A STUDY OF THE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING PROCESS WITHIN

THE CONTEXT OF A SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT

_____

A Dissertation
presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri-Columbia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

_____

by

TODD LEE KRAFT

Dr. Jay Scribner, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2009

This study is dedicated to the memory of Grandma Kraft,

who was the perfect example of how one person can make a tremendous impact in the

lives of many people.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with deep gratitude that I acknowledge the many people who have supported me throughout this journey. The help I received from my dissertation committee was much appreciated. Dr. Dan Cockrell, Dr. Joe Donaldson, Dr. Brendan Maxcy, and Dr. Jerry Valentine offered insight and advice that helped direct this study. Dr. Jay Scribner led me through the high and low points that were a part of this journey. He provided insight and perspective that encouraged me to view the planning process in a unique manner.

I want to thank Wayne Hogue for his constant support of my efforts. He was a great encouragement and his prayers for my successful completion of this study were answered. I also want to thank my great encouragers at Green Tree Elementary—Jan Griffin and Char Jones.

I want to thank my children: Ryan, Dalton, Mallory, and Josie. When I started my dissertation they thought they were going to have a dad who was a "real" doctor. By the time I finished my program they understood that I wasn't going to be a "real" doctor— just a doctor that helped at school. I appreciate Ryan allowing me to read part of my paper to him and providing me with his honest feedback.

I want to thank my wife: Angie Kraft. She encouraged me to keep working and moving forward during the difficult stretches. Many times she reminded me of how close I was to finishing and that the end was near. She is my best friend and I can not express how thankful I am for her support throughout the completion of my study.

I want to thank my Mom and Dad who have always supported my goals and dreams. Even though they never had the opportunity to receive a college education, they

made sure I had every opportunity to further my education. I want to thank them for giving me the opportunity to do what they themselves never had the opportunity to do. They have been instrumental in any success that I have achieved during my lifetime.

I also want to acknowledge my heavenly Father. He is the greatest leader to ever walk the face of this earth and the only one to ever come up with a plan that is absolutely perfect. His plan is collaborative and meaningful and His actions shaped a future that offers wonderful hope for every person who chooses to participate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

A STUDY OF THE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING PROCESS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF A SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT

Todd Lee Kraft

Dr. Jay Scribner, Dissertation Chair

ABSTRACT

Currently, in the United States, 75% of school buildings are in need of repair or renovation. The current physical condition of those school buildings and the effect they have on educational achievement has been a major topic of concern among policymakers, community members, parents, taxpayers, and educators. Just to bring the United States' existing schools into acceptable conditions would take an estimated $127 billion (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2000). Along with concerns related to a school's adverse physical environment, many school districts are facing facility issues due to overcrowding. Significant increases in student population brought about by immigration, migration, suburban sprawl, and the baby boom echo have led many schools to exceed the student capacity they were designed to accommodate (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). These current issues of overcrowding and adverse physical conditions of schools make it clear that educational leaders and the school community as a whole must be prepared to address and plan for school districts' facilities needs (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000).

The extensive need to renovate, replace, and plan educational facilities may sound like an overwhelming task, but it also presents a great opportunity for educational leaders to plan and design schools that will meet the needs of students being educated in the 21$^{\text{st}}$ century. In order for leaders to successfully address the planning and design of

educational facilities, research should be undertaken that examines the authentic context of the planning process. Examining the educational facilities planning process may provide insight into the social and political dimensions that are present within the context of the planning process. Insight into the political and social dimensions of change may allow leaders to successfully guide stakeholders through the social and political dimensions of change.

The purpose of investigating this planning episode was to develop an understanding of how an educational leader guided stakeholders through the social and political dimensions that existed within the authentic context of the planning process. Three major themes emerged from the in-depth interviews and data analysis. First, the leader engaged key stakeholders to create a collaborative and meaningful planning process. Second, the effective actions of the leader contributed to a meaningful planning process. Third, the leader successfully shaped the context of the planning process. In reference to engaging key stakeholders to create a collaborative and meaningful planning process, the data analysis resulted in the emergence of three themes: (1) involving key stakeholders, (2) listening to key stakeholders, and (3) developing a flexible planning process. In reference to the actions of the leader contributing to a meaningful planning process, four themes emerged from the data: (1) establishing credibility, (2) envisioning the future, (3) empowering key stakeholders, and (4) ensuring parity. In reference to the leader shaping the context of the planning process, one specific theme emerged from the data: (1) shaping the context of the planning process.

Chapter One

Background to the Study

In the United States today approximately 59 million students, educators, and community members spend their working day in school buildings (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2000; American Architectural Foundation and KnowledgeWorks Foundation, 2005). The current physical conditions of those school buildings and the effect they have on educational achievement have been and remain a major topic of concern among policymakers, community members, parents, taxpayers, and educators. Current research related to the physical environment of school buildings in the United States indicates that 75% of school buildings are in need of repair and renovation to upgrade them to good condition (American Architectural Foundation and KnowledgeWorks Foundation, 2005). In the United States, billions of dollars have been allocated to replace old schools and to repair and renovate worn out schools (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). Adverse physical conditions that include leaking roofs, poor air quality, and broken plumbing have raised serious concerns about not only student and teacher safety but also about how inadequate schools negatively impact the educational success of students.

Along with concerns related to a school's adverse physical environment, many school districts are facing facility issues related to overcrowding. Significant increases in student population brought about by immigration, migration, suburban sprawl, and the baby boom echo have led many schools to exceed the student capacity they were designed to accommodate (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). According to the research of Kozol (1991), the problems of overcrowding and worn out schools are

closely related. School districts that have experienced significant student population growth are more likely to have schools in need of repair, renovation, or replacement (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000).

These current facility issues make obvious the need for educational leaders and the school community as a whole to be prepared to implement a planning process that will address the educational needs of students and the community (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). The difficulty for school leaders is not recognizing the need to plan; the difficulty is implementing the most appropriate planning method for the specific needs within a district. As nationally recognized educational planner and past president of the Council of Educational Facility Planners (CEFPI), Dr. Nancy R. Myers (2000) pointed out, "In addressing facilities, 'planning' has become the new educational word of choice. But defining what it means, and who should be facilitating and participating in the planning process, is often difficult" (p. 1).

In an attempt to address facility needs, many school districts systematically create extensive lists of needed renovations, conduct comprehensive school surveys, produce timelines for completing projects, convene informational meetings to justify the need for new facilities, and develop plans for new educational facilities. This type of rational approach has been utilized by school districts since the middle of the 20th century (National Council on Schoolhouse Construction, 1949; Engelhardt, Engelhardt, and Leggett, 1947; Sumption, 1952; McGuffey, 1973; and Kowalski; 1989). Although the development of the comprehensive planning model has provided many positive contributions to the field of educational facilities planning, for the most part this rational

approach is a linear, step-by-step approach that has not recognized the social and political context in which the planning process takes place (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

According to research on educational facilities planning, a disconnect exists between understanding the social and political context in which people work together during the planning process and the ability to apply the understanding in an authentic setting (Cervero and Wilson, 1994; Tanner and Lackney, 2006; and Hansman, 2004). Cervero and Wilson (2006) addressed this disconnect in their book "Working the Planning Table: Negotiating Democratically for Adult, Continuing, and Workplace Education." The authors commented:

Over the decades, the gamut of rational decision-making models, linear and feedback procedural task systems, and general planning theories have not produced working understandings of the context in which people plan programs. Most planning theory, with its lack of attention to context and its pervasive focus on planning steps, is only partially helpful in focusing attention on what matters in planning programs (p. 5).

School districts serious about providing innovative educational facilities will be prepared to address the disconnect between understanding the social and political context in which stakeholders work together during the planning process and the ability to apply the understanding in an authentic setting. In the real world of providing educational facilities, addressing this disconnect means that "the practical decisions and technical strategies about needs, objectives, design, administration, and evaluation are now connected to the real-world contexts in which power, interests, ethical commitments, and negotiation strategies are part of everyday life" (Cervero and Wilson, 2006, vii).

Although numerous models provide steps and strategies for planning, educational leaders must be able to understand and choose the appropriate plan that works for their school district and the context in which the planning takes place (Hansman, 2004).

The lack of proficiency in responding to the social and political dimensions present during change is often a stumbling block in attempts to address issues related to planning and designing educational facilities. Educational leaders who have gained an understanding of the context surrounding the planning process may be more successful in guiding stakeholders into exploring effective methods of educational delivery and the systems-change implications as related to educational facility planning (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). When vital contextual components (power, interests, ethical commitments, negotiation strategies) are coupled with the appropriate educational facilities planning components (needs, objectives, design, administration, evaluation), school districts should be able to take giant strides toward providing educational facilities that will meet the needs of students and members of the school community (Cervero and Wilson, 2006).

<center>Purpose and Research Questions</center>

With so many school districts either currently involved in the educational facilities planning process or quickly approaching the need to enter into the planning process, now is the opportune time to explore a school district's process for planning educational facilities (Coghlan and Brannick, 2005). As a result, this study investigated the planning process utilized by one school district to plan and design an educational facility intended to meet the needs of students being educated in the 21st century. The purpose of investigating the educational facilities planning process was to develop an

understanding of the relationship between the way key district leaders guide stakeholders through the social and political dimensions of change and how these leaders approached issues related to planning for current and future facility needs.

A school district in a Midwestern state was selected for this study because the district experienced significant student population growth over the past fifteen years. This incredible student population growth was the catalyst for the construction of two high schools, a middle school, and five elementary schools in the last nine years. In August of 2007, the school district completed the majority of the construction phase of the newest high school and during the 2007-2008 school year, the district discussed plans for a new elementary school in the near future. The researcher found the limited number of studies that investigated educational leaders' ability to guide stakeholders into exploring new and more effective methods of educational delivery during the planning process to be significant. Developing an understanding of the relationship between the way effective educational leaders guide stakeholders into exploring effective educational delivery options within the social and political context of planning and how those leaders approach issues related to meeting current and future facility needs will be of great importance. The importance is not only because school districts across the United States will spend billions of dollars to construct schools but also because those schools represent the heart of our society (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). Proper planning should assure that new and renovated schools provide the best in both structure and program flexibility (Myers, 2000).

In an attempt to understand the relationship between how educational leaders guide stakeholders into exploring effective educational delivery options within an

authentic context, and how these leaders approach issues related to planning for current and future facility needs, I addressed the following research questions:

1. In what ways did the leader involved in one planning episode in one school district engage stakeholders in a collaborative and meaningful planning process?

2. In what ways did stakeholders involved in one planning episode in one school district perceive a superintendent's actions contribute to a meaningful process?

3. How did a leader involved in one planning episode in one school district negotiate the concerns and interests of stakeholders?

Statement of Problem

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (1999), the average school in the United States is 50 years old; extreme use and neglected maintenance have taken a toll on school buildings in this country. In addition to the adverse physical environment of many schools, a high rate of student population growth has led many school districts to experience significant overcrowding (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). Poor physical environments and overcrowding are conditions that affect at least 75% of school buildings in the Unites States (American Architectural Foundation and KnowledgeWorks Foundation, 2005). These conditions mean that students who will be applying for jobs requiring 21st century skills are being educated in 20th century schools. Not only were these schools designed to educate people who were going to work in factories, on assembly lines, and as domestic servants, but many of these schools have been maintained in unacceptable physical conditions (The School of the Future, 2006).

Although the idea that the aforementioned issues would exist in the United States would seem unthinkable, the more critical problem is that as ineffective school buildings are being replaced or renovated, they are being replaced with the same Victorian style buildings that existed during the past 150 years. Sean McDougall, Managing Director of Stakeholder Design, explained that schools have not changed a great deal in over 150 years: "A Victorian teacher would get the hang of a modern school quite easily" (Thomas, 2006, p. 1). So why are schools constructed in the 21st century still designed to meet the needs of students of the Victorian era?

Current research speaks to the fact that although most schools engage in a planning process, most of these processes have not led to the type of dialogue that results in educational change (Hansman, 2004; Hudson, 2007; & Tanner and Lackney, 2006). Locker (2008) commented that school districts are still creating Victorian style schools because educational leaders are not asking the right questions. Locker stated:

Opportunities to do really good work in exciting best educational practices and facilities planning are missed. In the typical school design process, many people feel good that they got 'the answers' right, but they are the right answers to the wrong questions (p. 2).

Hansman (2004) suggested planning requires that the key stakeholders involved in planning "listen to and work with each other to negotiate program components in an ethical planning process, while at the same time, not taking actions that are counterproductive for the program" (p. 10). A question that educational leaders and stakeholders involved in educational facilities planning must consider is: How does a school district employ a collaborative and meaningful planning process that will result in

a school that will meet the needs of students being educated in the 21st century and serve as a community resource. Cervero and Wilson (2006) asserted that a successful planning process must be ethical in regard to every decision that is made during planning.

Although the complex process of planning educational facilities has led to many significant challenges for school districts, the process has also presented school districts with the tremendous opportunity to "design the right solution in the right place at the right time" (Hudson, 2007). When educational leaders utilize the appropriate information and resources, the opportunity to plan and design an educational facility should result in an innovative learning environment that responds to the educational needs of all students and to the culture of the community (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

Scholarly research that presents the concepts, processes, and steps to educational facilities planning is adequate in scope, but the majority of this research is presented within a linear and structured framework. This linear approach dominating much of the literature does not take into account the complexity of the planning process, nor does this approach consider the fact that woven within all of the information and resources is a social and political process (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). According to Cervero and Wilson (1994), planning is a social and political activity in which the stakeholders negotiate personal and organizational interests to create an educational program. Separating himself from the more historical linear approach, McGuffey (1973) recognized that "careful management of the planning, design, and construction processes will provide for a comprehensive, overlapping, non-linear approach to the delivery of a facilities project" (p. 24). Although an understanding of the technical aspect of planning is essential to success; the educational leader's ability to guide stakeholders into

exploring more effective methods of educational delivery provided a major piece of the framework for understanding the context of this study (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

The planning and design of an educational facility, according to Cervero and Wilson (1994), cannot be limited to the technical aspect or the "how to" skills that most of the literature discusses. The planning process should also address the social and political dimensions embedded in the "what for" and "for whom" questions. Cervero and Wilson stated that almost all planning models have regarded the elements within political relationships "as noise that gets in the way of good planning; in so doing, these models set up dichotomies between rationality and politics or, more generally, between planners and social structures within which they act" (p. xii). The authors went on to assert that power, politics, and ethics are far from being just noise but actually create the environment in which programs are planned and in which planners must perform (Cervero and Wilson, 1994).

An additional theoretical framework that helped to explain the forces at work within an organization's environment was the open systems approach. The opens systems approach, as explained by Morgan (1997), was developed with the thought that an organization is open to its environment and must strive to maintain a suitable relationship with that environment if it is to stay healthy. The theory has direct application for educational leaders involved in planning facilities. The health of a planning committee relies on the leader's ability to develop relationships and to encourage continuous dialogue framed around meeting students' educational needs today and in the future (Locker, 2008).

The view of the planning process becomes clearer when stakeholders become adept at viewing the exchange of interactions through multiple lenses. Bolman and Deal (1997) advised that stakeholders involved in the planning process must be able to use multiple lenses to understand the forces in their environment and to successfully interact with those forces. A goal of this study was to view the planning process through multiple lenses (i.e. political, social, negotiation, and the open systems approaches) so that a clearer and more realistic approach would be applied to the challenges educational leaders will face during a time of change (Bolman and Deal, 1997).

Speaking to the challenges that the planning process can present stakeholders, Kowalski (1983) stated, "Since the 1960s, the task of educational facility planning has confronted new, and dramatically different, challenges" (p. 8). These challenges may be in the form of social, political, cultural, technological, and economic changes. These changes may occur both internally and externally in the setting in which each respective school district operates. An educational facility planning team must be able to recognize and understand the potential effects of these dynamic forces (Kowalski, 1983). Finding a way to appropriately frame challenging events has always been complicated, but according to Bolman and Deal (1997) facing changing environments has become overwhelming in the unstable and complex society in which people today live.

The purpose of each section of the literature review was to create an awareness of the political, social, and environmental dimensions that exist during educational facilities planning. The literature revealed that on countless occasions school districts have failed to engage stakeholders in dialogue that leads to creating effective educational delivery methods and a better awareness of how education will be changing in the future. Locker

(2008) stated, "Education has changed, is changing, and will continue to change…teachers and school leaders don't think long term, are not aware of the innovative and proven highly effective practices evident in isolated examples around the country, and have little awareness of innovative educational facilities" (p. 2). Hopefully the literature in this review will provide a framework for analyzing, evaluating, and improving the planning process for school districts facing the challenge of planning schools.

<div align="center">Significance of the Study</div>

Many school districts in the United States find themselves faced with the issue of planning new facilities. A study of the planning process may provide valuable insight for not only the school district where the study took place but also for the many other school districts that may find themselves facing the planning process for an educational facility. Researching the way educational leaders guide stakeholders into exploring effective educational delivery options within an authentic context and how these leaders approach issues related to planning for current and future facility needs would be beneficial. The research may contribute to a more efficient process of planning schools that "are designed and built to enhance teaching and learning and serve as centers of the community" (Tanner and Lackney, 2006, p. 51).

This research project could be shared with school leaders, members of the school community, and other participants (i.e. architects, construction managers, engineers) to enable those participants to prepare and take a proactive stance when the need for planning an educational facility is presented. Many times, school leaders only learn of

how educational planning should have been addressed after they have experienced the issue firsthand, at a point often too late to undo the effects of ineffective planning.

Planning educational facilities is not just about providing a school building; planning and designing educational facilities is about engaging stakeholders in a social and political process that results in a learning environment that will respond to the needs of students, teachers, and the entire community (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). Tanner and Lackney commented that in spite of the recent findings, researchers have provided regarding the value of involving stakeholders in the process of planning, incorporating those findings into planning schools has not been a widely adopted practice by school districts. In chapter five, I consider the relationship between how one school district approached concerns and issues that unfolded throughout a planning process and how that school district guided stakeholders to participate in a collaborative planning process in an effort to address and resolve these concerns and issues.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations associated with this study should be taken into account when considering its contributions. Although many school districts in the United States have recently completed or are currently involved in the planning process for an educational facility, data collection and analysis were limited to a single, intentionally selected school district in the central part of the United States. The selection of a single case study design logically brings limitations as far as the generalization of the study is concerned. The empirical setting, the school district and the planning process it experienced, can only be viewed as a sample context of the educational facilities planning process. However, generalization of findings is not a specific objective of this study, nor does the study set

out to imply through its presentation of findings that all school districts are similar to the district examined. Gaining an in-depth understanding of the multiple layers of stakeholder interactions involved in a planning process, however, may contribute to general knowledge about the phenomena.

Another limitation was the selection process. The site chosen for this study was only one of many sites that could have been selected. The site chosen for the study may vary from other sites in the way the planning process was implemented. Also, instead of attempting to understand the planning process in general, the study attempted to make sense of the planning process from the limited, yet detailed, view of one site.

Examining the planning process retrospectively, as opposed to viewing it as it unfolded was also a limitation. The retrospective examination meant the study relied on participants' recollections and self-reports.

Definition of Key Terms

Contingency Theory: "Theories of organization and management that allow us to break free of bureaucratic thinking and to organize in a way that meets the requirements of the environment" (Morgan, 1997, p. 43).

Educational Facilities Planning: A course of action whereby a set of organized activities permits decision makers to select choices from a set of feasible alternative solutions (Tanner, 1991).

Framing: Framing is the procedure of selectively using frames to create a particular image or idea. "Frames are both windows on the world and lenses that bring the world into focus. Frames filter out some things while allowing others to

pass through easily. Frames help us order experience and decide what to do" (Bolman and Deal, 1997, p. 12).

Leadership: Leadership is the ability to guide, direct, or influence others.

Learning Environments: "Effective learning environments are designed to enhance teaching and learning and accommodate the needs of all learners; serve as center of the community; result from a planning process involving all stakeholders; and allow for flexibility and adaptability to changing needs" (Tanner and Lackney, 2006, p. 101).

Mechanical Thinking: "Has proved incredibly popular, partly because of their efficiency in the performance of tasks that can be successfully routinized and partly because they offer managers the promise of tight control over people and their activities" (Morgan, 1997, p. 31).

Planners: "A broad array of people who are involved in the deliberating about the purposes, content, audience, and format of educational programs" (Cervero and Wilson, 1994, p. 6).

Open Systems Approach: "Builds on the principle that that organization, like organisms, are 'open' to their environment and must achieve an appropriate relation with that environment if they are to survive" (Morgan, 1997, p. 39).

Political Dimension: "Focused on the relations between interests, conflict, and power. Organizational politics arise when people think differently and want to act differently" (Morgan, 1997, p. 160).

Rational Approach: "Is achieved through clear lines of authority with huge amounts of data to use as a basis for decision-making; an analytical process administered by specialists" (Tanner and Lackney, 2006, p. 69).

Social Dimension: "An activity where educators negotiate personal and organizational interests" (Cervero and Wilson, 1994, p. 6).

Stakeholders: "People who have a vested interest in the results of the strategic plan" (Tanner and Lackney, 2006, p. 397). "People who make decisions or desire information about a program" (Patton, 1997, p. 42).

Technical Knowledge: Refers to possessing the skills necessary to accomplish a task.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Many school districts in the United States currently find themselves faced with the critical issue of planning and designing educational facilities. The planning process should present school districts with a great opportunity to develop educational facilities that take into account developments in technology, educational theory, and research regarding the different ways students learn and teachers teach (American Architectural Foundation and the KnowledgeWorks Foundation, 2005). Regrettably, in many cases the opportunity to plan and design an effective learning environment is wasted. The planning process that most school districts utilize to design and construct educational facilities does not result in a school with the necessary design elements that will foster a 21st century education and serve as a community resource (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). All too often, facilities planning results in "a lot of new-old buildings designed around some already outdated current practices of the teachers and other adults who define needs in fairly traditional ways" (Locker, 2008).

In order for school districts to reverse this trend, educational leaders must generate dialogue that results in educational change. The importance of facilitating high-quality dialogue is provided by Locker:

A good dialogue with administrators, teacher, staff, students and the community for designing a building would correlate with changes in educational delivery to align with current best practices and an understanding of how education will be changing in the future (p. 2).

Educational leaders must be aware of the context in which the dialogue is taking place during facilities planning. Tanner and Lackney (2006) suggested that leaders must gain an understanding of the context surrounding the planning process to be successful in helping stakeholders deal with the social and political dimensions present during change. Making sense of the social and political dimensions of change and how stakeholders approach issues related to school district growth may contribute to the idea that planning has less to do with what a school is going to look like and more to do with the process itself.

Developing a value of the process allows the school community to move away from what Bingler (1995) identified as conventional wisdom. Bingler explained:

The conventional wisdom…is that educational facilities simply provide the containers in which learning occurs, but that the form of the containers, and even the process of making them, has little to contribute to the real purpose of education, which centers around the curriculum and instruction delivered by the educator and received by the student (p. 23).

Providing stakeholders with information to understand the contextual components that surround the process may challenge the conventional wisdom (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). Tanner and Lackney stated that simply providing information is not enough, however. The authors recommended stakeholders be provided with the opportunity to apply the understanding in an authentic setting that would encourage "working with people rather than for them and involving them in critical, relevant aspects of the process" (p. 47).

This chapter provides an examination of the literature related to the social and political dimensions of planning and seeks to develop a framework for understanding the planning process and how it might result in new and more effective educational delivery systems. Such an understanding might encourage school districts to place as much significance on the process as the product. In Chapter 2, the first section provides a historical overview aimed at identifying the social, political, and educational dimensions that influenced educational facilities planning. The second section views the planning process in relationship to the open-systems approach and provides a framework that views organizations as open to the environment. The third section explores the impact the social and political environment has on an educational leader's ability to guide the process into exploring innovative and highly effective educational practices.

Historical Overview of Planning School Facilities

The goal of this section of literature is to provide a historical perspective that would offer insight into the journey that educational facility planning has taken through time as societal conditions have changed and developed. This long journey is currently at a point where examining the past, evaluating the present, and focusing on the future may provide valuable information to assist educational leaders in guiding stakeholders into designing educational facilities that will meet the needs of students being educated in the 21st century. The value of this overview is not only in observing the historical progression of educational facilities planning but also in developing an understanding of how the social and political environment has always had an impact on educational planning (Cervero and Wilson, 2006). The social and political dimensions of change and the effect those dimensions have on all stakeholders should be acknowledged. A better

understanding of the social and political activities that have influenced education will help stakeholders recognize that the planning process has been carried out in the middle of "personal, organizational, and social relationships of power among people who may have similar, different, or conflicting sets of interests" (Cervero and Wilson, 1994, p. 4). Equipped with historical insight into how social and political dynamics have affected educational facilities planning, the goal of educational leaders should be to apply the insight to improve the process of planning for every school constructed in the 21st century (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

The historical periods of the school building documented by many researchers (Brubaker, 1947; Castaldi, 1982; Gwynne, 1976; Kowalski, 1983; Leu, 1965; Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003; and Tanner and Lackney, 2006) reflect the history of instruction, which in turn, reflects the social and political philosophies of the time. Studying the historical relationship between the educational facility and instruction provided an informative look at how society has influenced the planning process (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003). The periods in the historical overview of facility planning and educational theory include: (a) Hellenistic and Roman Periods; (b) Early American; (c) Pre-Civil War Period; (d) Post-Civil War Period; (e) Early 20th Century; and (f) Post-World War II. These time periods will be addressed and analyzed in the literature, along with a discussion of two additional periods--The Current Period and The Future.

Hellenistic and Roman Periods

During the Hellenistic and Roman period (500B.C.—200 B.C.), famous educators, such as Aristotle and Plato met with students to exchange and discuss ideas in the open air. Teachers and students would meet in any convenient location, possibly the

shade of a temple wall or other building. According to McCormick and Cassidy (1953), during this time period the only teachers who had the means to provide a classroom for their students were the ones who were well paid by collecting student fees. One or two centuries later in Rome, educational facilities had not changed from the ones found in Greece. The Romans held school in a variety of locations. One of the most popular teaching settings for the Romans was the veranda, an open air setting in which a roof provided some protection for students from the weather conditions (Brubaker, 1947). During the Hellenistic and Roman Period, architects appeared to show no interest in the design of school facilities. As a result, the school buildings that we picture today did not exist, and the meeting place of a teacher and his students was secondary to the instructional process. The instructional program of the Greek student of this time period was straightforward and consisted of teaching three basic areas of music, grammar, and gymnastics. This approach, established in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, continued to exist in the Middle Ages with one exception. The church became an important conveyor of education. As a result, the facilities for educating children were often located in the church building. The church's involvement in education became common practice beginning in the Middle Ages and continued in America when the earliest colonial schools were church affiliated.

Even though school buildings did not formally exist during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, the form of education was shaped as a result of the social and political atmosphere that existed during those two periods. For example, only males of affluent families were provided with educational opportunities. During the Middle Ages the

church building became a prominent location for education, and the beliefs of the church influenced the planning and process of education.

Early American

The early American period continued to reflect the thoughts of previous time periods. School facilities were of little consequence to educating children. Early American schoolhouses were generally single room, primitive structures made of wooden walls, a roof, and a small number of windows. These settings usually included backless benches and long tables for the children and a raised podium for the teacher. Most accounts hold that colonial schools were built on land considered undesirable for any other use. These schools were referred to as "old field schools" because the land the school was built on had lost its productivity due to excess use. These early schools were basic structures that included only the absolute necessities (Castaldi, 1982). Brubaker (1947) offered a description of early American schools in the following account: "Ceilings were low; ventilation bad; lighting unsatisfactory; heating uneven; and sanitary arrangements often unmentionable" (p. 594). The stale, uninviting interior did little to increase student interest in education. These problems were accentuated by the fact that colonial schoolhouses were rarely maintained properly. In most cases the schoolmaster was expected to provide the upkeep and maintenance of the schoolhouse in addition to his regular responsibilities, and as a result, many basic repairs went unfinished (Kowalski, 1983).

Seventeenth and eighteenth century American schoolhouses had advanced very little beyond simple shelters in which pupils and teachers could meet to discuss and exchange ideas. Early American schools had also advanced little from the European

design the colonists had been used to before migrating to America. Schools in England were often in terrible condition and offered very limited opportunity for children, yet the colonists frequently tried to copy these same educational facilities once in America (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003). Advancement in school design was also hindered by the fact that very few architects were available in the early settlements. Architects during that time were primarily interested in designing public buildings associated with government (Castaldi, 1982). In most cases, the citizens of the seventeenth century felt no need of architectural guidance in planning a schoolhouse. Citizens of village settlements were building simple one-room structures with a fireplace at one end and a few windows at the other (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003).

The one-room structures also served as the church and the meeting hall where much of the village's social activities took place. The schoolhouse served the entire community during the early American period, and thus at that time the school began to provide its community with an identity (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). In 1647, the political and social processes resulted in the General Court of Massachusetts passing the Old Deluder Satan Act. This law required each community to provide a school or to pay an amount of money to the next bigger town to support a school. This law led to the concept of collecting a tax on property to pay the wages of teachers and to construct school buildings (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003). According to Pulliam and Van Patten the early American period was one point at which American "schools underwent changes as a result of cultural forces in the colonies and the experience of coping with the American wilderness" (p. 82). The goals and objectives of colonial schools and teachers were to reinforce stability, tradition, authority, discipline, and preordained value systems.

Although crude in form and poorly supported, these schools began the traditions of universal schooling and public support (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003). Even before the United States became a country, Americans had initiated what was to become the standard ambition—"better education for children than their parents enjoyed" (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003, p. 97).

Pre-Civil War Period

With the arrival of the nineteenth century and a newly earned independence, the country began to develop an American culture and a set of national institutions. The first quarter of the century was influential in many ways, including the establishment of the school systems that still exist in some forms today (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003). The nineteenth century also ushered in the westward growth of the United States, and urbanization and industrialization brought about changes in the way schools were designed. The problem was that not all of these changes were necessarily positive for student learning. One example of a change that did not bring about positive results was the development of Lancasterian schools. These schools were developed by British schoolmaster, Joseph Lancaster, in response to the need to efficiently educate large groups of children in Eastern seaboard towns (Gwynne, 1976). Lancasterian schools featured a large (50' by 100') room furnished with numerous rows of benches facing a teacher's platform. With the help of teaching assistants, the master teacher would instruct as many as 500 students. "Comfort was irrelevant in this education venture which operated on strict discipline and regimentation. Thankfully, the Lancasterian schools were utilized only until about 1840" (Gwynne, 1976, p. A-3).

Even though ineffective educational systems like the Lancasterian schools were abandoned, as late as the middle of the nineteenth century American schools remained in an unacceptable state (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003). Knight (1948) described the sad state of the school facility in 1844 in the state of New York:

The great majority of the schools of New York state in 1844 were officially described…as naked and deformed, in comfortless and dilapidated buildings with unhung doors, broken sashes, absent panes, stilted benches, yawning roofs and muddy mouldering floors….Only one third of the schoolhouses were reported in good repair, another third in only comfortable circumstances, while more than 3,300 were unfit for the reception of either man or beast (p. 183).

Pulliam and Van Patten (2003) went on to add that during this time period most school buildings were not kept up and lighting was extremely poor. Materials like textbooks, blackboards, and general provisions were in extremely short supply.

As America began to transform from a rural to a more urban society, school buildings grew bigger and more complex. An example of a bigger and more complex school was the Quincy Grammar School, a facility constructed in Boston in 1848 and the first graded elementary school in this country. This four-story school consisted of twelve classrooms, an assembly hall, a principal's office, a basement, and an attic. The entire facility was built on less than one acre of land and was large enough to house a student body of 660 students (Leu, 1965). The Quincy Grammar School, built over 150 years ago, is still being used today. By 1850, 45 percent of the country's children attended common elementary school, and half of the states had established school systems before the start of the Civil War (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003).

Post-Civil War Period

In 1874, the landmark Kalamazoo case paved the way for tax-supported free public schools in the United States. This event ushered in the age of the American public high school and the principle that public education, including public secondary schools, should be free for every person. At the same time, due largely to the efforts of Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, school building design and use made valuable advances (Leu, 1965; Gwynne, 1976; Castaldi, 1982). The quality of school construction improved, as schools were no longer being built out of wood but were built of brick and stone. Improved methods of constructing nineteenth century schools led to schools being designed as architectural works, yet at this time little regard was given to the goal of meeting the instructional needs of students in the planning process. Architectural focus was primarily on shape, form, and style, rather than on the relationship between learning and the school facility's environment. Features such as cupolas, parapet walls, high ceilings, excessive ornamentation, and central fan heating systems were characteristic of these early secondary schools.

As society began to increase in complexity, schools began to make additions that included rooms for shop, homemaking, music, physical education, and science courses (Leu, 1965). The addition of instruction, such as homemaking and shop classes, meant that schools provided the skills necessary for economic success as opposed to apprenticeships or family members providing the primary education for children (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). According to Tanner and Lackney, rapid urbanization and economic development in the mid to late 1800s produced various social problems. Leaders of communities desired to develop the ability to instill in children the values of hard work

and obeying authority. Community leaders understood that children who knew how to work hard and obey authority would be good employees in an industrial setting. Tanner and Lackney described the effect on the school system as "factories created to produce things led to factories to produce learning" (p. 6).

The advance of the modern American school system between the period of the Civil War and World War I was significant. During this time, the continuation of the westward expansion and the increase of industry, agriculture, and population placed new burdens upon existing schools and brought about the need for not only building new schools but also of entirely new educational systems (Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003). Along with the obvious need for providing new educational facilities, a shift in thinking about the educational practices taking place inside school buildings also occurred. Pulliam and Van Patten (2003) referenced this period when educational theory experienced significant changes:

> Education theory passed through a series of stages that included sectarian dominance, *laissez-faire*, slavish copying of European models, and the scientific progressive movement. Compulsory attendance, expanded curriculum, fully graded common schools, public high schools, and large increases in spending for buildings and equipment marked the period (p. 158).

Early 20th Century

Roth (1957) explained that at the turn of the 20th century, the architectural response to designing schools meant to encourage students to apply the skills of observation, investigation, discussion, evaluation, and self-expression was uninspired.

Schools were either castles or palaces and their architectural style either Gothic,

Renaissance, or Baroque, or a combination of styles. Whatever their shapes or

forms were, they in no way resembled a school (in the functional sense). The

child's own scale was not taken into consideration, either practically or

emotionally. Out-sized entrances, corridors, stairways seem to be particularly

selected by the architect for his "artistic" effects with the well meant aim of

contributing to the child's education in art.

It would be wrong and unfair to blame the architect alone. The absence of

unbiased pedagogical conceptions, and of a curriculum based on them were as

much a cause of mistaken evolution, as was the lack of close collaboration

between the architect, educator and building authorities (p.26).

Roth (1965) added that neither the educators nor the architects had a clear

understanding of the educational learning to be accomplished at the beginning of the 20th

century. Harrison and Dobbin (1931) commented that stakeholders involved in the

planning and design of schools associated certain styles of buildings with certain types of

architectural design and thus hindered progress in school architecture. This

standardization that was practiced during the 20th century resulted in a level of overdone

replication in school design. The high level of standardized school design and curriculum

was also a result of the influx of immigrants from Europe, the need to build schools

quickly and the need to "Americanize" a very diverse student population (Tanner and

Lackney, 2006).

 As educational change was being discussed and initiated in America, the

depression of the 1930s had a profound effect on the building of new schools. According

to authors Harrison and Dobbin (1931), during the 1930s some architects involved in the design of school buildings were awakened to the understanding that modern buildings must be modern in their plan, their design, their construction, their equipment, and the part they play in the life of the neighborhood in which they are located. Harrison and Dobbin (1931) went on to declare:

> Considering the schoolhouse as the educational center for the youth of this land, it is readily appreciated that our school buildings should be expressive of our highest standards in architectural design, in building construction and in mechanical equipment. While methods of teaching have been improved, new structural materials invented, and mechanical equipment perfected, the plans and structural design of our school buildings must change to conform to these new conditions (p. I).

During the first quarter of the 20th century educators began to investigate the prospect of a relationship between learning and the design of learning environments. As a result of these studies, educational facility planning began to develop new approaches to solving educational related problems facing school planners (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

Post-World War II

Following World War II and into the 1950s and 1960s, school planners utilized new studies related to the design of instructional spaces. The school construction effort became a multi-billion dollar effort, and architects and educators took an avid interest in school design. The massive, box-like structures with "egg crate" classrooms gave way to school design that reflected an interest in accommodating more movement, activity, and experiential learning (Gwynne, 1976). Pearson (1972) pointed out that in approximately

1948, educational leaders recognized the changes that were taking place in educational attitudes and advocated for a collective effort on the part of administrators, educators, and architects to address these educational changes during the educational facilities planning process. To initiate this collaborative effort architects began observing children at school and initiating discussions with teachers about the type of school facilities they envisioned for their students.

Pearson (1972) stated:

Collaboration is not just the educator stating his demands, and the administrator finding the means to erect the building. It involves each of these in an active and informed understanding of the others' interests, and requires from each a readiness to compromise for the common good. The architect must have a genuine sympathy for educational objectives and ideals, and must not merely design a school building but the best possible total environment for the living and learning of young children (p. 23).

Along with the noteworthy advances in planning and designing educational facilities that occurred in the 1950s and 1960s, issues of social unrest also affected the planning process of educational facilities during the period. Critics such as John Holt, Paul Goodman, and Herbert Kohl expressed disapproval and questioned the structure of public education. Large urban comprehensive schools were criticized for not meeting the needs of minority, disadvantaged, and low-income youths. Schools were blamed for suppressing children's creativity and dampening their love of learning across all social classes (Campbell et al., 1980).

Change in school facility planning and design paralleled the rapid changes taking place in the midst of the social activism of the 1960s. The cultural change from the industrial factory model to the information age resulted in "a global economy with unpredictable, accelerated, differentiated, diverse, and miniaturized markets based on industries such as electronics, molecular biology, space sciences, computer science, and telecommunications" (Tanner and Lackney, 2006, p. 11). An understanding of these cultural and social changes contributed to a better understanding of how school facilities could bring people together to solve problems (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

New designs in constructing educational facilities perpetuated that excitement. The new designs included the clusters, finger, and campus plans. These plans often included large blocks of windows that let in large amounts of natural light. New materials, such as, glass, concrete, and steel became standard features used during designing and constructing school facilities. Accompanying these advances in construction materials, school building design integrated features of open space, flexibility, color schemes, complex equipment, carpeting, air conditioning, moveable walls, pods, and the use of new energy sources (Gwynn, 1976).

The 1960s were a time of dramatic reform in both educational research and instructional practices. Commenting on educational reform, Tanner and Lackney (2006) stated, "Open education, community education and the community school concept, the middle school concept, and alternative and magnet schools were all explored during this period" (p. 11). This era also provided an insightful new view of how architects were thinking about school design. According to Leu (1965), "many architects are attempting to design a physical environment that would not only contribute to existing theories of

learning, but also assimilate educational changes" (p.5). Kowalski (1983) added that during the1960s, public education became concerned with a desire to innovate. New financing made available through federal programs, such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, encouraged this desire. School districts experimented with "nontraditional" ideas that presented new educational concepts, such as, non-graded school, team teaching, and mini-courses. Even though the ideas were aimed at changes in curriculum and instruction, school facility planning was in the end affected. According to Kowalski (1983), open space plans and the educational park were two concepts which enjoyed a significant degree of popularity during that era" (p.12).

In the 1960s, the thought that schools should become an important part of the community gained popularity. The opinion was that parents should feel welcome as soon as they enter the building and space should be designated for interaction between parents and teachers. The design of the school building should support current social change and new teaching strategies. During the post-war period constructing buildings did not progress merely on the foundation of new building technologies or architectural design but on also what was in the best interest of children as apparent by informed educators and architects (Pearson, 1972).

Educational leaders in the 1970s had to cope with a new dimension of growing and complex issues. Some school districts experienced an enrollment decline. Architects introduced the controversial "windowless" school in response to energy concerns of the 1970s; air conditioning became a widely expected practice. The school community sought after more creative forms of career education. Modernizing and renovating existing facilities was of great concern; designing schools for the handicapped became

prevalent; and broadening the use of school facilities as a community resource were just some of the complex issues facing school districts and their educational leaders (Gwynne, 1976). This array of issues created another challenge for school facility planners. Gwynne (1976) astutely noted the challenge as, "the necessity for updating the school facility planning process and for improving, through careful selection, education and training, the performance of the educational planner" (p. A-5). Effective educational planning can be a vague process, but a vision of the future must be included as a decision-making element in the comprehensive facility plan (Gwynne, 1976). The Educational Facilities Laboratories (1960) stated that the goal of comprehensive facility planning is to construct "the right schools, in the right places, at the right times" (p.44). The Educational Facilities Laboratories also commented that to avoid an ongoing crisis, the planning process should include thinking about the complete collection of all the school buildings in the community and not just one individual school at a time.

The Modern Era

The transformation of the learning environment during the past three thousand years has gone from the open-air classroom of the Hellenistic and Roman Period, to the one room shelter of colonial times, and on to the modern facilities of the early 21st century. Common threads throughout those many years have been the political and social factors that have impacted the history of designing and constructing school facilities. These factors have guided educators and architects to develop the philosophies and procedures of modern-day facility planning. External and internal issues of great importance were addressed in the 1980s. These issues included "enrollment trends,

legislation, economics, energy, taxpayer revolt, instructional priorities, and the changing use of school building" (Kowalski, 1983, p.12).

Social and political issues have played an important role in the modern era of educational facility planning. Several major laws were passed during the 1970s that pertained to the accessibility for handicapped students. Kowalski (1983) noted in particular that, "Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Public Law 94-142, and corresponding state statutes have had dramatic consequences for the process of school facility planning" (p.17). When discussing school design and handicapped accessibility, Erekson defined an architectural barrier as:

> Those elements of design or construction which prevent a handicapped person
> from entering and making use of a building or school facility with a reasonable
> effort. The definition includes exterior as well as interior features of the structure,
> such as, sidewalks and parking lots (as cited in Kowalski, 1983, p.17).

The enactment of Public Law 94-142 required that every child be educated in the "least restrictive environment" possible, regardless of the child's handicap. Public Law 94-142, in combination with Section 504, made considerations for handicapped students a prerequisite to any school construction project.

Another issue confronted in the modern era was the lack of stability in the economy. Kowalski (1983) indicated that inflation and interest rates were two key components that greatly affected the comprehensive facility plans of many school districts. For example, school districts planning for facility improvements in the late 1960s and into the 1970s were working with an inflation rate of 6.3 percent; whereas, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' (as cited in Kowalski, 1983) study showed that beginning in

1979 and into 1980, inflation began to grow at a rate of 12 percent per year. The rate of inflation and increasing interest rates had a dramatic affect on the cost of building or remodeling facilities (Kowalski, 1983).

Another aforementioned factor was the "taxpayer revolt." This revolt by citizens meant that facility projects would undergo a level of scrutiny virtually nonexistent prior to The Modern Era. The revolt against higher taxes that emerged during this time period expressed citizens' displeasure with the high cost of government. The trend that most affected school districts was the extreme difficulty in passing tax increases to support school budgets (Baratz and Moskowitz, 1978). Regardless of how critical the financial need of a school district was, restrictions from the public's lack of support made large expenditures, such as school facilities, difficult to fund (Kowalski, 1983). Additional factors such as energy efficiency, instructional programs, social awareness issues, political awareness, and educational facility usage joined the tax issue to make comprehensive facility planning a challenging facet for those involved in education:

> The products of legislation, economic conditions, population trends, political trends, and educational programming have forced many practices of the 1960s and 1970s into obsolescence. The direct and subtle implications of these issues permeate every phase of the facility planner's task (p. 24).

The Future

Most schools being built today will be in service well into the 21st century. If America's 21st century schools must provide 21st century instruction, any individual or group involved in facility planning would be wise to consider how a building may function in the future (Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1960). Although this study

sought to explore dimensions of the planning process as related to designing and constructing school buildings for the future, a great deal of understanding can be applied to the future by first looking back at history. Pulliam and Van Patten (2003) pointed out that history might seem a strange way to approach the future, but through research of past events people can gain an understanding by studying "how human beings expected things to go, how things actually did go, and what consequences followed" (pg. 340). The book *Planning America's School Buildings* produced by the American Association of School Administrators stated in 1960 what could be applicable for 2008:

> With a look toward the future, the school building reflects the ambitions, the hopes, the aspirations, and the dreams of a people that is striving to move forward and upward to a way of life that is better, fuller, richer, and more rewarding than that which it now knows (p. 1).

As the design and construction of future school buildings progresses, educational leaders will be responsible, "To look ahead—to anticipate, to peer around the corner, to predict. Because long-range effects follow what leaders do or what they may fail to do" (American Association of School Administrators, 1960, p.6).

Since the late 20th century and into 21st century, research in the area of planning and designing schools has been evolving to provide a new mindset of what a school building should look like and how it should affect the process of learning. The American Architectural Foundation and KnowledgeWorks Foundation (2005) report, "National Summit on School Design," and Building Futures (2004) study, "21st Century Schools: Learning Environments of the Future," have offered insight into the intricate issues that

shape how designing the school building of the 21st century will affect teaching and learning.

The study "21st Century Schools: Learning Environments of the Future" examined the changes occurring in education and the impact that these changes may have on the design of new school buildings. "Considerable change can be foreseen in future models of education and there is an increasing risk that school buildings will stand in the way of evolving models of delivery" (Building Futures, 2004, p.6). For educational planners, the chance that newly constructed school buildings could actually be an obstacle to students' learning and teachers' teaching should not be accepted. To prevent that chance from occurring, school planners need to take in account not only the critical role of the political and social dimensions but also the common themes that have been established through research.

The study, "21st Century Schools: Learning Environments of the Future," recommended that school buildings of the future should be:

1. Flexible at different scales and timescales, allowing for variation in use, occupancy and layout.

2. Inspiring to those working, learning and visiting, and embodying organizational aims.

3. Supportive of effective teaching and learning, accommodating a wide range of experiences and activities.

4. Involving the users and the wider community, and linking with other learning spaces (Building Futures, 2004, p.6).

Recent research asserts that the people involved in designing and constructing school facilities for the future will be required to think differently about school construction and will be confronted with forming new values and principles when deciding what elements are most important in school design (American Architectural Foundation and KnowledgeWorks Foundation, 2005; Pulliam and Van Patten, 2003; and Tanner and Lackney, 2006). The "Report from the National Summit on School Design" (2005) stated that school planners would need to create new paradigms regarding learning environments. The "Report from the National Summit on School Design" stated:

A one-size-fits-all approach to school design is going to have to give way to a new paradigm of smaller and more diverse learning environments that give parents and students more choices and options about what, where, and how they learn (p. 4).

The issue of more choices and options for learning environments is brought about by the trend that more stakeholders want to be involved in how new school facilities are being planned, designed, and constructed (American Architectural Foundation and the KnowledgeWorks Foundation, 2005, p. 4). Bingler, Quinn, and Sullivan's (2003) "Schools as Centers of Community: A Citizen's Guide for Planning and Design" stated, "Schools should be planned by the many people who will use them—including educators, parents, students, senior citizens, and members of civic and business organizations" (p.9). The involvement of so many people reinforced the social nature of the planning process (Bingler, Quinn, and Sullivan, 2003). Cervero and Wilson (1994) stated:

Planning is essentially a social activity in which people negotiate personal and organizational interests. An educational program is never constructed by a single

planner acting outside an institutional and social context. Rather, programs are constructed by people with multiple interests working in specific institutional contexts that profoundly affect their content and form (p. 4).

Richard Riley (2005), former United States Secretary of Education, echoed the previous authors' thoughts while speaking at the National Summit on School Design. Riley stated:

> Twenty-first century schools ought to be designed as community learning centers—facilities that are open year-round and for people of all ages. Adopting this concept requires a new working relationship between the school and the community that blurs boundaries that have been rigid in the past. School officials need to be talking to mayors, city planners, realtors, and developers in addition to all the community-based groups that provide the extra services that so many of our children need (pp. 35-36)

As complex as the challenge may be to provide effective learning educational facilities, the dilemma does have a silver lining. The immediate need to restore and construct new school facilities offers a great opportunity to evaluate existing research about what represents the best possible learning environment (Schneider, 2002) and then engage stakeholders in a social and political process that results in a school that will respond to the needs of students, teachers, and the entire community (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

Educational Facilities Laboratories (1960), in its book *The Cost of a Schoolhouse*, summarized the importance of a planning process that results in schools that provide

children with the opportunity to improve themselves and their community. The authors concluded:

> The schoolhouse is not, of course, as important as the school teacher. But the schoolhouse, because it stands there to be seen, speaks of the intentions of the community toward the children. Any school you build either helps to anchor the people to the community or, instead, hastens their departure. The schoolhouse more than any other structure in town declares the public intention to press on, to rest awhile, or to go back. Winton Churchill said it best: "We shape our buildings; thereafter they shape us" (pg. 139).

The Planning Process and the Open Systems Approach

The planning process and open systems section of the literature review examined the idea that many organizations are much like organisms. School districts provide a prime example. Like organisms, school districts are largely dependent upon their environment for their successful continuation. The literature in this section should allow the reader to reexamine the ways in which a school district is open to the environment and the resulting need of the district to attain the proper relation with that environment to maintain a healthy existence. An understanding of the open systems approach should allow stakeholders involved in the process of change to organize in a way that satisfies the requirements of the environment (Morgan, 1997). For this study, a school district is regarded as a social system operating in a political and social environment. The environment consists of an elaborate network of relationships and interactions of many people who engage in planning for the purpose of change (Olmstead, 2002).

As cited in Kowalski (1983), Roe and Drake commented about the benefits of using a conceptual system that allows for organizations to be broken down into its elements:

> Systems analysis is a process of studying something by categorizing it as a system. Therefore, systems analysis becomes a way of viewing an existing whole by breaking it down into its elements. The purpose of such dissection is to study the interactions and relationships of the parts to the whole and to each other in various combinations (p. 28).

The open-systems approach (Morgan, 1997; von Bertalanffy, 1975; Katz and Kahn, 1978; Senge, 1990) provides a theoretical framework from which to view the school planning process. Morgan (1997), summarizing the work of Ludwig von Bertalanffy, stated, "the systems approach builds on the principle that organizations, like organisms, are 'open' to their environment and must achieve an appropriate relation with that environment if they are to survive" (p. 39).

Educational leaders would be wise to use the open systems approach during the planning process to allow stakeholders to develop an understanding of the importance of environment. For example, an organism such as a cell must exist in a continuous exchange with its environment. The exchange is essential for supporting the life and form of the cell. The idea that the cell is open to the environment and that an emphasis is placed on key relationships between the environment and the cell can be developed into a metaphor for stakeholders to use in the planning process. The metaphor frames the stakeholders' views of a school district as an organization that is open to its environment and in a constant state of "interaction and mutual dependence" (Morgan, 1997, p. 40).

At a practical understanding, the open systems approach focuses on several important ideas. The first idea is that emphasis must be placed on the environment in which the organization is situated. Surprisingly, classical management theorists gave little attention to the issue of environment. Theorists treated organizations as "closed" mechanical systems and centered their attention on internal design (Morgan, 1997). The open systems view changed that thought process, emphasizing that the environment should always be a part of an organization's planning process. A second idea of the open systems approach characterizes organizations as consisting of interrelated subsystems. Similar to how molecules, cells, and organs can be viewed as subsystems of a living organism--students, parents, teachers, administrators, patrons, architects, and contractors can be viewed as subsystems of a planning process. A third important idea is that the open-systems approach focuses on the effort "to establish congruencies or 'alignments' between different systems and to identify and eliminate potential dysfunctions" (Morgan, 1997, p. 42).

Katz and Kahn (1978) stated that understanding organizations as open systems has been recognized in organizational theory for several years. Kowalski (1983) reported that within the systems analysis approach, specific pieces of data should be available. The following pieces are typically included: (a) an accurate depiction of the "whole"; (b) identification of all constituent elements; (c) environmental restrictions; (d) internal restrictions; (e) environmental needs; (f) internal needs; (g) objectives; (h) values; and (i) identified outcomes. These pieces of data allow a leader to plan, study, evaluate, and adjust processes through a systems analysis approach (Kowalski, 1983).

Coghlan and Brannick (2005) also provided an excellent mental framework of open systems thinking by comparing an organization to the human body. These authors stated that organizations as a whole are made up of interrelated and interdependent parts, just as the human body as a whole is made up of bones, muscles, tissues and organs performing interdependent and interrelated functions (p. 118). Providing further explanation of systems thinking and practice, Coghlan and Bannick, 2005 wrote:

> While we might dissect the body and make an analysis of any particular part, the body's functioning depends on a holistic view of how all the parts work together. Similarly, organizations may be viewed as systems, in which planning, control, structural, technological and behavioural systems are interdependent and inter-related (p. 118).

A holistic view can be applied to the educational facilities planning process, allowing school planners to rid themselves of bureaucratic thinking and to organize in a way that meets the requirements of the environment. These insights are also referred to as "contingency theory," where an organization has the ability to adapt to the environment to regulate the health of the organization. Morgan (1997) discussed several main ideas included in the contingency approach. He stated that organizations are open systems that should strive to "satisfy and balance internal needs and to adapt to environmental circumstances" (p. 44). Different approaches may be needed to meet an organization's needs or adapt to the environment. The appropriate approach will depend on the organization's environment.

A school district's ability to understand and adapt to its unique environment has direct application to the level of success or failure the district may experience as a result

of the planning process. A school district involved in any planning process must understand that the educational environment that exists in the 21ˢᵗ century is changing at an incredible rate. One example of incredible and constant change in the educational environment is technology. Many school districts are still at the beginning stages of incorporating technology into the instructional process. The future of education will be infused with new technological advances that will impact instruction and learning. Emerging technology that involves computers, telecommunications, and virtual reality will bring about not only new methods of learning but also the need for new methods of designing and planning schools (Lackney, 2001).

In order for educational leaders to successfully address the myriad of environmental changes, a fresh alternative to the mechanical thinking so prevalent in modern organizations must be applied. Morgan (1997) stated that "mechanistically structured organizations have great difficulty adapting to changing circumstances because they are designed to achieve predetermined goals; they are not designed for innovation" (p. 28). Cervero and Wilson (1994) recommended that educational leaders should move away from the classical view of Weber (1947) and Tyler (1949) that "assumes that programs emerge from application of a set of prescribed planning steps" (p. 27).

Educational leaders should strive to gain an understanding of how the context or environment affects planning. Many authors (Umble, Cervero, & Langone, 2001; Yang and Cervero, 2001; and Hansman, 2004) have stated that planners always work within a context that is demanding. Choosing to disregard the demands of the context is like a person walking across a busy intersection with his eyes closed. Without taking into account the complete surroundings and conditions of the intersection, the person will

quite possibly be run over by a vehicle (Forester, 1989). Just as a person crossing the busy intersection must observe every element that exists at the intersection, educational leaders must recognize the social and political elements that exist within the planning process (Cervero and Wilson, 1994). As school districts continue to approach issues related to school district growth, educational leaders who have an understanding of the open systems approach will be able to help their respective organizations maintain healthy relationships with the different elements that exist in the rapidly changing environment (Scheerens, 2000).

Planning as a Social and Political Process

This section of the literature defined essential aspects of the social and political context in an attempt to establish a framework for understanding and analyzing facilities planning. The investigation explored the effect a social and political environment had on an educational leader's ability to guide stakeholders into exploring innovative and highly effective educational practices. Most contemporary facilities planning processes have transpired within a social context involving stakeholders who negotiate issues, exchange ideas, share data, and solve problems (Wilcox, 2006). The stakeholders may include students, teachers, staff, administrators, planners, and community members who participate in "complex organizations that have sets of historical traditions, relationships of power, and human needs and interests" (Cervero and Wilson, 1994, p. 4).

Negotiation of Interests

A greater awareness and understanding of the political and social context of educational facilities planning should enhance an educational leader's ability to negotiate the interests of stakeholders involved in the planning process. In turn, the successful

negotiation of common and conflicting interests may lead to a more effective process of planning educational facilities that support a high level of teaching and learning. If educational leaders neglect the process of negotiating the interests of those represented at the planning table, facilities will continue to be built to meet housing rather than instructional needs (Castaldi, 1982).

A primary objective and responsibility of the planning process is to negotiate the interests of people and organizations involved in the planning process (Cervero and Wilson, 1994). The people and organizations will have various levels of power and resources, common and conflicting interests, and social and political relationships. All planning processes will be affected by these interactions and interests. As a result, the construction of a new school is ultimately the result of negotiating the interests of stakeholders involved in planning (Umble, Cervero, and Langone, 2001). Cervero and Wilson (1994) stated that "negotiation is the central form of action that planners take in constructing programs" (p. 29). Negotiation theory takes into account the social and political dimensions of planning and may provide an explanation for stakeholders' actions during planning. The premise of negotiation theory is that planning "is a social activity, and the planner's action is contingent upon the social and organizational contexts in which the program is shaped" (Yang and Cervero, 2001, p. 289).

Elgstrom and Riis (1992) provided a useful explanation of two forms of negotiation, meta-negotiation and substantive, which may take place during the planning process. The first form, meta-negotiation, is an attempt to alter the frame factors that shape an educational facilities planning process. The authors defined frame factors as "factors that constrain the intellectual space and the space for action within a process,

which the actors at each point of time during the process cannot influence or perceive that they cannot influence in the short run" (p. 104). Frame factors can be categorized as conceptual and material. Conceptual frame factors place limitations on the intellectual space and the ideas that have formed regarding the planning process. Material frame factors constrain the freedom to act and include constraints on finances, supplies, space, time, and people (Umble, Cervero, and Langone, 2001). The second form is substantive negotiation. Elgstrom and Riis (1992) explained that substantive negotiation pertains to content, audience, and the format of a process. The authors stated that stakeholders will have limited power in shaping these details of the planning process because substantive negotiations usually occur within frame factors that have been previously established by an organization. This limited power to shape the planning process means that stakeholders who may want to change the format of planning educational facilities "must either already have power with respect to the program or organization or find a way to obtain it, that is, engage in meta-negotiations about power relationships" (Umble, Cervero, and Langone, 2001, p. 131).

Recent literature related to planning confirms educational leaders must be aware of power, politics, social interaction, and negotiation as they guide stakeholders into designing educational facilities. The process of planning educational facilities has extensively been viewed as a technical process while politics has been viewed as noise that gets in the way of planning. Experts involved in researching the planning process have challenged the aforementioned point of view and have encouraged educational leaders involved in planning to pay attention to organizational politics (Cervero and Wilson, 1994).

Essential Aspects of the Social Context

Cervero and Wilson (2006) framed planning as "a social activity of negotiating interests in relationships of power" (p. 5). The importance of understanding how social structures and political systems can impact the planning process at any time is crucial to the success of the planning and design of an educational facility. Educational leaders in school districts should not only become skilled in the technical application of the planning process, but they must also focus on understanding the characteristics of the social context that surrounds the planning process. Leaders in school districts who believe they can circumvent the social dimension of facility planning by applying a rational or linear approach are mistaken. The planning process is seldom a rational process or one that follows a linear approach. Planning an educational facility is a social activity involving architects, boards of education, administrators, teachers, staff, students, and community members. As a social activity, the educational leaders should include not only technical knowledge, but also the ability to guide constructive interaction among stakeholders with diverse and occasionally conflicting interests (Castaldi, 1982). Discussing the involvement of stakeholders in the planning process, Sommers (1983) stated:

> Social design is working with people rather than for them; involving people in planning and management of the spaces around them; educating them to use the environment wisely and creatively to achieve a harmonious balance between the social, physical and natural environment…social designers cannot achieve these objectives working by themselves. The goals can be realized only within the

structures of larger organizations, which include the people for whom a given project is planned (p. 7).

Educational leaders should strive to include all the user groups for whom the school is planned in making important educational decisions (Yukl, 2002). Including these participants in facilities planning should not present a problem according to the Report from the National Summit on School Design:

> A new element in school design is the reality that there are many more active participants who want a voice in how new school facilities are designed. Community-based groups, foundations, universities, mayors, and city agencies are just a few of the groups that have come to the table in the past decade to promote their ideas (American Architectural Foundation and KnowledgeWorks Foundation, 2005).

Cervero and Wilson (2006) asked participants to view planning issues through the lens of a planning table. The authors utilized a planning table as a powerful metaphor to place attention on what the priority should be in educational planning, "namely, the fact that people make judgments with others in social contexts about specific program features" (p. 6). The planning table to which the authors refer could be either a physical one where stakeholders meet to discuss ideas or a metaphorical one where people communicate in various settings. Whether stakeholders utilize the physical or metaphorical table, or a combination of both, the results of the social interaction at the table should be "the seamless integration of the technical demands and political dimensions of planning educational programs" (Cervero and Wilson, 2006, p. 241).

The integration of the technical demands and the political and social dimensions would allow stakeholders to more responsibly represent the interest of every person who may be become a user of the facility. The traditional procedures of program planning, which began appearing in the 1920s, encouraged the use of rational problem solving. Cervero and Wilson (2006) spoke against applying a rational approach in every planning situation. The authors research in "Working the Planning Table: Negotiating Democratically for Adult, Continuing, and Workplace Education" pointed out:

> It is this insistence on rationalism, in any and all situations and at any and all costs, to conduct practical human action in social and organizational settings that creates and sustains the theory-practice gap. Rationalism itself is an ideal prescription that is unable to enable action in the structural flows of power (p. 244).

Essential Aspects of the Political Context

Political context refers to the political aspects of the environment that are necessary to result in action. The political context of facilities planning reflects the environment in which a school is created and reveals the purpose and mission of stakeholders involved in the planning. The political framework of planning may include features such as the allocation of power, the number of organizations involved and their interests, and the informal and formal rules that stakeholders use during their interactions. According to Nash, Hudson, and Luttrell (2006), educational leaders are "seeking to influence policy, political context matters because it determines the feasibility, appropriateness and effectiveness of their actions" (p 1).

Educational leaders who understand the nature of the political context will be able to respond appropriately and enhance a school district's chances of implementing a successful planning process. School districts that failed to implement a successful planning process may have been unsuccessful in large part because they overlooked, tried to avoid, or tried to contradict the political nature of the issues that affected the organization (Bryson, 1995). When issues are carefully framed, ensuing choices, decisions, and proceedings are more likely to be politically supportable and technically effective. School districts discussing the need for planning new facilities would be wise to learn from school districts that to one extent or another overlooked, avoided, or contradicted the political environment associated with their educational facilities planning process. Of course, these same school districts would be wise to learn from and glean information from school districts that successfully framed issues and navigated the educational facilities planning process.

The educational leaders in school districts entering the educational facilities planning process must not become dismayed by the social and political nature of the process. School districts that become dismayed with the chaotic nature of planning may feel inclined to turn control over to "politically neutral and professionally competent experts" (Ortiz, 1994, p. 18). Unfortunately, when school districts look to remove the politics and rely on experts, the planning process becomes disjointed, and groups become resistant to collaborating with each other. Michael Fullan (1992) asserted that educational leaders cannot make the choice to shrink from planning just because it may be chaotic. He wrote:

Many of us who have pursued the theory and practice of planned change over the past 25 years have now decided to take a different track. This change in strategy is based on the conclusion that educational reform not only does not work as the theories say it should, but more fundamentally that it can never work that way. Educational reform is complex, non-linear, frequently arbitrary, and always highly political. It is rife with unpredictable shifts and fragmented initiatives. I am afraid that this is the nature of the beast in complex socio-political societies (p. 2).

A school district is without doubt a complex socio-political organization. Successful leadership in such a setting calls for an educational leader who when presented with the challenges of facilities planning can "find simplicity and order amid organizational confusion and chaos" (Bolman and Deal, 1997, p. xii). In an effort to assist educational leaders to find simplicity and order amid chaos, Bolman and Deal presented the idea of reframing. Reframing allows leaders to view a situation from a variety of perspectives. The authors stated that "managers often misunderstand the situation they're in. They have not learned how to reframe, using multiple lenses to get a better reading of what they're up against and what they might do about it" (p. xiv).

The political frame is a useful lens from which to view a school district, especially noting the political reality that surrounds such a district. Key issues of the political frame are power, coalitions, conflict, bargaining and negotiation, and the allocation of scarce resources. "The political frame views organizations as alive and screaming political arenas that host a complex web of individual and groups interests" (Bolman and Deal, 1997, p. 163). Bolman and Deal summarized this perspective with five propositions:

1. Organizations are coalitions of individuals and interest groups.

2. Enduring differences between and among these individual and interest groups in values, beliefs, information, interests and perceptions of reality exist.

3. Most important decisions involve allocation of scarce resources.

4. Enduring differences and scarce resources give conflict a central role in the organizational dynamics and make power the most important resource.

5. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiations and jockeying for position among different stakeholders (p. 163).

As mentioned above, a prominent aspect of the political frame is power. Power is the ability to make things happen. Pfeffer (1992) defined power as "the potential ability to influence behavior, to change the course of events, to overcome resistance, and to get people to do things they would not otherwise do" (p. 30). From the view of the political frame, power is not a dimension that can be eliminated from organizations, nor should that be the goal. Although power is often viewed in negative terms, educational leaders who use power in a constructive manner will lead a planning process that is both efficient and just (Bolman and Deal, 1997).

Summary

The discussion in the preceding literature review focused on the social and political nature of the planning process and the fact that the planning process has always taken place in organizations that are open to their social and political influences. The development of educational facilities has spanned more than two thousand years, and throughout that time the social and political state of each society has influenced the planning process.

The historical perspective offered insight into the journey the educational facilities planning process has taken through time as societal conditions have changed and developed. The modern day process of planning 21st century educational facilities has been enhanced significantly by advancements in technical procedures, but what may be a more significant advancement of the planning process will be an increase in the quality and breadth of research related to the successful engagement of stakeholders in the social and political environment that exists during planning.

Once architects, boards of education, administrators, teachers, staff, students, and community members are engaged in the planning process on a consistent basis, Cervero and Wilson (2006) pointed out the next important step. According to these authors, that step is connecting "the practical decisions and technical strategies about needs, objectives, …design, administration, and evaluation …to the real-world contexts in which power, interests, ethical commitments, and negotiation strategies are a part of everyday life" (p.vii). No exact blueprint exists for making this connection happen, but educational leaders who take the time to make stakeholders aware of the social, political, and environmental dimensions that influence the planning process will start the facilities planning process with a solid foundation (Cervero & Wilson, 2006).

Chapter Three

Research Design and Methods

Educational facilities planning process is the term used in this study to explain the course of action whereby the stakeholders of a school district would participate in a social and political process designed to encourage the planning and design of a school based on current research and best practices (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). The goal of this study was to examine one school district's educational facilities planning process within the real-life context in which the process transpired. The goal was accomplished by including a twenty-four month time frame during which the school district's fourth high school was planned and designed, constructed, and opened.

This chapter outlined the reason for using the case study methodology. The chapter provided an explanation of the case study, participant selection, setting, and the sources of data. Data collection methods and data analysis were discussed. A discussion of researcher bias and the trustworthiness of the data were included to assure consistency and dependability.

Research Design

The object of a case study is to provide a detailed examination of a person or several persons, a group, an institution, an innovation, an event, or a process. A case study is used to investigate real life experiences and circumstances, allowing a researcher to study both the phenomenon and the context in which it takes place. According to Yin (1994), case studies are the "preferred strategy when 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context" (p.1). The real-life context in

this case study is one school district that completed the planning process and construction of a high school. The focus on one school district allowed the researcher to perform an in-depth study of the school district and its key stakeholders in the natural setting, using a variety of data sources to collect data. Case study research has a distinct strength in its ability to handle a variety of evidence, such as, artifacts, documents, interviews, and observations (Yin, 1994). This case study was bound by the events that transpired within one school district and the time frame in which the events took place.

Case studies are initiated when a desire exists to understand complex issues. A case study's emphasis is on a detailed contextual examination of a limited number of events and their relationships. Case study research can offer insight for people who may encounter a comparable issue and enable them to comprehend the issue more thoroughly by relating both theory and context (Fish, 1998; Golby, 1993; Merriam, 1998). Yin (1994) provided the technical definition of a case study as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p. 13). The researcher selected a case study approach to investigate one school district's educational facilities planning process within the district's real-life context, assuming that the context would be highly significant to the phenomenon of the study. This case study was carried out in a natural setting with participants providing the details.

The research design of this study was explanatory. An explanatory case study research method was an appropriate method because it allowed a detailed examination of the planning process of the school district in which the planning transpired. Also, the case study was chosen because the research questions were asked about a current phenomenon

over which the researcher had no control. Yin (1994) stated that "how," "why" and "what" questions, such as the questions posed in this study, are "more explanatory and likely to lead to the use of case studies" (p. 6). For this study, the researcher selected a case study to explain how an educational leader in one school district made sense of the social and political dimensions of change and how this leader approached issues related to planning an educational facility. The case study methodology also allowed the researcher to focus on questions that would help to explain the case's social and political dimensions (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

Setting

As the focus of this study was to examine the planning process of an educational facility, the selection of the school district was a significant decision. According to Stake (1995) the most important criterion when selecting a case is to be able to learn as much as possible through the case. The school district was carefully selected to provide the appropriate setting and context for the study. The setting of the study was in a suburban school district in a Midwestern city with an enrollment of well over 18,000 students. According to the state Department of Education (2007), the school district's enrollment has grown from 17,679 students in 2003 to 18,776 students in 2007. In four years the student enrollment is projected to be over 20,000 students.

The school district is located in two communities that have seen tremendous population growth in recent years. The population of West Side City increased from a 1980 count of 8,677 people to a 1990 count of 53,271 people to a 2000 level of 85,091 people, including 43,218 (50.8%) females and 41,873 (49.2%) males. Thirty-five percent (29,781) of the community's population was between the ages of 25 and 44 years, and

31.5% (26,803) of the community's population was 17 years old and under. Of the city's

23,226 households, 46% of those households had children less than 18 years of age. The

population was 95.4% white, 2.1% black, 1.5% Hispanic, .8% Asian, and .2% American

Indian and Alaska Native (Department of Education, 2007). The household income of the

community's population included 30.2% earning between $50,000 to $74,999, 17.2%

earning between $35,000 to $49,999, 17.2% earning between $75,000 to $99,999, and

10.1% earning between $100,000 to $149,999 (Data Information, 2007).

The population of East Side City increased from a 1980 count of 15,700 people to

a 1990 count of 40,660 people to a 2006 level of 54,839 people. Thirty-four percent

(18,371) of the community's population was between the ages of 25 and 44 years, and

30.0% (16,451) of the community's population was 18 years old and under. Of the city's

18,435 households, 42.3% of those households had children less than 18 years of age.

The population was 94.25% white, 2.8% black, 1.49% Hispanic, 1.23% Asian, and .2%

Native American. The household income of the community's population was $57,898

(Data Information, 2009).

The school district is located in the fastest growing county in a Midwestern state

and in the top 100 fastest growing counties in the United States. The county covers more

than 561 square miles, making it one of the largest counties in this Midwestern state. The

region offers opportunities for business development and relocation because of

widespread access to labor markets, the interstate highway system, close proximity to an

international airport, and navigable waterways. The county added 54,826 new residents

between 2000 and 2006. The county's residents have a median household income of

$71,470, the highest in this Midwestern state. It is fourth in the nation for owner-occupied housing units (Data Information, 2007).

The school district has 15 elementary schools, four middle schools, and five high schools. The school district was chosen for this study because the district had just completed the construction of a high school, was in the design phase of an additional elementary school, has completed numerous building projects in the last ten years, was in close proximity to the researcher, and was staffed by administration and faculty who were open to participating in the study. In order for the reader to form a clear picture of the setting involved in this study, a detailed profile of the school district is included in chapter four.

Participant Selection

The sampling of participants was undertaken in a purposeful manner. The strength of purposeful sampling is based on selecting information-rich cases for in-depth analysis related to the phenomenon being studied (Barton et al., 1997). The participants of this study were chosen primarily from the stakeholders who participated in the planning process. The stakeholders included central office administrators, building administrators, teachers, staff, parents, an architect, a construction manager, and community members. Additionally, a participant not directly involved in the school district's planning process was chosen to participate in the study as a result of her expertise in the field of educational facilities planning.

The participants from the school district's central office personnel included the superintendent, deputy superintendent, assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction, and the assistant superintendent of facilities and construction. The

superintendent has been employed by the school district for 26 years. The deputy

superintendent has been employed by the school district for 12 years. The assistant

superintendent of curriculum and instruction has been employed by the school district for

13 years. The assistant superintendent of facilities and construction has been employed

by the school district for eight years. Due to the long tenure of the central office

administration personnel listed above, each administrator has been witness to the school

district's years of significant growth and the process of planning for educational facilities.

The principal from the newly completed high school was interviewed. The

principal has been employed in the school district for 12 years and was previously an

assistant principal at the school district's third high school opened in 1998. Other

interviewed participants included parents and community members who were involved in

the planning process. Also, the construction manager who was onsite throughout the

construction process and the architect involved in the design process for the high school

were participants in the interview process.

Data Collection Methods

Data consist of the information the researcher actively documents, such as

participant observations and interview transcripts (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). Data could

also include material such as newsletters, web sites, memos, emails, and handbooks. The

sources of data for this study included interview transcripts, observation fieldnotes, and

participant interactions. Minutes and agendas from meetings, official documents,

manuals, and personal writings were collected in an attempt to ensure the insightfulness

of the case. The interviews presented information about the planning process in

relationship to the political and social dimensions that existed in the real-life context of the setting.

Observations

The intention of this study and the research questions presented dictated that interviews were the primary data collection tool. Nonetheless, the researcher acquired fieldnotes from observations made of the physical condition of the new high school, board meetings, and planning committee meetings. Observations were also made of social interactions that took place at the high school and the overall atmosphere of the school. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) discussed the fact that detailed fieldnotes are essential to participant observation. These authors stated that the collection of detailed, accurate, and complete fieldnotes is crucial to the successful outcome of the study. Fieldnotes may allow for the meaning and context of an interview to be summarized more completely. For example, a researcher can write field notes that supply views, impressions, and comments said before and after the interview.

The content of a researcher's fieldnotes are made up of two types of materials. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) categorized the two types of materials as descriptive and reflective. The authors explained descriptive fieldnotes as "…the researcher's best efforts to objectively record the details of what has occurred in the field" (p. 121). The researcher was aware that all description of what took place in the field represented choices and judgments and attempted to be as accurate and descriptive as possible. The descriptive features of the fieldnotes included descriptions of the subjects, reconstruction of dialogue, description of physical settings, explanations of particular events, depiction of activities, and the researcher's behavior. Reflective fieldnotes were described as

"sentences and paragraphs that reflect a more personal account of the course of the inquiry. The emphasis is on speculation, feelings, problems, ideas, hunches, impressions, and prejudices" (p. 123). The researcher's goal was to remain aware of his relationship to the setting and the development of the design and analysis and to keep a precise record of methods, procedures, and developing analysis (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998).

Interviews

For the qualitative researcher, an interview is a purposeful conversation that takes place between two or more people. The objective of an interview is to collect descriptive data in the subject's own words so that the researcher can come to understand a part of a phenomenon. The researcher guides the interview in order to acquire information (Morgan, 1988). Interviews may be the main approach for data collection, or they could be utilized with participation observation or document analysis.

Interviews may vary in how they are structured. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) stated that interviews provide the researcher with the opportunity to pursue a variety of subject matter and provide the subject the ability to shape the content of the interview. Many case studies employ interviews that are considered open-ended. In open-ended interviews, the subject is asked for facts of the matter as well as encouraged to discuss the area of interest and to offer opinions about events (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Yin, 1994). Yin stated that researchers "may even ask the respondent to propose his or her own insights into certain occurrences and may use such propositions as the basis for further inquiry" (p. 84). A second type of interview is the focused or semi-structured interview. This style of interview may still maintain an open-ended and conversational tone, but the researcher is more likely to make use of a set of questions produced from case study procedures.

The focus of the interview may be to support certain facts that have been established (Yin, 1994). Semi-structured interviews may provide comparable data across subjects and may provide the researcher the ability to focus on specific topics that emerge during exploratory interviews (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998).

A combination of the different formats of interviews was employed based on the research goal of the study. The research questions posed in this study were investigated by asking subjects to respond to open-ended and semi-structured questions about the school district's educational facilities planning process, the roles and purpose of stakeholders involved in the planning process, and the outcome that resulted from the planning process. Follow-up questions were used to focus on specific topics that surfaced during the preliminary interviews. The ability of the researcher to develop quality relationships with the interviewees was a vital component to this study.

The researcher conducted approximately 20 hours of open-ended and semi-structured interviews over a period of three months. The twelve participants mentioned above participated in face-to-face interviews. Each participant was asked to answer from twelve to 26 open-ended questions (Appendix A-D). Each interview lasted from 45 to 90 minutes and was audio taped. These tapes were transcribed immediately after the interviews were completed. In addition to the interviews, newspaper articles, the school district's website, and a complete collection of the steering committee's meeting notes was provided to the researcher. The in-depth interviews formed the main source of data collection for the study. Pseudonyms were used for the names of the participants, schools, and school district.

Documents

Documents are collected to provide a formal framework for what may be an informal reality (Gillham, 2000). Documents may take the form of letters, memoranda, agendas, announcements, minutes of meetings, written reports, formal studies or evaluations, newspaper clippings, and other articles appearing in the mass media. Yin (1994) stated that the most important use of documents is to support and supplement evidence from other sources. Documents were used to help in determining the level of participation of stakeholders who were involved in the planning process. The researcher attempted to link documents to the research questions and the framework of the study in expectation of developing better understanding of the planning process and how it might be improved.

Data Analysis

Data analysis involves organizing what the researcher has seen, heard, and read in order to make sense of what was learned. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) describe data analysis as "the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and other materials that you accumulate to increase your own understanding of them and to enable you to present what you have discovered to others" (p. 157). This style of qualitative data analysis requires some resourcefulness, as the goal is to place the evidence into logical, significant categories and to examine the categories in a holistic approach. The identification of themes that emerge from the evidence is frequently referred to as open coding. Open coding is the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data, which in turn allows the researcher to talk about the data (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

At this point, the researcher begins to reassemble the themes identified to find out how they are linked, a process referred to as axial coding. Hoeplfl (1997) stated that the "purpose of coding is to not only describe but, more importantly, to acquire new understanding of a phenomenon of interest" (p. 9). During the axial coding the researcher attempts to construct a conceptual model and determines if satisfactory data exist to support that explanation. Finally, the researcher enters into a stage sometimes referred to as selective coding. The researcher begins to develop a story line by analyzing core categories, developing interrelationships with subcategories, and refining and further developing categories and emerging theory.

The researcher used interviews, observations, and official documents to increase the accuracy of data analysis and the trustworthiness of the study. All interviews were conducted in person and were tape-recorded and then transcribed. Data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously and repeatedly. The informal analysis of the data collection influenced and guided subsequent data collection methods. As the data collection progressed, the researcher continually analyzed fieldnotes and interview transcripts to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. As the researcher's understanding of the phenomenon increased, the understanding allowed for the development of interview questions that yielded richer data.

Trustworthiness of Data

The fundamental question addressed by the idea of trustworthiness is how a researcher convinces the reader that research findings of the study are significant (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Convincing the reader of the significance of the findings of a study depends largely on the researcher's ability to integrate both data analysis and the

writing process. A number of authors (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Miles and Huberman; & Yin, 1994) discuss and describe the different dimensions to consider when evaluating the quality of a study.

The dimensions Bogdan and Biklen described for evaluating a qualitative study are whether the work is convincing, readable, and makes a contribution. A study that is convincing will give an explanation of the procedures used and a description of the data collected. For example, the study will include how many subjects were involved, how long the interviews or observations lasted, and how effectively data was displayed to prove points. A researcher who produces a readable study establishes control of the writing process and develops a clear logic that readers can follow. The researcher can shift "from substance to theory to personal reflection as the study is written" (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998, p.206). When readers asks the question "so what," they are generally referring to the worth of the study or asking what contribution the study makes to understanding human behavior. Is the contribution the fact that the study described an event that has never been described, offered a stage for voices that had never been heard, or shaped a grounded theory that was new, or disproved someone else's theory (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998).

Trustworthiness was insured in this study by keeping a detailed account of the qualitative process, including details of the specific setting and people who were studied. Consistency was achieved by comparing the collection of documents, observations, and insights gained during interviews (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998).

Researcher Bias

Qualitative researchers have recognized the accusations of the ease with which the researcher's attitudes and prejudices can bias the data. To combat those accusations, Bogdan and Biklen indicated researchers try to "objectively study the subjective states of their subjects. While the idea that researchers can transcend some of their own biases may be difficult to accept at the beginning, the methods researchers use aid this process" (p. 33). Researchers involved in a qualitative study attempt to acknowledge and consider their own personal biases as a way to deal with those biases. A researcher's most important purpose is to increase knowledge, not to pass judgment on a case. The overall worth of a study is its ability to produce theory, description, or understanding (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998).

The researcher has observed the educational facilities planning process within the setting of two school districts. This past experience increases the researcher's belief about the significance and worth of the study.

Chapter Four

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The district certainly has the final responsibility for determining, in my opinion, what this facility is going to be and how it's going to function and what final needs it does address. But I think you always have to listen and take into account the needs and concerns of the people that you ask to participate in the planning process (School District Leader).

I found out about it [*school district's purchase of tract of land to build a high school*] and said wait a minute. There are a lot of concerns over here with the type of housing going in that area and the amount of traffic. It was going to be relatively dense housing compared to the other areas and so people were very much in arms about it. There were several hundred people in that meeting that were concerned with the amount of traffic that was going to be dumped immediately here and how might that affect home values and that kind of thing (Parent).

You go through a process like that as a school district for one of two reasons—to cover your ***, pardon my French. So that at the end of the day you can say, look, we solicited opinions from everybody. Quite frankly in this day and age you need to do that, but I don't think that was the primary reason. I sincerely believe they took the input from this group and it made its way into the facility (Parent).

These words, spoken by members of the steering committee involved in planning and designing a high school for the *Westview School District*, provide a brief look at the social and political context that surrounded the school district's most recent planning process. The task of engaging stakeholders in a meaningful planning process may represent one of the greatest challenges faced by educational leaders. Recognizing, addressing, and resolving the conflicting issues and concerns that stakeholders bring to the planning table can be a challenging process. To meet this challenge, leaders must not only focus attention on planning steps and technical strategies but also the political and social dimensions that are present throughout a planning process (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

This chapter is separated into four sections. Section one includes a profile of the school district and the superintendent. The school district is described and information about the superintendent is included in these descriptions. In the second section, I address the first major theme: engaging stakeholders in a collaborative and meaningful planning process. The third section of this chapter addresses the second major theme: identifying stakeholder perceptions of superintendent leadership. In the fourth and final section, I address the third major theme: negotiating concerns and interests of stakeholders. In each section the three major themes are explained in detail. Within each major theme sub-themes are identified and discussed.

Section One: Profile of the School District and Superintendent

Profile of Westview School District

Westview School District, a suburban school district, educated 18,776 students in grades kindergarten through high school during the 2007-2008 school year. The school district had 15 elementary schools, four middle schools, and five high schools. There were 1,305 certified teachers. This district had an assessed evaluation of $2,145,276,541 and a tax levy rate of $4.3789. The school district's student population was comprised of 90.10% white, 5.80% black, 2.20% Hispanic, 1.80% Asian, and .20% Indian. The school district's poverty rate, as indicated by the percent of students eligible for free or reduced lunch, was 12.90%. The average daily attendance rate was 94.80%. This school district did not have any schools on school improvement status (Department of Education, 2007).

Westview School District was established on July 19, 1949. The school district covers 136 square miles and includes two large communities located within its boundaries. Both communities have experienced rapid population growth during the last

three decades. The population of *West Side City* increased from a 1980 count of 8,677

people to a 1990 count of 53,271 people to a 2000 level of 85,091 people (Census Data

Center, 2007; U.S. Department of Commerce, 1982). The population of *East Side City*

increased from a 1980 count of 15,700 people to a 1990 count of 40,660 people to a 2006

level of 54,839 people (Wikipedia, 2008).

    Westview School District first began offering a comprehensive educational system

for students in grades first through twelfth when the first high school opened in 1960.

Until the first high school opened in 1960, students who wanted to attend a public high

school were transported to neighboring school districts. During the 1960s, the school

district struggled to meet the demands of the rapidly growing student population. From

1969 to 1972, split sessions were implemented and students attended schools from

6:30am to 6:45pm. Half-day kindergarten classes started in 1978 and demographic

studies at that time indicated that student population growth would necessitate the

addition of schools. In 1987, an eighth elementary school and second high school were

opened. During the 1990s, four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high

school were constructed. Since 2000, the school district has constructed three elementary

schools, a middle school, and a fourth comprehensive high school which opened for the

2007-2008 school year. Discussions have been held about the need to begin a planning

process for a sixteenth elementary school to meet anticipated growth in the northern part

of the district's boundary (*Westview School District* Web Page, 2007).

    A review of the progression of *Westview School District's* enrollment figures

from 1992 to 2007 is provided in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, the school district's

student population grew by 7,657 students between the 1992 and 2007 school years. In

eight of the seventeen school years the student population grew by over 600 students and
in four of these eight school years the student population grew by over 900 students.

_____

Table 1

Westview School District's Prior Year's Enrollment Figures

_____

Year	Total Enrollment
1992-1993	11,062
1993-1994	12,596
1994-1995	13,345
1995-1996	14,309
1996-1997	14,498
1997-1998	15,326
1998-1999	15,964
1999-2000	16,031
2000-2001	16,522
2001-2002	17,270
2002-2003	17,653
2003-2004	18,098
2004-2005	18,981
2005-2006	19,862
2006-2007	19,296
2007-2008	19,427

_____

Profile of the Superintendent

A unique contextual aspect of this study is the long tenure of the superintendent. The superintendent has been employed by the school district for 26 years—three years as an assistant superintendent, and the remaining years as superintendent of schools. The school board honored him when they named a school after him to recognize his leadership and service to the school district (_____, 2007). This superintendent has been involved in planning, design, and construction of eight of the fifteen elementary schools, two of the four middle schools, and three of the four high schools (*Westview School District* Web Page, 2007). During the planning for capital improvements, only once have the voters rejected a bond issue, and that bond issue was approved the next time it was presented to the voters of the district (A._____, personal communication, February 28, 2008).

Section Two: Engage Stakeholders in a Collaborative and Meaningful Process

The participants in this study discussed the superintendent's efforts to engage stakeholders in a collaborative and meaningful planning process. The data from these discussions resulted in the emergence of three themes: (1) involving key stakeholders, (2) listening to key stakeholders, and (3) developing a flexible planning process.

 Involving key stakeholders

Key stakeholders were active participants who assumed a significant interest in providing information and making decisions that would affect the planning process in a meaningful way. The data revealed that key stakeholders were invited to the planning table and their involvement resulted in significant contributions to the planning process. The involvement of key stakeholders allowed the superintendent to address social and

political dimensions from the onset of the planning process. Stakeholders expressed that their involvement at the planning table empowered them to share concerns and discuss information in a collaborative environment. Many stakeholders commented that the planning process was enhanced by the superintendent's willingness to invite key stakeholders who represented the critical issues related to this process. As the planning process proceeded, the superintendent enhanced stakeholder involvement by providing multiple settings to increase stakeholder involvement. As a result of the collaborative environment, key stakeholders felt they were involved in a meaningful planning process that addressed the needs and concerns represented by each stakeholder seated at the planning table.

Involving key stakeholders amid social and political dimensions. Results of analysis of the data strongly indicated that district leaders made involving key stakeholders a priority. The superintendent engaged students, parents, teachers, principals, assistant superintendents, board members, and architects in meaningful discussions focused on planning and designing a school that would meet the educational needs of students. Emphasizing the importance of including a representative sample of key stakeholders throughout the planning process, the assistant superintendent stated, "We absolutely make sure we do that. I think you have to have a representative sample of the people who are going to be using the facility and the people who are responsible for overseeing that facility."

Although the concept of involving a representative sample of people to plan a school may seem simple enough, the data revealed that involving stakeholders in planning was actually a complex process consisting of a range of social and political

dimensions. The school district's planning process unfolded amid a range of social and political dimensions, and in most cases these dimensions were interconnected. The analysis of data revealed that the superintendent developed an awareness and understanding of these social and political dimensions that threatened to hinder the type of dialogue supportive of educational change. According to the interview data, stakeholders provided examples of socially and politically complex issues. One principal provided insight into one such politically complex issue and how the superintendent responded. He stated:

> Well, you'd be surprised how upset some people become because of a school built in their neighborhood. You'd think it would make everyone happy, but it doesn't. *Dr. Johnson* was very concerned about including the community in the planning of this building because there were a lot of people in those subdivisions on, I think it's *Oak Street Drive*, whatever that road that runs up there. There were a lot of folks concerned about the lights and the noise and the increased traffic flow. So *Dr. Johnson* included some leaders from that subdivision in the planning process and it did impact the planning. I was very—as a building principal I don't always think district wide. I think about my kids in my building. So it was very informational for me to see how *Dr. Johnson* really worried about the community.

The principal continued to explain that *Dr. Johnson* responded to the fears of people living in the neighborhoods by inviting a resident of the neighborhood to be a member of the steering committee. The resident, an outspoken opponent of the project, agreed to represent the neighborhoods in mitigating their fears and concerns. The principal commented:

There was one gentleman who was on our committee who *Dr. Johnson* invited because he was a great opponent, fighting against the high school. So *Dr. Johnson* said why don't you come and help us design it. I think his fears were lessened. His kids are going there. So he had the option of taking them to *Washington* or sending them there, and he chose to go to *Lincoln* after going through the design process.

The resident expressed major concerns about the effects a comprehensive high school would have on the neighborhoods adjacent to the 44-acre building site. He explained that he became involved when he attended a neighborhood meeting and became concerned about the potential effect this project could have on neighborhoods. The parent stated:

There were probably several hundred people in that meeting that were concerned with the amount of traffic that was going to be dumped immediately here and how might that affect home values and that kind of thing. So I became concerned. You have a couple of hundred people here and a couple of thousand people here when you consider students, faculty; venders making deliveries, all sorts of things— sporting events.

Another extremely complex social and political issue was whether the athletic complex would be located off-site. The neighborhood representative expressed that the desire of the residents living in the neighborhoods bordering the land was to have the school district locate the athletic complex off-site. Students and principals asserted the importance of keeping the athletic complex on-site because it "is important to the

school's culture and is consistent with the other schools." This issue was a point of discussion among the key stakeholders during the Kickoff Programming Meeting.

Creating collaborative environments. Stakeholders noted that the superintendent had a strong desire to create a collaborative environment in which stakeholders could negotiate their personal and organizational interests. The creation of the collaborative environment and the involvement of key stakeholders affected the outcome of the planning process in a meaningful way. Data pointed out that the collaborative nature of the planning process led stakeholders to feel the critical issues were resolved because their input was valued and useful. One parent stated, "I sincerely believe they took the input from this group and it made its way into the facility."

According to the interview data, stakeholders believed the collaborative environment was advanced by the superintendent's ability to develop relationships and encourage dialogue. Commenting on the superintendent's role in creating an environment that encouraged a high level of stakeholder involvement, one parent stated, "He [*Dr. Johnson*] did a fantastic job of getting the input that was available and did nothing to stifle, but more to encourage participation from all the members."

The data clearly emphasized the concept that when stakeholders are provided with meaningful opportunities to discuss their concerns and needs, they feel empowered to work with people to create viable solutions. The data also revealed that truly meaningful opportunities are only created when a leader is willing to address the social and political dimensions that surround the planning process. One key stakeholder explained how the superintendent facilitated the type of planning process that addressed social and political dimensions:

I called *Dr. Johnson* with some concerns that I wanted him to be aware of

regarding this particular site within the neighborhood and surrounding

neighborhoods, which I'm a resident and my wife and family. So I passed these

concerns on to *Dr. Johnson* and he discussed some potential means of mitigating

those particular concerns and then mentioned that they were going to have this

committee meeting and it was appropriate to have residents and parents as part of

it, and he asked me if I'd be interested. So it was really, very much kind of by

accident. I think he saw it as an opportunity to get someone from the surrounding

neighborhoods involved.

The data revealed that the involvement of key stakeholders in a collaborative

process resulted in the critical issues being discussed and negotiated. Although

stakeholders came to the planning table prepared to address and negotiate personal issues,

the data illustrated an interesting phenomenon occurred as each stakeholder listened

carefully to the needs and concerns presented by other stakeholders. As a result of

stakeholders listening intently and respectfully to each other's input, the focus of

conversations gradually shifted away from meeting personal needs to meeting the needs

for the greater good. The lead architect summarized how this process occurred when he

stated:

The committee initially put together for the planning purposes, kind of

represented a different sector of each of those involved. The students, the three

students on the planning committee, or the two, they represented the student body.

The principals represented the administrative voice. The teachers with their—

represented the teacher level. The school board from an administrative overall

responsibility, and the community people represented the voice of the community. I think it was evident that they talked to their peers or their neighbors or their coworkers and they brought either surveys or other little bits of information. You answer all those questions so that you've addressed their concerns and their needs, but you prioritize it and make it fit in the overall equation and they usually understand since the different members of the committee that were representing those groups were also part of the whole. They always had appreciation for what the person sitting next to them had to say. They would listen to them, then the next person would listen to the next person speak. So they would have a willingness to try to balance it all out.

The collaborative environment encouraged conversations to remain framed around meeting students' educational needs. One parent spoke of a willingness to place conversations regarding critical issues within the context of meeting the needs of the students. The parent stated:

The majority of the discussions stayed focused on the utility of the building, not necessarily the color of the walls. You know, as I said in the beginning, our main concern was to build a facility…that would serve the needs of the students. If a kid walks in there from eighth grade to be a freshman and they walk out of there their senior year, they are prepared to move on with whatever part of life they're moving on to. So that was always the main criteria.

Inviting the appropriate stakeholders. The idea of a leader inviting key stakeholders who represented critical issues proved to be a significant component of this school district's planning process. The superintendent recognized early in the planning

process that including the right people would be critical. He explained that by inviting an outspoken proponent to be a member of the planning team, critical issues were addressed at the beginning of the process with input from all sides. The superintendent stated:

> We're coming in and plopping down a 44-acre project down in the middle of their community with football lights and sounds and bands practicing and 300 or 400 kids driving in the morning. There was some animosity, maybe not animosity, that might be too strong, but there was somewhat of a fear that this was going to change their lives. The bands were going to be practicing and they won't be able to hear themselves speak and the kids will be leaving school at 2:30 every day and they were going to be trapped in their subdivisions. So there was some fear. We put our biggest—one of our biggest critics on there. One of the residents who was a critic, we put him on the team.

The action of inviting critical voices to the planning table allowed the superintendent to better understand the nature of the political context and to respond to issues in the appropriate manner. Critical issues were viewed from a variety of stakeholder perspectives, allowing the choices and decisions throughout the process to be more politically supportable and technically effective. The superintendent's ability to understand the political context and view critical issues from a variety of perspectives was a direct result of inviting stakeholders with serious concerns to the planning table. One assistant superintendent explained that some very serious issues and concerns called for a planning process with a different approach:

> When we did *Lincoln High School*, we were going into the center of a developed area and it was a little bit different approach. And so, we had to be good

neighbors and there were some people in that area who were concerned about a

high school being built in their community. And so we had some of those folks

with some very serious concerns on our planning committee.

Providing multiple settings. The data revealed that the opportunity for key

stakeholders to be involved in the planning process was not limited to one setting, but the

planning table was actually moved to a variety of settings during the course of planning.

The concept of moving the planning table to multiple settings resulted in increased

opportunities for stakeholders to be involved in the planning process. The concept of

moving the planning table was put into play in the middle of the planning process when

Steering Committee members hosted a community meeting to share the preliminary

master plan of the high school with parents and stakeholders.

The community meeting provided an opportunity for members of both

communities to ask questions and provide feedback. An assistant superintendent

described the process as "an evening that people are invited to come and [*Dr. Johnson*]

gives an update on what's happening." During the meeting the community members were

divided "into small groups and discuss questions and concerns. And then, at the end of

the evening, we bring those [*groups*] back together and review those [*questions and

concerns*] with the larger group." Numerous stakeholders mentioned the open meeting as

an opportunity to engage in discussions that resulted in a better understanding of the

issues facing the school district and the stakeholders of the community.

Summary of involving key stakeholders. Participants interviewed during this study

felt that the involvement of key stakeholders was an important component in engaging

stakeholders in a collaborative and meaningful planning process. Participants expressed

that the superintendent's willingness to include key stakeholders who represented the critical issues resulted in a planning process that was meaningful. The combination of stakeholder involvement and the superintendent's actions resulted in a planning process that addressed the needs of students and members of the community.

Listening to key stakeholders

Listening to key stakeholders was considered to be a significant characteristic of a collaborative and meaningful planning process. According to the data, the superintendent placed a priority on listening to all of the input supplied by each stakeholder. As the superintendent listened to input, stakeholders felt that he had a genuine interest in addressing their issues and concerns. The data also revealed that district leaders listened to stakeholders in a variety of settings. The willingness of the superintendent to move the planning table to multiple settings enhanced the opportunity for people to voice their concerns and comments. The data on the planning process also indicated that the concept of deliberate listening resulted in dialogue that focused on addressing stakeholders' concerns and issues.

Placing a priority on listening. The data provided evidence that the school district's leadership team placed great importance on listening to all stakeholders who took the opportunity to express their concerns and issues. The assistant superintendents and superintendent explained their views on the importance of listening to each stakeholder's input. One assistant superintendent stated, "I think you listen to everything. I mean, you listen to everybody's input and what they think is important." Another assistant superintendent stated, "Well, I think you certainly have to listen to what their concerns are and what needs they express and identify." He went on to add, "I think you

always have to listen and take into account the needs and concerns of the people that you ask to participate in the planning process." The superintendent reiterated the importance of listening to stakeholder input:

I haven't seen anything that we haven't listened to, frankly, because it has been so out of bounds. But, if you do completely reject it out of hand, you set yourself up for confrontation, which is probably not going to do any good for that school.

An assistant superintendent expressed his belief that placing a priority on listening to stakeholder's concerns and issues was the catalyst for crucial issues being discussed and addressed:

You always have to listen and you always have to know what the issues are. And until you listen and know what the issues and concerns are, you just can't address them. It doesn't mean you always agree, but I think we really try to accommodate issues and concerns. But I think you always need to be open to hearing what people have to say. And then you can demonstrate to people that you hear their concerns and that you are addressing them. And let's give you a couple of examples. Like, when we were doing *Lincoln High School* one of the concerns was about noise at the football stadium. What we did at the football stadium as a result of that was—we put an earthen berm around our football stadium to help contain and control noise. And for lighting we had our electrical engineer do some research and we had some lights that we don't have a lot of bleed over of lighting. We were able to show those to these folks who had those concerns. Here is what we're doing to address your concerns and issues.

Addressing concerns and issues through deliberate listening. The ability to address concerns and issues was successful when the superintendent placed a priority on deliberate listening. Stakeholders on the steering committee felt that the superintendent placed a priority on listening intently to their comments. One parent stated, "I don't think it was a meeting for *Dr. Johnson* to express his personal opinions. I think it was a meeting that was established for him to listen to what the constituency had to say."

Consistent throughout the interviews is the idea that the superintendent listened to every stakeholder, including those stakeholders involved in the planning process who voiced a critical concern or issue. The idea of not only involving critical or adversarial stakeholders in planning but also listening intently to capture their concerns and needs was a concept that provided the superintendent the ability to set the planning table up to be a collaborative and meaningful setting. The superintendent's ability to set the planning table allowed for a meaningful process and more success in addressing the social and political dimensions that existed within the planning process.

The concept of deliberate listening was crucial to critical issues being addressed because it allowed the superintendent to gain an understanding of the context. Equipped with an understanding of the context, he could then respond appropriately to the social and political dimensions surrounding the planning process. A parent expressed his view of how the superintendent's deliberate listening led to critical issues being addressed in a meaningful way:

I actually recall *Dr. Johnson* answering my questions off of the top of his head—a very knowledgeable man. He knew what he was talking about, but I wasn't satisfied. I wanted to see the data. So the following meeting he brought the data to

show the population growth and what the expectations were. I thought that was

good. I felt like he was seriously considering, you know, a concern that I had and

other parents that I mentioned earlier expressed to me, that we don't under build

this thing. I do also recall one of the local neighbors who had property adjacent to

the facility expressed a lot of concern about athletic events and lighting spilling

over into the properties, and noise, and those kind of things. And they did a very

nice job of providing information of how those things were going to be taken into

consideration.

The data revealed that prior to information being provided and discussions taking place

regarding how issues would be addressed, district leaders listened deliberately as

stakeholders expressed their concerns. An assistant superintendent expressed this idea

when she said:

I think most people recognize that we're interested in their thoughts and what they

think is important. Their concerns were heard and if it wasn't done—there was a

good reason why it wasn't done. And, so in my mind, we really listened to

everything that was wanted or needed. We provided it if there was anyway

possible to do it.

Listening in multiple settings. The data showed that during the planning process

district leaders were willing to listen to stakeholders in a variety of settings. The

willingness of the superintendent to move the planning table to multiple settings

enhanced the opportunity for people to voice their concerns and needs and for district

leaders to listen. The superintendent stated:

We do parent coffees and teas, and we give opportunities for people to speak their

peace at those meetings. They can say anything they want. The board is going to

hear. That's a great venue for hearing what issues might be out in the community.

A principal explained the opportunity that district leaders had to listen to people as a

result of moving the planning table away from the boardroom. The principal explained:

I think they did a good job of providing forums for the patrons to meet and

discuss. As I said, there was some local opposition initially to this building. The

district had a series of parent and patron forums that they hosted and broke up

geographically. Those were good opportunities for people to be able to voice their

concerns and questions and make comments. But of course we were talking about

a new high school—that was kind of a hot topic and those forums provided a

good outlet for that.

The willingness of the superintendent to move the planning table to alternative

sites was mentioned repeatedly by stakeholders. One parent explained that the

superintendent and a stakeholder visited a high school so the stakeholder could see a

specific design element that he had questioned. A parent stated, "They offered to take

him to various facilities that had already been constructed that might be of a similar build

out and see how it impacted the neighborhood. So that was good."

Summary of listening to key stakeholders. Stakeholders who participated in this

study emphasized the significance of the superintendent listening to their issues and

concerns in a deliberate manner. Stakeholders expressed that the deliberate listening

resulted in their input being captured, and as a result, issues were addressed in a

meaningful way. As this process repeated itself during the planning process, stakeholders

felt that their input was valued and that they were participating in a truly collaborative process.

The data on the planning process also indicated that because the superintendent listened in a deliberate manner the dialogue among stakeholders remained focused on addressing concerns and issues. A parent spoke of the superintendent's ability to listen to input and encourage dialogue:

> He [*Dr. Johnson*] did a fantastic job of getting the input that was available and did nothing to stifle, but more to encourage participation from all the members. If we as a group thought that the ball field should be flipped with the parking lot or let's move the tennis courts here and put this over here or we think the cafeteria should be in this manner—those things were included. I think they did a nice job.

Developing a flexible planning process

The ability of stakeholders to view the planning process as flexible resulted from the fact that their actions were not made to fall in line with a linear progression of planning steps often associated with facilities planning. Instead of focusing exclusively on a linear set of planning steps to control the process, the superintendent placed significant attention on developing an understanding of the context in which stakeholders interacted. As the superintendent gained an understanding of the context, he recognized the importance of creating a flexible process that would respond to the needs and concerns of stakeholders. The data suggested the flexible nature of the planning process was created because stakeholders were provided with opportunities to offer input and address issues and concerns. Stakeholders described qualities of a flexible process and believed their input led to issues and concerns being addressed in a meaningful way.

Their desire to engage in a planning process they viewed as flexible influenced the outcome of the planning and contributed to a collaborative and meaningful process.

Developing a flexible process. Stakeholders who participated in this study expressed the concept of a flexible process. Steering committee members did not feel as if they were a part of a predetermined or a step-by-step process. As one parent stated

You know, going through the process and attending the meetings I didn't get the impression that, you know, that they were retooling and reengaging a process that they had been through before. That's not to say they didn't apparently not do that, but it didn't strike me that—we're in this business of building new high schools and now we're going to get out the book. I didn't detect that.

Steering committee members commented that the flexibility of each work session facilitated their ability to address issues and concerns. The work session agenda did not hinder or prevent discussions from taking place regarding critical issues. The superintendent allowed the planning process schedule to be flexible enough to include visits to surrounding high school campuses in an effort to view potential solutions to design issues. A principal explained one such visit, "We visited *Central High School* to see how their lights were configured so to avoid light from bleeding over into their neighborhood and on to the highway."

In yet another example of a flexible process, the lead architect explained that the district leaders allowed the steering committee to explore three separate design concepts for the high school and the result was the merging of the three design concepts into one master plan. Both principals noted that the superintendent's willingness to allow the steering committee to discuss and explore unique design concepts resulted in the unique

placement of the fine arts facility and the gymnasiums at separate ends of the building. The lead architect explained that the steering committee had conversations that went "beyond just a surface level" and they discussed "the importance of the presence or the imagery" of the school. As a result of in-depth conversations, "we have three distinct entrances, but there is a certain hierarchy" with the main academic entrance being "the core" or center of the school, and then "we've given you two ends of the building for separate identity," each end played "down slightly below" the main entrance of the school. As a direct result of stakeholder collaboration each area received its own identity, with separate entrances, parking lots, and space.

The superintendent contributed to the flexibility of the planning process by encouraging stakeholders to assume significant roles. Stakeholders believed their roles were significant in part because the superintendent never pushed an agenda or attempted to steer the process one way or another. A parent commented that he thought the superintendent "did a fantastic job of getting the input that was available and did nothing to stifle, but more to encourage participation from all the members."

Providing input that influenced the process. The data showed that the flexible planning process provided stakeholders with the opportunity to provide input that influenced the planning of the school from the very beginning. The lead architect explained:

> The district, along with *Dr. Johnson*, generated a task group. A planning
>
> committee, if you will, made up of administrators, school board members,
>
> representatives from the community, and representatives from the student body.
>
> Whoever they could think of that kind of touched upon those that would be using

the facility, influenced by the facility, or has direct input in planning the facility. And then we started. We had a series of meetings with them to generate, beginning in words, what their goals and aspirations were for the building. What worked and didn't work in their previous or existing schools. And we shared, and then we'd come back. We would go every two weeks or three weeks or so and then meet again and share what our investigations yielded from those previous discussions. And then, the next meeting, after they reviewed and shared those ideas and talked about those and what else was important, the next one would try to organize those in maybe overall diagrams, overall footprints of the building.

A parent expressed his view of the significance of a process that allowed stakeholders to contribute to the planning process by providing input and discussing ideas:

> I think it's real important to get that input. All too often people outside the academic world think that people within academics really don't have a common sense as to what's going on out there in the trenches. And so, although the group that we were involved with seemed very connected to what needed to be done, I think from an overall perspective from both the ability to get good input and also from the ability to even say we solicited input—I think it's a critical factor. And when you're spending someone else's money, it's important you touch all the bases and get all the opinions in or at least allow those who are contributing to the process to at least have voice.

Stakeholders expressed their belief that their input influenced the decision-making regarding the planning and design of the high school. A parent expressed this idea when he stated:

I sincerely believe they took the input from this group and it made its way into the facility. Quite frankly, I was glad to do it. I was proud to have the opportunity to do it. And you know what, I'm proud of the facility and that we had a little bit to contribute to it.

Addressing issues and concerns in a meaningful way. The data suggested that the flexible planning process encouraged meaningful dialogue regarding issues and concerns. The dialogue fostered a collaborative environment that led to issues and concerns being addressed in a productive way. The data revealed numerous examples of when discussions produced solutions, and solutions were applied to the design of the high school.

Students were deeply involved in addressing issues that affected the design and planning of the new high school. During a work session, the idea of locating the athletic facilities at an off-site location was presented to the steering committee. Students voiced their concerns that an off-site athletic complex would have a detrimental effect on the culture of the high school. As a result of the students' ability to express their views and the steering committee's willingness to listen and discuss the issues, the committee agreed that an on-site athletic complex would be the appropriate choice. Student input also contributed to the layout of the cafeteria in the new high school being changed from the layout of previous high schools. Students shared with the committee that the flow of traffic in and out of each area of the cafeteria needed to be improved to make the

cafeteria a more desirable location for the student body. Students also expressed their opinion that as much natural light as possible should be allowed to filter into the building. The lead architect noted "students really said that they really liked a lot of the natural light when it was previously implemented in the other school design, so we tried to make that a real component of this design." One design element that students discussed that seemed to be given less credence was their preference on a color scheme for the school. One parent commented, "They didn't have a lot of worldly experiences so they did sometimes get hung up in what colors this would be, more superfluous things."

Parents participating in the planning process expressed their pleasure in knowing that their input made a positive contribution to the planning and design of the new high school. Parents stated that school district leaders worked diligently to capture parent input and incorporate that input into the master plan of the school building and the layout of the athletic complex. A parent stated, "*Dr. Johnson*, as I said before, I was very complimentary about…he did a fantastic job of getting the input that was available."

Summary of developing a flexible planning process. The data revealed the interaction of two important concepts—a flexible process and deliberate listening—influenced the outcome of the planning and contributed to a collaborative and meaningful process. Stakeholders in the study believed that the flexible nature of the process was encouraged by the fact that the architect served as the facilitator of the meetings and the superintendent supported the process by listening intently to the input of the members of the steering committee. One parent stated:

I really felt like it was a well-rounded, managed discussion and I think the gentleman that ran it did a nice job of making sure the different personality types

were handled in a manner to solicit their contributions. Overall, I believe the gentleman that did most of the facilitating, did a good job, but that's a fine line. But everybody's opinion was respected and I believe those issues that were brought up were addressed—every issue.

Section Three: Stakeholder Perceptions of Superintendent Leadership

In section two, I focused on concepts generated from the data to explain the engagement of stakeholders in a collaborative and meaningful planning process. The third section of this chapter explains the ways stakeholders perceived the leadership of a superintendent contributed to a collaborative and meaningful planning process. The interviews and field notes offered evidence that the superintendent's past and present actions were linked to a collaborative and meaningful planning process. Not only were the superintendent's actions found to be meaningful in the events described in this section but his actions were also found to be related to the three sub-themes discussed in section two. Each interviewed participant expressed the planning process benefited from the leadership of a superintendent who was perceived to be highly credible in facilitating the planning process and committed to serving people. The superintendent's goal was to implement a planning process that would ultimately meet the needs of each stakeholder represented at the planning table.

In this section, I examined stakeholder's perceptions of how the superintendent's leadership contributed to a meaningful process. Four themes emerged from the data: (1) establishing credibility, (2) envisioning the future, (3) empowering key stakeholders, and (4) ensuring parity.

Establishing credibility

The data revealed the importance of a superintendent who comes to the planning table with established credibility. The concept of established credibility is when a leader has the capacity to inspire trust as a result of his past actions. The superintendent, as a result of his interactions and relationships with people over a long period of time, developed a high level of credibility that was significant to the outcome of the planning process.

The ability of the superintendent to establish positive relationships across two communities was a major reason why patrons have supported the actions of the school district as related to facilities planning, the passing of bond issues, and tax increases. The superintendent has also established credibility by demonstrating a clear understanding of how to guide the school district through a sustained period of tremendous student growth. The ability of the school district to accommodate tremendous student growth was successful because facilities planning began years in advance to schools being constructed. The participants in this study believed the superintendent has developed a level of trust that has been a key component of successfully leading the school district through multiple planning processes.

Establishing credibility with the community. The school district benefited greatly from the leadership of a superintendent who over a long period of time has established a relationship with the community based on trust and credibility. Describing the importance of establishing credibility with the community, the superintendent stated:

> You need to realize how important it is that you have credibility. I have been here
> 26 years, 23 as superintendent, and I have made it my business to become
> involved in the community. I get involved in boards and chambers of commerce

and the RCGA and things like that. People know me and if they have questions

they ask. I think I'm respected in the community. So, I think it is important for the

superintendent to establish credibility.

The extensive community involvement the superintendent spoke of was also pointed out

by an assistant superintendent. She emphasized that the relationships he has developed as

a result of his community involvement have led to trust. She explained:

He builds relationships with the community. He's really active—chambers of

commerce, Rotary, he speaks to the pipe fitters and different local unions. So

really, to try to get out there to the common person, the common parent, and

community member in our district and let them know what's going on, let them

ask questions and see who he is—so they trust him.

One principal provided an example of how the superintendent's actions have

established credibility with the community. He explained:

He is so credible with our community and that's evidenced by the number of

times he's gone to our community and asked for a tax increase and then he turns

around and says I recommend that we decrease the taxes. He's done that two

times since I've been here. He decreased taxes more than we were mandated to.

That builds credibility.

These types of actions by the superintendent are a major reason why taxpayers

across the school district have supported $240 million in bond issues since 1985 and

seven tax increases. The superintendent believes taxpayers have supported their schools

because the school district has a track record of doing what it said it would do. School

districts that do not follow through on what they told the public they would do lose

credibility. The superintendent explained:

> If you pass a bond issue and you say that you're going to do something, and for
>
> some reason you don't do it, that is going to be pointed out the next time you ask
>
> for help. They're going to tell you, you know what, we voted the bond issue
>
> before and we never saw that football stadium renovated. We never saw that
>
> phone system that you said you were going to put in. I think that it's critical that
>
> you don't lose that credibility because if you lose credibility, very often it's going
>
> to take somebody else to get it passed because people just don't forget it, and
>
> sometimes superintendents change.

The participants involved in this study believed that the superintendent developed

a high level of trust. This high level of trust has been a key component of the school

district's successful facilities planning. One principal stated:

> I think it's essential. Because watching other school districts flounder, and I think
>
> that's a fair term, when they face rapid growth and they just don't seem to be able
>
> to get bond issues passed and their always behind. They struggle with double
>
> sessions and the board is in contention and there's all kind of stresses. For the last
>
> 13 years and for several years prior, *Dr. Johnson* has pulled the district together,
>
> used the money to buy facilities or to create facilities that work. And did so
>
> frugally because the public doesn't want to get ahead of themselves and I think
>
> that's why they vote down a bond issue. They don't have that trust level, but he
>
> developed that trust level early.

An assistant superintendent explained that the superintendent developed a high level of trust and credibility with the community because he demonstrated that he understood how to address issues related to student growth and planning facilities. The assistant superintendent stated:

They have to trust that the district knows what they're doing, that the Board of Education and the superintendent know what they're doing. Part of it for him, I think, is just that he has the perfect track record. I mean he has been here for a long time. And when he said we needed a new—we needed two new elementary schools or three new elementary schools in the southwest area, guess what? We did. So, I think, he's just proven himself by what has happened. So, that's one way that he has built trust.

Planning to accommodate future growth. The superintendent established credibility by demonstrating an understanding of the school district's short and long-range facility needs and planned accordingly to meet these needs. During the period of rapid student growth, the superintendent was proactive in determining what areas of the school district needed schools constructed to accommodate student growth. The lead architect explained, "I think it registered to him. It's time for a new school and that new school means x amount of time to properly plan, design, and build. So, he would usually be out ahead of that curve."

Planning facilities to accommodate student growth required that planning begin years in advance to the school being constructed. An assistant superintendent commented, "What I've seen him do with planning is start out years in advance and look down the road in five years and ten years. What are we going to need in *Westview*?" The

same assistant superintendent added that the superintendent's long tenure with the school district has allowed long-range planning. "*Dr. Johnson* has been here for 26 years. And so 26 years ago he was projecting what we were going to need in *Westview* in terms of elementary schools and middle schools and high schools.

Envisioning the future

The idea of envisioning the future is an important concept for a school district that experienced tremendous student growth over a sustained period of time. Many school districts may plan and construct one new school during a twenty year period of time, but not many school districts will plan and construct seven new elementary schools, two new middle schools, and two new high schools in eighteen years as the *Westview School District* has done. The leadership of a superintendent who envisioned future events and developments was crucial in determining and meeting the facility needs of the school district.

The superintendent applied a progressive vision to meet the short and long-term facility needs of the school district. The members of the steering committee recognized the superintendent as a leader with the expertise and knowledge to plan for both short and long-range facility needs. Coupled with his knowledge of the planning process, stakeholders also felt he was extremely committed to the students of the school district. This commitment was clearly evident when he made the renovations of older facilities a priority as each new building was being planned and constructed.

A progressive vision for planning. The superintendent applied a progressive vision to meet the short and long-term facility needs of the school district. Stakeholders commented that the superintendent worked diligently to manage the tremendous student

growth, rather than react to it. This approach allowed the school district to stay up with or ahead of the tremendous student growth it experienced.

The superintendent demonstrated a commitment to the short and long-term facility planning in an effort to meet the needs of the rapidly growing school district. The superintendent kept up with the school district's facility needs by "looking forward, looking ahead" and applying "a very progressive vision." He studied the school district's history of growth and analyzed trends in an effort to manage the growth rather than react to the growth. For the most part, the superintendent's leadership allowed the school district to "stay ahead of that [*tremendous growth*] rather than waiting until we were so crowded."

Members of the steering committee recognized the superintendent as a leader with the expertise and knowledge to plan for both short and long-term facility needs. One steering committee member stated:

I think a great example of such a leader is *Dr. Johnson*. It's recognizing the need

for facilities and that's done through a 10-year plan. It's commitment to seeing

those facilities constructed and having the board buy in to recognizing that need.

The steering committee member went on to add, "*Dr. Johnson* has always done a 10-year plan, but a 10-year plan that's constantly looked at and updated."

A sense of commitment. The superintendent's history of planning schools has demonstrated a commitment to the stakeholders of the school district. The lead architect described how "in his [*Dr. Johnson*] case, [*he*] has a lot of history of doing this, but at the same time doesn't lose sight of who the building is for." Describing the superintendent's commitment to students and parents, one principal stated, "I think, first and foremost, is

his commitment to the kids in this district. He is so committed to the families, he really is." One assistant superintendent discussed how the superintendent's "belief that the environment has a very strong impact on teaching and learning" led to his commitment that every school, old or new, would have an environment that facilitated great teaching and learning.

The data revealed that the superintendent's commitment went beyond providing new schools. One stakeholder commented that he remains well aware of the fact that "every time you build a new building like the new high school, obviously there are new products and new aesthetics that went into the building that our older high schools don't have." The stakeholder continued to explain that the superintendent's commitment to the people using the older buildings is realized when he "makes a point to go back over the next few years and add some of that [*updates*] to the older buildings to keep them more— to provide more parity."

The superintendent commented on the importance of attending to older facilities. He stated, "Again, I think that's a real critical thing that you don't get people feeling that they are second class citizens because they have to go to an older school." The actions of the superintendent demonstrated that he used the planning process as more than just a means to create a building, the planning process was an opportunity to meet people's needs.

Empowering key stakeholders

The superintendent empowered steering committee members to assume significant roles during the planning process. Specifically, he empowered an architect and a parent to assume roles that would play an integral part in addressing the social and

political dimensions that surrounded the planning process. Empowering the architect and the neighborhood representative contributed to the development of a flexible process where stakeholders engaged in dialogue regarding the issues and concerns that had the greatest potential to impact the planning process.

Empowering the architect. From the beginning of the planning process, the superintendent empowered the architect to assume the role of facilitator. The action of empowering the architect to facilitate the work sessions impacted the planning process in positive ways. The data revealed that the action helped to create an environment that encouraged open dialogue and provided the opportunity for the superintendent to establish his role as a deliberate listener. These interconnected concepts of deliberate listening and a flexible process were described previously in section two as being instrumental in the development of a collaborative and meaningful planning process.

The data revealed the combination of the architect being empowered to engage stakeholders in meaningful dialogue about important issues and the superintendent's deliberate listening, created a flexible planning process where stakeholders felt issues and concerns were addressed in a meaningful way. Stakeholders believed that their opinions were respected and that the environment of the planning process allowed issues to be discussed in a collaborative environment. A parent commented that he "believed the gentleman [*architect*] that did most of the facilitating did a good job…everybody's opinion was respected and I believe those issues that were brought up were addressed— every issue." The same parent also expressed that he felt that work sessions were established for the superintendent to listen to stakeholders. The parent commented:

I'm certain *Dr. Johnson* was very involved in the planning process and putting the whole thing together. But I'll tell you that during the meetings, I don't think it was a meeting for *Dr. Johnson* to express his personal opinions. I think it was a meeting that was established for him to listen to what the constituency had to say.

Stakeholders referred to the architect as the facilitator of the planning process and expressed that he did a nice job managing the process and capturing the comments of each stakeholder. They mentioned that he served as a guide and that he did a nice job sharing information and soliciting input. One parent stated:

The architect was hired to manage that function or that phase of the project and was the facilitator of the meetings. He did a very nice job talking about things that have worked in the past, things that haven't worked in the past and various options we had based upon the topography we were working with and the budget we were looking at. He more or less served as a kind of guide and mentor through the process.

The data from the Kickoff Programming Meeting notes supported the idea that the architect assumed the role of facilitator. The meeting notes pointed out that the superintendent introduced steering committee members and provided an explanation of their roles. He then introduced the architect and explained his role, and from that point forward, the architect was empowered as the facilitator of the planning process. The notes from the kickoff meeting provided the following explanation:

Dr. Johnson introduced the steering committee, explaining that it would be their role to participate in the development of the Master Plan for the new high school. The committee would have the responsibility, for the district, of overseeing the

planning process and design concept for the new facility. *The architect* introduced the planning process.

The architect introduced the objective of the planning process and served as the facilitator throughout the planning process. The superintendent expressed a confidence in the architect's knowledge, experience, and understanding of the process. He commented "our architect has experience from around the country" and he has been heavily involved in the "master planning process" and "is really leading that process."

The assistant superintendent for facilities also emphasized the importance of an architect assuming a key role in the planning process. He stated:

An architect is, in my opinion, really a key element of the planning process. I truly think that is an important step in the whole planning needs assessment. Making sure the facility that you are designing does indeed meet those needs. That you are coming up with the best combination of needs, quality, and budget. So, I think the architect plays a key role and I think selecting the right architect is really important.

Empowering the parent. The superintendent realized several months prior to the start of the planning process that including a representative from the subdivisions that bordered the building site would be critical to the success of the project. Soon after neighbors learned that the 44-acre tract of land was purchased by the school district for the purpose of building a comprehensive high school, they began expressing their concerns and fears. The purchase of the 44-acre tract of land led to a neighborhood meeting where several hundred people discussed the issues and concerns associated with this project.

Shortly after this neighborhood meeting, a neighborhood representative called *Dr. Johnson* and expressed the concerns and fears of residents of the subdivisions bordering the building site. During their discussion, *Dr. Johnson* invited the neighborhood representative to serve on the steering committee. The parent agreed to serve on the steering committee and was empowered by the superintendent to serve as a spokesperson for the surrounding neighborhoods. The superintendent explained:

> In this type of project it was critical that we had parents from that area on the team. Because this is, in this instance, it was the first time after the three high schools we have built—it is the first time we've built a high school when the community was already built up around it. So now, we're coming in and plopping down a 44-acre project in the middle of their community with football lights, and sound, and bands practicing, and 300, 400 kids driving in the morning and there was some animosity, maybe not animosity, that might be too strong, but there was somewhat of a fear that this was going to change their lives over there. So there was some fear and we put our biggest—one of our biggest critics on there. One of the residents who was a critic, we put him on the team.

The parent expressed major concerns about the effects a comprehensive high school would have on the neighborhoods adjacent to the 44-acre building site. He explained that he became involved when he attended the neighborhood meeting and became concerned of the potential effect this project could have on neighborhoods. The parent stated:

> There were probably several hundred people in that meeting that were concerned with the amount of traffic that was going to be dumped immediately here and how

might that affect home values and that kind of thing. So I became concerned. You have a couple of hundred people here and a couple of thousand people here when you consider students, faculty; venders making deliveries, all sorts of things—sporting events.

The parent explained that he called the superintendent with some concerns about the impact that a high school would have on the neighborhoods. Speaking of the discussion with the superintendent, the parent stated:

I called *Dr. Johnson* with some concerns that I wanted him to be aware of regarding this particular sight within the neighborhood, surrounding neighborhoods, which I'm a resident and my wife and family. So I passed on those concerns to *Dr. Johnson* and he discussed some potential means of mitigating those particular concerns and then mentioned that they were going to have a committee meeting and it would be appropriate to have residents and parents as a part of it and he asked me if I'd be interested. So it was really, very much kind of by accident. I think he saw it as an opportunity to get someone from the surrounding neighborhoods involved.

A steering committee member explained that initially this key parent was "a great opponent, fighting against the high school." District leaders expressed that the action of the superintendent to include this parent in the planning process as a representative of the community played a significant role in the overall success of the planning process. The superintendent felt the parent's participation allowed the school district to address issues "right up front."

The superintendent also believed that with the assistance from the architect who "did a great job addressing those issues," and as a result of the planning process, the district "won him over mostly." The parent believed he assumed a unique role in the planning process and felt he was very involved in the design of the school and the use of the land. The parent stated:

> I thought my unique role was as a resident and how the school—how the school was designed, laid out, the property, the fields, parking, traffic, all of those things. How it would impact the surrounding community and so other than general comments that came up, I was very much zeroed in on those aspects that might have a favorable, or my bigger concern was the unfavorable impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

The parent commented that he was happy for the opportunity to serve on the steering committee and understood that compromise was a part of the planning process. He stated, "I was happy for the opportunity to participate on the steering committee. In the end my view of how it turned out was mixed, but I guess on things like this there are always compromises."

Ensuring parity

The superintendent presented a clear understanding of the importance parity played in managing facilities planning during a period of tremendous student growth. As the school district's student population exploded, the superintendent grasped the concept that community support from both established and newly developing areas would be essential in meeting the facility needs of the rapidly growing school district. The data revealed that community support developed as the superintendent demonstrated a

commitment to parity—the idea that all students would benefit from the community's support.

The superintendent explained that if the school district was going to receive support from the public in the way of passing bond issues and tax issues, people cannot feel as though only one section of the school district will benefit. The superintendent explained:

> I just knew that if we were going to receive the kind of support we've received from the public, people have to feel good about passing bond issues and tax issues. I think it has been critical that people do not feel in a large district that one section of the school district is getting more attention than another section of the school district. So as we pass big bond issues, our biggest was $50 million in 2006 and prior to that I guess $35 million was next biggest, we've got to plan projects for every corner of the school district.

School district leaders developed plans that ensured every corner of the school district benefited from the community's support. These plans helped to establish parity between older schools and the new schools being planned. Parity has been accomplished by allocating resources to upgrade, renovate, and improve existing facilities as they build the new facilities. The superintendent explained this process:

> The lion's share of what the $50 million went for was our new high school— about $37 million of it. But then the remainder you are doing roofs, you are doing black top, you are doing building additions, you are doing phone systems, you are doing other things that keep your district up and helps the public feel that you are not showing attention to only one part of your school district. To me that is almost

as important as the actual design of the building—that people feel comfortable

that you are going to share. They're going to get a chance to share in that project

and that their kids are going to get the benefit of that.

One assistant superintendent commented that the school district has established a history

of upgrading and improving older schools as new schools were constructed. The assistant

superintendent stated:

This district has always made a concerted effort to upgrade and improve existing

facilities as they built new facilities. If you look at the history of the bond issues

the district has passed, along with the new construction, a part of that bond issue

has always included funds to renovate, upgrade and improve the existing

facilities.

The superintendent cited a specific example of the school district's commitment

to providing parity for the students, staff, and parents. Shortly after completing the

construction of what at the time was the newest high school, the Board of Education

proposed a $7.5 million bond issue to construct a new auditorium and make renovations

to its oldest high school. The superintendent described the process:

I think that's a real critical thing that you don't get people feeling that they are

second class citizens because they have to go to an older high school. *Jefferson

High School* needed to have a facelift and so shortly after we opened *Washington

High School*, we passed a bond issue and we went back and put about $7.5

million renovation on *Jefferson High School*, which really spruced it up. We

added an auditorium to it at that time. And although, I don't think we totally took

away that concern over the older building versus newest building, I think we

really handled an awful lot of it. People felt pretty good about it and we continue
to do that with our other buildings.

Steering committee members noted how the superintendent's actions demonstrate
a commitment to children and to making sure the entire school district benefits from the
community's support. One principal commented:

Well, I think, first and foremost, is his commitment to the kids in this district. He
takes a lot of pride that our kids have an equal opportunity for an education and
that includes the buildings. And he tells the community, here's what we need for
Lincoln High School, but were not going to forget about the others out there and
he doesn't.

Another principal commented that the superintendent has done an effective job
using bond issues to allocate money for facility improvements throughout the school
district. The principal felt this action helped people served by older schools to feel like
they are keeping up with the rest of the district. The principal stated:

He's done a great deal on every bond issue of placing money throughout the
district and helping people feel as though they are keeping up. Again, 13 years
ago a lot of our buildings were not air-conditioned and he used bond issues.
Maybe we're building a new elementary—I'll throw out a number—that was $5
million. We're doing a bond issue for $9 million and he puts four million into
older facilities. So they are getting air conditioning or they're getting an add-on,
and *Jefferson High School* had a lot of add-on's at that time. It's like throw each
part of the equation, each part of the district—throw them each some part of the
pie.

The data revealed the superintendent was committed to providing parity. One stakeholder commented that the superintendent remains well aware of the fact that "every time you build a new building like the new high school, obviously there are new products and new aesthetics that went into the building that our older high schools don't have." The stakeholder continued to explain the superintendent's commitment to the people using the older buildings is realized when he "makes a point to go back over the next few years and add some of that [*updates*] to the older buildings to keep them more—to provide more parity."

Section Four: Negotiate the Interests of Stakeholders Involved in Planning

In section two, I provided a description of a superintendent's efforts to engage stakeholders in a collaborative and meaningful planning process. The third section explained ways stakeholders perceived how the superintendent's leadership contributed to a meaningful planning process. In this fourth and final section, I will explain how the superintendent shaped the planning process to negotiate the interests of stakeholders involved in the planning process. This explanation will use the context of conflict to examine how the superintendent's actions shaped the negotiation process. The superintendent's ability to shape the context of the planning process and successfully negotiate stakeholder's interests was related to the concepts generated and discussed in sections one and two. The application of these concepts throughout the planning process enhanced the superintendent's ability to negotiate the interests of stakeholders represented at the planning table.

In an effort to provide insight into the complex process used to negotiate the interests of stakeholders, this section was arranged around one specific theme that emerged from the data: (1) shaping the context of the planning process.

Shaping the context of the planning process

The ability of the superintendent to shape the context of the planning process was a significant element in successfully negotiating the interests of stakeholders. The data revealed that the superintendent's actions shaped the environment of the planning process by altering factors that hindered the negotiation process. As factors were altered stakeholders were allowed to influence the planning process by negotiating their concerns and interests.

The *Westview School District* planned to construct a comprehensive high school on a 44-acre site located within an established neighborhood and community. This construction project created the need for the superintendent to shape a planning process that would address the concerns and interests of residents and community members. The superintendent believed these critical issues had the potential to impact the planning process in an extremely negative manner. The superintendent demonstrated an understanding of how social structures and political systems would impact the planning and design of the high school, and he acted to shape the type of flexible planning process that would respond to these social and political dimensions.

Understanding the critical issue. The superintendent was aware several months before this planning process began that there was an influential group of stakeholders who expressed their opposition to building a comprehensive high school on this site. Prior to the school district's purchase of the land, the 44 acres had been an orchard farm,

and during that time the existing subdivisions had built up next to the orchard farm. Once residents found out about the school district's intentions to build a high school, they were quick to organize and discuss the negative impact this project could potentially have on their lives. One parent explained:

I found out about it and said, 'Wait a minute. There are a lot of concerns over here with the type of housing going in that area and the amount of traffic because it was going to be relatively dense housing compared to the other areas and so people were very much in arms about it. There were probably several hundred people in that meeting that were concerned with the amount of traffic that was going to be dumped immediately here and how might that affect home values and that kind of thing.' So I became concerned. You have a couple of hundred people here and a couple of thousand people here when you consider students, faculty; venders making deliveries, all sorts of things—sporting events.

The data revealed the superintendent seriously considered the information he received from residents and community members prior to initiating the planning process. The information he received and the input he gathered resulted in the development of a different type of planning process than had been used to build the school district's three previous high schools. The superintendent stated:

In this type of project it was critical that we had parents from that area on the team. Because this is, in this instance, it was the first time after the three high schools we have built—it is the first time we've built a high school when the community was already built up around it. So now, we're coming in and plopping down a 44-acre project in the middle of their community with football lights, and

sound, and bands practicing, and 300, 400 kids driving in the morning and there

was some animosity, maybe not animosity, that might be too strong, but there was

somewhat of a fear that this was going to change their lives over there. So there

was some fear and we put our biggest—one of our biggest critics on there. One of

the residents who was a critic, we put him on the team.

Altering the factors that constrain the planning process. The data revealed the

actions of the superintendent succeeded in altering the frame factors that had been

established by the school district in previous planning processes. The superintendent's

willingness to alter established frame factors was the key element in shaping the context

of this planning process. Shaping the context of the planning process took place as the

superintendent consciously altered the conceptual and material factors that constrained

stakeholders from successfully negotiating the critical issues.

The superintendent focused on altering conceptual frame factors that limited

stakeholders' perceptions of their ability to influence the planning process. A clear

example of a conceptual factor that limits intellectual space is when stakeholders feel as

though the input they provide is not listened to or applied to resolve conflicts. An

examination of the data revealed this factor was addressed by the concept of deliberate

listening.

Stakeholders believed the superintendent was successful in shaping the planning

process because he placed a high priority on listening. One parent stated, "I don't think it

was meeting for *Dr. Johnson* to express his personal opinion. I think it was a meeting that

was established for him to listen to what the constituency had to say." The parent went on

to say, "I sincerely believe they took the input from this group and it made its way into

the facility." One assistant superintendent, expressing his thoughts on the importance of listening, stated, "I think you listen to everything. I mean, you listen to everybody's input and what they think is important." Another assistant superintendent stated, "Well, I think you certainly have to listen to what their concerns are and what needs they express and identify." He went on to add, "I think you always have to listen and take into account the needs and concerns of the people that you ask to participate in the planning process." The superintendent summarized the importance that deliberate listening played in the planning process. He stated:

> You always have to listen and you always have to know what the issues are. And until you listen and know what the issues and concerns are, you just can't address them. It doesn't mean you always agree, but I think we really try to accommodate issues and concerns. But I think you always need to be open to hearing what people have to say. And then you can demonstrate to people that you hear their concerns and that you are addressing them.

Another example of a conceptual factor that was altered was that the linear planning process the school district used to design previous schools was replaced with a flexible planning process. The data clearly showed that this conceptual factor was altered as a result of stakeholders being provided with opportunities to provide input, discuss issues and concerns, and influence decision-making. The data revealed stakeholders believed their input influenced the decisions that were made regarding the planning and design of the high school. A parent expressed this idea when he stated:

> I sincerely believe they took the input from this group and it made its way into the facility. Quite frankly, I was glad to do it. I was proud to have the opportunity to

do it. And you know what, I'm proud of the facility and that we had a little bit to contribute to it.

Stakeholders who participated in this study supported the idea that the planning process was flexible. Steering committee members did not feel as if they were a part of a predetermined or a step-by-step process. As one parent stated:

You know, going through the process and attending the meetings I didn't get the impression that, you know, that they were retooling and reengaging a process that they had been through before. That's not to say they didn't apparently not do that, but it didn't strike me that—we're in this business of building new high schools and now we're going to get out the book. I didn't detect that.

In addition to the focus placed on altering conceptual frame factors, there were also material frame factors within the planning process that were altered. Material factors constrain stakeholders' freedom to act and the space in which they act. An example of a material factor that constrains the freedom to act is when key stakeholders are not included in the planning process. An examination of the data revealed that this frame factor was addressed by the superintendent's willingness to include key stakeholders who represented the critical issues related to this process.

 Emphasizing the importance of including key stakeholders throughout a planning process, one assistant superintendent stated, "We absolutely make sure we do that. I think you have to have a representative sample of the people who are going to be using the facility and the people who are responsible for overseeing that facility."

Stakeholders involved in the planning process felt the superintendent was careful to include key stakeholders who would represent the socially and politically complex

issues. One principal provided insight into how the superintendent responded to these complex issues. The principal stated:

> *Dr. Johnson* was very concerned about including the community in the planning of this building because there were a lot of people in those subdivisions on, I think its *Oak Street Drive*, whatever that road that runs up there. There were a lot of folks concerned about the lights and the noise and the increased traffic flow. So *Dr. Johnson* included some leaders from that subdivision in the planning process and it did impact the planning. I was very—as a building principal I don't always think district wide. I think about my kids in my building. So it was very informational for me to see how *Dr. Johnson* really worried about the community.

The principal continued to explain that *Dr. Johnson* responded to the fears of those people living in the neighborhood by inviting an outspoken critic who lived in the neighborhood to participate on the planning committee. The principal commented:

> There was one gentleman who was on our committee who *Dr. Johnson* invited because he was a great proponent, fighting against the high school. So *Dr. Johnson* said why don't you come and help us design it. I think his fears were lessened. His kids are going there. So he had the option of taking them to *Washington High School* or sending them there, and he chose to go to *Lincoln High School* after going through the design process.

Another example of a conceptual factor that was altered was the lack of empowerment afforded to stakeholders participating in the planning process. The data clearly showed that this material factor was altered when an architect and parent were empowered to assume significant roles during the planning process. Stakeholders

expressed that the action of the superintendent to empower the architect and parent played a significant role in shaping the planning process.

Speaking of the architect's role, one parent explained that he served as a guide and he did a nice job sharing information and soliciting input. The parent said:

> The architect was hired to manage that function or that phase of the project and was the facilitator of the meetings. He did a very nice job talking about things that have worked in the past, things that haven't worked in the past and various options we had based upon the topography we were working with and the budget we were looking at. He more or less served as a kind of guide and mentor through the process.

The superintendent invited the parent to serve on the Steering Committee and he was empowered to serve as a spokesperson for the surrounding neighborhoods. The superintendent explained his actions:

> In this type of project it was critical that we had parents from that area on the team. Because this is, in this instance, it was the first time after the three high schools we have built—it is the first time we've built a high school when the community was already built up around it.

Another factor that may constrain the planning process is when the setting is limited to a single location. The superintendent addressed this factor by allowing the planning process to move to multiple settings. The data revealed that the opportunity for stakeholders to be involved in the planning process was not limited to one setting, but the planning table was actually moved to a variety of settings during the course of planning. The concept of moving the planning table to multiple settings resulted in increased

opportunities for stakeholders to be involved in the planning process. The data revealed moving the planning table was put into play in the middle of the planning process when steering committee members hosted a community meeting to share the preliminary master plan of the high school with parents and stakeholders. The community meeting provided an opportunity for members of both communities to ask questions and provide feedback.

Negotiating interests and concerns of the stakeholder. The data revealed the superintendent's ability to successfully negotiate the interests and concerns of stakeholders was contingent on understanding the critical issue and altering the factors that constrained previous planning processes. The superintendent worked diligently to develop a clear understanding of the critical issue that impacted the planning process. After developing a clear understanding of the critical issue, he then proceeded to shape the environment of the planning process by altering factors that hindered the negotiation process. As a result of these factors being altered, stakeholders were able to influence the planning process by successfully negotiating their concerns and interests.

The following paragraphs provide an explanation of how stakeholders were able to influence the planning process by successfully negotiating their concerns and interests. Each participant of the steering committee interviewed for this study felt the issue of greatest concern was the community's unrest regarding the impact the new high school would have on neighborhoods and the community. One major concern the steering committee faced emerged when many neighbors whose homes bordered the site of the new high school expressed "a fear that this was going to change their lives." Several hundred neighbors gathered to discuss concerns such as the "traffic," "noise," and

"lights." Many homeowners wanted to know "how might that [*high school*] affect home values." The leadership of the school district made it a priority to "listen to the suggestions" of every stakeholder and "address all of their issues and concerns."

From the beginning of the planning process, school district leaders understood building a comprehensive high school in the middle of an established community would "cause a lot of concerns." School district leaders expressed their concern about "contributing to a major change in the community by putting a school in what was a peach orchard." One principal commented that shortly after the school district purchased the 44-acre tract of land "we had a pretty vocal group of neighbors who didn't want a school here." Members of the community organized a meeting "where several hundred people" discussed the negative impact constructing a high school at that location would have on neighborhoods and businesses.

The concerns presented to the school district by community members were numerous. These concerns included size and topography of the property, design of the school, layout of the facility, placement of athletic fields, design of the stadium, traffic flow, student parking, student access to parking, student access to roads, noise, lighting, and safety. A resident in very close proximity to the school district's property contacted *Dr. Johnson* and shared the communities concerns regarding the construction of the new high school. The resident of the subdivision stated, "I called *Dr. Johnson* with some concerns that I wanted him to be aware of regarding this particular sight within the neighborhood, surrounding neighborhoods, which I'm a resident and my wife and family."

The parent went on to explain that as he shared his concerns, "*Dr. Johnson* and he discussed some potential means of mitigating those particular concerns." The parent added, "*Dr. Johnson* mentioned that they [*school district*] were going to have this committee meeting and it was appropriate to have residents and parents as part of it and he asked me if I'd be interested. I think he saw it as an opportunity to get someone from the surrounding neighborhoods involved."

Even before the community began expressing their dissatisfaction with the choice of the site for the new high school, the superintendent understood the new high school would be "a little bit trickier project because it was in the middle of a residential area." The superintendent felt that residents of the community had "somewhat of a fear that this was going to change their lives." The assistant superintendent of facilities explained, "Typically, when we did a high school--we found 50 acres out in the boonies and we built our building and then it [*community*] would develop around our school. When we did *Lincoln High School*, we were going in the center of a developed area and it was a little bit different approach." Another assistant superintendent stated, "The community made it clear that there was a concern with the high school going in their neighborhood."

School district leaders understood a primary objective of the planning process would be to negotiate with community members who had voiced their concerns. The school district entrusted the superintendent with the critical responsibility of establishing a steering committee that would be "a representative sample of the people who are going to be using the facility and the people who are responsible for overseeing that facility."

The superintendent also included stakeholders who were critical of the project, knowing they represented an important segment of the community. The superintendent

explained, "It makes it a little rougher, but most of the time you are better off facing your accusers and putting them in a position where they have kind of an upfront say. I have seen most of the time that we have done that we've won people over." The assistant superintendent for facilities added, "We absolutely make sure we do that. And so we had some of those folks with some very serious concerns on our planning committee."

The members of the steering committee negotiated issues and concerns within a planning process that consisted of social and political dimensions. The social and political dimensions caused school district leaders to consider carefully how to implement the planning process in a way that would increase the chances of successful negotiations. The social dimensions were a result of the interaction among stakeholders with diverse and occasionally conflicting interests. The ability of the school district's steering committee to interact in a positive and respectful manner created a safe atmosphere for dialogue and discussion. One parent commented, "Everybody's opinion was respected and I believe those issues that were brought up were addressed—every issue." Another parent noticed that the school district placed great attention on listening to stakeholder's conversations. The parent commented, "They [*school district*] seemed to put a lot of attention on capturing the comments that folks would have."

The planning process was successful because individual members of the steering committee had a willingness to balance their responsibility of representing a specific group with what was in the best interest of the whole. The lead architect commented that the individual needs and concerns of stakeholders were always discussed within the context of how to reach the overarching goals and objectives for the new high school. The lead architect commented that steering committee members "usually understand

that…the different members of the committee that were representing those groups were a part of the whole." Throughout the planning process each steering committee member "always had appreciation for what the person sitting next to them had to say, and because they would listen to them, then the person next to them would listen to the next person speak."

The political dimensions focused on the relations between interest, conflict, and power. The neighborhood wanted to discuss how building a school on a 44-acre property "would impact the surrounding community" and they "very much zeroed in on those aspects." Neighbors expressed "a lot of concern about athletic events and lighting spilling over into the properties, and noise and those kinds of things." An assistant superintendent explained that some very serious and legitimate concerns emerged. He stated:

> When we did *Lincoln High School*, we were going in the center of a developed
> area and it was a little bit different approach. And so, we had to be good
> neighbors and there were some people in that area who were concerned about a
> high school being built in their community. And so we had some of those folks
> with some very serious concerns on our planning committee. The issues were
> noise, lights from the football stadium, how students would access the building
> and whether there would be a lot of traffic through their neighborhoods. So we
> addressed all of their issues and concerns and showed them how we would do
> that. And I can't say that everybody was 100% happy, but I do think we went a
> long way to alleviate a lot of their fears and concerns.

Parents believed that the superintendent did an effective job of providing answers to the critical questions and negotiating the major concerns and fears of stakeholders. One parent explained that even when emotions were high and the topic of discussion controversial, the superintendent was an effective negotiator. The parent stated:

He was very open, but quite frankly I challenged him a bit on his explanation and I was interested to see what his reaction would be. You know I run a business here and I'm used to collaborative meetings and confrontation, and he's the man. I expressed my concern about the population, the numbers; he gave me…you know, he gave me a good answer, but it wasn't good enough because that was my major concern and I wanted to be able to tell the people who I talked to about this, that I did see the data and he was very good about it. So I think he did a fantastic job.

Summary

In chapter four, the data analysis for this study was presented. The reader was presented with a detailed explanation of the themes that emerged from the data for engaging stakeholders in a collaborative and meaningful planning process, identifying stakeholder perceptions of superintendent leadership, and negotiating concerns and interests of stakeholders. In-depth interviews, planning meeting notes, field notes, web sites, and articles provided data for this study.

Chapter Five

Conclusions and Implications

In this chapter, the conclusions will be presented from the qualitative research that investigated one planning episode within one school district. The purpose of investigating this planning episode was to develop an understanding of how an educational leader guided stakeholders through the social and political dimensions that existed within the authentic context of the planning process. Three major themes emerged from the in-depth interviews and data analysis. First, the leader engaged key stakeholders to create a collaborative and meaningful planning process. Second, the effective actions of the leader contributed to a meaningful planning process. Third, the leader successfully shaped the context of the planning process.

Research Questions

This study was guided by three research questions. Based on the findings presented in Chapter Four of this study, the answers to the research questions provide the framework for the conclusions that follow.

The first research question to be answered was:

1. In what ways does the leader involved in one planning episode in one school district engage stakeholders in a collaborative and meaningful planning process?

The superintendent made it a priority to invite a representative sample of key stakeholders to the planning table. The involvement of these key stakeholders resulted in a collaborative and meaningful planning process. By including key stakeholders throughout the planning process, the superintendent was able to develop an awareness

and understanding of the wide range of social and political dimensions that threatened to hinder the type of dialogue that would produce educational change. Included in the representative sample of key stakeholders were those individuals who represented the voice of critical issues. One such example of a critical voice was the resident who represented the people living in the subdivisions bordering the building site of the high school. The superintendent's decision to invite this neighborhood representative allowed for critical issues to be addressed at the beginning of the planning process and in a productive manner.

The superintendent demonstrated a strong desire to create a collaborative environment in which stakeholders could negotiate their personal and organizational interests. The creation of such a collaborative environment allowed for crucial concerns and needs to be addressed in a meaningful way. Stakeholders believed critical issues, such as resident's opposition to building a comprehensive high school on this particular site and the decision to locate the athletic complex on-site or off-site, were resolved because input was valued and used to create viable solutions. Stakeholders commented that they felt empowered to participate when they realized their input was valued and applied to the design of the facility.

As might be expected, the willingness of the superintendent and stakeholders to listen to each other's input was significant. The superintendent and the school district's leadership team placed a priority on listening to all of the input supplied by each stakeholder. Deliberate listening allowed the superintendent to capture the concerns and needs of each stakeholder and, as a result, the planning table became a collaborative and meaningful setting. The creation of a collaborative setting also meant that stakeholders

listened carefully to the needs and concerns presented by other stakeholders. As a result of stakeholders listening intently and respectfully to each other's input, the focus of conversations gradually shifted away from meeting personal needs to meeting the needs for the greater good. Stakeholders spoke of a willingness to place dialogue regarding critical issues within the context of meeting the needs of the students who would be attending this school.

The superintendent increased his opportunities to listen to key stakeholders by moving the planning table to multiple settings. The willingness of the superintendent to move the planning table to multiple settings enhanced the opportunity for people to voice their concerns and needs and for school district leaders to listen. The significance of the superintendent's willingness to move the planning table away from the boardroom was mentioned repeatedly by stakeholders.

The superintendent created a flexible planning process that responded to the needs and concerns of stakeholders. The ability of stakeholders to view the planning process as flexible resulted from the fact that their actions were not made to fall in line with a linear progression of planning steps. Instead of focusing exclusively on a linear set of planning steps to control the process, the superintendent placed significant attention on developing an understanding of the context in which stakeholders interacted. As the superintendent gained an understanding of the context, he recognized the importance of creating a flexible process that would respond to the needs and concerns of stakeholders.

Superintendents face three challenges when creating a collaborative and meaningful planning process: First, they must involve key stakeholders, including those stakeholders who represent the critical voices. Second, superintendents must place a

priority on listening intently to key stakeholders. Third, superintendents need to create a flexible process that will provide stakeholders with opportunities to offer input and address issues and concerns in a meaningful way.

The second research question was:

2. In what ways do stakeholders involved in one planning episode in one school district perceive a superintendent's actions contribute to a meaningful process?

The superintendent's past and present actions were found to have a significant impact on the planning process. Stakeholders viewed the superintendent as highly credible in facilitating a planning process. Stakeholders also recognized his commitment to serving people. The school district benefited from the leadership of a superintendent who over a long period of time had established a relationship with the community based on trust and credibility. This relationship has been enhanced as a result of his extensive involvement in the community. Participants commented that the superintendent has made a concerted effort to provide consistent communication with patrons of the school district.

The superintendent established credibility by demonstrating an understanding of the school district's short and long-range facility needs and planned accordingly to meet these needs. During a period of rapid and sustained student growth, the superintendent was proactive in determining what areas of the school district needed schools constructed to accommodate student growth. The superintendent's ability to manage tremendous student growth, rather than react to it, allowed the school district to stay up with or ahead of the tremendous student growth it experienced. Stakeholders also mentioned that the

superintendent's history of planning schools has demonstrated a commitment to the stakeholders of the school district.

Stakeholders believed the action of the superintendent to empower steering committee members contributed to a meaningful planning process. Specifically, he empowered an architect and a neighborhood representative to assume roles that played an integral part in addressing the social and political dimensions that surrounded the planning process. Empowering the architect helped to create an environment that encouraged dialogue and provided the superintendent with the opportunity to establish his role as a deliberate listener. The combination of the architect being empowered to engage stakeholders in meaningful dialogue about important issues and the superintendent's deliberate listening, created a flexible planning process where stakeholders felt issues and concerns were addressed in a meaningful way. The superintendent also included a representative from the subdivisions that bordered the building site. Stakeholders expressed that the key action of including the neighborhood representative played a significant role in the overall success of the planning process.

The superintendent presented a clear understanding of the importance parity played in managing facilities planning during periods of tremendous student growth. The superintendent grasped the concept that community support from both established and newly developing areas would be essential in meeting the facility needs of the rapidly growing school district. The superintendent demonstrated a commitment to parity—the idea that all student would benefit from the community's support.

Superintendents must accomplish four significant actions when contributing to a meaningful planning process: First, they must establish a relationship with the

community based on trust and credibility. Second, it is essential that superintendents demonstrate an understanding of the school district's short and long-range facility needs and plan accordingly to meet those needs. Third, superintendents should empower key stakeholders to assume roles that play an integral part in addressing the social and political dimensions that surrounded the planning process. Fourth, superintendents must demonstrate a commitment to parity—the idea that all students will benefit from the community's support.

The third research question was:

3. How does a leader involved in one planning episode in one school district negotiate the concerns and interests of stakeholders?

The superintendent shaped the context of the planning process to negotiate the interests of stakeholders involved in the planning process. The process of shaping the environment of the planning process was achieved as the superintendent altered factors that hindered the negotiation process. As factors were altered, it allowed stakeholders to influence the planning process by negotiating their concerns and interests. The *Westview School District* planned to construct a comprehensive high school on a 44-acre site located within an established neighborhood and community. This construction project created the need for the superintendent to shape a planning process that would address the concerns and interests of residents and community members. The superintendent believed these critical issues had the potential to impact the planning process in an extremely negative manner. The superintendent demonstrated an understanding of how social structures and political systems would impact the planning and design of the high school,

and he acted to shape the type of flexible planning process that would respond to these social and political dimensions.

The superintendent succeeded in altering frame factors that had been established by the school district in previous planning processes. The superintendent's willingness to alter established frame factors was the key element in shaping the context of this planning process. For instance, he addressed the issue of stakeholders feeling as though the input they provide is not listened to or applied to the planning process in a meaningful way. This issue was specifically addressed by the superintendent's willingness to be a deliberate listener. The superintendent also addressed the linear, step-by-step fashion of planning the school district used to design previous schools with a flexible planning process. Participants commented that they did not feel as if they were a part of a predetermined or step-by-step process.

The superintendent worked diligently to develop a clear understanding of the critical issues that impacted the planning process. After developing a clear understanding of the critical issue, he then proceeded to shape the environment of the planning process by altering factors that hindered the negotiation process. As a result of these factors being altered, stakeholders were able to influence the planning process by successfully negotiating their concerns and interests.

Superintendents face a significant challenge when negotiating the concerns and interests of stakeholders: They must shape the context of the planning process to negotiate the interests of stakeholders involved in the planning process.

These findings provide a framework to better understand the purpose of investigating the planning process and the research questions presented. Having

developed and analyzed these themes in Chapter Four of this study, I present conclusions that develop a better understanding of the context of the planning process and how critical it is for an educational leader to develop a type of planning process that will address key stakeholder's interests and concerns in a meaningful way. Following the presentation of these conclusions, I discuss the major connections and relationships that exist among these themes. This discussion will seek to shed light on how the interaction of these key themes affected the context of the planning process. Finally, in the implications section I present ideas and concepts for educational leaders to use in addressing the social and political dimensions present during the planning process. I conclude Chapter Five by identifying areas for future study.

<div align="center">Conclusions</div>

After collecting and analyzing data, I developed a better understanding of the nature of the planning process and how critical it is for an educational leader to create a type of planning process that will address key stakeholder's interests and concerns in a meaningful way. A planning process is a complex socio-political process (Michael Fullan, 1992) and it takes an educational leader who, when presented with the challenges of facilities planning, can connect "the practical decisions and technical strategies about needs, objectives, design, administration, and evaluation" with "the real-world contexts in which power, interests, ethical commitments, and negotiation strategies are part of everyday life" (Cervero and Wilson, 2006, vii). The collection and analysis of data has resulted in several enduring ideas that may assist educational leaders to be more insightful when leading a planning process. These enduring ideas are:

1. The superintendent's efforts and actions focused on meeting the needs of stakeholders across the entire school district, most importantly, the students. This was accomplished because he has been willing to expend the necessary time and energy to gain an understanding of the critical issues affecting the planning process.

2. The superintendent invited the critical voices to participate in the process.

3. The superintendent was aware that the style of planning that had been established for previous planning processes would not fit this most recent planning process.

4. The superintendent recognized the importance of creating a flexible process that would respond to the needs and concerns of stakeholders.

5. The superintendent empowered key stakeholders to assume critical roles throughout the planning process.

6. The superintendent's established credibility played a crucial role in the district's ability to manage facility planning in a time of tremendous growth.

Participants involved in this study's real-world context made numerous references to critical issues that had the greatest potential to disrupt the planning process. Critical issues that surrounded the context of this school district's latest planning process, such as rapid student growth, overcrowded schools, problematic site location, parity among four high schools, and an alarmed and fearful neighborhood, were addressed by not only implementing technical strategies but also by gaining an understanding of the social and political dimensions present throughout the planning process. Equipped with an understanding of the social and political dimensions and the expertise to implement

technical strategies, the superintendent was successful in meeting the needs of stakeholders across the entire school district, most importantly, the students.

Stakeholders believed their needs were met because the school district's planning process encouraged involvement from each member of the steering committee. Steering Committee members stated that the collaborative environment that existed during planning meetings was crucial to addressing the concerns and needs expressed by themselves and residents of the communities at large. Steering committee members felt school district leaders listened deliberately to the many concerns presented by stakeholders, and by doing so, gained an understanding of the social and political dimensions interwoven throughout the planning process.

As the superintendent demonstrated his willingness to expend the necessary time and energy to understand the social and political nature of the planning process, the traditionally step-by-step, linear style used in facilities planning (Tanner and Lackney, 2006) gave way to a more flexible process that allowed key stakeholders to influence decision-making. Instead of focusing exclusively on a linear set of planning steps to control the process, the superintendent placed significant attention on developing an understanding of the context in which stakeholders interacted (Yang and Cervero, 2001). As the superintendent gained an understanding of the context, he recognized the importance of creating a flexible process that would respond to the needs and concerns of stakeholders.

The ability of the superintendent to create a flexible planning process was a significant element in successfully negotiating the interests of stakeholders. The superintendent's actions shaped the environment of the planning process by altering

factors that hindered the negotiation process (Elgstrom and Riis, 1992). Altering factors allowed key stakeholders to influence the planning process by negotiating their concerns and interests. The actions of the superintendent succeeded in altering the frame factors that had been established by the school district in previous planning processes. The superintendent's willingness to alter established frame factors was a key element in shaping the context of this planning process. Shaping the context of the planning process took place as the superintendent consciously altered the conceptual and material factors that constrained stakeholders from successfully negotiating the critical issues (Elgstrom and Riis, 1992).

The collaborative actions of the superintendent and key stakeholders led to a meaningful planning process. Although stakeholders came to the planning table prepared to address and negotiate personal issues, an interesting phenomenon took place as each stakeholder listened carefully to the needs and concerns presented by other stakeholders. As a result of stakeholders listening intently and respectfully to each other's input, the focus of conversations gradually shifted away from meeting personal needs and interests to meeting needs for the greater good. The following section offers guidelines for educational leaders to lead stakeholders through the facilities planning process by addressing the social and political dimensions that exist within that process.

<center>Discussion</center>

Current research speaks to the fact that most educational leaders who are presented with the opportunity to plan and design new schools typically endeavor to include stakeholders in a planning process (Hansman, 2004; Hudson, 2007; & Tanner and Lackney, 2006). This collaborative effort in planning schools is essential, but the problem

identified with many planning processes is that the dialogue among stakeholders focuses solely on a series of planning steps and does not address the social and political context in which people plan together. Educational leaders who are responsible for planning and designing schools must be aware that facilities planning is not just about providing a school building; planning and designing educational facilities is about engaging key stakeholders in a social and political process that results in a learning environment that will respond to the needs of students, teachers, and the entire community (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

In spite of the recent findings researchers have provided regarding the value of addressing the social and political dimensions that exist during a planning process, incorporating those findings into planning schools has not been a practice widely adopted by educational leaders (Cervero and Wilson, 2006, Tanner and Lackney, 2006; and Hansman, 2004). With many school districts either currently involved in the educational facilities planning process or quickly approaching the need to enter into the planning process, now is the opportune time to explore the process for planning educational facilities (Coghlan and Brannick, 2005). As a result, this study investigated the planning process utilized by one school district to plan and design an educational facility intended to meet the needs of students being educated in the 21st century. The purpose of investigating the educational facilities planning process was to develop an understanding of the relationship between the way key district leaders guide stakeholders through the social and political dimensions of change and how these leaders approached issues related to planning for current and future facility needs.

Significant relationships and interactions among key themes

The outcome of this study offers not only the emergence of eight key themes but also a brief analysis of the significant relationships and interactions that exist among these key themes. These relationships are significant because no single theme would be successful in addressing the political and social environment that surrounds a planning process. The findings of this study emphasize that it was the continuous interaction of key themes throughout the planning process that served to successfully address the political and social dimensions that existed within the environment of this school district's planning process.

Deliberate listening. The concept of deliberate listening was a key component in addressing the social and political dimensions surrounding this planning process. Stakeholders expressed that the superintendent's deliberate listening resulted in their input being captured, and as a result, issues were addressed in a meaningful way. As this process repeated itself during the planning process, stakeholders felt that their input was valued and that they were participating in a truly collaborative process. Deliberate listening allowed the superintendent to gain a deeper understanding of the context and then respond appropriately to the social and political dimensions surrounding the planning process. The data revealed the interaction of the two concepts—deliberate listening and a flexible process—influenced the outcome of the planning and contributed to a collaborative and meaningful process.

Flexible planning process. The creation of a process that was flexible meant that key stakeholders were able to influence the proceedings in truly meaningful ways. Instead of focusing on a linear set of planning steps or guidelines, the superintendent created a flexible process that responded to the needs and concerns of stakeholders. A

significant attribute of this flexible process was the continuously meaningful dialogue regarding the critical issues and concerns. The meaningful dialogue fostered a collaborative environment that led to issues and concerns being addressed in a productive manner. The data revealed numerous examples of when discussions produced solutions, and solutions were applied to the design of the high school.

Established credibility. The benefit of a superintendent who comes to the planning table with established credibility greatly benefited the planning process. It was noted by numerous stakeholders that *Dr. Johnson* inspired trust as a result of his past actions. The superintendent also benefited from his positive interactions and relationships that had been developed with people over a long period of time. The fact that the superintendent had developed a high level of credibility was significant to navigating politically charged issues that had the potential to negatively affect the outcome of the planning process.

Empower key stakeholders. The action of empowering the architect to facilitate work sessions impacted the planning process in positive ways. This action helped to create an environment that encouraged open dialogue, and, it provided the opportunity for the superintendent to establish his role as a deliberate listener. The action of empowering key stakeholders is directly connected to the concepts of deliberate listening and a flexible planning process. The relationships and interactions of these key themes were instrumental in the development of a collaborative and meaningful planning process.

The combination of the architect being empowered to engage stakeholders in meaningful dialogue about important issues and the superintendent's deliberate listening, created a flexible planning process where stakeholders felt issues and concerns were

addressed in a meaningful way. The superintendent also empowered a representative from the subdivisions that bordered the building site and this action turned out to be critical to the success of the project.

Ensure parity during growth. The superintendent presented a clear understanding of the importance parity played in managing facilities planning during a period of tremendous student growth. As the school district's student population exploded, the superintendent grasped the concept that community support from both established and newly developing areas would be essential in meeting the facility needs of the rapidly growing school district. The data revealed that community support developed as the superintendent demonstrated a commitment to parity—the idea that all students would benefit from the community's support. The superintendent's commitment to ensuring parity was a significant factor in his development of credibility and trust throughout the school district.

Shape the context of the planning process. The actions of the superintendent succeeded in altering the frame factors that had been established by the school district in previous planning processes. The superintendent's willingness to alter established frame factors was the key element in shaping the context of this planning process. Shaping the context of the planning process took place as the superintendent consciously altered the conceptual and material factors that constrained stakeholders from successfully negotiating the critical issues.

The superintendent's ability to successfully negotiate the interests and concerns of stakeholders was contingent on understanding the critical issues and altering the established factors that would have constrained this planning process. The superintendent

worked diligently to develop a clear understanding of the critical issues that impacted the planning process. After developing a clear understanding of the critical issues, he then proceeded to shape the environment of the planning process by altering factors that hindered the negotiation process. As a result of these factors being altered, stakeholders were able to influence the planning process by successfully negotiating their concerns and interests.

Implications

This study has provided new insight into the way a superintendent can successfully guide stakeholders through a planning process surrounded by social and political dimensions. But gaining insight is only the first step to improving the facilities planning process. The most important step is when this insight is applied to the authentic setting of a planning process so that stakeholders can be meaningfully involved in creating innovative schools that respond to the educational needs of all students and to the culture of the community (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).

In this section, I present ideas and concepts for a superintendent to consider for the social and political dimensions that can impact a planning process at any time. First, I will provide practical ways a superintendent can create a collaborative and meaningful planning process. Second, I explain how a superintendent's leadership can contribute to a meaningful planning process. Third, I provide information that will help superintendents negotiate the concerns and interests of key stakeholders.

Practical Ways to Create a Collaborative and Meaningful Planning Process

Superintendents assume the responsibility for creating a collaborative and meaningful planning process. The concept of creating such a process may seem like a

straightforward idea where people join together with a common purpose to achieve a common goal, but in reality, facilities planning is a complex process that unfolds amid a range of social systems and political structures (Castaldi, 1982). From the interviews and analysis of data, I identified four key components in creating a collaborative and meaningful planning process. Table 2 provides a summary of a superintendent's responsibilities in creating a collaborative and meaningful planning process.

Table 2

Responsibilities of a Superintendent in Creating a Collaborative and Meaningful Planning Process

---

This research identified the following responsibilities that a superintendent has in creating a collaborative and meaningful process.

---

1. Invite key stakeholders who represent critical issues to participate in the planning process.

2. Move the planning table to multiple settings, increasing the opportunity for stakeholders to participate.

3. Make use of deliberate listening to address stakeholders' concerns and issues.

4. Develop a flexible planning process that allows stakeholders to provide input that affect decision making and influences the planning of the school.

Invite key stakeholders who represent critical issues to participate in the planning process. Several months before the planning process began the superintendent placed a priority on creating a steering committee that consisted of stakeholders who would be involved in planning and designing the new high school. The superintendent included students, parents, teachers, principals, assistant superintendents, board members, and architects to participate in the planning process. While each of these participants played an important role in the success of the planning process, one key stakeholder the superintendent invited proved to be an essential factor in addressing the social and political dimensions surrounding the most critical issue facing this school district's planning process.

This key stakeholder represented the most politically charged issue surrounding the planning process. This critical issue was created when the school district purchased a 44-acre orchard farm for the purpose of constructing a fourth comprehensive high school. The tract of land was bordered on two sides by established subdivisions, and once residents of these subdivisions found out about the school district's intentions to build a comprehensive high school, several hundred residents attended a meeting to discuss the negative impact this project could potentially have on their lives.

Shortly after this meeting, the neighborhood representative called *Dr. Johnson* and expressed the concerns and fears of the residents. The superintendent responded to the representative by discussing means to mitigate his concerns and then invited him to be a part of the school district's planning team. Several participants involved in this study emphasized that the resident was in complete opposition to the school district's plan to construct a comprehensive high school on the 44-acre site. One steering committee

member explained that this resident *Dr. Johnson* invited was "a great opponent, fighting against the high school."

My observation is that inviting a key stakeholder who represented a critical voice was extremely important to the overall success of this planning process. The decision of the superintendent to invite this key stakeholder to serve on the steering committee and represent the neighborhoods was vital in addressing the social and political dimensions that surrounded this critical issue. During the planning process this key stakeholder made many positive contributions that led to a more effective planning and design of the high school. One member of the steering committee commented that he was impressed this neighborhood representative agreed to join the steering committee. He stated, "I was impressed this gentleman did [*join the committee*]. Often times, people want to complain and talk a lot and don't follow through. He was there. He came and showed up for just about every planning meeting and was very actively involved." The superintendent felt that this key stakeholder's participation allowed the school district to address issues "right up front."

The parent commented that he was happy for the opportunity to serve on the steering committee and understood that compromise was a part of the planning process. He stated, "I was happy for the opportunity to participate on the steering committee. In the end, my view of how it turned out was mixed, but I guess on things like this there are always compromises."

Move the planning table to multiple settings. A second way for a superintendent to create a collaborative and meaningful planning process is to provide multiple settings to increase the opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the planning process.

Moving the location of the planning table to a variety of settings not only created more opportunities for stakeholders to participate but also resulted in the superintendent gaining a better understanding of the issues facing the school district and the stakeholders of the community.

Participants in this study made several references to the alternative settings where stakeholders met to provide input and discuss issues and concerns. Many mentioned a series of parent and patron forums and visits to surrounding high school campuses to view potential solutions to design issues. A principal explained one such visit to a high school allowed stakeholders to view a design concept for lighting athletic fields. He commented, "We visited *Central High School* to see how their lights were configured so to avoid light from bleeding over into their neighborhood and onto the highway."

One stakeholder also explained that the superintendent and the key stakeholder visited a high school so the stakeholder could see a specific design element that he had questioned during a work session. The stakeholder stated, "They offered to take him to various facilities that had already been constructed that might be of a similar build out and see how it impacted the neighborhood. So that was good." Educational leaders who find themselves addressing the social and political dimensions that are sure to exist in any planning process should give strong consideration to the possible benefits that may result from moving the planning table to a variety of settings.

Make use of deliberate listening. A third responsibility the superintendent has when creating a collaborative and meaningful process is to employ the concept of deliberate listening. A superintendent must be the type of person who listens with the intention of capturing the concerns and needs of each stakeholder. The superintendent in

this study placed a priority on deliberate listening, and as a result, he was successful in addressing the concerns and needs presented by stakeholders.

Consistent throughout the interviews is the idea that this superintendent listened intently to every stakeholder, including those stakeholders involved in the planning process who voiced a critical concern or issue. The idea of not only involving critical or adversarial stakeholders in planning but also listening intently to capture their concerns and needs is a concept that provides a superintendent with the ability to create a collaborative and meaningful setting. The superintendent's ability to create a collaborative and meaningful process leads to success in addressing the social and political dimensions that exist within the planning process.

The concept of deliberate listening is crucial to critical issues being addressed because it allows the superintendent to gain an understanding of the context. Equipped with an understanding of the context, he can then respond appropriately to the social and political dimensions surrounding the planning process. Stakeholders on the steering committee expressed that this superintendent placed a priority on listening intently to their comments. One parent stated, "I don't think it was a meeting for *Dr. Johnson* to express his personal opinions. I think it was a meeting that was established for him to listen to what the constituency had to say." From my observation, superintendents who listen to stakeholders in an intent and deliberate manner have the opportunity to gain a better understanding of the political and social dimensions that are interwoven within the context of the planning process, and are more likely to be successful in addressing these dimensions.

Develop a flexible planning process. A fourth responsibility that superintendents must assume when creating a collaborative and meaningful process is to develop a planning process that is flexible. Stakeholders who participated in this study alluded to the concept of a flexible planning process. A flexible planning process is characterized by stakeholders receiving the opportunity to provide input that influences the decision-making process.

The ability to truly influence decision-making exists when planning is not limited by a linear, step-by-step approach that ignores the social and political context in which the planning takes place (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). The superintendent in this study avoided a strictly linear, step-by-step approach by ensuring that each work session allowed stakeholders to address issues and concerns. Work session agendas did not hinder or prevent discussions from taking place regarding critical issues.

Another example of how this flexible planning process contributed to a collaborative and meaning planning process was when the superintendent supported the steering committee's desire to explore unique design concepts to address the specific needs of this project. Stakeholders acknowledged that the flexibility of the process allowed the steering committee to discuss and explore unique design concepts that resulted in the merging of three unique design concepts into one master plan.

A superintendent can develop a flexible planning process by encouraging stakeholders to assume significant roles. Stakeholders who assume significant roles provide valuable input and contribute to meaningful dialogue regarding issues and concerns. Parents participating in this planning process expressed their pleasure in knowing that their input made a positive contribution to the planning and design of the

new high school. One parent stated, "I sincerely believe they took the input from this group and it made its way into the facility. And you know what, I'm proud of the facility and that we had a little bit to contribute to it."

Actions of a Superintendent that Contribute to a Meaningful Planning Process

Since any person who assumes the position of superintendent of schools could possibly face the complex task of implementing an educational facilities planning process, superintendents should seek to gain an awareness of how certain key actions can contribute to a collaborative and meaningful planning process. Stakeholders in this study perceived the superintendent to be highly successful in facilitating the planning process in part because his past and present actions demonstrated a commitment to serving people. From the interviews and analysis of data, I identified three key actions that superintendents can carry out to contribute to a meaningful planning process. Table 3 provides a summary of the superintendent's key actions that contributed to creating a meaningful planning process.

_____

Table 3

Actions of a Superintendent that Contribute to a Meaningful Planning Process

_____

This research identified the following actions a superintendent can carry out to create a meaningful process.

_____

1. Establish credibility with the community by developing relationships based on trust and credibility.

2. Envision future events and developments to determine the facility needs of the school district.

3. Demonstrate a commitment to parity—the idea that all students will benefit from the community's support. Community support from both established and newly developing areas is essential in meeting the facility needs of a school district.

Establish credibility with the community. To begin with, a school district reaps benefits from employing a superintendent who is successful in establishing credibility within the community. One of these benefits is that a superintendent who has established a high level of credibility can play a significant role in the successful outcome of a planning process. Understanding the importance of establishing credibility is crucial to gaining the support of patrons of a school district. My research confirmed the significance of credibility and most participants interviewed in this study provided specific examples of how this superintendent's actions have established credibility that contributed to a meaningful process.

One way a superintendent can establish credibility is by getting involved extensively in the community. Involvement in activities such as the chamber of commerce, local boards, Rotary Club, and various associations builds relationships with members of the community. One assistant superintendent emphasized that this superintendent has developed positive relationships with the community. She explained:

He builds relationships with the community. He's really active—chambers of commerce, Rotary, he speaks to the pipe fitters and different local unions. So really, to try to get out there to the common person, the common parent, and

community member in our district and let them know what's going on, let them

ask questions and see who he is—so they trust him.

Superintendents must be viewed by the community as trustworthy. When a

superintendent tells the community that the school district will do something, the

superintendent must make sure that the school district follows through on what they told

the public they would do. Superintendents who have a track record of doing what they

said they would do often garner more support from taxpayers. The superintendent

explained his view on this point:

> If you pass a bond issue and you say that you're going to do something, and for
>
> some reason you don't do it, that is going to be pointed out the next time you ask
>
> for help. They're going to tell you, you know what, we voted the bond issue
>
> before and we never saw that football stadium renovated. We never saw that
>
> phone system that you said you were going to put in. I think that it's critical that
>
> you don't lose that credibility because if you lose credibility, very often it's going
>
> to take somebody else to get it passed because people just don't forget it, and
>
> sometimes superintendents change.

Participants in this study believed that once the credibility of this superintendent

was established, a high level of trust was built within the community. Such a high level of

trust is a key component of any school district's facilities planning. To sustain a high

level of trust, superintendents must also demonstrate by their actions that they understand

how to address issues related to facilities planning. An assistant superintendent stated:

> They have to trust that the district knows what they're doing, that the Board of
>
> Education and the superintendent know what they're doing. Part of it for him, I

think, is just that he has the perfect track record. I mean he has been here for a long time. And when he said we needed a new—we needed two new elementary schools or three new elementary schools in the southwest area, guess what? We did. So, I think, he's just proven himself by what has happened. So, that's one way that he has built trust.

Envision future events and developments. A second way the actions of a superintendent contribute to a meaningful process is to envision future events and developments. A superintendent must apply a progressive vision to meet the short and long-term facility needs of a school district. Superintendents who develop the ability to prepare for future growth are more likely to manage the process, rather than react to it. After envisioning the future, a superintendent must have the ability to apply the expertise and knowledge to actually implement a plan that meets the needs of the stakeholders of the school district.

Members of the steering committee recognized the superintendent in this study as a leader with the expertise and knowledge to plan for both short and long-term facility needs. One steering committee stated:

I think a great example of such a leader is *Dr. Johnson*. It's recognizing the need for facilities and that's done through a 10-year plan. It's commitment to seeing those facilities constructed and having the board buy in to recognizing that need.

Demonstrate a commitment to parity. A third action that has great implications for achieving a meaningful planning process is a superintendent's commitment to parity. A superintendent must understand the importance parity plays during facilities planning, particularly if the school district is in a period of tremendous student growth. In this

study, the student population increased rapidly over a sustained period of time and the superintendent grasped the concept that community support from both established and newly developing areas would be essential in meeting the facility needs of this rapidly growing school district.

The superintendent explained that if the school district was going to receive support from both established and newly developing areas in the way of passing bond issues and tax issues, people could not feel as though only one section of the school district would benefit. The superintendent explained:

> I just knew that if we were going to receive the kind of support we've received from the public, people have to feel good about passing bond issues and tax issues. I think it has been critical that people do not feel in a large district that one section of the school district is getting more attention than another section of the school district. So as we pass big bond issues, our biggest was $50 million in 2006 and prior to that I guess $35 million was next biggest, we've got to plan projects for every corner of the school district.

Superintendents should develop plans that ensure every corner of the school district benefits from the community's support. This type of planning can help to establish parity between older schools and the new schools being constructed. According to the data in this research, parity can be accomplished by allocating resources to upgrade, renovate, and improve existing facilities as new facilities are constructed. The superintendent cited a specific example of the school district's commitment to providing parity for the students, staff, and parents. Shortly after completing the construction of what at the time was the newest high school, the Board of Education proposed a $7.5

million bond issue to construct a new auditorium and make renovations to its oldest high school. The superintendent described the process:

> I think that's a real critical thing that you don't get people feeling that they are second class citizens because they have to go to an older high school. *Jefferson High School* needed to have a facelift and so shortly after we opened *Washington High School*, we passed a bond issue and we went back and put about $7.5 million renovation on *Jefferson High School*, which really spruced it up. We added an auditorium to it at that time. And although, I don't think we totally took away that concern over the older building versus newest building, I think we really handled an awful lot of it. People felt pretty good about it and we continue to do that with our other buildings.

Above everything else, parity demonstrates a commitment to children and to making sure every child in the entire school district benefits from the community's support. One principal, emphasizing how the superintendent is committed to this important idea, stated:

> Well, I think, first and foremost, is his commitment to the kids in this district. He takes a lot of pride that our kids have an equal opportunity for an education and that includes the buildings. And he tells the community, here's what we need for *Lincoln High School*, but were not going to forget about the others out there and he doesn't.

Negotiate the Concerns and Interests of Key Stakeholders

A primary objective of a planning process is to negotiate the interests of people and organizations involved in the planning process (Cervero and Wilson, 1994). In most

school districts this considerable responsibility is assumed by the superintendent. The ability of a superintendent to shape the context of the planning process is a significant element in successfully negotiating the interests of stakeholders. Superintendents who choose to neglect the process of shaping the context of the planning process will find it extremely difficult to negotiate the interests of stakeholders (Castaldi, 1982). Again, from the interviews and analysis of data, I was able to identify two main areas that superintendents can use to shape the context of the planning process in an effort to negotiate the concerns and interests of key stakeholders. Table 4 provides a look at the superintendent's responsibilities in shaping the context of the planning process in an effort to negotiate the concerns and interests of key stakeholders.

Table 4

Superintendent's Responsibilities in Shaping the Context of the Planning Process in an Effort to Negotiate the Concerns and Interests of Key Stakeholders

---

This research identified the following responsibilities a superintendent can carry out to successfully negotiate the concerns and interests of key stakeholders.

---

1. Develop a clear understanding of the critical issues that impact the planning process.
2. Demonstrate a willingness to alter factors that could constrain stakeholders from successfully negotiating critical issues.

Develop a clear understanding of critical issues. Prior to initiating the planning process, a superintendent should spend the time necessary to develop an understanding of critical issues that are likely to have an impact on the planning process. The data in this study indicated a superintendent's ability to successfully negotiate the interests and concerns of stakeholders is contingent on understanding critical issues. When a superintendent gains an understanding of the critical issues, he or she is then able to shape the context of the planning process to address these critical issues.

The superintendent in this study worked to gain an understanding of the critical issues several months before the actual planning process began. In this study, there was an influential group of stakeholders who expressed their opposition to building a comprehensive high school on this 44-acre tract of land. Previous to the school district purchasing the land, it had been an orchard farm and during that time, the existing subdivisions had built up next to it. Once residents found out about the school district's intentions to build a comprehensive high school, they were quick to organize and discuss the negative impact this project could potentially have on their lives.

The data revealed this superintendent seriously considered all of the information he received from residents and community members prior to initiating the planning process. The information he received along with the input he gathered resulted in the development of a planning process that addressed the social and political dimensions and allowed for successful negotiation. A superintendent's responsibility is to gain a clear understanding of the critical issues within the context of the planning process and apply that information to negotiate the interests and concerns of key stakeholders.

Alter factors that constrain stakeholders from successfully negotiating critical issues. Finally, superintendents may have to alter frame factors that have been established during previous planning processes. These established factors have the ability to hinder the negotiation process. Altering conceptual and material frame factors is a key element in shaping the context of a planning process because it allows stakeholders to influence the planning process by negotiating their concerns and interests.

Superintendents should be prepared to alter conceptual frame factors that limit stakeholder's perception of their ability to influence the planning process. Stakeholders often feel that the input they provide is not listened to or applied to resolve the critical issues in the authentic context (Tanner and Lackney, 2006). In an effort to alter these perceptions that hinder the negotiation process, a superintendent should place a high priority on deliberate listening and replace linear, step-by-step planning with flexible planning.

A superintendent is also responsible for altering material frame factors. These factors constrain the freedom to act and include constraints on finances, supplies, space, time, and people (Umble, Cervero, and Langone, 2001). Examples of material frame factors may include not empowering key stakeholders to participate in the planning process in a meaningful way and limiting the planning process setting to a single location.

My observation is that is takes a conscious and deliberate effort on the part of a superintendent to gain a thorough understanding of the political and social dimensions surrounding the critical issues and a determined willingness to apply this understanding to alter frame factors that constrain stakeholders from participating in successful

negotiation. Participants in this study believed the superintendent was successful in addressing critical issues and altering frame factors because he placed a high priority on listening, and as a result, their input was a valuable part of the process. One parent stated, "I don't think it was meeting for *Dr. Johnson* to express his personal opinion. I think it was a meeting that was established for him to listen to what the constituency had to say." The parent went on to say, "I sincerely believe they took the input from this group and it made its way into the facility."

In summary, superintendents who want to provide a collaborative and meaningful planning process must be willing to address the complexities of the social and political dimensions that are a unique part of any planning process. These dimensions can be addressed successfully when educational leaders create the type of process that encourages the negotiation of key stakeholder's interests and concerns. Although it is the superintendent who is responsible for preparing the planning table, effective facilities planning process is never accomplished by a single planner controlling the process. Stakeholders with multiple interests must be willing to come to the planning table and then balance their responsibility of representing a specific group or organization with what is in the best interest of the whole. Cervero and Wilson (1994) stated:

> Planning is essentially a social activity in which people negotiate personal and organizational interests. An educational program is never constructed by a single planner acting outside an institutional and social context. Rather, programs are constructed by people with multiple interests working in specific institutional contexts that profoundly affect their content and form (p. 4).

Recommendations for Further Study

While this research has developed a better understanding of how an educational leader's actions can contribute to a planning process that encourages the negotiation of the concerns and interests of stakeholders, the following recommendations for further study appear warranted.

First, I focused on one school district in order to allow myself to perform an in-depth study of the school district and its key stakeholders. Further research could expand to multiple sites in other parts of the state or perhaps the country. Research could be conducted that compares the facilities planning process in rural, suburban, and urban areas. Additional research could also be conducted that examines the planning processes at colleges and universities to determine how information from these settings could contribute to facilities planning process knowledge. Qualitative research that provided a detailed examination of a school district was the basis for this study. A mixed or quantitative study could be applied in an effort to further inform this study.

Another area for further study would be research that investigates the outcome of a school district's planning process. The research could compare the format of a school district's planning process with the effectiveness of the newly constructed school in meeting the needs of students and members of the school community. While the effectiveness of a planning process is critical to the planning and design of a new school, there must also be follow through and implementation of the master plan to lead to the successful construction of a school.

An additional area of study would involve researching the personal qualities, experience level, length of employment, and other factors directly related to superintendents who have undertaken a facilities planning process. The objective would

be to see what role these factors may play in the success or failure of a planning process.

One observation I noted was a superintendent who has had a long tenure in a school

district has the opportunity to establish relationships, understand the history of the school

district, accomplish short and long-range planning, develop credibility, evaluate and

assess past planning processes, and develop an effective and loyal administrative team

that contributes to the process. Such information could provide educational leaders with

insight into how these factors affect the planning process and the importance of

mentoring superintendents who will experience the planning process in the near future.

Another area for further study would be to investigate the role that university

graduate programs play in preparing educational leaders to facilitate educational facilities

planning. It would also be interesting to explore what, if any, type of assistance or

collaboration occurs between professors who teach facilities planning and educational

leaders who are in the field leading facilities planning. This type of research would

provide an evaluation of how well graduate programs are preparing educational leaders

for the considerable task of facilities planning. This would be useful information for

individuals in both K-12 and university settings.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

In conclusion, the implementation of an educational facilities planning process is

a critical issue facing many school districts in the United States. Whether the need for

planning a new school is brought about by rapid student growth or the need to replace

worn out, dilapidated schools, every school district faced with planning a school must be

prepared to implement the type of planning process that will meet the needs of students

being educated in the 21st century and members of the school community. In order for

these needs to be met, educational leaders must be able to create a collaborative and

meaningful planning process that not only focuses attention on the most effective

planning steps and technical strategies but also on the political and social dimensions that

are present throughout a planning process. My desire is that the qualitative data and

analysis provided by this study will assist educational leaders in addressing the

disconnect that exists between understanding the social and political context in which

people work together throughout a planning process and the ability to apply this

understanding in an authentic setting (Cervero and Wilson, 1994).

References

American Architectural Foundation and KnowledgeWorks Foundation. (2005). *Report from the national summit on school design*. Convened by the American Architectural Foundation and the KnowledgeWorks Foundation.

American Association of School Administrators. (1960). *Planning America's school buildings*. Washington, DC: Author.

Baratz, J. C., & Moskowitz, J. H. (1978). Proposition 13: How and why it happened. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60, 9-11.

Barton, T., Borrini-Feyerabend, G., de Sherbinin, A., & Warren, P. (1997). *Participatory action research: basic methods and techniques*. Retrieved November 12, 2007, from http://www.iucn.org/themes/spg/Files/opor/opor3_2.html

Bingler, S. (1995). Place as a form of knowledge. In Meek, A. (ed.), *Designing places for learning*. Alexandra, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 23-30.

Bingler, S., Quinn, L., & Sullivan, K. (2003). *Schools as centers of community: A citizen's guide for planning and design*. (2nd ed.). Washington, DC.

Bogdan, R. C., and Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An Introduction to theory and methods*. (3rd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L. G., and Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brubaker, J. S. (1947). *A history of problems in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Bryson, J.M. (1995). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide*

to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement. San

Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Building Futures. (2004). *21st Century schools: Learning environments for the future*.

http://www.buildingfutures.org.uk.

Burby, R. J., III & Donnelly, T. G. (1997). *Schools in new Communities: New community

research series*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Campbell, R. F., Cunningham, L. L., Nystrand, R. O., & Usdan, M. D. (1980). *The

organization and control of American schools*, (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles

E. Merrill Publishing.

Carter, G. R., & Cunningham, W. G. (1997). *The American school

superintendent: Leading in an age of pressure*. San Francisco, CA:

Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Castaldi, B. (1977). *Educational facilities: Planning, remodeling, and management*.

Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Castaldi, B. (1982). *Educational facilities: Planning, modernization, and

management*. (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (1994). *Planning responsibly for adult

education: A guide to negotiating power and interests*. San Francisco, CA:

Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (2006). *Working the planning table:

Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing, and workplace education*. San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

The City's Schools: A treasure. (1930, July 27). *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

Coffey, H. E. (1992). *Guidelines for planning future public school facilities: A trends-oriented approach*. (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 1992.) Dissertation Abstracts International, 53-03, 0670.

Coghlan, D., & Brannick, T. (2005). *Doing action research in your own organization*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crampton, F. E., & Thompson, D. C. (2003). *Saving America's school infrastructure*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Cubberley, E. P. (1948). *The history of education*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, Co.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Educational Essentialism. *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc*., (2007) Retrieved June 29, 2007, from http://wikimediafoundation.org/wiki/Home

Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc. (1960). *The cost of a schoolhouse*. The Georgian Press, Inc.

Elgstrom, O. & Riis, U. (1992). Framed negotiations and negotiated frames. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 35, (2), 161-177.

Engelhardt, N. L. (1970). *Complete guide for planning new schools*. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.

Erekson, E. L. (1980). Identifying, removing architectural barriers. *NASSP Bulletin*, 64, 102—108.

Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the face of power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fullan, M. (1992). *What is worth fighting for in headship?* Buckingham: Open University

    Press.

Gillham, Bill. (2000). *Case study research methods*. New York: NY: Continuum.

Glossary. (2007). Retrieved July 1, 2008, from

    http://www.stanford.edu/group/arts/nicaragua/student/mural/glossary.html

Gwynne, S. K. (Eds.). (1976). *Guide for planning educational facilities*.

    Columbus, OH: Council of Educational Facility Planners, Int.

Hansman, C. A. (2004). Planning for communities: Practice and politics in the real world.

    Adult Learning, 14 (2), 10-12.

Harrison, W.K. & Dobbin, C.E. (1931). *School buildings of today and tomorrow*. New

    York: Architectual Book Publishing Company, Inc.

Hoepfl, M. C. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education

    researchers. *Journal of Technology*, 9 (2), 1-17.

Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M., & West, M. (1994). *School improvement in an era of*

    change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hudson, R. (2007, November 2). Designer of schools makes sure to get the process in

    place first. *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

Hudson, A., Luttrell, C, & Nash, R. (2006). *Mapping Political Context: A Tool Kit for*

    Civil Society Organisations. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Jennings, W. B. (1992). Starting new schools: Lessons for success. *Center on*

    Organization and restructuring of schools. Madison, WI.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. (2nd ed.).

    New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kowalski, T. J. (1983). *Solving educational facility problems*. Muncie,

      IN: Accelerated Development, Inc.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York:

      HarperCollins Publishers.

Leu, D. J. (1965). *Planning Educational Facilities*. New York: The Center for

      Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Lackney, J. (2001, September). *Classrooms of the future: Thinking out of the box*. Paper

      presented at the Annual Michigan Educational Facilities Conference, 9, 1-

      19. Retrieved September 15, 2007, from CSA Illumina.

Lewis, A., Bednarek, D., Chion-Kenney, L., Harrison, C., Kolodzy, J., McCormick, K.,

      Smith, J., Speich, D., & Walker, L. (1989). *Wolves at the schoolhouse door: An*

      investigation of the condition of public school buildings. Washington, DC:

      Education Writers Association.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

      Publications, Inc.

MacConnell, J. D. (1957). *Planning for school buildings*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-

      Hall, Inc.

Mauer, M. M., & Davidson, G. S. (1998). *Leadership in instructional technology*.

      Columbus, OH: Merrill.

McGuffey, C. W. (1973). *Systematic planning for educational facilities*. Chicago, IL:

      Chicago Board of Education.

Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

      Publications, Inc.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of Organization*. (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Thousand Oaks,

      CA: Sage Publication, Inc.

Myers, Nancy R. (2000). Planning the planning process: Building educational facilities.

      School Planning and Management. March 2000. 1-2.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). *How old are America's public schools?*

      Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *Condition of America's public*

      School facilties: 1999. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Ortiz, F. I. (1994). *Schoolhousing: Planning and designing educational facilities*. Albany,

      NY: State university of New York Press.

Olmstead, J. A. (2002). *Creating the functionally competent organization: The open*

      systems approach. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Passmore, S. (2002). *Education and Smart Growth: Reversing school sprawl*

      for better schools and communities. Translation Paper.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text*.

      (3ʳᵈ ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pearson, Eric. (1972). *Trends in school design*. New York: Citation Press.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*. Boston:

Harvard Business School Press.

Pilcher, L. (1948). *Encyclopedia Americana*. (Vol. 2. p. 183).

Pulliam, J. D., & Van Patten, J. J. (2003). History of education in America. (8ᵗʰ

      ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Riley, R. W. (1999). *Schools as center of communities*. Remarks as prepared

for delivery by U.S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley.

Roth, A. (1957). *The new school*. New York: Frederick Praeger.

Scheerens, J. (2000). *Fundamentals of educational planning: Improving school effectiveness*. France: SAGIM.

Schneider, M. (2002). *Do school facilities affect academic outcomes?* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities. Retrieved October 30, 2006 from http://www.edfacilities.org

Senge, P. (1990) *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Tanner, K. C. (1991). Planning in the content of state policy making. In Tanner, C. K., & Lackney, J. A. *Educational Facilities Planning: Leadership, architecture, and management*. (p. 69). Pearson Education, Inc.   .

Tanner, C. K., & Lackney, J. A. (2006). *Educational Facilities Planning: Leadership, architecture, and management*. Pearson Education, Inc.

Thomas, K. (2006). *The school of the future*. Bristol, UK: Future Lab Innovation in Education.

Thomas, R. M., & Brubaker, D. L. (2000). *Theses and dissertations: A guide to planning, research, and writing*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Umble, K. E., Cervero, R. M., & Langone, C. A. (2001). Negotiating about power,

frames, and continuing education: A case study in public health. *Adult Education Quarterly*. 51, (2), 128-145.

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1975). *Perspectives on general systems theory*. New York: George Braziller.

Washor, E. (2003). *Innovative pedagogy and school facilities*. DesignShare.com.

Westview School District Web Page. (2007). *History*. Retrieved from http://www. _ _ _ _ _ _.org

Wilcox, J. (2006, November). Building schools that build learners. *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*, 48, (11), 1-8.

Wilder, D. E. (1976). Goals for new schools: Agreement, succession and displacement. *Center for Policy Research*. New York, NY.

Wilson, B. G. (2001). Trends and futures of education: Implications for distance education. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*.

Yang, B and Cervero, R. M. (2001). Power and influence styles in programme planning: relationship with organizational political contexts. *Int. J. of Lifelong Education*. 65, (4), 289-296.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Designs and methods*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organization*. (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A

Participant Interview Protocol

Superintendent Interview Questions

1. What key elements do you include during a planning process in order to design a school that will meet the needs of students being educated in the 21st century?

2. How do you make certain those key elements are included during a planning process?

3. How has the tremendous student population growth the district has experienced during your tenure as superintendent influenced the way you approach the planning process?

4. How has the district's need to plan and construct schools in such a short time frame affected the way you approach the planning process?

5. What qualities do you feel a leader must demonstrate to successfully guide a school district through a period when tremendous growth requires the addition of schools?

6. How do you take into account current research that encourages planners to engage a cross-section of the community in the planning process?

7. How do you take into account current research that encourages planners to design schools as community resources? Where the cafeteria, the computer lab, the gym, and the library are available to the public even after the school day ends?

8. Describe how you determine what role district and community stakeholders will assume in a planning process? What is the range of involvement and roles these stakeholders might have in the process?

9. How do you address the issue of schools that may be 30 or 40 years old and the parents of those schools perceive the condition of their school places their

children at a disadvantage to children who will be attending a newly constructed school?

10. What method do you use to identify key issues that are needed to properly align the community's support?

11. How do you prepare district stakeholders for the changes and issues that take place as a result of school district growth? (i.e. reconfiguring attendance boundaries)

12. How do you open up dialogue with district stakeholders on the important issues in the community?

13. Tell me about your approach when stakeholders bring their own interests to the planning process?

14. Tell me about your approach to resolve conflicts during the planning process?

15. How do you negotiate the personal and organizational interests that are represented by the stakeholders involved in the planning process?

Appendix B

Participant Interview Protocol

Construction Manager Interview Questions

1. What is your role as a project manager in creating a school that will meet the needs of students being educated in the 21st century?

2. What role do key district officials, such as superintendents and principals, assume during the planning and construction of *Lincoln High School*?

3. How do those key district officials communicate their vision and objectives for the planning, design, and construction of the school?

4. Based on your past and present experience, how have the roles of district stakeholders, such as teachers, parents, students, and community members, changed when planning a new school?

5. How would you assess the level of involvement stakeholders in the *Westview School District* have assumed during the planning and design of the high school?

6. How do you establish open lines of communication with district officials during the planning and construction of a school?

7. How has the *Westview School District's* need to plan and construct schools in such a short time frame due to tremendous growth affected the way you approach the planning process?

8. What qualities do you feel a district leader must demonstrate to successfully guide a school district through the planning, design, and construction of a school?

9. What is your involvement in negotiating key issues that district stakeholders bring to the planning process?

10. Tell me about the concept of a "shell" and a "standardized design" for schools that can be flexible enough to meet the needs of community members in the future.

11. What is the most rewarding part of your work?

Appendix C

Participant Interview Protocol

Architect Interview Questions

1. Please describe your role and involvement in planning and designing new schools in the *Westview School District*.

2. How do you stay current on best practices as related to planning and designing the educational space needed to facilitate the instructional programs of students being educated in the 21st century?

3. Please describe the importance of including district and community stakeholders during the planning and design of educational space?

4. What roles did *Dr. Johnson* and *Mr. Smith* assume during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

5. What qualities do you feel *Dr. Johnson* possesses that have allowed him to successfully guide *Westview School District* to plan and design schools that enhance student learning?

6. What were the roles of students, parents, and teachers during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

7. Based on your experience, how often did conversations regarding the impact of the school's environment and space take place during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

8. How do you encourage dialogue with key district stakeholders on the important issues that come about during the planning and design of a school?

9. What role do you believe *Dr. Johnson's* past experiences in planning and designing schools has played in his ability guide *Westview* during the district's rapid growth?

10. How do key district officials communicate their vision and objectives for the planning, design, and construction of a school?

11. How did you establish open lines of communication with district officials during the planning and construction of *Lincoln High School*?

12. Please describe the process for negotiating the personal and organizational interests that are represented by the stakeholders involved in planning and designing schools?

Appendix D

Participant Interview Protocol

Assistant Superintendent Interview Questions

1. Please describe your experience and involvement in planning and designing new schools in the *Westview School District.*

2. How is current research related to providing educational space that will support 21st century learning taken into account during the planning and design of new schools in the *Westview School District*?

3. How do you stay current on best practices as related to planning and designing educational space for the instructional programs of students being educated in the 21st century?

4. Based on your experience, do the needs of instructional programs translate into space (square footage) requirements during the planning and design of new schools in the *Westview School District*?

5. Based on your experience, how often do conversations regarding the impact of a school's environment and space take place during the planning and design of new schools in the *Westview School District*?

6. What qualities do you feel *Dr. Johnson* possesses that have allowed him to successfully guide *Westview* to plan and design schools that enhance student learning?

7. Describe the importance of including district and community stakeholders during the planning and design of educational space?

8. What does the district do to anticipate the facility needs for instructional and educational programs that may be implemented in the future?

9. Please describe the process for negotiating the personal and organizational interests that are represented by the stakeholders involved in planning and designing schools?

Appendix E

Participant Interview Protocol

Parent Interview Questions

1. Please describe your role and involvement in planning and designing *Lincoln High School*?

2. How were you selected to be a member of the Steering Committee for the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

3. How have you informed yourself on best practices as related to planning and designing a school that will best serve the students being educated in the *Westview School District*?

4. How did district officials inform or educate you about how to use the planning process to design a school that will provide the most effective learning environment possible?

5. Please describe the importance of including community stakeholders during the planning and design process of a school?

6. How did you go about representing or being the voice of the community during the planning and design process of *Lincoln High School*?

7. Do you feel that *Lincoln High School* was designed with the needs of the community in mind? For example, will the school serve the needs of the surrounding community that it serves?

8. What role did *Dr. Johnson* assume during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

9. What qualities do you feel *Dr. Johnson* possesses that have allowed him to successfully guide *Westview* to plan and design schools that enhance student learning?

10. What were the roles of students, parents, and teachers during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

11. Based on your experience on the steering committee, how often did conversations take place regarding the design of the school's space and the effect that space would have on student learning? What role do you believe *Dr. Johnson's* past experiences in planning and designing schools played in his ability guide the steering committee during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

12. What methods do key district officials use to communicate their vision and objectives for the planning, design, and construction of a school to the patrons of the district? What feedback have you received from students, parents, teachers, and community members regarding the design, planning and construction of *Lincoln High School*?

13. How did the planning process of *Lincoln High School* address the rapidly changing educational needs of students who are being prepared and educated for life in the 21st century?

14. Please describe the process that was used for negotiating the personal interests that were presented by the stakeholders involved in planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

15. Based on your experience on the steering committee, what recommendations would you make that would assist future planning committees in planning and designing a school?

Appendix F

Participant Interview Protocol

Board Member Interview Questions

1. Please describe your role and involvement in planning and designing *Lincoln High School* and any other schools in the district?

2. When you are a part of a steering committee to plan and design schools what are your major objectives during the planning process?

3. Please describe the importance of including district and community stakeholders during the planning and design of schools?

4. What roles did *Dr. Johnson* and *Mr. Smith* assume during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

5. What qualities do you feel *Dr. Johnson* possesses that have allowed him to successfully guide *Westview School District* to plan and design schools that enhance student learning?

6. What were the roles of students, parents, and teachers during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

7. How much dialogue takes place regarding the impact of the school's environment during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

8. What role did the input from district stakeholders have on the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

9. What role do you believe *Dr. Johnson's* past experiences in planning and designing schools has played in his ability guide *Westview* during the district's rapid growth?

10. How do key district officials communicate their vision and objectives for the planning, design, and construction of a school to the patrons of the district?

11. What feedback have you received from students, parents, teachers, and community members regarding the design, planning and implementation of *Lincoln High School*?

12. How has the planning process of *Lincoln High School* result in a school that provides educational space that will support 21st century learning for all students?

13. Please describe the process for negotiating the personal and organizational concerns that are represented by the stakeholders involved in planning and designing schools?

14. Based on your experience in planning and designing schools, what recommendations (both negative and positive) would you make to future planning committees regarding planning and designing a school?

Appendix G

Participant Interview Protocol

Principal Interview Questions

1. Please describe your role and involvement in planning and designing *Lincoln High School* or any other school in the district?

2. How did you inform yourself on best practices as related to planning and designing a school that would facilitate the instructional programs of students being educated in the 21st century?

3. Please describe the importance of including district and community stakeholders during the planning and design of schools?

4. What roles did *Dr. Johnson* and *Mr. Smith* assume during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

5. What qualities do you feel *Dr. Johnson* possesses that have allowed him to successfully guide *Westview School District* to plan and design schools that enhance student learning?

6. What were the roles of students, parents, and teachers during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

7. Based on your experience, how often did conversations regarding the impact of the school's environment take place during the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

8. What role did the input from district stakeholders have on the planning and design of *Lincoln High School*?

9. What role do you believe *Dr. Johnson's* past experiences in planning and designing schools has played in his ability guide *Westview* during the district's rapid growth?

10. How do key district officials communicate their vision and objectives for the planning, design, and construction of a school to the patrons of the district?

11. What feedback have you received from students, parents, teachers, and community members regarding the design, planning and implementation of *Westview School District*?

12. How has the planning process of *Lincoln High School* result in a school that provides educational space that will support 21st century learning for all students?

13. Please describe the process for negotiating the personal and organizational interests that are represented by the stakeholders involved in planning and designing schools?

14. Based on your experience at *Lincoln High School* so far, what recommendations (both negative and positive) would you make to future planning committees regarding planning and designing a school?

Appendix H

Interviewee Consent Form

Interview Consent Form

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study on the planning process of an educational facility. The purpose of this study is to examine the social and political dimensions of the planning process, and as a result, increase my understanding of how those dimensions affect the planning and design of an educational facility. This project is being conducted as part of my Dissertation for my Doctorate in Education at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Data for this study will be collected using open-ended and semi-structured interviews that will last for approximately 45 minutes to 90 minutes. Interviews will be taped to ensure accurate and consistent data collection and to assist in data analysis. The information I acquire through interviews will be organized and collected so that I can make meaning of the social and political dimensions that affect the educational facilities planning process. The names of interviewees will not be shared at any time.

It would also be beneficial if I could make observations during meetings where the planning process is being discussed. The information regarding those meeting would come from my discussions with participants of the study.

Your involvement in this study represents no risk to you as a participant. Your willingness to volunteer is entirely up to you, and if you wish to cancel the interview, you may do so at any time. Your identity will be protected in the reporting of my findings. On the tape and tape transcripts only a number will identify you. I must maintain copies of all important information related to the study, including, video and audiotapes, instruments, copies of written consent agreements, and any other supportive documents for a period of three years from the date of completion of my study.

Please don't hesitate to ask questions during the interview or after the interview is completed. If you have any questions or concerns after the interview has been completed please call Todd L. Kraft at 636-294-1333. If you have any other questions or concerns at any time please feel free to contact the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus IRB at 483 McReynolds Hall at 573-882-9585.

Your signature below indicates you have read and understand the purpose of this study, and are willing to participate in this study. I appreciate your time and assistance.

Signature:_____   Date:_____

VITA

Todd Lee Kraft was born and raised in Lake City, Iowa. This small-town farming community provided a "Mayberry" like environment and an excellent school system. While growing up he enjoyed participating in high school sports and playing basketball in his garage or on the elementary basketball court—usually with his best friend, Bret Hicks.

He attended Evangel College in Springfield, Missouri where he earned a B.S. degree in Communication and received his teaching certificate in journalism and English. At Evangel College he worked on the college newspaper staff writing sports stories in preparation for his future career with Sports Illustrated.

His first teaching position was as a journalism and English teacher in El Dorado Springs, Missouri. He then moved to Rolla, Missouri and taught journalism and English at Salem High School and then Rolla High School. During this time he completed his Master's and Educational Specialist degrees in administration from the University of Missouri—Columbia. While working on these two degrees he had the good fortune to work with two exceptional educational leaders—Dr. Jim Simpson and Dr. Roger Berkbuegler.

In 1999, he took his first position as an assistant principal in St. James, Missouri. During this time he began working on his educational doctorate degree through the University of Missouri—Columbia. In 2003, he began working in the Wentzville R-IV School District where he is currently an assistant principal at Green Tree Elementary. While working in the Wentzville School District he has been blessed to have two

outstanding mentors—Mr. John Schulte and Mr. John Waters. Both of these outstanding

leaders put people first and programs second.

    In addition to his educational endeavors, Kraft enjoys spending time vacationing

with his family, landscaping his yard, and proving to his children that he is still the fastest

person in the family.