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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The university's involvement with the surrounding community has become significantly more important in recent years. No longer considered immune from the ills of the deprivation and deterioration of the society around them, the urban universities have redirected their energies for the betterment of the community. Continuing Education Programs sponsored by our nation's universities may have been mandated by the following recommendations:

The universities and colleges of the United States are currently being called upon to expand their traditional educational programs in unprecedented dimensions and to enter new areas of service. Not only is the demand for higher education growing rapidly, but also the need for continuing education in a period of rapid change, technological and otherwise, is greater than ever before. Not to meet these challenges would be to prejudice the future of the present generation. (1)

Wilkinson (2), in her article on special community programs discusses the attention the urban problems are now receiving from institutions of higher education. Basic prerequisites on program planning, community relations, and areas of services are outlined for the improvement of social
interaction of the university with the community.

The urban university has regretably learned of the community's human drive for survival through tragic outbursts of violence and destruction by minority groups. The militancy of the 1960's has opened the door for protest against authority in cases where a social injustice is perpetrated against an individual or group. The confiscation of open lands and the razing of low income housing by Urban Renewal projects will not be tolerated unless realistic alternatives are negotiated before acquisition takes place.

One of the early attempts to institute an urban recreation program was initiated by Columbia University but its planning of facility construction and approach to community relations in dealing with the residents ended in total chaos. Perhaps this incident, which the writer is about to report, was one of the determining factors in the delay of urban groups utilizing university facilities to meet their recreational needs.

Columbia University negotiated a long term lease with the City of New York for 2.1 acres of a 30 acre tract of Morningside Heights Park. The property was the proposed site of a $10 million physical education facility for the undergraduates of Columbia, plus a $1.6 million gymnasium complex for the Harlem community. In addition to the construction costs, Columbia had agreed to finance the annual
expense of services such as sports equipment and sport supervision and utilities to the sum of $75,000. The main physical education complex would be made available for local programs during summer and other vacation periods.(3)

It was evident that the community was not appeased by the university's monetary offering in return for the park land. The mayor and city government were denounced for leasing the site for use by the private institution. Urban leaders were also disgruntled about the political pressure placed on members of the New York Legislature to gain support for the leasing of the public land to Columbia University.

The culmination of community and student protests erupted in the form of campus riots. "Left Wing" students, blacks and non-students seized five university buildings in protest against the gymnasium construction on the proposed site. "The gym project was denounced as racist and a symbol of Columbia's usurpation of neighborhood land without regard for neighborhood residents."(4) The rioters became indiscriminate about which buildings were to be occupied and gave even less concern to the extensive damage they incurred.

In the midst of all this confusion, Columbia's President Kirk announced that the Trustees had agreed to withhold a decision on the Morningside Heights Park gym pending full consultation and negotiations with community and city
representatives. The work stoppage was permanent with Columbia University and the surrounding community both denied the physical education facility which they needed so desperately.

Could such a confrontation with the community have been averted and would Columbia have had the sorely needed facility six years ago? Is the administration to blame in its irresponsible actions in terms of land manipulations, communications and planning? Is it possible for other institutions to avoid similar occurrences in the construction and use of their facilities in the community and by its residents?

Today's universities must accept the responsibility to investigate the need for developing an extensive recreational program on their campuses for community members. In this world of increasing technological advancements, one has to be educated in the art of utilizing the abundance of leisure time now available in a creative and constructive manner.

It is these questions and thoughts which have motivated this study which attempts to develop guidelines to assist administrators and community leaders in implementing productive community recreation programs on university campuses.

The writer sincerely believes that the university based community recreation program is essential to the well being of all who reside in the urban area. The institution of
higher learning can provide the necessary facilities and leadership to operate such a venture and create new alternatives for those who want to participate in physical activities. The City's contribution, through its' Department of Parks and Recreation, in the form of financial assistance and support with personnel, could augment such a university project.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is to determine the pertinent issues involved in the utilization of college and university physical activity facilities by community groups for the purpose of recreation.

Sub-Problems

(1) Identify problems associated with the utilization of college/university recreation facilities by community groups in urban areas.

(2) Develop guidelines for the purpose of directing future university-based community recreation programs.

Significance of the Problem

In view of the lack of current studies in this area, there is an urgent need to provide university administrators with guidelines to assist them in initiating community recreation programs on their campus. The need for a set of guidelines is evident by the lack of such a tool.

Definitions

Recreational Facilities - that space, both indoor and outdoor which is used by physical education, athletics and intramurals for physical activity.
Community - that segment of population situated in a specific geographic area and using the recreational facilities which are indigenous to the locale.

Physical Recreation Activity - that activity which is more concerned with physical exertion and not passive activities such as: chess, arts and crafts and music.

Community Recreation Time - that portion of the normal facility usage not scheduled for institutional activities and therefore made available to the community.

Recreation Coordinator - that individual working as a liaison between the urban community and the institution.

Urban University - that institution located in a city having a population greater than 500,000.

Assumptions

(1) It is assumed that information collected by personal interview will provide data.

(2) It is assumed that data gathered by this study will be significant in the development of guidelines for institutions wishing to open its facilities to outside groups and for assisting those programs presently in operation.

(3) It is assumed that the recommendations made from this study will help improve existing community-university relations and recreational programs in terms of organization and administration.

(4) It is assumed that recommendations for the development of program personnel and the creation of a position of community affairs coordinator will be defined.

Limitations

(1) The study is limited to the investigations of selected urban universities.

(2) This study is limited by the investigations of only those university facilities used for recreational purposes.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Research and writing considering the development and growth of positive university and community relations has been limited. The first segment of this chapter discusses the need for the urban universities to understand their impact on the community and to reassess their commitment in solving social problems afflicting the urban centers. The reallocation of resources by higher education for the improvement of environmental conditions of the urban core has received impetus from the Southeast Chicago Corporation and the West Philadelphia Corporation. The University of Chicago and the University of Pennsylvania, respectively, sponsored these corporations and have been instrumental in coordinating and developing land needs in the use of urban renewal properties adjacent to their campuses.

The second part of this chapter deals with the involvement of institutions of higher learning with the community in their attempts to coordinate the use of campus physical activity facilities. An initial attempt by
Columbia University resulted in a six year delay of the construction of a new multi-million dollar recreational complex. A detailed explanation of the issues of this confrontation with urban members and similar problems encountered by Wayne State University and the University of Illinois-Chicago Circle will be discussed. Additional institutions having conducted urban recreational programs for inner city neighborhood residents are also described.

Community and University Relations

To grasp the significance of a university initiating a community recreation program on its campus, one must first be aware of relationships which have existed between neighborhood residents and university officials. Many social, physical, economic and racial factors complicate the conditions under which administrators and community leaders attempt to rectify decades of urban neglect. The association remained distant between the university and the neighborhood surrounding its campus. Mild tremors resulted when local urban leaders requested the opening of university facilities for recreational purposes.

The writer will examine briefly the literature pertaining to situations which typify the relationships between the urban community and the institutions of higher learning. The issues to be included are: examination of land acquisition, urban renewal and the joint relationships which have existed between the university and the community. In
addition, consideration will be given to those institutions attempting a partial or total commitment to recreation on their campuses. Problems associated with the urban recreation concept are to be discussed on the following pages. These include: legal liability, methods of funding and staff personnel.

Perhaps the most critical issue is that of land acquisition by the urban university for campus expansion. Vehement opposition by community groups has resulted because of encroachment upon properties adjoining the campus. This often creates the loss of low cost housing, displacement of long time residents, and open play areas.

Urban renewal has been the loop-hole by which large metropolitan universities have acquired large tracts of land for campus development. According to Parsons(1) the main provisions provided for in urban renewal projects were the clearance of slums, improving availability of low and middle income housing to prevent further deterioration and progressive rehabilitation of the neighborhood structure. Accordingly, all such acts would increase a sagging tax base of a community operating in the red. The non-profit institution had no intention of investing funds in such projects and by assuming these lands, immediately take them off the tax roles. A confrontation of parties involved is eminent and strong criticism of such practices usually had little effect on future negotiations for community
properties. It is no wonder institutions participating in such maneuvers to acquire land were often criticized.

Skeikholeslami(2) and Morisseau(3) have substantiated these statements and conclude the urban renewal programs entice universities to demolish large tracts of property within the community with little concern for the plight of its inhabitants. The indiscriminate acquisition of lands surrounding the urban campus resulted in continual tension because of the physical and social environment and the racial and economic characteristics of the residents inhabiting these areas.

Morisseau also reports that the rapid growth of the institution does not always result in public conflict but the location of this development seems to be the key factor. He believes that universities have become sensitive to trouble spots in terms of potential growth problems and have used alternative sites for new building construction.

Learn(4) believes that the almost constant threat of further land acquisition by the urban university is viewed by the local citizenry as an insatiable appetite for land. He suggests, to avoid tension stemming from urban renewal, that distinct boundaries be designated to inform citizens to what extent spatial growth is anticipated.

To raze entire city blocks is not the solution of this land grabbing manifestation of the urban university. The destruction of such an area will result in not only the
removal of a tenament district but also untold damages could occur in the loss of the social identity of those families who once lived in that former neighborhood. For this reason, new and innovative measures must be taken to ensure the economic and social survival of certain segments of the inner city.

Nash and Nash (5) advocate a very positive view of the role of the university in its relationship to the surrounding neighborhoods. A total commitment by the university was emphasized in assisting the redevelopment of a deteriorating environment into a thriving community interested in rejuvenating its economic and social structure. Their criticism of Columbia University's handling of the Morning-side Heights "affair" lead them to investigate two successful joint ventures between inner city residents and the university.

First, the University of Chicago embarked on a most ambitious program involving a $200 million investment to coordinate its growth with the surrounding city of which it was an integral part. The formation of the Southeast Chicago Corporation (SECC) created by Chicago University and directed by one of their professors had been credited with easing community tensions and the collection of data for future construction.

Second, the University of Pennsylvania was credited with taking Chicago's SECC lead in its inception of the
West Philadelphia Corporation (WPA). Both organizations are concerned with coordination of land needs in urban renewal, development of housing to attract professional and blue collar workers, and the improvement of the local school system.

The concern for the redevelopment of urban dwellings and commercial structures is only one side of the coin. Such a face lift without a total commitment to the elimination of those social ills affecting the inhabitants of this revitalized environment will only result in its features slowly sagging to expose the old wrinkles of neglect. To alleviate such an occurrence, a complete understanding of the causes of social problems and a sincere effort to resolve them will be investigated.

Banovetz(6), Ylvisaker(7), and Duhl(8) corroborate in their belief that an increased awareness of community problems must be realized and a vigorous effort made to correct social problems which technological advancements created. The universities must dedicate more time and effort to public service in an attempt to find solutions to the deteriorating cities of which they are a part. Elimination of intellectual research is not expected but its priorities must be attuned to the responsibilities of ridding the urban community of many of its debilitating problems. Complete blame cannot be placed directly on the institution of higher learning only, but the community's skeptical view of the
university's intentions must be altered through increased lines of communications. Aggravating many situations is the traditional "town and gown" split, "which the community residents tend to view the academicians with hostility and suspicion, and are in turn viewed with a curious blend of aloofness, humor and distain."(9) Complete understanding of each one's role in community affairs has to be clearly defined before fruitful negotiations can take place.

Levine(10) discusses priorities of the university's responsibilities to the community and the allocation or reallocation of the institution's resources to meet societal needs. He wants an investigation of what will happen to the university if the problems are not resolved, what problem has priority and what crisis will arise if solutions are not discovered. He concludes:

It is true that the university should contribute to the solution of major problems threatening the well being and maintainence of society and if it is also true that wise allocation of societal resources in the service of overarching social goals must recognize the current nature of the problems as well as the distance to be traveled in solving them, then it follows that university discussions not only must be informed by a vision of the future but also must be made in accordance with an incisive picture of the current state of that society.(11)

Levine stresses that the university is a key figure which must direct its human material resources to bear on solutions of problems threatening the total existance of the urban society. The question is, will the institution
of higher learning devote sufficient time and money to make more than a token effort in resolving significant issues that inevitably could destroy its very existence.

Raines(12) investigated those institutions already working with community groups to determine their effectiveness in solving urban problems. He found that significant contributions were made by those programs undertaken independently or in cooperation with other community groups and agencies which direct the educational resources of the college towards serving individual, group and community needs.

The investigation does not end with a statement of the problem but it must initiate innovative methods of implementing proposed solutions for social change. To assist in the achievement of these goals, Woods(13) has formulated three specific university obligations in its role with community affairs. They are as follows: (1) the university must direct more research capabilities to analyzing and understanding the facts of urban life. (2) Corporate citizenship when the university as an organization impinges directly on urban development, i.e., civic ventures of university into city areas and more contact with city officials and solutions to the crisis of the day. (3) The universities and their facilities have an obligation to take stands on larger public issues of urban areas not immediately related to the organizational interests of the
camps, i.e., urban politics, public affairs, poverty and ignorance of the urban area.

Communications and cooperation are the stalwarts of any successful organization and such factors are essential in the development of a sound community-university relation. Patton(14), in a later article, stressed the need for mutual awareness of the contribution each could make to one another in the ever growing complexities of the urban cities. The preservation of identities of the institution and the neighborhood working together as one in community affairs is essential. An intimate relationship will assure their very existence in a nation and world growing more and more dependent upon one another.

Expressed by Solnit(15) and substantiated by Lauter(16) is the urgency of mutual cooperation and good will gestures conveyed by the universities and the avoidance of the "house of intellect" image. "If universities are to develop successfully, allowance must be made for a novel interdependency between 'town and gown'." The call for complete coordination of university and community is stressed in an effort to stimulate a healthy environment comprised of faculty, students, staff and residents. Physical growth must be relevant for the betterment of the community as well as the university and excess land grabbing tactics must be avoided.
To stimulate a mutual effort of "town-gown" unity, Banovetz has suggested the following:

1. Survey the faculty to determine what expertise may be utilized.
2. Encourage college participation in areas that contributions can be made for the betterment of the community.
3. The university should frequently encourage faculty members to become involved in community affairs so that they can identify with the community.
4. Formal college recognition to be given to faculty involved in community programs, released time and ranked in importance with research and publishing for consideration in promotion and tenure decisions.
5. Increased input in the solving of community problems and to work with community leaders through a liaison committee.
6. Improved public relations to upgrade the image of the university. (17)

In a number of instances a new position has been created on the university level to coordinate such functions as listed above. This official is usually designated community relations director or liaison and his duties include the soliciting of suggestions from community groups to their needs and respond to their reports of program impact, procedures and results.

The liaison cannot be a figure head but he must be assured of participation in policy making. In addition to a thorough knowledge of the inner workings of the institution, the community liaison must acquaint himself with outside resources that can provide services to the community which the university cannot or does not have available. The official is responsible for the organization
and administration of the program and strives for the following:

Provisions for changes based on continuous evaluation accomplishments and developing needs; to assure flexibility of plans as an underlying philosophy to be prepared for changing and unexpected demands; to maintain continuous communications and direct contact with the community through visits, telephone conversations, meetings, conferences, correspondence and newsletters; to encourage community groups to make suggestions with the understanding that explanations will be given of implementation is impossible; to educate the community through use of seminars, tours, workshops, orientation sessions, lectures, films and other techniques; to stimulate involvement of various segments of the community, whether on a voluntary or planned basis; to maintain that patience which is a sine qua non is understanding and brings out the best in each group; and to strive for objectivity, optimism and perseverance that meets the challenge of working with a variety of groups and personalities. (18)

In the pursuit of these objectives, the community liaison can become engrossed in numerous administrative problems which result from continual staff turnover; complaints of discrimination regarding age, race, sex, income and religion; demands for quotas to represent various groups; demands to have requirements waived; and political pressures. (19) The implementation and commitment to the community recreation program must remain constant and not subject to continual policy changes because of administrative problems.
University-Community Recreation Relations

The inadequate recreational facilities of urban areas has become a critical issue in the inner city because of the increased congestion and deterioration of the surrounding environment. Numerous social disturbances have occurred as a result of the lack of sufficient play space. Seymour Gold substantiates this with his reporting of the findings of the U.S. Riot Commission Report as to the priority placed upon recreation by the urban community. Gold states:

Among the 20 cities that accounted for the 24 most serious disorders, grievances relating to recreation were found in 15 cities and were ranked of first importance in three, second in one, and third in four cities. (20)

In many of our metropolitan cities, these sorely needed facilities can be found on the campuses of institutions of higher learning. In recent years, a handful of universities have implemented new and innovative programs in recreation and leisure services for members of the surrounding community. Although, in several instances, the impetus was the result of social conflict between the community and the university which later lead to relationships and then blossomed into cooperative partnerships.

A growing number of urban universities have accepted the challenge of providing leadership in the role of coordinator of community recreation. A deep awareness of the
needs of those living in the immediate area surrounding the campus and a strong commitment to meet those needs has enriched the prospects of additional recreational space.

The Columbia "Affair" had created bitter resentment among community residents towards the university because of its insensitive approach in campus expansion. Lack of communication with neighborhood leaders in the proposed acquisition of local park land for Columbia's new gymnasium complex was the spark that ignited a very volatile situation.

Nash and Epstein(21) reported that a survey conducted shortly after the campus unrest, indicated only 26% of those opposed the gymnasium construction and the reasons stated were: (1) loss of park land for the children and (2) the acquisition of land grabbing for campus expansion. It should be reiterated that Columbia had designed a separate but connecting gymnasium for the Harlem Community. Undoubtedly, early communications, cooperation and involvement by all interested groups of the urban area in conjunction with university administrators and planners, could have resolved the conflicting viewpoints before the riots occurred.

The importance and potential of improved relationships between the university and the urban community for the betterment of the quality of life for all those living there has been recognized. The Carnegie Commission on
Higher Education stated:

The troubles that beset American higher education today are sharpened by the crisis of American cities. Pressure created by urban problems reinforce the demands from within our colleges and universities for reassessment of higher education's priorities and functions. The challenge is to forge a new relationship between the campus and the city that will both aid the city and revitalize urban higher education. (22)

Higher education is now committed to the investigation of new programs which encourage members of the surrounding community to utilize the university's recreation facilities. On the following pages, the writer will discuss a variety of formal and informal programs which have been or are presently being conducted, in cooperation with the universities, to coordinate community recreation on campus facilities.

In 1969, the Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation published a feature article called "Sports as Agents of Change." (23) It provided information for innovative programs in professional preparation of recreation majors and details of the NCAA's National Summer Youth Sports Program as well as a project initiated by the University of Pennsylvania in which a group of inner city boys were invited to campus to participate in a six week Summer Recreation Workshop.

Out of this workshop came the following implications for college and university involvement in a university
Our colleges and universities revise their existing programs, as well as increase opportunities for meeting the needs and interests of the culturally disadvantaged. The professional preparation of physical educators, as well as all educators, should include more practical experience in working in the disadvantaged areas to develop a better understanding of the people they will later be attempting to teach. The colleges wide variety of facilities and employment opportunities should be available to the disadvantaged youth, in order to develop skills for leisure time and later life.

Hartsoe and Gerstein(25) emphasize the urgency of community relations and discuss the unique collaboration of Temple University, the Philadelphia Recreation Department and the Board of Education in a joint effort in planning recreation for surrounding neighborhoods. The major tasks associated with the projects included:

(1) Developing an exemplary recreation program at each of these locations that will provide expanded recreation opportunities for all segments of the population. The opportunity to concentrate resources in a demonstration area and to pool planning talent from the three institutions, (2) Mobilizing appropriate resources within city government, school district and university that will contribute to the development of a well rounded and diversified recreation program at each of these locations, (3) Establish a Community Recreation Coordinating Council whose purpose would be to bring representatives of private and governmental recreation agencies and other interested organizations and individuals into association for the purpose of joint recreation planning for the betterment of the community.

The specific objectives of the coordinating council would be:

- to increase community understanding of recreation
opportunities available; to consider areas of cooperation and endeavor to prevent unnecessary duplication of efforts among agencies, to promote high standards of services, to study cooperatively the changing recreation needs of the community, to develop techniques to coordinate recreation services in the designated area, and to consider joint training programs for the staff and volunteers in public and private agencies in the area. (27)

This unique triad epitomizes the determination of a group striving for the revitalization of a depressed environment through community recreation. The availability of faculty and student expertise, are an integral part of this innovative program.

The most extensive coordination of facilities of higher education for recreational purposes has been conducted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The NCAA has instituted a nationwide National Summer Youth Sports Program (28), directed by colleges and universities located in or near large urban cities for the benefit of disadvantaged youth. Institutions not geographically situated in the inner city, may still qualify if it is feasible, to serve a specified number of city youngsters. Good facilities are a prerequisite and these are utilized in the creation of numerous physical fitness and sport activities with the assistance of staff personnel.

The Project is a joint venture of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEA), the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports (PCPES) and the NCAA. The NCAA has
contacted this federally subsidized program from the President's Council and NCAA member institutions are responsible to the national organization.

The report specifies detailed guidelines under the following headings: (1) Objectives (2) Programming (3) Program Organization and Structure (4) Program Financial Management (5) Other Program Resources.

A very ambitious summer youth program had been conducted by Trinity College of Connecticut, prior to the inception of the NCAA's program. In 1974, a policy change in terms of programming was instituted and a shift from primarily athletic skills to those of cultural and artistic activities took place. Guidelines of the program were as follows:

(1) The main purpose of this program is to offer primarily cultural and artistic activities not currently available in other city-run recreation programs, making the best use of the Trinity College facilities available for that purpose. (2) The program will take place on the campus of Trinity College, utilizing such facilities as the Field House, Darkroom, Dance Studio, Stage and Auditorium, facilities in the Ferris Athletic Center and the field and grounds of the college. (3) Any youngster living in the city of Hartford will be eligible to participate. Children living beyond walking distance will be given tokens to take the bus. (29)

The complete details of program operations have been compiled by Ivan Bacher (30) Director of Community Affairs, in his Annual Report.

Berrafato (31) (32) writes that higher education is becoming increasingly socialized, public-oriented,
publicly aided and public-policy conscious. He stressed the growing awareness of the university's responsibility to the public sector surrounding its campus. Reasons are given for the needed involvement by the university to contribute to the immediate betterment of the local neighborhood. The first step is the coordination of institution and community into working committees. Program organization to initiate community recreation is outlined with the assistance of a Neighborhood Relations Office.

Methods for investigation to the feasibility of such a program in terms of needs and interest of those participating in activities are reviewed. In closing, the author suggests a review of the tentative programs and then proceeds to list steps to their implementations.

A very voluminous report was compiled by Taylor Thompkins(33), Director of the Community Leisure-Learn Program, at the University of Pittsburgh. This First Annual Report described the Leisure-Learn Program as a multifaceted project which offers the following: regularly scheduled gymnasium programming; its regularly scheduled swimming program, the special interest groups, the Community Exceptional Adapted Activities Project; educational/training projects, the NCAA/National Summer Youth Sports Project, and of course, the Administrative Board and other Citizen-input aspects of the total program.(34)
The Leisure-Learn Program is in its seventh year of service and is presently under the auspices of the School of Education's Division of Teacher Development. Although this program is separate from the Physical Education Department, they work closely together in program operations. The Leisure-Learn project is completely funded with "hard monies" and not dependent on Federal grants to sustain it.

The basic philosophy of the program is to make the physical education and athletic facilities of the University of Pittsburgh available to the residents of the local neighborhood who are not usually considered a part of the university family. This year-round program seeks input from its clientele and by means of the Citizen's Administrative Board their voices are heard. The Constitution and By-Laws of the Board are included in their entirety in this report.

Other areas discussed in this comprehensive report included: (1) development of recreation para-professionals (2) workshops and classes (3) programming (4) personnel (5) attendance and (6) budgeting. The Leisure-Learn Office had developed an information booklet 'discussing policies and procedures for employees and prospective employees.

James Gillis(35), Director of Boston University's Human Environment Institute, informed the writer of the development of a Sports Activity Program for the elementary school youngsters of the city of Boston. The students are bused several times per week from different parts of the city to
Boston University's Physical Education Complex where they participate in sports activities for several hours per session.

The duration of this sport program is eight weeks, at which time the participants have the option to terminate their involvement or continue for one additional full week in an outdoor camp setting. The camping experience will take place at the university's campgrounds and the youngsters will engage in a modified Outward Bound program.

Program objectives are the development of the psychological, social and physical awareness of the youngster to those around him and to his environment. Also, the integration of Boston's youth from various sections of the city to engage in activities of mutual interest, is the prime factor for the inception of this program.

Cornelius Goodwin(36), the Coordinator of the Community Recreation Program at the University of Illinois-Chicago Circle, reports the progress of the first months of the community's utilization of the campus recreational facilities. He includes a complete listing of activities offered, time schedules, attendance records, budgets and staffing as well as the names of those community agencies participating in the program.

Insistance of neighborhood residents to determine what activities will be offered is emphasized. Procedures for the use of facilities are outlined in the following
categories: (1) handling of requests for use (2) scheduling (3) admission policies and (4) supervision. It should also be noted that the local sponsoring agency is responsible for screening members of their groups which use the facilities.

Wayne State University sponsors one of the more established community recreation programs on their campus but it is controlled by the community residents rather than the institution. All policy making decisions, staff hiring and operational procedures are handled by the community people.

Fred Kane (37), former Program Director of the Matthaei Community Program, stated the goals of the recreation program as educational and developmental and they are not to be limited to only the area of physical activity. Kane also mentioned in this summary that a Community Board and a Faculty University Committee had been formed with the latter being inefficacious. Criterion for hiring staff and the implementation of an In-Service Training Program under the auspices of the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation were mentioned.

Hunter (38), speaks to the question of legal liability and authority of a state university to open its facilities for the benefit of local neighborhood youngsters. He refers to a state law that declares: "Wayne State University shall be maintained by the State of Michigan, and its facilities shall be made equally available and upon the same basis to
all qualified residents of this state." The question is whether the university can limit its clientele to the campus area for the community recreation program or accommodate all comers. His interpretation of the law is that the university is obligated to provide for opportunities for persons living in the outlying areas of the city. This ruling could jeopardize the entire university based community recreation concept if the law was enforced.

Although many institutions rely on participants signing liability waivers, Hunter suggests that this attitude could create a false sense of security on the part of the staff and the university. As a safeguard, liability insurance should be purchased by the university to protect itself in the event of a successful claim.

Hoop(39) is concerned with the problem of financing university based recreation programs and discusses a number of the previous assumptions by which applications for funding were made. Money is tight and only innovative programs will receive support. The Federal Government is especially disgusted with the investment of large sums of money on traditional programs which have not gained significant results.

In seeking Federal funds the following guidelines were presented:

(1) change the "thrust" - convince the Federal Government that you are not using monies to deal with existing technology at the community level (2) your
program will generate new information about how to handle a problem or demonstrate a way of handling a problem (3) the solution that you are going to demonstrate or evolve will generalize to the nation as a whole or to a large segment of the population (4) you will have to become better at selling your program.(40)

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Campus has initiated a unique community athletic program as part of their Club Sports Program. The Basic Guide to Club Sports developed by the intramural department includes a clause which states:

"clubs may wish to admit community members. The number of members is limited only by the number that can be accommodated by a club. In cases where the number wishing to participate is larger than the number which can be accommodated on a team, selection of players will be made by club members subject to final approval by club advisor or coach."(41)

The program's main emphasis is on individual sports where open competition in organized meets, sponsored by the university, is allowed. A facility user fee is charged to all non-students which includes faculty, staff, and community residents. For membership, the community resident is charged a fee of $7.50 per semester and $3.50 during summer school.

This comprehensive guide includes numerous forms for the Club Sports Program as well as a lengthy section on general policies and procedures.

Kraus(42), Dexter and Sherman(43) view university based community recreation programs as an obligation to the citizens surrounding the urban campus. Total involvement
in an effort to provide leisure services include: arts, entertainment and aesthetics of passive recreation and leisure. The commitment has gone beyond the program stage and

"enlists the expertise of the university to create facilities and area: from buildings, to quiet lounges, to game rooms, to grassy areas, to campus scenery and lighting, to entertainment, trips and outings."(44)

The writers expressed the necessity of the university to recognize the urban community as a viable force in its affect on the institution's decision making process on those matters directly or indirectly having a bearing on their everyday life.

Johnson and Kelva(45) of Brookdale Community College express the responsibility of the community college to reach all citizens within a specified geographic area in terms of higher education and recreational skills. The obligation is placed upon the college's Physical Education Department to institute four specific programs: (1) fitness learning laboratory(profile) (2) community athletic programs (3) walk-in recreation opportunities and (4) adult life fitness enhancing courses.

The Brookdale proposal is given as an example of alternatives for community residents to participate in programs sponsored by the college. One segment of their program would allow post-high school community residents to compete on college teams, provided medical clearance and
insurance coverage are obtained. The walk-in recreation program makes the gymnasium and all auxiliary facilities available for residents with supervision and instruction in physical activities. Specific activities and a discussion of the potential of Brookdale's fitness laboratory and possible spin-off programs are investigated.

Foothill Community College(46) followed the lead of community service provided by its institution in the academic area into the recreational field. The report emphasized the need for a comprehensive recreation program with all the physical education facilities of the college made available to the community when not in use for regularly scheduled classes and activities. The physical education staff provided instruction in a variety of activities and a nominal fee was charged for this service. It was found that attendance remained constant and a greater appreciation existed when the individual had made a financial commitment.

Kutch(47) reports the joint venture of Napa College and its surrounding community to provide adequate recreational facilities after their individual efforts failed. Both were interested in constructing an aquatics facility but neither had sufficient funds to build the swim center which was necessary to meet their needs.

After several bond issues were defeated for additional financing of the community pool, the recreation director contacted the administration of Napa College with the
proposal of consolidating their funds for pool construction. As a result, an olympic size pool was funded and the agreement for use provided that the college would utilize the facility during the regular school hours and the recreation department would conduct its program in the evening and on weekends.

The writer, primarily through personal correspondence, was able to secure information on a limited number of institutions which in some capacity allowed community groups to use campus facilities. As expected, neighborhood organizations have last priority on available space, behind classes, athletics, intramurals and faculty-staff.

Canisuis College of New York has scheduled the gymnasium one night per week during the academic year for neighborhood groups. A one mile radius was designated as the boundary line from which "block groups" could be considered eligible to participate in the program. In the summer months the facilities are opened up for a six week period during June and July for community recreation.

Leach(48) in a one page summary describes a four week summer youth program conducted at Western Illinois University that provided staff and facilities for a group of 26 inner city high school students. The criteria for selection were given and the activities were designed to increase the motivation of the participants. Exposure to academic, cultural and social functions was also considered an integral
part of the campus visit.

The University of San Francisco extended the use of its facilities to community groups but it resulted in a lawsuit. During a sports contest, a neighborhood resident was injured on the athletic field and a liability claim was filed against the University. As a result, outside groups must procure adequate insurance before permission is granted and usually the coverage is one million dollars property damage and public liability.

San Francisco has made their physical education and athletic complex available for state tournaments, championships and fund raising benefits but a very substantial fee is charged if community groups wish to use the gymnasium. Application for a waiver of the rental fee can be made to the Vice-President for Student Development.

Boston College has recently completed a new physical education building and has attempted to off-set financial cost of this facility by selling memberships for its use. During the summer months, the college enrollment drops drastically and it is at this time that the sports complex is made available to community residents.

A fee schedule is incorporated and the charges are as follows: alumni, friends of the college and community residents are charged $125 per family or $75 per individual, faculty-staff $40 per family or $20 per individual, and students buy in for $15. It should be quite apparent that
the high membership dues completely excludes the people of its inner city to utilize this facility.

The following institutions indicated that demands on the facilities from regularly scheduled functions prevented them from opening their facilities to surrounding neighborhood groups. They were: Phoenix College, Columbia University, New York University, Brooklyn College, City College of New York, Queens College, Springfield College, SUNY-Albany, Cheyney State College, University of Alabama, Howard University, Wichita State University, Trinity University, Oklahoma City University, University of Illinois, University of Detroit and the University of Chicago.

Summary

Higher education's commitment for the betterment of the urban environment has received significant impetus over the past decade. Increased understanding of social and racial problems has created new areas of study at many urban universities in an attempt to reclaim a deteriorating society.

The movement in university sponsored recreation programs has not received the attention that other socially oriented programs have. Perhaps the Federal Government and higher education does not consider this form of social interaction a key factor as a rehabilitating agent in the inner city. This could prove to be a great oversight on their part since several of the organized programs on the
campuses today were born out of controversy and have grown into a healthy adolescent without a major incident. A very positive attitude exists between the university and the community where this relationship, through recreation, has developed.

Present trends indicate a very limited number of institutions will be developing university based recreation programs on their campuses. Many will continue to allow incidental use of their facilities as a stop-gap to quiet those requesting recreational time.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter contains the description of the methods and procedures used in this study. The following topics are discussed: (1) the sample and criterion for selection, (2) procedure used for construction of the data-gathering instrument, (3) and a method of gathering and analyzing the data.

The Sample

The writer contacted 105 colleges and universities in 71 cities that were engaged in providing recreational activities for urban youth through the NCAA's National Summer Youth Program. Since these institutions were conducting summer sports programs for disadvantaged children of the inner city, it was assumed that they would be the most likely candidates to continue a similar program on a year round basis.

Evaluation of responses received from the inquiry sent to institutions participating in the NCAA National
Summer Youth Program indicated that only five universities were engaged in organized urban recreation on their campuses. They were: University of Illinois-Chicago Circle, University of Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh, Temple University and Wayne State University. As a result of numerous telephone conversations and letters of correspondence, the interviews were arranged with the program directors of those institutions having formal recreation programs for the neighborhood residents.

**The Instrument**

The open-end questionnaire interview technique was selected to obtain the desired information concerning university based community recreation programs.

The open-end questions are those that supply a frame of reference for respondent's answers, but put a minimum of restraint on the answers, and their expression. While their content is dictated by the research problem, they impose no other restrictions on the content and manner of respondent's answers. (1)

The personal interview technique has been rated superior to the self administered questionnaire technique. Kerlinger(2) stated the following reasons as distinct advantages of the interview method of gathering data and he is supported by Good and Scates.(3) The reasons were: openness and flexibility, depth, interviewers able to clarify misunderstanding, ascertain a respondent's lack of
knowledge, detect ambiguity, to encourage cooperation and achieve rapport with interviewee. Also a respondent will sometimes give unexpected answers that may indicate the existence of situations not originally anticipated.

All interviews were recorded on tape to eliminate the necessity of note taking or the need for immediate recall after the sessions. This method has also allowed for repeated analysis of their answers by the writer. Permission for taping was granted prior to the interview.

The review of a recreational survey conducted by Krause(4) was reviewed for ideas in the formulation of the questionnaire. All questions were stated as concisely as possible and constructed to secure the desired information for the study. The following areas of interest were selected for inclusion in the schedule: (1) administrative aspects (2) communications (3) finances (4) facility use (5) program content (6) personnel (7) additional comments.

The questions used in the schedule were selected from more than 200 designed by the writer. Screening was conducted by university associates to detect problems of duplication, ambiguity, misunderstanding and conciseness. The final step was the pre-testing of the schedule before taking it into the field for data collection. The interview questionnaire then was tested for the continuity and length of time needed to complete the entire session. It was estimated that 40 minutes was the least amount of time
needed when questions were answered briefly.

**Method of Gathering Data**

The writer proceeded to contact those institutions which were engaged in offering recreational services to the neighborhood residents and then traveled to their campuses to interview the director or coordinator of the university-based community recreation program. The emphasis was on recreational services and no limitation to the length of response was made.

**Analysis of Data**

The case study method will be used to analyze the data. Good and Scates discussed the merits of this process in the following statement:

> The essential procedure of the case study method is to take account of all pertinent aspects of one thing or situation employing as the unit for study an individual, an institution, a community or any group considered as a unit. The case consists of the data relating to some phase of the life history of the unit or relating to the entire life process, whether the unit is an individual, a family, a social group, an institution, or a community. The complex situation and combination of factors involved in the given behavior are examined to determine the existing status and identify the causal factors operation.(5)

Good and Scates also report that statistical techniques are employed when cases are classified and summarized to reveal frequencies, types, trends, uniformities or patterns of behavior.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The data were analyzed according to the following headings: Administration, Communications, Finances, Facility Utilization, Program Content, and Personnel. Henceforth, Urban Recreation On Campus will be designated by the letters UROC.

Analysis of Data

The data collected during the course of the investigation are presented in tables. The table will list a brief statement to represent the particular item of the questionnaire being discussed. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A. In addition to the tables, each section will have a brief comment to clarify the statement and to expand on pertinent information recorded but not computed in the responses listed.

So the reader will not be misled, it should be known that although N=5, the number of responses in the frequency
column will record higher than that sum. This is a result of the interviewee giving multi-responses to a particular item of the questionnaire.

The writer has investigated those institutions actively engaged in promoting community recreation on their campuses as a university commitment to the surrounding neighborhood. A brief observation of those universities, also located in urban areas, not opening their facilities to the local residents and their reason for not doing so will also be discussed.

**Administrative Aspects**

**University Commitment.** The results of the questionnaire for this segment of the survey are reported in Table 1. Responses to these questions were quite similar in that the Directors of the UROC programs felt a very strong responsibility in terms of meeting the needs of the community of which they were an integral part.

The motivation for the creation of a neighborhood recreation program on their campuses was not generated from within the institutions. The impetus was the vivid demonstrations against the university's attitude of indifference towards the development of a constructive program on their campus to meet the community's recreational needs. The writer was informed that the recreational facilities
of Wayne State University were taken by force, windows des-
troyed, and the building held in siege until university
administrators agreed to provide activity time for the com-
munity. The present UROC Director felt that the recreation
problem was used by special interests groups to promote
their cause against numerous other social and racial prob-
lems not at all associated with the urban recreation ques-
tion.

University of Illinois-Chicago Circle had a similar
incident to that of Wayne State University in that immedi-
ately upon the completion of its spacious complex, wide
scale vandalism and looting occurred. This developed before
the local citizenry was informed of the university's intent
to make the facility available for an urban recreation pro-
gram. A joint community-university committee had been in
operation before the completion of the building to discuss
program and facility usage for the neighborhood. Once this
point was clarified, the problems associated with the dis-
turbance at the facilities were dramatically reduced.

The three remaining institutions investigated had a
mild transition into the role of urban recreation coordi-
nators. Only the Director of the UROC Program at the Uni-
versity of Pittsburgh indicated that the development of the
UROC Program resulted from verbal confrontation with com-
munity residents and not one of malicious nature.
TABLE 1
Response to Questions on University Commitment to UROC in Relation to Administrative Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Opening of facilities</td>
<td>a. Community pressure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Reduce racial tension</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Token response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. University's commitment to community</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Philosophy of UROC</td>
<td>a. Introduction to new sports activities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Socialization factor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Calm community unrest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Public relations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Resource center for community programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Services provided UROC</td>
<td>a. Facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scheduled facilities</td>
<td>a. Regularly scheduled</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Occasionally scheduled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Drop-in</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each institution investigated reported a sincere effort to extend itself into the urban core as a resource center and to eradicate the image of a "land grabbing monster" of urban properties. The universities were also the focal point of extensive recreational facilities surrounded by inner city sprawl which attracted the neighborhood youth since no public facilities existed in the area. This factor played heavily in the institution's decision to cooperate with local agencies in adopting a feasible UROC program.

Reduction of hostility, discontent, demonstrations and destruction toward the university were all compelling forces in their decision to develop a UROC program.

Role of the UROC Director. In addition to those responsibilities normally associated with such an administrative position, as illustrated in Table 2, the directors discussed some of the more significant aspects of their office. The emphasis is on the director's ability to expand the present UROC program with the utilization of those resources available upon request.

The UROC Director at Temple University, fostered the concept of inter-institutional cooperation in providing a resource flow in and out of the University to service their program. Wayne State University also advocates the inclusion of university resources to extend the perimeter of UROC. Why not investigate the contributions that the Medical School, Performing Arts Department, Dental College or Home
### TABLE 2

Response to Questions on the Role of the UROC Director in Relation to Administrative Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Responsibilities of UROC Director</td>
<td>a. Community-University liaison</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Administrator program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Activity leader</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Director of UROC is a member of the physical education staff</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Director of UROC established committee of all local agencies</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UROC Director is a member of community committee of which coordinates recreational programs</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Alternative facility suggested when university not available</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economics Department could possibly make if properly cultivated?

Three institutions listed a joint university-community coordinating committee. Only the one at the University of Pittsburgh is a functional body which continually determines UROC programming and policy. This body included all interested citizens, local agencies, a member from the Pittsburgh Parks and Recreation Department and the UROC Director. A similar committee was formed at the University of Illinois-Chicago Circle to hire the initial staff and design the policies of the UROC program. The Director stated that the committee is no longer functioning and believes it should be reactivated.

Item number nine of the questionnaire received a variety of responses in the interpretation of the intent of suggesting alternate recreational facilities to those of the university. The Director of the Pittsburgh UROC program viewed this method of service to the community as subtle harassment and a means of discouraging local residents from requesting future space. He believes that the community is aware of the availability of all recreation facilities in their neighborhood and if such space was available, they would not approach the university.

University of Pennsylvania's Director of Community Related Recreational Program, insists that alternative areas for recreational use by the community are available but not
utilized. He referred to the increased demand on University of Pennsylvania's activity space during holidays and extended vacations when the elementary and secondary schools are closed. He has urged community representatives to approach the city Board of Education and request them to open what he described as outstanding facilities in the local schools.

The Director of the University of Illinois-Chicago Circle UROC program discussed a similar problem with the continual requests from local agencies to make time allotments for gymnasium use. He reports that a number of these agencies have adequate facilities for recreation but since they depend heavily on volunteer help to conduct their program, the quality and leadership for recreation is lacking. Consequently, the maintainence of these facilities begin to deteriorate and the requests to utilize Chicago Circle Campus activity space increased.

Wayne State University reportedly rented a gymnasium from a church in the area to provide facilities for their community basketball league. The cost has since become prohibitive and this solution to space needs has be discontinued.

The Trumbull Store Front Center in conjunction with VISTA has been supported by the University to help with child care and develop programs in arts and crafts. An old gymnasium on campus, in addition to the new recreational
complex has also been made available for evening activities in the UROC program.

The director is not just an administrator but one who must relate to the needs of the community by continually seeking input and providing feedback to community residents. It is only by working intimately with the participants of the UROC program and functioning as a liaison for the university, that a director can hope to coordinate a successful program.

**Program Policy.** The administrative guidelines are quite similar in the response to questions numbered 10, 11, 12, in Table 3, in that these were no more than organizational formalities. The only contractual agreement that was specific in nature was the one Wayne State University required of all groups outside of the regularly scheduled UROC program. The agreement insured the University that the outside organization had secured a "hold harmless" insurance policy covering injury or damages which might occur during the groups function on campus.

The methods used to identify community residents involved in UROC displayed a variety of procedures. The program at the University of Pittsburgh developed a most elaborate technique of providing identification cards for all neighborhood participants. The residents completed a general information form either at the directors' office or through one of the local agencies active in the UROC program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response (N=5)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Organization chart developed</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Geographic boundaries limiting UROC population</td>
<td>a. Model Cities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Walking distance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Determined by community &amp; Office of Campus Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. No restrictions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Facility request form required</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Contractual agreement required</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Screening of UROC participants</td>
<td>a. UROC Director</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Participating agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Community Relations Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Response (N=5)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Methods of identifying UROC participants</td>
<td>a. I.D. cards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Picture I.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Color code I.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Sign-in check list</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. UROC Program evaluation</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The I.D. card was then issued to the participant on a monthly basis and was color coded to simplify checking upon entrance to the gymnasium. The sex of the participant was designated by M or F printed on the card and on the reverse side the complete gymnasium-pool schedule for the UROC program was listed.

The issuance of a monthly card affords the university and local agencies the ability to continually monitor the levels of participation by individual or group visitation. This method also allows the agency to redistribute UROC I.D. cards to other residents who were not able to use facilities because of a shortage of cards. The University Leisure-Learn Office mails a certain allotment of these cards to community agencies which can then issue them to new persons or renew the old card holders. Since the participation rate in relation to the number of cards issued is low, the director allots twice as many cards as there is room for recreators.

Temple University will take the lead of University of Pittsburgh and use color coded I.D. cards. University of Illinois-Chicago Circle subscribes to the use of a yearly I.D. system. Wayne State University selected the photo I.D. which is more accurate but considerably more costly. In addition to the regular enrollment card, the resident is also requested to give information on the condition of
his health and ability to swim. All those enrolled in the UROC program at Wayne State University are screened to determine their level of swimming ability.

University of Pennsylvania requires local agencies to submit a list of names of those individuals which they will be sponsoring to use facilities. Upon entering the building the individuals give their names to a receptionist who gives clearance. If the group supervisor was not already in attendance, the participants were not allowed to go beyond the entrance until he arrived and assumed responsibility.

The boundaries delimiting the area from which UROC participants could come were determined by joint community-university committee. In all cases, it was understood that the immediate environment was of prime concern in the plans of service to the community. Since all institutions are public, consideration is given to groups beyond prescribed limits, but only if it does not exclude the regular scheduled UROC program.

No formal method of evaluation had been used to appraise the status of UROC programs or the procedures used in their operation. Wayne State's UROC Director stated that they had hoped to achieve certain goals as a result of a successful program. He gave the following statement as a measure of evaluation for the value of the community recreation program. They were: "reduction of hostility toward the University, reduction of fist fights between
faculty, staff and students with community residents, and reduction of vandalism."

**Local Agency Involvement.** The two items in Table 4 show the ineffectiveness of agency to play a significant part in the development of UROC. A very candid opinion of those agencies involved in the UROC program was that they were not able to contribute due to the lack of staff, finances, or control over those individuals they sponsored.

**Summary**

The inauguration of the Urban Recreation On Campus (UROC) program had considerable impetus because of the demands of community residents. The university administrators of the UROC programs have made a sincere commitment to utilize the campus and surrounding area as a resource center for the betterment of the local residents. The role of UROC Director is to coordinate facilities and programs as well as act as a community-university liaison. The method of identifying UROC participants and restricting unauthorized persons from entering recreational facilities has created problems. To alleviate this situation, the institutions have established a variety of I.D. systems ranging from check-ins, to photo I.D.'s to color code I.D. cards. No formal method of program evaluation had been developed but the change of the community's attitude toward the university administration, faculty and students was determined to be significant in subjective terms. Local
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response (N=5)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Local community service agencies assistance in UROC</td>
<td>a. Screen participants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Distribute I.D. cards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Coordinating council member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. No involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Agency monetarily responsible</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non-profit agencies sponsoring individuals for participation in UROC did little else in program operations.

Communicative Aspects

Program Feedback. The degree of feedback on the UROC program by both the community residents and the university family has been minimal. Although Table 5, Item 19, records a variety of complaints lodged by the citizenry, most were very infrequent and superficial. All the directors subscribed to the open door policy to encourage suggestions for modification of the present program. At the University of Pittsburgh, all persons affiliated with the UROC program or the University were invited to air their views on the urban recreation program at regularly scheduled joint university-community committee meetings.

Problems brought forth that were deserving of further investigation were handled by the Director of UROC. Considerable time and energy were consumed in the attempt to verify complaints of locker room thievery by UROC participants. Many of the accusations were unfounded and frequently university students, staff and faculty members were actually to blame, either because of their carelessness or the perpetrations of stealing.

Community Relations. A most significant comment arose as a result of the responses to item number 24 as listed in Table 6. A "qualified" yes had been given by two of the directors when asked to elaborate on the change in attitude
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Complaints of UROC participants</td>
<td>a. Insufficient space 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Insufficient time 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Harassment by university students 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Lack of understanding 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. None 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. UROC participants able to express grievances</td>
<td>a. Yes 5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Committee investigation of UROC problems</td>
<td>a. Yes 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. University personnel complain of UROC</td>
<td>a. Yes 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
toward the University on the part of community residents. The Department of Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics had definitely gained the confidence and respect of community residents because of their working relationship with the University's personnel handling the UROC program. The reduction of hostility was much in evidence as university personnel and community residents co-recreate without fear of impending violence.

Unfortunately, the university in general does not enjoy the same type of community relations as does Health, Physical Education and Recreation. The institution was still considered suspect because of their encroachment upon low cost housing and numerous play areas. Suspicion, curiosity and distain are the attitudes held by most local residents toward the faceless administrations controlling the modernistic sprawl of new buildings in their old neighborhood. The personalized contact with administrators of the UROC program has humanized the university on a grassroots level but has not been successful changing the overall "establishment" image of the university.

Several UROC Directors believed the initial support for urban recreation was a token or stop gap affair to pacify the residents. The "public relations" aspects as noted in item 26, Table 6, was a factor in the institution's sudden awareness in meeting recreational needs for the local residents. The university's sincerity in its'
### TABLE 6
Response to Questions on UROC Community Relation Effects In Relation to Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>University-Community coordinating committee for UROC</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Negative affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. No affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Community leadership of UROC</td>
<td>a. Enlist political support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Organize neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Program development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Public relations dominate factor</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
commitment does, on occasion, change to a "show and tell" affair in publicizing what the university is doing for the community.

**UROC Information.** Perhaps this paragraph sidehead and the title of Table 7 is a misnomer. The lack of continual flow of pertinent information to the community participants of the UROC program and university personnel was most evident. Sporadic publications and features in local tabloids publicized particular activities or business reports, not weekly happenings. No method has been developed to continually keep all persons of the university family abreast of the happenings of UROC.

Wayne State University distributes information leaflets to the schools in the immediate area of its institution to inform them of specific activities. Recently, during the search for a new community liaison of the UROC program, information was disseminated throughout the schools that there would be a partially suspended program until a new administrator was hired. The availability of such a network of communication to large numbers of school children for a UROC announcement is a most helpful system. All UROC information concerning policies and procedures of university facility use was simply that which was posted in certain activity areas.

Improper communication or the lack of it can often create embarrassing situations for administrators. It was
TABLE 7
Response to Questions on UROC Information
in Relation to Communicative Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Informing university personnel</td>
<td>a. Campus newspaper</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Feature articles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Community paper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Report of Community Relations Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Informing UROC participants of policies</td>
<td>a. Mailed information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Posted information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Verbal information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Lack of communications creates avoidable problems</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
most evident that no systematic framework for the dissemination of UROC information had developed. Such a "hit or miss" approach often results in a breakdown of communication and the misinterpretation of directives learned second or third hand. It is evident that this area should be one in which prime consideration is given in any organization if it hopes to foster understanding and avoid confusion.

Summary

The UROC Director's "open door" policy has perpetrated a sound basis for the assimilation of program input and feedback when working with community residents. The problems of lack of adequate time and facility space for the UROC program are understood and not considered legitimate complaints. In some instances, faculty members have complained of thievery during simultaneous activity periods but allegations could not be substantiated in most cases that a UROC participant was involved.

The change in the community's attitude towards the Physical Education Department was significant but the university in general was still considered a stranger in the community. Public relations had been a factor in the initiation of the UROC program in hopes to quiet the disgruntled neighborhood residents but little evidence can be seen that this reason exists today.

Program communications and information of the policies and procedures of facility use were limited. No systematic
communicative network had been developed to inform the participating agencies, community residents and activity leaders of the UROC happenings.

Financial Aspects

Operational Funds. The UROC programs are almost totally financed from the general funds of their respective supporting institution as an ongoing commitment to the community that surrounds their campus. The exception is Temple University's Urban Recreation Program which is funded for the next three years under the auspices of a Foundation Grant. Despite the disparity of operational budgets, as noted in item 32 on Table 8, the directors of UROC felt that monetary support was adequate. This does not mean additional funds are not necessary to expand the programs, but the present availability of facilities has limited their offerings which reduces or stabilizes present costs.

In four of the five institutions investigated, seed money was sown by both private and foundation funds. The University of Pittsburgh received a $10,000 grant from the Mellon Foundation to conduct a pilot urban recreation program for the neighborhood surrounding that campus. In similar instances, Temple University was given $45,000 by the William Penn Foundation. Wayne State University of Detroit accepted funds from a local publisher to initiate an urban recreation program on their campus.
The University of Illinois-Chicago Circle received its funds from the chancellor's office as an attempt to develop the UROC program and dampen community unrest over the lack of recreational space.

Since the initial contribution to the organization of a UROC program at University of Illinois-Chicago Circle, the operating funds have been transferred to the Physical Education Department which is responsible for administering the program.

Racial tension and the threat of vandalism stimulated the institutions of higher learning in recognizing the need for positive action by the administration. As a result, the inception of the UROC concept was to become a reality with the investment of university funds and community resources.

The investigation of federal grants as a primary or supplemental source of financial assistance was not considered. In one instance, the Director of UROC applied for a federal grant as a subcontractor for a modified summer day-care program but the aid was denied. Another director felt it was the responsibility of the Neighborhood Relations Office of his university to apply for such aid if it did exist. The directors of the UROC programs all believed that the fact that budgets were "hard money" funded assured the community and themselves of the commitment by the universities. "Soft money" funding left them uneasy and
very skeptical of what the chances of continual growth and stability would be under such a financial arrangement.

The University of Pennsylvania was the only institution that did not have a budget for its UROC program. The Director of campus recreation also administered the urban recreation schedule and his office simply absorbed the cost for community recreation. Although no dollar figure was given, it appeared to be a very modified program as compared to the other institutions investigated and therefore a token investment.

Wayne State University was the most active in seeking community resources to broaden its services to the neighborhood youth. Contributions from the United Community Services, camperships sponsored by the Detroit Youth Board and transportation donated by a city transit company has allowed UROC to expand itself beyond the boundaries of campus. A federally funded hot lunch program had provided nutritional foods for those participating in urban recreation on the university campus.

Although there is a significant difference in the total budget figures of participating institutions as noted in item 32, Table 8, all of the directors believed a significant contribution has been made in providing the neighborhood residents the opportunity to participate in a variety of activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Methods of funding UROC</td>
<td>a. University general funds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Federal funds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Foundation funds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Private funds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Inquiries for Federal funding</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Indirectly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Present UROC budget</td>
<td>a. 35,000-45,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. 45,000-55,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 56,000-65,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Not directly funded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**User Fee.** The UROC programs have been unanimous in their position, as indicated in item 33, Table 9, on the refusal to levy user fees for services or facilities provided to the local community. It was not envisioned to be a self supporting or profit making venture. In most cases, the participants come from the lower socio-economic level families and would be unable to engage in a "pay for play" situation. In the case of state or city supported institutions, the argument of double taxation has been echoed when others have considered the possible adoption of a fee system. Individuals do not like to pay fees to use facilities already built and funded by their tax dollar.

The University of Pennsylvania, being a private institution, assesses groups participating in the UROC program a fee for use of their facilities. Individuals are not charged but the agency sponsoring the group has to pay a $2.00 per hour fee. When a group requests time in the swimming pool, the charge is the hourly rate paid to the student life guard on duty.

The Director believes that the small fee takes some of the personal aspects out of dealing with a large variety of groups. Neighborhood agencies do not take the program for granted nor the attitude that the facilities are open whenever they wish to recreate. On occasion, this fee system has made it easier to refuse a group for nonpayment of the specified fee for facilities previously used. In this
situation, the Director felt it made his job less complicated in controlling community use of the university's facilities.

Groups located outside of the geographic boundaries, item 34, Table 9, of the UROC program do have limited access to the university's facilities but at a standard rental rate which is determined by the type facility requested and the function held. The most widely scheduled events are those of the state high school tournament variety which need a large facility in a centrally located area. The rental fee for such events are based on the gate receipts or a flat rate determined by the total seating capacity of the facility.

Many non-profit organizations have also used the universities facilities but at a drastically reduced rate. In most instances the only expense billed to the group was that of custodial service required before, during and after the event. Several fraternal and ethnic groups have scheduled annual tournaments for the day and were charged custodial rate. All space allocation is based on the availability of the requested facilities and not in lieu of the regularly scheduled university activities or the UROC program.

The University of Pennsylvania has taken the outside user situation one step further than the other institutions investigated. The lack of adequate and accessible recreational space in the urban area has been recognized by the affluent. Continual pressure from the personnel of the University-City Science Center Project lead to utilization
### TABLE 9

**Response to Questions on User Fees in Relation to Financial Aspects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response (N=5)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. User fees for UROC participants</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Fees for participants outside of UROC Program</td>
<td>a. Flat rate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Custodial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Based on gate receipt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Faculty, staff and dependent user fee</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Fee for control or income</td>
<td>a. Control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Income</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Not considered</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of campus facilities for their staff and a modified membership arrangement devised.

The Science Center Project Director had been given ten passes which allowed individuals to enter and use the University of Pennsylvania's recreational facilities at a specified time. The passes cost approximately $150.00 a piece and were purchased by the company for distribution to its employees on a rotating basis. The cards are the responsibility of the office secretary and must be requested in advance of the day to be used. The staff member pays a deposit and picks up the pass on the day he schedules and must return it to the office the following morning. This arrangement has been on a trial basis and thus far there has been no problems. Such a commercial venture could prove very profitable to the institution if its facilities were extensive enough as not to interfere with regularly scheduled university activities.

Fees, for the purpose of traffic flow and control of UROC users, has not been investigated but considered a feasible way of modifying the "in and out" behavior of certain participants. Since time for activity is limited and group entry to the facility the usual procedure, it has not been necessary to institute such a system.

Although faculty, staff and dependents may use the campus recreational facilities at no cost, there is strong consideration being given to the levying of a fee in the
near future. Presently, guests of university personnel using the recreational facilities do pay a fee.

**Outside Contributions.** Wayne State University indicated that on several occasions the Women's Club of General Motors and concerned private citizens had made small contributions to the urban recreation program. Two additional institutions indicated small sums were contributed to the support of UROC but could not name specific organizations since the assistance was insignificant to the total budget. The local agencies and neighborhood residents, as reported in item 37 and 38, Table 10, have not been approached nor have they voluntarily offered financial assistance to the UROC program.

Fund raising ventures have not been a beneficial way of securing monies for support of the program. The bake sales, car washes and other traditional methods used by community groups to raise funds have been frowned upon by the urban community. The director of the UROC program also believes that it is unwise to consider this avenue of funding because of lack of interest by the urban residents, the limited amount of funds to be raised and the liability to support a continual program on such a basis.

**Summary**

Several of the early UROC programs were the outgrowth of seed money provided by private or foundation funds. Presently all are financed through the general funds of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response (N=5)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Charitable organization contributions</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. UROC participants contributions</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
university, with one exception, Temple University, which is operating under a three year foundation grant. The investigation of Federal funding had not taken place and several of the directors inferred that they would not like to depend on "soft money" for their existence. Contributions by participating agencies and community residents for the support of the UROC program were not in evidence.

One institution sold memberships to a research foundation, affiliated with the university for use of their recreation complex. These passes were distributed on an appointment basis and had to be returned to the main office after the day it was used.

Recreational Facilities

UROC Utilization. All the universities made whatever facilities not previously scheduled for a university function, available for the UROC program, with the exception of the University of Pennsylvania. The indoor tennis courts and ice skating rink are operated as a semi-commercial venture and members of the university family are required to pay a fee for their use. The UROC participant must also pay the admission charge if he wishes to take advantage of these areas.

Item number 40, Table 11, lists the responses of local recreational facilities used by the university students. As indicated, all directors responded no, primarily because very little was available or comparable
space could be found on campus. The directors followed their statement with the point that the majority of the student body were commuters to the outlying suburbs. The point being that they were taking advantage of facilities all over the city and therefore opened more time for UROC scheduling. Intramural sports on the urban campus were in evidence but the ratio of student population to number of participants was quite low compared to a more residential type campus.

The problems of simultaneous or separate use as noted in items number 41 and 42, Table 11, were merely incidental to the activity engaged in by the participants. Several altercations arose as the result of competitive situations of the game. In general, university students did not complain of the UROC participants utilization of the campus recreation areas. The large influx of community residents has discouraged serious minded individuals from attempting to complete rigorous workouts during joint recreational sessions because of limited space.

**Facility Construction.** The responses listed in Table 12, are primarily concerned with problems which arose from the design of the recreational structure. The most frequent complaint is the accessibility resulting from numerous doors which prevent control of those entering the facility. Too often, community youths would enter with a UROC I.D. card and proceed to open one of the exit doors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>39. Facilities available</strong></td>
<td>a. Indoor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Outdoor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. All recreational facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40. Use of local recreation</strong></td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities by university students</td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41. Problems with simultaneous</strong></td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university and UROC use</td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42. UROC and campus recreation</strong></td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separate</td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12

Response to Questions on Recreation Building in Relation to Facility Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>43. Problems with facility design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hazardous areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Locker room design</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44. Lands formerly urban renewal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45. Demonstrations against construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and allow friends to enter which had not been screened by the director's office.

Door alarm systems were suggested to curb illegal entry but the fact is that this method of control only acknowledges someone has opened an exit door. By the time you get to the door location, scores of persons could have entered and have mixed with those scheduled to be there. Several institutions have resorted to chaining the doors at the risk of being given a summons for violation of the safety code. It was assumed the violation would possibly be overlooked by university safety inspectors. The blocking of fire exits can be a most dangerous solution to the control of traffic flow in and out of the recreational complex.

Individual door monitors would be prohibitive in terms of financial costs. Therefore, the UROC Director has to rely on educating the urban residents of the importance of keeping unauthorized persons out if they do not want to jeopardize their opportunity to use the facilities. Overcrowding is not the primary problem of illegal entry but the increased potential of thievery and vandalism is the most significant factor.

Locker room design came under fire because of the inability for proper supervision and security. Separate dressing facilities were considered necessary in order to eliminate the problems where UROC participants
and university personnel utilize the same area.

**Scheduling.** The priorities of facility use remains in the traditional mode as listed in item number 46, Table 13. One attempt to move UROC activity time scheduled from the last position to that on par with campus intramurals is taking place at the University of Pittsburgh. It is the contention of the Director that if the program is a regularly budgeted department of the university, specific time allotments must be made and not left to what time remains after physical education, athletics, intramurals and campus recreation.

Presently, all institutions participating in UROC open facilities to the community at times when no other regularly scheduled university function is in operation. This often leaves the community program with an alternating schedule with a variety of evening and weekend hours. More consistency in scheduling has promoted increased attendance and a greater variety of activities and included a wider range of age groups serviced.

**Participant Use.** Great concern is given to the method by which the UROC participant should be allowed to enter and utilize the recreational facilities. The program directors agree that group entry with an agency supervisor to control participants is the best method to monitor facility use. Item 49, Table 14, indicates that three of the five institutions involved in urban recreation programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response (N=5)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46. Priorities of use</td>
<td>a. Physical Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Athletics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Intramurals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Campus recreation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. UROC program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Time of use for UROC</td>
<td>a. Weekend</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Evening</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Daytime</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Requirements for UROC</td>
<td>a. Insurance coverage</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Request form</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will not permit local residents to go beyond reception area unless accompanied by a group leader from the area agency.

The group entry method enables the receptionist to become familiar with group members and prevent unauthorized persons from passing the reception desk undetected. The agency provides the university with a check list of residents they are sponsoring and individuals are checked-off as they enter the building. Individual entry has been permitted when adults insist on using facilities without going through the agency screening. These persons are only allowed to use recreational areas when the UROC program is in operation and not whenever they wish. Individual admission is to be discouraged if proper control and adequate supervision is to be maintained. The agency approach and group entry affords the participants and the university the best method to insure a safe and productive program.

The control of equipment issued to participants in the UROC program has lacked a professional approach to insure its return. Item 51, Table 14, shows three institutions having no prescribed method of guaranteeing equipment return when recreating in university facilities. One university used the system that the participant leave his I.D. card when obtaining a piece of equipment and upon return of said item he would get the card back. Since individual I.D. cards only cost 50 cents, the equipment
### TABLE 14

Response to Questions on Participants Use of Recreational Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. Method of entry</td>
<td>a. Individually</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Individually and group</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Recreational equipment provided</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Method of equipment control</td>
<td>a. I.D. card</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Security deposit</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Supervisor responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. No system</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Un-authorized participants</td>
<td>a. Door monitors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Security guard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. No system</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Security guards to reduce vandalism and un-authorized entry</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
room manager ended up with a drawer of cards and no athletic gear by the end of the year. The financial cost of replacing stolen or damaged equipment has become an economic factor that can no longer be ignored.

The agency supervisor or the university recreation leader has also been involved in securing the necessary equipment for the particular activity engaged in by UROC participants. The supervisor goes to a centralized equipment cage and is issued the necessary items for that particular group. At the end of the session, it is the responsibility of the supervisor to return whatever he borrowed. This arrangement seems to have the most merit in keeping a well stocked equipment room and reducing expenditures.

Three universities insinuated that the location of their facilities necessitated the employment of several security guards. The inner city institutions with buildings open in the evenings, have found that security personnel is necessary to reduce unauthorized entry, thus helping to decrease the incidence of thefts.

Programming. The UROC directors fostered the belief that the program participants should determine program content and that they should not impose a ready-made activity schedule upon them. In theory this approach seems very democratic and conclusive in generating a variety of activities but this did not materialize. Items number 53
and 54, Table 15, indicates that the community makes program selection and the choice is team sports.

The philosophy of the UROC program was an attempt to introduce community residents to those activities not readily available in the urban setting. The "exposure" theory resulted in an underdeveloped picture of what the program was planned to look like. As a result, the UROC Director at the University of Pittsburgh, made a deliberate attempt to decrease the emphasis on basketball during the UROC time period.

He approached the problem of de-emphasizing basketball by limiting the number of playing courts available during the UROC session. He then proceeded to place sport standards for such net games as volleyball, badminton and tennis on the remaining floor space. The necessary equipment to play the different sports was made available and the program leader often demonstrated the activities. That was the extent of formal instruction and from there it was considered a challenge for the UROC participant to play the game. With the program leader and supervisor as opponents, their interest was stimulated at the thought of "whipping" the staff. Informal instruction often accompanied such encounters with the UROC participants continually inquiring the "whys and hows" of the game. Programs designed specifically for female participation is not encouraged and the trend is for all activities to be
coeducational. The UROC weight training program at the University of Pittsburgh is made up of approximately 40% female membership. Men are encouraged to attend a variety of dance classes which have been dominated by women in the past.

Item number 57, Table 15, substantiates the earlier comment about the reluctance of the UROC participants to shun formal instruction in individual and dual sports. It seems their attention span for organized instruction is quite short and attendance drops dramatically when leaders insist upon using this approach to activities. Paddleball is one sport where the above situation has occurred. All the directors of UROC were quite perplexed by this refusal to accept fundamental guidelines in certain activities.

Summary

All indoor and outdoor recreational facilities were made available, when possible, by the sponsoring university. The simultaneous use of facilities by the university family and UROC participants demonstrated the ability to recreate together without incident.

Problems associated with the facilities construction centered on the number of doors which allowed unauthorized persons to enter the building during the UROC program. Separate locker room facilities for UROC participants solved the problem of community youths stealing from university persons. It was felt that group entry of UROC
TABLE 15
Response to Questions in Relations to Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54. Community determines program</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Activities offered</td>
<td>a. Individual sports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Dual sports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Team sports</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Activities only for women</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Evening hours discourage women and children</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Reluctancy to participate</td>
<td>a. Formal instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Informal instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Individual and dual sports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants to the recreational facilities was far superior to individual entry.

Scheduling of facility time for UROC was determined by availability of space after regularly scheduled university functions. The priority of facility use was: physical education, athletics, intramurals, campus recreation and then the UROC program. Co-educational activities have been advocated for all offerings in the UROC program. Formal instruction in these activities have been rejected by the UROC participants.

Personnel

Personnel Recruitment. The development of a competent UROC staff can be a most difficult assignment for any program director. Item number 59, Table 16, shows only the tip of the iceberg when one is considering the recruitment of personnel for the urban program. Qualifications, place of residency, financing and committee approval are some of the issues involved in the hiring of UROC staff.

It has been a general policy that the coordinator of the UROC program be a resident of the community of which he is serving. To engage an administrator from outside the neighborhood was considered an attempt to foist a university person on the community residents. The program coordinator is responsible to the UROC Director in the administration of the urban recreation program. Strong sentiments against such a stipulation has grown in recent
years because of the added pressures placed on the coordinator by dissatisfied area residents.

The hiring process in some UROC programs has created obstacles in selecting individuals needed for supervisory positions immediately. At the University of Pittsburgh, job descriptions are distributed to all agencies and interested citizens in the community. All applicants are interviewed and the community residents committee has the final approval for the employment of the individual.

Wayne State University and the University of Illinois-Chicago Circle have operated under similar guidelines in that the program leaders and assistants are to be hired from the neighborhood population. Since these are payed positions, the community believes the local youths should have the opportunity to fill the jobs because of the very high unemployment rate for that age group.

The Faculty Representative of UROC at Wayne State University, has found that many persons employed under these conditions are interested in the monetary return of the program and have little interest in what is being done. He believes the hiring of adults and physical education and recreation majors would improve the quality of the program, simply by adding more consistency in instruction and supervision.

The UROC Director of Wayne State University, has strongly opposed the continuation of the University's
appropriation for the funding of salaries for the UROC personnel. He contends that the Detroit Parks and Recreation Department must assume the responsibilities of providing staff for the UROC program and Wayne State's personnel be used in an advisory capacity. At the same time all the university's recreational facilities would be placed at their disposal to develop an activities program.

He stated that the Detroit Parks and Recreation Department has conscientiously or unconscientiously used Wayne State as a crutch to support recreation in Model Cities "A" without giving any assistance. Looking at an overall master plan of the development of Parks and Recreation facilities in Detroit, a very noticeable exclusion of city operated facilities for recreation in the university area is evident. Consideration for new construction by Parks and Recreation in the Wayne State is out of the question and therefore the only alternative is to form a joint commission for UROC operations.

The $60,000 UROC personnel budget is financially taxing the already tight budget of the Wayne State Physical Education Department. The Director feels that these funds could be used for new faculty, professional travel, guest lecture series, etc., all which have had to be eliminated because of the budget squeeze. An effort is under way to convince the Detroit Parks and Recreation Department that this
burden must be lightened, and only through their cooperation can UROC grow. According to the Director, this arrangement with Detroit Parks and Recreation should have been agreed upon long before the first activity was held in Wayne State's recreational complex.

As indicated in item 60, Table 16, para-professionals are utilized in all of the UROC programs investigated. Only one institution, Wayne State University, made an effort to train local youths for these positions. Many of the UROC program life guards received their Senior Life Saving Certificates in programs held on Wayne State's campus. Presently, community youths are attending regularly scheduled physical education major classes to learn the basic fundamentals of specific activities in order to supervise such sports in the UROC program.

Professional Personnel. Members of the Physical Education and Recreation staff are used quite sparingly in the UROC program. Item number 62, Table 17, lists two institutions engaging in the services of the professional staff, but these are not payed positions. The coaching staff conducts clinics in their area of expertise and on occasion work individually with children highly motivated in a particular sport, for example, gymnastics. It was also pointed out that most staff members commute one-half to one full hour to their homes and most were reluctant to
TABLE 16
Response to Questions on Recruiting
in Relations to Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59. Orientation for staff</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Methods of recruitment</td>
<td>a. Community referrals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Interested community residents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Job announcements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Physical Education and recreation majors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Use of para-professionals</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Qualifications of staff</td>
<td>a. College graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. High School graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Expertise in activity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17
Response to Questions on the Use of University's Professional Staff in Relation to Program Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response (N=5)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63. Physical Education and coaching staff used</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Proposed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Field experience majors</td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Proposed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
remain on campus any longer then they must.

Summary

Early agreement between the university and neighborhood leaders stipulated that the UROC Director reside in the local community. This has softened in recent years but strong emphasis is placed on hiring para-professionals from the large group of unemployed youths in the neighborhood. One university is training these para-professionals by having them attend regularly scheduled physical education major activity classes.

The UROC Director at Wayne State University believes that the Detroit Parks and Recreation Department should assume the cost of program personnel. He is presently working for an arrangement where Wayne State provides the facilities and Detroit Parks and Recreation supplies the staff.

Responding Institutions Not Participating in UROC Programs

One-hundred and five urban universities were contacted in the initial survey requesting information about community recreation programs held on their campuses. Response from less than 5% of the sample would indicate that the remaining institutions have no need to develop an urban recreation program, have not considered such a program or felt they did not have adequate facilities for such a program.
A sampling of those institutions not engaged in UROC were selected and the writer proceeded to interview Campus Recreation Directors for their comments which detailed the reasoning for not opening their facilities. The following remarks are the results of the information received from fifteen institutions (see listing in Appendix B) not offering organized community recreation. Several respondents inferred that interest in such a program was sincere but caution had to be exercised to prevent premature action on their part.

The Intramural Director of a large mid-western urban university indicated that an opportunity does exist at their institution as a result of a large commuting student enrollment. Investigation to the feasibility of sponsoring an urban recreation program is presently being conducted. The Director's visitations to those institutions participating in UROC programs were made with extreme caution so as not to publicize his university's possible intentions. It is anticipated that this pre-planning would alleviate many of the problems experienced by other institutions if a UROC program was initiated.

Most of the directors interviewed, expressed deep concern for the potential dangers of excessive vandalism and the control of building security. It is inevitable that such questions arise because of the precarious location of these institutions in the inner city. Chronic
unemployment has increased the number of young local residents loitering around university buildings. Individuals not affiliated with the universities have been observed rifling lockers in the gymnasium and thus increased acts are assumed if the facilities are opened to the local residents.

Anticipation of future facility needs for university students posed a very difficult situation for the university's facilities coordinator. Once the community residents have access to the facilities, how do you extricate them as the student body's needs increase? Possible alternatives were not investigated and only the denial of use for the community was the end result. The fear of physical repercussions against the university and its personnel, if the institutions reneged on the continuation of the facilities commitment to the community, also heightened the "closed door" policy.

Maintaining building security was high on the priority list but the increased prevalence of lawsuit claims on legal liability had made university officials very reluctant to open the recreational facilities to outside groups. A case in question is the recent filing of a lawsuit against the University of San Francisco claiming that a local resident was injured while utilizing the institution's playing field. The plaintiff argues that as a result of the poor condition of the playing surface his
injury occurred and therefore the university was negligent in their responsibilities to make such areas safe for competition.

The University of San Francisco has continued to allow local residents to utilize its playing field, but these outside groups must first provide proof that they have secured their own liability insurance plan.

Columbia University officials have not forgotten the 1968 confrontation with community residents over the construction of a recreational complex on neighborhood park property. The early structure had plans calling for a separate recreation area for the residents of Harlem but the violent turmoil resulting from protests of the building construction ended with the abandonment of the proposed site.

In the Fall of 1974, Columbia University completed the recreational complex on their campus but time and inflation had cut deeply into its design. During a telephone interview with the Assistant Director of Intramurals at Columbia University, he indicated that the community residents would not be allowed to utilize the new facility. The needs of the university family would utilize all available space and the opening of the facility to the community would only create an overcrowded condition. The memories of the 1968 riots on campus also crept into the conversation, leading the interviewer to believe that this
too, was an underlying factor for refusal.

During the dedication ceremonies of Columbia's new recreation complex, the University's President indicated that the facilities would be made available for community use. It shall be interesting to observe what type of community recreation program develops out of the contradicting statements of these university officials.

One private institution located in the urban community had its views on UROC explained by the Intramural Director. He stated that the present recreational complex is inadequate for regular university functions and a community recreation program would over burden the facilities. At this time, a new structure is planned to house physical education and campus recreation with a completion target date in late 1976.

The interviewer inquired if this facility would be made available for community use. He responded with the following statement. "Presently, more than 25,000 of the university's alumni are living in the immediate area surrounding campus. Therefore, it is proposed that the alumni will be extended the opportunity to utilize this recreational complex based on a membership arrangement which is to be determined at a later date. Time for physical activity for the "membership" will be scheduled around the regularly planned athletic, academic and recreational programs."
His response to the interviewer's question of how his institution planned to assist in meeting the recreational needs of the neighborhood residents, was most concise and very candid. "A private institution should not be obligated to open its' facilities to the community and this responsibility should fall on the several other state supported institutions of higher learning located in the city of Dayton." He referred to Sinclair Community College, a tax supported institution and felt that its resources should be made available to the community. Upon contacting the office of the Intramural Director at Sinclair, it was determined that the institution had no recreational facilities at the present time and therefore no program for community residents.

The institutions contacted in the New York City area all claimed that their facilities are presently being over taxed by the university family and to open them to the community would be disasterous. Brooklyn College and Columbia University have recently completed new physical education complexes and adequate space seemed available if proper scheduling was utilized. Once again, these urban universities have been reluctant to even consider making a commitment to block certain periods of time for community groups.

The preconceived notions that their buildings would be vandalized and complete chaos would result if community
residents were allowed regularly scheduled gymnasium time. This attitude seemed to influence their decision. No investigation had been conducted to determine the possibility of a UROC program at their institutions and most felt it would be best to leave it that way.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND GUIDELINES

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine the problems associated with community recreation programs which were sponsored by urban universities and to develop guidelines to assist in the implementation of such a program. More specifically, the study investigated the following elements of such an urban recreation program. They are: administrative aspects, communicative aspects, financial aspects, recreational facilities, programming and personnel. Also, the investigation of the working relationship between urban residents and university personnel in their commitment to coordinate programs and facilities for a productive UROC program, was studied. Details of the intricate relationship between the university and community in dealing with urban problems are discussed in both a positive and negative vain.

The writer conducted an identification survey in which one-hundred and five institutions were contacted to
establish the existence of a community recreation program on their campuses. In the final tabulations, thirty-five institutions responded to my inquiry of which only five indicated having a viable recreation program for its neighborhood residents. The thirty remaining respondents suggested that special events were conducted in their facilities but no regularly scheduled recreation program for their community existed at their institution. These special events usually consisted of secondary or collegiate championship play-offs and a substantial fee was charged for its use. Limited activities in the area of physically or mentally handicapped have been conducted in these facilities without charge.

The data collected in this study were provided by an open ended personal interview questionnaire that was completed by the UROC Program Director of those institutions spearheading urban recreation on their inner city campuses. The schedule used in the study contained 64 open ended questions and the time of each interview ranged from 3/4 to 1 1/2 hours for completion. The variability was the result of the open ended format of the questioning which allowed the interviewee to elaborate on most responses. The more significant information that could not be listed in the tables was included in the brief explanation accompanying said tables.
In view of the small N, the information collected was recorded by checking one or more of the responses given for each question.

Of those institutions responding negatively, the writer selected fifteen universities and followed up with a telephone interview, when possible, to determine their reason(s) for not developing a UROC program. Most of those interviewed were most candid in their explanations as to why they could not or would not involve themselves in urban recreation.

CONCLUSIONS

Within the limits of this study, the following conclusions for each category of the study seem justified:

I. Administrative Aspects

1. Confrontation with community residents resulted when university officials neglected to include them in the proposed utilization of the recreational facilities constructed in their neighborhood.

2. Special interest groups or militant individuals will utilize the opportunity to demonstrate for their causes at the expense of recreational problems between the university and the community.

3. A inter-disciplinary approach to meeting problems of the surrounding community would more realistically
meet the total needs of that community and its individuals. This approach encourages the university to utilize all of its potential resources in offering community programs which would provide several types of services to the urban community. An example of this is the proposed model to be used at Temple University which will utilize the recreational, medical and social resources of its institution.

4. The data indicated that the Recreation and Parks Departments of these urban cities have systematically eliminated the development of recreational facilities in the immediate area of these urban campuses.

5. The director of a UROC program has a multi-role position with the responsibility for a number of the following duties. They are: liaison, supervisor, instructor, advisor, administrator, coordinator, etc.

6. The trend now exists that the UROC Director no longer resides in the urban community where he works.

7. The potential for recreational facilities within the neighborhood agencies needs to be investigated before abandoning them for the newer facilities at the university.

8. It is not the policy of the institution to require urban agencies utilizing the university's facilities to provide insurance coverage for damage or injuries that occur while recreating.
9. Screening of program participants is most effective when conducted by the UROC Director's Office rather than the sponsoring agencies.

10. Authorization for utilization of campus recreational facilities is best controlled by using a color coded or photo identification card.

11. Individuals admittance to campus facilities is being discouraged in favor of group entry with agency supervisors.

12. A geographic area should be designated to be used as boundaries in determining the sector of the city to be serviced by the UROC program.

13. There is a lack of leadership for program planning and its supervision of groups by the local agencies utilizing the university's recreational facilities.

14. Consideration for the implementation of an objective instrument for the purpose of evaluating the UROC program has not been developed.

II. Communicative Aspects

1. The data indicates that the lack of dissemination of program information is detrimental to the development of urban recreation.

2. Absences of regularly scheduled university-community planning meetings seems to create a communication gap between program officials and urban residents.
3. The trend towards improved community relations with the university's Physical Education and Recreation departments is directly related to the development of the UROC program.

4. The lack of the communicative process had created numerous problems, sometimes embarrassing, that could have been avoided if a systematic approach to program information had been developed.

5. Program policies for the utilization of the recreation facilities were not clearly defined for the community resident which resulted in hard feelings between participants and the supervisors.

III. Financial Aspects

1. From all indications the funding method most advantageous for the continuation of the UROC program would be to receive its budget from the university's general funds.

2. Inquiries to the possibility of Federal and State financial assistance for the operation of the UROC programs seemed to be totally ignored.

3. Limited effort is being made by the universities to generate funding from outside private resources for the UROC program.

4. Local agencies participating in the UROC program assumed no monetary responsibility for its operations. Such an arrangement will in time be detrimental to urban recreation.
5. University faculty and staff will in the near future be charged a small fee for the use of the recreational facilities.

IV. Recreational Facilities

1. The information collected indicated that those institutions having a large commuter enrollment makes it more feasible to conduct an urban recreation program. The daily exodus to the suburbs has limited the intramural offerings and made recreational time available for the community.


3. The data indicates that all indoor and outdoor recreational facilities are made available for urban recreation when not scheduled for the usual institutional functions.

4. Simultaneous use of the recreational facilities by the university population and the UROC participants has not created any undue tension between recreators.

5. Design and location of locker rooms makes supervision and security most difficult to monitor the actions of UROC participants.

6. The architectural design of the recreational complex makes security of the structure almost impossible
because of the excess numbers of doors to be monitored.

7. Employment of security officers will decrease the number of unauthorized persons entering the facilities and discourage vandalism.

8. The method of distribution and return of equipment provided the UROC participants was inadequate.

9. The cost of equipment stolen or destroyed by UROC participants was simply absorbed by the university.

10. The procedure for the replacement of a lost UROC participant's identification card is in need of revision.

V. Programming

1. Community involvement in determining program content increases participation by urban groups.

2. Inclusion of individual and dual sports into the UROC program has had little effect in stimulating urban residents to participate in new activities.

3. Activities offered in the UROC program which necessitated formal instruction are rebuffed by most youthful participants.

4. The trend is that activities of a coed nature be offered to best meet the needs of community recreation time.

VI. Personnel

1. The policy of having the director and personnel of UROC be approved by community residents is a most
ineffective and time consuming process.

2. Since activity supervisory personnel are not required to have prior experience in recreation, program supervision is inadequate.

3. Employment of inner city youth as UROC supervisory personnel as a means of supplementing their spending money often results in program breakdown.

4. Para-professionals trained in the university's activities classes for the development of UROC personnel has great potential.

5. Survival of the UROC program hinges on the stipulation that the City's Department of Recreation and Parks assume or supplement the cost of personnel salaries.

6. Attempts to utilize the university's faculty and staff to supplement the UROC personnel has been ineffective.

7. The data collected indicates that UROC programs will be used as an early field experience for its Physical Education and Recreation majors.

GUIDELINES

Administrative

1. The university must be totally aware of the long term commitment of facilities, personnel and finances involved in a UROC program and their ramifications on
existing programs.

2. A statement of the policies and procedures for the utilization of the institution's recreational facilities must be developed and distributed to all UROC participants.

3. Administrative policy dealing with the problems of injury and legal liability when dealing with the UROC program has to be most specific.

4. Identify all the recreational facilities located in the community and determine their availability for use in conjunction with the UROC program and also to avoid duplication of services.

5. Inquiries should be made of the City's Parks and Recreation Department to determine what effects such a program would have on the future development of facilities in that area by their department.

6. Designate the geographic boundaries from which UROC participants will be accepted but be flexible in its enforcement when facilities allow. Suggested guides in boundary design are: model city format, city precincts, local school systems, arbitrary number of city blocks, etc.

7. Individuals interested in participating with the UROC program should be encouraged to obtain sponsorship through one of the local agencies already active in the program. Admittance of individuals without agency affiliation should be discouraged.
8. The color code I.D. cards, issued to the UROC participants on a monthly basis, would provide the most feasible method of monitoring the community's utilization of the university's facilities. The card color could also signify the month of expiration, access to specific activity areas, denote male or female and list the program hours.

9. The UROC office should keep a file card on each participant which contains all vital information needed in the event of an emergency.

10. The UROC Director must continually investigate the feasibility of utilizing the vast resource of the university for the betterment of the recreational needs of the community.

Communications

1. The community should be informed from the outset of the UROC program that a change in the university needs could result in program cutbacks or termination.

2. A committee comprised of the UROC Director, participating agencies personnel, City Recreation and Parks personnel and civic leaders should be formed to provide the needed input and feedback required for program growth.

3. Institute a bi-monthly or monthly newsletter to inform the UROC participants and their parents of the type of programming being offered and proposed activities. Distribution of a newsletter could be handled through the local schools, agencies and community centers.
4. A grievance committee consisting of the UROC Director, program staff and community residents should be formed to investigate complaints of program operations.

**Personnel**

1. The significance of the UROC Director's position must be in his ability as a program coordinator and, most importantly, that of an effective liaison between the university administration and the community residents.

2. It is recommended that the UROC Director be a member of the faculty in the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

3. The UROC Director should not be required to reside within the immediate vicinity of the community unless he expresses a desire to do so.

4. Job descriptions should be developed which state the responsibility of the recreational position and define the specific requirement necessary for employment.

5. The UROC Director should take into consideration the recommendations of the community coordinating committee in hiring program personnel but he must have the final decision on staff development.

6. The recruitment of UROC personnel from the community residents is recommended but instruction should be given to these individuals to develop skill competencies where necessary before supervising activity programs. Sports clinics or enrollment in regularly scheduled
Physical Education classes could help meet this criterion.

7. The utilization of para-professionals can contribute significantly to this UROC program's offerings not met with present staff members.

8. Professional teaching and coaching staff of the university should be encouraged to assist in program development and conduct clinics in their area of expertise.

9. The university's Physical Education and Recreation majors should be a prime source of program personnel. Their services can be on a voluntary, paid or field experience credit basis.

10. Weekly staff meetings should be conducted by the UROC Director to discuss pertinent issues of either a positive or negative nature.

Programming

1. Scrutinize all existing programs presently scheduled in your facilities for time allotments and chart the remaining hours for UROC consideration.

2. A set time schedule should be established, whenever possible, for UROC activities to promote consistency in programming and participant attendance.

3. Designated UROC activity periods must be honored and sufficient notice given if university scheduled events are to take precedent on UROC.

4. Consideration must be given to meeting the needs of all the community members interested in
recreational activities. Therefore, programming for all segments of the urban population is needed and should be on a co-educational basis where applicable.

5. Equipment when provided should be issued to the group supervisor or activity leader and it is their responsibility to return it at the end of each session. The supplies provided UROC members should be kept in a separate area for inventory purposes.

6. The participants preferences for a variety of activities should be given a high priority in developing the program offerings.

7. When a swimming pool is available, a screening of all UROC participants should be conducted to determine their level of swimming ability and the results used for pool scheduling.

Facility

1. Admittance of the UROC participants to the university facilities should be made en masse at the prescribed time allotted and only if their agency supervisor has accompanied them.

2. Large recreational facilities have numerous entrances which creates a serious problem in the control of accessibility to the recreational areas. Since monitoring of these doors is prohibitive in cost, emphasis should be placed on educating the UROC members of the importance of keeping un-authorized persons out of the
building.

3. The employment of university students as building monitors will increase the supervisory support on a low profile level to supplement a smaller contingent of uniformed security personnel.

4. Depending upon facility size and university demands, joint usage of activities space should be considered as long as overcrowding does not result.

5. Locker room facilities for UROC participants should be in a dressing area separate from those used regularly by the university students.

Finance

1. Financial assistance for the City's Recreation and Parks Department for payment of personnel and equipment to operate the UROC program should be negotiated prior to the program's inauguration.

2. Investigate the potential of federal funding of new and innovative programs but not for the exclusive reason of financing your UROC program.

3. A token monthly fee charged to the participating agencies of the UROC program should be initiated primarily for the purpose of administrative control and not financial gain.

4. The sponsoring agency should be held accountable for the payment of damages resulting from malicious acts against university property by members of its group.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE
URBAN RECREATION ON CAMPUS (UROC) QUESTIONNAIRE

Administrative Aspects

1. What prompted your institution to open its recreational facilities for community use?

2. What is the basic philosophy behind the UROC Program?

3. Would you clarify what specific services your institution provides the UROC Program (e.g., facilities and supervision and or institution)?

4. Does your institution provide activities on occasional basis for the community members or is it considered a systematic program of regularly scheduled meetings?

5. What are the responsibilities of the Director of UROC?

6. Is the Director of UROC a member of the Physical Education Department?

7. Has the Director of the UROC Program attempted to form a committee which would include all agencies interested in using the university's facilities?

8. Does the UROC Director participate on a council of community agencies in an attempt to coordinate recreational programs held in your facilities?

9. Have alternative sites been suggested to community groups when university's facilities are not adequate or available?

10. Do you have an organizational chart showing the line of authority in making UROC decisions?

11. Do you set geographic boundaries to delimit the population using the facilities and how were they determined?

12. Does the university require a standard request form to be completed by all community groups wishing to use university facilities?
13. Does your institution require a formal contract be signed by each group (agency) using the university's facilities?

14. Who is responsible for screening individuals from the community wishing to use the university's recreational facilities (e.g. agency or university)?

15. How do you identify or control community persons who are authorized to use facilities?

16. What method of evaluation for the UROC Program has been developed?

17. What part does the local agencies play in the development of the UROC Program?

18. Are the sponsoring agencies responsible for payment of damages to university facilities which were incurred by members of their group?

Communicative Aspects

19. What are the most frequent complaints from the UROC groups using university facilities?

20. Is there an opportunity provided for concerned citizens to air their grievances about the UROC Program?

21. Has a committee been formed to investigate problems associated with UROC?

22. Does the university personnel complain of the UROC's use of recreational facilities?

23. Has a recreation committee comprised of both community and university representatives been established to develop the UROC Program?

24. What affect has UROC had in changing the community's attitude towards the institution?

25. How does community leadership assist in making the UROC more effective and efficient?

26. Has public relations been a dominant factor for the development of UROC?

27. What attempts have been made to inform the students, faculty and staff of the significance of UROC?
28. What method is used to inform the UROC participants of prescribed policies and procedures when using the university's facilities (e.g. mailed, posted or verbal)?

29. Has the lack of communications between the university and the community created certain problems which could have been avoided?

Financial Aspects

30. What methods of funding have been investigated to generate financial support for UROC?

31. Has federal funding been utilized for UROC?

32. What is the total budget for the UROC Program?

33. Is there a fee for those neighborhood groups active in the UROC Program for the facilities they use?

34. What rental fees are charged groups outside the UROC Program for the use of the university's recreation facilities?

35. Can the families of faculty and staff of the university use the recreation facilities without charge?

36. Would a fee for community utilization of the university's recreational facilities be considered more for control of use rather than income?

37. Have local charitable organizations offered financial or other assistance in operating the UROC Program?

38. Have the community members attempted to contribute to the financial support of UROC (e.g. fund raising drives)?

Recreational Facilities

39. What specific facilities are made available for UROC?

40. What recreational facilities of those belonging to local agencies are your students receiving the benefits of?

41. Has the simultaneous use of facilities by UROC and the university students created any altercations?
42. Have you attempted to completely separate the community recreation groups from the university population when using facilities?

43. What particular aspects of the facility's design has created most of the problems in terms of accessibility, security and supervision?

44. Are the university's recreational facilities situated on lands which were previously low income housing or urban renewal areas?

45. At any time during the planning and/or construction of the university's physical education-athletic facilities were there any repercussions from the community in protest of the building?

46. What priorities have been set for facility use?

47. When are the university's facilities made available to the community?

48. What specified requirements must an outside agency fulfill before permission to use the university's facilities is granted (e.g. insurance coverage)?

49. Can an individual from the community use the facilities during open-free time or must he enter with the sponsoring agencies?

50. Does your institution provide recreational equipment for the UROC Program?

51. How do you control the issuance and return of recreational equipment provided participants of the UROC program?

52. How have you attempted to keep unauthorized persons from using your recreational facilities?

53. Have security guards been employed to check identification cards, patrol the building and prevent vandalism?

54. Is the community involved in determining what activities should be sponsored by the university?

55. What types of activities are offered in the UROC Program?
56. What activities have been instituted specifically for the girls and women of the community recreation program?

57. Do evening hours discourage young children and women from participating in the UROC Program?

58. Has there been a reluctance on the part of community people to participate in certain recreational opportunities provided in the UROC Program (e.g. formal instruction, aquatics and net games)?

Personnel

59. Do you hold an orientation session to inform staff members working with UROC of potential problem areas and how to avoid or handle them?

60. What procedures have been followed in recruiting persons from the community to assist in the operation of the UROC Program?

61. Do you use para-professionals in the UROC Program?

62. What specific qualifications are desired of those individuals who are hired to assist with the UROC Program?

63. Does the Physical Education and Coaching staff contribute to UROC?

64. Has the Physical Education and Recreation Departments used the UROC Program as early field experience for their majors?
APPENDIX B: FOLLOW UP ON UNIVERSITIES NOT PARTICIPATING IN UROC PROGRAMS
| University of Akron | Akron, Ohio          |
| University of Chicago | Chicago, Illinois |
| University of Cincinnati | Cincinnati, Ohio |
| Cleveland State University | Cleveland, Ohio |
| City College of New York | New York City, New York |
| Columbia University | New York City, New York |
| University of Dayton | Dayton, Ohio         |
| University of Detroit | Detroit, Michigan    |
| Ohio State University | Columbus, Ohio       |
| Queens College | Flushing, New York    |
| Queensborough Community College | Bayside, New York |
| Sinclair Community College | Dayton, Ohio        |
| Springfield College | Springfield, Massachusetts |
| Staten Island Community College | Staten Island, New York |
| University of Toledo | Toledo, Ohio         |
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