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OPINION SURVEYS

Leader’s Opinions of Parks and Recreation

476 Mayors (47% return)
58 County Supervisor’s (47% return)
58 County Executives (69% return)
120 State Legislators (48% return)
411 Chambers of Commerce (50% return)
1043 School District Superintendents (70% return)
WHY ARE WE DOING THIS?

Schools are an important part of the state’s system of park and recreation facilities

1. To understand the opinions of California’s public school Superintendents about parks and recreation.
2. To understand the opinions of local park and recreation professionals about schools and recreation.
3. To position park and recreation community for the Prop 49 After-school program.
SUPERINTENDENTS OPINIONS ABOUT RECREATION

• 2002 survey of all public school district Superintendents in California
  – 70% response

• Results reported in 3 segments:
  – Statewide
  – Large Metro, Small Metro, Non-metro
  – 12 substate regions
CALIFORNIA’S SCHOOL DISTRICTS

- >8,000 public schools in 1,043 districts
- >6 million children K-12
- Distribution of school districts:
  - 49% in large metropolitan areas
  - 28% in small metropolitan areas
  - 23% in non-metropolitan areas
  - 40% in Southern California & San Joaquin Valley
DATA ANALYSIS

- **Statewide**
  (what it means for all of us)

- **Substate**
  (what’s in it for you)
MAJOR FINDINGS

Superintendents:

• Report near-universal use of schools for public recreation (94% of districts)
• Think park facilities and recreation benefit local communities
• Believe community residents hold similar positive opinions of parks and recreation
• Are aligned with other opinion group leaders

Opinions vary in metro/non-metro areas, regions
SENSE OF RESIDENTS’ VALUE FOR PARKS & RECREATION

3 = high value 2 = medium value 1 = low value

Ranking

Team sports  Family fun  Sense of place  Exercise  Afterschool  Cultural  Special pop  Jobs & income
# SENSE OF RESIDENTS’ VALUE FOR PARKS & RECREATION

## Regional Variation --- High Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGEST IN</th>
<th>WEAKEST IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team sports</strong></td>
<td>Sac Metro, SF Bay</td>
<td>FtHill/Mlode, N Sierra Casc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family fun</strong></td>
<td>Sac Metro, E Sierra</td>
<td>MonBay, N Sac Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of place</strong></td>
<td>E Sierra, Cent Coast</td>
<td>FtHill/Mlode, N Sac Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exercise &amp; personal development</strong></td>
<td>Cent Coast, SF Bay</td>
<td>N Sierra Casc, FtHill/Mlode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After-school programs</strong></td>
<td>E Sierra, SoCal</td>
<td>N Sierra Casc, MonBay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sense of Residents’ Value for Parks & Recreation

## Regional Variation --- Medium Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongest In</th>
<th>Weakest In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural unity &amp; diversity</strong></td>
<td>FtHil/MLode, MonBay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Coast, Cent Coast</td>
<td>FtHil/MLode, MonBay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Sierra, N Sac Valley</td>
<td>San Diego (low value), MonBay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Areas
- **E Sierra (high value)**
- **N Coast, Cent Coast**
- **E Sierra, N Sac Valley**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Value Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LARGE METRO</td>
<td>(higher) team sports, exercise, after-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL METRO</td>
<td>(lower) cultural unity/diversity, special populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-METRO</td>
<td>(higher) jobs &amp; income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPERINTENDENTS’ VIEWS OF PARKS & RECREATION

3=strong agree 2.5=agree 1.5=disagree 1=strong disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERINTENDENTS’ VIEWS OF PARKS &amp; RECREATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Variation --- Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGEST IN</th>
<th>LESS SO IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRONG AGREEMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGREEMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>San Diego (very), SF Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; delinquency</td>
<td>N Coast, San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property values</td>
<td>San Diego, E Sierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Sierra, FtHil/Mlode (agreement)</td>
<td>E Sierra, FtHil/Mlode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley, N Sierra Casc (neutral)</td>
<td>San Joaquin Valley, N Sierra Casc (neutral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTS’ VIEWS OF PARKS &amp; RECREATION</td>
<td>Regional Variation --- Neutrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGEST IN</td>
<td>LESS SO IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business location decisions</td>
<td>Cent Coast, N Sierra Cascade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too crowded</td>
<td>E Sierra, N Sierra Casc (both disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jobs &amp; economy</td>
<td>E Sierra, N Sierra Casc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attract undesirable people &amp; activities</td>
<td>E Sierra, MonBay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Sac Valley (agree), San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (agree), SoCal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Coast, Sac Metro, Central Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FtHill/Mlode, SoCal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUPERINTENDENTS’ VIEWS OF PARKS & RECREATION

#### Regional Variation --- Disagreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th>Strongest In</th>
<th>Less So In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existence of enough facilities</td>
<td>San Diego, Foothill/Mother Lode</td>
<td>Central Coast, Eastern Sierra (both neutral)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUPERINTENDENTS’ VIEWS OF PARKS & RECREATION

**Metro Area Variation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LARGE METRO</td>
<td>quality of life, crime, property, business location, crowds</td>
<td>undesirables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL METRO</td>
<td>undesirables, exercise, after-school, enough parks</td>
<td>cultural unity/diversity, special populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-METRO</td>
<td>jobs &amp; economy</td>
<td>quality of life, crime, property, business location, crowds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOINT USE OF FACILITIES AND COOPERATION WITH OTHER ENTITIES

Do schools allow use for public recreation?
  – If so, why?
  – If not, why?
  – Are there charges for use?

Do schools partner with other entities?
  – If so, which entities?
  – What has resulted from partnerships?
  – Is there a possibility of forming an agreement with a Recreation and Park agency?
USE OF SCHOOLS FOR RECREATION

- Is nearly universal in California
- Vast majority is unrestricted use
REASONS FOR USE OF SCHOOLS FOR RECREATION

- Team Sports
- Healthy Community
- Fun for Kids
- Youth Non-school
- Student Learning
- Fun for Adults
- Reduced PhysEd

Statewide Responses
# Reasons for Use of Schools for Recreation

## Regional Variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Strongest in</th>
<th>Weakest in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team sports</td>
<td>N Sac Valley, N Coast, Cent Coasts, E Sierra</td>
<td>San Diego, MonBay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>N &amp; Cent Coasts, E Sierra</td>
<td>SoCal, MonBay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun for kids</td>
<td>N Coast, SF Bay</td>
<td>MonBay, E Sierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth non-school</td>
<td>FtHil/MLode, Cent Coast</td>
<td>N Sierra Casc, MonBay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>E Sierra, N &amp; Cent Coasts</td>
<td>MonBay, N Sierra Casc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun for adults</td>
<td>N Coast, Sac Metro</td>
<td>San Diego, FtHil/MLode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE reductions</td>
<td>Cent Coast, E Sierra</td>
<td>SJ Valley, N Sierra Casc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REASONS FOR USE OF SCHOOLS FOR RECREATION

**Metro Area Variation**

**LARGE METRO**

(higher) all but “Enhance schools role as a central link for healthy children”

**SMALL METRO**

(lower) all, especially “Positive effects on student learning, enhancing physical and mental well-being”

**NON-METRO**

(higher) “Enhance schools role as a central link for healthy children”
DENIAL OF SCHOOL USE FOR RECREATION

- Rare in California
- Restricted use 4% average, 12% high
- Where denied, Superintendents say because:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>RATE OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>CITED MORE OFTEN IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management issues</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>MonBay, SoCal, SJ Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else decides</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>N Coast, SF Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility constraint</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>MonBay, SoCal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one asked</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>MonBay, N Coast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHARGES FOR USE OF SCHOOLS FOR RECREATION

Percent of School Districts that charge fees

- **STATEWIDE**: 43% YES, 27% DEPENDS
- **LARGE METRO**: 59% YES, 20% DEPENDS
- **SMALL METRO**: 42% YES, 25% DEPENDS
- **NON-METRO**: 34% YES, 28% DEPENDS
SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS
OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Region

Monterey Bay
Foothill/Mother Lode
Southern California
San Diego
San Francisco Bay Area
Central Coast
Northern Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin Valley
North Coast
Northern Sierra Cascade
Sacramento Metro
Eastern Sierra

Percent that Partner

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS
NON-PROFIT ENTITIES

Percent that Partner with Non-Profit Organizations

- Monterey Bay
- Northern Sacramento Valley
- Northern Sierra Cascade, San Diego
- Eastern Sierra
- North Coast
- San Francisco Bay Area
- Southern California
- Foothill/Mother Lode, ***Statewide Average***
- San Joaquin Valley
- Sacramento Metro
- Central Coast
SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS

FAITH-BASED ENTITIES

Region

Percent that Partner with Faith-based Organizations

- Northern Sierra Cascade, Monterey Bay
- Foothill/Mother Lode
- Northern Coast
- Eastern Sierra
- San Francisco Bay Area
- San Diego
- Central Coast
- San Joaquin Valley
- Southern California
- Northern Sacramento Valley
- Sacramento Metro
- Statewide Average

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
EFFECTS OF PARTNERSHIPS FOR RECREATION

Percent of Superintendents responding

went down

went up

-10% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90%

MEDIA EXPOSURE
COMMUNITY SUPPORT
PROGRAMS
FACILITY USE
PERSONNEL HRS
GRANTS WON
OPS BUDGET
CAPITAL BUDGET
AGREEMENTS WITH LOCAL PARK & REC AGENCY

Percent of School Districts that will or might form a partnership

- **STATEWIDE**: 55% 30% YES 22% MAYBE
- **LARGE METRO**: 53% 31% YES 22% MAYBE
- **SMALL METRO**: 46% 35% YES 22% MAYBE
- **NON-METRO**: 66% 22% YES 22% MAYBE

**Legend:**
- **Yes**
- **Maybe**
SUPERINDENTS’ IDEAS vs. THOSE OF OTHERS

• Generally in agreement with other opinion group leaders
• Slightly different from those of local park and recreation professionals
SENSE OF RESIDENTS’ VALUE FOR PARKS & RECREATION

3=high value 2=medium value 1=low value

Ranking

Team sports
Family fun
Sense of place
Exercise
Afterschool
Cultural
Special pop
Jobs & income

Supes
Others
SUPERINTENDENTS’ VIEWS OF PARKS & RECREATION

3=strong agree 2.5=agree 1.5=disagree 1=strong disagree

Ranking

- Qual life
- Crime
- Prop value
- Biz locate
- Crowds
- Jobs & econ
- Undesirables
- Enough parks

Supes  Others  Public
LOCAL RECREATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Rate the importance of schools for recreation

Percent stating

A Lot
Some
Little/None
Don't Know
LOCAL RECREATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Characterize the use of schools for recreation

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents stating the use of schools for recreation is well used, accessible, unusable, costly, or prohibited. The chart indicates that the majority of respondents feel schools are well used, while a smaller percentage find them accessible or usable.](chart.png)
IF SCHOOLS PROVIDE ONLY RECREATION IN AREA

Percent of region’s superintendents and total number of superintendents who commented about lack of recreation

- SoCal: 4% (4)
- SFBay: 6% (6)
- S Diego & SacMet: 9% (8)
- Central Coast: 14% (3)
- Monterey Bay: 16% (4)
- S Joaq & N Sac Val: 20% (40)
- Gold Country: 22% (5)
- North Coast: 23% (9)
- N Sierra Cascade: 29% (11)
PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS

3/2/04 PRIMARY ELECTION:

- STATEWIDE SCHOOL BOND APPROVED (50.6%)
- 47 of 61 LOCAL SCHOOL BOND MEASURES APPROVED
- 7 OF 20 LOCAL SCHOOL PARCEL TAX MEASURES APPROVED
WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR RECREATION DEPTS?

• Meeting customer needs
• Partnering
• Facility sharing
• After-school programs

DECISION: BE A PLAYER?
TO DO LIST

SCHOOL RECREATION USE POLICIES

• Look for direct recreation partnership opportunities with schools
• Consider joint use school parks
• Seek mutual understanding of Prop 49 Before-and-After school program

SCHOOL RELATIONSHIPS WITH COMMUNITY-BASED RECREATION PROVIDERS

• Look for recreation partnership opportunities with NPOs and FBOs through their associations with schools
BEFORE-AND-AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

• **Funding**
  
  FEDERAL: No Child Left Behind Act
  
  STATE: Proposition 49

• **Purpose**
  
  Education? Recreation? Both?

  *In loco parentis?*
BEFORE-AND-AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Regional Network for program delivery

- Funds distributed to schools and School Districts through County Offices of Education (COE)
  - System of field support through COEs, Districts and non-profit contractor
- Local park agencies seen as contractors
Strengths of parks and recreation programs

- Kids gravitate to parks when school is out
- Safe, positive places and activities for kids
- Recreation programs teach things the schools do not or cannot do much anymore
- Parks are associated with natural resources that are highly suited for learning
- Parks are fun (i.e., meeting customer need)
BEFORE-AND-AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

**Weaknesses: parks and recreation programs**

- After-school money goes to the schools
- Park money shifted away from parks
- Public policy orientation is about extended learning, not about fun

**Opportunity: Proposition 49**

- Expanded statewide program in a few years
- Allows programs away from schools
- Consultation--- program planning
How can you use this information?

• Do you see an opportunity to develop or expand a before-and-after school program in your area?

• What are the barriers?

• How might they be overcome?

• If you were tasked to develop or expand a before-and-after school program, what steps would you have to take?
Given this information, what can we do for you?