

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

THE POTENTIAL ROLE OF WINNIPEG SCHOOLS AS SITES FOR  
INTEGRATING AND EXPANDING SOCIAL SERVICES  
TO YOUNG PEOPLE

by

JOSEPH FRANCIS SCOTT

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

JANUARY, 1979

THE POTENTIAL ROLE OF WINNIPEG SCHOOLS AS SITES FOR  
INTEGRATING AND EXPANDING SOCIAL SERVICES  
TO YOUNG PEOPLE

BY

JOSEPH FRANCIS SCOTT

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1979

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

# ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the present and potential role of Winnipeg Schools as sites for integrating and expanding social services to school age young people in the Winnipeg School Division #1. Data were collected via questionnaires that were mailed to all principals in the Winnipeg School Division and to thirty selected administrators of social agencies. The data were examined to determine the present role of the school in the delivery of non-educational services, the range of social services now being offered in the schools, the effectiveness of these services, the factors enhancing or inhibiting integration and the potential role of the school for integration of social services.

The major findings of this study indicated that (1) principals would rather have social agencies available to them than located in the school, (2) the majority of principals and agency administrators had different perceptions of the feasibility of integration and (4) the concept of integration, although acceptable to both principals and agency administrators, raised a number of legitimate concerns.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. J. A. Riffel, Chairman of the thesis committee, for his cooperation and guidance in the preparation of this thesis; to Dr. D. A. Downie and Dr. D. Baker, members of the thesis committee, for their support; to all the respondents to the questionnaires for the provision of the data for a major portion of this study; to Mr. Wayne Bembridge for his assistance in proofreading, and to Mrs. Joan Stewart for typing this thesis.

The author especially wishes to thank his wife, Pat, and his family, for their patience, understanding and love during the time of this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM. . . . .	1
1. The Problem	2
2. Significance of the Problem	2
3. Definition of Terms	3
4. Delimitations	3
5. Methodology	4
6. Organization of the Study	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .	7
1. Historical Background	7
2. The Current Context	8
3. Problems in the Delivery of Social Services	9
4. The Many Facets of Integration	11
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	21
1. Source of the Data	21
2. Collection of the Data	21
3. The Survey Instrument	22
4. Presentation of the Data	24
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION. . . . .	25
1. Information Obtained from School Principals	25
A. General Information	25
B. Community Characteristics	27
C. Non-educational Services	30
D. Evaluation of Present Services	35
E. Future Services	37

	Page
2. Information Obtained from Agency Administrators	46
A. General Information	46
B. Present Association with Winnipeg Schools	48
C. Integration of Services in Winnipeg Schools	49
3. Indepth Profile of Two Typical Schools	52
4. Observations	56
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	60
1. Summary	60
2. Conclusions	61
3. Recommendations	63
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	66
APPENDICES. . . . .	69
A. Letter to Principals	70
B. Questionnaire to Principals	72
C. Letter to Administrators	83
D. Questionnaire to Administrators	84

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Classification of Schools . . . . .	25
II. Size of Schools by Number of Classes. . . . .	26
III. Size of Schools by Student Population . . . . .	26
IV. The Number of Families Served by Responding Schools . . .	27
V. Income per School Family in Responding Schools. . . . .	28
VI. Student Mobility in Responding Schools. . . . .	28
VII. Families Receiving Welfare in Responding Schools. . . . .	29
VIII. Single Parent Families in Responding Schools. . . . .	29
IX. Agencies Maintaining Offices or Visiting on a Regular Basis in Responding Schools . . . . .	31
X. Agencies Principals Would Like Located or Readily Available in Responding Schools. . . . .	33
XI. Agencies Present Time Spend and Time Principals Would Like Them to Spend in Responding Schools . . . . .	34
XII. Effectiveness of Agencies as Judged by Principals in Responding Schools . . . . .	36
XIII. Possible Barriers to the Effective Delivery of Services in Responding Schools. . . . .	37
XIV. Integration of Social Services Worthwhile in Responding Schools. . . . .	38
XV. Effects of Integration of Social Services in Responding Schools. . . . .	40
XVI. Ranking of Factors Responsible for the Ineffective Coordination of Social Services in Responding Schools. .	43
XVII. Geographical Area Served by Responding Agencies . . . . .	47
XVIII. Other Agencies Offering Similar Services as Responding Agencies . . . . .	47

Table	Page
XIX. Clients Served by Responding Agencies. . . .	48
XX. Integration of Social Services Worthwhile by Responding Agencies. . . . .	49
XXI. Impact of Integration in Increasing Effectiveness in the Delivery of Services .	51



## CHAPTER 1

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Historically, social services to school age young people have been provided by a large number of governmental and private agencies. These agencies have tended to operate independently, each addressing a particular aspect of a young person's needs - physical health, mental health, welfare, job training, recreation, and so on.

Recently, however, ". . . the integration of social services-- "physically" or geographically, but especially organizationally-- is seen as having great potential."<sup>1</sup> Numerous pilot projects in the United States and, to a lesser degree in Canada, have pointed in this direction and are giving impetus to what may prove to be an important development in education and in society generally.

The rationale for integrating social services and locating them in schools is multi-faceted. Melby<sup>2</sup> states that the school is but one institution in the community, but that it, along with the family, exerts the most influence. He further states that the school is in a unique position to function as the coordinator of all community agencies and institutions by providing leadership direction and support. Furthermore ". . . schools can play a vital and central role in integrated social services programs because there are reasonably accessible educational facilities in virtually every neighborhood."<sup>3</sup> These facilities are utilized for only a short period per day. As well, educational services are an integral element of social services.

Aside from the "core" educational program of kindergarten through twelfth grade, there are a number of other educational needs which are intimately related to other social services: day-care--early childhood education centers, vocational education, prenatal and nutritional education, job training and re-training, and so forth.<sup>4</sup>

## I. THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the present and potential role of the school as a site for the integration of social services to school age young people in the Winnipeg School Division #1. Questions addressed were:

- 1) what is the present role of the school in the delivery of non-educational services?
- 2) what range of social services is now offered in schools?
- 3) what is the effectiveness of the social services now offered in the schools?
- 4) what factors might enhance and/or inhibit integration?
- 5) what is the potential role of the school as a site for integration of social services?

## II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The integration of social services with education offers a potential for improvement of the quality and nature of both the social services and education. There are many agencies and organizations in each community that provide programs and services of an actual or potential educational nature.<sup>5</sup> The schools could strengthen the work of other agencies, not duplicate it.

However, merely reorganizing social service offices would not fundamentally alter the quality of these services unless other goals are

pursued simultaneously. Such goals include increased access to services for clients, improved quality of services, and increased community participation in decision-making about these services. While physical integration of social services and schools does not automatically improve delivery of services, locating them under one roof constitutes a viable starting point to achieving their functional integration. The benefits can include a more comprehensive approach to the needs of the children.

### III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study the following definitions were used:

Integration - the term as used here included two aspects. Firstly, it referred to the physical location of social services and education at one site or in one building. Second, it referred to the complementary interaction of social services as opposed to the highly independent and self-contained social service bureaucracies.

Non-educational Social Services - these dealt with child-oriented services. Examples included recreational services, physical and mental health services, day care services and welfare services.

### IV. DELIMITATIONS

This study dealt only with schools of the Winnipeg School Division #1 and selected social agencies which provided non-educational social services to school age young people in the Winnipeg area. It was based only on the school year 1976-77.

## V. METHODOLOGY

Questionnaires were distributed to all principals in the Winnipeg School Division #1 in the spring of 1977. These questionnaires were divided into four parts and attempted to gain information about the school and the community, the present situation of non-educational services, their effectiveness and future role. At the same time, another questionnaire was distributed to administrators of social agencies providing non-educational social services to school age young people in the Winnipeg area. These questionnaires were divided into three parts and sought information about the role of the agency, the present association with Winnipeg schools, and the administrators perception of the integration of services. The data obtained from these two sets of questionnaires were treated descriptively.

In addition to the questionnaires, personal interviews with two principals were conducted in the fall of 1977 to obtain an in-depth profile of two typical elementary schools in order to show the varying needs of schools in the delivery of social services.

From these sources the situation regarding the delivery of social services was examined and recommendations made as to the possibility of expanding and or integrating social services in the schools.

## VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study has been delineated. Chapter II contains a review of the literature dealing with a brief historical background, the current situation, problems in the delivery of social services and the many facets of integration. In Chapter III the methodology employed in obtaining the data is described. Chapter IV contains the

results of the questionnaire data set up in a series of tables along with an analysis of this data. As well, an in-depth profile of two typical schools and observations drawn from the study are included. In the final chapter, Chapter V, a summary of the major findings of the study is presented, some implications are considered and recommendations for further research are made.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

- <sup>1</sup> Susan Baillie, Laurence De Witt, and Linda Schluter O'Leary. The Potential Role of the School as a Site for Integrating Social Services, (Syracuse: EPRC Research Report RR-10, 1972), p.2.
- <sup>2</sup> Ernest O. Melby, Administering Community Education, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955).
- <sup>3</sup> Baillie, op.cit., p.56.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., p.3.
- <sup>5</sup> Roger Hiemstra, The Educative Community: Linking the Community, School and Family, (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972), p.67.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature concerning the integration of social services in schools. The literature in this area is largely American. Care is required in applying it to the Canadian scene. It contains four main parts; the first deals with a historical background of the educational and non-educational responsibilities of schools; the second part explains the current situation; in the third, problems in the delivery of social services are discussed; and the fourth part deals with the many facets of integration.

#### I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Historically the educational and non-educational responsibilities of schools have undergone many changes. Barlyn<sup>1</sup> notes the emergence of formal schools in the Anglo-American colonies as an historical development responding to radical social changes. He suggests that even before formal schools emerged, people acquired an effective education through less formal processes.

The forms of education assumed by the first generation of settlers in America were a direct inheritance from the medieval past. Serving the needs of a homogeneous, slowly changing rural society, they were largely instinctive and traditional, little articulated and little formalized. The most important agency in the transfer of culture was not formal institutions of instruction or public instruments of communication, but the family. . . .

. . . the family's educational role was not restricted to elementary socialization. Within these kinship groupings skills that provided at least the first step in vocational training were taught and practiced. In a great many cases, as among the agricultural laboring population and small tradesmen who together comprised the overwhelming majority of the population, all the vocational instruction necessary for mature life was provided by the family. . . .

What the family left undone by way of informal education the local community most often completed. It did so in entirely natural ways, for so elaborate was the architecture of family organization and so deeply founded was it in the soil of stable, slowly changing village and town communities in which inter-marriage among the same groups had taken place generation after generation and it was at times difficult for the child to know where the family left off and the greater society began. . . .

More explicit in its educational function than either family or community was the church. . . . It furthered the introduction of the child to society by instructing him in the system of thought and imagery which underlay the culture's values and aims. . . .

. . . the rapid expansion of instructional facilities of which they were witness had not sprung from dissatisfaction with the traditional modes of education, but from the opposite, from confidence, from satisfaction, and from the desire and the capacity to deal more fully, in familiar ways, with familiar social needs.<sup>2</sup>

With the growth and change in society, the necessary skills and information needed to lead a productive life also changed. A shared responsibility process began to emerge among community agencies and community members. However, somewhere along this path of change, it was decided that learning had become too complicated for the family or community to manage alone and education as a specialized community service was created.<sup>3</sup> The schools soon took over as parents, community members, and agencies relinquished their share of the educational responsibilities. This trend continued until parents and community had little influence on the school. The modern American ". . . no longer construes family, church, or other community agencies as vital educational institutions."<sup>4</sup>

## II. THE CURRENT CONTEXT

Many of our present schools find themselves isolated from the home and the community. The school has been successful in convincing others that they lack the expertise to get involved in any direct way in school



affairs and that education is strictly the business of the educator.

A large portion of school training is separated from, and has no significant effect on students' behavior outside of school mainly because of the isolation of the school establishment from problems, dilemmas, choices, and phenomena encountered beyond school walls. . . . To the extent that schools are staffed by professional educators, learning tends to become isolated from the significant concerns of the community, and the narrower functions and tasks of the school come to dominate the broader purposes of education.<sup>5</sup>

A general lack of information and understanding by parents, community members and agencies of their role in schooling is prevalent. This has lead to indifference and detachment. " . . . In many cases people have been purposely shut out of the school."<sup>6</sup> However, it has become increasingly evident that lay participation in educational planning is necessary to meet the needs of the self-development of individuals in today's society.

The school must be a place where young people are prepared for life roles, not a place isolated from the main current of life where students spend several years concentrating primarily on subject content. Thus, education should be person-centered, problem-orientated and community-centered.<sup>7</sup>

The school can no longer afford to remain isolated from the community, its citizens or its various institutions. There has been development in some areas to include the notion of mobilizing social agencies and other resources to meet the particular needs of the community. The community school concept has attempted to deal with the problem but for the most part, has been unsuccessful in integrating social services to its members.

### III. PROBLEMS IN THE DELIVERY OF SOCIAL SERVICES

With the complexity of the organization of social services, a

number of problems become evident in the delivery of these services. During the last decade there has been turmoil regarding the delivery of social services with much said about the failure of such delivery.<sup>8</sup>

Service inundation implies an 'overservicing' of clients by having many agencies involved with the same family. Workers in different social agencies perform similar or related tasks and thereby duplicate efforts. A solution to this problem might include fewer workers visiting the same family or improving communication among the various agencies.

A related difficulty concerns the problem of obtaining needed services within the fragmented and specialized service system. Each agency defines its own service boundaries and jealously guards them, thus suggesting a need for a supplementary approach. With the attempt to secure needed services, agencies often refer their clientele to other community agencies. If this process fails, the agency may find itself compelled to undertake the task thereby leading to a competition for limited personnel and facilities or even inappropriate treatment.

A client's dealing with specialized agencies may find that the program becomes disjointed or discontinuous. This will happen when programs are not linked with other activities. In examining strategies to reduce discontinuity it is useful to specify at least interrelated tasks; service entry; training or treatment; and reabsorption or placement.<sup>9</sup> The delivery of social services can also suffer from the bureaucratic problems of delivery of services that the client is entitled to, and protection from unfair practices of the institution which is serving him. "The public is disenchanted with what they consider to be needless duplication, overlapping and competition in community social services.

This applies to both the government and voluntary sectors."<sup>10</sup>

Other problems existent in the present system of delivery of  
11  
social services as outlined by Kahn include:

- a) not enough service
- b) stigma attached to many social services
- c) difficult access for the uneducated and poor
- d) inadequate provision for case liability
- e) specialization, bureaucratization, and historical accident have created some service boundaries which are inherently dysfunctional
- f) the balance between resources and facilities, on the one hand, and diagnostically-rendered case service, on the other, may be inappropriate
- g) manpower shortages in the relevant professional fields are serious
- h) major gaps between the case service model and the service as actually rendered.

#### IV. THE MANY FACETS OF INTEGRATION

The complex and varied system for the distribution of social services is well known.

First, there is a three-tier vertical system, in which some services are distributed by sponsors administratively located at the national, state, or local levels. The three hierarchical tiers are bound together by financial, administrative, legal and professional loyalties. The ties may be loose, as in the case of federated structures, where local operations are autonomous and create a national body to service their needs; or tight as in the case of corporate structures, in which the locals are branch offices of a national agency. Within the boundaries of any one tier, there is a horizontally organized system, which can be sorted by auspices (public, voluntary, or private), or by functional specialization (health, education, housing, etc.) or by the type of clientele serviced (classified by age, problem, income grouping, etc.)<sup>12</sup> and by the skill performed (teaching, medicine, social work, etc.).

The problems and difficulties expressed indicate a need for a more comprehensive delivery system. ". . . A social service system or network in the full sense is essential, . . . separate, occasional inter-related islands of service will no longer serve."<sup>13</sup> However, in some areas ". . . proposals to redesign an almost ramshackle arrangement of social services are now under discussion. . . . Steps are being taken toward new forms of delivery, administration and finance."<sup>14</sup> If the goal is to correct the inadequacies of the present situation, the base of the total social services system would appear to be in the neighbourhood. In short, the service must be, in large measure, adapted to the community in which the people already live.<sup>15</sup> Decentralization of social services, in particular, must go to the neighbourhood level.<sup>16</sup> Many physical and social planners advocate a return to coherent and definable neighbourhoods.

The neighbourhood is seen as a logical base for the organization of social services; here the provider and the consumer of services can have direct contact; the services can be better coordinated and adapted to local differences; and they can draw upon the participation of local citizens in policy development and priority setting.<sup>17</sup>

In today's mobile urban society and changes in family structure, a localized delivery system can be facilitated by neighbourhood solidarity. Without a neighbourhood service available to link people to impersonal institutions, " . . . people will not find or use the services that are available, no matter how adequate such services may be."<sup>18</sup>

Obviously one would have to practice discretion in determining the decentralization of the services. According to Kahn<sup>19</sup> a localized delivery system would not apply:

- a) where the need-density is too little to justify a local service unit

- b) where skills or resources are so rare that they could not be supplied at the most immediate local level
- c) where costs of decentralization are so high as to outweigh by far the potential benefits
- d) where services are so standardized that they allow no local variation.

It is recognized that all services could not be based in every neighbourhood and some form of hierarchical pattern would have to be established.

Certain services, facilities and responsibilities are best placed at the most immediate local level; other services--generally more specialized or in less demand--reside in certain large units (perhaps several neighbourhoods combined or a district); while still others--those that are highly specialized--belong at a central government level, whether city, region, province or federal.<sup>20</sup>

Two different systems presently dealing with the neighbourhood concept are the British Citizens' Advice Bureau and France's Committee of Liaison and Coordination. Under the British system, a neighbourhood centre operates under the following stated purpose:

To make available to the individual accurate information and skilled advice on the many problems that arise in everyday life; to explain legislation; to help the citizen to benefit from and use wisely the services provided to him by the state.<sup>21</sup>

These centres are staffed by both volunteers and professionals and are readily accessible to every segment of the population. Their functions include: information, advice, steering, personal help and emotional support, referral, feedback, advocacy, case-finding and community facilitation service during crisis.<sup>22</sup> British CAB's maintain a high credibility with the populace because of their qualities: an open door atmosphere, expertise, range, service to all social classes, confidentiality, nonpartisanship and nonsectarianism, unbiased case channeling accountability.<sup>23</sup>

The French system operates on three simple, but radical, principles.

First, no more than one family social worker may work with a family. Second, unless there is special reason, each family social worker is responsible for all families in a compact, geographical area. Third, no work is done twice.<sup>24</sup>

The worker may be from any one of a number of social agencies. Any family has the right to reject a worker if they so desire and another worker will be assigned to them. The worker offers information, advice and referral and does the individual counselling and casework. This system is not viable in North America without reforms in social work education, as our family social workers are "specialists" and not "generalists" as in the French system.

Many obstacles arise in determining the most satisfactory delivery system.

The selection and development of a specific service delivery system depends in large measure on commitment to priorities of service; whether to serve individuals or social goals, to emphasize hard or soft services, and to administer to the poor or to all income levels. The choice of a specific delivery system, in turn, will shape the emphasis of the program to a considerable extent.<sup>25</sup>

The neighbourhood centre concept brings a variety of specialists together in one central location. This approach has been tried with limited success in some localities, notably in California.<sup>26</sup> As well, a lack of suitable accommodation for these services and facilities has proved an obstacle. However, "... representations were urged for a broadening of the terms of the National Housing Act to include capital grants for buildings to accommodate social and recreational facilities in low-income neighbourhoods.<sup>27</sup> The United States offers assistance - two-thirds grants - through the Department of Housing and Urban Development

for the building of neighbourhood centres. In Canada it is conceivable that the Canada Assistance Plan, which shares fifty per cent of the cost of specified services approved by a province, might be a resource in underwriting the cost of such neighbourhood services.<sup>28</sup>

To overcome the obstacles and implement a satisfactory delivery system ". . . it is suggested that one educational organization in each community should be designated or created as a central coordinating agency."<sup>29</sup> The community school can assist in the coordination of all agencies which deal with school age young people.

The community school and its personnel can work with all of these groups in order to better coordinate and strengthen their combined influence. The school is concerned with the elimination of duplicate services and the coordination of all services that bring about the best positive influence on the development of individuals in the community. Mutual understanding of services offered by the various organizations and agencies is basic to effective united effort.<sup>30</sup>

In some areas the community school has been used as the coordinator of social services. In New Haven ". . . the community school added the dimension of distribution of social services."<sup>31</sup> Thus, the school may act as a service center by housing service agencies. The overall purpose is to decentralize services so that they are available in the neighbourhood.<sup>32</sup> The school is regarded by Berridge<sup>33</sup> as a logical site for the housing of many of the service agencies. The advantages are quite evident: monies are spent on people not buildings; communication is established through the community education project; referral and follow-up may more easily be obtained; agencies serving under one roof are more likely to cooperate; and people may "drift in" for agency help along with the crowd involved in other programs.

The combining of social services in the schools could lead to

cost savings, especially capital costs. As well, operating costs could also result in savings and an increased efficiency in the use of the facility in some instances. The cost of creating school/social service complexes would probably not be greater than that of creating separate, geographically unrelated facilities.<sup>34</sup>

The integration of services with schools could make them more accessible and available to current and potential clients. This would result in an increased use and more efficient monitoring of services.

The end results of a service center in the school are that tax payers are saving money, agencies avoid overlapping and duplication, additional persons become aware of services, and people are better served.<sup>35</sup>

However, there are many obstacles implied in such a delivery system. For it to be successful would require a dedicated and strong individual. Some impediments that would be encountered in commencing such a project are:

- a) fears, especially on the part of heads of social service agencies, that their power and authority will be diminished
- b) bureaucratic immobility
- c) obtaining the cooperation of all employee and professional groups
- d) defining the service boundaries of service center components
- e) community participation.<sup>36</sup>

Until some attempts are made to see if such a delivery system is workable, we must continue to be served by a fragmented system with little coordination at the school level. But the all important question is ". . . since the schools are being asked to assume more and



more responsibilities of society - the home, the church, health, etc.,  
how can they escape becoming allied with agencies in the community?"<sup>37</sup>

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

- <sup>1</sup> Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study, (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1960).
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp.15-21.
- <sup>3</sup> Hiemstra, op.cit., p.18.
- <sup>4</sup> Fred M. Newmann and Donald W. Oliver, "Education and Community" in Community and the Schools, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review, 1969), p.15.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid., p.17-18.
- <sup>6</sup> Robert I. Berridge, The Community Education Handbook, (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973), p.7.
- <sup>7</sup> Hiemstra, op.cit., p.19.
- <sup>8</sup> William J. Sahlien, A Neighbourhood Solution to the Social Services Dilemma, (Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1973), p.19.
- <sup>9</sup> Martin Rein, Social Policy: Issues of Choice and Change, (New York: Random House, 1970), p.3.
- <sup>10</sup> Dr. F. R. MacKinnon, Social Service Delivery Systems. A Commissioned Paper to the Community Health Centre Project, (Halifax: Canadian Public Health Association), p.20, undated.
- <sup>11</sup> Alfred J. Kahn, Studies in Social Policy and Planning, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969).
- <sup>12</sup> Rein, op.cit., p.3.
- <sup>13</sup> Kahn, op.cit., p.252.
- <sup>14</sup> Robert Perlman, Consumers and Social Services (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1975), p.93.
- <sup>15</sup> Sahlein, op.cit., p.20.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., p.79.

- <sup>17</sup>Michael Wheeler, Integration of Physical and Social Planning. Report Number Two. Report on a seminar held 27 - 29 March, 1968, under the joint sponsorship of the Special Project on Low-Income Housing and the Community Funds and Councils Division of the Canadian Welfare Council. (Ottawa) p.i.
- <sup>18</sup>Sahlein, op.cit., p.9.
- <sup>19</sup>Kahn, op.cit., p.277.
- <sup>20</sup>Wheeler, op.cit., p.ii.
- <sup>21</sup>Alfred J. Kahn et al, Neighbourhood Information Centers: A Study and Some Proposals, (New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1966), p.16.
- <sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp.33-35.
- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp.35-36.
- <sup>24</sup>Alvin L. Schorr, Explorations in Social Policy, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968), p.240.
- <sup>25</sup>Barbara Joe, Social Services in the Seventies: Issues and Challenges, Washington: National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1974), p.18.
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid., p.21.
- <sup>27</sup>Wheeler, op.cit., p.ii.
- <sup>28</sup>Ibid., p.iii.
- <sup>29</sup>Hiemstra, op.cit., p.74.
- <sup>30</sup>W. Fred Totten, The Power of Community Education, (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1970), p.30.
- <sup>31</sup>Mario Fantini, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat, Community Control and the Urban School, (New York: Praegar Publishers, 1970), p.79.
- <sup>32</sup>Berridge, op.cit., p.40.
- <sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp.40-41.

<sup>34</sup>Baillie, op.cit., p.25.

<sup>35</sup>Berridge, op.cit., p.41.

<sup>36</sup>Baillie, op.cit., pp.42-43.

<sup>37</sup>Berridge, op.cit., p.78.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### I. SOURCE OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the present and potential role of the school as a site for the integration of social services to school age young people in the Winnipeg School Division #1. The source of the data was the principals of schools in the Winnipeg School Division and administrators of selected social agencies. The social agencies were chosen from the 1976-77 Manual of Social Services in Manitoba based on the following criteria: serving the Winnipeg area; dealing with school age children; and offering non-educational social services. The data were collected by means of questionnaires and two case interviews.

#### II. COLLECTION OF THE DATA

A questionnaire (Appendix B) was mailed to the seventy-six principals in the Winnipeg School Division #1. The mailing took place on April 6, 1977, with a covering letter (Appendix A) and a self-addressed stamped envelope for the return of responses. A deadline for returns of April 20, 1977, was included in the letter but was not adhered to as many returns came in after that date. Fifty-seven responses were received.

At the same time, a covering letter (Appendix C) was sent to thirty selected administrators of selected social agencies along with a questionnaire (Appendix D). Eighteen responses were received; the deadline date stated in the covering letter was ignored as well.

In October, 1977, in-depth interviews were held with two elementary school principals based on only two criteria; size and location. The

interviews were an extension of the questionnaire that had been sent in the spring for the purpose of showing the varying needs of schools in the delivery of social services.

### III. THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The questionnaires used to collect data from the principals and agency administrators were developed by the investigator. Though it was not piloted, the final form was the result of consultation with three principals who offered suggestions and advice which assisted in its overall development.

The principals' questionnaire contained four major sections. The first part of the first section requested information about the school; the name, address, type of school, number of classes and number of daytime students. The second part of the first section requested information about the school's community; number of school families, range of income of school families and characteristics of the community including the percentage rate of student mobility, families receiving welfare and single parent families. The respondent was also asked to add any other information that might better explain the community.

The second section contained a list of fifteen agencies with space to add others. Principals were asked to check the listed agencies which: maintained offices in the school, visited on a regular basis, they would like located in school, would like readily available, the amount of time presently spent and the amount of time they would like spent.

In the third section, the principal was directed to assess the effectiveness of the listed agencies and indicate the extent to which the

listed barriers inhibited the delivery of services. In both areas, space was available for the respondent to add other items to the given lists.

The fourth section asked principals to indicate if they felt integration was worthwhile, if integration would have any positive effects on the delivery of social services to the children, and to explain their responses in both cases. As well the respondents were requested to rank the ten factors they considered most important in causing ineffective coordination of social services. Finally, the respondents were asked to identify any advantages and disadvantages to having coordinated social services in the school under the following headings; for the children at the school, for the school administration and for the service agency.

The agency administrator's questionnaire was divided into three major sections. The first section requested information about the agency: its name, its address, total area served, and services offered to school age children. Information was also requested regarding other agencies that offer a similar service. Respondents were asked about the facilities in the Winnipeg School Division area: the number of offices, the number of workers, the clients served and the number of school age children serviced.

The second section requested information regarding the agency's association with schools in the Winnipeg School Division and the manner of association; if the agency was located on a permanent basis in any schools in the Winnipeg School Division and how many; if the agency visited any schools in the Division on a regular basis, how many and amount of time spent in schools on a weekly basis; and if the agency received any direct referrals for services from the Winnipeg School

Division personnel and from whom the referrals came.

In the third section, the respondents were asked if they felt the idea of integration was worthwhile and an explanation of their response; the extent they felt integration would have any positive effects on the children in the school; and any problems or disadvantages that integration would have for their agency. As well they were asked to list any other factors that might affect the delivery of services to the children from their agency if integration did take place.

#### IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Analysis of the data was descriptive. Responses were placed in a series of tables for comparison and analysis.

Written responses to questions were reported on the basis of a cross section to accurately represent the respondents replies. Questions requiring only a written response were grouped and reported with no attempt at a comparative analysis.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter contains: a summary of the information obtained in response to the survey of principals and administrators of selected social agencies; an in-depth profile of two typical schools; and observations drawn from the study.

#### I. INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

##### General Information

Fifty-seven principals in the Winnipeg School Division completed the questionnaire. The principals represented a variety of school types and sizes as shown in Tables I to III. Most of the schools were, as expected, elementary schools. The sizes of the schools ranged from four to 59 classrooms and 55 to 1591 students.

TABLE I  
CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS

Type of School	Number	Percentage
Elementary	41	72
Elementary - Junior High	3	5
Junior High	7	12
Junior - Senior High	4	7
Senior High	2	4
TOTALS	57	100%

TABLE II  
SIZE OF SCHOOLS BY NUMBER OF CLASSES

No. of Classes	No. of Schools
0 - 10	16
11 - 20	21
21 - 30	11
31+	4
No response	5
TOTAL	57
Mean = 17	

TABLE III  
SIZE OF SCHOOLS BY STUDENT POPULATION

No. of Students	No. of Schools
0 - 200	7
201 - 400	22
401 - 600	13
601 - 800	10
800+	5
TOTAL	57
Mean = 461	

Community Characteristics

The communities served by the schools revealed similar variability as shown in Tables IV to VIII. Most schools served fewer than 400 families. Family incomes, in the opinion of the respondents, averaged about \$8,000.00. Student mobility rates, the number of families receiving social assistance, and the number of single parent families varied considerably. These are factors which, perhaps, contribute to a need for social services.

TABLE IV  
THE NUMBER OF FAMILIES SERVED BY RESPONDING  
SCHOOLS

No. of Families	No. of Schools
0 - 200	26
201 - 400	18
401 - 800	8
801+	3
No response	2
TOTAL	57

TABLE V  
INCOME PER SCHOOL FAMILY IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Income per school family	No. of Schools
under \$4,000	3
\$4001 - \$6000	5
\$6001 - \$8000	17
\$8001+	23
No response	9
TOTAL	57

TABLE VI  
STUDENT MOBILITY IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Percentage rate of student mobility	No. of Schools
0% - 10%	21
11% - 25%	14
26% - 50%	14
51%+	6
No response	2
TOTAL	57

TABLE VII  
FAMILIES RECEIVING WELFARE IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Percentage rate of families receiving welfare	No. of Schools
0% - 10%	26
11% - 25%	11
26% - 50%	3
51%	2
No response	15
TOTAL	57

TABLE VIII  
SINGLE PARENT FAMILIES IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Percentage of families with a single parent	No. of Schools
0% - 10%	22
11% - 25%	18
26% - 50%	7
51%+	4
No response	6
TOTAL	57

Further insights into the characteristics of the communities served by the schools were obtained from the written comments of a number of the respondents:

"Students come from all parts of Winnipeg including the suburban school divisions and St. Amant."

"Dominant ethnic group is Ukrainian, Metis and native population on the increase. Number of E.S.L. students on increase."

"Increasing transient population plus falling enrollment."

"Wide range of economic resources and level."

"The community is deteriorating year by year, discipline problems are increasing in the schools and I imagine also in the home - most likely due to the increasing breakdowns in the family. We constantly hear about "Mom" and "Dad" separating."

"Increasing number of new immigrant families and declining socio-economic level."

"55% do not speak English at home; 23 different ethnic groups; 93% attendance recorded monthly."

"High native-Metis population. Approximately 65% of our school population."

#### Non-educational Services

Table IX provides information about the agencies which maintain offices in, or regularly visit, schools.

The responses concerning the present role of the various social services in the school were somewhat ambiguous in that the respondents did not treat "maintain offices" and "visit on a regular basis" as discrete categories as had been intended by the investigator. This ambiguity was evident when 44 respondents indicated the Public Health Nursing Department maintained offices while 14 indicated it visited on a regular basis. (One principal checked both areas.) In fact, each public school in the Winnipeg School Division maintains a Public Health Nursing

office within the building, but the nurse, in the majority of schools, spends less than a day per week in the office. Another source of ambiguity was apparent with respect to the Child Guidance Clinic about which two principals indicated the agency both maintained offices and visited on a regular basis. The present situation of the Child Guidance Clinic and the Winnipeg School Division is that clinicians from the agency are assigned to each school with some schools having a designated area or room for them.

TABLE IX  
AGENCIES MAINTAINING OFFICES OR VISITING ON A REGULAR BASIS  
IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Name of Agency	Maintain offices	Visit on regular basis	Total
a) Child Guidance Clinic	9	51	60
b) Inner City of Winnipeg Health Department			
i) Public Health Nursing	44	14	58
ii) Medical Clinic	2	6	8
iii) Dental Clinic	3	15	17
c) Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg	2	10	12
d) Department of Health and Social Development			
i) Social Security/Financial Assist.	0	2	2
ii) Child Welfare	0	3	3
iii) Child Day Care Services	1	2	3
e) Public Welfare Department, City of Winnipeg	0	2	2
f) Legal Aid Manitoba	0	1	1
g) Family Services of Winnipeg Inc.	0	1	1
h) Juvenile Division, Winnipeg Police Dept.	0	11	11
i) Dept. of Parks & Recreation, City of Winnipeg	10	19	29
j) Others			
i) Manitoba Home & School Association	1		1
ii) Society for Crippled Children and Adults		1	1

Table X presents data on the agencies that principals would like located in the school or readily available to the school. Of the two

possibilities, more principals would like agencies readily available than located in the school. Four principals did not mark any of the agencies listed and indicated they were already available to them.

Their written comments were:

"All of the above are as close as the phone - no need for location in school."

"Those that we need are readily available."

"All are available but contact is sparse - not the need."

"Services of all of the above are readily available to me."

Once again an ambiguity existed in the definition of having an agency located in the school. Thirteen respondents indicated a desire to have the Public Health Nursing Department located in the school but actually each school does have a Public Health Office. Possibly some respondents equated the location of an office in the school with full time staffing from the agency.



TABLE X

AGENCIES PRINCIPALS WOULD LIKE LOCATED OR READILY AVAILABLE  
IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Name of Agency	Would like located in school	Would like readily available	TOTAL
a) Child Guidance Clinic	18	9	27
b) Inner City of Winnipeg Health Department			
i) Public Health Nursing	13	3	16
ii) Medical Clinic	6	8	14
iii) Dental Clinic	7	9	16
c) Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg	6	18	24
d) Department of Health and Social Development			
i) Social Security/Financial Assistance	2	4	6
ii) Child Welfare	2	11	13
iii) Child Day Care Services	7	7	14
e) Public Welfare Department, City of Winnipeg	2	4	6
f) Legal Aid Manitoba	3	4	7
g) Family Services of Winnipeg Inc.	4	10	14
h) Juvenile Division, Winnipeg Police Department	2	6	8
i) Department of Parks and Recreation, City of Winnipeg	13	5	18
j) Others			
i) Probation Services	1	1	2
ii) Indian Affairs		1	1

Although the principals were asked to indicate the amount of time presently spent by agencies located in the schools as opposed to the amount of time principals would like them to spend, the replies proved difficult to interpret. Although responses should have been only for agencies located in the schools, the number of replies for the agencies is greater than the indicated number of social services located in the schools from Table IX. In spite of this discrepancy, Table XI indicates a significant

increase of time from the needed agencies is desirable over the present amount of time presently spent.

TABLE XI

AGENCIES PRESENT TIME SPENT AND TIME PRINCIPALS WOULD LIKE THEM TO SPEND IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Name of Agency	Present time spent per cycle				Time would like spent per cycle			
	0-½ day	1 day	2-3 days	4+ days	0-½ day	1 day	2-3 days	4+ days
a) Child Guidance Clinic	11	18	24	2	3	10	18	17
b) Inner City of Winnipeg. Health Department								
i) Public Health Nursing	11	14	24	5	4	9	19	17
ii) Medical Clinic	3		1		5	2	1	1
iii) Dental Clinic	3			3	5	4		1
c) Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg	5		1		9	4		2
d) Department of Health and Social Development								
i) Social Security/ Financial Assistance	2				3	1		
ii) Child Welfare	2				6	1	1	
iii) Child Day Care Services	2		1		2			5
e) Public Welfare Department, City of Winnipeg	2				3		1	
f) Legal Aid Manitoba	2				3	3		
g) Family Services of Winnipeg Inc.	2				2	2		
h) Juvenile Division, Winnipeg Police Department	4				5	1		
i) Department of Parks and Recreation, City of Winnipeg	7	3	4	7	7	1	7	8
j) Others								
i) Manitoba Home & School Association			1				1	
ii) Probation Services					1			
iii) Indian Affairs							1	

### Evaluation of Present Services

Table XII indicates the degree to which the delivery of services is judged effective by school principals. Although only the agencies that maintain offices or visit on a regular basis were to be assessed, some principals evaluated agencies that did not fall into these categories.

In general, Table XII reveals that the majority of agencies, as judged by principals, were rated as being very or moderately effective indicating a general satisfaction with the present delivery of services.

Information about possible barriers to the effective delivery of services is shown in Table XIII. Generally, principals indicated that few barriers exist. However, it appears that communication between the agencies and the school, "bureaucracy," and duplication of services are identified as frequent sources of concern. Four principals included the following written comments:

"this type of school and environment does not really need too much of the above services. Grade one to four only in the school. Would need more resource help time rather than the above agencies. i.e., remedial help within the school. (library teacher also)."

"the real problem is an agency not visiting the school."

"many of the services are used on a referral basis with our own guidance department being the coordinating people."

"the above response refers to Public Health Nursing only. Child Guidance Clinic services at present are excellent."

TABLE XII

EFFECTIVENESS OF AGENCIES AS JUDGED BY PRINCIPALS IN  
RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Name of Agency	Degree of Effectiveness			
	Very Effective	Moderately effective	Not very Effective	Not Effective
a) Child Guidance Clinic	17	35	3	
b) Inner City of Winnipeg Health Dept.				
i) Public Health Nursing	32	19	2	
ii) Medical Clinic	1	3		2
iii) Dental Clinic	4	3	2	
c) Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg	1	5	4	4
d) Department of Health & Social Development				
i) Social Security/Financial Assist.		1		2
ii) Child Welfare				2
iii) Child Day Care Services		1		2
e) Public Welfare Department, City of Winnipeg		1		2
f) Legal Aid Manitoba		1		2
g) Family Services of Winnipeg Inc.			1	2
h) Juvenile Division, Winnipeg Police Department	1	7		3
i) Department of Parks & Recreation City of Winnipeg	4	16	3	
j) Others				
i) Probation Services				1
ii) Society for Crippled Children and Adults		1		
iii) Manitoba Home and School Assoc.				1
TOTALS	60	93	15	23

TABLE XIII

POSSIBLE BARRIERS TO THE EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF SERVICES  
IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Barriers	Frequency			
	Always	Frequent ly	Occasion ally	Never
a) Lack of space	6	11	25	11
b) Too time consuming	2	10	18	16
c) No real benefits derived		7	23	14
d) Too much "red tape"	2	17	22	7
e) Lack of teacher support		4	23	21
f) Agencies not approachable	1	7	18	22
g) Little communication between agency and school	2	19	22	9
h) Duplication of services	2	13	21	7
i) Others				
i) Workers not able to cope with job		1		
TOTALS	15	89	172	107

Future Services

The majority of principals were in favour of some form of coordination of social services. Table XIV presents these data.

TABLE XIV  
INTEGRATION OF SOCIAL SERVICES WORTHWHILE IN  
RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Responses	Number
a) Yes	19
b) No	5
c) Yes, under certain conditions	28
d) No, under certain conditions	0
e) No response	5
TOTAL	57

Three respondents who did not mark any response wrote the following comments:

"Unsure"

"N/A"

"In a high school the need for the services of most of these agencies is occasional, often on a crisis basis. Most high school youngsters want to deal with these agencies without benefit of the school."

Principals who gave a negative reply explained their responses with the following comments:

"Not needed in this small school. The principal does it."

"The necessity at this time is not significant."

"We already have more bodies around than we can cope with."

"The real need is for extra Child Guidance Clinic personnel (and more effective coordination of services)."

"One of my roles is that of integration and coordination, and, in all probability, would remain so, in a school of this size,

even with the appointment of a person to do these tasks, especially with regard to T.M.H. children, their doctors, and agency services."

"In our school we do not need most of the agencies you have cited - perhaps at P- - - -!"

The majority of positive responders included written comments providing some explanation for their answers. The responses ranged from a complete acceptance of the concept to acceptance with various reservations. Some principals accepted the possibility if the need of the school or community warranted it.

Many comments revolved around the position and role of the proposed coordinator. Some principals suggested the necessary qualities needed; other suggested the expectations of the individual. Two principals indicated that the school social worker would be in the best position to coordinate the social agencies; others suggested the role would be performed best by a Divisional employee, a school-community worker or a person not associated with the school as it would be a non-academic function.

Reasons offered in support of the idea of integration included avoiding duplication of services, better communication and/or contact, consistency, and lessening difficulty in contacting agencies. Two areas of concern raised were the expense involved and the possible lack of guidelines. However, the general consensus could be summed up by one comment - "A cooperative coordinated approach would seem to be the most effective manner to provide services."

The idea of integration was justified by the principals because of its expected positive effects on the delivery of social services to the children in the school. Table XV shows that most respondents expected that positive effects would be forthcoming with integration.

TABLE XV  
EFFECTS OF INTEGRATION OF SOCIAL SERVICES IN  
RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Responses	Number
a) Yes	24
b) No	5
c) Yes, under certain conditions	22
d) No, under certain conditons	0
e) No response	6
TOTAL	57

Six principals did not reply; of these, three included the following written comments:

"Questionable"

"I am in no position to say there would be no positive effects from integration of services, but in this school and community the advantages to the children or parents, are not strikingly apparent."

"N/A".

Negative responses from principals indicated a lack of need; an example follows:

"Requirement of such services are minimal - hence no need for coordinating."

The majority of respondents who indicated that positive effects would be forthcoming also included written comments in support of their view. Most principals suggested that the benefits accruing from integration were obvious: more efficient and immediate service, less "red



tape" and duplication of services, less time consuming for school and agencies, less cost, consistency, better communication between home, school and/or agency and the possibility of problems being better identified.

They also indicated benefits to children: better attendance, with the children more apt to be in a position to learn; problems handled by the appropriate agency; and easier access to the agencies with the coordinator able to supply a need when known. One respondent felt that parents would be more willing to go to school for help rather than venture downtown for an appointment.

Respondents also indicated that an integrated approach could heighten the possibility of recognizing and dealing with ongoing concerns. Trade-offs and "buck-passing" between agencies may be eliminated, resulting in more accountability. As well, it was stated that it may be easier for children to relate to a central coordinated agency, namely the school.

A total of 36 principals did not comment on the possible negative effects forthcoming in the delivery of social services to the children in the school. Of the concerns expressed, most dealt with the foreseeable failings on the part of the agencies or the inter-agency coordinator. Inter-agency rivalry, bureaucracy of agencies, and the problem of coordinating educational and social services were mentioned as possible failings. The responsibility of the person to facilitate the coordination of the social services was questioned. Concern was expressed that the individual could become a "bottleneck" and if the position was not handled properly, fragmentation and splintering could result.

Other concerns included an increase in costs, lack of space in

schools, workloads of staff being increased, and too many demands already placed on the school. Other areas cited involving clients included hurt pride, lack of privacy and confidentiality and welfare "stamp". One respondent stated that any improvement in the present system would be welcomed as the present system is poor while one principal was totally against any change with the comment "Let's run a school - not a glorified social agency."

Table XVI shows the ranking of the various factors that are responsible for the ineffective coordination of social services as seen by the respondents. Three principals did not rank any factors; one wrote the following comment:

"My experience in working with various agencies has been very positive. I have found agencies to listen carefully and to act decisively when the "school" speaks. The trick is to speak to the right people and to document the cases well. Very often schools have failed in the latter."

Ten principals did not rank order up to ten items as contained in the instructions.





A total of five items were listed under the "others" category:

"Too much talk and no action" (6)

"Personal problems within the agencies" (1)

"Insufficient staff" (3)

"Most services are fragmented, i.e., a dozen different children and workers in the same area" (8)

"NOT enough need for this service" (1)

The principals' perception of the major factors lessening the effective coordination of social services would appear to be mainly in the area of communication. This lack is not only between agencies but also among agency, family and school.

All but 13 principals provided written comments on the advantages of integration to children, the greatest number alluded to prompt and immediate service, thereby saving time in dealing with problems. Quick response to referrals would result in better service and follow-up. Coordination could also result in dealing with the "whole" child by fewer people. The school was perceived to be a comfortable environment reducing tension for the child. With home, school and health problems related, a coordinated effort seems desirable. Comments also included involvement with one agency better, more understanding for teachers, and a greater number of contacts with children possible. One respondent did not see any advantage "at the present time."

The advantages for the school administrators revolved around time. Many respondents felt coordination would mean a saving of time with fewer contacts and meetings if one knew who to contact. Better understanding of resources, quicker answers, less conflict and closer liaison would all result if services were the responsibility of one individual. Other potential

benefits included a greater awareness of problems, more information for better decisions, accountability of workers, and facilitating communication. Thirteen principals did not respond with any written comments.

Twenty-four principals failed to list advantages for the service agency in having coordinated social services in the school. Their written comments dealt with the possibility of increased efficiency both of time and people and effectiveness of results. Location in the school was felt to be a distinct advantage due to the nearness and easier accessibility of clients, not being considered an outsider, working in a smaller geographical area, receiving the whole accurate picture of the child, and knowing the teachers' and schools' expectations. One principal felt no advantages would be realized "unless increase in staff."

A few disadvantages of having coordinated social services in the schools were mentioned. These included the possible danger of interference with school work, loss of privacy and confidentiality, overkill, labelling, overwhelming the children, parents taking offence, pressure to take advantage of services, too ready dependence to accept help, and children may not want the school to know about their contact with some agencies. Two principals felt that a child would have fewer alternatives if a clash occurred and no one person would feel responsible to respond to a child's needs.

Several disadvantages for the school administrators were mentioned: additional work and worries, the possibility of being too closely identified with the service agency, lack of space, the possibility of a power struggle, frustration if expectations were not met, and the problem of the ultimate responsibility. One respondent felt if this was to be, the role of the principal would have to be redefined.

For the service agency the major concern centered around increased costs with the need for more personnel. Other concerns dealt with the problem of agencies spreading themselves too thinly, decentralization adversely affecting communication, pressure to perform and the difficulty of coordination between agencies.

## II. INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS

### General Information

Eighteen administrators of selected social agencies completed questionnaires. Several difficulties became apparent in analyzing the data; many of the agencies do not serve the same geographical area as the Winnipeg School Division, few deal only with school age children, and many agencies offer a wide range of social services.

Table XVII shows the geographical area served by the agencies.

TABLE XVII  
GEOGRAPHICAL AREA SERVED BY RESPONDING AGENCIES

Geographical Area	Number
a) Manitoba	6
b) City of Winnipeg	7
c) Winnipeg School Division	1
d) Segment of Winnipeg School Division	3
e) No response	1
TOTAL	18

In Table XVIII information about other agencies offering similar services as responding agencies is shown.

TABLE XVIII  
OTHER AGENCIES OFFERING SIMILAR SERVICES AS RESPONDING AGENCIES

Similar Services Offered by Other Agencies	Number
a) Yes	12
b) No	4
c) No response	2
TOTAL	18

Responding to the facilities in the Winnipeg School Division proved difficult for agencies serving a larger geographical area. Although the number of offices ranged from zero to 12 and workers from one to 80, no attempt was made by the reporting agencies to separate the number within

the Winnipeg School Division area.

Table XIX provides information about the agencies' clientele.

TABLE XIX  
CLIENTS SERVED BY RESPONDING AGENCIES

Clients	Number
a) Adults only	1
b) Adults and children	13
c) School age children only	2
d) Pre-school age children only	2
TOTAL	18

Present Association with Winnipeg Schools

All agencies reported some association with schools in the Winnipeg School Division. This association included inservices for teachers, class presentations, working with staffs to identify concerns, program planning and follow-up, use of recreational facilities in the schools, supplying resource materials, and referral of children with special needs.

The location of an agency on a permanent basis in a school was interpreted by the administrators as maintaining an office. Seven agencies responded that they were permanently located in a school while 11 replied as not being permanently located.

Eight agencies visited schools on a regularly scheduled basis while ten did not visit schools at all. Agencies located on a permanent basis spent from 25 - 30 hours weekly in the schools while some agencies allocated



50 - 60% of their staff time to the schools.

Direct referrals for services from Winnipeg School Division personnel were made to 14 agencies, two agencies did not receive any referrals and two other agencies received only questions or concerns regarding children. Referrals were made by teachers (10), principals (8), guidance counsellors (7), Child Guidance personnel (3), nurses (1), community workers (1), and physiotherapists (1).

Integration of Services in Winnipeg Schools

Table XX provides data from the agency administrators regarding the feasibility of integration of social services.

TABLE XX  
INTEGRATION OF WORTHWHILE SOCIAL SERVICES BY RESPONDING  
AGENCIES

Responses	Number
a) Yes	6
b) No	4
c) Yes, under certain conditions	6
d) No, under certain conditions	0
e) No response	2
TOTAL	18

The agencies responding negatively explained their responses with the following comments:

"Big Brothers has such a limited involvement with the schools that integration is not necessary to us."

"Guidance counsellors in schools should know what social agencies to take advantage of and referrals to make."

"I feel that better services to the children would not evolve out of such a system. People merely had a tendency to get involved on their own, or their organizational needs, to the detriment of service."

"Our traffic and liaison personnel make their schedules and arrangements directly with school supervisors."

Although most agencies agreed with the concept some concerns were raised: the fear of students becoming "labelled"; the "agency" becoming the arm of the school thereby lessening its value among the students; the possibility of overservice; and accountability for coordination. It was felt that integration and coordination were essential, could help avoid duplication, and serve as a liaison between agencies and students. One respondent stated the school social worker should be the coordinator for the student. Certain conditions were listed in one questionnaire; "if space and facilities provided, money, open throughout the year, services to other than school-aged children and their families and services not limited to the school's catchment area." One administrator summed it up by commenting - "we would like to see more community-based neighbourhood service centres - in effect, a one-stop shopping mall for human services."

In Table XXI the impact that integration would have on effectiveness in the delivery of social services is shown:

TABLE XXI

IMPACT OF INTEGRATION IN INCREASING EFFECTIVENESS IN  
THE DELIVERY OF SERVICES

Degree of effectiveness that would accompany integration	Number
a) Very effective	5
b) Moderately effective	3
c) Not very effective	3
d) Not effective	3
e) No response	4
TOTAL	18

Two respondents who indicated integration would not be effective felt it did not apply to them and commented "we are not a social agency" and "services not geared to children." One respondent felt that as they are in contact with most agencies the only real advantage would be a greater accessibility to the persons required. However, respondents who felt integration would be very or moderately effective were very positive in their comments. They stated "this would greatly facilitate the integration of services to children by the many agencies in the city"; "improvements would result from 'under one roof' communication"; "we would be more accessible to families, and an increased contact with the youth would result as students might approach a coordinator of social services for information as to where to go for help.

Eight respondents listed a number of problems or disadvantages. Problems included conflicts over use of space, too time consuming, possible confusion from too many people, expense, schools open only on a ten month basis, accessibility of nonstudent families, possible loss of confidentiality,

and fragmentation of their services. Disadvantages involved social agencies becoming identified with the school, possible misinterpretation of information as it passed through a number of people, and the use of the school by agency clients who might be undesirable to have in a school, and one thought it would fragment their service.

Two respondents did not feel integration would have a significant effect on their programs. Two other respondents commented that the school would be an ideal point for intervention of potential problems rather than the "after the fact" present situation and having a social worker coordinate the work of social agencies with a clearly defined role and responsibility would be an asset.

### III. IN-DEPTH PROFILE OF TWO TYPICAL SCHOOLS

An in-depth profile of two typical elementary schools was developed in order to show the varying needs of schools in the delivery of social services. The schools were chosen on the basis of only two criteria; size and location.

School A is a designated inner city school. It is located in an economically depressed area where the private rental housing is degenerating, causing people to stay only a short time. The student population is presently 272 pupils, a slightly smaller number than the past year.

The student body is made up of 25 - 30% Indian and/or Metis students. The remainder are of many ethnic backgrounds - Chilean, Vietnamese, Korean, Croatian, Russian, Polish, and others, with no identifiable group predominating. A number of immigrant children and many Indian and Metis children have difficulty with the English language. However, because not enough children at the intermediate level are in this category, no English as a Second

Language Program can be set up. Although half of the enrollment is stable, the other half will turn over two or three times throughout the year.

The number of school families served by the school is under 200. The average family income is over \$8,000.00 because in many instances both parents work. There is little adult attachment to the school due to the mobility of the families. A few adults act as volunteers in the library and for lunch hour supervision. When an adult nutrition program was implemented, it attracted only people who were already involved in the school and consequently was dropped. Single parent families make up about 20% of the population with the rest having both adults employed. This creates a problem in contacting a parent for emergencies during the day. When parents are contacted, the communication barrier has to be overcome. This is often done by drawing pictures rather than writing a message.

The school has run three nutrition programs for the past three years. One is an education program designed to teach children about nutrition. In conjunction with this a snack program once a cycle exposes the students to various foods they might not normally eat. As well, a breakfast program for approximately 40 children is offered every morning. There is no charge as the program is paid for by the school division and the provincial government. This program is considered a success because of the noticeable improvement in the children's attitude and work.

The role of the principal at the school tends to be more of a social worker than of an educational leader. Most of the time is spent dealing with the pupils and community in a social rather than in an

educational manner. An example would be the prominent role played in starting a day care centre in the community. Recognizing a need, the principal was the moving force in approaching the Child Day Care Services of the Department of Health and Social Development to investigate the necessary requirements for such a venture. He acted as the treasurer at the beginning and assumed the role of chairman for a short period of time. The child day care centre is presently operating out of a local church and his role now is mainly supervisory.

The only social services maintaining an office or visiting on a regular basis are the Child Guidance Clinic and the Public Health Department. These are rated as being very effective and the social worker from the Child Guidance Clinic has done much good by offering advice on how to proceed in answering the children's varied needs. It is felt that more contact with other agencies is needed, either by locating them in the school or by having them more readily available. These agencies include a Medical Clinic, Childrens' Aid Society, Child Welfare, Child Day Care Service and the Department of Parks and Recreation. The amount of time presently spent by the Child Guidance Clinic and the Public Health Nurse should be increased substantially.

Some schools have reported improvements in the attitude toward, and involvement of, the agencies. The Childrens' Aid Society will visit the school as the need arises. This change occurred after the principal wrote a letter to the Director. Sharing of information does take place although the workers feel that school contact can be an impediment. The Juvenile Division of the Police Department also visits the school in connection with specific children.

The basic problem expressed by the principal is that agencies will not share information. Frustrations arise when the Manitoba Youth Centre will not contact the school with any information on the status of children. All such information is presently classified confidential and the school is never aware of when children are released or why they are detained. This makes it very difficult for the school to attempt to answer the needs of the child. Another frustration concerns the Welfare Department. The principal would like the school to have some input regarding the families receiving welfare. This could take the form of an evaluation because it is felt that some responsibility should go along with the receipt of public money. The school would be in an excellent position to judge whether the money received is benefitting the children at school.

The principal is in agreement with the concept of integrating social services to the mutual benefit of the children, the school staff, and the agencies involved.

School B is also an elementary school with a total enrolment of 261 students. It is located in an economically advantaged area made up of professional and middle management parents. It is a relatively stable neighbourhood with single family dwellings and a high income range. It has a very low student mobility and only six out of the 178 families served have a single parent. The school boasts a large parent volunteer program in a number of areas.

The agencies presently involved in the school on a regular basis are the Public Health Department (one-half day per week) and the Child Guidance Clinic (one-day per cycle). These agencies are rated, in order, as being very and moderately effective. The amount of time presently spent is considered adequate with a possible increase needed from the speech and

hearing clinician. The Child Guidance Clinic clinicians serve only 10% of the students. The principal felt that there was no need for any other social service in the school.

The role of the principal at this school is that of an educational leader, ensuring the academic needs of the students are met. However, in dealing with parents regarding social agencies, the situation is one of having the parents face reality. Many parents attempt to avoid the problem or demand copious amounts of data before being convinced that a problem exists. This proves to be very time consuming both to the principal and the agency.

The lack of necessity of more social services in this area stems from the fact that children are better able to cope with problems. This would be a result of their environment and involvement in various activities such as swimming lessons, music, ballet and sports programs. The integration of social services would appear not to be necessary for this school.

#### IV. OBSERVATIONS

A number of observations can be drawn from the information presented.

One, principals would rather have social agencies readily available to them than have them located in the school. This is possibly based on the lack of frequent need for the majority of listed agencies and the feeling that most are available as needed. However, with the agencies presently located or spending time in the schools a need was expressed for an increase in the time presently allotted. This would seem to indicate that if additional time was given by the agency, principals could and would



make use of it because of their general acceptance of the effectiveness of the agencies.

Two, the majority of the principals indicated that coordination would be worthwhile with positive effects forthcoming. Whether this is based on their own situation or a perceived notion is difficult to determine. Some stated that coordination was unnecessary due to the school or community situation. In smaller schools, principals may feel they are more in control and able to cope in most areas without having an outsider coordinate the necessary services. However, most principals could see the advantages resulting from coordination if the need for a number of social services existed. These advantages included the obvious; better communication, less time and less bureaucracy. Although some concerns were expressed as to the disadvantages, most principals did not, or could not, foresee any real problems in the coordination of social services.

Three, the administrators from the social agencies had a more difficult time responding to the questionnaire. Some do not deal directly and exclusively with the schools, while some do not consider themselves social agencies. Although the majority felt that integration would be worthwhile, some concerns and conditions were noted. These included similar problems as raised by the principals. Most administrators, because of their present clientele, did not want to deal only with school children but with the entire community. No suggestion was made by any agency of it losing its autonomy although a few mentioned that integration would have a detrimental effect on their program.

Four, both the principals and administrators shared some common thoughts on the feasibility of integration of social services in

the schools. The majority of both groups felt integration was worthwhile, citing similar reasons such as avoidance of duplication of services and consistency. Other reasons advanced dealt with their own perceptions of the advantages of integration. The school social worker was suggested as the possible coordinator by individuals in both groups. Concerns raised included the accountability of the coordinator and the possible additional expenses involved. Positive benefits as seen by both groups included greater accessibility to persons requiring help, better communication and easier contact from the student's viewpoint. On the negative side, it was felt that lack of space in schools and the possible loss of confidentiality and privacy would be detrimental if integration was implemented.

Five, the principals and administrators, although sharing some common points on integration, expressed some concerns indicating they did not agree with one another. While some principals indicated it would be easier for children to relate to the school and parents would be more willing to go to the school rather than downtown, some administrators stated that they did not want to be associated with the school as it would lessen their value among students. It was also felt that schools would not be as accessible for nonstudent families. This difference of opinion appears to be based on how the school is viewed by both groups. Another concern raised by principals included inter-agency rivalry and the bureaucracy of agencies resulting in possible negative effects in the delivery of services to the children. However, the administrators felt they were in contact with other agencies and did not express any difficulties in this area. The possible reason for this is that schools have an opportunity to view

the whole situation while agencies may only view their own offered services and not be aware of the full needs of the children.

Six, the concept of integrating services was generally acceptable to the principals and agency administrators. Each group raised some legitimate concerns that would have to be carefully examined if integration were to work well. Principals in small schools with little need for services from social agencies saw no need for integration. The coordination of social agencies would appear to be necessary only at larger schools with a possible defined geographical area that would allow for enough students to make it worthwhile. A possible solution may be each school having a coordinator located in it with the larger area or "feeder" high school housing the necessary agencies to answer the needs of the students. Administrator concerns revolved around the lack of space and facilities in schools, the ten month term, and the possibility of dealing only with children. Certainly for intergration to be successful, space and facilities would have to be provided in the schools. As well, schools would have to remain open year round with extended hours. The services offered would also have to include the entire community, not only school age children. If these areas of concern could be overcome, integration could be a viable system.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine the present and potential role of the school as a site for the integration of social services to school age young people in the Winnipeg School Division #1. To achieve this purpose, the present role of the school in the delivery of non-educational services, the present effectiveness of social services in the school, some barriers to integration, the positive effects of integration, the factors causing ineffective coordination of social services, and advantages and disadvantages of having coordinated social services in the school for the children, the school administration and the service agency were examined. As well, information regarding the agencies' role(s) in the delivery of services, their association with Winnipeg schools, the positive effects integration might have on the delivery of social services and any factors which might affect this delivery if integration took place were also examined. To achieve these purposes, a review of the views expressed by various writers on the subject of integration and the inherent difficulties in the delivery of social services in school provided additional information and understanding of the situation and provided the necessary background to the achievement of the purpose of this study. Additionally, two questionnaires were developed by the writer: one was sent to all principals of schools in the Winnipeg School Division and the other was sent to a selected number of administrators of service agencies in the Winnipeg area. The respondents were requested

to determine if the integration of social services in the school was worthwhile.

The data supplied by the respondents to the survey was compiled, analysed and presented in a series of tables and written comments. These tables and comments provided information on the overall response to the survey; on the type of school, number of classes and pupils in the school; on the community; the number of families served, amount of income, student mobility, welfare recipients, and single parent families; on the agencies serving the schools; their relation to the school, time spent in the school, their effectiveness, possible barriers to the delivery of services, the positive effects of integration, and advantages and disadvantages of integration. The administrators' questionnaire provided information on the agencies; on the area they served and services provided; on the facilities within the school division and number of children serviced; on the positive effects integration might have and problems or disadvantages integration would have for their agency.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study resulted from the data provided by the respondents in their responses to the survey questionnaires. This data was tabulated, analysed and presented in a series of tables and written comments which provided the information of the survey.

The findings of this study suggest the following conclusions about the integration of social services to school age young people in the Winnipeg School Division.

One, principals do not wish to have social services located in the

school if they can have them readily available as many services are not needed on a frequent basis. However, additional time of agencies presently used is wanted as these agencies are considered, for the most part, to be effective.

Two, principals felt positive benefits such as better communication, less time and less bureaucracy would be forthcoming with the coordination of social services. In smaller schools, coordination was deemed unnecessary as there appeared to be little need for it.

Three, administrators of social agencies had difficulty responding to the questionnaire because of their not dealing exclusively with schools. The majority felt integration was worthwhile but a few felt this would have a detrimental effect on their program.

Four, most principals and administrators felt integration was worthwhile and expressed similar reasons of the positive effects it might have on the servicing of children. These reasons included avoidance of duplication of services, more consistency, greater accessibility, better communication and easier contact for the student. Concerns expressed by both groups included lack of space in schools, loss of confidentiality and privacy, and possible additional expense involved. The school social worker was viewed as a possible coordinator.

Five, different views were expressed by the principals and administrators in the area of accessibility. Principals felt that location in a school would result in easier access to social services for the community but the administrators felt this would have a detrimental effect on their programs. The relationship among agencies was also viewed differently; principals felt that cooperation would not

exist among agencies, administrators felt that this aspect was not a problem.

Six, both principals and administrators agreed with the concept of integration. Legitimate concerns were raised by both groups that would have to be carefully examined to make it a viable system.

If the goal of integration is to be achieved, it would appear a number of factors would have to be present. These include:

- 1) a new school building with input from the community in the planning stages.
- 2) a school population that is large enough to maintain a variety of social services.
- 3) a dynamic leader who would be able to effectively coordinate the many facets of integration.
- 4) a problem such as segregation or accommodating immigrants that would strengthen arguments for the integration of social services.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The study failed to bring out any clear cut recommendations for integrating social services in the schools. The various size(s) and location(s) of the schools resulted in inconsistent responses as to the needs of the children. A possible grouping of schools using predetermined criteria might help to alleviate this problem. A future study might also attempt to solicit responses from other Winnipeg school divisions to determine if they see any advantages to the integration of social services in the schools.

In order to gain a clearer insight into the effect of social services

on school age children, teachers may be better able to determine the ramifications of integration. They have more of a direct contact with the students than do the principals. A survey aimed at classroom teachers rather than principals might shed more light on the route to follow with integration. Administrators of social services and principals tend to deal with the theoretical aspect of a situation and are not always familiar with the practical aspect.

The questionnaire, as submitted to principals and administrators, may not have furnished the information necessary to reach a decisive answer. As explicit as it might be, the respondents may interpret a question in a number of ways. The tendency to read into a question what we want is a failing that is difficult to overcome. Additionally, not every response is well thought out as to the positive and negative effects. The only way to overcome this deficiency is conducting interviews with each respondent.



## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baillie, Susan, Laurence De Witt, and Linda Schluter O'Leary.  
The Potential Role of the School as a Site for Integrating Social Services. Syracuse: EPRC Research Report RR-10, 1972.
- Bailyn, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1960.
- Berridge, Robert I. The Community Education Handbook. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973.
- Buell, Bradley. Community Planning for Human Services. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Comprehensive Neighbourhood Services Programs: Guidelines for Programs. Office of Economic Opportunity. Washington, February, 1970.
- Crichton, Anne. Community Health Centres: Health Care Organization of the Future. Montreal: Canadian Printco Ltd., 1973.
- Developing Neighbourhood Services: Report of a Two-Year Demonstration Project. The Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton and District. January, 1968.
- Donnison, D. V. and V. Chapman, et al. Social Policy and Administration. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1965.
- Fantini, Mario, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat. Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praegar Publishers, 1970.
- Fusco, Gene C. Improving Your School-Community Relations Program. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1967,
- Hickey, Howard W., Curtis Van Voorhees, and Associates, eds. The Role of the School in Community Education. Midland, Michigan: The Pendell Company, 1969.
- Hienistra, Roger. The Educative Community. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972.
- Joe, Barbara. Social Services in the Seventies: Issues and Challenges. Washington: National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1974.
- Kahn, Alfred J. Planning Community Services for Children in Trouble. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

- \_\_\_\_\_, et al. Neighbourhood Information Centres: A Study and some Proposals. (New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1966).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in Social Policy and Planning. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Theory and Practice of Social Planning. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.
- Lepper, Mark H. "Health Planning for the Urban Community: The Neighbourhood Health Centre." 1st National Congress on the Socio-Economics of Health Care. Chicago, June 22-23, 1967.
- MacKinnon, F. R. Social Service Delivery Systems. A Commissioned Paper to the Community Health Centre Project. Halifax: Canadian Public Health Association, undated.
- Manual of Social Services in Manitoba 1976-77. Winnipeg: Social Planning Council of Winnipeg.
- Marris, Peter and Marten Rein. Dilemmas of Social Reform. New York: Atherton Press, 1969.
- Melby, Ernest O. Administering Community Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.
- Milliken, William G. Preface, in the Role of the School in Community Education. ed., Howard W. Hickey, Curtis Van Vlorhees and Associates. Midland, Michigan: The Pendell Company, 1969.
- Minzey, Jack D. and Clarence R. Olsen. An Overview, in The Role of the School in Community Education. ed., Howard W. Hickey, Curtis Van Voorhees and Associates. Midland, Michigan: The Pendell Company, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Clyde Le Tarte. Community Education: From Program to Process. Midland, Michigan: The Pendell Company, 1972.
- Morrison, T. and A. Burton. Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Co., 1973.
- National Commission on Community Health Services. Health is a Community Affair. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1966.
- National Consultation of Neighbourhood Services. Department of National Health and Welfare. Geneva Park, Ontario. February, 1970.
- New Directions in Public Policy for Health Care. The New York Academy of Medicine: 1966 Health Conference. December, 1966.

- New Horizons in Health Care. Proceedings of the International Congress in Group Medicine. Winnipeg, 1971.
- Newmann, Fred M. and Donald W. Oliver. "Education and Community" in Community and the Schools. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review, 1969.
- Perlman, Robert. Consumers and Social Services. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and David Jones. Neighbourhood Service Centres. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967.
- Rein, Martin. Social Policy: Issues of Choice and Change. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Rivlin, Alice M. Systematic Thinking for Social Action. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1971.
- Sahlein, William J. A Neighbourhood Solution to the Social Services Dilemma. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1973.
- Sarri, Rosemary C. "Education in Transition" in The School in the Community. ed., Rosemary C. Sarri and Frank F. Maple. Washington: National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1972.
- Saxe, Richard W. School-Community Interaction. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1975.
- Seay, Maurice F. and Associates. Community Education: A Developing Concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1974.
- Schorr, Alvin L. Explorations in Social Policy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.
- The Red Door: A Report on Neighbourhood Services. The Area Development Project: United Community Services. Vancouver, 1968.
- The Task Force Report on the Cost of Health Services in Canada. (Vol.III) Department of National Health and Welfare. Ottawa, 1970.
- Totten, W. Fred. The Power of Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Frank J. Manley. The Community School. Galien, Michigan: Allied Education Council, 1969.
- Wheeler, Michael. Integration of Physical and Social Planning. Report Number Two. Report on a seminar held 27-28 March, 1968 under the joint sponsorship of the Special Project on Low-Income Housing and the Community Funds and Councils Division of the Canadian Welfare Council. Ottawa, 1968.

## APPENDIX A

Robert H. Smith School  
500 Kingsway Avenue  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3M 0H8

April 6th, 1977

Dear Fellow Principal:

To complete my Masters degree in Educational Administration, I am conducting a study of the potential role of the school as a site for integrating and expanding social services to young people. To enable me to continue this study, I would appreciate it if you would answer the enclosed questionnaire which will take approximately 20-30 minutes of your valuable time. It is also my intention to follow up at a later date with a personal interview in a few selected cases.

All replies will be held completely confidential. If you wish to receive the results of the survey please indicate your desire on the questionnaire.

I would appreciate the return of your questionnaire by April 20th, 1977. Thank you for your assistance and anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

J. F. Scott,  
Principal.

pp  
encl.

## APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION

1. School

- a) What is the name of the school? \_\_\_\_\_
- b) What is the address of the school? \_\_\_\_\_
- c) What type of school is it? (check one)

Elementary \_\_\_\_\_

Elementary-junior high \_\_\_\_\_

Junior high \_\_\_\_\_

Junior-senior high \_\_\_\_\_

Senior high \_\_\_\_\_

Actual Number

- d) What is the number of  
classes in the school?... grades N - 6 \_\_\_\_\_
- 7 - 9 \_\_\_\_\_
- 10 - 12 \_\_\_\_\_

Actual Number

- e) What is the number of  
daytime students in  
the school? ..... grades N - 6 \_\_\_\_\_
- 7 - 9 \_\_\_\_\_
- 10 - 12 \_\_\_\_\_

.....2



## 2. COMMUNITY

- a) What is the approximate number of school families in the community?

0 - 200 \_\_\_\_\_  
200 - 400 \_\_\_\_\_  
400 - 800 \_\_\_\_\_  
800+ \_\_\_\_\_

- b) What is the approximate percentage range of income per school family in the community?

under \$4000 \_\_\_\_\_  
\$4000-\$6000 \_\_\_\_\_  
\$6000-\$8000 \_\_\_\_\_  
\$8000+ \_\_\_\_\_

- c) Characteristics of the community

- i) What is the approximate percentage rate of student mobility in a year?

\_\_\_\_\_

- ii) What is the approximate percentage rate of school families receiving welfare?

\_\_\_\_\_

- iii) What is the approximate percentage rate of school families with a single parent?

\_\_\_\_\_

- iv) Add any other factors which you feel might contribute to a better understanding of the community.

Additional comments for Section 1 (if needed)

PART II - NON-EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

1. The following is a partial list of various social services that deal with school age children. Please check the agencies in column one that maintain offices within the school. In column two, check the agencies that visit on a regularly scheduled basis.

	<u>Maintain Offices</u>	<u>Visit On Regular Basis</u>
a) Child Guidance Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Inner City of Winnipeg Health Department		
i) Public Health Nursing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Medical Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Dental Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Department of Health & Social Development		
i) Social Security/Financial Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Child Welfare	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Child Day Care Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Public Welfare Department, City of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Legal Aid Manitoba	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Family Services of Winnipeg Inc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Juvenile Division, Winnipeg Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Department of Parks & Recreation, City of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Others (please list)		

2. Of the social services listed below that are not located within the school, check the ones that you would like to have located in the school in column one. In column two, check the agencies that are not now readily available but you would want to have readily available.

	Would like located in <u>school</u>	Would like readily available
a) Child Guidance Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Inner City of Winnipeg Health Department		
i) Public Health Nursing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Medical Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Dental Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Department of Health & Social Development		
i) Social Security/Financial Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Child Welfare	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Child Day Care Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Public Welfare Department, City of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Legal Aid Manitoba	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Family Services of Winnipeg Inc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Juvenile Division, Winnipeg Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Department of Parks & Recreation, City of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Others (please list)		



PART III EVALUATION OF PRESENT SERVICES

1. Check the following list of agencies that presently maintain offices within the school or visit on a regularly scheduled basis as to their effectiveness in the delivery of services to the children in the school.

	Very Effective	Moderately Effective	Not Very Effective	Not Effective
a) Child Guidance Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Inner City of Winnipeg Health Dept.				
i) Public Health Nursing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Medical Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Dental Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Department of Health & Social Development				
i) Social Security/Financial Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Child Welfare	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Child Day Care Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Public Welfare Department, City of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Legal Aid Manitoba	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Family Services of Winnipeg Inc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Juvenile Division, Winnipeg Police Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Department of Parks & Recreation, City of Winnipeg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Others (please list)				

2. Following is a partial list of possible barriers to the effective delivery of services to the children in the school. To what extent do you feel these are barriers in dealing with social agencies that are located in the school or visit on a regularly scheduled basis? List any other barriers you may feel are applicable.

	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
a) Lack of space	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Too time consuming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) No real benefits derived	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Too much "red tape"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Lack of teacher support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Agencies are not approachable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Little communication between agency and school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Duplication of services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Others (please list)				

Additional comments for Section 3 (if needed)

PART IV FUTURE SERVICES

1. The possibility of integrating various social services in the school is one solution that has been advocated to provide better services to the children in the school. This integration may range from the school merely providing space in the building for different agencies to the establishment of a full time person coordinating the work of the various social agencies. Check the response that you feel best indicates if this idea of integration is worthwhile.

☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Yes, under certain conditions  
☐ No, under certain conditions

Please explain your response.

- 2.a) Do you feel this integration would have any positive effects on the delivery of social services to the children in the school? Check one.

☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Yes, under certain conditions  
☐ No, under certain conditions

- b) Please explain your response in terms of the positive effects you feel would be forthcoming in the delivery of social services to the children in the school.

1.

2.

3.

c) If you feel there may be some negative effects forthcoming in the delivery of social services to the children in the school, please list them below.

1.

2.

3.

3. Experience shows us and the literature informs us that the effective coordination of social services is lessened because of a variety of factors. Please rank the following list of factors from 1 to 10, starting with the factor that you consider most important in causing this ineffectiveness.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Factors</u>
_____	Too many agencies dealing with one family
_____	Poor communication between agencies
_____	Lack of communication between agency, family and school
_____	Lack of follow-up
_____	Agencies working in isolation
_____	Lack of trust between agencies and school
_____	Lack of information sharing between agency and school
_____	Lack of time i.e. scheduling
_____	Lack of facilities and space
_____	Lack of input of schools for evaluation
_____	Problem of agencies withholding information from schools
	Others (please list)
_____	
_____	
_____	
_____	



4. a) Although the integration of social services in the school may have a number of problems associated with it, would you identify any advantages to having coordinated social services in the school under the following headings:

Advantages

i) For the children at the school

ii) For the school administration

iii) For the service agency

- b) If possible identify any disadvantages in having coordinated social services in the school under the following headings:

Disadvantages:

i) For the children at the school

ii) For the school administration

iii) For the service agency

Additional comments for Section 4 (if needed)

Would you like to receive the results of this survey upon completion?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C

Robert H. Smith School  
500 Kingsway Avenue  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3M 0H8

April 6th, 1977

As part of my Master's degree program in Educational Administration at the University of Manitoba, I am conducting a study of the potential role of the school as a site for integrating and expanding social services to young people. This study will help contribute to the better utilization and referral of social services in the schools.

I have chosen a number of non-educational service agencies such as yours which may deal with school age children. Although your agency may cover a wider area I am interested only in the services offered to children in the Winnipeg School Division attendance area. To enable me to complete my study, I would appreciate it if you would answer the enclosed questionnaire which will probably take 20-30 minutes of your valuable time. It is also my intention to follow up at a later date with a personal interview in a few selected cases.

All replies will be held completely confidential. If you wish to receive the results of the survey please indicate your desire on the questionnaire.

I would appreciate the return of your questionnaire by April 20th, 1977. Thank you for your assistance and anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

J. F. Scott,  
Principal.

pp  
encl.

## APPENDIX D

## 1. Agency

- a) Name of agency \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Address of agency \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Total area served \_\_\_\_\_
- d) Services offered to school aged children
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

Are you familiar with other agencies that offer similar services in your service area? (Please check YES or NO)

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please list the agency(ies)

a) Number of offices \_\_\_\_\_

b) Number of workers \_\_\_\_\_

c) Clients services (check one): adults only \_\_\_\_\_  
children only \_\_\_\_\_  
adults and children \_\_\_\_\_

d) Approximate number of school-aged children serviced \_\_\_\_\_

Additional comments for section I (if needed)

PART II - PRESENT ASSOCIATION WITH WINNIPEG SCHOOLS

1. At present does your agency have any association with schools in the Winnipeg School Division? Please check YES or NO.

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

If yes indicate in what manner

- i) Educational material supplied \_\_\_\_\_
- ii) Newsletter \_\_\_\_\_
- iii) Informational meetings with teachers \_\_\_\_\_
- iv) Other (please list) \_\_\_\_\_

2. At present is your agency located on a permanent basis in any schools in the Winnipeg School Division. Please check YES or NO

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

- i) If yes, in how many schools? \_\_\_\_\_

3. At present does your agency visit any schools in the Winnipeg School Division on a regularly scheduled basis? Please check YES or NO

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

- i) If yes, how many schools? \_\_\_\_\_

- ii) Approximately how much time is spent in schools on a weekly basis? \_\_\_\_\_

4. At present does your agency receive any direct referrals for services from Winnipeg School Division personnel? Please check YES or NO

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

- i) If yes, who makes the referrals? \_\_\_\_\_

Additional comments for Section II (if needed)

PART III INTEGRATION OF SERVICES IN WINNIPEG SCHOOLS

1. The possibility of integrating various social services in the school is one solution that has been advocated to provide better services to the children in the school. This integration may range from the school merely providing space in the building for different agencies to the establishment of a full time person coordinating the work of the various social agencies. Check the response that you feel best indicates if this idea of integration is worthwhile.

☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Yes, under certain conditions  
☐ No, under certain conditions

Please explain your response.

2. a) To what extent do you feel this integration would have any positive effects on the delivery of your services to the children in the school? Check one.

☐ Very effective  
☐ Moderately effective  
☐ Not very effective  
☐ Not effective

- b) Please explain your response in terms of any positive effects you feel would be forthcoming in the delivery of your service to the children in the school.

3. If possible list any problems or disadvantages this integration would have for your agency on the delivery of service to the children.

1.

2.

3.

4. Please list any other factors you feel that would affect the delivery of services to the children from your agency if integration of social services did take place in the schools.

Additional comments for Section 3 (if needed)

Would you like to receive the results of this survey upon completion?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_