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ABSTRACT

EXPLORING PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF THE GUELPH HUMANE SOCIETY FACILITIES AS A CENTRE FOR HUMAN-ANIMAL AND COMMUNITY INTERACTION

Anna Chow
University of Guelph, 2015

Advisory Committee
Nathan Perkins, PhD
Amy Estill, MSc

While humane shelters are multi-functional centres for animal-human activities, many are not designed to capitalize on community engagement, education and interaction. This research gathered public opinion about the Guelph Humane Society (GHS) and features that would enhance not only animal welfare but also community engagement and activities. An online survey was conducted to gather information on community members’ perceptions and opinions regarding the GHS. Results indicated that the respondents preferred features that aided in human-animal interaction, as well as those that would provide comfort to the animals and enhance shelter programming. The findings from this survey highlighted outdoor play spaces, walking trails, and shelter from weather as preferred features. For indoor space, natural light, auditory quality (noise protection or calming music), and indoor play spaces were rated highly. These results will help inform the design of future GHS facilities, and better enable it to become a centre in the community.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Modern humane shelters are often multi-functional hubs of activity that fulfill a number of mandates. One can observe potential adopters looking to select a shelter animal, or the bustling of volunteers socializing with the animals both indoors and outdoors. Front desk staff may be fielding questions from visitors; groups may be given a tour; or are at the shelter for special education programs. All these activities culminate in humane shelters becoming more than just a centre that cares for animals and finds them homes, but as places in the community acting as a resource centre for rescue animal-related issues, a far cry from the shelters of old that only housed homeless animals.

Perhaps because of activities that take place in shelters generate noise and odours, animal shelters have historically been located on the outskirts of a community, placed next to sewage treatment plants or landfills. Shelter animals were often viewed as a nuisance, put in warehouse-like settings, housed in crowded metal cages, and were given little stimulation (Miller, 2007; Hettinger, 2013). As views towards animals have changed in recent decades, from seeing animals as purely pets, towards viewing them as companions, public views of animals in shelters have also changed (Miller, 2007). Many shelters have improved their facilities, or are in the process of remodeling or constructing new shelters that are light, clean, and spacious. Shelter locations have also been increasingly in more central or more visible parts of cities and towns (Hettinger, 2013).
Through the design of animal and ‘public-friendly’ shelters, animals may benefit from enriched environments and behave in a manner that is more attractive for potential adopters. A better-designed shelter is also thought to be more inviting to people (Miller, 2007). While there are shelter design guides that include components on the humane treatment of animals, and even shelter medicine programs at veterinary schools that focus on preventive medicine and management of disease in shelters, only recently have shelter design standards been expanded to include broader issues such as public perceptions and community engagement (Attard, Duncan, Firmage, Flemming, Mullaly, Pryor, Smrdelj, Cartwright, & Rastogi, 2013; University of California Davis Koret Shelter Medicine Program, 2015).

Modern shelters also help to draw more volunteers and can act as a community centre for public outreach including adoption events, neutering and spaying, or educational programs (Hettinger, 2013). Already, shelters are moving towards becoming these centres by providing pet-related services such as training, and low-cost clinics, addressing behavioural issues, or troubleshooting between neighbours and landlords. Some also include pet agility courses and a community dog park, with the aim of helping pets stay in homes and to prevent abandonment (Monahan, 2013).

Can shelters become a centre in the community that people use on a regular basis, so that they could interact with shelter animals? Perhaps a place where people
could bring their own pets, go to when they seek animal interaction, or even a place where people who don’t wish to interact with animals can watch them from a distance? While the features, amenities, and programming at every shelter may differ between various geographic regions in size and local culture, it can be argued that all shelters could be a node for people and animals. How can humane shelter needs be defined, especially when a new shelter is to be built or an old one renovated?

Community participation in design helps local residents to determine what facility features are specific to their local culture and geography, and may drive a sense of ownership. In landscape architecture, community participation in design has taken on many forms and can involve interactive modes such as workshops or charrettes, or non-interactive methods such as questionnaires (Sanoff, 2000). In the case of humane shelter design, there is not much research available to indicate the role and use of participation in humane shelter design. Obtaining the public’s opinion of the components that would improve the facilities of a humane shelter is the focus of this research. Located in the city of Guelph, Ontario, Canada, the Guelph Humane Society is undergoing a transition phase to move to a new location. This project aims to solicit local residents’ opinions of what aspects of the Guelph Humane Society could be improved at the new location, including its indoor and outdoor facilities, with the goal of the shelter becoming a centre to support homeless animal-related issues in the community.
The Guelph Humane Society

Present Location

The Guelph Humane Society (GHS) incorporated in 1893, provides shelter for homeless animals, receives surrendered animals, and provides adoption services, pet identification, and helps reunite people with their lost pets. The shelter also provides regular veterinary care for its animal residents and offers a spay/neuter program. As an affiliate of the Ontario Society of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (OSCPA), the GHS hires OSPCA agents to investigate animal cruelty cases in Guelph and in Wellington County. It also contracts with the City of Guelph to carry out animal control services, such as enforcing animal-related by laws, providing animal licensing services, and impounding stray animals. As well, the GHS provides humane education programs to children and has around 300 volunteers.

The GHS has been in its location near a wastewater treatment plant since 1974 and is undergoing the process of moving to a new shelter location, as its lease will terminate in 2016 (Guelph Humane Society, 2015). The GHS’s present location may not be accessible to some users as the facility is hidden down a side road from a main arterial road, and is not well-served by public transit (Figure 1, Figure 2). For transit users, the bus stops on the west side of Wellington St., and there is no immediate pedestrian crossing to walk across the six-lane road to the GHS. For the safest crossing, the pedestrian/bus rider would need to walk an extra 270km to the nearest intersection with a pedestrian light, and double back across the street, with
a one kilometre total walk from the bus stop to the GHS (Figure 3) (Google Maps, 2015). The shelter building itself is old, and lacks designated space for the interaction of animals and people, as well as features that promote health, such as adequate air ventilation. The outdoor run is limited in size and the general outdoor environment has an unpleasant odour due to the adjacent wastewater treatment plant (Figure 4).

Figure 1 - Inconvenient access to GHS from Wellington St.  Figure 2 - Side road to GHS. No public transit.
Figure 3 - Walk from bus stop to GHS, a 1 km walk if cross at nearest pedestrian crossing

Figure 4 - Front entrance to Guelph Humane Society with wastewater treatment plant in rear.
In its aim to better serve the local animal and human community, the Board of Directors of the GHS was interested in the public's opinion about the GHS and its facilities. It was this need for public perceptions about the facilities and programs that prompted this research.

**Goal of Research**

The goal of this study was to better understand how the Guelph Humane Society’s (GHS) shelter facilities and programs are perceived by residents in the Guelph area. By better understanding the public’s perceptions it follows that the GHS shelter and programs might better serve both human and animal ‘clients’ and that the shelter could become a centre in the community that fosters human-animal and community interaction. The implications of this research and its focus on gathering public opinion could be applied to other humane shelters looking to redesign their facilities or relocate. Furthermore, public participation could also be a component of both animal and human-friendly environments on a broader scale, such as the planning of dog parks, or other public outdoor spaces where both people and their pets may go.

The objectives that support this goal include:

1. Explore what the public thinks of the current, and potential outdoor and indoor features of GHS facilities and programs through an online survey.

2. Explore a range of shelter design examples by conducting Post-Occupancy Evaluations of two selected shelters in North America.
3. Explore community engagement efforts at selected shelters in North America through informal correspondence and examining the literature.

Questions in the online survey aimed to explore the public's interest in the design and programming aspects of the Guelph Humane Society that could foster increased and regular activity among people and animals, as well as increase interaction between people in the shelter environment. The results from this survey will help to inform the design process of a new shelter that can provide for the welfare of its animals and would facilitate increased interaction between animals and people.

Post Occupancy Evaluations and correspondence with various shelter staff in Canada and the United States aimed to add to the body of information on how humane shelters engage with their communities. As well, a literature review examined both shelter design trends and community engagement initiatives.

**Limitations**

The creation of the survey was done by a working group at the GHS, and was not validated. Further limitations of this survey include a non-random sample of community residents and the potential for a non-representative sample bias. The online survey also has limitations in that only respondents with internet access were able to provide information. The nature of research ethics and assurances of respondent confidentiality also were limiting in that it was not possible to obtain person specific information or follow up with individuals. Most of the survey
respondents were female, and owned pets, with 20 percent of respondents being GHS volunteers, indicating an existing interest in animals and their welfare. As such, the respondent ‘pool’ is not representative of the general population and indeed the survey implementation may have captured a select group that was knowledgeable about the GHS to begin with and motivated to express their opinions that may or may not reflect the broader public’s opinions.

Given more resources and time, it may be possible to design a follow-up study to capture a representative sample of the Guelph area population, especially those who may not be interested in animals. Qualitative methods (e.g. focus groups) could also be used to follow-up on findings to dive deeper into the details of main concepts resulting from the survey.
Chapter 2
Literature Review

Overview

This Chapter will present some of the relevant literature on the background of humane shelters and how they have changed over time, along with information on the value of pets in society. Current shelter design and programming will be explored, in conjunction with how features of a shelter can enhance the behaviour of animals, or improve the environment for animal enrichment, and ultimately, their welfare.

In addition to addressing the literature for shelter facilities that would benefit animals, the social meaning of a gathering place for humans and how that may relate to the humane shelter as a centre in the community will be reviewed. Literature about community participation in design will be examined, as every community is unique, and obtaining input from local citizens can help to ensure that the building of a humane shelter fits within the community. Finally, a review of Post-Occupancy Evaluations (POE) will exhibit some photographic features from two large humane shelters considered to be successful community centres and will showcase some potential shelter features discussed in the literature about animal enrichment.

The design of humane shelter environments can facilitate the enrichment of animals through play and social interaction with humans, and can decrease their stress.
levels. This reduction in stress can influence or improve animals’ behaviour and sociability and can help animals get adopted sooner (Normando, Corain, Salvadoretti, Meers & Valsechhi, 2009). The design of a shelter can also impact the likelihood that people will visit and volunteer. A well-designed centre can create more of a sense of community with a hub of activity aimed at the welfare of the animals (Monahan, 2013). Community participation is one component of design research that can help inform design by suggesting the local needs of users, a process that is often done with space in the public realm. Public participation has rarely been done in the design of humane shelters (at the time of writing, no instances had been found in the literature) and this research aims to address that gap by soliciting public perception of the facilities of a local humane shelter.

**Humane Shelters – Purpose and Function**

Animal shelters have historically focused on animal control services and, up until the 1970s, shelters provided humane deaths to unclaimed or unadopted animals. Since the 1980s, shelters have increasingly focused on reducing the death of healthy animals and increasing adoption rates (Miller, 2007).

The first animal welfare organization in North America, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), was founded in 1866. The ASPCA originally formed to protect the welfare of horses, and was lead by Henry Bergh, a New York aristocrat who took action against cruelty to animals while a diplomat in Russia. He later visited London to learn about England’s Royal Society for the
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) established in 1824 (the world’s first and largest animal welfare organization today) (Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 2015). Upon Bergh’s return to New York, he gave a speech on animal rights, and was able to convince dignitaries to sign his “Declaration on the Rights of Animals”. This declaration led to the charter that formed the ASPCA. An anti-cruelty law was subsequently enacted and the ASPCA was given the right to enforce it (Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 2015; National Museum of Animals & Society, 2015).

Influenced by Bergh’s work, other humane societies were formed in the United States and Canada in the late 1800s. Montreal opened the first humane shelter in Canada in 1869 and the Canadian Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was also formed in 1869. Additional anti-cruelty laws were passed, and by the end of the century, animal welfare focus shifted from large to small animals (American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 2015; Canadian Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 2014).

Humane shelters today fill a similar mission to the first humane societies started in the 1800s, to prevent cruelty to animals and promote or advocate animal welfare. In the province of Ontario, the Ontario Society of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (OSPCA) is the umbrella of the Society of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCAs) in the province. The OSPCAs network includes 50 shelters throughout Ontario. Some of these shelters are branches of the OSPCA, directly operated by them, and some
are affiliates that operate independently. Affiliates have their own governance board and funding, but they pay a membership fee to use resources from the OSPCA. The SPCAs receive no government funding but sometimes contract with their respective municipalities for animal control services. The OSPCA and its branches and affiliates are unique in comparison to other animal welfare organizations as they can enforce the OSCPCA Act, an Ontario law that is mandated by the province to ensure animal welfare and the investigation of cruelty cases (OSPCA, 2015). The OSPCAs programs and services include: cruelty investigations, sheltering and adoptions of animals, government and industry advocacy, humane education, reducing pet overpopulation, emergency rescue and treatment, and reuniting lost pets with their owners (OSPCA, 2015).

In addition to the SPCA humane shelters, there are also many other types of private non-profit rescue organizations, such as breed rescues or those that are dedicated to one species, such as dogs, cats, donkeys, or multiple species. Around Guelph, the New Hope Animal Rescue shelter places dogs and cats in homes, and runs a feral cat program and a pets for seniors program. They also run foster programs and educate the community (New Hope Animal Rescue, 2015). The Grand River All Breed Rescue in Cambridge runs a foster program for dogs, cats, and small mammals. (Grand River All Breed Rescue, 2015). Whether an SPCA humane shelter, or a private rescue, each organization runs many different types of programs based on what works in their communities.
Existing Shelter Programming

Many shelters such as the Humane Society of Silicon Valley, the SPCA Los Angeles, or the San Diego Humane Society have built state-of-the-art facilities in order to have more presence in the community, and attract more visitors, adoptions, and increase volunteerism. They have done this by using modern architectural designs instead of traditional structures typical of animal shelters. The Humane Society of Silicon Valley (HSSV) in Milpitas, California recently constructed new facilities that they term “an animal community centre” (Monahan, 2013, para.7). The new HSSV facility consists of a modern and airy design that attracts people and provides many amenities for the animals. The shelter also rents out their facility for special events. On site is a dog park that is also open to the public by membership, complete with rolling hill topography in the landscape, separate areas for large and small dogs, water features, and picnic tables with umbrellas (Hettinger, 2013, Humane Society Silicon Valley, 2015).

Modern humane shelters host a range of programs and services, depending on the local demographics, population size, and culture. Besides the physical design, increasingly, animal shelters aim to attract the community via humane education programs, veterinary services, dog-training programs and educational classes. Shelters also offer classes for behavioural problems, a sanctuary for animals belonging to victims of domestic violence, programs that help at-risk youth and other populations, bite-prevention, and animal-assisted-therapy programs. They
also offer externship and training programs for future shelter veterinarians and microchipping and vaccination clinics for low-income clients. In addition, shelters engage in various fundraising efforts to benefit shelters and their animals (Miller, 2007). As many animal welfare activities are occurring within shelters, there is also much activity outside of shelters, in other venues of the community.

*Shelters Moving Adoptions to the Community*

Shelters are also moving away from adoption occurring only at their facilities and are bringing pets to where the people are, such as to pet stores, store-fronts, farmers’ markets, and community areas where there is high traffic. Innovative solutions are also emerging, such as the Ikea partnership with animal shelters to display cardboard life-sized cutouts of adoptable dogs in their showrooms, along with QR codes with the dog’s information. The effort aims to show customers what the dogs may look like in different rooms in their homes so that they may want to adopt them (Gorenstein, 2014). Community involvement may be a key in increasing adoption rates. One study in particular reports that collaboration between shelters and other animal welfare groups in a community, along with sharing data, has helped to increase adoption rates (Weiss, Patronek, Slater, Garrison, & Medicus, 2013).

In addition, innovative shelters have created corporately-sponsored educational centres, such as the Purina *Pawsway* Educational Centre at Queen’s Quay in Toronto,
which houses exhibits, seminars, trainings, and even a weight loss program for pets (Purina Pawsway, 2015). Pet-oriented centres and informational resources such as blogs and websites (Dogster, Catster) are becoming popular as public interest in pets’ well-being has increased.

Value of Pets in Society

In 2014, about 57 percent of households in Canada owned or cared for a pet, comprising approximately 5.9 million dogs and 7.9 million cats. Small mammals, fish, birds, and herptiles were owned by nine percent of Canadian households (Alberta Agriculture & Rural Development, 2014). According to a 2008 national “Business of Urban Animals” survey coordinated by the Banff Summit for Urban Animal Strategies, about 35 percent of dogs acquired in Canada were from breeders, 13 percent from animal shelters, 10 percent from pet stores, and 3 percent as offspring from animals already owned. Of cats, it was estimated that 65 percent were obtained from friends and family, adopted as strays, or through advertisements. About 17 percent of cats were adopted from animal shelters, and 10 percent were bought from pet stores, and (Perrin, 2009)

Pets over the last few decades have increasingly been seen as members of the family, who provide companionship and affection (Franklin, 1999; Manning & Serpell, 1994). Many pet owners see their pets as children-like, and refer to themselves as their pet’s ‘parent’, and even some playing the role of ‘pet
grandparent’ to their children’s pets (Cohen, 2002, Robins, 2015). Some people do not think of their pets as humans, but regard them as members of the family in a different category, to the extent that a pet functions within a family (Cohen, 2002).

In 2014, according to the American Pet Products Association, Americans spent over $58 billion on their pets, almost 250 percent more than the $17 billion spent in 1994. In 2015, the expenditure is expected to top $60 billion, with a large proportion on food, supplies, veterinary care, grooming and boarding (American Pet Products Association, 2015). In Canada, it was estimated that Canadians spent $6.6 billion on their pets in 2014. Even with a downturn in the economy in recent years, spending on pets has been increasing, indicating the increasing value that people place on their pets, even when trying to economize in other areas of life (Saltzman 2014).

People are increasingly integrating pets into their daily environments, such as bringing their dogs to work (Sier & Nickless, 2014). Annually, there exists also a “Take Your Dog to Work Day” in some countries (Days of the Year, 2015). There are also creative ideas with the fusion of creating animal-centred environments around regular human environments, such as the emergence of the cat café across the world, popular in Japan and China, where cat-loving customers go to interact with cats while enjoying coffee. As well, the cats are sometimes available for adoption (Galloway, 2012). The idea is also catching on in North America, with cat cafés in New York and the Café Chat L’Heureux in Montreal, with the latter offering educational programs on felines (Poletick, 2014; Café Chat L’Heureux, 2015).
Remote interaction, like the launch of the virtual iPetCompanion, allows computer users to activate toys in a cat shelter in order to play with the cats (Firth, 2014).

The value placed on pets can outweigh a person's inconvenience. Some people go to great lengths to keep their pets, such as moving if a pet is not welcome in a building (Fogle, 1981). Cohen also indicated through a survey that if there was a choice of who to give a scarce drug to for an illness, most pet owners would prefer to give the drug to their pet rather than to a stranger (Cohen, 2002).

Despite the value that some North Americans place on their pets, on the other end of the spectrum, many animals are also surrendered to animal shelters or abandoned.

**Animal Needs – Enrichment for Shelter Animals & Adoption**

Animals are surrendered to humane shelters or merely abandoned for various reasons such as behavioural issues or because the owner is no longer able to care for them. The Canadian Federation of Humane Societies estimates that in 2012, greater than 119,000 cats, 53,000 dogs and 15,000 other species of animals were received and cared for by Canadian shelters (Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, 2013). Cats are given up to shelters at twice the rate of dogs. In Ontario, about 22,000 dogs are admitted each year to the Ontario Society for the Prevention to Cruelty to Animals (OSPCA) branches and affiliates, excluding animals taken in by other organizations such as rescues or animal control services (Hodder, 2014). The
Guelph Humane Society takes in about 3000 animals per year, and adopts out about 800 animals each year. They also reunite about 300 lost animals with their owners and are supported by about 9000 hours of volunteer time every year (Guelph Humane Society, 2015).

The welfare of animals in shelters can be addressed in both the physical and mental realms, from adequate food, housing, and veterinary care, to caring for animals’ mental well-being. Adequately designed shelters and properly designed programs can help accomplish those important welfare functions. The American Veterinary Medical Association recommends Five Freedoms for humane shelters in caring for animals: 1) freedom from hunger and thirst; 2) freedom from discomfort; 3) freedom from pain, injury, or disease; 4) freedom to express normal behaviour; and 5) freedom from fear and distress (Attard et al., 2013). When animals are healthy and happy, they may have better chances of getting adopted, and enriching their environment can play a role in an animals’ well-being.

**Benefits of Animal Enrichment**

Animal enrichment is a process that involves improving the environment of confined animals in order to address their natural behavioural needs, allowing them to “think, learn, and explore” (Cornell University College of Veterinary Medicine, 2014). Enrichment of animals in shelters can help improve their physical and emotional well-being and decrease their stress levels. As stress levels can affect physical health or lower immune system responses, decreasing stress levels may help to prevent illnesses in the shelter (Maddie’s Fund, 2010).
Stress response, as studied by Sapolsky (2009), has shown that when animals are in a fight-or-flight stress response mode, such as a zebra being chased by a lion, the zebra's physiological response mechanism is concentrated on the stress response for the short-term duration of the chase. However, the prolonged duration of this stress response limits or halts normal physiological processes in the body, and illnesses such as ulcers may result (Sapolsky, 2009). In one particular study, Uno et al. indicated that vervet monkeys housed in a primate centre in Kenya who passed away naturally, were shown upon necropsy, to have gastric ulcers and degeneration of the hippocampus in the brain, which is caused by long-term exposure to glucocorticoids (GC's), an adrenal hormone secreted during stress. These monkeys also had numerous bite wounds, indicating the likelihood of social stress endured in their captive breeding situations. It was concluded that sustained stress in the environment spurred the secretion of GC's, which ultimately caused the neural degeneration in the monkeys (Uno, Tarara, Else, Suleman, & Sapolsky, 1989).

Animals in a shelter setting who experience stress in the form of noise, isolation, or separation anxiety for example, may also experience a prolonged stress response and weakened immune system. The steroid hormone, cortisol, has been shown to be an indicator of stress levels in mammals (National Institutes of Health, 2015). Salivary cortisol levels in dogs were shown to be highest during the first three days of entering the shelter. Dogs who received human contact within the first few days
at the shelter showed lower cortisol levels than those who did not have social
contact with people during the same time period (Coppola, Grandin & Enns, 2006).
It is important that shelter animals receive social interaction, training, and
environmental enrichment help to decrease their stress levels and allow them to
perform their innate behaviours (Tuber, Miller, Caris, Halter, Linden, & Hennessy,
1999).

Enrichment specific to different animal species can be addressed in shelter settings
to enhance their natural behaviours, such as providing objects for chewing activity
in dogs and rodents, and, for cats, surfaces to satisfy their scratching behaviour
(Attard et al. 2013). Even in zoos and wildlife rehabilitation centres, environmental
enrichment helps to decrease stress and return animals to their natural behaviour
in the wild. Feeding boxes for primates to forage; water for bears and large cats to
soak in (live fish in large pools have also been provided for jaguars to practice their
fishing behaviour); and trees and plants for gorillas to climb or rest under are all
descriptions of how zoo animals have been enriched so that they can perform their
natural behaviours (Maple & Purdue, 2013). Daily human-animal interaction in zoo
animals, suggested as part of a regular enrichment program, can help to reduce their
stress levels and become accustomed to humans (Claxton, 2011).

Forms of animal enrichment can include socialization, exercise, toys, play, training,
and a complex environment for exploration (Coppola et al., 2006). Enrichment
activities, such as providing training, can be an effective means for increasing
adoptability of shelter dogs. Through training, the improvement in a dog’s behaviour has been shown to draw potential adopters and result in more adoptions (Luescher & Medlock; 2008; Coppola et al., 2006). For example, when dogs are trained to not bark and walk to the front of the cage when a person walks by, it may increase their chances of being adopted, as the person may perceive the dog to be more sociable and less aggressive. Adoptions are also thought to increase when the dog is perceived to be in a more complex vs. a more barren environment (Wells and Hepper, 2000).

**Shelter Design and Animal Enrichment**

The physical design of a shelter, in both its outdoor and indoor space, can aid in the process of animal-human interaction, and provide for various enrichment opportunities for the animals. Design features can also provide comfort for the staff and volunteers who work with the animals. Outdoor spaces that provide for play and socialization are important for dogs, yet Hodder (2014) explains that many Ontario shelters lack outdoor enrichment spaces for dogs. Hodder (2014) found that only 10 percent of the total 21 shelters visited included adequate shade. Hodder also noticed a shortage in amenities for both people and animals, with only 42 percent of shelters having benches, 26 percent having garbage cans, and 5 percent having dog watering stations. When shelter staff and volunteers were asked about preferred outdoor spaces, natural areas, exercise areas, shelter or shade from snow and heat, and the provision of tables and chairs were at the top of the list (Hodder, 2014).
Outdoor enrichment opportunities can also be provided for other species such as cats and rabbits in the form of outdoor enclosures, with access from the indoors. Indoor enrichment can offer the same elements of play and socialization as the outdoors. Hodder also found that only 36 percent of 21 shelters visited in Ontario had indoor space for dogs to be trained and socialized (Hodder, 2014). Each animal species has specific natural behaviours, and social and environmental enrichment can help address those needs.

**Enrichment of Dogs**

Dogs are social beings and need interaction with people and conspecific interaction with other dogs (Pullen, Merrill & Bradshaw, 2013). In a shelter environment, social contact and training can improve a dog’s welfare and behaviour and decreases their stress level. Coppola et al. (2006) indicated that the cortisol level of dogs decreased after three days of 45 minutes of daily human contact in the form of accompanying the dog into an outdoor enclosure, play, grooming, petting, and basic obedience training.

Through improved behaviour, dogs are viewed as more social and friendly and this may increase their chances of being adopted, and decrease the return rates from adopters due to behavioural problems (Normando et al., 2009). For some potential adopters, a dog’s behaviour has been found to be more important than physical appearance, while in others, breed type, history of how dogs were taken into the shelter (higher when adopters found the animal was relinquished by their owners),
and location of the kennel in the shelter weighed more than adoption rates (Wells and Hepper, 2000; Protopopova, 2012).

Spaces that allow enrichment for dogs include areas for socialization and play, but also opportunities to stimulate their senses. As dogs are well known for their keen sense of smell, olfactory stimulation involving interesting scents in the environment, allowing sniffing when walking, and hiding treats for the dogs to track are some examples (Cornell University College of Veterinary Medicine, 2014). Auditory stimulation in the form of low level, soothing music can also help to calm dogs during day hours, and soundproofing against the noise of other dogs can also decrease their stress (Attard et al. 2013). Other forms of stimulation recommended by shelter specialists include visual stimulation with objects that perpetuate motion; tactile touch such as through grooming; mental stimulation via training or a feeder toy; and physical exercise in the form of running, fetch, playing games, and agility (Cornell University College of Veterinary Medicine, 2014). Behaviours specific to certain dog breeds were suggested by Brown (2012) in reference to features or landscapes in dog parks, but these may also apply to outdoor space in humane shelters. For example, open lawns would facilitate the need for fetching for some breeds or the obedience training needs of sporting, herding, and working dogs (Brown, 2012). Sand pits, on the other hand, may help address the digging needs of terriers and hounds (Brown, 2012).
**Enrichment of Cats**

Environmental enrichment, cat-to-cat interaction, and handling can all have an effect on cat adoption rates in shelters. An enriched housing environment where there are opportunities to perch and hide, in addition to handling by humans and opportunities to interact with other cats, can increase a cat’s activity level and playfulness. This can increase adoption rates compared to cats in isolated and barren housing (Gourkow & Fraser, 2006; Rochlitz, 1999).

Olfactory stimulation, such as providing catnip and prey scent, encourages a play-like catnip response (Ellis & Wells, 2010). Visual moving images such as televised moving images (i.e., prey movement) may be enriching for captive cats in shelters or bird feeders outside windows (Ellis & Wells, 2008; Attard et al., 2013). The presence of toys in cat cages at a shelter may not always affect a cat’s behaviour, but a study by Fantuzzi, Miller, & Weiss (2010) showed that potential adopters viewed cats with toys more positively, in addition to other factors such as upper tiered housing vs. lower tiered housing.

Vertical housing in addition to horizontal housing is preferred by cats, as they naturally prefer to perch in high spots (Association of Shelter Veterinarians, 2010). The need for play and socialization helps cats behave in more alert and playful manners that may attract potential adopters (Gourkow & Fraser, 2006). Mellow music (i.e. classical or music with a calm tone) can also act as auditory stimulation, and petting and grooming cats can serve as forms of tactile stimulation. Mental
stimulation can also be provided through food gathering, training, socialization, and play (Attard et al., 2013). Housing for cats should provide separate areas for eating and elimination, as well as give cats the ability to retreat and be concealed when necessary. The external environment around a cat’s enclosure can affect their welfare and forms of visual and auditory stimulation can be provided with views of human and animal activity. These options may include outdoor enclosures in a garden or outdoor areas for cats trained to walk on a leash (Rochlitz, 1999).

Fresh air for cats is also important for respiratory disease control. Feline upper respiratory infections (URIs) can often occur in shelters, as conditions may be crowded and viruses spread easily. Providing air ventilation from the outside helps to reduce URIs, both in incidence and severity. Windows with screens that can be opened when weather permits is one method of introducing fresh air (ASPCA Professional, 2015).

**Enrichment of Other Animals**

Other species of animals in a shelter including rabbits, birds, and rodents all need enrichment as well. Examples may include providing an aviary that permits flight for birds or dirt for rabbits to dig, natural light, or partial outdoor access (Morris, 2014). The enrichment needs of various species in a humane shelter would need to be researched further to accommodate local climate and geographic locations.
The enrichment needs of various species of animals offer an insight into the activities they need in order to stay physically and mentally healthy, and this translates into the design of spaces that can accommodate these enrichment activities. Furthermore, humans can also benefit from the design of indoor and outdoor space at humane shelters since they are the ‘other’ species that most commonly interacts with the animals.

**Human Needs - A Gathering Place for the Community**

A sense of community is often lacking in modern communities, in part due to a lack of community nodes and events that allow people to interact (Hester, 2006). With suburbanization and the emphasis on the car as transportation, communities have become disjointed, and long commutes have become much more normal in people's daily lives (Oldenburg, 1989; Putnam, 2000). With predominance of the car, communities have become less cohesive. Cars have enabled people to live, work, and play in many different regions (Oldenburg, 1989; Putnam, 2000).

Before suburbanization, there was a *third* place, apart from home and work, where people would go to spend informal time for relaxation. These places consisted of coffee houses, the market, church, pub, post office, and town centre to name a few. These places held the unique character of their respective neighbourhoods, and were the personal news and gossip stations of those neighbourhoods. With the diminishment of third spaces, there is a corresponding diminishment in sense of
community and increasing emergence of sterile environments (Oldenburg, 1989; Community Toolbox, 2014).

According to Putnam (1995), civic participation and volunteerism has decreased in recent years not only as a result of mobility and suburban sprawl, but also changes in family structure and digital entertainment. Less emphasis has been placed on the building of public spaces, and more effort has been made in enhancing private residences. As a result of sprawl and fewer public spaces, people do not have as many gathering places, or the time to engage civically as they spend much more time travelling or on electronic media. When a community is disjointed and there is inadequate involvement and interest in local organizations, places such as humane shelters may suffer. Humane shelters depend on the efforts of people, its staff, and to a large extent, volunteers because of their non-profit nature. Without local involvement, especially from volunteers, humane shelters may not operate to its full potential.

In civically-engaged communities, as social trust is generated by the sharing of purposed activities, social issues are tackled more successfully through the collective effort of citizens. Citizen involvement, or social capital, has been shown to succeed in the fields of education, urban poverty, unemployment, crime and drug abuse, and health (Putnam, 1995). Similarly, as animal welfare is also a social issue, it may benefit from the work of a group of dedicated people. Neuman (2010) found that most animal welfare volunteers share an affinity for animals and are motivated
to volunteer based on their values relating to animals. Volunteers who share in their love of animals and their welfare may create a sort of community gathering place, a third space, at the humane shelter or other places such as dog parks.

Affiliation with a particular group helps to define one’s self-image, and volunteers who value the type of volunteer work they choose tend to develop pride and respect in their organization, which can also predict their long-term commitment to that organization (Boezeman & Ellemers in 2008). Putnam’s work indicates that the “simple act of joining and being regularly involved in organized groups has a very significant impact on individual health and well-being” (Smith, 2007, para. 29). In other words, the involvement and dedication of people to a cause, such as animal welfare, can support and address that cause, as well as provide a means of social well-being for the people involved.

Increased exposure between humans and animals benefits both species by increasing social interaction, and mental stimulation, and may also increase physical activity. There exists a movement towards healthy environments, environments that promote healthy activity in people (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2011). A humane shelter as a community destination may provide physical activity in its volunteer opportunities with animals, especially in outdoor spaces, or may even provide the public with an opportunity to exercise with their dogs if a park is nearby or part of the shelter’s amenities.
In the public health industry, the recent focus on prevention of chronic diseases and addressing obesity has been linked to access to environments that encourage physical activity, which affect health behaviour. Beyond the doctor’s office, health is affected by where people “live, learn, work, and play” (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2011). There is now more focus on these environmental factors that affect health, such as where people might obtain healthy food, or parks where people may exercise. Neighbourhoods that provide for walking opportunities and green space has been shown to improve not only physical and mental health, but also provide social benefits for its residents (Sallis & Spoon, 2015). There are numerous policies in public agencies aimed at healthy environments, and the setting of a humane shelter may also provide health benefits for people, both physically and socially.

The social aspect and the common mission or work that people believe in can foster a community, and the physical facilities or space of a place becomes a means or a physical tool to enable that sense of community. In the case of humane shelters, it can become a centre of community for activities relating to the welfare of animals, and the physical location and amenities support this function.

**Humane Shelters as Community Centres**

According to the Oxford dictionary, a community centre is “a place where people from a particular neighbourhood can meet for social events, education classes, or recreational activities”, and the word *community* comes from the Latin word
'communis', meaning common (Oxford University Press, 2015; Community Toolbox, 2014). A community is formed by a group of people of a shared geographical location connecting to share common interests and concerns (Community Toolbox, 2014). Humane shelters of today are becoming centres where the common interest of animal welfare is carried out.

Animal or humane shelters are moving away from the traditional dog pound image and are becoming centres in the community with features that enhance both the animal residents and the people who work, volunteer, or visit. Features such as welcoming lobbies with natural light, artwork, home-like rooms with furniture, indoor plants, gardens, glass or Plexiglas enclosures vs. bars or cages, and access to fresh air are increasingly common. Shelters of the past did not focus on making animals comfortable and finding them a home, and funds were not allocated to the shelters (Morris, 2014). Fortunately, today’s shelters are becoming centres where animals are not only taken care of, but where there are a variety of services, including low-cost veterinary services, training classes, behaviour counseling, humane education, and foster programs (Miller, 2007).

In effect, shelters are becoming not just for animals, but also for communities, and this vision is changing shelters to become community-oriented (Morris, 2014).

According to Geoffrey L. Handy with The Humane Society of the United States,

Because of their unique services, animal shelters must have the disease-prevention components of a hospital, the functional capabilities of a police station, and the user-friendly appeal of public attitudes toward animal welfare (Monahan, 2013, para.3).
Some state-of-the-art shelters are the result of multi-million dollar projects, and others implement simple solutions. Relying on creativity, the shelters with less resources may obtain donated furniture to make a dog's space seem more home-like, play classical music to soothe the animals, or even raise modest funds to make cat condos (Maddie's Fund, 2010). Some old shelters are run well despite their older facilities, but lack the atmosphere of a home for the comfort of the animals (Monahan, 2013). In addition to providing comfort for the animals, attractive facilities can draw more volunteers and provide for their comfort. Examples such as putting benches and shade outside, providing a staff/volunteer break room, and even a coffee stand, can enhance staff and volunteer morale and make the shelter a comfortable setting to spend their work or personal volunteer time. The Humane Society of Silicon Valley in Milpitas, California constructed a larger, new facility in 2013, with a spacious lobby full of natural light, comfortable surroundings for the dogs (eg. simulated living rooms, indoor-outdoor kennels), as well as sound proofing features for both the animals and people. The attractive facility brought in 50 percent more volunteers. Shelter staff have found caring for the animals easier with improved facilities as the environment is a quieter and safer place for staff to work (Monahan, 2013).

There is also the idea of incorporating a dog park if space allows on or adjacent to shelter grounds so that the public can also use the facilities with their own dogs. This has already occurred in some Ontario shelters where shelter dogs are brought to parks and may draw the interest of the public who are exposed to dog, and may
potentially adopt it (Hodder, 2014). In addition, dog parks can foster social interaction between people, as dog owners can meet and can form friendships (Community Toolbox, 2014).

In designing humane shelters, the local population, character, and culture of each environment may differ, as a shelter in a suburb or small city would differ from the needs in a large metropolitan shelter. Hester (2006) talks about the idea of connectedness in the landscape, that everything is connected within a web, and an understanding of interrelationships is needed to solve problems. For efficient design to occur, it is important to determine the web of activities that need to be located near each other. Locating a humane shelter in an accessible place in town is important as people are more likely to visit if it is close to other everyday activities and main avenues of transportation. For example, Helping Hands Humane Society, in Topeka, Kansas, moved from a more isolated location to a busy street next to a shopping mall, drew more visitors in and received comments about the convenience of the new location (Hettinger, 2013). The number of volunteer hours increased five times after it moved to its new facility. The new shelter has more spacious kennel space and an animal display area that has helped increase adoptions (Hettinger, 2013). The focus of planning for humane shelters in more visible locations matches with the new movement in sheltering to market or display the animals as much as possible to find them new homes, very different from the old image of keeping sheltered animals out of sight of mainstream society (Hettinger, 2013; Miller 2007).
A demand from the community for better shelters and decreasing euthanasia of healthy animals by rehoming them can drive the creation of humane shelters that are more community-centred (Morris, 2014). Spending money on shelter features that enhance its community use may cost more up front, but could save money in the long run through an increase in volunteer hours or a reduction in medical costs due to decreased stress and disease prevention of the animals (Monahan, 2013). Some shelter experts see shelters shifting from functioning as adoption centres to prevention centres, where there is the possibility that their eventual focus may be on providing services and education for pet owners to keep pets in their homes instead of focusing primarily on finding homes for surrendered pets and stray animals. Such services may include training, behavioral hotlines, and services to troubleshoot problems (Monahan, 2013).

According to the Project for Public Spaces, placemaking:

...is how we collectively shape our public realm to maximize shared value. Rooted in community-based participation, placemaking involves the planning, design, management and programming of public spaces. More than just creating better urban design of public spaces, placemaking facilitates creative patterns of activities and connections (cultural, economic, social, ecological) that define a place and support its ongoing evolution (Project for Public Spaces, 2014, para.1).

A humane shelter can also become a place, where there are these ongoing patterns and activities that occur to make it a vibrant entity. To determine what is the best animal shelter for a local community, the process of community participation can highlight local culture, geography, population, and even climate.
Community Participation in Design

The design process usually starts with the user’s needs in mind, and ideally, public or user opinion is sought prior to a site design. According to Hester, when participation in design is useful, the physical environment that results ‘integrates and expresses the unique social goals of the residents” and the design fits the users (Hester, 1990, p.8). Participants from the community can identify essential topics and design issues specific to the place and the people that use that space (Sherk, 2013). Hester emphasizes that the success of a design depends on who the users are, not just the design of the space, and needs to go through the process of a real and represented community process (Project for Public Spaces, 2014).

Community participation in design, or participatory design, is a process where users of a potential space, whether they are residents, visitors, or stakeholders, give their feedback to designers regarding that space. The process has a number of terms and can be referred as public involvement, public engagement, and citizen participation or facilitated problem-solving (Meyer, 2011; The International Association for Public Participation 2010). Its core values, to name a few, include a belief that those affected by a decision have a right to be part of the decision-making process; the public’s contribution will affect the final decision; and that the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers, are met (The International Association for Public Participation 2010).
A wide spectrum of methods of community participation exists, and can range from informing stakeholders of a new project or policy, to involving stakeholders in key decisions. The role could be non-participatory, or involve ‘tokens’ of engagement, to ‘citizen power’ (Arnstein, 1971; University of Guelph, Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship 2014). Community participation in design, or participatory action research according to Sanoff (2000), consists of a number of techniques divided into five main categories:

1. Awareness Methods – Educational methods used to inform the public via exhibits in public places such as a fair or mall; news media, often in the form of a news release; and walking tours to enable participants to become familiar with the site in question.

2. Indirect Methods – These methods include surveys, questionnaires, and interviews to gather opinions from a sample of the population that will use the space. Surveys, although they produce rapid, quantifiable results, are biased towards the views of the researcher or survey designer. Interviews provide more detailed information in the form of qualitative data.

3. Group Interaction Methods – Workshops, focus groups, charrettes (interactive meetings addressing specific issues), and design-ins (where professionals and citizens work together) are the primary modes of group interaction methods.

4. Open Ended Methods - Involves informing a large audience about a proposed project or seeking approval for a project, often in the form of community meetings or forums. This methods tends to have less interactive participation, with bolder personalities who volunteer to speak.

5. Brainstorming Methods – These methods involve generating as many ideas as possible within a group. The methods of participation may vary depending on group size or if participants can be in the same location.

In order for public participation to be useful, opinion from a wide representation of the population should be sought through a variety of methods to get a sense of the views of the entire community. It is also important that the process not be
impersonal, as the public is composed of a number of individuals, and there is the need to know who those individuals are and to understand what issues are relevant to them (Faga, 2006).

Community or public participation in the design process can gain the public’s trust and confidence in the legitimacy of the process and integrity of the leaders of the project (Faga, 2006). When projects have citizen involvement, there is more ownership versus letting planners and designers make decisions. This process has been shown to increase the success and sustainability of the project (Sanoff, 2008). Public participation allows for better analysis of the situation and for better decision-making (Dubbeling, Bracalenti & Lagorio, 2009). In Meyer’s (2011) thesis, the claims of public participation are to aid three components: the landscape (i.e. helps locals protect conservation projects), the individual (i.e. enabling the individual to be heard, and social benefits (i.e. community self-sufficiency).

When a new humane shelter is being built, public participation can help inform what the community thinks is important for the animals and people in a shelter and inform the design process. Methods of community participation may range from a purely educational means to indirect methods such as surveys, or full participation with residents in the form of workshops or charrettes.
**Post Occupancy Evaluation (POE)**

Post occupancy evaluations (POEs) are intended to evaluate the use of a space anytime from the stage of the design concept to after the space is occupied to help inform the design of future projects of a similar nature (Zimmerman & Martin, 2001). A light POE was conducted on two state-of-the art or major humane shelters considered to be community centres in North America to help inform the types of outdoor and indoor features mentioned in the survey for this study. Site visits were made to two humane shelters in California, the SPCA Los Angeles, and the San Diego Humane Society, to gather visual examples of shelter features and talk to shelter staff about their shelters and programming. Photographs were taken to use as visual examples of some of the proposed features outlined in the survey for this thesis and for presentation purposes. Brief correspondence with the San Diego Humane Society was done to evaluate the features that have worked well and not so well.

Specific outdoor features photographed included separate entrances for different functions such as adoptions and animal services (Figure 5); a store (Figure 6); a gazebo for resting, gathering and shade (Figure 7); a pond (Figure 8); outdoor dog run with shade (Figure 9); memorial garden (Figure 10); and an entrance showing outdoor seating space, greeters, and an outdoor café stand (Figure 11, Figure 12). Figure 11 indicates that in addition to the physical design of facilities, programming aspects, such as having greeting volunteers, may also be considered. These photographed outdoor features represent some of the examples or elements that
may be considered in the design of outdoor space at a new humane shelter, depending on the local user needs, building capacity and climate of the location.

Figure 5 - SPCA Los Angeles Companion Animal Companion Center - Front Entrance shows separate entrances for adoptions and animal services.

Figure 6 - SPCA Los Angeles Animal Companion Center - Marketplace. Separate entrance for pet supply store.
Figure 7 - SPCA Los Angeles, Gazebo

Figure 8 - SPCA Los Angeles, Water Feature

Figure 9 - San Diego Humane Society. Outdoor run with shade and water access.

Figure 10 - San Diego Humane Society, memorial garden
Figure 11 - San Diego Humane Society front entrance. Coffee stand to the side, seating for people, and greeters at entrance.

Figure 12 - San Diego Humane Society. Coffee stand with seating.  
Figure 13 - Cattery with natural light

Indoor features photographed included a cattery with natural light and enrichment opportunities in the form of climbing apparatus and tunnels, along with bench seating for both humans and cats (Figure 13); an indoor-outdoor room for cats with an open wall to the outside (Figure 14); a dog kennel with a skylight and seating
area (Figure 15); a glass enclosure for ease of viewing animals (Figure 16); and a lobby area with glass animal enclosures down the hall (Figure 17).

The San Diego Humane Society has also adopted living-room-style rooms for dogs and have large multi-purpose rooms used for events and classes. In the living-room-style dog rooms, the shelter staff and volunteers have found that sound amplifies inside the rooms, and the windows allow dogs to only see the top halves of people. These factors may induce stress in the dogs (A. Curtis, personal communication,
April 27, 2015). For kids’ programs, they make enrichment materials for the animals. A veterinary clinic is housed with nine full-time veterinarians. In terms of programming, the San Diego Humane Society also partners with other rescue agencies in the community to coordinate rescues and take animals in and have found this collaborative effort to be beneficial in rehoming animals. However, the facility at the San Diego Humane Society was built for limited admissions, and since they have partnered with two other shelters to take in strays, their main adoption spaces have been filled, and back space at the shelter is used to house more dogs and smaller kennels for some of the cats (A. Curtis, personal communication, April 27, 2015). The SPCA Los Angeles also holds classes for law-enforcement staff to teach them about the body language of animals, so that they don’t indiscriminately harm animals while on duty.

Even though some of the features shown may be more feasible in a shelter in a larger municipality and is specific to a warmer region, some of the elements including outdoor seating and shelter, play areas, natural light use, more visibility of the animals, a welcoming lobby, and separation of entrances for animal adoptions and admissions could be applied at a smaller shelter facility in Ontario with adjustments for weather.

**Summary**

The literature review for this project ties the concepts of animal enrichment and welfare into the environment of humane shelters. Enrichment and socialization has
been shown to decrease animals’ stress in shelters, and may even help increase their adoption rates. The design of outdoor and indoor features of a humane shelter has been described as a means to facilitate enrichment and socialization activities between animals and humans.

Many modern humane shelters serve multiple functions and there is the growing concept of humane shelters becoming community centres. These shelters not only receive and facilitate adoptions of homeless animals, but also serve as educational centres for different populations, and offer low cost veterinary clinics and stores that sell pet supplies to profit the shelter. Many people in society today place a high value on pets, but there are also numerous animals surrendered to shelters each year, making those animals homeless. There is a growing concern for the welfare of animals amongst people who may voice their opinions on issues related to homeless animals. To determine which elements of a humane shelter centre are appropriate, community participation or public opinion can aid in determining what is best for the local animal population, culture and size of the municipality, and local geography and climate, so that the design of the shelter fits the activities of the users. Each species has innate natural behaviours that can be enhanced by enrichment. Humans have the need for a sense of community, a place with a purpose, and socialization with others. With a focus on animal welfare, humane shelters could become those community places for people and the animals they care for.
Chapter Three
Methods

Overview

This chapter provides an explanation of the methods used for data collection, background research, and data analysis. The methods used for this research consisted of a self-administered electronic survey to gather public opinion about the Guelph Humane Society, its function, and its facilities.

The aim of the survey was to explore a sample of Guelph area residents’ perceived value of animal and human-friendly features in a new humane shelter facility, including both indoor and outdoor features and spaces, as well as their perception of existing facilities at the GHS (Appendix 1). The survey also asked questions about residents’ perceptions of the GHS, such as what they know about the GHS, their involvement with the GHS, such as volunteering, as well as the interactions and activities that they participate in with their own pets, and some demographic data on the respondents. GHS expressed an interest in learning what the community thought of their organization and facilities, so there was mutual interest between the organization and the researcher.

For a background understanding of animal welfare, and the importance that animals have on current society, a literature review was done to look at areas of pet ownership, animal welfare, the animal-human bond, humane shelters as community
centres, and community participation in design. The Primo database was used to find peer-reviewed journal articles and books. Other sources used included relevant news articles, online publications, or organizational websites, including government agencies.

A post-occupancy evaluation (POE) was carried out with two large humane shelters in California, the SPCA Los Angeles and the San Diego Humane Society, where photographs were taken of shelter features that would visually support the shelter features discussed in this research project. These humane shelters were chosen on account of their status as large companion-animal centres, with specific facilities that may serve as precedents of what features may look and function as to inform the design of another humane shelter. Furthermore, questions were asked of shelter staff about the types of programming available at each shelter.

**Study Approvals**

Approval of the survey was processed through the Research Ethics Board at the University of Guelph, REB #14DC005.

**Survey Development**

A pilot survey was developed with the content focused in 5 main areas:

1. ‘Tell Us Some Things About You’, which asks the respondent about their demographics, such as their age, education level, and city of residence;
2. ‘Tell Us Something About You and Your Pets’ or activities that people engage in with their pets;
3. ‘You and the Guelph Humane Society’ or respondent involvement in the GHS;
4. ‘Perceptions of the GHS’ or what respondents know and think of the GHS and;
5. ‘GHS – Facilities and Features’ which asked respondents to rate their preferences on suggested outdoor and indoor facilities and features, along with opportunities for open-ended short answers.

The format of the questions on the survey was designed to obtain short answers or ratings on numerical scales. An introductory section or letter was also included at the beginning of the survey that introduced the survey and specified how long it would take to complete the survey. The survey (see Appendix 1) was developed and administered using Qualtrics software, the official online survey software offered through the University of Guelph.

An initial draft of the survey was presented to members of the GHS Board of Director’s Community Engagement and Building Committees. Upon review, changes were suggested and made. Some questions were edited, added, or deleted with the final total of 61 questions divided into the five survey sections. The final survey was pilot-tested by committee members for technical errors. A final draft of the survey was completed for a launch to the public on Dec 14, 2014.

Two minor edits were implemented on two separate occasions after the survey launch: one to correct a browser display issue; the other to revise the survey length time in the introductory letter preceding the survey.
**Survey Promotion**

With aid from the GHS Community Engagement Committee, a survey promotion plan was devised (see Appendix 2), with a timeline of the distribution venue. One of the first venues of survey distribution was at an open house for the GHS on December 14, 2014 where event participants were notified of the survey.

An online push via the GHS Facebook and Twitter pages was also done by GHS staff. A short article about the survey with a link to the survey was published in the Guelph Tribune on January 6, 2015. An email request was sent by the chair of the community engagement committee to coworkers to distribute the survey to their colleagues and friends. Other venues of distribution included a radio announcement on GHS’ weekly Furry Friday show.

The formal survey timeline spanned from December 14, 2014 until January 30, 2015. The survey was closed on March 4, 2015, and a few additional surveys (less than five) were completed after the survey timeline ending January 30, 2015.

**Survey Analysis**

Collection of survey data was done through the Qualtrics survey system used at the University of Guelph. The survey was designed to solicit both quantitative and qualitative data. Analysis of survey data was done using the reporting system available in Qualtrics, as well as Microsoft Excel (2011). The Qualtrics reporting system provided analysis of responses that were multiple-choice (i.e. yes or no) or
rating on a scale. Short answers to open-ended questions were imported into Excel 2011 spreadsheets and categorized manually to capture the frequency of themes, such as types of pets owned by respondents, or opinions about local dog parks. Data was also manually cleaned to streamline answer units. For example, when answering the age question, some respondents wrote the number out in text or in fractions for the question about the age of their pets. These text answers were converted back to numerical form for easier analysis. Microsoft Excel was used to find means and standard deviations of numerical responses that were open-ended, such as “How old is your pet”, and “How long have you had your pet”.

**Contact with Other Humane Shelters**

To aid in developing community engagement efforts of the GHS, to learn about what other humane shelters had done to get community opinion, and to inquire about what types of community engagement they carry out, phone calls and emails were sent to six humane shelters around North America, of which three responded: the Ottawa Humane Society, the Toronto Humane Society, and the San Francisco Humane Society.

**Summary**

The main method used in this thesis was an electronic survey to the public to solicit opinions about the Guelph Humane Society and its function and facilities. In addition to the survey, POE information from two shelters in California was collected and
assessed by the investigator to use as comparative examples when analyzing the GHS survey results. Correspondence with other humane shelters was done to supplement the primary data collection and gain a basic understanding of shelter design and practices.
Chapter 4
Results & Discussion

Overview
This chapter provides the results and discussion of the public survey. The email correspondence with humane shelters about community engagement will also be addressed in this section.

Response Rate of Survey
A total of 258 survey responses were recorded, including 171 completed surveys (where the respondent hit the ‘submit’ button at the end of the survey). The remaining 87 surveys were partially complete and not submitted, but still recorded by Qualtrics, the survey software. Both completed (where the respondent submitted the survey) and partially completed surveys (where the respondent did not ‘submit’ the survey) were analyzed. It is not known for what reason, whether intentional or not, that some respondents did not click on the submit button at the end of the survey. However, for 87 of the partially complete surveys, 69 of these respondents reached the last question in the survey so it can be speculated that the user forgot or did not see the submit button. Thirty survey responses were left blank by the respondents so were not included in the analysis, leaving 228 total responses for analysis. Since not all questions in the survey were answered by each respondent, each question had responses with a variable N sample size number, as respondents could choose which questions to answer or not.
On average, respondents took about 22 minutes to complete the survey. A spike in survey responses occurred for three days after promotion of the survey, such as after the GHS Open House or an online push for the survey. Not all respondents completed every question in the survey. The highest completion rate of the survey was by 48 percent of survey respondents who completed 60 to 70 percent of the survey questions (see Appendix 3 – Survey Completion Rate).

**Survey Results**

A summary of the results from the five sections of the survey were as follows:

**Section 1: Tell Us Something About You**

This section outlines the demographics characteristics of the survey respondents (Figure 18). Respondents ranged in age from 14 years to 77 years, with most respondents in their 20s, 30s, and 40s. The mean age of the respondents was 38 years old, with a standard deviation of 14 years (N= 194). The majority of respondents were female (83 percent), with a minority male (16 percent), and one percent of respondents not identifying with either group (N=224).
### Demographics of Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (N=194)</th>
<th>Residence (N=224)</th>
<th>Residence Type (N=221)</th>
<th>Education (N=218)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Age:</strong> 38 years</td>
<td>City of Guelph: 80%</td>
<td>Own home: 63%</td>
<td>Bachelor's: 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std Deviation:</strong> 14 yrs</td>
<td>Wellington Cty: 12%</td>
<td>Own condo: 5%</td>
<td>Advanced degrees: 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 8%</td>
<td>Rent apt: 16%</td>
<td>College/trade school: 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (N=224)</strong></td>
<td>Mean length of time lived in Guelph: 18.5 yrs (N=168)</td>
<td>Rent house: 12%</td>
<td>Incomplete or some post-high school: 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: 83%</td>
<td>Std Deviation: 16.4 yrs</td>
<td>Other: 4%</td>
<td>High school: 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: 16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some high school: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID with neither: 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most (80 percent) of the respondents lived in the City of Guelph, with 12 percent living in Wellington County, and eight percent living in other areas such as Waterloo and Cambridge (N=224). The most frequent length of time that respondents had lived in Guelph was either four to five years, or 20-25 years. The mean number of years lived in Guelph was 18.5, with a standard deviation of 16.4 years (N=168). About 63 percent of survey respondents lived in their own home, 16 percent rented an apartment, 12 percent rented a house, 5 percent lived in their own condo, and 4 percent in other housing arrangements, such as living with their parents (N=221).

In reference to educational levels, 31 percent of the survey respondents had bachelor’s degrees, 22 percent had advanced degrees, 16 percent completed college or trade school, 21 percent had some post-high school education (university,
college, or trade school), and seven percent completed high school, with three percent having some high school education (N=218).

In summary, most of the respondents were young to middle-aged, as well as female, and from a middle (to higher) socio-economic background as indicated by their housing situation and education, indicating a relatively stable group of mostly Guelph residents who answered this survey.

The age range of most respondents indicates that there might be bias in access to the survey due to computer savvy. The age range of the majority of respondents fell between 20-40+ years old; this is the demographic group that may be most active with electronic mediums. The age range of these respondents closely matches the median age of 38.7 years of Guelph residents according to Statistics Canada (Statistics Canada, 2011). The predominance of female respondents may be that mostly females visited the sites of the survey promotion (the GHS open house and the GHS Facebook site). Additionally, the mainly female demographic may reflect a broader realm of mostly females being involved in animal welfare (Kruse, 1999).

Section 2: Tell Us Something About You & Your Pets

This section discusses the pets that the respondents care for, as well as the type of activities that they and their pets enjoy participating in. Overall, 88 percent of respondents owned or cared for one or more pets, and 12 percent did not have a pet (N=220). Of the collective 189 pets owned or cared for by respondents, the most
popular animal was the dog (54 percent of all pets owned), followed by the cat (40 percent of all pets owned). The rest of the respondents lived with small mammals, birds, and fish, such as ferrets and parrots (N=182).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents with Pets (N=220)</th>
<th>Type of Pet (N=182)</th>
<th>Obtained Pet From (N=120)</th>
<th>Top Activities with Pets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 88%</td>
<td>Dogs: 54%</td>
<td>Shelters or rescues: 45%</td>
<td>Relaxing: 91% (N=170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 12%</td>
<td>Cats: 40%</td>
<td>(Guelph Humane Society: 20% of those who adopted pets from shelters)</td>
<td>Playing indoors: 91% (N=171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small mammals, birds, fish: 6%</td>
<td>Breeders: 15%</td>
<td>Playing outdoors: 67% (N=126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private sales: 5%</td>
<td>Walking: 66% (N=124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family/friends: 8%</td>
<td>Visiting dog parks/playing with other dogs: 42% (N=79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barns: 9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19 - Respondents’ Pets & Activities

The ages of their pets spanned from a few months old to 20 years, with a mean age of seven years. Respondents had cared for their pets for an average of almost six years, with some only recently adopting their pet, to those who had cared for their pet for many years, with 19 years being the longest stretch of time. Approximately 20 percent of the pets outlined in the survey were adopted from the Guelph Humane Society, with another 25 percent of pets adopted from other humane shelters, animal services, or rescue groups. About 15 percent of pets were obtained from breeders, and five percent were bought from stores or private sales. Around eight percent of pets were given by family or friends, nine percent were obtained from
barns, and the rest of the pets were adopted online, or found as strays or at miscellaneous places such as a veterinarian's office or a First Nations reservation.

Popular activities that owners engaged in with their pets included relaxing and playing indoors (indicated by 91 percent of responses to the activity question), followed by playing outdoors (67 percent) and walking (66 percent). Other less frequent activities included visiting dog parks or playing with other dogs (42 percent), training (33 percent), travelling (30 percent), camping (22 percent), and sports (seven percent) (N=187). The main theme for activity was play or relaxing with pets. An average of 62 hours were spent with pets each week, with some respondents saying that they spent almost all of their non-working hours with their pet (N=178). Phrases such as “all my waking hours”, “almost all the time”, or all of their free time other than work and errands were recorded in 13 percent of respondents’ answers. Twenty-four percent of respondents indicated that they spend 100 or more hours with their pets each week. The responses to this question may be skewed as the question merely asked respondents how much time they spend with their pets each week, with no reference to ‘active’ play or social time. A total of 37 percent of respondents counted not only active playing time, but also sleeping and time spent hanging out with their pets. If the 37 percent of respondents’ answers were omitted from the answer pool for this question (including comments about the amount of time spent with pets and those entries which indicated greater than 100 hours a week spent with pets), then an average of 38 hours were spent with pets every week (N=113). Despite the differences in
interpretation of the meaning of time spent with pets, overall, respondents indicated that they spent many hours of quality time (as indicated in the type of activities engaged in with pets) with their pets every week, and this may reflect the value that they place on their pets.

Of the dog owners, 59 percent take their dogs to local dog parks or off-leash areas (N=140). Common perceptions on existing local dogs parks were that there were not enough dog parks, especially fenced off-leash areas or designated open off-leash areas in Guelph. Some respondents thought that the existing off-leash areas were dangerous due to the areas being close to roads or playgrounds, or owners not being able to control their dogs. Others thought that there were adequate dogs parks or off-leash areas in Guelph.

For those that reported not having a pet, 98 percent of respondents indicated that they enjoy spending time with animals, and spend about five to ten (leisure) hours per month with others’ pets (N=53).

Of those respondents who did not own a pet, 90 percent wished to someday have one (N=39), with the majority wishing for a dog, followed by wishes for a cat (N=32). For those who did not wish to have a pet in the future, reasons were related to lifestyle (i.e. travel), allergies, and not being able to care for a pet properly.
In summary, the respondents who indicated that they were pet guardians showed their dedication to their pets through the amount of time spent with their pets, as well as the interactive type of activities enjoyed with their pets. As respondents indicated that they spend time engaged with their pets in activities, and as they may likely be attuned to animal behaviour with their own pets, they may be positioned to give valuable feedback the enrichment needs of shelter animals.

Section 3: You & the Guelph Humane Society

This section covers respondents’ experiences with the Guelph Humane Society. When asked if they had visited the Guelph Humane Society at its present location, 84 percent of respondents indicated that they had visited before (N=208). Of the respondents who commented, most of their first impressions of the GHS were “friendly” (44 percent), “clean” (22 percent), “welcoming” (15 percent), “warm” (12 percent), and “inviting” (11 percent) (N=167). At the same time, respondents also commented that the GHS was “hectic” (21 percent), “small” (19 percent), in an “inconvenient location” (19 percent), and “old” or “run down” (13 percent), as well as “smelly” (seven percent), “uninviting” (seven percent), and the front desk staff “unfriendly” or “rude” (10 percent). Less frequently mentioned, but related to the state of the current GHS facility, was that the entrance was uninviting (three percent), the layout was confusing or not clear as to where to go to see animals (two percent), and that animal housing was in need of improvement (three percent). Most respondents commented on more than one aspect of their first impression of the GHS. Overall, the respondents had positive perceptions of the current GHS staff
and found them to be very friendly and warm. A small proportion of respondents had negative experiences in the past with staff they found to be unfriendly. In general, respondents thought negatively of the GHS’s current inconvenient location and dated facilities.

Most of the respondents (83 percent) were not members of the GHS (N=175). About 20 percent of respondents (N=174) identified as being current GHS volunteers, indicating that a proportion of the respondents were already quite familiar with the GHS. Of the GHS volunteers, the most frequent activities at the GHS (from most frequent to least frequent) included socializing with the animals, walking the animals, cleaning, and attending community events. Fostering animals, grooming, and delivering programs such as Junior Humane Program, as well as rescue-driving were also noted. When asked about their favourite aspect of volunteering with animals, most of the volunteers agreed that the animals themselves were the best thing, as well as being able to help them, working with the staff and fellow volunteers, and being able to make a difference or giving back to the community.

When asked about how the current GHS facilities add or subtract to their volunteer experience, 38 percent of volunteers (N=21) commented that the facilities were too small, and that there needs more space for quiet or socializing with animals (19 percent). Comments from volunteers added that the entry way was not welcoming and too small, especially when front desk staff is busy (nine percent) (Figure 20), and that the layout and connections of the facility were awkward (nine percent). An example is that, during a tour of the GHS by the researcher, it was learned that new
dogs arriving at the shelter had to pass through an area with sometimes up to 23 kenneled dogs to get to the new arrivals room. This process introduces the risk of disease transmission and puts the new dogs under stress as the other dogs may bark at them (Figure 21) (G. Preece, personal communication, April 15, 2015). There was also positive feedback from volunteers about the availability of the trails nearby and outdoor space (nine percent). This latter finding is consistent with Hodder’s research that volunteers prefer outdoor trails to walk dogs (Hodder, 2014).

Figure 20 - Guelph Humane Society front lobby
Besides volunteering, other reasons respondents noted for visiting the shelter included adopting an animal or visiting the animals. When asked to rate aspects of the shelter, general ratings on the current functionality of GHS facilities resulted in the lowest scores, or a higher designation of the “Poor” or “Not Good” categories than the “Neutral”, “Good”, or “Very Good” categories. The lower ratings included: access by public transportation (23 percent “Poor”, 31 percent “Not Good”; N=105); volunteer work spaces (11 percent “Poor”, 36 percent “Not Good”; N=73), and visitor spaces. The most positive ratings were given to the operational and animal viewing hours at GHS (Figure 22). These results show a lack of comfortable physical spaces and accessibility of the shelter location for the people who work and volunteer at the GHS, especially for spaces that encourage interaction between animals and people.
Respondents’ own comments about accessibility mirrored comments from volunteers about their experience of needing a bigger, more welcoming facility that is more accessible by public transit. In addition, in contrast to the high ratings of GHS’ hours in the rating question, 23 percent (N=78) of the comments focused on the inconvenience of GHS’ opening hours, and especially hours for viewing.

Participant suggestions for improving viewing included adjusting shelter hours so that viewing is open on both Saturdays and Sundays, or opening one evening a week to make is easier for residents who work full-time to visit animals or volunteer.

About 14 percent (N=78) of the comments indicated that a private socializing space was needed for people to interact with animals, and to spend time with them one-on-one, whether for the purpose of play or potential adoption. There were also a few comments (five percent) suggesting that a more open viewing space for people to
see the animals, especially the dogs, is needed, as well as having AODA accessibility and more parking.

In summary, respondents who had visited the GHS mostly thought that the staff was friendly, welcoming, and helpful, while at the same time describing the facility as needing to be more accessible by transit or foot, as well as a bigger, updated, and more welcoming space for both its animal and human residents.

Section 4: Perceptions of the Guelph Humane Society

This section presents some of the knowledge that respondents have of the Guelph Humane Society, including what they think the GHS does, their image of the GHS, how important they think the GHS is to the Guelph community, and what functions or issues they think are important for the GHS to address.

Knowledge & Perception of GHS

Around 56 percent of the respondents who answered the question about how much they know about the GHS (N=180) indicated that they were ‘somewhat knowledgeable’ about the GHS, with 14 percent being ‘very knowledgeable’. On the other side, 23 percent of respondents to this question were ‘not very knowledgeable’, and eight percent were ‘not at all knowledgeable’ about the GHS. The majority, or two-thirds of respondents, almost 70 percent, knew something about the GHS, or were familiar with the GHS and its work, and one-third of the respondents were not familiar with the GHS. The respondents pre-existing
knowledge of the GHS would bring a bias in their responses, which is another limitation of this survey.

When asked about what they thought the GHS does in its work, the respondents (N=167) understood the GHS’ mission to: care for abandoned animals, ensure their well-being through housing or sheltering them (71 percent of comments); finding homes for animals/adoptions (53 percent); humane education (to adults and kids) (19 percent); provide medical attention to shelter animals (18 percent); carry out/contract with the city on animal control services (23 percent); carry out investigations of animals cruelty (nine percent), and reunite lost pets with owners (eight percent). When asked about what their perception of ‘image’ of the GHS was, respondents to this question (N=153) stated that the GHS was ‘caring’ (18 percent), and had positive descriptions for the organization, such as it was ‘doing a great job’ (five percent), but needed a better or more visible location (five percent). On a scale of one to ten, with ten being the most important, respondents (N=176) rated the importance of the Guelph Humane Society and its services in the community at ‘nine’ on average. Their knowledge of the GHS mainly came from their own experience with visiting, volunteering, or adopting from the GHS, as well as information from the media, including the news, websites, and social media, as well as information from friends.

When asked to rate important issues for GHS to address in the community, providing safe and appropriate shelter was rated the highest (9.54); followed by
reuniting lost pets with their owners (9.31); providing affordable and accessible adoption services (9.11); low-cost spaying and neutering (9.05); homeless cats (9.03); educating children on animal welfare (8.53); offering temporary emergency housing (due to domestic violence or illness) (8.42); and offering facilities that the public could use (dog park, grooming, training, etc.) which was rated the lowest (6.27) (Figure 23). This indicates that survey respondents emphasize the importance of the core functions of the humane society to address animal welfare, while rating ‘extras’, such as public dog parks and other services as less important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses (N)</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing safe &amp; appropriate shelter</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuniting lost pets with owners</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing affordable and accessible adoption services</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-cost spaying and neutering</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless cats</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating children on animal welfare</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering temporary emergency housing (domestic violence, illness)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering facilities that the public could use (dog park, grooming, training, etc.)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23 - Importance of Issues for GHS to Address

When asked about what the GHS could do to improve their image in the community, the most popular comment given by 23 percent of respondents (N=141) was that GHS could improve their visibility in the community as they do not seem to promote themselves and many residents are not aware of what they do. Additional
suggestions included partnering with more community organizations, improving the GHS website and social media channels, more advertising and public relations efforts, and recruiting more volunteers from the general public and student population, and not just students at the Ontario Veterinary College. More education (14 percent), an improved location (eight percent), and better shelter facilities (12 percent) were also mentioned by survey respondents, and may indicate a wish for the GHS to be more visible to the community. Other comments for improving GHS’ image centered around more process and policy-oriented suggestions including: to improve adoption fees and processes (13 percent), to improve customer service (11 percent), and to provide a no-kill shelter (nine percent) or to improve euthanasia rates/policy and be more transparent (four percent) (N=141).

In summary, about two-thirds of respondents knew about GHS and its functions and thought that GHS provided important services in the Guelph community. They thought that GHS was doing a good job overall, but could use a more visible location, increase their visibility in the community to make their organization more well known, and improve on some operational aspects such as better customer service or have better or more transparent policies on euthanasia rates.
Section 5: Guelph Humane Society – Facilities & Features

This section covers respondents’ ratings and thoughts on potential outdoor and indoor features that might be implemented in a new humane shelter, as well as some suggestions on programs.

Outdoor Features

Respondents were asked to rate outdoor features on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from ‘Strongly Agree’ (1) to ‘Strongly Disagree’ (5), with ‘Neither Agree nor Disagree’ (3) in the middle. When asked about important features for the outdoor environment at GHS, keeping in mind the experience and comfort of both the animals and people, the top three features rated were outdoor fenced play areas for animals Strongly Agreed by 81% of respondents (N=174); overhead sheltered area for shade in summer and warmth in winter Strongly Agreed by 68 percent of respondents (N=178); and walking trails Strongly Agreed by 58% of respondents (N=177) (Figure 20). The highest-rated features point to areas where people can engage in outdoor activity or exercise with animals (mostly dogs), as well as shelter from weather conditions that may bring discomfort to both animals and people.

Parking, a water source, and quiet seating areas were also rated highly. Since each of the items listed for outdoor features had an average rating under 3, which meant a neutral rating, it meant that no feature was disagreed upon as a whole. However, of the most disagreed-upon features, the memorial gardens or cemetery was the least favoured with seven percent of respondents who ‘Strongly Disagreed’ and 16
percent of respondents who 'Disagreed' with this idea (N=177) (Figure 24). In

Figure 23, the mean rating value for the top three features are highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Pool (N)</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parking</td>
<td>32% (57)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13% (23)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>.005% (1)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Walking trails</td>
<td>58% (102)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10% (17)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>.005% (1)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td><strong>1.56</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Outdoor fenced play areas for animals</td>
<td>81% (141)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>.005% (1)</td>
<td>.005% (1)</td>
<td>.005% (1)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td><strong>1.22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wading pools/ponds</td>
<td>18% (32)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31% (55)</td>
<td>11% (20)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Water source</td>
<td>43% (75)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20% (35)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overhead sheltered area for summer shade, winter warmth</td>
<td>68% (121)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9% (16)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.005% (1)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td><strong>1.43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quiet seating areas</td>
<td>33% (59)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23% (41)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Memorial gardens/cemetery</td>
<td>10% (18)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38% (67)</td>
<td>16% (28)</td>
<td>7% (12)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cat garden with seating for people</td>
<td>29% (52)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30% (53)</td>
<td>6% (11)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dog park accessible to public</td>
<td>30% (53)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30% (53)</td>
<td>9% (15)</td>
<td>6% (10)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Training areas for dogs/obstacle course</td>
<td>26% (45)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26% (46)</td>
<td>11% (20)</td>
<td>5% (8)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Animal-friendly plantings (ie. cat grass)</td>
<td>26% (46)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25% (44)</td>
<td>6% (11)</td>
<td>3% (6)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24 - Ratings on Potential Outdoor Features of GHS
When asked about the top three features preferred from the list of outdoor features, (N=164), 69 percent of the respondents pointed to an outdoor fenced play area for animals, 50 percent of the respondents favoured overhead shade for summer or shelter for winter, and 43 percent mentioned walking trails. Other popular features included parking (26 percent), a water source (21 percent), a dog park accessible to the public (18 percent), a cat garden with seating for people (18 percent), a quiet seating area (15 percent), and training areas or an obstacle course for dogs (15 percent).

When asked to comment about ‘other’ or additional outdoor features besides their top three choices, respondents again indicated that outdoor spaces to socialize such as enclosed play areas were important (nine percent; N=75); quiet seating areas (six percent); accessible location by transit or in a more viewable location (five percent); outdoor cat enclosures (five percent); and trees or naturalized landscaping (five percent). The following suggestions received four percent of the total suggestions each: clear public signs for the humane shelter as that is currently lacking at the old shelter; an obstacle course for the dogs; a dog park for community use with one respondent suggesting there be a viewing area for the public to watch the dogs; and more level walking trails. Further suggestions (that received three percent of comments each) included keeping the existing bird feeders (a cue to care in landscape architecture meaning that the existing GHS outdoor is perceived to be maintained and cared for), providing dogs access to the outside from their inside
kennel; animal-friendly plantings, and a larger meet and greet area. One observation was that there should be easy access or separate entrances for surrendering animals (live or dead) and for visitors or potential pet adopters. This was also a primary feature that was observed at the two California shelters, where municipal animal services had completely separate entrances and processes than adoption services.

All of the highlighted outdoor areas indicate the respondents’ perception of animals’ play and socialization needs (for both dogs and cats). Physical comfort such as shelter from weather and a water source was also recognized. Overall, respondents indicated a preference for an environment that would enhance the interaction of animals and humans, such as outdoor play areas, dog parks, cat gardens with seating for people, and quiet seating areas.

Implications for landscape architecture are that public suggestions about these features can act as guides to design the outdoor space of the humane shelter to enhance play, rest, and socialization with the animals. The results from this section of the survey also point to site design or master planning considerations including circulation, parking, and signage, and accessibility of the site by transit and foot traffic, a more visible location that may have access to walking trails, and perhaps the creation of a dog park.
Indoor Features/Environment

Respondents were asked to rate indoor features on a five-point scale ranging from ‘Strongly Agree’ (value=1) to ‘Strongly Disagree’ (value=5), with ‘Neither Agree nor Disagree’ (value=3) in the middle. When asked about important features for the indoor environment at GHS, keeping in mind the experience and comfort of both the animals and people, the top three features were air quality, ‘Strongly Agreed’ by 74 percent of respondents \( N=172 \); features that let light in, ‘Strongly Agreed’ by 63 percent of respondents \( N=172 \), and acoustic quality, such as soundproofing, and music to calm the animals, ‘Strongly Agreed’ by 57 percent of respondents \( N=172 \) (Figure 21). Cat play rooms (55 percent; \( N=171 \)), a greeting area or lobby (49 percent; \( N=170 \)), indoor play areas (52 percent; \( N=170 \)), visiting rooms with a home-like atmosphere (53 percent; \( N=172 \)), washing stations (47 percent; \( N=171 \)), kitchens (43 percent; \( N=171 \)), multi-use rooms (perhaps for various species of animals as they come in) (47 percent; \( N=170 \)), and energy-efficient facilities (43 percent; \( N=170 \)) were features that were rated under “Strongly Agree”, after the top three choices. The features that were rated the lowest on this question were learning kiosks for visitors, the design and aesthetics of the facility, rooms with greenery, a cat café, and a coffee stand for people, which had the most responses from the ‘Strongly Disagree’ and ‘Disagree’ rating categories (Figure 25). In Figure 24, the top three rated indoor features are highlighted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Pool (N)</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greeting area/lobby</td>
<td>49% (84)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6% (10)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>0.05% (1)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indoor play areas (large play room/indoor yard)</td>
<td>52% (88)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9% (15)</td>
<td>2% (3)</td>
<td>0.05% (1)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visiting rooms/home-like atmosphere</td>
<td>53% (92)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13% (22)</td>
<td>2% (3)</td>
<td>0.05% (1)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Washing stations for animals</td>
<td>47% (81)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14% (24)</td>
<td>0.05% (1)</td>
<td>0.05% (1)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quiet seating areas</td>
<td>33% (56)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26% (44)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coffee stand (for people to obtain refreshments)</td>
<td>6% (10)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>47% (80)</td>
<td>21% (36)</td>
<td>8% (13)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cat cafe</td>
<td>17% (29)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48% (80)</td>
<td>11% (18)</td>
<td>5% (8)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cat play rooms/climbing &amp; swing gyms</td>
<td>55% (94)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6% (11)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Multi-use room (for rabbits or other animals that come in)</td>
<td>47% (80)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11% (19)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rooms with 'greenery'</td>
<td>27% (45)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29% (49)</td>
<td>8% (14)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kitchen to prepare animal meals</td>
<td>43% (73)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14% (24)</td>
<td>2% (3)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Volunteer/staff room</td>
<td>49% (83)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9% (16)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>0.05% (1)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Energy efficiency/recycling features &amp; waste into energy</td>
<td>43% (73)</td>
<td>27% (63)</td>
<td>15% (26)</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Features letting light in</td>
<td>63% (109)</td>
<td>31% (54)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td><strong>1.44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Air quality</td>
<td>74% (128)</td>
<td>23% (39)</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.005% (1)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td><strong>1.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Acoustic quality (ie. soundproofing &amp; music to calm animals)</td>
<td>57% (98)</td>
<td>34% (58)</td>
<td>9% (15)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.005% (1)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td><strong>1.53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Design/aesthetics/colour</td>
<td>23% (40)</td>
<td>48% (82)</td>
<td>25% (42)</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
<td>2% (3)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td><strong>2.11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Learning kiosks for visitors</td>
<td>34% (57)</td>
<td>37% (63)</td>
<td>25% (42)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td><strong>2.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25 - Ratings on Potential Indoor Features of GHS

When asked to list their top three indoor features, respondents listed an indoor play area (54 percent; N=154) as the top choice, followed by home-like visiting rooms (32 percent; N=154), and a cat play room (31 percent; N=154). Air quality, acoustics (soundproofing to reduce animal stress and music to calm animals), a greeting area or lobby, features letting natural light in, a washing station, energy efficiency and recycling at the facility, and a multi-use room (also for other species as needed such as rabbits) were also mentioned. These rankings reflect some of the ratings for preferred features in earlier questions.
In summary, respondents put the animals first. They indicated that they cared about features that would promote the health and well-being of the animals by choosing features that allowed for less stress and disease transmission, and enrichment of the animals through spaces that would allow socialization and play with humans. Less important were add-ons such as rooms with greenery or a coffee-stand for people or a memorial garden.

When asked about other indoor features that perhaps were not mentioned earlier in the survey, space for training animals, a room for the education program and birthday parties for kids, and a shop with sales to benefit the GHS were mentioned. Other indoor features brought up by respondents indicated their interest in a better design of the building, and not an institutional building like the current one. Comments surfaced on features that enhance the comfort and enrichment of animals, such as windows for them to see out, better dog kennels, and for logistical movement through an improved flow of rooms. Also, 5 percent of respondents (N=78) suggested providing better viewing of animals through Plexiglas (Figure 16) or some sort of viewing room, versus bars in cages that deter the public from viewing the animals for a longer period of time. Another interesting comment was that stairs should be provided to train dogs who are not used to going up and down stairs.
Indoor features can help inform landscape architecture in a shelter setting. The function of these indoor features can be continued outdoors. Since socialization with the animals and more space for human-animal interaction was rated highly for indoor features, the same can be said of the outdoor features as indicated from survey results. When designing or planning for outdoor space, socialization space needs to be kept in mind. The flow of activities between the indoors and outdoors could also be coordinated between the design of the building and the design of the outdoor space. For example, indoor cat play rooms may be connected to a room or enclosure with seasonal access to the outdoors, or with an open window or wall so that the cats would not have to physically be moved outside to a separate space (Figure 14). Dog enclosures could be placed close to outdoor play areas and sheltered areas, which may be useful during cold Ontario months. Consideration of microclimate and direction of winter winds may be useful for the placement of indoor-outdoor dog kennels in a less affected location in the shelter building. If separate entrances for animal intake and adoption services are planned, it may be useful to coordinate the design of separate entrances to match the flow of activity from the outside going into the building. The San Diego Humane Society has separate entrances for animal intake and adoptions as an example. Figure 11 shows the general layout of the entrance, with adoptions entering on the east side of the complex into a spacious lobby (Figure 26), and the animal intake entrance on the north side (Figure 27). Other examples of how indoor features could be considered when designing for outdoor space could be determined through community input and a multi-disciplinary planning and design team.
In addition to design of the humane shelter facility, there was also a question in the survey asking people about what programs they thought would be ideal for both people and animals at the shelter. About 33 percent of the respondents to this question (N=110) suggested programs for training the animals, or training people (both adults and kids) to care for animals to improve their understanding of animals and their behaviour. When asked whether or not respondents would use an amenity open to the public such as a dog park, 71 percent indicated that they would use it, and 29 percent replied that they would not use it (N=160). The willingness to use a shared park with shelter dogs could mean that a number of residents would be open to a more community-centred humane shelter. In answering a question about providing any other comments about the humane shelter facilities, 11 percent (N=74) of respondents indicated again that the GHS needs a more central location in
Guelph, and one that is close to public transit. Others (nine percent) commented that the current GHS staff is doing a great job, five percent suggested that there be a vet clinic and low cost spay and neuter for the public, and four percent suggested that there be more educational programs (Figure 28). Besides the physical design of a shelter, programming is also important in making a humane shelter more of a place for the community. The latter two suggestions could also indicate that people desire a more community-oriented humane society, with services for the public. Other suggestions included decreasing expensive adoption fees, and having a greeter at the shelter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Comments (N=74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need more central location; close to transit</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more vet clinics/low cost neuter &amp; spay services</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more educational programs</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing great job</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28 - Respondents comments about shelter facilities

**Summary**

For both indoor and outdoor features preferred by respondents, room for socialization stood out. This includes features such as indoor play rooms for passive activities like quiet time with the animal, outdoor fenced play areas, or trails for active play or exercise. Additional features point to the need to provide comfortable features for the animals. For the outdoors, shelter from the heat and cold were rated highly, and for the indoors, features such as natural light, air ventilation and acoustics, (soundproofing from the noise of other animals, and calm music to reduce stress) were at the top of the list. Despite the small facilities of the current GHS
location, respondents overall thought that the GHS is doing a good job with the
limitations of the site, but that a bigger and more centrally-located shelter is needed.

**Findings with Other Humane Shelters**

Email correspondence with the Toronto Humane Society, the Ottawa Humane
Society, and the San Francisco Humane Society, as well as visits with the SPCA Los
Angeles and San Diego Humane Society indicated that no surveys or other types of
community participation have been done with their shelter space designs; however,
collectively, the humane shelters do seek input from their constituents (donors,
volunteers, hospital clients, community stakeholders) about special projects, or
their strategic plan via surveys or town-hall type meetings. Furthermore, comments
from the public are welcomed through the media, and social media, such as
Facebook. Evaluation input is also sought from clients for paid programs such as
birthday parties and training classes.

Community engagement efforts of these shelters encompass programs such as dog
obedience classes, school break camps, birthday parties, adoption events on-site and
partnered through the community, Pet of the Week announcements on TV,
microchip clinics, humane education to schools, working with at-risk youth and
hard-to-adopt dogs, programs for low-income residents. One of the programs
provided education on animal behaviour for law enforcement staff (S. Iles, personal
communication, November 25, 2014; M. Deleo, personal communication, December
For programming, the GHS runs a Junior Humane Club, visits schools, holds community visits, and camps for kids (Guelph Humane Society, 2015). By sharing information with other humane shelters, other programming ideas may surface in the future. As programming is related to activities, the various types of activities that a shelter runs relates to the type of space that is needed, whether indoors or outdoors. For example, an outdoor sheltered area can function as shade from the weather for dogs and people, and perhaps also be used as an outdoor classroom. More research can be done on specific programming activities that the GHS wishes to carry out to support the design of its future activity spaces.

The Guelph Humane Society has indicated interest in more community engagement efforts and to learn more about what other shelters are doing. As the GHS is in the process of moving to a new location, they would like to know what the community thinks of their work and old shelter facilities, as well as potential features at the new shelter. Community participation to gather opinions about shelter design has not been done by the humane shelters surveyed here, but the other forms of engagement, such as input on special projects, may be something to use by the GHS as is fitting for the future.
Chapter 5
Conclusion

As the Guelph Humane Society is moving to a new location by 2016, this research aimed to solicit community members’ opinions of the current and preferred future features of the Guelph Humane Shelter. The main findings were that respondents put the animals’ basic comfort first, prioritizing animal-human socializing areas and walking trails, as well as shelter from the summer and winter elements. For the indoors, natural light, air ventilation, and acoustics were rated as priorities. Suggestions for bells and whistles such as a coffee stand for people, and a cat café, were rated lower, and not at the forefront of respondents’ preferences. This indicates their concern that the basic needs and comfort of the animals come first.

Respondents also expressed an interest in using a public outdoor fenced area such as a dog park with their own dogs if the shelter had this amenity.

Even though many of the questions in the survey covered indoor features or thoughts about the GHS, these aspects could help inform site planning in landscape architecture. Results can help determine the flow of activities outside, once the indoor activities are also understood. An example is with the current flow of new dog arrivals needing to pass by existing dog kennels at the GHS. In this case, the logistics of having separate outdoor access for new and existing dogs may be considered. As landscape architects tend to take a holistic view, looking at all the activities and features of the site would help in the process of site design and to create a more usable outdoor environment.
There is nothing new about each of the components of this research (animal enrichment in shelters, and community participation in design), but combined, it shows a picture of what local residents in Guelph experience and think about the needs of the local humane shelter, which may or may not be different than that of another geographical location. The results from this survey add to community engagement efforts by giving residents a say in what they think works or does not work for the GHS in terms of facilities and some operational aspects. It is an exploratory step to see what the residents of Guelph think of the GHS and if they are familiar with GHS’s work and their facilities. Since the GHS has been in their current, somewhat hidden location for 41 years, respondents see the need for a more central location and features for the socialization of the animals, including both outdoor and indoor space.

Aside from their physical location, respondents also thought that the GHS could promote their organization more in the community through such avenues as electronic media (website, social media), public relations, partnering with other community organizations, and recruiting more volunteers. The GHS is more likely to gain support from residents, such as volunteer and financial support, and become a place that is used by the community, if the community learns and knows about GHS and their work.
As the literature review examined the value that people place on pets, the same was also reflected in the respondent population. Respondents cared for pets through the animals they own, activities they engage in with their animals and the time they spend with their pets. In turn, their concern for animal welfare was alluded to through their knowledge of the GHS, their ratings and opinions about future GHS facilities, and their willingness to fill out the lengthy survey for this research project.

About one-fifth of survey respondents had adopted a pet from the GHS, and even though the survey respondents may already have been familiar with the GHS, this study shows that there is a community in Guelph that is concerned about animal welfare, who looks to adopt homeless animals, and who may be supportive of the GHS. One quarter of respondents adopted pets from other humane shelters, indicating the respondents’ value of rescuing homeless animals. Literature also examined how enrichment helps to maintain or increase the health of animals, and respondents also recognized that enrichment, especially in the form of socialization and play, was important to animals living in a shelter. As humane shelters are becoming more of a community centre, the features rated by respondents pointed to more socialization spaces with animals, more educational programs, and their willingness to use a dog park along with shelter animals. Respondents prefer the elements that can help create a humane shelter that’s more community-oriented, and this fits in with the notion of GHS becoming more of a centre or place in the community. Community participation helps to create a space that is specific to the activity and culture of its users.
The study exemplifies the community participation role that landscape architects can employ in the planning stage of projects. For more in-depth community participation, face-to-face engagement in the form of educational sessions, workshops, charrettes, and in-person interviews could be done. Even building samples of outdoor features for animal-human interaction for participants to test out (such as what is being done in tactical urbanism with temporary furniture or installations on streetscapes) can be a form of community participation. Also, participation should be facilitated with a more diverse sample of the public, and staff and volunteers of the GHS, which would give a more accurate picture of the features that would be relevant for the new GHS shelter. As landscape architects in general have the skills to communicate visually and verbally, and have a view towards planning multi-functional spaces for the activities of the users, they would bring much value to the community engagement process for the outdoor environment of a new GHS shelter.

Consultation from shelter experts would also balance the research for the new GHS shelter and support the building of specific shelter features with experience and expertise. A more comprehensive assessment of how the features of the shelter would best suit the Guelph community, including additional programming, would help the GHS become a centre in the community, potentially even drawing those who might not know much about animals, or who regard animals at an arms length, to the shelter. As well, the more the community is aware of the GHS, the more public interest in the GHS could be raised to attract donations from the public or from
businesses. Other members of the animal community in Guelph, such as the presence of the Ontario Veterinary College, other animal rescue organizations, and animal care services (veterinarians, pet-sitters) make a strong base for a cooperative animal welfare and rescue network, and community-partnering opportunities with the GHS.

Besides being solely involved as designers of outdoor space, landscape architects are able to offer the broader skills of community participation in helping to design spaces for public organizations such as the Guelph Humane Society that are both functional and aesthetic to its users which, in this case, includes both animals and people. Information to help an analysis of the opportunities and constraints of sites can be gathered not only from physical observations, but also from community input. Community participation brings more ownership to the people who use that space. Those spaces grow into places in the community that people are drawn to, hence a community centre or a place, used and welcomed by the community.

On a broader scale, in everyday life, more animal-centred places are becoming popular, and animals are integrated into our daily lives. Pets can be seen in the workplace, on restaurant patios, or even on public transit in some cities. As this trend continues, programming, planning, and design for spaces for animal welfare and enrichment can be brought outside of the shelter and applied to everyday environments.
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APPENDIX 1 – SURVEY QUESTIONS

Guelph Humane Society Survey

Tell Us Some Things About You

Guelph Humane Society - A survey asking for your thoughts.

PURPOSE
The purpose of this survey is to gather public opinion through a survey administered to the public of Guelph. Specifically we are interested in gathering public perceptions and preferences for an optimal humane society shelter and its programs.

As you may know, the Guelph Humane Society will be moving next year to another location in Guelph and we hope that by gathering your opinions, we can better understand how to make the GHS shelter and programs be the best they can be.

INTRODUCTION
Welcome and thank you for agreeing to participate in a study exploring your perceptions and opinions about the Guelph Humane Society (GHS) programs and facilities. We are interested in your opinions and as such there are no 'right' answers. Any information you provide will be completely anonymous as no personal identifiers will be gathered - all information will only be reported in aggregate form.

The survey will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary. You will be indicating your consent to participate in this research project by completing the survey. Your decision not to participate, complete, or submit the survey will not result in any penalty.

Our analysis would benefit from your completing all questions pertinent to you, however, you are not required to do so, and you may refrain from answering any question. The results of this survey will be presented to the GHS community in the Spring of 2015.

Encrypted survey response data will be collected on a secure web server hosted by a third party survey platform vendor. Despite the use of the HTTPS protocols (encrypted secure connection) for this survey, as with any data sent over the internet, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

https://aqguelph.en.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel/Ajax.php?action=GetSurveyPrintPreview&T=5JiHAgC1obpsC2Q3aj70ksf
This survey is a research project being conducted by researchers at the University of Guelph (UofG) and it has received clearance by the UofG Research Ethics Board (REB). If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may contact the UofG REB at 519-824-4120 x56606 or sauld@uoguelph.ca

Information from this study will enable the GHS to better understand the needs of the community, as they engage with the GHS facility, its programs, and services. These data will be used to assist planning and development of future programs and facilities.

Thank you in advance for your consideration, time and effort in participating in this research. You can print a copy of this letter for your own records. If you have questions regarding this study, or wish to obtain a copy of the results of this study, you may contact the investigators (listed below) by email to chow@uoguelph.ca or nperkins@uoguelph.ca.

Sincerely,

Anna Chow and Nathan Perkins

Tell Us Some Things About You

It is important that we know a little about you so that the information we receive can be representative of all views.

1. How old are you? (Please respond in years)

2. Are you?
   ○ Male
   ○ Female
   ○ I don’t identify with either
3. Where do you live?
   - In the City of Guelph
   - In Wellington County
   - Other

   Please specify where you live:

How long have you lived in Guelph? (years)

Please specify how long you have lived in Guelph:

4. Do you:
   - Live in your own home
   - Live in your own condominium
   - Rent a house
   - Rent an apartment
   - Other

   Please specify the type of housing in which you live:

5. What is the highest level of education you have received?

Tell Us Something About You and Your Pets
Tell Us Something About You and Your Pets

We would like to know a little about your involvement with pets, and what kinds of activities you and your pet, or the animal you care for, like to do together.

1. Do you presently care for or own, or are the guardian of a pet or pets?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

2. If yes, could you describe them, their species, age and how long you have had them? (If more than 5 pets, please lump the number of each species together in one line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pet 1</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Age of Pet</th>
<th>Length of Ownership (Years)</th>
<th>Where pet was obtained from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What kinds of activities do you and your pet like to engage in together? Please check all that apply:
   ○ Walking
   ○ Playing indoors
   ○ Playing outdoors
   ○ Sports
   ○ Training
   ○ Hang out in café patios
Please specify what other activities you and your pet like to do together:

4. How many hours would you say you spend with your pets each week? (Hrs/week)

5. If you own dog(s), do you take them or others' dogs to local dog parks or off-leash areas?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, what do you think of these dog parks or off-leash areas? (eg. Are they adequate, are there enough in Guelph?)

6. If you do not own a pet, do you enjoy spending time with animals?
   - Yes
   - No

7. How many hours would you say you spend with other peoples' pets (friends, family) in an average month? (Hours/month)
8. If you do not own a pet, do you anticipate having a pet of your own one day?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, what type of pet would you like to have?


If no, why not?


You and The Guelph Humane Society

You and the Guelph Humane Society

We would like to understand your views of the Guelph Humane Society (GHS), its volunteerism as well as how much you know about GHS.

1. Have you ever visited the Guelph Humane Society at its present location?

☐ No
☐ Yes

2. If Yes, could you describe your first visit impressions using your own words (such as warm/friendly, inviting/uninviting, welcoming/intimidating, hectic, noisy, clean, inconvenient, etc.)?
3. Are you presently a member of the Guelph Humane Society?
   ○ No
   ○ Yes

4. Do you volunteer at the GHS?
   ○ No
   ○ Yes

5. Can you describe the nature of your volunteer activities with the GHS? Please check all that apply:
   - Animal walking
   - Socializing with animals
   - Cleaning
   - Grooming
   - Program delivery (i.e., Junior Humane Program, etc.)
   - Adoption services
   - Community events
   - Fostering
   - Rescue driver
   - Media
   - Other, please specify

6. What are the best aspects of your volunteer work with the GHS?

7. How else have you interacted with the GHS?
1. I have adopted a pet
2. I have retrieved a pet who had been rescued
3. I have visited to see the animals
4. Other
5. I have not interacted with the GHS

Please specify

8. In your own words, how do the physical facilities of the GHS add or subtract to your volunteer experience?

9. This question is about accessibility to the GHS and how functional are some of its facilities. Can you rate on the following?

(Accessibility refers to how easy it is to get to or "access" the facility and "functional" refers to how user-friendly the feature is.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours that GHS is open</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-F 9-6; Sat 9-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Sundays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours for Animal Viewing:</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-F 10-430; Sat 12-4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Sundays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodates disabilities (Adheres to Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act - AODA)</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking availability</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor work spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor spaces or areas</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access by Public Transportation
Facility: Base of Use (eg. animal
wearing/interaction, adoptions, resource centre)

10. Please provide any comments:

Perceptions of the Guelph Humane Society

Perceptions of the Guelph Humane Society

Your (honest) perceptions of the Guelph Humane Society are important to us. Your opinions will help us evaluate GHS's image in the community.

1. How much do you feel you know about the Guelph Humane Society and its activities?
   - Very knowledgeable
   - Somewhat knowledgeable
   - Not very knowledgeable
   - Not at all knowledgeable

2. Can you describe your understanding of what the Guelph Humane Society does?

3. Can you describe in your own words your ‘image’ of the GHS?
4. Where does your knowledge of the GHS primarily come from?

5. On a scale of importance/essentialness, how important do you feel the GHS is in Guelph? (eg. Is it important that Guelph has the services of a humane society?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of GHS in Guelph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Essential At All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. For each of the issues below, please tell us how important you think it is for GHS to address each in your community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important At All</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reuniting lost pets with their owners
- Providing safe and appropriate shelter
- Providing accessible, affordable adoption services
- Municipal animal control contracts
7. If the Society could do one thing to improve your perceptions of the organization- what should it do?

Guelph Humane Society - Facilities & Features

A range of features are possible for animal shelters so that animals’ lives are enriched and less stressed. The comfort of people is also important so that visitors and volunteers have a positive experience spending time there with the animals.

https://weguelph.ru.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel/Ajax.php?action=GetSurveyPreview&kT=3XHAg34bpeQzG70kaf
1a. What kinds of outdoor physical features do you think are most important to the outdoor environment of the GHS? (Please think of features that would enhance the experience and comfort for both animals and people.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking trails</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor fenced play areas for animals</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wading pools/ponds</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water source</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead sheltered area for shade in summer and warmth in winter</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet seating areas</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial gardens/temple</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog garden with seating for people</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park accessible to public</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training area for dogs/Obstacle course</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal-friendly plantings in garden areas (sunip, cat grass)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b. Of the above items, what do you think are the top 3 features?

[Blank space for input]

1c. Are there any other desirable outdoor features that you feel would enhance the GHS?

[Blank space for input]

2a. What kinds of indoor physical features do you think are most important to the indoor environment of the GHS?
environment of the GHST (Please think of features that would enhance the experience and comfort for both animals and people.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeting area/lobby</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor play areas (a large play room, or indoor yard/greenhouse)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting rooms/Home-like atmosphere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing stations for animals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet seating areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee stand (for people to obtain refreshments)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat cafe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Play Room/Climbing &amp; Swing Gyms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use room (eg. for rabbits or other animals that come in)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms with ‘greeneries’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen to prepare animal meals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/Staff room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency/recycling features/waste into energy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features letting light in</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic quality (eg. soundproofing and music to calm animals)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/aesthetics/colour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning blocks for visitors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Of the above items, what do you think are the top 3 features?
2c. Are there any other desirable indoor features that you feel would enhance the GHS?


3. In your own words, what programs would be ideal to both animals and people in an animal shelter? Innovative ideas are welcome.


4. If you have pets, and if the shelter has amenities you could use with your pets, such as a dog park, or training facilities, would you use it?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

5. Do you have any other comments about the Facilities and Functions you feel are important for the GHS?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR THOUGHTS

Are there any points you would add about any aspects of the GHS that you feel are important to raise?


https://www.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel.jsp?page=SurveyView&name=909293&surveyReset=false&submit=Submit
## Guelph Humane Society Survey Promotion Plan

### Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution venue</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GHS Facebook & Twitter Page** | - Amy to create draft content  
- Sabrina to modify content as need and post (3x/week) | Dec 8- Dec12  
Dec 16- Jan 30 (3x/week) |
| **GHS Website (rotating graphic on front)** | - Amy to create content  
- Sabrina/Clare to post | Dec 8 – Dec 12  
Dec 15 |
| **GHS Email lists** | - Amy to create content  
- Sabrina/Adrienne to send out email  
- Ability to align with newsletter in Early Jan? | Dec 12  
Dec 19-22 (send out before Christmas) |
| **Partner Websites, email lists, & social media** | - Amy to create content  
- Sabrina to ask partners to post on their website and social media pages | Dec 8 – Dec 12  
Dec 15 – Jan 9 |
| **Rogers TV Spot (visually display humane society website link on screen)** | - Amy to create Q&A  
- Sabrina to do the spot | Dec 8-12  
Tape: Tues 23, Tues 30  
Air: Fri 26, Fri 2 |
| **Magic FM** | - Amy to create Q&A  
- Sabrina to do the spot | Air: Friday 18  
Air: Fri Jan 9 |
| **Newspapers** | - Amy to create media release  
- Clare to rework  
- Adrienne to distribute to newspaper contacts | Dec 8-Dec 12  
Dec 12  
Dec 19 |
| **Promo Cards (with bit.ly link)** | - Amy to create palm cards  
- Adrienne to get printed and distribute  
- Reception & humane educator to distribute cards | Dec 8 - Dec 12  
Dec 18  
Dec 18 – Jan 30 |
| **Only if numbers are low**  
On location sampling at:  
- Mall  
- Downtown  
- Pet stores/partners? | - Anna (volunteers - UoG or GHS) iPads & paper  
- Ability to align with the booth in the mall in Jan? | Jan 15-Jan 30 |
Note: We should also have paper copies of the survey at the shelter with a confidential/anonymous box for depositing for people who can’t access the internet.

Facebook/Twitter Draft Content:

Tell us what you think about our programs, services, and location. Please fill out our quick survey here: http://bit.ly/1zdxWu5

We want to know what you think of us! Please fill out our quick survey here: http://bit.ly/1zdxWu5

We want to know what we can do to be the best humane society we can be! Please fill out a survey for us here: http://bit.ly/1zdxWu5. It should only take you 10 minutes.

Provide input into our programming and the design of our new shelter. Fill out this 10 minute survey: http://bit.ly/1zdxWu5

Draft Media Release:

[New Release]

Guelph Humane Society seeks input from the public

Guelph, Ontario (December 15, 2014) - The Guelph Humane Society is seeking input from the public on how to improve its shelter and services to better serve the community.

University of Guelph researchers Anna Chow and Nathan Perkins are conducting the survey of Guelph and Wellington County residents, and will focus on the perceptions of the Guelph Humane Society and their preferences for optimal sheltering and programs.

This comes ahead of the planned 2016 move, and the results of the survey will be used to inform their future site selection, shelter design, and programming.

“We are excited to partner with the University of Guelph on this research,” says Adrienne McBride, Executive Director of the Guelph Humane Society. “As a charitable organization that serves a large and diverse community, we need to be in step with the priorities of our customers. This survey will provide valuable insight as we plan our move to a new facility in the next two years.”

The survey should take residents no longer than 10-minutes to complete and will be open until January 30th, 2015. All residents of Guelph and Wellington County are invited and encouraged to take part.

The Guelph Humane Society has been sheltering and caring for animals in Guelph and Wellington County since 1893. Each year the GHS cares for approximately 3000 animals in need, providing animal sheltering and adoption services, veterinary care and a progressive spay/neuter program. The Society also boasts strong humane education programs that impact thousands of children and youth annually. Visit www.guelph-humane.on.ca/
Contact:
Adrienne McBride, Executive Director
Guelph Humane Society
ed@guelphhumane.ca

**Q&A for Media Spots (to help you prepare for television/radio spots):**

**What is the survey?**
The Guelph Humane Society is conducting a 10-minute, online survey to find out how to be the best humane society we can be. The survey covers topics like public perceptions of the humane society, use of our facilities, and what facilities and programs people might like to see from the humane society in the future. All residents of Wellington County and Guelph are welcome and encouraged to participate, whether or not they have used our services or visited the shelter. We value everyone’s opinions.

**How many responses are you hoping to get?**
We are hoping to get 300 responses from Guelph and Wellington residents.

**Who is conducting the survey?**
The survey is being conducted by University of Guelph researchers Anna Chow and Nathan Perkins in partnership with the Guelph Humane Society’s Community Engagement committee.

**Why is the survey being done?**
The survey will help us connect with the public and get a sense of how we’re perceived and how we can be more relevant and effective in our work. This survey will provide valuable insight as we plan our move to a new facility in the next two years.

**How will the survey results be used?**
Researchers Anna Chow and Nate Perkins will analyze the survey results and create a report for us that will help us plan our programs and especially our move into a new facility within the next two years.

**Will you share the results of the survey when it’s finished?**
Yes, the survey results will be available at our Annual General Meeting in May.

**When can we participate in the survey?**
The survey is open from now until January 30th, 2015.

**Where can we access the survey?**
The survey is available online and it can be accessed the survey from the Guelph Humane Society Website homepage. Just click on the tab that says “Tell us what your perfect GHS looks like”. If you don’t have access to the internet you can also complete a paper copy of the survey at the shelter.
Are you offering any type of incentive for people to complete the survey?
We are not able to offer any incentives for the survey because we need to be consistent with ethics protocols at the University of Guelph and we want to make sure no one feels coerced into filling it out.

Website content:

You are invited to participate in a survey about how to make the Guelph Humane Society the best Humane Society we can be! The survey will take about 10-minutes to complete and will help inform our future site, shelter design, and programming. Click here to access the survey: [CLARE TO INSERT HTML CODE – already sent]. Thanks so much for your time!

Email content (add a picture if you like – the one from the website is cute!):

Dear [INSERT NAME],

You are invited to participate in a 10-minute, online survey about the Guelph Humane Society. The survey will ask you questions about what you think about the humane society and what facilities and programs you’d like to see from us in the future. We value your opinion, whether or not you have used our services.

Click here to complete the survey: http://bit.ly/1zdxWu5

The survey is being completed by University of Guelph researchers Anna Chow and Nathan Perkins in partnership with the Guelph Humane Society Community Engagement Committee. This survey will help keep us in touch with the community and will provide us with valuable insight as we plan our move to a new facility in the next two years.

Please pass this invite along to your clients, friends, and family. The more responses we get, the better!

Thank you so much for your time and input!
[SIGN NAME]
APPENDIX 3 – SURVEY COMPLETION RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Completion (%)</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35 (13.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (4.68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12 (4.68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>23 (9.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>15 (6.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>22 (8.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>71 (27.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>91 (35.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>7 (2.71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 258
Completion Mean: 49%