arizona community college physical education facilities by community recreational agencies.
8. Public groups who select to use Arizona community college physical education facilities can expect to pay the costs for utilities and custodial services.
9. Forty percent of Arizona community colleges in the study do not inspect their physical education facilities regularly.
10. Sixty percent of the Arizona community colleges in this study could not agree to the first priority use of their physical education facilities.
11. No clear responsibility for enforcement of rules and regulations that govern community use of Arizona community college physical education facilities was reported by the respondents in this study.
12. No clear procedure as to when to apply and to whom was reported by Arizona community college administrators.

13. Eighty percent of the Arizona municipal parks and recreation administrators responding to this study wanted to cooperatively plan new physical education facilities with their host community college administrators, while only forty percent of the Arizona community college administrators wanted to utilize cooperative planning.

As a result of this study, the following recommendations were made for Arizona community college administrators who select to recommend to their boards written facility usage policies: Know the Arizona law as it applies to public use of school physical education facilities; cooperatively plan physical education facilities with state, county, and municipal public recreation officials; submit for board action, written facility usage policies, procedures and fee schedules; develop a simple administrative system for the procedure to apply, receive permits, use, and maintenance of physical education facilities for public use; and develop written policies to ascertain the priority use of the physical education facilities.

Recommendations for further study were: develop an Arizona study to research the facility usage problem for public recreational agencies; develop an Arizona study for public school physical education facilities and public recreational use of these facilities; develop an Arizona study to find out what the difference in policy is for community groups who use community college physical education facilities.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

School facilities belong to the public and should be available for any legitimate public purpose that is not inconsistent with the school program and purpose. In Arizona, with 14 public community colleges, the question was are the two-year schools making their facilities available to the public? This study was designed to answer a part of that overall question, namely, are physical education facilities in Arizona public community colleges available for recreational purposes? Along with the availability of these facilities it was necessary to study the policies, procedures, and practices connected with the multiple use of school physical education facilities by community groups.

The developing interrelationship between the school and its community beyond the eight-hour daily educational schedule has compounded administrative problems at the local level. Utilization of facilities by school groups for activities beyond normal hours, and by non-school groups for various purposes at irregular times, can generate difficulties. "Solutions to these difficulties [facility usage] depend upon a careful analysis of

available information regarding current policies and practices (Finchum 1967, p. iii)."

The Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges and individual Arizona community colleges have a large financial obligation in facilities financed by the state and local taxpayers. As the state community college enrollments continue to expand (Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges 1974, p. 21), the question is, are the existing facilities being utilized efficiently?

The physical education facilities represent a significant portion of the entire Arizona community college physical plant. This study examined the specific area of policies as they pertained to community use of Arizona community college physical education facilities in an effort to aid Arizona community college administrators to use those facilities to their maximum.

Statement of the Problem

Since little information was available upon exploratory study, the purpose of this study was to investigate current practices in shared use of community college physical education facilities among schools and other community agencies.

Purpose of the Study

The study was concerned with the following:

1. (a) Locate, classify and analyze existing policies, regulations, and practices dealing with public use of

community college recreational facilities, and (b) to locate, classify and analyze existing statutes, attorney general opinions and court cases dealing with public use of community college recreational facilities.

2. Produce a set of guidelines for use in developing policies, regulations and practices for use by Arizona community college administrators.

Significance of the Problem

Accountability as expressed by school personnel usually means fiscal responsibility. The rapid rise in construction, maintenance, and utility costs have pushed some of the fiscal accountability out of the curricular and into the facility manager's area of concern. Arizona taxpayers have spent $104,069,366 on the plant investment for land, buildings, grounds, and equipment for the Arizona community college campuses (Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges 1974, p. 18). Gleazer (1968) reported in his book, This Is the Community College, that one-third of the total community college plant costs are for space, equipment, and buildings related to health, physical education, recreation, and athletics.

Using these figures as guides, Arizona community colleges could have spent as much as $34,687,786.67 for existing health, physical education, recreation, and athletic facilities.

Konopnicki (1974, p. 96) reported in his dissertation that the Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges

during the period 1960 through 1973 made 1,686 decisions. He classified the decisions as subject area or functional. Of all the specific areas in which decisions were made, 29% consisted of decisions about buildings and building procedures. This was the category in which the board made the most decisions. Governing decisions during the 13-year period studied was reported as averaging 78%.

If the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges in Arizona is making the majority of its decisions in governing matters, and if those decisions are made in the subject area of Arizona community college buildings and building procedures, what data are they using to support this large number of decisions dealing with facilities?

George Hall (1974, n.p.), Executive Director of the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges in Arizona, responded to a request for state policies covering cooperative use of physical education facilities by writing that there are ". . . no such state regulations."

It further can be argued that the Arizona Legislature is moving to develop laws for insuring public use of the schools and supporting the concept of community use of facilities. Bills such as Arizona S. B. 1072 Community Schools Act, 1974, S. B. 1076 Arizona Civic Center Act, 1975, and H. B. 2283 Rio Salado Project Act, 1975, all aim at opening school and related facilities for wide community use (see Appendix K). According to the Secretary

of State (1971, p. 55), "Arizona law defines the two year institutions as a 'community college' instead of 'junior college'." "Community use of college facilities is one of the most common services provided by community colleges (Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson 1965, p. 212)."

Arizona community colleges are service oriented. One area of service is to make facilities available for use by the general public. There seems to be little doubt that community college administrators today, and in the future, will need to assist their boards in providing written policies which encourage and promote maximum and appropriate use of recreational facilities.

For the purpose of this study, descriptive data were gathered concerning Arizona community college policies, practices, and procedures for community recreational use of the physical education facilities.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:

1. That recreation is a vital part of the educational purpose of a number of institutions in the society.
2. That the respondents from among educational and recreational institutions providing data for this study would see recreation programs as a part of the community college spectrum of services.

3. That the community itself is a significant part of an educational effort.

Limitations to the Study

There were three limitations to this study:

1. It was concerned with tax supported public community colleges in the State of Arizona. It did not include facilities of private, religious, or other state educational institutions.
2. The research was confined to the investigations of policies, regulations, and practices concerning the public use of Arizona community college physical education facilities.
3. The population involved was limited to seven community college districts in Arizona, representing 10 separate campuses, as well as their 10 corresponding municipal parks and recreation departments (see Appendix D).

Definitions of Terms

Community College ". . . means an educational institution which provides a program not exceeding two years training in the arts, sciences and humanities beyond the twelfth grade . . . (Secretary of State 1971, p. 54)."

Community Recreation Agency refers to that office of the municipal government that serves the recreation needs of its constituents through activities for leisure.

Guidelines are the written sequential steps to execute an action.

Intensity Factor is the percent of agreement of survey respondent answers for each question. At least 50% agreement (5 of 10) was necessary to qualify a question for the intensity factor tables.

Multiple-Use refers to these five facility users: (1) administrative (registration, assemblies, etc.), (2) athletic (intercollegiate), (3) community (parks and recreation departments, YMCA, etc.), (4) instructional (academic credit counsel), and (5) intramural (within school activities).

Physical Education Facilities are those areas, structures, fixtures, and equipment used to support that part of the school curriculum dealing with the art and science of movement and physiological development (The Athletic Institute 1974). For this study, it is also meant to include the program activities related to sports and athletics.

Policies are principles adopted by the school board to chart a course of action.

Practices refers to unwritten procedures.

Regulations are detailed directions that are developed by the administration to put policy into practice.

Users refers to the community group scheduling the use of public community college physical education facilities for recreation purposes (Hafen 1968).

Write-In Responses--hand written words or sentences by the survey respondents beyond the scope of the question were considered write-in responses.

Summary

This chapter has shown the parameters of a problem in community college governance which has significant implications for the concept of the community college in general. That is, in these times when states are hard pressed to support institutions at various educational levels, the institutions providing the thirteenth and fourteenth years of school either as career or college parallel programs are experiencing unprecedented growth. For instance, in Pima Community College district, "the average rate of increase, on an annual basis, has been about 44% (Pima Community College 1975, p. 2)."

As a result of this growth the notion of a community college as a campus begins to disappear and the visions of those who foresaw the transformation of the junior colleges into institutions blending into the community itself is occurring. This blending into the community does not occur without attendant difficulties. Many important reciprocal relationships must be established. This study undertook the problem of determining what policies prevailed in Arizona community colleges for shared use of facilities which "ostensibly" belong to the college. That is, the problem becomes one of seeing if the community colleges are using their physical education facilities efficiently, and if

not, to provide an administrative procedure better to do so. If it is believed that a community college ought to include the use of its community facilities (e.g., public school classroom space, golf courses, pools, parks, etc.) as part of the service provided to bring the educational opportunities closer to the people, then the examination of policies, procedures, and practices need to be examined to see if this purpose is being met.

Further, by examining current practices by means of surveys, interviews, and examination of existing documents, it should be possible to determine those practices which best meet the goal of providing maximum service to the entire community. Thus a further purpose of this study was to develop guidelines for policies, regulations, and practices for Arizona community college administrators for the multiple use of physical education facilities.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Literature related to the topic of this study is presented in this chapter in five sections. The first section, labeled Historical Review, presents literature which gives a foundation to policy development for school facility use by non-school groups. The second section, Policy Development, selectively reviews literature which demonstrates the responsibility for development of written school facility use policies. The third section, The Arizona Law, reviews statutes, attorney general opinions and actual court cases related to school facilities and joint use of same. Section four, Physical Education Facilities, presents the literature specifically highlighting these school facilities. The last section, section five, investigates literature dealing with Future Facility Trends.

Portions of information may be gathered surrounding topics such as school administrators, school policy development, community college administration, community college service functions, and physical education facilities in general. In an ERIC search by the National Computer Bank Probe System (see Appendix G), the author submitted 18 different descriptors and 23 different combinations of queries with the net result of four

print-outs referring to any combinations submitted. This is a clear example of the lack of data available in the educational literature concerning physical education facility usage.

Historical Review

> There once was a schoolhouse, a great mental tool house
> Was shut every night in the year.
> "Till the people who hovered around discovered
> That this was a folly too dear."
> Said they, "If 'tis ours, then we have the powers
> To use it whenever we will,"
> So 'twas opened at night, and to-day with delight
> You can hear them a-shouting their fill
> (Mayer 1911, p. 206).

The above stanza appeared in the pages of The American Review of Reviews over 60 years ago. With each passing year the sentiment expressed has increased in pertinence until it is now almost continental in its application to American school systems. No longer are our schools for children only. Anyone responsible for the planning and/or administration of school plants must be prepared to give serious consideration to the widening use of school facilities by the entire community.

Through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, community pressure developed to open school facilities for the common man during non-school hours. In 1858 Indiana was the first state to pass legislation related to the extended use of public schoolhouses (Keesecker 1938, p. 3).

In 1902 John Dewey (1902, pp. 373-374) wrote: "School districts should undertake an educational function relevant to

the contemporary needs of the community, and operate a center of life for all ages and classes in their facilities." President Eliot (in Baxter 1903, p. 3248) of Harvard University wrote in 1903, "There is no such waste of plant as to shut it up and not use it."

After World War I, the question continued to surface--whom should the school serve? Walter D. Cocking (1949, p. 253) had this answer: "It is no longer correct to say that the school should serve only children of certain ages. If the school, as an agency of society, is to justify itself for the period ahead of us, it must be accepted that its fundamental function is to serve the people of the entire community."

After the second World War, more and more communities became involved in their schools. The Mott Foundation gave life to the idea of community schools in Flint, Michigan, in 1947. "The bell rings, the children leave, and millions of dollars worth of physical facilities are tightly locked--leaving education sealed from the real life of the community (Whitt 1971, p. 3)." The community school concept developed to break down this previous practice.

Since the late fifties, school districts have had a renewed interest in opening their facilities up to community users. The question then becomes, has any board of education the right to say that these people should not be permitted the use of their own school facilities?

The problems confronting most boards who face community facility usage seem to be, ". . . indifference, ignorance and ill-defined responsibilities (Smodic 1963, p. 22)." The answer must be in carefully spelled-out policy, formulated after thoughtful consideration of the problems peculiar to a given community, studied in the light of existing legislation, and with an eye toward similar situations in other communities. Community college literature and, in particular, community college physical education literature, is void on this point.

Policy Development

"School districts that permit or encourage wide use of school facilities should have policies and regulations--and a designated official to administer them--if conflicts and confusion among users are to be held to a minimum (Finchum 1967, p. 7)."

Louis A. Sullivan has indicated that many school districts do not have a set of written policies. He (1965, p. 26) underscored the point by stating:

> The original development or the making of a major revision of a policy statement involves a great amount of time, planning, and efforts of many people. A guiding device, aimed at specific situations, can reduce the enormous features of the task by providing a basis from which good educational planning can proceed in all directions.

Bartels (1973, p. 1) also supported the concept of school board policies for administrative efficiency when he said:

"Properly developed school board policies in critical areas can do much toward developing understanding of, and support for, community education."

One of the main functions of the governing board for a community college is to determine policies for the operation of the school. Many phases of the school operations are covered by the general school laws of the state. All of the mandatory laws governing school operation naturally control school policy. Permissive legislation has given governing boards authority to establish policy at the local level.

Arizona is a state that operates under the permissive legislation concept for community use of facilities (Smodic 1963, p. 27). Such legislation denotes a grant of power to enable, but not compel, a district board to do certain things. A search of the school legal literature seems to indicate that there is a general feeling that boards of education, within the spirit of their power and responsibility, have taken the position that our school system was designed to promote public education, and that any use of school property tending to this end may be permitted, provided it does not interfere with school work. This stance recognizes the need for placing the disposition of school property for community purposes at the discretion of the local school boards.

The Arizona Law

The first question to consider is what are the powers and duties of the State Board of Directors for Junior Colleges in regard to school property?

ARS§§15-624 and 15-602 state that junior college boards have the same powers and duties as do high school boards of education. ARS§15-545 states that a high school board of education has all the powers and duties that are vested in common school trustees.

Reading the above statutes together then, it is evident that a junior college governing board of either a high school or junior college district has the same powers as are conferred by statute on the board of trustees of common schools. Therefore, it is these common school trustees' powers and duties which will determine the issue here.

The Arizona legislature has delegated to the board of education of a high school district control of district affairs, subject to certain statutory controls, Quimby v. School District No. 21 of Pinal County, 10 Ariz. App. 69, 455 P. 2d 1019 (1969). ARS§15-442 A (3) states that common school trustees shall have the power to "rent, furnish, repair and insure the school property with its district." Upon reading ARS§15-442 A (3), it would appear that Arizona school districts have the statutory authority to rent out school property for non-school uses. This is the interpretation that the Attorney General of Arizona has given the

statute in Op. Atty. Gen. 60-41. (This opinion refers to ARS§15-445, which is now ARS§14-442.)

In the opinion cited above, the Attorney General read ARS§15-442 as conferring on the board of trustees the power to rent school property, with no limitations placed on what class of school property could be so rented out. Therefore, since athletic and recreational facilities are school property, it appears that this property can be rented for community use (see Appendix K). The Attorney General mentioned ARS§§15-451 and 15-452, which allow use of school buildings as civic centers and use of school buildings and grounds for a public recreational center, as evidencing a secondary role schools play as a "hub" of civic and cultural community life.

The opinion continues by stating that in renting out the school property, the school district must not be put to any loss of the property's useful life, or put to any expense of operation or maintenance, without securing adequate rent to totally compensate for such use. In stating this, the Attorney General affirmed Prescott Community Hospital v. Prescott School District No. 1 of Yavapai County, 57 Ariz. 492, 115 P. 2d 160 (1941), which stated that a school district could not in effect make a gift of school property to other parties. Also, the Attorney General recognized that in renting out school property for non-school use to other parties, the school district is acting in a proprietary capacity and is therefore liable for any injuries

resulting from its negligent upkeep of the rented out property. This was the holding of Sawaya v. Tucson High School District No. 1, 78 Ariz. 389, 281 P. 2d 105 (1955). Sawaya was further elaborated on in the Attorney General's opinion, i.e., a requirement that insurance be taken out by the leasee to provide the school district with protection in its capacity of propriety leasor was recognized.

On the question of whether or not recreational facilities are school buildings or part of the schoolhouse, the Arizona Supreme Court has held that they are, Alexander v. Phillips, 31 Ariz. 503, 254 P. 1056 (1927). Alexander held that a stadium was a "schoolhouse" because it is a building used for a prescribed use, i.e., physical education is part of all school curriculums. Therefore, it appears to follow that all physical education facilities in the state's schools are part of the schoolhouse or school buildings by analogy, and as such come under ARS§15-442 A (3).

Recognizing that Arizona school districts can lease school property out for non-school purposes, O. Atty. Gen. 60-41 and Sawaya, supra, it must be remembered that in doing so this non-school activity taking place on school property should not interfere with regular school use or school activities, Carter v. Lake City Baseball Club, 218 S.C. 255, 62 S.E. 2d 470 (1950). Royce Independent School District v. Reinhardt, 159 S.W. 1010 (1913). Also, the United States Supreme Court has held in

Brown v. Louisiana, 383 U.S. 131, 86 S. Ct. 719, 15 L. Ed. 2d 637 (1966), that even though a state or its instrumentalities may of course regulate its libraries or other public facilities, they cannot do so in an unreasonable or discriminatory manner.

The Arizona Supreme Court has stated also that:

> . . . courts should keep in mind that when they are asked to determine whether the regulation of a school board is reasonable or unreasonable, they should do just that and nothing more. Courts should not intrude upon the "lawfully vested . . . discretion" of the school board. Judicial review by the courts of the wisdom rather than the reasonableness of board regulations amounts to a usurpation of the legislative delegation of power to the school board and violates the separation of power fundamental to our form of government (Pendley v. Mingus Union High School District No. 4 of Yavapai County, 109 Ariz. 18, 504 P. 2d, 1972, 23).

Physical Education Facilities

The study of physical education facilities as a subject area in education took a different turn in 1945 when the first national conference on facilities was held by the Athletic Institute in Chicago. In 1956, the Kellogg Center for Continuing Education at Michigan State University held the second national conference on Sports and Physical Education Facilities. The third national conference on facilities in physical education was held at Indiana University at the Biddle Continuing Education Center in 1965. In 1974, the latest national effort on physical education facilities culminated in the publication of a manual, Planning Facilities for Athletics, Physical Education and Recreation, by the Athletic Institute.

The literature on health, physical education, and recreation is nearly void of major works concentrating on the subject area of "facilities." Journal articles are sparse and those that do exist generally describe a particular facility. Neither the Research Quarterly nor Physical Educator has published a single article on physical education facilities since 1968. The bulk of the literature consists of facility-related (carpeting, acoustical materials, artificial surfaces, swimming pool maintenance) articles appearing in the Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation as well as the Park Maintenance Journal (The Athletic Institute 1974, p. 2).

The dimensions of the management of physical education facilities, equipment, and supplies are immense. "Physical education and athletics employ the use of perhaps more space than any other department in the institution (Keller 1973, p. 1)." The construction of buildings is of the utmost importance; once a building is erected, the people who occupy it must live within the limitations which it imposes on their programs.

Now new goals in physical education are leading instructors to seek new kinds of facilities. Education Facilities Laboratories of Chicago has published four manuals to help school facility managers in general, and physical education facility managers in particular, become more flexible in their operations. Generating Revenues from College Facilities (Education Facilities

Laboratory 1974a) is a report to suggest methods of producing income from higher education facilities.

The Education Facilities Laboratory (1971, p. 11) also published the booklet, Guide to Alternatives for Financing School Buildings, which described physical education facilities as prime income makers: ". . . physical education facilities may be similar to facilities operated by Parks and Recreation Departments." Sharing the costs and the profits of facilities is essential to agencies today.

The publication Physical Recreation Facilities (Education Facilities Laboratory 1974b) discussed such topics as updating old places, shared facilities, low cost-per-use places and general facility factors related to physical education-recreation facilities. An actual cost analysis of "covered space" was detailed in Education Facilities Laboratory's (1969) An Investigation of Costs of Inexpensive Enclosures for Recreational Areas.

Few research studies have been completed concerning community college physical education facilities. Present structures can be labeled copies of the secondary school plant or the higher education plant.

In a study done by Hodges (1974, p. 13), it was reported that 53% of public two-year colleges in the midwest used community or high school facilities in their physical education programs because 47% of the schools surveyed had inadequate facilities.

P. R. Theiberg (1974, n.p.), Special Assistant to the President of Hofstra University and an internationally known expert on school facilities, wrote:

> I know of no model for planning a health, physical education and recreation facility at the community college. Like everyone else in the business, I am entirely for progress and opposed to change. There are many books out which are basic facilities books, but in my experience they are totally inadequate when it comes to planning facilities. What they teach you to do is plan a facility that would have been great in 1928. The existing sources do not relate to tomorrow.

Future Facility Trends

"The community college, as a relatively new segment of American education, is unencrusted with tradition, not hidebound by rigid history, and in many cases, new and eager for adventure (Evans and Neagley 1973, p. 237)."

Community colleges may choose to serve the community partially, at least by making available the facilities related to physical education and recreational activities as a new approach to service. "Community use schools do not differentiate between school hours and public hours because the entire building is operated for the benefit of all the people, of all ages, who paid for it (Education Facilities Laboratory 1973, p. 3)."

Federal, state, and local governmental agencies are encouraging cooperative alliances. Federal grants are available from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and Department of Urban Development for school/recreation facility construction. "Acceptance of the

concept of education for lifetime learning, to be pursued by adults and the handicapped as well as the rationale for community education are worth federal and state funding (Education Facilities Laboratory 1973, p. 5)."

The community may become a viable future direction for higher education, Pullius, in 1964, spoke of the "center of education being movement" and physical education "will be that center." Even Buckminster Fuller (1973, p. 38) wrote about "HYPER: A Concept for an Integrated Physical Education Facility" of the future.

Summary

The format for reviewing the literature needed to study the present state of cooperation among community colleges and other agencies and institutions outside the community was designed to determine: (1) if any tentative solutions to present problems could be gleaned from past problems and solutions and (2) if present policies of schools and other governmental agencies and if present state laws facilitate or hamper cooperation.

The historical review section reported that community desires to use school facilities beyond the normal "school day" have been developing over two centuries in America. Specific literature on physical education facility availability was lacking since such facilities are recent in nature.

The policy development section reported that logically, legally, and administratively, school personnel ought to develop written policy statements for board approval to promote as well as regulate community use of facilities.

In the Arizona law section, it was clearly demonstrated in the literature through statutes, attorney general opinions, and actual court cases that Arizona school facilities in general and physical education facilities in particular may be opened to community use for very broad purposes.

The physical education facilities section related that specific facilities for sports and recreational use are new to the spectrum of curriculum and administrative concern. Only since 1947 has the school educational literature reported a specific area known as physical education facilities.

The section concerning future facility trends developed the theme that community colleges and use of their facilities by the general public was a relatively recent phenomenon. Community groups use of physical education facilities was a pressing problem that needs "space" and what natural space should be available but constructed, tax developed school space?

The related literature chapter looked at the past concerning multiple use of school physical education facilities and established the parameters within which this study of policies, procedures, and practices for public use of a community college physical education facility was framed.

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The design used to obtain the data for this study is presented in this chapter. The design consisted of six separate phases.

The first phase involved a review of research and appropriate literature related to policies, practices, and procedures for use of school physical education facilities. Information found was used to develop an instrument for collecting data pertinent to physical education facilities from Arizona community college campuses. The instrument (Appendix E) was designed to gather information under the following headings:

1. General Information
2. Facility Inventory
3. Policies
   a. Applications and Permits
   b. Charges and Fees
   c. Use and Supervision
   d. Records
   e. Legal Matters
4. Facility Planning

Two classifications for responses to the survey were developed. First, the write-in responses category was developed to permit open-ended participation in the survey. Second, preestablished questions were asked in order to determine what

agreement there currently was on facility usage among administrators. An intensity factor consisting of at least 50% agreement on questions asked was designed to produce a format for reporting these data of write-in responses and intensity factors for each question could then also be combined to produce other formats for data analysis.

As a result of the review of related literature completed in Chapter 2, a survey questionnaire concerning recreational governmental agencies using school physical education facilities was developed. The information gathered from this questionnaire resulted in a survey instrument to be sent to the municipal parks and recreation administrator serving the same community as the host community college. The instrument (Appendix F) was designed to gather information under the following headings:

1. General Information
2. Policies
   a. Applications and Permits
   b. Charges and Fees
   c. Use and Supervision
   d. Records
   e. Legal Matters
3. Facility Planning Procedures

Phase three consisted of submitting the two survey forms to selected professionals for evaluation of appropriateness for gathering the substantive data. These authorities were asked to recommend acceptance, rejection, or change, regarding the content of the instrument. Inclusion or exclusion of items in the final survey instrument was determined by majority recommendations

of the authorities. A list of the panel of experts with their respective positions appears in Appendix C.

Phase four consisted of a sample selection of community colleges for participation in the study. All but one Arizona community college was included in the original invitation to participate (13 campuses). Maricopa Community College District physical education facilities, consisting of five separate campuses, were treated as separate entities in this study, although one campus, Maricopa Technical College was not invited to participate since it has no physical education facilities. Ten community colleges and their 10 corresponding parks and recreation departments accepted the invitation to participate in this study. There was 100% return on both surveys (see Appendix D).

Phase five consisted of administering the instrument to representatives of Arizona community colleges and supporting parks and recreation agencies, listed in Appendix D, for data collection.

Phase six consisted of the tabulation and recording for analysis and interpretation of the data. Comparisons were made as to whether existing practices comply with the data developed. Conclusions were drawn and recommendations formulated from the interpretations of the findings. The study sought opinions as well as data related to existing policies and procedures for comparisons with the instrument developed.

Sources of Data

All but one Arizona community college and host parks and recreation department received an invitation letter to participate. Follow-up procedures were conducted by telephone. Data were obtained by the survey instruments from designated Arizona community college administrative officials and by administrative staff of the host municipal parks and recreation departments.

Instruments for Collection of Data

A survey instrument (Appendix E) of 38 questions was sent to each participating Arizona community college designated administrative official. A second survey instrument (Appendix F) of five selected questions was sent to each participating host parks and recreation department administrator.

Data Analysis and Presentation

The study identified and classified existing Arizona community college physical education facilities by inventory form (see pages 31 and 32). The study identified, classified, and analyzed existing policies for facility use from Arizona community colleges and local parks and recreation agencies by having them submitted as part of the questionnaires (see Appendices H and I).

A scale for write-in responses and intensity factors for each question of the community college survey was developed.

This scale, then, lead to a reordering of priorities for policy development by administrators and boards.

The study identified, classified, and analyzed Arizona law as it affects multiple use of school facilities.

Summary

Chapter 3 reported the design of the study in its six phases. Phase one, review of the related literature, sought pertinent policy and facility information from the past to aid in the development of the community college instrument. Phase two continued with the review of related literature from the recreational field to aid in the development of the recreational survey instrument. Phase three consisted of submitting the two instruments to a panel of experts (see Appendix C) for determination of question validity. Phase four was the selection of the sample from all Arizona public community colleges by written invitation (see Appendix A). Phase five consisted of administering the instruments to designated representatives of Arizona community colleges and supporting parks and recreation agencies for data collection. The final phase, phase six, consisted of the development of the format for data analysis which could lead to the drawing of conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data collected in accordance with the design and instruments developed are presented in Chapter 4. These data are organized according to general information concerning the community colleges: community college facility inventory, community college policies (legal matters, charges and fees, records, use and supervision, and applications and permits), and general recreation and facility planning.

General Information

Ten Arizona community colleges responded to the survey, as did 10 municipal parks and recreation departments (see Appendix D). The 10 schools in this study represent most geographic areas of the State of Arizona. Community college enrollments (1974 headcount) were reported to range from 1,217 (Mohave Community College) to 11,669 (Pima Community College). Municipal populations (1974) ranged from 7,800 (Coolidge) to 775,000 (Phoenix).

Community College Facility Inventory

Nine of the 10 community colleges reported having physical education facilities. Mohave Community College did not have

physical education facilities constructed at the time of this survey. The nine schools which did have physical education facilities are presented in Table 1.

Community College Policies

Legal Matters

Questions 34, 35, and 36 of the community college survey made up this section. The legal matters questions received the highest intensity factor and the most write-in responses from the community college respondents. Table 2 presents a summary of questions in the legal matters section.

Local and state laws were examined as to how they affect educational policy making for community college physical education facilities. In question 34, 70% of the respondents said that state laws had affected their policy making, while 20% said state laws had not. Ten percent did not answer the question. Forty percent indicated that local laws influenced their community college physical education facility policy making and 40% said they did not. Twenty percent of the community colleges surveyed did not answer the question. Under local and state laws, specific restrictions were reported as follows:

Local laws. Forty percent were concerned with smoking restrictions; 30% were concerned with times the facilities could be used and by whom; 20% were concerned with the county attorney; and 10% were concerned with auditing of monies.

Table 1. Inventory of Types of Physical Education Facilities Presently Available at Nine Arizona Community Colleges (1974)*

Facility	Community College** AWC	CAC	EAC	GCC	MCC	PCC	PHX	SCC	YCC	Total
Archery range	-	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	12
Artificial grass area	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Classroom space in gymnasium	-	4	6	-	1	-	2	1	6	20
Dance studio	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	5
Equipment room	1	1	1	1	3	1	4	2	-	14
Golf range	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	4
Grass fields (baseball, soccer, etc.)	-	4	3	1	5	1	2	4	-	20
Gymnasium	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	10
Gymnastics room	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3
Handball courts	-	-	4	6	8	8	9	6	-	41
Ice rink	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outdoor hard surface areas	-	-	-	1	6	1	1	4	-	13
Sauna area	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	4
Shower and locker rooms	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	18

Table 1, Continued

Facility	Community College** AWC	CAC	EAC	GCC	MCC	PCC	PHX	SCC	YCC	Total
Ski run	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stadium	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	4
Storage rooms	3	-	-	1	5	3	-	-	-	12
Swimming pool	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	4
Tennis courts	6	8	-	8	8	8	11	8	-	57
Track	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	4
Weight training room	-	2	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	7
Wrestling room	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2

*Question 21 of community college survey.

**Key to community college abbreviations:
AWC--Arizona Western College
CAC--Central Arizona College
EAC--Eastern Arizona College
GCC--Glendale Community College
MCC--Mesa Community College
PCC--Pima Community College
PHX--Phoenix College
SCC--Scottsdale Community College
YCC--Yavapai Community College

Table 2. Intensity Factors and Write-In Responses for the Legal Matter Questions

Question Number*	Intensity Factor in Percent	Number of Write-In Responses
34	70	7
35	90	6
36	80	8
3 Total	80 Mean	21 Total

*Number of questions qualifying for intensity factor 3 of 3 or 100%.

State laws. Sixty percent were concerned with smoking restrictions; 50% were concerned with auditing of monies; and 10% were concerned with times the facilities could be used and by whom.

In question 36, it was reported that 60% of the survey respondents required "proof of a minimum of $100,000 liability insurance by each user" before facilities could be assigned to outside groups or agencies.

Write-in responses to the legal matters questions ranged from "too complex" to the "institution has no well developed or defined system based on the law, for the non-academic use of facilities. The need for such is becoming more and more evident. New policies and procedures based on the law are forthcoming."

Charges and Fees

Questions 10 through 20 made up the charges and fees section of the community college physical education facilities survey. Eleven questions made up this section. Ten questions received enough agreement by answers to qualify for the use of the intensity factor. Table 3 shows the charges and fees section in numerical form.

Sixty percent of the community colleges surveyed said "no charge" was their policy for recreational groups using their physical education facilities. Thirty percent said they do charge for "utility costs" in answer to question 10 of the charges and fees section. A number of community college administrators suggested that "reciprocal arrangements for facility use with parks and recreation agencies was preferred to any actual exchange of monies."

When a fee is charged, according to the answers given to question 11, the community college administrators said the fee was charged for: 70% extra custodial services, 70% utilities, 40% extra teacher services, 20% depreciation of facilities, and 10% honoring of contract.

Seventy percent of the community colleges surveyed reported "no deposit was required" for recreational use of physical education facilities. Question 12 received 30% "no response" from the community college administrators.

Table 3. Intensity Factors and Write-In Responses for the Charges and Fees Questions

Question Number*	Intensity Factor in Percent	Number of Write-In Responses
10	60	2
11	70	3
12	70	0
13	50	1
14	60	2
15	70	0
16	70	3
17	90	3
18	50	2
19	60	1
10 Total	65 Mean	17 Total

*Number of questions qualifying for intensity factor 10 of 11 or 91%.

Question 13 asked if the community college had a "published rental schedule" with 50% of the respondents saying "yes" and 40% said "no." Ten percent did not answer the question. Forty percent also reported that the college dean of business services "set the fee schedule" with 30% reporting the responsibility of setting the fee schedule to the governing board. Thirty percent did not respond to the question.

Sixty percent of the community colleges in this study reported that the college officer actually receiving any payment for physical education facility use by recreational groups was the "fiscal officer"; 20% reported rental fees paid to the college "cashier"; 20% did not answer question 14.

For question 15, 70% of the Arizona community colleges reported the amount charged to use the physical education facilities did not depend on the "size of the group"; 20% said the amount charged did depend on the size of the group; and again, 10% did not respond to the question.

Responses to question 16 brought 70% of the community colleges reporting "fees are collected after the activity"; 10% collected fees at the time of application; and 20% reported fees collected according to "stipulation of the written agreement."

Question 17 was nearly unanimously answered by the Arizona community college administrators who responded with 90% agreement that "reimbursement be made by the user for damage to the district property"; 10% did not answer the question. Again,

90% said that if damage occurred, the amount of reimbursement was decided and paid for "after the establishment of the cost of damages by the college." Ten percent did not respond to the question.

Question 18 asked if the policy was the same for all community groups who used the community college physical education facilities. Fifty percent reported that the policy was the same for all groups; 40% said it was not the same; and 10% did not respond. Of those community colleges who declared that there was a difference in policy for certain community groups, all said the "written contract would specify the differences."

Question 19 received 60% "yes" and 20% "no" to the question of "refunds being permitted on cancellation by the users"; 20% did not answer the question in the survey.

"Are refunds permitted on revoked permits by the community college district?" The response to question 20 above was 40% "yes" and 40% "not applicable," with 20% not choosing to answer the question.

Records

There were six questions making up the records section of the Arizona community college physical education facilities survey. These questions were 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 37. Table 4 shows how the intensity factors and write-in responses applied to this section.

Table 4. Intensity Factors and Write-In Responses for the Records Questions

Question Number*	Intensity Factor in Percent	Number of Write-In Responses
29	80	0
30	50	2
31	80	3
32	60	3
37	50	1
5 Total	64 Mean	9 Total

*Number of questions qualifying for the intensity factor 5 of 6 or 83%.

Eighty percent of the Arizona community colleges surveyed in this study answered question 29 as "yes," monies collected from rentals and fees for the recreational use of physical education facilities are deposited in the general fund; 10% said they deposited the monies collected in the auxiliary fund with another 10% not answering the question.

Answers to question number 20, "who receives copies of the financial receipts," were as follows: 50% board of governors, 30% college cashier, 20% group using the facility; and 20% chief fiscal officer.

Monies collected from fees for recreational use of community college physical education facilities are audited at 80%

of the Arizona schools responding to this survey; 20% did not answer question 31.

Question number 32 asked if "records must be kept of community use of physical education facilities." Sixty percent responded by declaring that records must be kept; 30% said that records need not be kept; and 10% did not answer the question.

The type of records kept were noted as follows: 50% monies involved, 30% failing to comply with regulations, 30% complaints, 20% abuse and breakage, and 20% number of participants.

Question 33 drew 40% response to calendar records as the "other type" of records kept not asked for in question 32.

The question of facility inspection and records was asked in question 37. Fifty percent of the Arizona community colleges in the survey said "yes, their facilities were inspected on a monthly, quarterly, or yearly sequence"; 40% of the responding community college administrators said they kept records of their inspections of their physical education facilities. Of the schools that did inspect their facilities and that did keep records, 50% said their physical plant director did the inspection; 10% said the athletic director did the facility inspection. In one case (10%) the community college administrator declared the State of Arizona inspected their physical education facilities.

Use and Supervision

Questions 22 through 28 made up the section of use and supervision in the Arizona community college physical education

facility survey. Table 5 shows the questions which qualified for the intensity factor and the number of write-in responses.

Question 22 was concerned with the priority of use of the community college physical education facilities. Administrators were asked to list "in order of priority the space utilization" of their physical education facilities. Responses were tabulated to produce the following: 40% placed instructional use first; 50% placed community use second; 70% placed intramural use third; 50% placed administrative use fourth; and 50% placed athletic use fifth.

Lack of agreement, that 50% for the first priority use of the community college physical education facilities, eliminated this question from eligibility for the intensity factor table.

Question 23 asked if there was a college policy in effect at the community college which reflected the priority selection in question 22. Fifty percent said there was such a policy while 30% said there was not; 20% did not answer the question. Of the five schools who have a written priority use policy, the office of the chief executive, the athletic director, and the physical education department chairperson each held 20% responsibility in contributing to the writing of such a policy. Both the board of governors and a student body representative were reported as having 10% each responsibility for such a policy.

Reporting for question 24, when college physical education facilities are used by community recreation groups, what

Table 5. Intensity Factors and Write-In Responses for the Use and Supervision Questions

Question Number*	Intensity Factor in Percent	Number of Write-In Responses
23	50	1
25	90	1
26	70	3
27	50	2
28	60	4
5 Total	64 Mean	11 Total

*Number of questions qualifying for the intensity factor 5 of 7 or 72%.

leadership and staff are required to be present, answers were tabulated as follows: 50% a responsible adult; 20% each for (a) police protection, (b) recreational staff, and (c) college district staff; and 10% no requirement.

Question 25 asked if the community college policies included restrictions on community recreation groups in or on physical education facilities. Ninety percent answered that there were restrictions with 10% not answering the question. The restrictions most often mentioned by community college respondents in this survey were: 70% alcohol; 60% (a) disorderly conduct, (b) smoking, and (c) liability insurance.

Seventy percent of the community college administrators responding to this survey reported that use of the physical education facilities was not denied any group; 20% mentioned "some religious groups" as being denied use of college physical education facilities; and 10% did not answer the question.

Question 27--What office is responsible for enforcing rules and regulations as outlined in your policy?--received answers from Arizona community college administrators in the following percentages: 50% campus security; 40% office of the chief executive; 20% each (a) athletic director, (b) physical education department chairperson, and (c) custodial staff; and 10% physical plant director.

Question 28 reported 60% of the Arizona community colleges responding to this survey allowed "portable equipment" to be used in or on physical education facilities. Items such as portable flags and collapsible boxing rings were mentioned as acceptable equipment. Thirty percent of the community colleges reported that recreation groups were not allowed to install any equipment in or on physical education facilities; 10% did not answer question number 28.

Applications and Permits

Questions 5 through 9 make up the section on applications and permits. Only one question in this section qualified for the intensity factor rating. Question 5 is depicted in Table 6.

Table 6. Intensity Factors and Write-In Responses for the Application and Permit Questions

Question Number*	Intensity Factor in Percent	Number of Write-In Responses
5	50	0
1 Total	50 Mean	0 Total

When a recreation agency would like to use an Arizona community college physical education facility, according to this study, to which college officer is application made? Question 5 provided answers to this inquiry with the results as follows: 50% athletic director, 30% office of the chief executive, 10% dean of student services, and 10% did not respond to the question.

Thirty percent responsibility each was recorded as the answer to question 6 concerning "who must give final approval to recreational use of community college physical education facilities" for the chief executive officer, the athletic director, and the physical education department chairperson. Twenty percent responsibility for final approval went to the dean of student services and 20% to the dean of business services; 10% of the respondents for the community college survey did not answer question 6.

Question 7 drew a range of responses to the question of "how far in advance must an application for community college

physical education facilities use be made." The range is recorded as follows: 40% as soon as possible; 20% each (a) one week, (b) one month; and 10% each (a) one year, (b) no notice, and (c) did not answer the question.

Again, a range was noted in response to question 8--"Who must give final approval for long term use and seasonal scheduling?"--30% each (a) office of chief executive and (b) athletic director; 20% each (a) physical education chairperson and (b) student services director; and 10% each (a) physical plant director and (b) business affairs dean.

"How far in advance must notice be given to cancel scheduled recreation use of community college physical education facilities by the district or its representative" was part (a) of question 9. A range from "nothing specific" to "as soon as possible" was reported. Ten percent each was reported for "earliest convenience" and "flexible" as well as 20% for "one month"; 10% of the Arizona community college administrators in this survey did not answer the question. Part (b) of question 9 asked about how far in advance the user may cancel scheduled use of community college physical education facilities in this study: 40% as soon as possible; 20% (a) 24 hours and (b) as soon as problem becomes known; and 10% (a) one week and (b) did not answer the question.

The policy sections of the community college survey have been tabulated to show intensity factors and write-in responses. The combination of sections on legal matters, charges and fees,

records, use and supervision, and applications and permits are shown in Table 7.

General Recreation and Facility Planning

Ten host parks and recreation departments (100%) responded to the survey. Size and locations of the municipal recreation agencies are listed in Appendix D. Like the community college survey, it can be said that most respondents to the recreation survey were from upper administrative positions.

Nine of the 10 community colleges and municipal departments reported that there was a "parks and recreation department in the host municipality." Thatcher reported that parks and recreation duties are administered by the city clerk. Of the nine municipalities that do have parks and recreation departments, all said their programs run "all year round" and they are administered by " a department of parks and recreation."

The community college survey revealed that four community colleges had "written contracts" for cooperative physical education facility use (question 3) with five community colleges responding that they do not. The recreation survey revealed that municipal parks and recreation departments have cooperative "written contracts" (question 4) on five occasions with four stating they do not.

Question 2 of the community college survey and question 3 of the parks and recreation survey are parallel questions. Forty percent of community college administrators agreed that they

Table 7. Priority Position Based on Intensity Factors and Write-In Responses for All Community College Policy Section Headings

Priority Position	Community College Policy Section Headings	Number of Intensity Qualifying Questions Per Section	Percent of Intensity Qualifying Questions Per Section	Mean Intensity Factor in Percent	Number of Write-In Responses
1	Legal Matters	3	100	100	21
2	Charges and Fees	10	91	65	17
3	Records	5	83	64	9
4	Use and Supervision	5	72	64	11
5	Applications and Permits	1	20	50	0
	Average	4.8		$\overline{X}$ = 68.6	58

ought to be planning new facilities cooperatively with parks and recreation officials. Fifty percent of the community college administrators felt they should not be cooperatively planning new facilities. The recreation survey revealed that 80% of the administrators wish to be planning cooperatively for new physical education facilities. Twenty percent of the parks and recreation officials did not respond to this question.

Summary

The data gathered by the survey instruments designed for this study was presented in Chapter 4. The section regarding general information reported college enrollments, reporting official, and participating institutions. Municipal statistical information suggested no relationship between population and use of community college facilities. There was a significant number of upper level administrators who answered each of the survey questionnaires.

The community college facility inventory section brought information to the study related to actual spaces available for community recreation programs. Such spaces as classrooms in the gymnasium, grass fields, handball courts, and tennis courts received the most acknowledgment by community college administrators.

In the community college policies section under legal matters received the highest write-in and intensity factor rating. It appears that community college administrators answering

this survey felt that knowledge of the Arizona education statutes, as they apply on the state and local levels, is essential before decisions on physical education facility policy development are made.

Charges and fees, of the community college policies section, received the second most attention by the Arizona two-year school administrators. Most schools reported no charge for recreational use of community college physical education facilities with the added responses suggesting reciprocal arrangements between agencies rather than any actual exchange of dollars. Custodial services and utility fees were the chief reasons for any charge for facility use. All but one college reported the user must pay for any damage to school property occupied during the time of community recreational use.

Records made up the third general category of questions in the community college survey. The results of this study indicate that 40% of the Arizona community colleges responding are not inspecting their physical education facilities, which may lead to serious legal implications. It was also noted the confusion of Arizona community college administrators as to "who receives copies of the records" of physical education facility usage by community groups.

In the last category, use and supervision, no clear first priority of community college use of physical education facilities was reported.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to produce a set of guidelines for developing policies, regulations, and practices for Arizona community college administrators for the multiple use of physical education facilities.

Chapter 1 provided background information. The problem was stated and the significance of the problem discussed. Assumptions, limitations, and definitions gave the study parameters.

The community college in Arizona is by legal definition and by practice an institution of the community. Capital spending by the state and local taxpayer has provided a large number of recreational facilities on the community college campuses. After instructional, intramural, administrative, and athletic needs of facility use are met, these activity "spaces" ought to be made available to the community.

The second chapter of this study included research findings from similar studies, legal opinions and court cases, as well as related facility use materials. References in this chapter could be used to strengthen the position of a community

college administrator who selected to recommend to his board the inclusion of written facility use policies.

In Chapter 3, description was given to the design of the study, the construction of the survey instruments, the nature of the samples, and the collection and treatment of data. It would appear that the descriptive method of research was appropriate to the type of data generated by both survey instruments.

Chapter 4 provided the opportunity to analyze the data both as single surveys and as combined surveys. In sections of general community college information, community college facility inventory, community college policies, and general recreation and facility planning, data were produced for analysis to relate to the purpose of development of written policies for recreative use of physical education facilities in Arizona community colleges.

The purpose of Chapter 5 is to draw together conclusions based on data gathered and to offer recommendations to Arizona community college administrators. Suggestions for further research are also made.

Conclusions

The following general conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study:

1. According to this study, only one Arizona community college district has written policies and regulations concerning multiple use of physical education facilities.

2. One hundred percent participation by both community college and municipal agencies suggests the timeliness and significance of this study topic.
3. The Arizona legal system treats community college physical education facilities and their regulation in the same manner as elementary and secondary facilities.
4. A re-ordering of policy sections by priority was developed by the Arizona respondent in this study.
5. No significance was noted among sizes of schools and facility availability or sizes of community and availability of community college facilities for recreational use.
6. It could be suggested, as a result of this study, that in Arizona the larger the community population base, the more likely the need for written cooperative use policies between community colleges and public recreation agencies.
7. It seemed evident from this study that the majority of Arizona community college physical education facilities are constructed for life-long, carry-over activities.
8. The "liability insurance" factor is the major criterion that allows use of Arizona community college physical education facilities by community recreational groups.
9. In Arizona, public groups who select to use community college physical education facilities can expect to pay for utilities and custodial services.

10. Forty percent of the Arizona community colleges responding to this survey do not inspect their physical education facilities regularly.
11. Sixty percent of the community colleges in this Arizona study could not agree to the number one priority for their physical education facility use.
12. No clear responsibility for enforcement of rules and regulations that govern community use of community college physical education facilities was reported by the survey respondents.
13. No clear procedure as to "when to apply" and "to whom" was reported by the Arizona administrators in this study.
14. Eighty percent of the municipal parks and recreation administrators who answered this survey questionnaire wanted to plan physical education facilities jointly, however, only 40% of the community college administrators reported they wished to do so.

Recommendations to Arizona Community College Administrators

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are made for Arizona community college administrators who select to recommend to their boards written facility usage policies:

1. Know the Arizona law as it applies to public use of school facilities.

2. Cooperatively plan physical education facilities with state, county, and municipal public recreation officials.
3. Submit for board action, written facility usage policies, procedures, and fee schedules.
4. Develop a simple administrative system for the procedure to apply, receive permits, use, and maintainance of facilities used by public groups.
5. Develop a written policy to ascertain the priority use of the physical education facilities.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Develop an Arizona study to research the facility usage problem from the public recreational agencies' point of view.
2. Develop an Arizona study for elementary and secondary school physical education facilities, and, public recreational use of these facilities.
3. Develop an Arizona study to find out what the difference in policy is for community groups who use community college physical education facilities.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE LETTERS OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85721

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF SCHOOL SERVICES

October 18, 1974

Dr. Robert H. Garin, President
Arizona Western College
Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Dr. Garin:

We are attempting to launch a research study that may aid the Arizona Community College Districts. In order to initiate the study, we are contacting you to solicit your participation.

This study will deal with community college facilities and policy development. Specifically, the Bureau is attempting to compile data that pertain to facility utilization by both the academic and non-academic segments of your community.

The study may produce data that will demonstrate facility availability, procedures to utilize facilities, charge rates and other pertinent information.

Would you advise us of your willingness to participate in this study and would you send us the name of a school officer whom we may contact for further details.

A copy of the study results will be available for your institution upon request.

Sincerely,

Dr. Roy F. Blake, Associate Professor
Educational Foundations and Administration

William B. Watkins, Graduate Associate
Educational Foundations and Administration

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85721

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF SCHOOL SERVICES

May 12, 1975

City of Coolidge
Parks and Recreation Director
or Clerk
Coolidge, Arizona 85228

Dear Sir:

A state-wide study is being conducted among Arizona community colleges and their host parks and recreation departments. We are gathering data to develop policies for cooperative use of community college physical education facilities by the above two agencies.

Would you please take the time to answer the five question survey form enclosed. Data developed may offer the Arizona citizen in your community a better opportunity to participate in recreation facilities at the community college in your area.

Sincerely,

William B. Watkins,
Graduate Associate

enc.

APPENDIX B

LETTER SENT TO ARIZONA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DESIGNATED ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL WITH SURVEY INSTRUMENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85721

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF SCHOOL SERVICES

March 13, 1975

Dr. Robert A. Harrell
Associate Dean of Instructional
Services/Resource Management
Pima Community College
2202 West Anklam Road
Tucson, Arizona 85709

Dear Dr. Harrell:

Last fall Dr. Spector suggested your name as a contact person for this study. We have now reached the stage where we are asking you, on behalf of your institution, to fill in the attached survey form and return it to me.

Your local parks and recreation department (the Tucson Parks and Recreation Department) has also been asked to complete a like survey in order for the study to receive input from both participants in physical education facility usage. The results of this survey will be analyzed for information that will, hopefully, suggest better policy procedures for multiple use of physical education facilities.

Please do not hesitate to call on me should you need further clarification on any point. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

William B. Watkins,
Graduate Associate

enc.

APPENDIX C

PANEL OF EXPERTS FOR EVALUATION OF SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Expert	Position
Dr. Roy F. Blake	Professor of Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Arizona. Dissertation Chairman.
Dr. Robert A. Harrell	Dean of Facility Planning and Resource Management, Pima Community College District.
Mr. Thomas Monahan	Deputy Director, Pima County Parks and Recreation Department.
Dr. Elmer Nix	Retired Dean of Business Services, Pima Community College District.

APPENDIX D

GENERAL INFORMATION FROM RESPONDENTS TO BOTH SURVEYS

Arizona Community College	College Official Responding to Survey	College Enrollment--Head Count 1974	Municipality	Recreation Official Responding to Survey	Municipal Population 1974
Arizona Western	Coordinator of Students	4,000	Yuma	Superintendent of Parks	35,000
Central Arizona	Assistant to District President	4,534	Coolidge	Human Resource Specialist	7,800
Eastern Arizona	Director of Business Services	3,313	Thatcher	Town Clerk	30,000
Glendale	Dean of Instruction	8,437	Glendale	Director of Parks and Recreation	60,000
Mesa	Associate Dean of Students	7,734	Mesa	Assistant Recreation Director	86,000
Mohave	Administrative Assistant	1,217	Kingman	Director of Parks and Recreation	13,500
Pima	Dean Facility Planning & Resources	11,669	Tucson	Assistant Parks and Recreation Director	415,000
Phoenix	Athletic Director	5,400	Phoenix	Recreation Supervisor I	775,000
Scottsdale	Dean of Instruction	7,279	Scottsdale	Community Service Director	88,000
Yavapai	Dean of Research and Development	N/Ans.	Prescott	Director of Parks and Recreation	25,000

APPENDIX E

SURVEY FORM FOR ARIZONA COMMUNITY COLLEGE MULTIPLE PHYSICAL EDUCATIONAL FACILITY USE

Name of college officer responding _____

Position _____

1973-74 population of community college district _____

Number of students attending your college:

		1973-74
FTSE	_____	
Head Count	_____	
Day Students	_____	
Night Students (after 4:00 P.M.)	_____	

(All questions pertain to Main Campus facilities.)

1. Is there a public recreation program in the district in which your college is located?

   Yes ___ No ___

   If the answer is yes, answer section (a) and (b) by checking that which applies.

   a. ___ Year-round recreation program
      ___ Part-time recreation program

   b. Which agency directs your public recreation program?

      ___ The Board of Governors of the community college
      ___ The Parks and Recreation Department
      ___ The public recreation department and the Board of Governors
      ___ Other public agencies, e.g., city council

2. Do college officials and public recreation personnel cooperatively plan new college physical education facilities so they will meet the needs of both programs?

   Yes ___ No ___

3. Regarding the cooperative plan, is there a written contract between these two agencies?

   Yes ___ No ___

   Briefly explain the cooperative plan: _____

   _____

4. Does your college district have written policies and regulations dealing with recreational facility use, for example: applications and permits; charges and fees; use and supervision; records; legal regulations; time availabilities, etc.?

   Yes ___ No ___

   If "yes," please enclosed copies with this survey.

Policies

A. Applications and Permits

5. To which college officer is application made when desiring use of your college physical educational facilities?

   ___ Office of the chief executive of the college
   ___ Athletic Director
   ___ Physical Education Department Chairperson
   ___ Physical Plant Director
   ___ Other, specify _____

6. Who must give approval to recreational uses of your facilities?

   ___ Office of the chief executive of the college
   ___ Athletic Director
   ___ Physical Education Department Chairperson
   ___ Physical Plant Director
   ___ Other, specify _____

7. How far in advance must an application be made?

   a. By public recreation agency _____

   b. By other community group _____

8. Who must give approval for long term use--seasonal schedules?

___ Office of the chief executive of the college
___ Athletic Director
___ Physical Education Chairperson
___ Physical Plant Director
___ Other, specify _____

9. How far in advance must notice be given to cancel scheduled use of college physical education facilities?

a. By college district or its representative _____

b. By user _____

B. Charges and Fees

10. What is the rental policy concerning the use of your college facilities?

a. For public recreation agencies:

___ No charge
___ Charge for light, heat, and water
___ Rent facility for each use or event
___ Fee for use of certain hours only--specify _____
___ Fee required for paying of college personnel on duty during agency use of college physical education facilities
___ Other, specify _____

b. For other community recreation groups:

___ No charge
___ Charge for light, heat, and water
___ Rent facility for each use or event
___ Fee for use of certain hours only--specify _____
___ Fee required for paying of college personnel on duty during agency use of college physical education facilities
___ Other, specify _____

11. Designate the reason for charging the fee:

___ Pay for extra custodial services
___ Pay for utilities
___ Pay for extra teacher services
___ Pay for depreciation of facilities
___ Regulatory measure--limit use of college facilities
___ To assure responsibility to honor contract
___ Other, specify _____

12. Is a deposit required? Yes ___ No ___

When: _____
By whom: _____
To Whom: _____

13. Does the college district have a published rental schedule?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," who determines the schedule of fees?

___ Board of Governors
___ Office of the chief executive of the college
___ Athletic Director
___ Physical Plant Director
___ Other, specify _____

14. Which college officer receives the fee payment?

___ Office of the chief executive of the college
___ College cashier
___ Athletic Director
___ Physical Plant Director
___ Fiscal Officer
___ Other, specify _____

15. Does the amount charged for the use of the college physical education facility depend upon the size of the group, number of participants?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," explain: _____

_____

16. When are fees collected?

___ Time of application for use
___ Just before activity
___ After activity
___ Other, specify _____

17. Must reimbursement be made by the user for damage to the district property?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," how is this handled?

___ Require a "breakage" deposit at time of application
___ Decided and payed for after estimation of cost of damage
___ Other, specify _____

18. Is the policy the same for all community groups?

Yes ___ No ___

If not, please explain: _____

_____

19. Are refunds permitted on cancelations by users?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," are they full or partial refunds?

Explain: _____

_____

_____

20. Are refunds permitted on revoked permits by the college district?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," are they full or partial refunds?

Explain: _____

_____

_____

21. Check the number of facilities that are a part of your campus and/or plant; list the rental rate/hour, evening, day, etc.

No. of Units	Facility	Rental Rate			
		Hour	Evening	Day	Other
	Archery range				
	Artificial grass area				
	Classroom space in gymnasium				
	Dance studio				
	Equipment room				
	Golf range				
	Grass fields (baseball, soccer, etc.)				
	Gymnasium				
	Gymnastics				
	Handball courts				
	Ice rink				
	Outdoor hard surface areas				
	Sauna area				
	Shower and locker rooms				
	Ski run				
	Stadium				
	Storage rooms				
	Swimming pool				
	Tennis courts				
	Track				
	Weight training room				
	Other, specify				

22. List the following categories in order of priority (1 - 6) for space utilization for physical education facilities at your college:

___ Administrative needs (e.g., registration, assembly, etc.)
___ Athletic needs (intercollegiate)
___ Community needs
___ Instructional needs
___ Intramural needs
___ Other, specify _____

23. Is there a written college district policy that reflects your priority list expressed in the answer to number 22?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," check the following personnel who contributed to the writing of your college priority-use policy for physical education facilities.

___ Board of Governors
___ Office of the chief executive of the college
___ Athletic Director
___ Physical Education Department Chairperson
___ Physical Plant Director
___ Student body representative
___ Other, specify _____

C. Use and Supervision

24. Check the leadership and staff required when college facilities are used by community groups for recreational purposes:

___ No requirements
___ Police protection must be provided
___ Members of the municipal recreation staff are required to be on duty
___ Members of the college district are to be on duty
___ A responsible adult leader must accompany the group.
Comment:

_____

_____

___ Other, specify _____

25. Do your policies include restrictions which must be observed by community recreation groups using college physical education facilities?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," check those that apply:

___ Disorderly conduct prohibited
___ Drinking (alcohol) prohibited
___ Smoking prohibited in facilities
___ Use restricted to certain age groups, specify _____

_____

___ Use limited to residents of college district in which your school is located
___ Other, specify _____

26. Which community activities or groups are not permitted to use the college physical education facilities?

___ Political associated events
___ Religious gatherings and events
___ Other, specify _____

27. What office is responsible for the enforcement of rules and regulations as outlined in your policy?

___ Office of the chief executive of the college
___ Athletic Director
___ Physical Education Department Chairperson
___ Physical Plant Director
___ Campus security
___ Custodial staff
___ Other, specify _____

28. Are groups allowed to decorate or install <u>any</u> equipment in college facilities?

Yes ___ No ___

Comment: _____

D. Records

29. Are monies collected from fees and rentals deposited in the general account?

Yes ___ No ___

If "no," where are they placed? _____

30. Who receives copies of the financial receipts?

___ Group using facility
___ Board of Governors
___ College cashier
___ Athletic Director
___ Other, specify _____

31. Are monies collected from fees audited?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," by whom? _____

32. Must records be kept of community use of physical education facilities at your college?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," what type of records?

___ Number of participants
___ Complaints
___ Groups who fail to comply with regulations
___ Abuse and breakage
___ Monies involved
___ Other, specify _____

33. Specify any other type of records kept concerning community use of the college physical education facilities:

_____

E. Legal Matters

34. Have the laws and regulations had any influence upon the nature of the policies that have been established to control use of college facilities by non-college groups?

a. Local Laws and Regulations

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," specify

___ As concerned with auditing of monies collected
___ As concerned with time when college facilities may be used
___ As concerned with who may use facilities
___ As concerned with special restrictions (e.g., no smoking)
___ Other, specify _____

b. State Law and Regulations

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," specify

___ As concerned with auditing monies collected
___ As concerned with time when college facilities may be used
___ As concerned with who may use facilities
___ As concerned with special restrictions (e.g., no smoking)
___ Other, specify _____

35. In case of accidents while community groups are using college physical education facilities, who is held responsible, according to the cooperative agreements and policies?

___ College district
___ Community group
Comment: _____

_____

36. Is insurance required for each group?

Yes ___ No ___

For each participant?

Yes ___ No ___

How much? _____

What kind? _____

37. Does your college keep regular (monthly, quarterly, yearly) written records of facility inspections?

Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," who does the inspecting?

___ Physical Plant Director
___ Athletic Director
___ Physical Education Department Chairperson
___ Custodian
___ Other, specify _____

Adequacy Experienced in Use of Present Policies

38. Are you experiencing success and satisfaction in the application of the present outlined policies which govern the multiple use of college physical education facilities by non-college groups? Comment on each of the following policy areas in regard to the success or problems that you are experiencing.

Applications and permits:

Charges and fees:

Use and supervision:

Legal matters:

Other comments regarding success or problems:

APPENDIX F

PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT
SURVEY FORM

Your host community college _____ has agreed to participate in this dissertation study being conducted by the Bureau of School Services, The University of Arizona. You are asked to complete the following brief survey form as soon as possible so that we may calculate the data for release within the study. All information will be treated confidentially. Thank you.

Name of recreation officer responding _____

Position _____

1973-74 population of municipality your recreational agency serves (e.g., Tucson 415,000)

Municipality _____
Population _____

1. Do you have a written policy statement relative to your cooperative use of physical education facilities with your local community college district?

   Yes ___ No ___

   If "yes," please attach a copy of all policy statements related to this matter.

   If "no," would you prefer to be operating under such a written policy?

   Yes ___ No ___

2. Please comment on the following areas as they relate to your cooperative use of community college's physical education facilities.

   a. Applications and permits:

   b. Charges and fees:

   c. Use and supervision:

   d. Records:

   e. Legal matters:

3. Do you feel the parks and recreation department ought to have input into "planning" any future physical education facilities within your community college district?

   Yes ___ No ___

4. To the best of your knowledge did your parks and recreation department have any input into the present physical education facilities at your community college campus?

   Yes ___ No ___

5. Suggest ways in which your parks and recreation department could work cooperatively with your local community college district in planning future physical education facilities.

APPENDIX G

E.R.I.C. SEARCH DESCRIPTORS

Description of Problem

Administrative policies for cooperative use of physical education facilities in community colleges.

Descriptors

1. Education policies
2. Community schools
3. Physical education facilities
4. Community colleges
5. Junior colleges
6. After school activities
7. Administrative policies
8. Recreational facilities
9. After school centers
10. Educational facilities
11. Educational park
12. Athletics
13. Parks
14. Co-curricular programs
15. Campus planning
16. Site analysis
17. School community cooperation
18. Facility inventory

Queries

1. Four (community colleges) AND 7 (administrative policies) AND 3 (physical education facilities).

2. Five (junior colleges) AND 1 (educational policy) AND 3 (physical education facilities).

3. Eighteen (facility inventory) AND 8 (recreation facilities) OR 3 (physical education facilities) OR 12 (athletics) OR 10 (educational facilities).

4. Fifteen (campus planning) AND 16 (site analysis) AND 13 (parks) OR 11 (educational parks).

5. Seventeen (school community cooperation) AND 2 (community schools).

6. Nine (after school center) AND 6 (after school activities) AND 14 (co-curricular programs).

APPENDIX H

SAMPLE ARIZONA COMMUNITY COLLEGE POLICIES, FACILITY RULES AND REGULATIONS, USER CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM, PERMIT FOR FACILITY USE FORM, AND FACILITY RENTAL SCHEDULE*

*Permission for reproduction has been granted by the Maricopa County Community College District.

Maricopa County Community College District
Use of College Facilities Policies

Note: The Maricopa County Community College District shall he hereinafter referred to as the "District." The Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board shall hereinafter be referred to as the "Board."

A. General Policies--

1. College facilities shall be made available for community use consistent with state statutes, and the policies and regulations of the Board. In all cases, college activities shall be given first preference for use of facilities.

2. The Executive Vice President for Business Services shall be responsible for interpreting the policies. He shall be authorized to act in any cases not specifically covered by these policies. Any agreement which cannot be consumated by the applicant and the Executive Vice President for Business Services shall be decided finally by the President of the District.

B. Operational Policies--

1. Permission for use of college facilities is granted by the Board, through its designated representative. An application (Permit for Use of College Facilities) for permission to use college facilities by persons or groups not officially a part of the District must be initiated at least three (3) weeks prior to the requested date(s). Such application shall be submitted to the college Executive Dean (or his delegated authority) who shall determine whether or not the facility may be used. An application approved at the college level must be forwarded to the District Business Office for final fiscal investigation and approval.

2. The applicant shall become familiar with and agree to abide by the printed rules and regulations of the District concerning the public use of college facilities. The use of facilities shall be granted only for legitimate purposes. Therefore the responsibility for the proper use of college facilities and observance of the rules and regulations shall rest upon the applicant, his sponsors and/or participants.

3. Charges shall be made on the basis of a published rate schedule prepared for such purposes. Final determination of the usage classification shall be made by the Executive Vice President for Business Services.

4. Regular use of college facilities for religious or political purposes shall not be permitted. Occasional use may be permitted as determined by the Executive Vice President for Business Services. The rate schedule in effect at time of approval shall be used to establish proper charges.

5. Agreements for use of the facilities by the municipalities shall be permitted through separate signed agreements. No such agreement shall extend beyond June 30 of the year involved. Reissuance of such an agreement may be effected.

6. At least one college employee shall be on duty at all times when college facilities are used by external groups. He shall be responsible to the District, paid by the District, and no organization using a college facility shall make any payment to said employee(s).

   Exception:
   Polling places for elections shall be handled as designated and approved by the Executive Vice President for Business Services.

7. Agreement for use of facilities for college level courses (other than those offered by the District) to be taught to groups of college employees shall be governed as follows:

   a. When such a request is initiated by the District, the facility shall be provided free of charge as a phase of further training of employees.

   b. When such a request is initiated by any other agent or agency, the regular fee schedule shall be in effect.

8. All concession rights shall be reserved for the college involved unless specifically approved otherwise.

9. Upon request of the Executive Vice President for Business Services, the applicant shall provide (in advance) the content of the program of speakers, plays, amusements, entertainment, or other activity.

10. Kitchen Facilities:
No college kitchen facility shall be used except as specifically outlined by the Supervisor of Food Services and approved by the Executive Vice President for Business Services. All charges for food served shall be established by the Supervisor of Food Services and approved by the Executive Vice President for Business Services. Charges for food service will contain a cost for use of the facility.

11. Athletic Fields:
Generally, athletic fields shall not be utilized on a regular basis by outside groups. Agreement may be entered into for the following types of activity:

American Legion Baseball
Pop Warner Football
Parks and Recreation Department Programs

Such agreements shall be separately written each fiscal year and are not continuing in nature unless there is reissuance of the agreement.

12. All permits shall be revocable at any time (without stated reason) by the Board through its delegated agent. Any applicant may cancel its request for use of facilities if notice of intention to do so is given at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to date of event. If such notice is not received by the college involved, the permit holder shall be held responsible for all direct (out-of-pocket) damages.

13. The person(s) or organization requesting the use of a facility shall pledge that it is not an adherent or subscriber to a political faith or ideology which advocated other than our American system of representative government of these United States, or of the State of Arizona.

Maricopa County Community College District
Rules and Regulations

1. Permit form (Permit for Use of College Facilities) must be completed in full and submitted to the office of the Executive Dean of the college involved at least three weeks prior to requested use date(s).

   All requirements for District personnel and equipment desired by the applicant shall be included on the permit form, at the time of submittal (cleanup is included in the rate schedule).

   Additional personnel may be required by the District (safety, health, welfare of persons; protection of facility; etc.) and shall be supplied by the District as directed by the Executive Dean and his staff and the Executive Vice President for Business Services. Cost shall be borne by the applicant.

2. All activities must be under competent adult supervision. The college employee on duty shall exercise authority over the lessee or its activities. If the adult supervision is inadequate, it shall be the responsibility of the college employee on duty to report same to the Executive Dean who shall forward such report to the Executive Vice President for Business Services. The employee may request cessation of the activity if he deems it necessary to protect the facility and/or personnel.

3. Facilities must be vacated by 11:00 p.m. unless permission is otherwise specifically granted in the permit. It is the responsibility of the lessee to see that this regulation is administered. Time of usage, as stated and approved on the permit, shall include the necessary time for pre-program availability of facility and clearance of facilities at conclusion of program or activity.

4. No apparatus, lighting, wiring, scenery, decorations, combustible materials, animals, furniture, equipment or other things of unusual nature is to be moved onto the college property unless special permission, in writing, is granted in advance. Such apparatus or furniture and equipment approved by the District and provided by the lessee shall be removed from the premises promptly at the termination of permit to avoid any interference with the normal college program, unless written permission has been granted otherwise by the Executive Dean of the college involved.

5. The lessee shall assume full financial responsibility for damages to any and all college property and equipment arising from the activities conducted by the lessee, its agent, members, guests or patrons. The lessee agrees that the college District shall determine whether any such damages has been done, the amount thereof, and the reasonable cost of repairing and/or replacing the same. College District decision shall be final in determining responsibility.

6. Lessee agrees to conduct its activities on the premises so as not to endanger any person lawfully thereon, and to indemnify and save harmless the college District and employees thereof against any and all claims for loss, injury or damage to persons or property including death arising out of the activities conducted by the lessee, its agents, members, guests or patrons.

7. Lessee agrees to furnish the college District, in advance of the occupancy time of the permit, a certificate of insurance in which the lessee is named as assured with the Maricopa County Community College District for minimum public liability insurance of $100,000.00 for any one person and $300,000.00 for any one occurrence, together with a minimum of $100,000.00 for property damage, said policy shall also provide for a ten day prior notice of cancellation to the District.

8. Only facilities approved in the permit are to be use and all persons attending or affiliated with the activity shall confine themselves to the specific section(s) of the facility approved in the permit.

9. The use of tobacco in any facility in any form shall be carefully controlled. Smoking shall be approved only in areas consistent with local municipality fire regulations. No smoking shall be permitted unless proper containers are provided.

10. Drinking of alcoholic beverages or gambling in any form anywhere in or on the premises is prohibited.

11. The District shall reserve the right to eject, or cause to be ejected from the premises any person(s) for disorderly conduct. The District nor any of its agents or employees shall be liable for any damages that may be sustained by the lessee through the exercise by the District of such right.

12. Lessee shall not admit to leased premises a larger number of persons than can safely and freely move about in rented area nor shall the lessee sell more tickets than the normal capacity of the rented premises.

13. All ordinances of the fire and police departments pertaining to public assemblies shall be fully complied with.

14. Lessee will not cause or permit, upon the premises, anything that will tend to injure, mar or deface any of the premises and will not install nails, hooks, tacks, or screws into any part of the buildings and will not make any alterations of whatsoever kind to buildings or equipment thereof, unless express written approval is granted.

15. No performance, exhibition or entertainment shall be given or held in or on the leased premises which is illegal, indecent, obscene or immoral, and should any such exhibition or performance, or any part thereof, be deemed by the District to be publicly criticized as indecent, obscene, lewd, immoral or in any manner publicly offensive, the District may require that such portions of the exhibition or performance receiving such criticism be immediately terminated and deleted to the extent necessary to remove their offensive character.

16. No portions of the sidewalks, entries, passages, vestibules, halls or ways of access to public utilities shall be obstructed by the lessee or permitted to be used for any purpose other than ingress and egress from the premises.

17. The use of District equipment shall be permitted only when operated by college employees or other persons specifically authorized in the permit.

18. If control personnel (police, parking attendants, etc.) are necessary, such personnel shall be procured by the District and charged to the lessee.

19. If, in connection with the purpose or use for which lessee is using facilities, chairs or other furniture and equipment require moving or removal, lessee agrees to pay the cost of moving and replacing the same. Moving or removal of equipment about the facility shall not be permitted without express approval of the college Executive Dean.

20. The District assumes no responsibility for the failure of the air-conditioning system to operate properly and the lessee agrees to release the District from all damage or claim of any sort which may result from such failure.

21. Athletic Facilities:

a. The use of college physical education or athletic equipment or supplies shall not be permitted.

b. Reasonable precaution shall be taken by the lessee to see that dirt, water, etc., are removed from shoes before being admitted to the gymnasium floor. Wearing of street shoes shall not be permitted on the gymnasium floor unless expressly approved in the permit.

c. Uncaged livestock shall not be permitted on the football stadium turf or surrounding track.

22. Lessee shall not sublet or assign the lease of the facilities or any area therein or any rights or obligations thereunder without the express approval of the Executive Vice President for Business Services.

23. In case of fire, casualty or other unforeseen occurrences which render impossible the fulfillment of the lease by the District, the said lease shall be immediately terminated. The lessee shall waive any and all claims for damages as a result of such termination.

24. Lessee shall comply with all the above rules and regulations, the laws of the United States, the State of Arizona, and local municipal ordinances. Violations may result in cancallation of lease and discontinuance of future use of facilities.

25. a. Organizations and groups classified under Class V (profit making in nature) shall pay the base fee as shown on the permit at least twenty-four (24) hours in advance of scheduled performance or entertainment.

The District retains the right to fully examine all ticket manifests prior to the performance and to secure an audit by an agent designated by the District. The lessee agrees to have available all ticket information needed to establish a comprehensive audit for fulfilling the financial articles of the permit.

b. All other Class rentals shall be invoiced within five (5) days after termination of permit. ALL CHARGES DUE AND PAYABLE WITHIN 10 DAYS OF RECEIPT OF INVOICE.

Classification Schedule

There shall be five categories of requestors for use of college facilities:

Class I--No Admission Charge

Maricopa County Community College District organizations
Boy Scouts
Brownie and Girl Scouts
Camp Fire Girls
Other organizations judged by the Executive Vice President for Business Services to fit this class.

Class II--No Admission Charge

Civic)
Service) Organizations--activity is co-sponsored
Educational) by the college
Community)
Other organizations judged by the Executive Vice President for Business Services to fit this class.

Charge--Out-of-pocket cost (direct expense caused by the usage) (each request shall be individually costed by the Business Division)

Class III--No Admission Charge

Civic Organizations
Service Organizations
Church Organizations
Other organizations judged by the Executive Vice President for Business Services to fit this class.

Class IV--An Admission Charge Is Made, But the Organization Is Non-Profit in Nature

Civic Organizations
Service Organizations
Church Organizations
Other organizations judged by the Executive Vice President for Business Services to fit this class.

Class V--Where an Admission Charge Is Made and the Organization Is "Profit-Making" in Nature

Generally, this type endeavor shall not be permitted in college facilities since it tends to place the District in the position of acting in a proprietary nature. Such action can significantly change present insurance coverage (liability). Such requests for use of college facilities shall be judged by the Executive Vice President for Business Services.

Charges are the same as Class IV plus 10% of gross receipts.

NOTE: Any usage request not specifically covered by this policy shall be interpreted and administered under the direction of the Executive Vice President for Business Services.

MARICOPA COUNTY
JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

108 EAST WASHINGTON STREET
P. O. BOX 13349
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85002
252-6661

Glendale Community College
Maricopa Technical College
Mesa Community College
Phoenix College

Distribution:
White Copy - District Business Office
Yellow Copy - returned to Applicant
Pink Copy - to College
Blue Copy - Supervisor of Physical Plant Facilities

PERMIT FOR USE OF COLLEGE FACILITIES

COLLEGE:_____

FACILITIES: (Building(s), Grounds, Room(s))_____

DATE(S) NEEDED: (Specify rehearsal, performance, etc.) List exact hours requested on each date.

Date:_____ Hours:_____

Date:_____ Hours:_____

NAME or ORGANIZATION:_____

PERSON(S) IN CHARGE:_____

STREET ADDRESS & TELEPHONE:_____

PURPOSE:_____

INSURANCE: Amount:_____ Policy No.:_____
Company:_____

Lessee agrees to comply with all federal, state, and municipal laws, rules, ordinances, regulations and orders with respect to the use and occupancy thereof. Lessee, during the term of this permit, covenants and agrees to indemnify and hold harmless lessor from each and every loss, cost, damage and expense arising out of any accident or other occurrance causing injury to or death of persons or damage to property due to the conditions of the leased premises or the use or neglect thereof by lessee. Lessee further agrees to provide, pay for and maintain public liability insurance with both lessor and lessee named as the insured. Lessee agrees that it will pay for any unusual wear, tear, breakage and damage to facility occurring from the public or principals representing the lessee. Subsequent to use of the facility, maintenance staff will inspect the premises to determine that no unusual wear, tear, breakage or damage was done. Should an inspection reveal damages, lessee shall reimburse the lessor for full costs necessary to restore facility to its condition prior to occupancy.

ORGANIZATION RATED: (check one) CLASS I_____ CLASS II_____ CLASS III_____

SPECIAL FACILITIES REQUESTED: (Note: an additional charge is made for all special facilities except tables and chairs).

	# Needed	Charge		# Needed	Charge
Public Address System & Operator		$	Tables		$
Projector & Operator		$	Chairs		$
Light Board & Electrician		$	Parking Attendants		$
Grand Piano		$	Police		$
Studio Piano		$	Extra Custodians		$
					$

CHARGES: Total amount due: $_____
Less Deposit Received: _____
Balance Due: $_____

APPROVED: _____
Executive Dean

Permit # _____

_____ (Date)
Signature of Applicant

_____ (Date)
Approval signature -- District

Charges for Use of Equipment

Item	Rate Since 1966	Proposed Rate 1973-74 Mon.-Fri.	Sat.	Sun.
Public address system or projector w/operator	$5.00/hr w/one mike	$6.00/hr	$7.50/hr	$9.00/hr
Grand piano	15.00/day	25.00/day	25.00/day	25.00/day
Studio piano	7.50/day	15.00/day	15.00/day	15.00/day
Organ, electric	--	25.00/day	25.00/day	25.00/day
All charges are/hr/student on items below				
Biology lab	--	.20		
Chemistry lab	--	.40		
Physics lab	--	.40		
Metal shop	--	.75		
Auto shop	--	.75		
Sewing lab	--	.30		
Manual typewriter	--	.15		
Electric typewriter	--	.30		
Adding machine	--	.25		
Calculator	--	.50		
Posting machine	--	.50		
Steno lab	--	.75		

Rates for Additional Personnel

	Mon.-Sat.	Sun/.Hol.
Guard	$5.50/hr	7.50/hr
Parking attendant	5.50/hr	7.50/hr
Electrician	8.50/hr	11.50/hr
Custodian	5.50/hr	7.50/hr

Rate Schedule Since 1966 and Rate Proposal 1973-74

Facility	Rate Schedule Since 1966 Class II	Rate Schedule Since 1966 Class III	Proposed Rates 1973-74 Class III Mon.-Fri. (3 hours min.)	Proposed Rates 1973-74 Class III Sat. (3 hours min.)	Proposed Rates 1973-74 Class III Sun. (3 hours min.)	Proposed Rates 1973-74 Class IV Mon.-Fri. (3 hours min.)	Proposed Rates 1973-74 Class IV Sat. (3 hours min.)	Proposed Rates 1973-74 Class IV Sun. (3 hours min.)
Classroom	$1.50/hr 2 hrs 1.00/hr after	$1.65/hr 2 hrs 1.10/hr after	$9.00 2.00/hr after	$22.00 7.00/hr after	$27.00 9/00/hr after	$9.90 2.10/hr after	$24.40 7.70/hr after	$29.70 9.90/hr after
Lecture Room	$6.00/hr 2 hrs 4.00/hr after	$6.60/hr 2 hrs 4.40/hr after	$15.00 3.00/hr after	$27.00 9.00/hr after	$32.00 11.00/hr after	$16.50 3.30/hr after	$29.70 9.90/hr after	$35.20 12.10/hr after
Choral Room	$4.00/hr 2 hrs 2.00/hr after	$4.40/hr 2 hrs 2.20/hr after	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "
Gymnasium Without Showers or Lockers			$30.00 8.00/hr after	$39.00 12.00/hr after	$48.00 14.00/hr after	$33.00 8.80/hr after	$42.90 14.30/hr after	$52.80 17.60/hr after
with Showers and Lockers ADD	$20.00/hr 2 hrs 13.50/hr after	$22.00/hr 2 hrs 14.85/hr after	8.00/hr	11.00/hr	8.80/hr	8.80/hr	12.10/hr	16.50/hr
Auditorium	$24.00/hr 2 hrs 16.00/hr after	$26.40/2 hrs 17.60/hr after	$40.00 13.50/hr after	$55.00 18.50/hr after	$70.00 23.00/hr after	$44.00 14.85/hr after	$60.50 20.35/hr after	$77.00 25.30/hr after
Auditorium/Rehearsal	6.00/hr 2 hrs 4.00/hr after	6.60/hr 2 hrs 4.40/hr after	21.00 7.00/hr after	26.00 9.00/hr after	30.00 10.00/hr after	23.10 7.70/hr after	28.60 9.90/hr after	33.00 11.00/hr after
Student Center (does not include Food Services Charges)								
Faculty Dining Area	$6.00/hr 2 hrs 3.00/hr after	$6.60/hr 2 hrs 3.30/hr after	$15.00 5.00/hr after	$27.00 9.00/hr after	$36.00 12.00/hr after	$16.50 5.50/hr after	$29.70 9.90/hr after	$39.60 13.20/hr after
Snack Bar Area	$6.00/hr 2 hrs 3.00/hr after	$6.60/hr 2 hrs 3.30/hr after	$20.00 5.00/hr after	$42.00 9.00/hr after	$54.00 11.00/hr after	$22.00 5.50/hr after	$46.20 9.90/hr after	$59.40 12.10/hr after
Main Dining Room	$10.00/hr 2 hrs 5.00/hr after	$11.00/hr 2 hrs 5.50/hr after	$39.00 6.00/hr after	$54.00 10.00/hr after	$75.00 12.00/hr after	$42.90 6.60/hr after	$59.40 11.00/hr after	$82.50 13.20/hr after
Student Lounge			$18.00 4.00/hr after	$39.00 9.00/hr after	$51.00 11.00/hr after	$19.80 4.40/hr after	$42.90 9.90/hr after	$56.10 12.10/hr after

Facility	Rate Schedule Since 1966 Class II	Class III	Proposed Rates 1973-74 Class III Mon.-Fri. (3 hours min.)	Sat. (3 hours min.)	Sun. (3 hours min.)	Proposed Rates 1973-74 Class IV Mon.-Fri. (3 hours min.)	Sat. (3 hours min.)	Sun. (3 hours min.)
Football Stadium (lighted) (4 hours) includes: Showers and Lockers, 1 Electrician, 1 AV man, 2 PE men, 1 Parking Guard	$250.00	$250.00	$250.00	$290.00	$330.00	$250.00	$290.00	$330.00
Football Stadium (unlighted) (4 hours)			$220.00	$260.00	$300.00	$220.00	$260.00	$300.00
Baseball Field (unlighted)	$10.00/hr 2 hrs 5.00/hr after	$11.00/hr 2 hrs 5.50/hr after	$30.00 5.00/hr after	$40.00 6.00/hr after	$50.00 8.00/hr after	$33.00 5.50/hr after	$44.00 6.60/hr after	$55.00 8.80/hr after
ADD: If lighted			15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00
For Shower and Locker Rooms			25.00	36.00	48.00	27.50	39.60	52.80
Turfed Areas	$5.00/hr 2 hrs 2.50/hr after	$5.50/hr 2 hrs 2.75/hr after	$18.00 3.50/hr after	$23.00 5.50/hr after	$30.00 7.50/hr after	$19.80 3.85/hr after	$25.60 6.05/hr after	$33.00 8.25/hr after
Paved Courts	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
Swimming Pool			$15.00 4.00/hr after	$25.00 6.00/hr after	$35.00 8.00/hr after	$16.50 4.40/hr after	$27.50 6.60/hr after	$38.50 8.80/hr after
Showmobile (plus $1.00/mile trans.)			$30.00 4.00/hr after	$35.00 6.00/hr after	$40.00 8.00/hr after	$33.00 4.40/hr after	$38.50 6.60/hr after	$44.00 8.80/hr after

APPENDIX I

SAMPLE ARIZONA MUNICIPAL RECREATION JOINT USE SCHEDULE, AND CONTRACT FOR FACILITY USE*

*Permission for reproduction has been granted by the City of Prescott, Arizona.

Proposed Joint Use Schedule
City-College Park
Prescott, Arizona

The construction of six (6) tennis courts and a multi-purpose athletic-sports field on Yavapai College property adjacent to the City of Prescott's Whipple Park, will be for educational purpose by Yavapai College and public recreation use by students of the college and citizens of Prescott, Arizona.

As both of these facilities are outdoor facilities, it is to be expected that there will be marginal use of the facilities from approximately November 15 until March 15. As Prescott, Arizona is above 5,000 feet elevation, it is to be expected that occasional use will be made of these facilities in the winter time rather than regular use. The dominant use will be spring, fall, and summer. The City of Prescott has past experience in this type of project and has used the recreation-school facilities use concept for maximum citizen use.

Listed below is a projected day-by-day use of the facilities by Yavapai College and the citizens of Prescott.

Projected Winter Months Use

(A) Weather permitting, Yavapai College's physical education classes would use proposed facilities for tennis instruction, field hockey, soccer, flag football, archery, and similar instructional and physical training subjects. Master schedule of classroom use each term or semester would be posted with the City of Prescott Parks and Recreation Department. As an example, if all

class instruction periods were in the mornings on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, the public would be notified through the Parks and Recreation Department, the hours available to the facilities for public use. Also, use by the public would be made available after the regular school day or on weekends and holidays.

Projected Spring-Fall Use

(B) Yavapai College will continue use as listed under schedule A but the public through the Parks and Recreation would have more hours of use during the fall and spring. Also, the City of Prescott sponsors many after school and twilight type of activity which is open to all citizens of Prescott and past experiences shown that many students participate as teams or individuals in the recreation sponsored activities. As the college size does not foresee that intramural college-only recreation sports programs, but rather in the spring and fall college students would enter into recreation programs such as tennis leagues, softball and baseball programs, flag football, and soccer leagues, under the sponsorship of the local community recreation department.

(C) It is projected that Yavapai College's major use would be September through May. While the City of Prescott's major use is expected to be June, July, and August. The recreation department will utilize the facilities in the summer for a variety of organized sports and free play use. Yavapai College summer sessions will still have the opportunity by schedule, to

use the facilities on a regular basis. The recreation department would have more emphasis in the summer months with tennis instruction and organized play and softball and baseball use of the multi-purpose field.

Resolution

WHEREAS, The Mayor and City Council of the City of Prescott, Arizona and the Board of Governors of Yavapai College at Prescott, Arizona, place importance on community service; and

WHEREAS, The City of Prescott's Parks and Recreation Department has a purpose of fulfilling the Parks and Recreation needs of the community; and

WHEREAS, Yavapai College is a comprehensive community college with a wide range of academic, vocational and community service programs; and

WHEREAS, The City of Prescott has made application to the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for a matching grant of $40,000 to construct six (6) tennis courts and a multi-purpose athletic play field; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Governors of Yavapai College has indicated their desire to commit a segment of the college campus to this cooperative venture as being in the best interest of the college and community; and

THEREFORE, Be it resolved by the Mayor and the City Council and the Board of Governors of Yavapai College as follows:

SECTION I: To construct six (6) tennis courts and a multi-purpose athletic field on Yavapai College property adjacent to the City of Prescott's Whipple Park.

SECTION II: That all construction meet the standards and criteria of the U. S. Health, Education and Welfare Department and the U. S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the building codes of the City of Prescott.

SECTION III: That the City of Prescott and Yavapai College hereby agree that the constructed facilities will be made available to students and the public.

SECTION IV: That joint use would specify a minimum time commitment of 25 years for this activity, and would establish the City of Prescott, through its Parks and Recreation Department, as the agency with responsibility for construction and maintenance of these facilities.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council and approved by the Mayor of the City of Prescott on this _____ day of _____, 1973.

ATTEST:

_____ CITY CLERK

_____ MAYOR

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____ CITY ATTORNEY

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Governors of Yavapai College of the City of Prescott on this _____ day of _____, 1973.

ATTEST:

_____ BOARD SECRETARY

_____ PRESIDENT

APPENDIX J

ARIZONA ATTORNEY GENERAL OPINIONS RELATED TO PHYSICAL EDUCATION FACILITIES*

*Permission for reproduction has been granted by the Arizona Attorney General's Office.

Gary K. Nelson, The Attorney General
State Capitol
Phoenix, Arizona

January 23, 1974

Department of Law Opinion No. 74-5 (R-9)

Requested by: THE ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS

THE HONORABLE JACK J. TAYLOR
Arizona State Representative

Question: Would the use of Sun Devil Stadium by the Billy Graham Crusade, on a reasonable lease basis, violate either the state or federal constitutional provisions regarding the separation of church and state?

Answer: No.

The Supreme Court of Arizona, in a recent decision upholding the expenditure of state funds through the Salvation Army, rejected a narrow, literal interpretation of Article 2, §12, Constitution of Arizona, 1 A.R.S. Community Council v. Jordan, 102 Ariz. 448, 432 P. 2d 460 (1967). The relevant part of Article 2, §12, supra, states:

> No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise, or instruction, or to the support of any religious establishment.

In construing the Constitution of Arizona, the court's language is very instructive:

> The respondents would have us adopt for this case of first impression the strict view that in essence no public monies may be channeled through a religious organization for any purpose whatsoever without, in fact, aiding that church contrary to constitutional mandate. We do not agree that such was the intent of the framers of the above cited constitutional provisions. The prohibitions against the use of public assets for religious purposes were included in the Arizona Constitution to provide for the historical doctrine of separation of church and state, the thrust of which was to insure that there would be no state supported religious institutions thus precluding governmental preference and favoritism of one or more churches. But the doctrine of separation of church and state does not include the doctrine of total nonrecognition of the

> church by the state and of the state by the church. The state constitutional provisions must be viewed in light of contemporaneous assumptions concerning the appropriate sphere of action for each institution. History is clear that as a state evolves from one decade to another the role of the state"transcends traditional boundaries and assumes new dimensions" necessitating a revision of the idiomatic meaning of "separation" to align it with "the new realities if original purposes and expectations are to be realized" . . . . Community Council v. Jordan, supra, 102 Ariz. at 451.

Our court then goes on, with characteristic candor, and rejects numerous theories of judicial legerdemain used by other courts, and simply states that on the facts in their case there was no unconstitutional aiding of the Salvation Army.

In a decision somewhat analagous to the fact situation before us here, and completely analagous to many contemporaneous arrangements between local school districts in Arizona and various and sundry churches and denominations, the Supreme Court of Florida held that the temporary or infrequent use of public school buildings for religious meetings and worship services, usually while new congregations were in the process of erecting their own houses of worship, and without preference being given to any one or group of churches and/or denominations, did no violence to the doctrine of separation of church and state. Southside Estates Baptist Church v. Board of Trustees, 115 So. 2d 697, 79 A.L.R. 2d 1142 (Fla. 1959). Both the Florida constitutional provisions and their statutes are comparable to Arizona's. See A.R.S.§§15-442 and 15-451. See also Attorney General Opinions No. 59-5-L and No. 63-20. Although the annotation following the case (79 A.L.R. 2d 1148), Use of Public School Premises for Religious Purposes During Non-school Time, cites some courts holding a contrary view, there can be little doubt, in light of the language in Community Council v. Jordan, supra, which position our court would take.

Many treatises have been written concerning the federal constitutional provisions regarding the separation of church and state and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court interpreting them. The most recent emphasis of that court has been in construing the numerous state efforts to find a way to constitutionally aid private schools, many of which are operated by churches. This opinion would be unduly lengthened if we were to attempt to include our analysis of even a few of these cases, none of which are in point here. Suffice it to say that we have not found, nor have we been referred to any decision of the United States Supreme Court which would interpret the Constitution of the United States in such a way as to prohibit the use of Sun

Devil Stadium in Tempe, Arizona, by the Billy Graham Crusade on a reasonable lease arrangement with the Arizona Board of Regents and Arizona State University.

In light of the decisions set forth above, it is also our opinion that such an arrangement would not be violative of any Arizona constitutional or statutory provisions regarding the separation of church and state.

Respectfully submitted,

GARY L. NELSON
The Attorney General

GKN:ell

Office of the Maricopa County Attorney
Moise Berger, County Attorney
400 Superior Court Building
101 W. Jefferson, Phoenix, Arizona

October 4, 1974

Mr. H. Ray Shipley, Superintendent
Paradise Valley Schools
3012 East Greenway Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85032

School Opinion No. 74-15

Dear Mr. Shipley:

This is in reply to your letter dated September 26, 1974, asking for opinion of this office in connection with use of 20 cent levy funds collected under the old statute for the construction of "open-air" classrooms, such as playing fields and tennis courts.

The previous version of A.R.S. §15-445 under which these funds were collected did restrict the expenditure of such funds to "erecting of school building."

The issue is whether or not your proposed construction comes under the heading of erecting of school buildings.

There is no Arizona Law which states directly that the construction you propose can qualify as a school building.

In general the Courts have been liberal in interpreting school buildings to include various types of construction such as: enclosed swimming pools (Petition of School Board, 377 P. 2d 4, Ore.); a gymnasium (In re Savannah District, 44 So. 2d 545, Miss.); and a school stadium with attached athletic field, (Nicholas v. Calhoun, 37 So. 2d 313, Miss.).

The only Arizona case that we have is Alexander v. Phillips, 31 Ariz. 503, wherein the issue was whether or not a stadium is a school building.

In holding that the stadium is such a building, the Court declared:

> "A structure whose chief purpose is to provide for the better giving of such competice athletic games and sports as aforesaid is reasonably a school house within the true spirit and meaning of

> paragraph 2736, supra, (giving school districts authority to sell bonds 'for building school houses')."

Although this is a case decided in 1927, the court indicated an attitude of liberally construing the meaning of school buildings. So long as the purpose of the construction is to aid in the educational programs of the school district, the court was willing to allow this interpretation. It should also be noted that the court used the word "structure" rather than building which also indicates that the proposal in question does not have to be a conventional type building. In this case it was a stadium which consisted to spectator stands and an athletic field, without any top covering.

In view of the liberal attitude of the court in the Alexander case, and the interpretations of courts in other jurisdiction, it is my opinion that your proposed construction of playing fields and tennis courts, provided that they are an integral part of your physical education program, could be considered school buildings within the meaning of A.R.S.§15-445.

A copy of this opinion is being sent to the Attorney General for concurrence.

Very truly yours,

MOISE BERGER
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

BY _____
Albert Firestein
Deputy County Attorney

54/9&10

DEPARTMENT OF LAW
OFFICE OF THE
Attorney General
STATE CAPITOL
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

N. WARNER LEE
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
RODERICK G. McDOUGALL
CHIEF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 10, 1974

The Honorable Moise Berger
Maricopa County Attorney
101 West Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Re: Concurring Opinion No. 74-33-C

Dear Mr. Berger:

We are returning herewith a copy of your letter (School Opinion No. 74-15) dated October 4, 1974, addressed to Mr. H. Ray Shipley, Superintendent of Paradise Valley Schools, concerning the use of 20¢ levy funds collected under the old statute for the construction of "open-air" classrooms, such as playing fields and tennis courts.

This office concurs in your opinion.

Sincerely,

N. WARNER LEE
The Attorney General

Ralph Willey

RALPH E. WILLEY
Assistant Attorney General

REW:lf

Enclosure

APPENDIX K

SELECTED ARIZONA LEGISLATIVE BILLS RELATED TO RECREATION FACILITIES

STATE OF ARIZONA
32nd LEGISLATURE
1st REGULAR SESSION

H O U S E

H.B. 2283
Introduced
February 18, 1975

Introduced by Representative Harelson of District 27

AN ACT

RELATING TO STATE GOVERNMENT; PROVIDING THAT MARICOPA COUNTY BE THE FISCAL AGENT FOR THE RIO SALADO PROJECT, THE INITIATOR OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS AND THE ARBITRATOR TO RESOLVE CONFLICTS AND PROVIDING FOR APPOINTMENT OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Duties of Maricopa county for Rio Salado project Maricopa county, through its board of supervisors, shall:

1. Be the fiscal agent to receive and disburse all state appropriate funds for the Rio Salado project.

2. Initiate the creation of a contract or contracts, pursuant to title 11, chapter 7, article 3, Arizona Revised Statutes, regarding the administration of the Rio Salado project between all governmental entities within the scope of such project to insure that each governmental entity affected shall be fairly considered. Such contract or contracts shall:

(a) Provide that Maricopa county shall serve as arbitrator in the resolution of any conflict which may arise between contracting governmental entities, other than those conflicts affecting only a particular governmental entity, such as planning and zoning, if such particular matter does not adversely affect the integrity of the project.

(b) Provide for appointment of a person or persons from each contracting party to serve on an advisory committee to the Maricopa county board of supervisors in connection with planning and carrying out the Rio Salado project.

STATE OF ARIZONA
30th LEGISLATURE
2nd REGULAR SESSION

S E N A T E

S.B. 1072
Introduced
January 12, 1972

Introduced by Majority of Committee on Education

AN ACT

RELATING TO EDUCATION; AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMS; AMENDING SECTIONS 15-302 AND 15-921, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING TITLE 15, CHAPTER 9, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING ARTICLE 5 AND MAKING APPROPRIATIONS.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Purpose

Because the physical facilities and trained staff of our common and high schools represent substantial investments and assets of our communities, an option is allowed by this legislation for the various common and high school boards to make fuller use of these assets through the effectuation of the community school concept which makes the school the community center for year-round, after-hours educational, recreational and social enrichment activities for all citizens. Such a community school may:

1. Provide trained personnel for the community available day and night, year-round.

2. Adapt its facilities, building and grounds to multiple use and to persons of all ages, night and year-round.

3. Develop much of its curriculum and activities from continuous study of people's basic needs.

4. Integrate, insofar as possible, the educational, social, physical, recreational and health programs for children, youth and adults.

5. Make full use of all available resources, both human and material, in carrying out its program.

6. Provide a source of initiative and give initial leadership in planning and carrying out constructive community projects.

7. Promote democratic thinking and action in all phases of its work.

8. Inspire its staff with a desire to be of service in other community life and activities and beyond the usual classroom responsibilities.

9. Expand and diffuse leadership throughout the community.

10. Involve many community persons concerned in planning much of its program.

11. Enrich all phases of the daytime program by use of community resources.

12. Help to develop a sense of unity and solidarity in its neighborhood.

13. Initiate program of usefulness for persons of all ages, classes and creeds.

14. Make its services and staff available for efforts in coordinated living, learning and service activities of other agencies in the community.

15. Help to establish confidence in the minds of people that they can solve cooperatively most of their own community problems.

Sec. 2. Section 15-302, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

15-302. Admission of pupils; defining six years of age; residents; nonresidents; tuition; exclusion of certain children

A. All schools other than high schools and evening or night schools shall, unless otherwise provided by law, admit children between the ages of six and twenty-one years who reside in the district. COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMS SHALL ADMIT PERSONS TO CLASSES AND OTHER ACTIVITIES WITHOUT REGARD TO AGE. A child shall be deemed six years of age if he will reach such age prior to January 1 of the current school year. If a kindergarten is maintained, a child shall be deemed five years of age and eligible for admission to kindergarten if he will reach such age prior to January 1 of the current school year.

B. The governing board may admit children who do not reside in the district but who reside within the state upon such terms as it prescribes.

C. Children of nonresidents of the state may be admitted upon payment of a reasonable tuition fixed by the board.

D. The board may exclude children of filthy or vicious habits or children suffering from contagious or infectious diseases.

E. Governing schools boards may admit children who are actually residents in rehabilitation or corrective institutions.

Sec. 3. Section 15,921, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

15-921. Establishment; admission of students; tuition

A. The board of education of a high school or a union high school or the board of trustees of a common school may establish an evening or night school when in its judgment the school is necessary or convenient. The school shall be open for admission of children between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one years, but this shall not be construed as a requirement for a full course of study therein nor as requiring the admission of a person to a class beyond his educational attainments. The schools shall be open to persons over twenty-one years of age only upon payment of tuition as provided by law.

B. COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMS SHALL ADMIT PERSONS TO CLASSES AND OTHER ACTIVITIES WITHOUT REGARD TO AGE.

Sec. 4. Title 15, chapter 9, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended by adding article 5, sections 15-921 through 15-958, to read:

ARTICLE 5. COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM

15-951. Definitions

IN THIS ARTICLE, UNLESS THE CONTEXT OTHERWISE REQUIRES:

1. "COMMUNITY SCHOOL" MEANS ANY PUBLIC SCHOOL ENGAGED IN A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM.

2. "COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM" MEANS A COMPOSITE OF SERVICES OFFERED BY A COMMUNITY SCHOOL TO THE CITIZENS OF ITS SERVICE AREA DURING ANY HOURS OTHER THAN NORMAL SCHOOL HOURS INCLUDING USE OF THE FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL OF THE SCHOOL YEAR-ROUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION AND RETRAINING, AFTER-HOURS EDUCATION, RECREATIONAL AND SOCIAL ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES FOR THE YOUNG, FAMILY EDUCATION AND COUNSELING, CIVIC AFFAIRS MEETINGS AND DISCUSSIONS, TEENAGER COUNSELING, COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS' ACTIVITIES, SENIOR CITIZEN ACTIVITIES AND OTHER SIMILAR ACTIVITIES WHICH INTEGRATE EDUCATIONAL, SOCIAL, RECREATIONAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND ADULTS.

15-952. Powers of board.

A. THE GOVERNING BOARD OF ANY COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICT OR HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT MAY:

1. ESTABLISH AND OPERATE IN ANY SCHOOL IN ITS DISTRICT A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM.

2. EMPLOY A COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATOR FOR EACH SCHOOL OR COMBINATION OF SCHOOLS ENGAGED IN COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMS. SUCH DIRECTOR SHALL MEET THE QUALIFICATIONS ESTABLISHED FOR SUCH POSITION BY THE GOVERNING BOARD.

3. EXPEND MONIES RECEIVED AS FEES, TUITIONS, GRANTS OR DONATIONS FROM ANY PERSON FOR USE IN DEFRAYING EXPENSES OF THE OPERATION OF A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM PURSUANT TO SECTION 15-953.

4. EXPEND MONIES FOR INSTRUCTION AND SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION WITHOUT REGARD TO THE AGE OF ANY PUPIL.

B. ANY DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MAY ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH ONE OR MORE OTHER DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARDS FOR OPERATION OF A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM, IN WHICH EVENT ONE GOVERNING BOARD SHALL BE DEEMED THE SPONSORING BOARD TO EXERCISE THE AUTHORITY PRESCRIBED FOR THE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD.

15-953. Community school program revolving fund

A. MONIES RECEIVED FOR AND DERIVED BY THE OPERATION OF A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM SHALL BE PROMPTLY DEPOSITED WITH THE COUNTY TREASURER WHO SHALL CREDIT THE DEPOSITS TO THE REVOLVING FUND OF THE RESPECTIVE COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM. MONIES PLACED TO THE CREDIT OF A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM REVOLVING FUND MAY BE EXPENDED FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL PURPOSES BY WARRANTS DRAWN UPON ORDER OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD.

B. THE REVOLVING FUND OF A SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM IS A CONTINUING FUND NOT SUBJECT TO REVERSION, EXCEPT UPON TERMINATION OF A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM.

15-954. Duties of coordinator

A. A COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATOR SHALL:

1. PLAN, PROMOTE, COORDINATE AND ADMINISTER, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD, THE ACTIVITIES OFFERED IN THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM.

2. MAKE USE OF AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR FACILITIES INCLUDING BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL OR SCHOOLS IN ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM.

3. SUPERVISE PERSONNEL AND EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN INSTRUCTION, COORDINATION AND PRESENTATION OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM.

B. THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR SHALL SERVE AT THE PLEASURE OF THE BOARD OF THE DISTRICT.

15-955. Community school attendance for average daily attendance

ATTENDANCE IN COURSES OF A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM WHICH QUALIFY AS PART OF AN ESTABLISHED CURRICULUM FOR A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA, WITHOUT REGARD TO THE AGE OF THE PUPIL, SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE UNDER SECTION 15-1212, SUBSECTION C.

15-956. Community school program assistance; applications

A. ANY COMMON OR HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD WHICH ESTABLISHES A COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM IS ELIGIBLE TO MAKE APPLICATION FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM ASSISTANCE.

B. AN APPLICATION FOR ASSISTANCE UNDER THIS SECTION MUST INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

1. A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM. COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMS MAY INCLUDE ACTIVITIES FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN, AFTER SCHOOL HOURS ACTIVITIES FOR CHILDREN AND ADULTS, CONTINUED AND REMEDIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND ADULTS AND CULTURAL, SOCIAL, EDUCATIONAL AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR CITIZENS IN THE COMMUNITY.

2. A STATEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS TO BE SERVED BY THE PROGRAM AND OF THE TOTAL COST OF THE PROGRAM.

3. A COPY OF THE GOVERNING BOARD RESOLUTION INDICATING ITS INTENTION TO PROVIDE THE TOTAL COST OF THE PROGRAM IN EXCESS OF THE STATE GRANT AND OTHER ANTICIPATED SOURCES OF FUNDING.

4. PROVISION FOR A COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATOR FOR EACH COMMUNITY SCHOOL.

C. FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMS WHICH OBTAIN ASSISTANCE MAY BE PROVIDED FOR A PORTION OF THE COST OF THE SALARY OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATOR IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS.

15-957. State board of education powers; duties

A. THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHALL:

1. ESTABLISH STANDARDS AND QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM ASSISTANCE APPROVAL.

2. REVIEW THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROPOSED FOR EACH COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM AS TO CONFORMITY TO PRESCRIBE STANDARDS AND QUALIFICATIONS, APPROPRIATENESS OF PRIORITIES, WORKABILITY OF PROCEDURES AND OVERALL VALUE.

3. APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE EACH COMMUNITY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE APPLICATION WITH APPROVAL BEING SUBJECT TO FUNDING AVAILABILITY.

B. THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MAY PROMULGATE ALL RULES AND REGULATIONS NECESSARY TO THE OPERATION OF THIS ARTICLE.

15-958. Superintendent duties

THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION SHALL:

1. PREPARE AND DISTRIBUTE ALL NECESSARY FORMS FOR APPLICATION BY ANY SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM ASSISTANCE.

2. ALLOCATE MONIES FROM APPROPRIATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMS APPROVED BY THE STATE BOARD.

3. REVIEW OPERATION OF COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMS WHICH RECEIVE COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM ASSISTANCE TO EVALUATE COMPLIANCE WITH STATE BOARD REQUIREMENTS AND THE PROGRAM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

4. SUSPEND ALLOCATIONS OF COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM ASSISTANCE BASED ON REVIEW AND FINDING OF FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH STATE BOARD REQUIREMENTS OR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Sec. 5. Appropriations; purpose

A. The sum of thirty thousand dollars is appropriated to the state department of education, for the fiscal year 1972-1973, for the purpose of financing the salary of a state coordinator for community school programs and providing the necessary, clerical and other expenses incurred by the department for community school programs.

B. The sum of two hundred seventy thousand dollars is appropriated to the state department of education, for the fiscal year 1972-1973, for distribution to approved community school projects as provided for in title 15, chapter 9, article 5.

Sec. 6. Effective date

The provisions of this act shall become effective July 1, 1972.

STATE OF ARIZONA
32nd LEGISLATURE
1st REGULAR SESSION

S E N A T E

S.B. 1076
Introduced
January 28, 1975

Introduced by Majority of Committee on Education

AN ACT

RELATING TO EDUCATION; AUTHORIZING CIVIC CENTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS BY SCHOOL BOARDS, AND AMENDING SECTION 15-451, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Section 15-451, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

15.451. Use of school buildings as civic center; revolving fund; coordinator

A. The board of trustees may USE OR permit the use OF FACILITIES, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, under its direction, and subject to conditions, rules and regulations it prescribes: ~~,-of-the-school-hours-or-houses-within-district~~

1. As a civic center for the district where the citizens, parent teachers' association, camp fire girls, boy scout troops, clubs and associations formed for recreational, educational, political, economic,artistic or moral activities of the district may engage in supervised recreational activities and where they may meet and discuss, from time to time as they desire, any and all subjects and questions which, in their judgment, relate to the educational, political, economic, artistic and moral interests of the citizens of the respective communities in which they reside. The use of public school houses, FACILITIES and grounds as a civic center shall in no way interfere with use and occupancy of school houses, FACILITIES and grounds as required for school purposes.

2. FOR A CIVIC CENTER SCHOOL PROGRAM CONSISTING OF SUCH COURSES OF STUDY AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AS THE BOARD MAY DIRECT. THE BOARD MAY PRESCRIBE A FEE FOR SUCH COURSES OR ACTIVITIES AND ALL SUCH FEES SHALL BE DEPOSITED PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION B OF THIS SECTION.

B. Monies received for and derived from the use of school facilities under this section shall be promptly deposted with the county treasurer who shall credit the deposits to the civic center school fund of the respective district. Monies placed to the credit of a civic center school fund may be expended for THE civic center school purposes PRESCRIBED BY SUBSECTION A by warrants drawn upon order of the school district governing board. The civic center school program is a continuing fund not subject to reversion, except upon termination of a civic center school program. Upon termination of a civic center school program any remaining funds shall revert to the operating budget of the district or districts.

Sec. 2. Emergency

To preserve the public peace, health and safety it is necessary that this act become immediately operative. It is therefore declared to be an emergency measure, to take effect as provided by law.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agricultural Research Services. Recreational Buildings and Facilities. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Alexander v. Phillips, 31 Ariz. 503, 254 P. 1056 (1927).

Alley, Louis A. "Athletics and Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 51 (October 1974), 102-113.

Alonso, Braulo. "Education and Recreation Programs and Facilities," Parks and Recreation, Vol. 3 (March 1968), 46.

Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges. Arizona Community Colleges: Annual Report to the Governor 1973-74. Phoenix: Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges, 1974.

Arnald, Donald. "Attitudes of Public School and Municipal Recreation Authorities in Southwestern Ontario Toward Policies for Joint Acquisition, Development, and Utilization of School Facilities for School and Recreation Use." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.

The Athletic Institute. College and Universities Facilities Guide for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation by Participants in the National Facilities Conference. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1968.

_____. Planning Facilities for Athletics, Physical Education, and Recreation. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1974.

Bartels, Rodney L. A Handbook of Model School Board Policies for Effective Community Education Programs. Omaha: Educational Policies Development Association, 1973.

Baxter, Sylvester. "Widening the Use of Public Schoolhouses," World's Work (March 1903), 3248.

Beaver, Lyle Burdette. "Evaluation of Selected Administrative Practices for Cooperative Relationships Between University and Public Recreation Departments." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1963.

Benner, Robert Earl. "The Present Extent of Cooperation Between Park Districts and School Districts in Selected Illinois Municipalties Under 150,000 Population." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Illinois, 1956.

Bignell, Edward E. "Pooled Facilities and Services Pay Off," Recreation, 57 (September 1964), 346-347.

Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Bonner, Frances. "School Sight Planning and the Extent of Its Coordination With Comprehensive Community Planning Within the State of Oklahoma." Unpublished master's thesis, Auburn University, 1972.

Brown v. Louisiana, 383 U.S. 131, 86 S. Ct. 719, 15 L. Ed. 2d 637 (1966).

Buechner, Robert D. National Park Recreation and Open Space Standards. Washington, D.C.: National Recreation and Parks Association, 1971.

Butler, George D. Recreation Areas: Their Design and Equipment. 2nd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1958.

Carter v. Lake City Baseball Club, 218 S.C. 255, 62 S.E. 2d 470 (1950).

Castaldi, B. Creative Planning of Educational Facilities. Columbus, Ohio: Council of Educational Facility Planners, 1969.

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.

Cocking, Walter D. "The School--Center of Community Living," Recreation, Vol. 53 (August 1949), 253.

"Connecting Campus, Community and School," Planning for Higher Education, Vol. 3 (October 1974), 1-35.

"Cooperative Plans Yield New Types of School for New Towns," E.F.L. Schoolhouse, Vol. 18 (July 1974), 1-35.

Crawford, Wayne H. A Guide for Planning Indoor Facilities for College Physical Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Crockarell, James. "Ten Right-Now Trends in School Planning," Nation's Schools and Colleges, Vol. 94 (July 1974, 15-17.

Delameter, James B. The Design of Outdoor Physical Education Facilities for Colleges and Schools. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Dewey, John. "The School as a Social Center," Journal of Proceedings. Vol. 51. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1902.

Education Facilities Laboratory. An Investigation of Costs of Inexpensive Enclosures for Recreational Areas. Chicago: Education Facilities Laboratory, 1969.

_____. Guide to Alternatives for Financing School Buildings. Chicago: Education Facilities Laboratory, 1971.

_____. Community/Schools: Sharing the Space and the Action. Chicago: Education Facilities Laboratory, 1973.

_____. Generating Revenue from College Facilities. Chicago: Education Facilities Laboratory, 1974a.

_____. Physical Recreation Facilities. Chicago: Education Facilities Laboratory, 1974b.

Elliott, Allan. "Space and Facilities for Physical Education and Community Use in Public Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1968.

Evans, N. Dean, and Ross L. Neagley. Planning and Developing Innovative Community Colleges. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Finchum, R. N. Extended Use of School Facilities. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, School Plant Management Series, 1967.

Fuller, Buckminster. "Geoview," World Magazine, Vol. 2 (April 10, 1973), 38.

Gans, Marvin. "Suggested Steps in Planning Facilities in H.P.E.R. and Athletics." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1972.

_____. "Providing for Low Cost, Multiple Use, Community-College Facilities for Physical Activity," Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 46 (April 1975), 27-28.

"Gigantic Gym," Nation's Schools and Colleges, Vol. 2 (February 1975), 23.

Gleazer, Edmond J., Jr. This Is the Community College. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968.

Gold, Seymore M. Urban Recreation Planning. Philadelphia: Tea and Febiger, 1973.

Gores, Harold B. "The Future File: Schoolhouse 2000," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 56 (January 1975), 310-312.

Grieve, Andrew. "Physical Education, Athletics, and the Law," Journal for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 45 (October 1974), 24-29.

Hafen, William. "Administrative Guidelines for the Cooperative Use of Public School Facilities for Recreational Purposes by Community Groups in the State of Utah." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1968.

Hall, George L., Executive Director for the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona. Personal telephone conversation, November 1974.

Hallberg, Edmond. "A Cost Analysis of Physical Education Programs in Terms of Utilization of Facilities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1960.

Harlacher, E. L. The Community Dimensions of Community Colleges. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Health, Education and Welfare News. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, June 18, 1974.

Higher Education Comprehensive Planning Program. Inventory of Physical Facilities in Institutions of Higher Education. Raleigh, N.C.: Higher Education Facilities Services, Inc., 1972.

Hodges, Patrick B. "Status and Structure of Physical Education in Public Two-Year Colleges in the Midwest," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 45 (June 1974), 13.

Johnson, William P., and Richard P. Kleva. "Community Dimensions of College Physical Education," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 44 (April 1973), 40-44.

Keesecker, Ward W. "State Laws Permitting Wider Use of School Property," School Life, Vol. 30 (March 1938), 3-7, 24.

Keller, Roy J. Modern Management of Facilities for Physical Education. Champaign, Ill.: Stipes Publishing Co., 1973.

Kelsey, F. Lamar. "Sports Facilities: The New Breed," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 56 (January 1975), 321-325.

Konopnicki, William S. "The Functions of the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges in Arizona from 1960 Through 1973." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1974.

Kraus, Richard G. Recreation and the Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964.

Kullman, Nathan. "School Plant Facilities Desirable for Community Use in a Community-School Program." Unpublished master's thesis, Cornell University, 1950.

Lares, Jess. "A College Serves the Community," Recreation, Vol. 58 (December 1965), 485.

Logsdon, James D. "Role of the Community College in Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54 (November 1972), 197-199.

Lucenko, Leonard. "The Availability and Extent of Use of Public School Facilities for Community Recreation in New Jersey." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Utah, 1972.

Lyser, Herbert S. "A Study of the Procedures Established for the Joint Use of Site Facilities for Recreation by Selected School and Park Districts." Unpublished master's thesis, Sacramento State College, 1961.

Martin, Keith. "The Arts, the Schools, and the Communitywide Resource Center," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 56 (January 1975), 334-357.

Mayer, Mary J. "Our Public Schools as Social Centers," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. 54 (December 1911), 206.

McCoy, William J. "The Community/School/Center," Community Education Journal, Vol. 4 (November-December 1974), 8-10.

Meritch, C. "Physical Educators Plan Facilities," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 45 (January 1974), 32-33.

Mott Graduate Studies Program. How Should Schools Be Used? Two Points of View. Flint, Mich.: The Mott Foundation, 1968.

Myran, Gunder A. Community Services in the Community College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, Community Service Project, 1970.

Olsen, Burton. "A Study of School Sponsored and Co-Sponsored Recreation Programs in the North Central Region of the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1970.

Olson, Gareth R. "Creative Guidelines for Using Multipurpose Sports Facilities," Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 46 (April 1975), 33-34.

Otto, William. "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, Clyde. "Legality of the Use of Public School Facilities by Non-School Groups." Unpublished master's thesis, Duke University, 1965.

Passantino, Richard J. "Community/School Facilities: The Schoolhouse of the Future," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 56 (January 1975), 306-309.

Pendley v. Mingus Union High School District No. 4 of Yavapai County, 109 Ariz. 18, 504 P. 2d (1972).

Pima County Community College. A Study in Growth, 1970-1975. Tucson: Pima County Community College, 1975.

Prescott Community Hospital v. Prescott School District No. 1 of Yavapai County, 57 Ariz. 492, 115 P. 2d 160 (1941).

Pullius, E. V. "Physical Education of the 70's." Speech given at the Western Men's P.E. Association, Reno, Nevada, October 10, 1964.

Quimby v. School District No. 21 of Pinal County, 10 Ariz. App. 69, 455 P. 2d 1019 (1969).

Robin, Keith. Community Participation in the Community College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971.

Royce Independent School District v. Reinhardt, 159 S.W. 1010 (1913).

Sanders, Joan. "An Analysis of Perception of Selected Subject Groups Relating to the Present Status of Physical Education Programs and Facilities in Colorado Junior Colleges." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1971.

Sawaya v. Tucson High School District No. 1, 78 Ariz. 389, 281 P. 2d 105 (1955).

School Board Policies on the Community Use of School Facilities: Educational Policies Development. Waterford, Conn.: Educational Policies Service, April 1971.

Scott, Harry A., and Richard B. Westkaemper. From Program to Facilities in Physical Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Secretary of State. Arizona Revised Statutes, Title 15, Education. Phoenix: Secretary of State Office, 1971.

Shaw, Frederick. "The Educational Parks in New York: Archetype of the School of the Future?", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 50 (February 1969), 329-331.

Smodic, William J. The Law and After-Hours Use of School Facilities. Pittsburg: M/S Press, 1963.

Staubs, Kenneth George. "An Analysis of the Combined Recreation Program of the City of Glendale Parks and Recreation Department and the Glendale Unified School District." Unpublished master's thesis, California State College, Los Angeles, 1961.

Strobbe, John E. "The Year Round School and Recreation," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 43 (March 1972), 20-21.

Sudell, Richard, and D. Tennyson Waters. Sports Buildings and Playing Fields. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1957.

Sullivan, Louis A. "Policy-Making and Implementation by Board of Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1965.

Theiberg, P. R., Special Assistant to the President of Hofstra University. Personal correspondence, May 16, 1974.

Thomas, Jerry R., Doyice J. Cotton, H. Douglas Leavitt, and Judson Biasiotto. "Status of Physical Education in Junior Colleges," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 44 (February 1973), 18-22.

Thompson, John C. Physical Education in the 70's. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Thornton, Raymond H. Communiversity. Irvine, Calif.: University of California, Irvine, 1974.

Thorstenson, Clark. "A Study of the Availability and Extent of Use of Public School Facilities for Community Recreation in the State of Utah." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1969.

U. S. Congressional Record. "Education Amendments of 1974 Community/School Bill, HR 69," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 56 (January 1975), 309.

Weiss, Marvin Wesley. "Coordination and Cooperation Between Community Colleges and Community Schools in Selected Community College Districts." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1973.

Whitt, Robert L. A Handbook for the Community School Director. Flint, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971.

Yarnell, D. A. "A Survey of Physical Education in Two-Year Colleges," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Vol. 42 (April 1971), 36-38.