

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 UNIVER-
SITY 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 other-
wise 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."¹ 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. Melby² 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."³ 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.⁴

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.⁵ 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

- ¹ 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.
- ² Ernest O. Melby, Administering Community Education, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955).
- ³ Baillie, op.cit., p.56.
- ⁴ Ibid., p.3.
- ⁵ 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. Barlyn¹ 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.²

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.³ 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."⁴

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.⁵

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."⁶ 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.⁷

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.⁸ 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.⁹ 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."¹⁰

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.) and by the skill performed (teaching, medicine, social work, etc.).¹²

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."¹³ 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."¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ Decentralization of social services, in particular, must go to the neighbourhood level.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷

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."¹⁸

Obviously one would have to practice discretion in determining the decentralization of the services. According to Kahn¹⁹ 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.²⁰

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.²¹

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.²² 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.²³

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.²⁴

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.²⁵

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.²⁶ 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.²⁷ The United States offers assistance - two-thirds grants - through the Department of Housing and Urban Development