

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
THE TASKS AND ROLES OF A PRINCIPAL-ELECT
DURING THE PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION
OF NEW EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
IN URBAN MANITOBA

BY

RON GUARINO

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

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

FEBRUARY 1980

THE TASKS AND ROLES OF A PRINCIPAL-ELECT
DURING THE PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION
OF NEW EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
IN URBAN MANITOBA

BY

RONALD AUGUST CHARLES GUARINO

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

MASTER OF EDUCATION

©1980

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the generous assistance and guidance I received from my advisor, Dr. J.A. Riffel. I am further indebted to Dr. Philip Husby and Dr. Louis Maurice who served on my committee. I wish to thank the sixteen principals-elect who gave me valuable assistance by providing information for the study. I am most grateful to Mrs. Ruth Fennell who sacrificed her evenings and weekends to type my proposal and the preliminary draft, and also to Louise Graham who typed the final draft of the thesis. Last but not least, a very special thank you to my wife, Bonnie, and my three children, Jodi, Jennifer, and Jay who on many occasions had to sacrifice our family time together to allow me the time to complete this thesis.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe actual and ideal practices concerning the tasks and roles of the principal-elect in the planning and construction of new educational facilities in Manitoba. The study focused upon questionnaire responses and interviews from urban Manitoba principals-elect who were appointed since January 1, 1970.

The responses to the questionnaire and to the interviews were analyzed and evaluated.

From the study it was determined that:

1. Urban Manitoba School Divisions have no written or unwritten policies regarding the timing of the appointment of a principal-elect, the criteria by which he was chosen, or the tasks for which he would be responsible.

2. The principals-elect are successfully completing the job of facilities planning leader which has been assigned to them by their respective school boards. They performed a wide variety of tasks with a great deal of authority and autonomy.

3. The major difficulties encountered by principals-elect were the lack of time, expertise and adequate help and guidance.

4. Some new Manitoba school buildings may not adequately reflect the philosophy and/or the anticipated educational activities of its principal and teachers since many principals and teachers were not sufficiently involved in the development of educational specifications.

5. The most important phase in the whole process of facilities planning, as seen by the principals-elect, was Staff Selection. Other phases which principals-elect felt were important were: Curriculum Development; Preparing the Facility for Use; and Educational Specifications.

6. The list of phases used in this study accurately and realistically represents the actual order of completion of phases for Manitoba schools.

This study is significant in that for the first time the tasks and roles of the facilities planning leader are examined in detail. Furthermore this study can serve as a helpful guide for: future principals-elect; school superintendents who plan to delegate the leadership of the facilities planning process; school divisions who wish to guide future principals-elect; and Department of Education officials who must work with, and help principals-elect.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	x
Chapter	
1. THE PROBLEM	1
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	1
SIGNIFICANCE	3
DESIGN OF STUDY	4
DELIMITATIONS AND LIMITATIONS	4
DEFINITION OF TERMS	5
Principal-Elect	5
Areas of Concern	5
Phase	5
Specific Task	6
Roles	6
Executive Role	6
Advisory Role	6
Supportive Role	7
ORGANIZATION	7
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
INTRODUCTION	8
FACILITIES PLANNING PROCESS	9
CHANGING ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL	16

Chapter	Page
Planning and Constructing a New Educational Facility	16
Educational Specifications	21
3. METHODOLOGY	25
INTRODUCTION	25
THE PROCEDURE	25
4. FINDINGS	29
INTRODUCTION	29
APPOINTMENT OF PRINCIPALS-ELECT	29
ACTUAL AND IDEAL AMOUNTS OF TIME DEVOTED TO THE PROJECT	33
PHASES IN WHICH PRINCIPALS-ELECT TOOK AN ACTIVE ROLE	37
THE PHASES IN WHICH PRINCIPALS-ELECT THOUGHT THEY SHOULD TAKE AN ACTIVE ROLE	40
SPECIFIC TASKS PERFORMED BY PRINCIPALS-ELECT DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS	43
SPECIFIC TASKS PRINCIPALS-ELECT WOULD LIKE TO HAVE PERFORMED OR ELIMINATED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS	44
Tasks the Principals-Elect Would Like to Have Performed	44
SPECIFIC TASKS PERFORMED BY PRINCIPALS-ELECT WHILE PARTICIPATING IN THEIR MOST ACTIVE AREAS	48
SPECIFIC TASKS PRINCIPALS-ELECT WOULD LIKE TO HAVE PERFORMED BUT DID NOT	51
SPECIFIC TASKS PRINCIPALS-ELECT WOULD HAVE LIKED TO ELIMINATE	54
PHASES IN WHICH PRINCIPALS-ELECT PERFORMED AN EXECUTIVE, ADVISORY, OR SUPPORTIVE ROLE	55
ACTUAL AND RECOMMENDED ROLE OF PRINCIPALS-ELECT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS	57

Chapter	Page
RECOMMENDED ROLES OF PRINCIPALS-ELECT IN THE VARIOUS PHASES	59
PHASES IDENTIFIED AS BEING THE MOST IMPORTANT	60
PHASES, TASKS, INDIVIDUALS, CIRCUMSTANCES OR OTHER ITEMS WHICH CAUSED THE MOST DIFFICULTY	61
GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS BY PRINCIPALS-ELECT	63
UNANTICIPATED FINDINGS	66
5. ANALYSIS OF THE TASKS AND ROLES OF THE PRINCIPALS-ELECT	69
GENERAL OBSERVATIONS REGARDING THE ACTUAL ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL-ELECT	69
GENERAL OBSERVATIONS REGARDING THE IDEAL ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL-ELECT	73
THE FINDINGS IN RELATION TO THE LITERATURE	75
THE IDEAL SITUATION	83
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	89
SUMMARY	89
The Problem	89
The Design of the Study	89
Summary of Findings	90
CONCLUSIONS	92
RECOMMENDATIONS	94
AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY	94
Incidence of Principals-Elect	95
Advantages and Disadvantages	95
Staff Hiring	95
Importance of Phases	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY	97

Chapter	Page
APPENDIXES	
A. SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE	102
B. POSSIBLE PHASES IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW EDUCATIONAL FACILITY IN MANITOBA	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Criteria for Choosing a Principal-Elect	30
2. Actual Amount of Working Time Devoted to Planning and Construction the Facility	34
3. Actual Amount of Personal Time Devoted by Principals-Elect	35
4. Ideal Amount of Working Time to be Devoted to Planning and Constructing as Viewed by the Principals-Elect	36
5. The Most Active Phases Performed by Principals-Elect	38
6. The Most Active Areas of Involvement Performed by Principals-Elect	39
7. The Phases in Which Principals-Elect Felt They Should Take An Active Role	41
8. The Areas of Involvement in Which Principals- Elect Felt They Should Be Most Active	42
9. Specific Tasks Relating to Developing Educational Specifications	45
10. Specific Tasks Relating to Staff Selection	48
11. Specific Tasks Relating to Curriculum Development	49
12. Specific Tasks Relating to Opening the Facility	50
13. Specific Tasks Relating to Building Design and Planning	51
14. Specific Tasks Relating to Developing Educational Specifications	52
15. Specific Tasks Relating to Construction	53
16. The Phases in Which the Principals-Elect Performed an Executive Role	55

Table	Page
17. The Phases in Which the Principals-Elect Performed an Advisory Role	56
18. The Phases in Which the Principals-Elect Performed a Supportive Role	56
19. Actual Role Played by Principals-Elect in Developing the Educational Specifications	57
20. Phases Most Important to Principals-Elect	60
21. Items Which Caused Principals-Elect Their Most Difficulty	62
22. General Recommendations and Improvements Suggested by the Principals-Elect	64

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

It appears to be an increasingly common practice in Manitoba for school boards to appoint principals-elect when they are preparing to build a new educational facility. This individual assumes responsibilities connected with the planning, constructing, equipping, staffing, budgeting and developing of the school program. These responsibilities are a prelude to the day-to-day administration of the school once it has opened. In some instances these are responsibilities for which the "principal-elect" has not been trained and in which he has had no experience. Furthermore he may not have had any practical guidelines which he could follow, in order to complete the task successfully. The principal often has no prior knowledge of the total number of areas for which he is responsible nor of the tasks involved and the scope of his responsibility.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to describe actual and ideal practices concerning the tasks and roles of the "principal-elect" in the development of educational specifications for, and in the planning and construction of, new educational facilities in urban Manitoba.

This study was guided by the following questions:

1. What are the actual policies of various Manitoba School

Divisions regarding the appointment of principals-elect?

2. What is the current and ideal amount of time devoted to the project by principals-elect?
3. In what areas or phases of the planning and construction process did the principals-elect take an active role?
4. In what areas or phases of the planning and construction process did the principals-elect feel they should have taken an active role?
5. What specific tasks did the principals-elect perform in the development of educational specifications for the new facility?
6. What specific tasks did the principals-elect indicate that they would have liked to perform, but did not, during the development of educational specifications for the new facility? Also what specific tasks did the principals want to eliminate in this area?
7. What specific tasks did the principals-elect perform during their participation in areas or phases in which they played active roles?
8. What specific tasks did the principals-elect indicate they would have liked to perform during the whole process but did not?
9. What specific tasks would the principals-elect indicate that they did perform but would have rather eliminated during the whole process?
10. In what areas or phases did the principals-elect perform an executive, advisory, or supportive role?
11. What was the actual and recommended role of principals-elect in the development of educational specifications?
12. What were the recommended roles of principals-elect in

the various phases of the project?

13. What phases did the principals-elect identify as being the most important to them?

14. What phases, tasks, individuals, circumstances or other items caused the principals-elect their most difficulty?

15. What general recommendations and improvements did the principals-elect suggest?

SIGNIFICANCE

As the review of the literature in Chapter 2 points out it is only fairly recently that the principal has been acknowledged as a prime participant in the planning and building process. However the literature fails to point out the extent to which the principals participate in the process. Also no mention is made of the tasks currently performed by the principal nor of the tasks which should be performed by the principal. The value of this study lies in the possibility that it may lead to guidelines for; people appointed principals-elect; principals involved in renovations or new additions to existing schools; school divisions so that they might properly instruct their future principals-elect as to their roles and expected responsibilities.

Furthermore, although no two school administrators or principals-elect will face exactly the same kinds of decisions, tasks, and responsibilities, it is assumed that the general task of planning and developing a new educational facility and its accompanying problems have sufficient universality that other administrators, school trustees, building superintendents and Department of Education

officials may benefit from this study.

DESIGN OF STUDY

Briefly, the design of the study involved several steps:

First, persons were identified who are or were principals-elect since January 1, 1970.

Second, several persons deemed to be principals-elect were requested to be consultants for the remainder of the study.

Third, a preliminary questionnaire and a list of phases considered to be essential to the development of educational specifications and to the planning and construction of new educational facilities was developed.

Fourth, the questionnaire and the list of phases following interviews with the consultants was revised.

Fifth, the questionnaire and the list of phases was mailed out to all persons deemed principal-elect in Urban Manitoba.

Sixth, the data from the survey and interviews were analyzed to determine the answers to the research questions.

LIMITATIONS

For the purpose of this study the following limitations were made:

1. The person to be interviewed were limited to those persons identified by their respective school superintendents as being principals-elect.

2. The study was limited to those decisions, tasks and roles which the principal-elect actually assumed, either alone or in

conjunction with others. It is acknowledged that the senior administration of each school division would be the final decision maker in many cases.

3. The study was limited to the building of new educational facilities and did not include major renovations or additions.

4. Only those persons deemed principal-elect since January 1, 1970 were consulted.

5. The study was limited to responses from urban Manitoba School Divisions.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Principal-Elect

A principal-elect was defined as that person identified or appointed by the school division superintendent, and who had participated in the development of educational specifications or in the planning and construction process of a new educational facility. The principal-elect generally assumed the duties of a principal following the preparation and completion of a new educational facility, but whose actual duties began some time prior to the first day of occupancy by the school children.

Areas of Concern

The two areas of concern in this study were (a) the development of educational specifications for a new educational facility; (b) the planning and construction of such a facility.

Phase

The term "phase" was defined as a stage or interval which must

be completed in the process of planning and constructing a new educational facility.

Specific Task

The term "specific task" referred to a piece of work imposed, exacted or undertaken as a duty by the principal-elect in the areas of concern. The word task denotes action. Words such as job and activity were used as synonyms.

Roles

The term "roles" in this study was used to denote the nature of the principal-elect's responsibility in regard to tasks he performed in the major areas of concern. Three possible roles were identified.

Executive Role

The term "Executive role" referred to having the responsibility to put into effect, to direct or to control. Specifically the types of roles the principals-elect played were:

- (a) Accounts for the complete execution of the task,
- (b) Plans procedures and policies,
- (c) Arranges and co-ordinates tasks.

Advisory Role

The term "Advisory role" indicated a responsibility of giving advice, counsel, and recommendations as opposed to binding instructions. Specifically the types of roles the principals-elect played were:

- (a) Consults with other persons involved in the process,

- (b) Makes recommendations.

Supportive Role

The term "supportive role" referred to supplying or furnishing data or such other information to aid others in decision making.

ORGANIZATION

Chapter 2 presents a critical review of some selected literature. It briefly traces the development of educational architecture and facilities planning. This is followed by a discussion of the trend to decentralization. The chapter concludes by tracing the inclusion of a principal-elect in the planning and construction process.

Chapter 3 provides a detailed description of the methodology used.

Chapter 4 contains a detailed description of the findings based upon the research questions. Included in this chapter are a number of tables illustrating some of the data gathered, as well as a discussion of some unanticipated findings.

Chapter 5 features a detailed analysis of the findings including conclusions regarding the actual role of principals-elect as well as the ideal role of principals-elect. The chapter goes on to discuss the findings in relation to the literature and concludes with a description of the ideal situation for a principal-elect.

Chapter 6 concludes the study with a general summary of the major findings, the conclusions drawn, a number of recommendations, and several suggestions for further study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature dealing with the tasks and roles of the principal-elect with regard to the planning and construction of new educational facilities and development of educational specifications. The chapter will briefly describe the changes in facilities planning with emphasis on the team approach and the apparent move from centralization to decentralization in terms of decision making. The chapter will also consider the changing role of the principal in relation to the planning and construction of new educational facilities, and in the development of educational specifications.

Much has been written about educational facility planning and yet very little of the information is related specifically to the school principal. However it would appear from the literature that the principal is indeed becoming highly involved in the process after a lengthy evolutionary process. As Aline Aubert stated, "The role of the principal, whether it be deemed leadership or management or both, is changing at such a whirlwind pace it leaves us not only breathless but gasping."¹

¹Aline Aubert, "The Elementary Principal, The Person in the Middle," Thrust For Educational Leadership, Vol. IV, Number 4 (March, 1975), p. 14.

FACILITIES PLANNING PROCESS

Traditionally the leaders in educational facility planning were, and still are, the school board, the school superintendent and the architect.² Originally, the school board and the senior administrator or superintendent, treated the situation as an architectural problem. Meager data such as: the total number of students to be housed, grades that were to be involved; and the total amount of funds available for the project, would be given to the architect who, in turn, was primarily responsible for developing the facility. The architect was thus forced into a role of describing how to establish instructional space and anticipating its potential use and the overall function of the school.³

One of the early pioneers of proper school design was Henry Barnard, whose book School Architecture first published in 1846, "defined the character of school architecture in the United States."⁴ He was one of the first persons to bring architecture and educational pedagogy into co-operation. Through this co-operation he determined the characteristic concerns to which designers of schools must still attend.⁵

²W.D. McLurkin, School Building Planning (New York: Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 10.

³James M. Thrasher, Effective Planning for Better Schools (Midland: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973), p. 3.

⁴Jean and Robert McClintock, Henry Barnard's School Architecture (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1970), pp. 5-6.

⁵Ibid., p. 6.

The point to be noted here was that generally it was the architect's responsibility to anticipate the educational organization and the techniques to be employed and then to incorporate these concerns into his building in order to make it operationally efficient. In practice the architect was the original leader in educational facilities planning.

Nevertheless, the final responsibility for the new facility ultimately passes from the architect to the school superintendent or senior administrator, to the school board. Both of whom were content, or had to be content, with the resulting facility since they chose not to have any input into its design or plan.

School architects, by approximately 1925, developed several desirable attributes of school buildings. These attributes appear to have been (a) adaptation of educational needs, (b) safety, (c) healthfulness, (d) expansibility, (e) flexibility, (f) convenience, (g) durability, (h) aesthetic fitness, and (i) economy.⁶

It is a credit to the early architects of school facilities that these desirable attributes are not very different from those being sought today. The blame for poorly designed or non-functional schools cannot be attributed solely to the architects of that time. Their goals were worthy ones. Educators did not appear to make a serious effort to become involved with the planning of educational facilities.

It should be noted however, that the educational and

⁶Frank I. Cooper, et al., Report of the Committee on School House Planning, a Report prepared by the National Education Association (Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1925, p. 14.

architectural concerns were now more clearly articulated. The facility was no longer looked upon solely as a shelter but was expanded to include within it such things as: comfort; positive learning environments; and functionalism, with a continual look to the future.

This increased concern for the facility came about namely from a new architectural principle which arose first of all in Europe. That belief was simply, that "form followed function."⁷ Briefly, that meant that in order for an architect to properly design any building he had to know what was going to happen inside that building.

This had great ramifications for educational facilities. Architects began to ask educators, usually the superintendent, about the activities going on inside the school house. Some educators were now being forced into taking a more active role in facility planning while other educators no doubt welcomed their inclusion. It now became the responsibility of the superintendent or senior administrator to supply the architect with a complete list of the tasks and activities taking place in the school house. This list, now in expanded form, could presently be called the educational specifications. The new leader of the facilities planning process was now either the superintendent or the architect, or both.

It was now apparent that the architect no longer operated in isolation. It was the beginning of a team approach to educational facility planning, combining architects and educators. There is no

⁷Basil Castaldi, Creative Planning of Educational Facilities (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969), p. 13.

doubt that initially the team approach likely still produced many mistakes. Nevertheless it was a beginning.

Since World War II the planning of functional school buildings has been the primary goal of both architects and educators.⁸ The team approach has now been expanded to include consultants, teacher groups, co-ordinators, principals, students, community groups, and other special interest groups.⁹ The executive planning team, those ultimately responsible for the facility, still include the school board, the superintendent, and the architect. Now it appears that the superintendents are delegating their role in the process to others such as the educational consultant or the principal.

The emerging role of the principal in the facility planning process must be viewed first from the overall shift in the organization of education to decentralization. Recent studies have shown that school districts or school divisions are becoming larger, either through natural growth or by amalgamation of school districts or divisions.¹⁰ Increasingly persons in central authority are becoming out of touch with local citizens, situations, and circumstances. One way to correct this situation was to make conscious efforts to include local persons such as principals, teachers and citizens on the

⁸ Ibid., p. 13.

⁹ James M. Thrasher, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

Wisconsin Association of School Boards, To Create a School (Winneconne, Wisconsin, Wisconsin Association of School Boards, 1970), pp. 5-12.

¹⁰ Mary T. Moore, "Local School Program Planning--Organizational Implications" (A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., April 7, 1975), "Developments in Canadian Education, 1968-1969, Major Trends," Education Canada, Vol. IX, Number 3.

facilities planning team.

Interestingly, for many years it was the habit of most school boards not to encourage active participation by citizen groups in most phases of the educational operations of a community.¹¹

However as school board officials continued to strive for the creation of functional facilities, it was obvious that the local needs, character, strengths, and weaknesses had to be taken into account. Persons in central authority found it almost impossible to anticipate local conditions and situations without seeking help from their local employees, namely the principal and teachers. Educational planning could no longer take place without taking into account the local community. As James McCabe stated "Theory must, of course, incorporate the experiences of the practitioner for if it does not subscribe to reality it is useless."¹²

Furthermore it was realized if the local citizenry, including employees, were included in the planning and decision-making it might be possible that the uncomfortable, anti-bureaucratic and hostile feelings of the citizenry would diminish.

Whatever the reason, more and more decisions now appear to be made at the local level, although the school divisions or districts themselves are becoming larger. It can be said that school districts

¹¹Frederick W. Hill, "Decentralization vs. Centralization in Urban Development," Preconstruction Planning for Educational Facilities (Chicago: Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials, 1972), p. 58.

¹²James McCabe, "Some Administrative Aspects of Educational Planning" (Paris, France: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 112503, 1975).

or divisions are becoming larger and smaller at the same time.

There are certain benefits to be gained from this change to decentralization. The direct pay-off appears to be increased teacher morale and program effectiveness as well as a decrease in the hostility from the local citizenry.¹³

As school officials try to adapt to local needs, there is an accompanying realization that local educational needs can only be anticipated at the local school site. The person best qualified at the site is the principal. His role becomes critical especially since he no longer functions solely as the instructional leader but must also manage budgets, select and co-ordinate staff composed of differentiated specialists, and link his local school with other sub-systems of the school district's organization and of the community.¹⁴

Thus the role of a principal is no longer merely that of an educational leader. He is now being thrust into making more and more managerial decisions as the move to decentralization continues.

Many people seem to feel that the principals lack the expertise and training to prepare them for their new role as combined manager and educational leader. As Seymour Sarason stated "One can re-align forces of power, change, administrative structures, and increase budgets for materials and new personnel but the intended effects of all these changes will be drastically diluted by principals

¹³"Determinants and Effects of School Site Management Reform in California Public 18 Schools" cited by Mary T. Moore, "Local School Program Planning--Organizational Implications" (paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., April 7, 1975), p. 17.

¹⁴Moore, op. cit., pp. 19-21.

whose past experience and training interacting with certain personality factors ill prepares them for the role of educational, managerial and institutional leader."¹⁵

Principals are also concerned over the fact that their role as educational leader is seemingly diminishing while their managerial tasks increase.¹⁶

One task which combines the educational, managerial, and institutional skills, is facility planning. However it is debatable whether or not principals have the expertise or background to consider them qualified. As J. Clark Davis stated "most books on educational facilities tend to ignore the one person who must live with the facility day in and day out: the school principal."¹⁷

Unless an administrator specializes in his educational course work, there are few courses designed to incorporate facility planning as part of the preparation to be an educational administrator. Few administrators fully appreciate the need, or the benefit, to have some knowledge about educational facilities.

Nevertheless the continuing emphasis on decentralization and adaptation to local needs has thrust the local school principal into the role of a prime member of the facility planning team and on

¹⁵Seymour Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problems of Change (New Jersey: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), pp. 148-49.

¹⁶The Man in the Middle, How the Urban Secondary School Principal Sees His Role and Responsibilities (Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1971), pp. 33-40.

¹⁷J. Clark Davis, The Principal's Guide to Educational Facilities (Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973), p. 2.

occasion into the role of leader of the facilities planning process. It is understood however, that the principal is merely assuming some of the responsibilities of the superintendent who is still ultimately responsible for managing the planning process.

CHANGING ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

Planning and Constructing a New Educational Facility

When one examines the literature in order to determine the tasks and roles of the principal or principal-elect in the overall planning and construction of a new educational facility, one finds the information sparse and very ambiguous.

Although most authors acknowledged the fact that a principal or a principal-elect should be a member of the facility planning team, it is near impossible to determine from most of the literature with any exactness, what tasks the principal-elect might complete on behalf of the school superintendent and to what extent the principal-elect is responsible. In other words what role does he play in the completion of the tasks?

Furthermore it appears that many authors were also unsure who would be actively responsible for the planning and construction of the facility. Although it was generally acknowledged that the superintendent and the local school board were ultimately responsible, texts and articles such as "Planning for an Urban Community School," Boughner's Development of a Model for Planning an Educational Facility," Sumpton and Landes' "Planning Functional School Buildings,"

Engelhardt's "Complete Guide for Planning New Schools"¹⁸ merely stated a full planning method to be used but failed to mention the specific responsibilities of the individuals on the planning team. It was expected, I presume, that the individual actively responsible, would use all or part of the guide as required. Furthermore the overall method failed to stipulate exact tasks.

Other articles which discussed the planning for an educational facility proceeded to break down the planning process and discussed certain parts in isolation, e.g., equipping, program development,

¹⁸ Planning for an Urban Community School (Springfield, Mass.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 029064, 1975, p. 8), Wesley Boughner et al., "Development of a Model for Planning an Educational Facility" (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 109732, 1975, pp. 3-49), Sumpton, Merle S., Landes, Jack L., "Planning Functional School Buildings," New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957, Engelhardt, Nickolaus L., "Complete Guide for Planning New Schools" (West Nyack: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1970).

staffing, educational specifications, etc.¹⁹

In reference to facility planning, these articles concentrated on only one or two phases of the overall planning process. Except for the articles dealing with educational specifications, there were little or no references to the specific tasks and roles of the principal. Once again it was assumed that persons actively responsible for that particular phase of the planning process would use the articles as required; would determine for themselves the tasks which they must undertake; and would have to discover for themselves the roles they must play in reference to the tasks.

It appeared that the authors of these articles, which did not indicate individual roles, were unsure just who would be actively

¹⁹ Educational Facility Series, A Guide to Planning (Trenton, New Jersey: State of New Jersey Department of Education, Field Services Division Bureau of Facility Planning Services); Administrators Guide to Programs for Speech Handicapped School Children (Columbia, South Carolina: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 072603, 1972), p. 7; Barr Greenfield, "Creating Effective School Programs, Orbit, Vol. I, No. 1 (February, 1970), p. 47; William Savard, "The Hierarchy of Curriculum and Instruction" The Cycle of Curriculum and Instruction Functions (Hawaii: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 020561, 1967); John Goodlad, School Curriculum and the Individual (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1966), Handbook for a Parent-School-Community Involvement Program (Austin, Texas: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 118709, 1972); Raymond Bried, "Design Your Plant to Avoid Maintenance Sore Sports," National Schools, Vol. LXXXIII, Number 4 (April, 1969), pp. 100-103; Kenneth E. Oberholtzer, "Instructional Television Facilities: A Guide for School Administrators and Board Members (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Research Service ED 034077, 1973), Malcom A. Levine and Roger Simon, "From Ideal to Real: Understanding the Development of New Educational Settings," Interchange, Vol. V, Number 3 (May, 1974), pp. 45-54; Louis Smith and Pat Keith, Anatomy of Educational Innovation, An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School (New York: Wiley Publishing Company, 1971); To Create a School, A Design for Working Relationships, 2nd ed. (Winneconne, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Association of School Board, Inc., 1970); Dr. Wallace Strevell, Preconstruction Planning for Educational Facilities (Chicago: Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials, 1972).

responsible for that particular phase. Although it is generally understood that the superintendent is the final decision maker, some authors were reluctant to assign specific responsibilities even to the superintendent. This might possibly be due to the fact that the superintendent might delegate some of his duties to someone else, e.g., a consultant or a principal. For this reason I believe some references such as McClurkin, Thrasher, and Len, referred to the responsibilities of the "School Administrator" in order to effectively cover all possible delegations of authority.²⁰

These references often included on their planning team an "educational consultant." The consultant was in reality one of the persons delegated by the superintendent to assume some of his duties.

It appears in these articles that the consultant assumes the leadership role of the planning and construction process and maintains the day to day management of the process. In short, he becomes the superintendent's "right hand man."

In actual practice it seems likely that the consultant would only be hired in the larger school divisions or districts, in order that the daily management of the division or district by the superintendent would not be interrupted. In smaller divisions or districts, this consultant position might be omitted with the bulk of the responsibility falling to the superintendent and the school board.

²⁰W.D. McClurkin, School Building Planning (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964); Donald J. Len, Planning Educational Facilities (New York: Centre for Applied Research in Education Inc., 1965); To Create a School, A Design for Working Relationships, 2nd ed. (Winnetonka, Wisconsin: "Wisconsin Association of School Boards Inc., 1970); James M. Thrasher, Effective Planning for Better School Buildings (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973).

It would seem natural that since the consultant was merely delegated to his role by the superintendent, another person might be delegated to this position from within the school division so as to avoid the extra cost of hiring the consultant while preserving the benefit of having the superintendent's active role reduced. In reality the latter method appears to be most prevalent in Manitoba. It would appear that an active employee of the school division is asked to assume this "consultative role." Generally this person is declared principal-elect of the new facility and proceeds to lead the planning team. On occasion other employees are declared co-ordinators until a local principal is appointed. Naturally if the new facility is an addition to an existing building, or if it is a process of renovation, the presiding principal generally co-ordinates the process providing the superintendent delegates this responsibility to him.

Although the extra cost of hiring an outside consultant is avoided, other costs are incurred: principal's salary while the facility is being built; time-off for persons involved in the planning process, etc.

These costs are offset when one considers the benefits; the saving of the superintendent's time; difference between the salary of the principal and the superintendent; the saving of the cost of the consultant; increased motivation, morale, and enthusiasm of the local principal and staff, and finally the benefits of providing an educational facility and program tailored to local needs.

In summation, when one considers the overall planning and construction phase, the literature fails to state the specific tasks to be undertaken. They are usually stated in oversimplified and

generalistic terms. Furthermore, due to the possible delegation of authority by the superintendent, the authors were reluctant to specify individual persons responsible for the tasks and of course the nature of the responsibility.

Educational consultants were indicated by many authors as assuming the leadership in the planning and construction phase under the direction of the superintendent. In reality, in many small school divisions or districts, consultants may not be hired at all. The superintendent might assume the job, or as it appears in Manitoba the principal-elect might be used as the leader in the planning and construction phase.

Educational Specifications

As stated earlier most authors acknowledged the fact that the principal should be included as part of the planning team under the headings "building committee" or "school staff." The latter term did not necessarily refer to persons who were going to be working in the new facility once it was completed. They were merely aides usually picked from employees elsewhere in the division. They might include department heads, curriculum supervisors, special area consultants, e.g., physical education, industrial arts, maintenance personnel. In terms of responsibility this assembly would be primarily responsible for developing the educational specifications for the new facility.

In some of the references, namely McClurkin, Castaldi, Thrasher, Len, and the text from the Wisconsin Association of School Boards, they either did not specifically name the team leader responsible for the development of educational specifications or they suggested that it was the superintendent or the educational

consultant.²¹ These references included general items of concern regarding educational specifications to which the staff planning team had to pay attention. These items of concern did not specify tasks to be undertaken by the team members. They merely listed types of information generally required by the architect.

Finally a review of the literature revealed references which acknowledged that the principal might indeed play an important role in educational facility planning and developing educational specifications. In these references the general view was that the principal could be a team leader in the formation of the educational specifications.²²

For example, John Frederickson states, "The development of educational specifications is often the responsibility of the school principals in conjunction with staff personnel, students, parents, citizens and outside consultants."²³

²¹W.D. McLurkin, School Building Planning (New York: Macmillan Company, 1964), pp. 17-45. Basil Castaldi, Creative Planning of Educational Facilities (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969), pp. 27-58. James M. Thrasher, Effective Planning for Better Schools (Midland: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973), pp. 45-85. Donald J. Len, Planning Educational Facilities (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education Inc., 1965), pp. 40-55. To Create a School, A Design for Working Relationships, 2nd ed. (Winnetonka, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Association for School Boards, Inc., 1970).

²²J. Davis Clark, The Principal's Guide to Educational Facilities (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973), p. 21; John H. Frederickson, "The Principal's Role in Facility Planning," National Association of Secondary School Principals (September, 1975), pp. 79-82; Herman Jerry J.; Hirsekorn, Robert, Administrators Guide to School Construction Remodeling and Maintenance (West Myack: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1975), p. 14.

²³John H. Frederickson, "Space Shortage, Space Surplus Renovations," The Principal and School Plant Planning (Chicago, Illinois: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 102683).

If one assumes that form follows function there is no doubt that preparing the educational specifications is an important, if not the most important, task of planning a facility. The amount of information required to properly prepare educational specifications is enormous and the job of team leader is an onerous one. The leader must interact with a large number of individuals with varying backgrounds and professional experience. The leader must be able to co-ordinate all of the information vital to his task.²⁴ Furthermore, the principals find their task difficult because generally they have had no experience on which to base their actions and also because they usually have substantial ongoing responsibilities.²⁵

Nonetheless the most recent articles acknowledge the leadership role played by principals in educational facility planning. A vast difference from the early beginning when the architects were asked to go it alone.

Unfortunately neither Hermann, Hirsekorn, Davis, nor Frederickson indicated specific tasks to be performed by the principal, nor did they indicate the extent of the principal's responsibility or roles he was to play for any tasks he was to perform.

In addition most authors such as Frederickson confined the principal to only preparing educational specifications, a conclusion which might be debatable.²⁶ Davis, however, appears to carry the

²⁴Davis, op. cit., p. 4.

²⁵John H. Frederickson, "The Principal's Role in Facilities Planning," National Association of Secondary School Principals (September, 1975), p. 79.

²⁶John H. Frederickson, op. cit., pp. 79-82.

principals' role beyond that of merely preparing the facility. He also included such items as: Furniture and Equipment Selection; Facility Utilization and Care; School Security; Maintenance and Remodeling; as well as Educational Issues and the Facility.²⁷ In short, he is concerned about the full relationship between the principal and the facility. For Davis, planning was merely a small part of this overall relationship.

This study however focused upon the present and ideal participation of the principal in only the planning and construction and the development of educational specifications process; the extent of the principals' participation, e.g., the role he played in these areas; and finally the recommendations of the principals concerning the tasks they would undertake and the roles they would play in the planning and construction of new educational facilities and the development of educational specifications.

²⁷Davis, op. cit., pp. 1-33.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Due to the lack of relevant literature regarding the specific tasks to be performed, and the roles to be played by principals-elect in building new educational facilities, it was necessary to gather the information first hand from persons who had experience as principals-elect.

THE PROCEDURE

First of all, those persons who are, or were, appointed to the position of principal-elect had to be identified. A letter was sent to all Manitoba School Divisions and Districts, outlining the proposed investigation, requesting their co-operation, and also requesting a list of all persons in their division who are, or were, principal-elect.

A definition of the principal-elect was included in the letter to all Divisions in order to ensure that all names forwarded to the study complied with pre-set common qualifications or norms.

In order to ensure that the data collected would be relevant and up to date, the names of persons deemed principal-elect prior to January 1, 1970, were not used in the study. Furthermore, the study was limited to the building of new educational facilities and did not include major renovations or additions.

Approximately six weeks following the first letter to all

Manitoba Divisions, a second identical letter was sent to all Divisions from whom no reply had as yet been received.

Replies were received from 44 out of a possible 64 Divisions or Districts. However only eight Divisions had indeed appointed persons as principals-elect. The total number of principals-elect was 18. Two of these persons were from rural Manitoba Divisions. In order to maintain some commonality, the names of these two persons were dropped from the study.

The study came to focus upon the practices of six urban Manitoba School Divisions with the names of 16 principals-elect.

A preliminary questionnaire was then devised. In order to field test the questionnaire, three principals-elect were contacted, informed about the nature of the study, asked to complete the preliminary questionnaire, criticize it, and suggest revisions. All three complied with the request and also participated in a personal interview. During the interview the preliminary questionnaire was examined as well as the period of time during which they acted as principals-elect.

Based upon the critical examination of the preliminary questionnaire a final questionnaire was devised and submitted for approval by faculty advisors. All 16 principals-elect were telephoned, informed about the nature of the study, and asked to complete the questionnaire. All 16 agreed to the request.

The principals-elect were then mailed a stamped return envelope, a copy of the final questionnaire, and a list of phases considered to be essential in the whole process of planning and constructing a new educational facility.

The primary sources for this list of phases was The School Building Projects Guidelines, published by the Manitoba Department of Education, and interviews with the three principals-elect who served as consultants, as well as interviews with two Superintendents and one Secretary-Treasurer.

Also included in the package sent to the principals-elect, was a covering letter addressed to each principal-elect, reviewing the nature of the study, indicating the small sample which was to be used, and the necessity for a prompt, detailed response.

Completed replies were received from 15 of the 16 principals-elect. Out of the 15 replies, one principal-elect was unable to finish the questionnaire because "time is of the essence." However the unfinished questionnaire was still returned. The study now focused upon 14 written responses.

The one non-respondent felt that he did not have enough time to devote to the questionnaire and provide adequate, meaningful answers. However he was willing to participate in a personal interview. An interview was arranged for and conducted in the new facility over a period of three hours.

Following the receipt of the questionnaires, three phone calls were received from principals-elect who wished to clarify answers they had given on the questionnaire. Further examination of their answers was conducted by telephone.

The questionnaire used in this study was therefore field tested, submitted to evaluation, and validated through the use of interviews used to test the questionnaire results.

Although the size of the sample (14) is relatively small, the

responses include approximately 78 per cent (14 out of 18) of all principals-elect in Manitoba, and approximately 88 per cent (14 out of 16) of all principals-elect in urban Manitoba.

Based upon these procedures and the number of responses received, the validity of the responses would seem assured.

The data collected was critically examined and analyzed. The specific questions in the questionnaire related directly to the tasks and roles of principals-elect in Manitoba School Divisions appointed since January 1, 1970.

Frequency of responses was noted, and typical responses were quoted as such. Some generalizations were made from the data. However, care was taken to not over-generalize.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the major findings of this study. The findings were guided by the 15 research questions posed in Chapter 1, and are discussed in the same order as they were posed.

APPOINTMENT OF PRINCIPALS-ELECT

Urban Manitoba School Divisions appear to have no written policies regarding the appointment of principals-elect. Three respondents replied that there was no real policy as stated by their school boards. Eight other respondents merely said that it was "past practice" to appoint a principal-elect whenever a new facility was being built. However no policy was in effect. Three other respondents stated some of their responsibilities as principal-elect but did not indicate that these responsibilities were in fact part of a school board policy. These final three respondents all came from three different school divisions. One came from a school division that another respondent said had no policy, while the other two came from school divisions that other respondents had stated it was merely past practice to appoint a principal elect.

It appears that once a school division had utilized the services of a principal-elect in any way, they continued to appoint a

person to that position whenever the occasion arose. This could be said to be an unwritten policy. However no urban Manitoba School Division appeared to have a written policy on this issue.

When the respondents were asked why they thought they were chosen as principal-elect, a variety of reasons were given (see Table 1). The principals-elect may have suggested two or three reasons why they felt they were chosen. All reasons were noted and the frequency of each reason was indicated.

Table 1
Criteria for Choosing a Principal-Elect

Criteria	Responses
Successful Experience	9
Ability to Work with People	4
Philosophy	3
Best Applicant for the Position	2
Judgement and Common Sense	1
Education	1
Right Place at the Right Time	1
I'm Single--With Extra time to Devote	1
It was my Turn	1
Total Number of Responses	23

Most principals-elect felt that their successful experience was the main criterion for their being chosen. The second most mentioned criterion was the ability to work with people, and thirdly, three

respondents felt that their educational philosophy was a major criterion for their choice. The rest of the mentioned criteria were of little or no significance.

On the whole, many respondents were unsure exactly why they were chosen. None of the respondents were told why they were chosen and some respondents stated non-educational reasons for being chosen.

Generally speaking it appears that successful experience was the main criterion in the choice of a principal-elect. However, it also appears that this may incorporate some of the other criteria such as the ability to work with people; educational philosophy; and judgment and common sense.

This indicated some lack of direction on the part of the school divisions. Again there were no clear written policies with respect to the choice of a principal-elect. There appears to be no real unwritten policies either, unless one deduces that successful experience is the main criterion. The school divisions may have missed an opportunity to give guidance and direction, not only to the rest of their division, but to the principals-elect who have been placed in an unfamiliar role with no explanation of why they were appointed. In discussion with some respondents all indicated that the appointment was a positive step for their careers, but the positiveness was tempered by their lack of knowledge. They were unsure what positive aspects of their performances they were expected to maintain.

In regard to the timing of the appointment of a principal-elect, the current practice appears to be to appoint a principal-elect at least prior to the construction phase; but following the approval

of the Letter of Intent by the Department of Education. Eleven respondents were picked prior to the construction phase and only three during or after. No one was appointed prior to the approval of the Letter of Intent.

Narrowing the appointment time even further, nine of the respondents were appointed prior to the choosing of a core staff, and prior to the development of the Curriculum and the Educational Specifications.

When the principals-elect were asked if they felt their appointment time was suitable or not, four of the five respondents appointed after the development of the curriculum and educational specifications indicated a desire to be appointed much earlier.

Three other respondents wanted to be appointed even earlier than just prior to choosing a core staff.

Only one respondent was satisfied with his being appointed during the construction phase. Upon examination it was found that the respondent was also employed as facilities planner for his division. Therefore he was involved with all building projects very early in the process. He merely was appointed as principal-elect later on in the process in this one instance. He was extremely knowledgeable in regard to facilities and facility planning in comparison to the other principals-elect.

When the respondents were asked to state the ideal timing of the appointment of a principal-elect, 13 stated the appointment should be made at least prior to choosing a Core staff and prior to developing the Curriculum and Educational Specifications.

The only respondent who indicated that the ideal timing of the

appointment should be during the construction phase was the person who also served as facilities planner.

Based on the data, the principals-elect stated that the appointment of a principal-elect should be made very early in the process and many were dissatisfied with the actual timing of their appointment.

There is evidently no policy by school boards regarding the timing of the appointment of a principal-elect. Current practice has not proven to be satisfactory from the viewpoint of the principals-elect. They felt that ideally school boards should make the appointments much earlier than they are at present.

ACTUAL AND IDEAL AMOUNTS OF TIME DEVOTED TO THE PROJECT

Respondents were first asked to indicate how much actual time off from regular duties they received, to devote to the project. The responses varied greatly, however occasionally two respondents indicated the same amounts of time. Table 2 indicates the various combinations of actual amounts of working time given the the principals-elect and also the number of respondents who indicated they had received this time off.

Based on the data gathered, a typical principal-elect spent an average of approximately four and one-half months full-time on the project. Although the actual amount of time spent was usually spread out over a period of time ranging from three weeks to one year.

The respondents were also asked to indicate how much personal time they actually devoted to the project. Table 3 indicates the

various amounts of personal time in hours per week devoted by the principals-elect. It also indicates the number of respondents who devoted each amount of time.

Table 2

Actual Amount of Working Time Devoted to
Planning and Constructing the Facility

Actual Amount of Working Time	Number of Respondents
One Year	2
Half time for 7 months, Full time for 7 months	1
Six months	2
20% for 6 months, 50% for 4 months, 66% for 3 months Dual duty for 3 months	1
Dual duties at 50% for one year	1
Three months	2
25% for 4 months, 100% for 2 months	1
40% for 6 months	1
3 weeks	1
None	2
Total Number of Respondents	14

Based upon the data received, a principal-elect spends approximately five and one-half hours a week of his own personal time, devoted to planning and constructing a new facility. This amount of time was spread out over a period of time ranging from three weeks to two and one-half years.

Table 3

Actual Amount of Personal Time
Devoted by Principals-Elect

Actual Amount of Personal Time (Hours per Week)	Number of Respondents
Too hard to count	5
0 - 2 hours per week	3
2 - 5 hours per week	2
5 - 10 hours per week	2
10 or more hours per week	2
Total Number of Respondents	14

The five responses which stated that the exact amount of personal time was too hard to count indicated that the actual amount of personal time spent on the project was probably much higher than what was stated in the responses. One respondent stated:

Very difficult to say. For me thinking and planning took place while eating, socializing and sleeping.

Finally the principals-elect were asked to estimate the ideal amount of working time that should be devoted to planning and constructing the facility. Table 4 indicates their responses and the number of respondents who preferred each amount of time.

Based upon the data received the respondents felt that generally six months to a year full time was ideal.

Of three respondents who could not specifically state the ideal amount of working time, one felt that a phasing in period was important. In other words the principal-elect should begin with dual

duties and slowly increase the amount of his working time devoted to the project until it becomes a single full time duty.

Table 4

Ideal Amount of Working Time to be Devoted to
Planning and Constructing as Viewed by the
Principals-Elect

Ideal Amount of Working Time	Number of Respondents
One year (full time)	1
Six months to one year (full time)	3
Six months (full time)	4
50% for one year (dual duty)	2
Three to six months (full time)	1
Couldn't answer	3
Total Number of Respondents	14

In discussion with the respondents, it was felt that the ideal amount of personal time was too difficult to state since it was dependent, to a large extent, upon the ideal amount of working time devoted to the project. The more working time devoted to the project, the less amount of personal time is necessary. Naturally the preferred division of time was zero personal time and all working time. In reality it was felt that this would never happen. There would always be some personal time spent on the project.

PHASES IN WHICH PRINCIPALS-ELECT
TOOK AN ACTIVE ROLE

Respondents were asked to indicate a minimum of four phases from the list provided, plus any additions, in which they felt that they had performed their most active role. They were also asked to rank them according to their degree of involvement or activity. The number of responses for each phase was noted. See Table 5.

In order to clarify the involvement of the principals-elect the phases were grouped under some general headings:

Choosing a Core Staff and Hiring a Full Staff were grouped under the heading Staff Selection.

Gathering Information re: Educational Specifications and Developing the Educational Specifications were grouped under the heading Educational Specifications.

Gathering Information re: Curriculum, Detailed Planning of Curriculum, Developing a Philosophy, Developing Curriculum Models, Developing Teaching Strategies, Staff Training, and Team Building, were grouped under Curriculum Development.

Developing Preliminary Building Plans, Developing Actual Working Drawings, and Consulting with the Architect were grouped under Building Design and Planning.

The Facility is Constructed (Supervision) was placed under the heading Construction.

The New Facility is Prepared for Use, and the New Facility is Opened was placed under the general heading Preparing and Opening the Facility.

Following this grouping a new frequency table including the

Table 5
The Most Active Phases Performed
by Principals-Elect

Phases	Rank Order of Involvement (with 1 being highest)				Frequency	
	1	2	3	4	Total	Weighted
Hiring a Full Staff	5	4	1	3	13	37
Preparing the New Facility for Use	1	2	4	1	8	19
Detail Planning of the Curriculum	1	1	1	3	6	12
Choosing a Core Staff	2	2	1	0	5	16
Gathering Information re: Curriculum	1	1	1	1	4	10
Gathering Information re: Educational Specifi- cations	0	1	0	3	4	6
Developing Actual Working Drawings	1	0	1	2	4	8
New Facility is Opened	0	0	2	1	3	5
Facility is Constructed (Supervision)	0	1	1	1	3	6
Developing the Educational Specifications	1	0	0	1	2	5
Developing an Educational Philosophy	1	0	0	1	2	5
Staff Training	0	1	1	0	2	5
Developing Preliminary Building Plans	1	1	0	0	2	7
Developing Curriculum Models	0	1	0	0	1	3
Developing Teaching Strategies	0	0	0	1	1	1
Team Building	0	0	1	0	1	2
Consulting with Architect	1	0	0	0	1	4
Total Number of Responses					62	

rank order of involvement was developed. Based upon the data received principals-elect currently spend most of their time and energy hiring a staff, both a core and a full staff; preparing for, and opening the new facility; and developing the curriculum.

Table 6
The Most Active Areas of Involvement
Performed by Principals-Elect

Phases	Rank Order of Involvement (with 1 being highest)				Frequency	
	1	2	3	4	Total	Weighted
Staff Selection	7	6	2	3	18	53
Curriculum Development	3	4	4	6	17	38
Preparing and Opening the Facility	1	2	6	2	11	24
Building Design and Planning	3	1	1	2	7	19
Educational Specifications	1	1	0	4	6	11
Construction	0	1	1	1	3	6
Total Number of Responses					62	

It is interesting to note that most principals-elect had little or no active involvement in developing the educational specifications although ideally this should be an outgrowth of curriculum development.

Furthermore few principals-elect were involved in building design and planning which should actually be a continuation or physical manifestation of the educational specifications.

It appears that while some school divisions are trying to involve the users of the facility, (principals, staff and community) in the planning and construction of the building, they are not fully utilizing them in developing the educational specifications. Therefore the buildings may not completely reflect the users' specifications since some other person or persons are developing them.

In effect one could almost interchange the new facilities in Manitoba without drastically altering the process.

THE PHASES IN WHICH PRINCIPALS-ELECT THOUGHT THEY SHOULD TAKE AN ACTIVE ROLE

Respondents were asked to indicate a minimum of four phases from the list provided plus any additions, in which they felt they should have taken an active role. The respondents were again asked to rank their preferred involvement or activity. The results are shown in Table 7.

Once again in order to clarify the suggested involvement by principals-elect, the phases were grouped under several general headings as was done in Table 6.

The phases, Gathering Information re: The Letter of Intent, Conducting a Community Study, Conducting a Student-Community Study, and Conducting a Post-High School Study, were grouped under the general heading Establishing a Need.

The principals-elect confirmed the need to be highly involved in hiring staff both the core and the full staff. These two phases were the two phases which principals-elect suggested should require their most active involvement.

After these two phases were grouped together it was found that

Table 7

The Phases in Which Principals-Elect Felt
They Should Take An Active Role

	Rank Order of Involvement (with 1 being highest)				Frequency	
	1	2	3	4	Total	Weighted
Hiring a Full Staff	4	1	2	4	11	27
Hiring a Core Staff	6	2	1	2	11	34
Detailed Planning of Curriculum	1	2	1	4	8	16
Developing Educational Specifications	2	1	3	1	7	18
New Facility is Prepared for Use	0	1	0	6	7	9
Gathering Information re: Curriculum	1	3	1	2	7	17
Gathering Information re: Educational Specifi- cations	0	1	2	3	6	10
New Facility is Opened	0	0	0	2	2	2
Staff Training	0	1	0	1	2	4
Facility is Constructed (Supervision)	0	1	0	1	2	4
Developing Preliminary Building Plans	0	0	2	0	2	4
Developing Actual Working Drawings	0	1	1	0	2	5
Developing an Educational Philosophy	0	0	0	1	1	1
Team Building	0	0	1	0	1	2
Consulting with the Architect	0	0	0	1	1	1
Gathering Information re: Letter of Intent	0	0	0	1	1	1
Conducting a Community Study	1	0	0	0	1	4
Conducting a Student- Community Study	0	1	0	0	1	3
Conducting a Post-High School Study	0	0	1	0	1	2
Total Number of Responses					74	

it was the area in which principals-elect actually did become highly active.

Table 8

The Areas of Involvement in Which Principals-Elect Felt They Should Be Most Active

Areas	Rank Order of Involvement (with 1 being highest)				Frequency	
	1	2	3	4	Total	Weighted
Staff Selection	10	3	3	6	22	61
Curriculum Development	2	6	3	8	19	40
Educational Specifications	2	2	5	4	13	28
Preparing and Opening the Facility	0	1	0	8	9	11
Building Design and Planning	0	1	3	1	5	10
Establishing a Need	1	1	1	1	4	10
Construction	0	1	0	1	2	4
Total Number of Responses					74	

The general area of curriculum development was the second most active area in both the actual and suggested areas of involvement. The two phases of this general area which principals-elect suggested their involvement should increase was in the Gathering of Information re: Curriculum Development, and in the Detailed Planning of the Curriculum.

The third most active area suggested by principals-elect was Educational Specifications. Based upon the data from Table 8, theoretically the principals-elect felt they should take an active role

in developing educational specifications although in actuality they did not play an active role. The principals-elect realized the importance of developing the educational specifications, and felt that this should be done after completion of the Development of the Curriculum, but prior to Building Design and Planning. This was considered the proper sequence. The facility should reflect the specifications for that particular building and the specifications should reflect the philosophy, the type of activities and the type of teaching that will take place within its walls. Generally the specifications should reflect the overall curriculum anticipated for the facility.

In actuality the principals-elect were more active in the preparation and opening of the facility and in the building design and planning than they were in developing the educational specifications. Both of these phases were more aesthetic in value than they were educational.

One area in which some principals-elect wanted to be involved was in Establishing a Need for the facility, getting to know the community, students and parents in which the facility was to be built, and looking at the effectiveness of education for the community.

In actuality this was not done by any principals-elect. It appears that some respondents wanted to see the context of the new facility first, thereby increasing the effectiveness of their planning.

SPECIFIC TASKS PERFORMED BY PRINCIPALS-ELECT
DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
SPECIFICATIONS

Despite the fact that only a small number of principals-elect

(six out of 14) were highly active in the development of the Educational Specifications, it was felt that the specific tasks performed by the principals-elect in this important phase should be examined.

Because the specific tasks vary a great deal, depending upon individual circumstances, they were grouped into six general task areas which the six responding principals-elect performed. This information can be found in Table 9.

The principals-elect also performed many secretarial tasks throughout all phases, but in particular, during the development of the curriculum and during the development of the educational specifications. The principals-elect were left pretty much on their own with very little help from the divisional offices. In fact one major complaint heard from principals-elect was the lack of secretarial help during the planning phases. Tasks such as arranging for meetings, arranging for time off for staff members, making phone calls, typing reports, taking notes, etc., were all handled by the principals-elect.

SPECIFIC TASKS PRINCIPALS-ELECT WOULD LIKE TO
HAVE PERFORMED OR ELIMINATED DURING THE
DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL
SPECIFICATIONS

Tasks the Principals-Elect
Would Like to Have Performed

Four principals-elect who were not involved in the development of the educational specifications preferred not to be involved and did not want to perform any tasks in this phase.

Four principals-elect who were involved in the development of the educational specifications were satisfied with the tasks they

Table 9

Specific Tasks Relating to Developing
Educational Specifications

General Areas	Specific Tasks
Research	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Collecting information about child development, curriculum, student movement, ideal classroom facilities, texts, special areas, type and number of students, etc. 2) Discussing issues and defining terms. 3) Consulting with other principals, teachers, superintendent, maintenance personnel, etc. 4) Reading articles and books relating to educational specifications and special areas.
Clarification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Clarifying in their own minds a basic educational philosophy.
Modification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Working with the core staff, and developing further clarification and modification to the basic philosophy.
Visualization	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Trying to visualize the philosophy at work in all specific areas of the school, library, gym, halls, labs, etc. 2) Determining the necessary features or considerations for the ideal use of each area in the facility.
Gathering Feedback	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Gathering opinions and views from teachers, parents, community, architect, superintendent, etc. 2) Co-ordinating views of all parties. 3) Acting as a liason for all parties.
Negotiation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Defending and negotiating the basic philosophy, needs and requests with the superintendent, the architect, the school board, the community, etc. 2) Modifying needs and requests based upon negotiation.

performed and did not want to add further to their responsibilities.

Four principals-elect who were not involved in the development of the educational specifications wanted to become involved in the following ways:

(a) One respondent merely stated that he wanted to have been involved.

(b) One respondent stated that he wanted to be involved in the layout of rooms, halls, special areas, etc.

(c) One respondent stated that he wanted to be involved in the architectural planning.

(d) One respondent stated that he wanted to be involved in working out the philosophy of the school consistent with the philosophy of the division.

Two principals-elect who were involved in the development of the educational specifications did not want to take on new tasks but indicated a desire that their authority during this phase should be increased. Based on the responses it appears that a majority of principals-elect (10 out of 14), want to be involved in developing educational specifications but are unsure as to the kind of tasks that need to be performed. Four respondents indicated they were satisfied with the tasks they had performed. It may be they are truly satisfied but on the other hand they may be unsure what other tasks they could have completed.

Out of the four respondents who wanted to become involved in the educational specifications only one named a task which could be considered part of this phase. Two other respondents indicated they actually wanted to be more involved in the Building Design and

Planning phase and not the Development of Educational Specifications.

Two other respondents indicated a desire to change their involvement during this phase but did not indicate additional tasks they wanted to perform.

In short the principals-elect who did participate in developing educational specifications were satisfied with their performance or else wanted to increase their authority in this phase.

The respondents who did not participate in developing educational specifications had no desire to do so, or were possibly unsure as to the kind of tasks they could have performed during this phase.

Both observations indicated some lack of knowledge on the part of these principals-elect, about the whole process of planning a new educational facility and the importance of educational specifications.

The fact that a large number of principals-elect (eight out of 14) did not participate in developing the educational specifications also indicated that many school divisions failed to give adequate or proper guidance to their principals-elect.

Some principals-elect were appointed following the development of the educational specifications. It would appear that many of these principals-elect had to try and mould the specifications and the resulting buildings to their own pre-determined philosophy or vice-versa. A fact which many school divisions overlooked or else preferred to do it this way for the sake of expediency.

The fact that principals-elect, and their core staffs are now involved in planning a new facility is encouraging. However much of the advantage is lost when the natural progression of the process is

altered, or if the people most concerned with the outcome are not involved in the planning.

SPECIFIC TASKS PERFORMED BY PRINCIPALS-ELECT
WHILE PARTICIPATING IN THEIR MOST ACTIVE
AREAS

The respondents were asked to write out all the specific tasks which they performed while completing their four most active phases. Many of the tasks seemed to fit into a general area rather than a specific phase. Therefore all the tasks have been assimilated and grouped in Tables 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 as they were grouped in Tables 6 and 8. Repetitions of individual tasks have been eliminated.

Table 10

Specific Tasks Relating to Staff Selection

Specific Tasks
1) Determined the staff requirements in consultation with the Divisional Office.
2) Wrote out a description of the teaching positions.
3) Advertised the positions locally within the Division and later in the newspapers.
4) Screened applications and arranged for interviews.
5) Interviewed prospective applicants.
6) Checked references.
7) Visited prospective applicants in their teaching situation.
8) Selected successful applicants.
9) Recommended the names of successful applicants to the Divisional Office.
10) Allowed for selected staff to participate in recruiting and interviewing.

Table 11

Specific Tasks Relating to Curriculum Development

Specific Tasks

-
-
- 1) Made staff feel welcome, prized, and special to have been selected.
 - 2) Assigned the various teaching tasks.
 - 3) Solicited input as to how teachers felt their subject could be best approached.
 - 4) Sought out staff assistance in selecting other staff.
 - 5) Shared decision making whenever possible.
 - 6) Prized individual input generally.
 - 7) Attended to individual needs of group members.
 - 8) Met socially several times to build up moral and team spirit.
 - 9) Researched the whole area of curriculum development, educational philosophies and educational organization.
 - 10) Held frequent staff meetings, outlined a basic philosophy by which we could all operate.
 - 11) Determined how the school should be organized and operated in light of the basic philosophy.
 - 12) Solicited feedback from Divisional Office.
 - 13) Held meetings with the parents, students and community outlining the philosophy, organization, and operation of the school.
 - 14) Consulted with the Department of Education, other teachers and administrators.
 - 15) Revised the philosophy, organization, and operation in light of the feedback.
 - 16) Obtained the Department of Education program and Curriculum guides.
 - 17) Consulted with persons knowledgeable in Curriculum to get Curriculum update.
 - 18) Had guest speakers speak to the staff.
 - 19) Reviewed information with staff.
 - 20) Weighed program implementation suggestions against the overall philosophy.
 - 21) Determined the basic academic program together with the core staff.
 - 22) Assigned staff members to develop a list of necessary texts and materials.
 - 23) Determined the type of social and personal development activities which might be held.
 - 24) Determined the areas of creative development which should be programmed (music, art, drama).
 - 25) Determined the needs of the social and personal activities as well as the areas of creative development (staff, texts, materials, equipment, and space).
 - 26) Determined the needs of the staff re: in-service.
-

Table 12

Specific Tasks Relating to Opening the Facility

 Specific Tasks

- 1) Determined the types of programs to be conducted.
 - 2) Met with the purchasing agent to discuss the procedure for ordering.
 - 3) Solicited ideas from core staff regarding furniture, supplies, texts, and equipment.
 - 4) Consulted with experts regarding special area needs such as Physical Education, maintenance.
 - 5) Prepared a tentative list of furniture, text, and equipment needs with staff input.
 - 6) Visited other schools for surplus books, and furnishings as well as for ideas.
 - 7) Consulted with other teachers, and administrators regarding furniture, texts, equipment, etc.
 - 8) Identified suitable surplus material.
 - 9) Arranged for storage and transportation.
 - 10) Met with maintenance department to see if items could be made by the division.
 - 11) Determined exact specifications of desired furnishings.
 - 12) Developed a detailed list of specific furnishings.
 - 13) Looked at samples of furnishings, equipment and supplies through salesmen and suppliers.
 - 14) Prioritized the list to meet budget restraint.
 - 15) Priced suitable equipment and furnishings.
 - 16) Made up requisitions for all materials including texts, supplies, equipment and furnishings.
 - 17) Selected resource materials.
 - 18) Submitted lists and specifications for tender and purchase.
 - 19) Arranged for receipt of goods and storage.
 - 20) Visualized living and working in each area and tried to anticipate problem areas such as location and number of light switches, outlets, opening of doors, height of counters, blackboards, etc.
 - 21) Negotiated with architect regarding problem areas.
 - 22) Organized classes.
 - 23) Assigned staff responsibility and duties.
 - 24) Developed school policies and procedures with staff input.
 - 25) Anticipated problems in opening such as an unfinished building, staggered hours, busing, etc.
 - 26) Met with the community to outline plans for the opening, and for the operation of the school.
-

Table 13
 Specific Tasks Relating to Building Design
 and Planning

Specific Tasks
1) Read and re-read educational specifications.
2) Met with the architect.
3) Explained to the architect the operational and teaching processes that were to take place.
4) Read and re-read the architects drawings.
5) Compared the educational specifications to the architect's drawings and asked for clarification.
6) Visualized the architect's drawings and tried to anticipate problem areas.
7) Consulted with the Superintendent's department, other administrators, teachers, core staff, parents and community.
8) Made compromises with the architect's drawings.

No attempt was made to prioritize the tasks or to list the tasks in any chronological order. All specific tasks performed by the principals-elect were assimilated under the six general headings. Repetitions were eliminated. The resulting tables were merely an exposition of the tasks performed, which might serve as a partial guide for newly appointed principals-elect.

SPECIFIC TASKS PRINCIPALS-ELECT WOULD LIKE TO
 HAVE PERFORMED BUT DID NOT

Ten principals-elect indicated that there were no additional tasks they would like to have performed.

Two principals-elect indicated they would have liked to have

Table 14

Specific Tasks Relating to Developing
Educational Specifications

General Areas	Specific Tasks
Research	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Collecting information about child development, curriculum, student movement, ideal classroom facilities, texts, special areas, type and number of students, etc. 2) Discussing issues and defining terms. 3) Consulting with other principals, teachers, superintendent, maintenance personnel, etc. 4) Reading articles and books relating to educational specifications and special areas.
Clarification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Clarifying in their own minds a basic educational philosophy.
Modification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Working with the core staff, and developing further clarification and modification to the basic philosophy.
Visualization	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Trying to visualize the philosophy at work in all specific areas of the school, library, gym, halls, labs, etc. 2) Determining the necessary features or considerations for the ideal use of each area in the facility.
Gathering Feedback	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Gathering opinions and views from teachers, parents, community, architect, superintendent, etc. 2) Co-ordinating views of all parties. 3) Acting as a liason for all parties.
Negotiation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Defending and negotiating the basic philosophy, needs and request with the superintendent, the architect, the school board, the community, etc. 2) Modifying needs and requests based upon negotiation.

been more involved in the architectural planning, especially in determining changes in the plans.

Table 15
Specific Tasks Relating to Construction

Specific Tasks
1) Visited the construction site periodically.
2) Monitored the construction.
3) Assessed problem areas.
4) Contacted maintenance personnel, Superintendent and Architect to suggest changes.
5) Selected colors and graphics.

Two other principals-elect indicated they wanted more involvement in determining how the money for the building was being spent. Both indicated some conflict with the architect. One felt the architect spent money on aesthetic items while educational items were left incomplete. The other felt that the architect as well as other persons, determined the deletion of items when the tender amount was reduced. He felt that as principal-elect he should have had some input.

Based on the data it appears that all four respondents wanted to have their authority role increased in dealing with the architect and the building plans. All four felt to some extent that their views were not being fully considered whenever decisions in this area were to be made.

SPECIFIC TASKS PRINCIPALS-ELECT WOULD HAVE
LIKED TO ELIMINATE

Twelve principals-elect indicated that there were no specific tasks which they would rather have not performed. One typical response was:

It was an experience doing each and every task.

One respondent replied that she wished that she had not become involved in site planning since it was too political an issue and there were no results. "It was a waste of time!"

Another respondent replied that he wished he had not assumed a dual role during the planning of his new facility. He had been a principal of another school, during the planning stages and up to the end of June, the same year the new facility was to be opened in September. He felt the dual role was too difficult.

One other task which seven principals-elect mentioned during interviews that they wished they could have eliminated, was the task of being a secretary or "meeting arranger." The problem appears to be the lack of secretarial assistance since the secretarial position was not created until the facility was almost ready to open. The principals-elect therefore, had to do all the secretarial tasks normally assigned to a secretary, such as arrange meetings, type, and make numerous phone calls, to name a few.

Although the respondents did not state their displeasure of this task on the questionnaire, the frequency of their displeasure during interviews, indicated that this task should be mentioned at this point in the study.

PHASES IN WHICH PRINCIPALS-ELECT PERFORMED AN
EXECUTIVE, ADVISORY, OR SUPPORTIVE ROLE

Respondents were asked to name all phases in which they actually played an executive, an advisory, and a supportive role. The definition of each of the terms, executive, advisory, and supportive was provided to eliminate ambiguity. The responses are shown in Tables 16, 17 and 18 along with the frequency of responses.

Table 16

The Phases in Which the Principals-Elect
Performed an Executive Role

Phases	Frequency of Responses
Selecting a Core Staff	10
Selecting a Full Staff	10
Preparing the Facility for Use (Purchasing)	6
Gathering Information re: Curriculum Development	6
Detailed Planning of the Curriculum	6
Gathering Information re: Educational Specifications	4
Developing Educational Specifications	3
Training of Staff	3
Preparing Actual Working Drawings	2
Team Building	1
Total Number of Responses	51

*One respondent felt he performed an executive role in all phases of the process.

Table 17

The Phases in Which the Principals-Elect
Performed an Advisory Role

Phases	Frequency of Responses
Building Design and Planning	11
Preparing the Facility for Use	4
Developing Educational Specifications	3
The Facility is Constructed (Supervision)	3
Staff Selection (Core and Full)	2
Detailed Planning of the Curriculum	1
Tendering the Project	0
Total Number of Responses	24

*One respondent felt he performed an advisory role in all phases of the project.

Table 18

The Phases in Which the Principals-Elect
Performed a Supportive Role

Phases	Frequency of Responses
Staff Selection (Staff Count)	3
Preparing the Facility for Use (Budget)	1
Conducting the Preliminary Study	1
Detailed Planning of the Curriculum (Philosophy)	1
Detailed Planning of the Curriculum (Choice of Texts)	1
Detailed Planning of the Curriculum (Teaching Strategy)	1
Total Number of Responses	8

*One respondent felt he performed a supportive role in all phases of the project.

*Four respondents felt they had not played a supportive role in any phase of the project.

*Five respondents did not answer this question.

The principals-elect felt that throughout the whole project they performed primarily an executive role, and to some degree an advisory role. However, very few of the principals-elect saw themselves in a supportive role despite the fact that all of them acknowledged that the superintendent was the ultimate decision maker.

It would appear that due to the importance and the enormity of their responsibilities, and the degree to which they were involved in the project, principals-elect were seldom placed in a supportive role. Their overall knowledge of the project would allow them to perform at least an advisory role.

ACTUAL AND RECOMMENDED ROLE OF PRINCIPALS-ELECT
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
SPECIFICATIONS

Respondents were asked to state the type of role they actually played in the development of educational specifications. The results are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Actual Role Played by Principals-Elect in
Developing the Educational Specifications

Role	Number of Respondents
Executive	3
Advisory	1
Supportative	0
Advisory and Executive	2
Not Involved	8
Total Number of Responses	14

Respondents were then asked if they would have liked to change the role they played in the development of educational specifications and what changes they would have made.

Only one of the six respondents who were previously involved, wanted to change his role. He had actually performed a combination executive-advisory role, but wanted the role to be completely executive. However, when his response was examined it was actually a desire to change his role in the Building Design and Planning Phase.

Four respondents who were not involved previously, indicated they were content with the non-role they had performed.

Four other respondents who were not involved previously indicated they wanted to become involved in developing the educational specifications. However no preferred role was indicated.

The principals-elect who were involved in the development of educational specifications performed primarily an executive role and to some extent an advisory role. None of the respondents performed a supportive role.

The majority of principals-elect preferred to maintain the roles they played, namely executive and/or advisory. While some respondents merely wanted to become involved in this phase.

The lack of response to this question again indicates some lack of knowledge on behalf of the principals-elect regarding educational specifications and the role to be played. It further indicated the inadequate guidance given to principals-elect by their respective school divisions.

RECOMMENDED ROLES OF PRINCIPALS-ELECT IN THE
VARIOUS PHASES

Respondents were asked to indicate if they would have liked to change the role they played in any of the phases. If so, they were to indicate the kind of change preferred.

Only one respondent replied that he would have liked to change his roles in three areas. In Choosing a Core Staff he wanted to change from no role to that of an advisory role. In Detailed Planning of the Curriculum he wanted to change from no role to that of an executive role. Finally in Developing the Educational Specifications he wanted to change from no role to that of an executive role.

The reason he gave for all these changes was that he felt this should have been his responsibility as principal-elect.

Seven respondents did not want to change the roles they played.

Six respondents failed to answer this question.

However two respondents indicated previously on other questions that they had a desire to change the role they performed during the Building Design and Planning phase. Both had performed an advisory role, and wished to increase their authority, therefore, to an executive role. This desire had obviously been overlooked when the two respondents answered this particular question.

In general the principals-elect were quite satisfied with the roles they played. Whenever a change was desired it was always an increase in the authority level of the principal-elect.

PHASES IDENTIFIED AS BEING THE MOST IMPORTANT

Respondents were asked to list the three most important phases in the project. The results are shown in Table 20 along with the frequency of responses. No attempt was made to group the phases in Table 20, however it should be noted that Staff Training, Team Development, Developing a Philosophy, Detailed Curriculum Planning, and Developing School Policies were previously grouped under Curriculum Development (see Table 6).

Table 20

Phases Most Important to Principals-Elect

Phases	Frequency of Responses
Staff Training	3
Team Development	1
Developing a Philosophy	3
Detailed Curriculum Planning	3
Developing School Policies	2
Staff Selection (Core and Full)	11
Preparing the Facility for Use	5
Developing the Educational Specifications	1
Co-ordinating all Parties	1
Building Design and Planning	1
Community Meetings	1
Total Number of Responses	32

Curriculum Development as a whole was most important to the Principals-Elect. However because the phase is so complex it was broken down into sub-sections. Dependent upon the individuals and the circumstances it was the sub-section which took on greater importance. It is important to note that they were merely sub-sections of the Curriculum Development Area.

The relatively low level of importance of the development of educational specifications phase is important to note. Considered by most experts to be of prime importance in the building of a new facility, it has not assumed great importance with the principals-elect. Due partly to the low involvement by principals-elect but also perhaps due to the fact that the principals-elect have little authority in the Building Design and Planning phase. This phase is a natural outgrowth of the educational specifications. The architects are apparently not bound by the specifications and the principals-elect do not have enough authority to insist that they are. Based upon the data from Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8, it was found that, in actuality principals-elect did not participate in developing the educational specifications, although theoretically they felt they should have participated in a more active way. From the data in Table 20 the principals-elect did not feel this phase was very important to them or to their job as principal-elect.

PHASES, TASKS, INDIVIDUALS, CIRCUMSTANCES OR
OTHER ITEMS WHICH CAUSED THE MOST DIFFICULTY

Respondents were asked to itemize all of the things which caused them the most difficulty during the whole process. The results

are shown in Table 21 along with a frequency of responses.

Table 21
Items Which Caused Principals-Elect Their
Most Difficulty

Items	Frequency of Responses
Unclear Directions	7
Unforeseen Circumstances, Lack of Time, Delays	7
Equipping and Purchasing	4
Dealing with the Architect	2
Staff Selection	2
Developing Educational Specifications	1
Departmental Approval	1
Co-ordinating Staff	1
Changing Expectations to Meet Reality	1
	26

One of the main problems was the lack of direction given to the principals-elect. Most were appointed to the position and basically left to learn on the job. They had to be self-starting individuals with the ability to plan and create a sense of direction. While they were actually given a great deal of authority, most principals-elect did not know how much or in what areas they had it.

The second problem area centered around the matter of time. Many principals-elect found it frustrating to try and maintain an accurate time line when delays were constantly occurring over which

they had no control such as strikes, equipment failures, errors, etc. Knowing the enormous cost of the project and knowing to some extent what lay ahead that had to be completed, the principals-elect found that time became a great problem no matter how early they were appointed.

The third item which caused problems was in equipping and purchasing. Those principals-elect who had problems in this area were not referring to educational texts and supplies but to furniture and equipment of which they had little or no knowledge.

Once again it was primarily a case of learning on the job and doing enough research to possibly avoid mistakes.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS BY PRINCIPALS-ELECT

Respondents were asked to indicate what advice would they give to any person newly appointed as a principal-elect. All of the responses are listed in Table 22. No attempt was made to eliminate repetitions, or prioritize the responses. They were merely grouped under general headings.

From the data it was found that the principals-elect gave advice nine times regarding the concept of time; six times regarding staffing; six times regarding increased authority and independence, four times regarding consulting with others; three times regarding establishing a philosophy; three times regarding observing the whole process; two times regarding increased directions; and two times regarding community ties.

When one groups the advice given regarding increased authority and independence, consulting with others, and increased directions,

Table 22

General Recommendations and Improvements
Suggested by the Principals-Elect

Area of Improvements	Specific Suggestions
Time	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) "Get as much release time as possible." 2) "Get lots of release time for core staff meetings, training, etc." 3) "Get appointed early." 4) "Get time off to do the job properly." 5) "Arrange for appropriate discretionary time for planning." 6) "Be prepared for delays and frustration." 7) "Prepare a concomitant time line." 8) "Get in there early." 9) "Be prepared for long hours."
Staffing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) "Have full control of your staff hiring." 2) "Choose and train your own staff." 3) "Pick a core of highly capable, hard working dedicated people devoted to developing the best possible school system." 4) "Select a good staff." 5) "Have a major input into staff selection." 6) "Choose a staff committed to the aims of the school, and involving them in the preparation and decision making will mean that they have a stake in making it successful."
Level of Authority and Independence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) "Have the freedom to try new things." 2) "Be demanding and even unreasonable if necessary." 3) "Try to establish a good amount of independence."

Table 22 (continued)

Area of Improvements	Specific Suggestions
Level of Authority and Independence	4) "Don't be stampeded into action by the pressure of others." 5) "Press for as much decision making responsibilities as possible and retain it."
Consultation	1) "Visit other principals-elect and discuss initial problems." 2) "Develop a harmonious relationship with other principals." 3) "Try to ensure you have a supportive superintendent and school board." 4) "Consult with others who went through the process."
Establishing a Philosophy	1) "Agree on a common philosophy and mode of operation." 2) "Know what you expect in the organization of the school and its programs." 3) "Develop your own philosophy."
Observation	1) "Try to anticipate everything." 2) "Watch where the money is being spent." 3) "Watch the working drawings carefully. The architect may "forget" what you want or simply ignore it."
Guidance and Direction	1) "Get the position outlined clearly as to duties, responsibilities, and authority." 2) "Prepare a detailed list of tasks to be performed."
Community Ties	1) "Work closely with the community to gain their confidence." 2) "Get to know your community well."

this whole area of poor directions and lack of knowledge of the position becomes the most concerned area by the principals-elect.

Time and the lack thereof was of great concern to the principals-elect. The job of principal-elect appears to be an enormous one and the individual desperately needs time to work things out especially when there appears to be some lack of direction by the school divisions. Basically the advice was, hopefully get appointed early and get as much working time devoted to the project as possible.

Of prime importance throughout the study was hiring or staff selection. This continued to be of importance to the principals-elect as seen by their advice.

UNANTICIPATED FINDINGS

In order to set up the context of the process and the relative order of completion of the process, a tentative list of phases, purposefully arranged in a seemingly logical order, was given to each of the respondents. The wording of the phases and the order in which they were written came as a result of researching the process not only in Manitoba but elsewhere. Also interviews were conducted with many of the principals-elect, two superintendents, and one secretary-treasurer.

Because it was felt that each facility would be unique, respondents were asked to add any phases which they felt were omitted. There were only two main additions to the original printed list of 22 phases. (See Appendix B.)

Three respondents felt that a phase relating to Conducting Community Meetings should be inserted and two respondents suggested a

phase relating to Staff Training and Team Building should be inserted.

The respondents were then asked to go over the list of phases including any additions and number them in the order of actual completion.

Following this the respondents were asked to re-number the phases according to an ideal completion sequence. Overwhelmingly the ideal choice corresponded to the sequence which was printed out and given to the respondents.

The following discrepancies were noted when comparing the actual completion sequence to the ideal.

1. The phases relating to Curriculum Development were eliminated in actuality on two responses and were placed during the construction phase on three actual responses.

Four of the respondents indicated the ideal placement of the Curriculum phases should be just prior to the Development of the Educational Specifications as stated on the printed phase list. (See Appendix B.)

2. The phases relating to Educational Specifications were eliminated in actuality on eight of the responses. All eight respondents indicated the ideal placement was as stated on the printed list.

3. Two respondents indicated that in actuality the architect was chosen prior to the whole process. Ideally one respondent felt he should be appointed after the need for the facility had been established. The other respondent felt the architect should be appointed after the educational specifications were developed.

4. Two respondents wanted to change the ideal placement of

the phase, Hiring a Full Staff. Both respondents wanted the full staff hired at approximately the same time a core staff is chosen, that is, prior to the Development of the Curriculum and Educational Specifications.

5. Three respondents eliminated the phase, Establishing a Letter of Intent Committee in actuality since it was primarily the Superintendent Department's responsibility and no committee was appointed. Ideally they placed this phase as it was stated on the printed list.

6. The three respondents who added the phase relating to Community Meetings felt the ideal placement of this phase should be ongoing, but especially important at various steps throughout the process, such as prior to the Letter of Intent, after the Educational Specifications are developed, after the Working Drawings are Prepared, and just prior to the Opening.

7. The two respondents who added the phase relating to Staff Training and Team Building also indicated that the ideal placement of this phase would be ongoing throughout the process, but especially important following the choice of a core staff, and following the choice of a full staff.

Based on the data, generally speaking, the principals-elect all felt that their own unique procedure was basically ideal. It is interesting to note that despite the uniqueness of each facility the actual order of completion for all respondents was almost identical. The ideal order indicated by the principals-elect corresponded almost exactly to the printed list given to the respondents.

Chapter 5

ANALYSIS OF THE TASKS AND ROLES OF THE PRINCIPALS-ELECT

Although each situation in which a principal-elect was appointed was different, some generalizations based on the data gathered can be stated about the actual role of a principal-elect. These generalizations both actual and ideal are discussed in this chapter.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS REGARDING THE ACTUAL ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL-ELECT

Principals-elect appear to have been appointed prior to the Development of the Curriculum and shortly after the Department of Education approves the building of the facility by accepting the School Divisions' Letter of Intent.

The principals-elect believed that the main criterion used to determine their appointment was successful experience, both as a teacher and as an administrator.

School Divisions in urban Manitoba do not have any written or unwritten policies regarding the timing of the appointment of a principal-elect; the criteria upon which he is chosen; or the types of responsibilities and amount of authority he is to assume during the process.

The School Divisions which have, in the past, used principals-elect as their primary leader in the facilities planning process,

continue to appoint persons to the position of principal-elect. However they also continue to give him little or no direction in the role he is assuming.

The principals-elect spent approximately four and one-half months of full working time, working on the project as well as five and one-half hours a week of their own personal time.

The total amount of time devoted to the project was usually spread out over a period of six months to two years prior to the opening of the facility.

The actual areas, in which principals-elect were most active, in rank order were: Staff Selection; Curriculum Development; Preparing and Opening the Facility; Building Design and Planning; Educational Specifications; and Construction.

One area in which most principals-elect had little or no involvement, was in Developing the Educational Specifications.

However six principals-elect did become involved in this area to some extent. The type of tasks which they performed were: research; clarification; modification; visualization, gathering feedback; and negotiation.

The six principals-elect who were involved in Developing the Educational Specifications indicated that they performed mainly as Executive role while completing the tasks in this area.

The principals-elect acknowledged the advantage of knowing more about the community they would be serving. Although none of them was actually involved in the initial phase "Establishing a Need," they indicated that they did not want to be involved. Most principals-elect felt that Establishing a Need should fall within the

superintendents' responsibility and should take place prior to the principal-elect being involved in the process.

The list of specific tasks, (see Tables 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15) actually performed by the principals-elect who took part in this study, are somewhat generally stated. However the list is important in that they were performed by one particular person namely the principal-elect. They were not a list of tasks which could be performed by a variety of administrators depending upon the stage of development. The list concentrated on only one person, the principal-elect, who was involved in the facilities planning process. Therefore the list as a whole could be considered quite specific.

It was found that the principals-elect performed the majority of their tasks while performing in an Executive role. In other words they were responsible to put into effect, to direct or control the tasks.

This high degree of authority by principals-elect was most evident in the areas of Staff Selection, Curriculum Development, and Preparing the Facility for Use.

Despite the magnitude of the job, and the need for some assistance, it was interesting to note that principals-elect had a great deal of authority throughout the process and wanted to maintain that authority or even increase it. They saw themselves performing in an executive or an advisory role primarily, and to a very small extent a supportive role.

The fact that the principals-elect saw themselves actually performing primarily in an executive or advisory capacity indicated that superintendents and school boards usually accepted the advice and

direction of the principals-elect. Therefore, the principals-elect may have had even more authority than what was evident, since their advice was seldom neglected.

When the list of areas considered by principals-elect to be most important, was examined, Curriculum Development and Staff Selection were at the top of the list as it has been throughout the study. However the next area indicated by the Principals-Elect to be most important was, "Preparing the Facility for Use."

It would appear that this phase was important to the principals-elect since this would be the most visible measuring stick of their performance during the facilities planning process. It could provide a public relations function which might be extremely important personally for the principal-elect.

Except for the placement of the phase Preparing the Facility for Use, the list of phases considered to be the most important to the principals-elect, also corresponds to the list of their ideal most active phases.

Educationally, Preparing the Facility for Use, perhaps, should not be more important than Developing the Educational Specifications. However, from the principals-elect point of view, it is understandable.

After analyzing the data and having viewed the importance given to Staff Selection by the principals-elect, it would appear that the greater benefit is derived from having persons involved in the planning process, who have a vested interest in the outcome, namely future staff members and a principal-elect.

In summation the principals-elect had a great many areas of responsibility throughout the whole process but especially in Staff

Selection, Curriculum Development, and Preparing the Facility for Use. They performed their job with little or no direction, insufficient time for preparation, lack of assistance, and with a great deal of authority.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS REGARDING THE IDEAL ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL-ELECT

Ideally the principals-elect wanted to be appointed as early into the process as possible. In fact the majority of principals-elect suggested the appointment take place immediately after the Letter of Intent was sent in to the Department of Education.

It was felt that the principals-elect needed about six months to one year prior to the opening of the facility in order to do their job well.

The principals-elect thought that ideally their position, as well as a secretary's, should be filled immediately after the Letter of Intent had been approved by the Department of Education.

The areas which the principals-elect considered were the ideal ones in which they should be involved, in rank order, were: Staff Selection, Curriculum Development; Developing Educational Specifications; Preparing and Opening the Facility; Building Design and Planning; Establishing a Need; and Construction.

The major difference between the actual list of active phases and the ideal, was in the placement of Developing Educational Specifications. In actuality this area placed fifth in active involvement while ideally the principals-elect placed it third. The principals-elect felt that the resulting building should reflect all

of the programs and activities planned for the facility. Since they were the ones who primarily determined the curriculum, programs, and activities, the principals-elect felt it was necessary to be involved in Developing the Educational Specifications which is the first step in the constructing the building. Furthermore the principals-elect expressed a desire to play at least a supportive role in this phase. Ideally they wanted to play either an executive or an advisory role.

Some principals-elect felt that they would like to know more about the community they would be serving. For this reason some principals-elect wanted to be involved ideally in Establishing a Need for the facility.

The principals-elect wanted to eliminate very few of the tasks which they performed. This would seem to indicate that once they were involved, the principals-elect wanted to be knowledgeable and involved in each and every facet of the process. All of the principals-elect appear to have been keenly interested in the total development of the facility.

The tasks most principals-elect wanted to eliminate were, secretarial tasks, indicating the need for some assistance during the process and enormity of their responsibility. When one considers the total amount of time principals-elect find they need to adequately do the job, and the number of different areas in which they must be involved, the responsibility does appear to be an onerous one.

When asked what role changes they wanted to make, the principals-elect were more than satisfied with their actual roles. Whenever changes were desired, it was always a desire to increase the level of authority of the principals-elect. It would appear that

despite the heavy responsibility, and the lack of time and assistance, the principals-elect wanted to continue playing their role in the process or even increase their level of responsibility. They were not prepared to give up anything.

The desire by principals-elect to have some specific direction given to them by their superintendents appears to be a desire by the principals-elect to clarify their areas of responsibility as well as their level of authority. In this way the principals-elect would know what areas upon which to concentrate their efforts, and how far they could go in promoting the outcome. By having some directions given to them, the principals-elect could possibly avoid wasted time and effort.

One of the main suggestions made by the principals-elect was that they should have complete jurisdiction over the staffing of the new facility. The rationale was that it didn't matter what "things" you had, it was the people who made it work. The total job of planning, and running a new facility was made much easier if the right people were hired.

In summation, the principals-elect viewed the ideal situation to be one in which they were given: ample time in which to complete the task; a wide range of responsibility but especially staffing; a high degree of authority; a clear cut set of directions; and sufficient help or aid to complete the project.

THE FINDINGS IN RELATION TO THE LITERATURE

The major difficulty in relating the literature to the findings of this study is that most of the literature concentrated on

either the overall process or on parts or phases of the process. There was little reference to individuals involved and especially little or no reference to a principal-elect. Therefore it was necessary to generalize somewhat when analyzing the data in relation to the literature.

When the literature regarding this study was examined, no phase was specifically singled out as being the most important. All phases were relatively equal and all were considered to be very much interconnected. A breakdown or a poor performance in any one phase would limit the success of the whole process.

It is interesting to note that the vast majority of authors listed the areas to be completed in almost exactly the same order as the principals-elect listed their ideal most active phases. Although the literature never really stated a proper sequence to follow, it appeared that they were listed in a reasonably logical order. The principals-elect also appear to concur with this placement for the ideal completion of the process.

One difference between the literature's listings and the ideal listing of active phases, is in the placement of the phase or area Establishing a Need. Most of the literature began with this area since it was usually concentrating on the overall process of facilities planning.

Some principals-elect wanted to be involved in Establishing a Need but it did not rank first in their ideal most active phase list. Establishing a Need was not considered by most principals-elect to be part of their responsibility.

Another discrepancy between the literature and the findings

was in the placement of Staff Selection and Curriculum Development.

Most principals-elect were most active in these two phases in the order of Staff Selection first and then Curriculum Development. For most principals-elect this meant they chose a core staff first and then concentrated on Curriculum Development. The final compliment of staff members was chosen even later on in the process.

Ideally the principals-elect continued the desire to be involved in Staffing first, and Curriculum second. In fact, many principals-elect wanted the full staff hired before considering the curriculum.

Most authors agreed with the order of these two areas. In the case of one author, Wesley Boughner, although he stated Curriculum Development was the area to be concerned about first, his first task in this area was to involve himself in hiring and training a staff.²⁸

The rationale for placing Staff Selection first is that a team approach appears to be considered the most successful. Generally no one principal has complete knowledge of, or expertise in the programs which might be offered in the new facility. Besides it is the teachers who will be doing the majority of the teaching, not the principals.

The principals-elect concurred with this latter reasoning. Furthermore the enormity of the task appears to necessitate the principal-elect getting some aid in this case.

Other authors such as John Frederickson and John Bisch had

²⁸ Wesley Boughner, et al., Development of a Model for Planning an Educational Facility. Practicum Report (U.S.A. Department of Health, Education and Welfare), ED 197732, pp. 70-73.

Curriculum Development taking place prior to Staff Selection.²⁹ The rationale was that principals should know the programs to be taught first, in order to know what type of staff should be hired and included in the planning team. Most principals-elect did not agree with this viewpoint

In regard to Developing Educational Specifications, all of the literature with absolutely no exceptions had the development of Educational Specifications following Curriculum Development. The rationale here was that the educational philosophy of the building, the activities to take place, the type and number of students, and the type of equipment and materials to be used have broad implications for the type of facility to be built. Therefore they should be determined first and must be articulated to the architect.

All of the literature indicated that facilities must be related to educational needs. It should follow that the best judges of the needs of the building would be its users, namely the principal, teachers and students.

In actual practice many principals-elect were not involved in developing the educational specifications despite the fact they were the most knowledgeable in terms of its needs, based upon the programs to be offered. However almost all principals-elect were involved in

²⁹ John Bisch, et al., Information Requirements for Planning Instructional Strategies: An Anthology for Teachers and Principals. Central Atlantic Regional Educational Lab. Inc. (Washington: Office of Education D.H.E.W., Bureau of Research), pp. 24-28; John Frederickson, "Space Shortage, Space Surplus, Renovations: The Principal and School Plant Planning" (Paper read at Annual Meeting of North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Chicago, Illinois, April 7, 1975), pp. 17-28.

Curriculum Development.

This apparent lack of involvement by principals-elect in developing Educational Specifications is a major weakness of the whole Facilities Planning process, uncovered by this study. Some Manitoba Schools may have been built primarily upon the wants of the architects, the school boards, and the superintendents instead of the needs of the students, the teachers, and the principal, perceived by the principal-elect and his core staff.

The principals-elect appear to have recognized this weakness and stated that ideally they wanted to be more involved in developing the Educational Specifications.

When the total list of tasks which the principals-elect performed was first developed, it was considered to be fairly specific and quite extensive. However, upon careful analysis, it would appear that the list may be still incomplete. This may be due to the fact that the principals-elect occasionally reported their tasks in rather general terms such as, "Researched the whole area of curriculum development, educational philosophies, and educational organization." This task could perhaps be broken down further into a series of specific tasks which had to be performed.

On other occasions a number of tasks, indicated by principals-elect, were very similar, but because of the person reporting, or perhaps because of the unique nature of each situation, they were worded slightly differently. When this occurred the tasks were grouped and then a new rewording of the task was created to encompass all of the principals-elect statements. This change to a general statement rather than a specific one was done for instance, when the

tasks relating to Educational Specifications were listed. As a result the total number of specific tasks was reduced.

Despite the fact that the list of tasks was, on occasion, general rather than specific, and perhaps somewhat incomplete, it is much more specific and complete than what was discovered in the literature. It is certainly much more specific and complete for a principal-elect since he is generally left out of most of the relevant literature.

Authors such as Basil Castaldi, Jerry Herman, Robert Hirsekorn and Clark Davis, who included a principal in the facilities planning process,³⁰ usually confined him to educational specifications, or merely as a member of the planning team. At no time did the literature discuss the role of the principal-elect in specific terms during the preconstruction and planning phase.

One group of authors who did delve into Facilities planning in some detail was Wesley Boughner, Clyde Fischer and Lee Randall. However their study concentrated upon the whole process and did not relate it to any one individual. It had no reference to the principal-elect except to include him on the planning team.³¹

Their study also had to generalize tasks to some extent. In

³⁰Basil Castaldi, Educational Facilities Planning Re-modeling and Management (Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1977), pp. 154-157. Jerry Herman and Robert Hirsekorn, Administrator's Guide to School Construction, Remodeling, and Maintenance (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co. Inc., 1975), pp. 14-16. J. Clark Davis, The Principals' Guide to Educational Facilities Design Utilization and Management (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973), p. 35.

³¹Boughner, et al., op. cit., pp. 13-15.

some areas they were very specific, such as Retaining an Architect. While in other areas they were quite general, such as in Educational Specifications and Curriculum Development.

The tendency to generalize is quite understandable when one considers that each situation is unique even if the facilities to be built are within the same School Division. The authors realizes that the final responsibility for the facility lies with the top school administrator namely the superintendent. They also knew that he may designate tasks to others but he maintains the responsibility. Therefore the authors even generalize when they are directing their information, by addressing themselves to the School Administrator.

The list of specific tasks, which was developed in this study, follows the tendency of the literature to generalize. However the list is important in that it concentrates upon the tasks and responsibilities of one particular person involved in the facilities planning process. A person who, up till now, has been neglected by the literature, and a person who is becoming more and more involved in the facilities planning process, namely the principal-elect.

The major discrepancy between the data uncovered in this study, and the literature is in the area of Staff Selection. In most of the literature the phase or area Staff Selection is only mentioned in passing. Nowhere in the literature is it pointed out that staff selection may well be the most important phase of the process. The principals-elect felt this area was the key to success or failure.

The literature treats the planning process and the individual phases in a very theoretical manner. There is very little personal involvement with the facility by any member of the planning team. The

process becomes much too mechanical.

None of the authors indicated that it would be of benefit to have future staff members on the planning team. They merely suggested that having some teachers on the team might prove to be of some benefit. Very few authors even acknowledged the presence of the principal-elect on the planning team.

In addition, authors such as Castaldi, and McClurkin, who do not make mention of the benefits of having a principal-elect or future staff members on the planning team, point out the great importance of developing the curriculum and the educational specifications. These two are key phases for authors such as these.

Therefore it appears to be somewhat unreasonable of these authors to have individuals who will not be involved in the new facility after it is built, dictating the type of curriculum to be taught and the resulting needs of the facility.

After analyzing the type of tasks that the principal-elect was asked to complete, and viewing the amount of authority he possessed in the process, it would appear that the principal-elect is to a large extent, the educational consultant mentioned in the literature, as well as the superintendent's delegate.

None of the literature examined, viewed the role of the principal-elect to this extent. He was merely one member of the planning team for most authors, and the designer of the educational specifications for others. In reality the principal-elect appears to be the key member of the whole planning process.

THE IDEAL SITUATION

By using the data gathered in this study, the advice offered by past principals-elect, and the literature on Facilities Planning, it was possible to develop an image of an ideal principal-elect situation.

School divisions should be assured first of all, that the appointment of a principal-elect would help to ensure the success of any facilities planning process. Based upon the benefits of a team approach to facilities planning, the apparent past success of, and continuing preference for, a principal-elect to act as team leader, school divisions should realize the advantages of such an appointment.

School divisions should therefore adopt some form of policy, preferably a written policy, governing the timing of the appointment, the types of responsibilities to be assigned to the principal-elect, and the degree of authority he is to assume at various stages in the process.

It would be beneficial for both the School Division and the principal-elect if this information was communicated specifically to the appointed principal-elect along with the reasoning for his appointment. The principal-elect would then know what his future job entailed, as well as the types of positive qualities or qualifications he possesses which allowed him the opportunity to get the job.

Ideally, the principal-elect should be appointed immediately after the Letter of Intent has been approved by the Department of Education.

If this step is viewed by the School Division as a mere

formality, it would be beneficial to appoint the principal-elect even earlier. He could help develop the Letter of Intent by gathering pertinent information about the needs of the community and the school division.

As soon as the principal-elect has been appointed, a secretary-elect should also be appointed. The secretary-elect could be employed on a dual basis, working on other regular duties with an appropriate amount of time devoted to the principal-elect and the new facility.

Both appointed persons should work in the same building during the planning stage to ease the channels of communication.

The actual appointment of a principal-elect may take place up to two years prior to the opening of the facility. However the principal-elect should be allowed to increase his working time devoted to the project in stages. Perhaps one or two days a week at the beginning, until six months prior to opening when he should devote his full working days along with his secretary, to the task at hand.

While the areas of responsibility may vary from situation to situation, the principal-elect should be primarily responsible for Staff Selection, Curriculum Development, Educational Specifications, and to some extent, Preparing the Facility for Use. Although the superintendent bears the final responsibility, the principal-elect should be seen in an Executive Role for these areas. This means that the principal-elect and the superintendent should develop good, close lines of communication. This will give the principal-elect additional direction and will avoid future areas of conflict between the planning team, the principal-elect and the superintendent. The wise superin-

tendent will not only allow the principal-elect to have a great deal of independence, he will make sure it appears that way as well.

The areas in which the principal-elect should assume an advisory role is in Building Design and Planning, Construction, and also Preparing the Facility for Use.

Although the principal-elect may be primarily an advisor in these areas, it would be wise for the superintendent to examine the advice very carefully since the principal-elect would now be the person most knowledgeable about the future use of the facility. The primary reason for the principal-elect being in an advisory role for these areas is that he lacks expertise. It is important that the persons most knowledgeable in these areas, such as the architect, the site foreman, and the purchasing agent, compromise with the principal-elect, since he is acting as their employer and they are his employees.

The principal-elect should work out for himself a general philosophy and mode of operation for the new facility. Following this the principal-elect should be given full control of the staff hiring, both for a core staff and a full staff.

Once the hiring has begun the principal-elect should be highly conscious of staff training and team building. This is an ongoing process which will continue long after the facility is being used. It is important to have the staff and the principal-elect working together to accomplish common goals but it takes a conscious effort on behalf of the principal-elect.

As the staff is being hired the principal-elect should use them to help him in his task. The staff can be used to develop a more

detailed philosophy, and mode of operation. They can be used to determine the types of activities which will take place in the facility, the space they will need in their classrooms, the types and numbers of necessary equipment and supplies.

In effect, the new staff should be used to develop a curriculum for the facility.

All of the information leading to the curriculum should be articulated and communicated clearly to the architect in order that he might begin to develop the preliminary drawings for the facility.

It would be wise to include the community for the first time, at this point, in order that they can also give feedback to the architect.

Based upon the results of the community meeting(s) and the meetings with the staff and the architect, the principal-elect should write out the educational specifications, confirm it with his staff and communicate it to the architect, translating if need be.

Following the receipt of the preliminary drawings, the principal-elect and his staff should examine them carefully to determine whether they are truly an outgrowth of the educational specifications. All questions should be directed to the architect for reasoning and compromise.

Throughout the planning stages, the principal-elect should consult with experts in all areas of educational planning, such as the Department of Education, Divisional personnel, and especially former principals-elect. In this way the principal-elect would increase the amount of direction given to him, and also increase his knowledge about what lies ahead.

Following the development of the actual working drawings, the principal-elect and staff should once again examine the plans to ensure there are no discrepancies. Another meeting could then be held to further inform the community and to promote co-operation and support.

During the construction stage the principal-elect should perform a monitoring role for himself and for the division. The site foreman should know the principal-elect and should be prepared to answer many questions during the construction stage.

All anticipated changes made to the plans and to the actual construction should be communicated to the principal-elect prior to them being made.

At the same time the construction is proceeding, the principal-elect and his staff should devote themselves to finalizing the curriculum and preparing the facility for use.

The major task in this area is purchasing equipment, supplies, and furniture. The principal-elect and his staff should make themselves as knowledgeable as they can in this area by talking to suppliers, touring other schools, and talking to colleagues. The principal-elect and his staff should make their needs known to the architect and to the purchasing agent, who in turn should endeavor to supply their needs, within reason and budgetary restraints.

The staff should be fully utilized in ordering textbooks and educational materials. This is the final stage of the curriculum development area and the principal-elect and his staff should ensure themselves that the materials support what has been previously developed in this area.

Once the building has been constructed and the building is prepared for use, the principal-elect can now look forward to hosting the community in the new facility.

Then it is a matter of helping to make the facility work on a day to day basis. The principal-elect is no more. The task is now to be a good principal.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The need for this study arose from an awareness of an increasing number of principals assuming a leadership role in the development of new educational facilities and of the difficulties these principals encountered.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to describe the current and ideal practices concerning the tasks and roles of the principal-elect in the planning and constructing of new educational facilities in urban Manitoba. It was felt that this study might lead to guidelines which would aid future principals-elect, their senior administrators, and school boards.

The Design of the Study

Briefly, this study involved identifying all individuals who had been appointed principals-elect in urban Manitoba since January 1970, and having them respond by way of a questionnaire or by interviews.

The questionnaire and interviews were devised with reference to both the literature and practices in urban Manitoba, and focussed on actual and ideal roles in the process. Information was obtained from 16 out of 18 potential respondents.

Summary of Findings

A large number of findings have resulted from this study. They can be categorized under several main headings:

1. The appointment of principals-elect. Urban Manitoba School Divisions have no written or unwritten policies regarding the appointment of a principal-elect. This includes the timing of the appointment as well as the criteria used to make the appointment.
2. Amounts of time devoted to the project. The typical principal-elect spends approximately a total of four and one-half months full time working on the project. In addition he spends approximately five and one-half hours per week of his own personal time. This time is usually spread out over a period of six months to two years.
3. The principal-elect's most active phases or areas. In rank order, the six areas in which principals-elect were actually most active were: Staff Selection; Curriculum Development; Preparing and Opening the Facility; Building Design and Planning; Educational Specifications; and Construction. The two phases demanding the most attention were Hiring a Full Staff and Preparing the New Facility for Use.
4. The phases or areas in which principals-elect desired to be most active. In rank order, the seven task areas in which principals-elect theoretically wanted to be involved were: Staff Selection; Curriculum Development; Educational Specifications; Preparing and Opening the Facility; Building Design and Planning; Establishing a Need; and Construction. The two phases in which the principals-elect desired to be most involved were Hiring a Full Staff and Hiring a Core

Staff.

5. The specific tasks which should have been included or eliminated during the development of educational specifications. The principals-elect who were involved in developing the educational specifications were satisfied with the tasks they performed and did not want to increase the number of tasks in this phase nor did they want to eliminate any. The principals-elect who were not involved in developing the educational specifications did not desire to become involved in this phase at all.

6. The specific tasks which should have been included. Generally speaking, the principals-elect did not feel that there were any additional tasks they would like to have performed during the process.

7. The specific tasks which should have been eliminated. The major tasks which principals-elect wanted to eliminate were those generally assigned to a secretary. Another response was site planning due to the political nature of the task.

8. The nature of the role of the principal-elect in the various phases. The nature of the role of the principal-elect was deemed to be either executive, advisory or supportive. The principals-elect felt that throughout the whole project they performed primarily an executive role and to some degree an advisory role. Very few principals-elect saw themselves in a supportive role.

9. The recommended roles in any of the phases. The principals-elect were quite satisfied with the roles they played. Whenever a change was desired, it was always an increase in the authority level of the principal-elect. Phases which were indicated

as requiring some change were: Choosing a Core Staff; Detailed Planning of the Curriculum; Developing the Educational Specifications; and in Building Design and Planning.

10. The most important phases. The principals-elect felt that Curriculum Development and Staff Selection were the two most important task areas for the whole process of developing educational facilities. The two most important phases were Hiring a Full Staff, and Hiring a Core Staff.

11. The items of most concern or difficulty. Of the items which caused principals-elect their most difficulty, the most significant were: lack of direction; time and the lack thereof; and equipping and purchasing.

12. General recommendations by the principals-elect. Of all recommendations and improvements made by principals-elect, the majority centered around the concepts of time, staffing, increased authority and independence, consulting with others, establishing a philosophy, observing the whole process, increasing directions, and community ties.

13. The actual order of completion of phases. Despite the uniqueness of each situation and facility, the actual order of completion for all respondents was almost identical and corresponded almost exactly to the printed completion list of phases given to the respondents.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of this study it can be concluded that:

1. Principals-elect have a great deal of authority and

autonomy throughout the process, perhaps even more than they themselves realize.

2. Principals-elect are not given enough direction regarding their tasks and responsibilities prior to, and during, their involvement in the facilities planning process.

3. Principals-elect devote a great amount of working time and personal time to the project. However the amount of time may be inadequate if the principal-elect is not appointed early in the project.

4. Principals-elect generally lack adequate aid or expertise throughout the whole process, especially in areas such as secretarial aid, help in developing the curriculum, and help in equipping and purchasing materials supplies and equipment.

5. Principals-elect in actuality are not highly involved in the area of developing the educational specifications. However theoretically they felt they should be more highly involved. They did not, however, see this area as being highly important to them or to their jobs as principals-elect.

6. Some new Manitoba school buildings may not adequately reflect the philosophy, and/or the activities of its principal and teachers, since they may not have been involved in developing the educational specifications.

7. The most important phase in the facilities planning process is Staff Selection. Hiring a core staff and a full compliment of staff members is the key to success for the whole process.

8. The list of phases, which was developed in this study, is very accurate and realistic for the purpose of indicating the order of

completion of the phases.

9. The literature regarding facilities planning, while helpful, is very inadequate in the areas of: reviewing the whole process in specific terms under the leadership of one person, acknowledging the need to delegate responsibility; determining specific individual tasks in each phase of the process; determining what tasks should be delegated; determining the amounts of authority which should be delegated; indicating the inclusion and examining the importance of principals-elect; examining and determining the relative importance of all phases especially staff selection.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Taking into consideration the findings derived from this study, I would recommend:

1. That school divisions appoint a principal-elect as the leader of the facilities planning process provided he is given ample time, help, authority and direction to complete the task.
2. That more orientation courses in facilities planning be made available.
3. That the Department of Education develop a guidebook for the newly appointed principal-elect.
4. That the Department of Education develop a list of reference people, namely past principals-elect, who could aid those newly appointed if requested.

AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study was based upon an apparent trend in facilities

planning in Manitoba. There are several areas which could be studied further.

Incidence of Principals-Elect

This study was based upon findings derived in Manitoba. It was here that the trend of appointing a principal-elect was most apparent. No effort was made to see if this trend is more widespread. A study investigating the incidence elsewhere of appointing principals-elect would be beneficial.

Advantages and Disadvantages

This study concentrated upon the tasks and roles of a principal-elect. There was no discussion as to the benefits or disadvantages of having a principal-elect act as leader of the facilities planning process. A detailed study, indicating the advantages and disadvantages, both practically and monetarily, for all parties concerned should be warranted.

Staff Hiring

It would be of great benefit to determine if in fact Staff Hiring is the key to success in the facility planning process. A comparison study comparing attitudes of the conventional school staff, a new facility with the staffing responsibility given to someone else, and a new facility with the staffing responsibility given to the principal-elect. The study could include criteria and methods employed to hire a full staff, and/or a core staff.

Importance of Phases

A study which determines the relative importance of each phase

in relation to the overall process would be warranted. Time and resources allotment could be determined from the results of this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Boles, Harold W. Step by Step to Better School Facilities. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Castaldi, Basil. Creative Planning of Educational Facilities. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969.

_____. Educational Facilities Planning Re-modeling and Management. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1977.

Davis, J. Clark. The Principal's Guide to Educational Facilities, Design Utilization and Management. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1973.

Educational Specifications. Educational Facility Series, A Guide to Planning. Trenton, New Jersey: State of New Jersey, Department of Education, Field Services Division, Bureau of Facility Planning Services.

Goodlad, John. School Curriculum and the Individual. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1966.

Herman, Jerry, and Robert Hirsekorn. Administrator's Guide to School Construction Remodeling and Maintenance. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co. Inc., 1975.

Leu, Donald J. Planning Educational Facilities. New York: Centre for Applied Research in Education Incorporated, 1965.

_____, and Hebert C. Rudman. Preparation Programs for School Administrators, Common and Specialized Learnings. East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1963.

McClurkin, W.D. School Building Planning. New York: Macmillan Company, 1964.

Smith, Louis, and Pat Keith. Anatomy of Educational Innovation, An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School. New York: Wiley Publishing Company, 1971.

Strevell, Dr. Wallace H. Preconstruction Planning for Educational Facilities. New York: Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials, 1972.

Sumpton, Merle R., and Jack L. Landes. Planning Functional School Buildings. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1975.

To Create a School, A Design for Working Relationships. 2nd ed.
Winneconne, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Association of School Boards
Incorporated, 1970.

Thrasher, James M. Effective Planning for Better School Buildings.
New York: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973.

B. Microfilm Reproductions

Bisch, John, et al. Information Requirements for Planning Instructional Strategies: An Anthology for Teachers and Principals.
Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 032292,
1972.

Boughner, Wesley, et al. Development of a Model for Planning an Educational Facility. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 109732.

Fredrickson, John H. Space Shortage, Space Surplus, Renovations: The Principal and School Plant Planning. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 102683, 1975.

McCabe, James. Some Administrative Aspects of Educational Planning. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 112503, 1975.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. A Study for the Re-Organization of Edmonds School District No. 15. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 108374, 1975.

Office of Education, D.H.E.W. Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research. A Comprehensive Planning Guide, S.E.L. Pathways to Better Schools. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 040803, 1970.

Savard, William. The Hierarchy of Curriculum and Instruction System Documentations. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 020561, 1967.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Handbook for a Parent-School-Community Involvement Program. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 118709, 1973.

Smith, Louise M., and Pat M. Keith. Social Psychological Aspects of the School Building Design. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 010672, 1967.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Planning for an Urban Community School. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 029064, 1974.

C. Periodicals

- Aubert, Aline. "The Elementary School Principal, The Person in the Middle," Thrust for Educational Leadership. Vol. 4, No. 4. March, 1975.
- Bried, Raymond. "Design Your Plant to Avoid Maintenance Sore Spots," National Schools. Volume 83, Number 4. April, 1969.
- Canadian Education Association. "Developments in Canadian Education 1968-1969," Education Canada. Volume 9, Number 3. 1969.
- Davis, Donald L., and John A. Shaver. "Five Proposals for Big City Schools," National Schools. Volume 83, Number 3. March, 1969.
- Frederickson, John H. "The Principals' Role in Facilities Planning," National Association of Secondary School Principals. Volume 59, Number 392. September, 1975.
- Greenfield, Barr. "Creating Effective School Programs," Orbit. Volume 1, Number 1. February, 1970.
- Kuehn, Phyllis R. "The Principal and the Media Center," National Association of Secondary School Principals. Volume 59, Number 392. September, 1975.
- Lawton, Edward J. "Principals and Program Planners Take Notice," National Elementary Principal. Volume 51, Number 2. October, 1971.
- Levine, Malcolm A., and Roger Simon. "From Ideal to Real: Understanding the Development of New Educational Settings," Interchange. Volume 5, Number 3. May, 1974.
- Lee, Mary. "A Practical Guide to Futuring for Secondary Administrators," Thrust for Educational Leadership. Volume 3, Number 5. May, 1974.

D. Unpublished Materials

- Linglits, Harold N. "A Study of the Allocation of Administrative Functions between the Chief School Administrator and the Secondary School Principal in Selected Schools in New York #37." Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse, 1968.
- Moore, Mary T. "Local School Program Planning Organizational Implications." Paper Presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., April, 1975.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine current and ideal practices concerning the tasks and roles of the principal-elect in the development of educational specifications for, and in the planning and construction of, new educational facilities in Manitoba.

Method of Completing the Questionnaire

A proposed list of phases which should be completed during the construction of a new educational facility in Manitoba accompanies each questionnaire. Respondents should use this list and refer to it whenever necessary.

When the questionnaire refers to specific tasks, words such as job and activity may be used as synonyms. In any case it refers to a piece of work imposed, exacted, or undertaken by the principal-elect. The tasks may appear to be inconsequential, e.g., arranging for meetings, but all specific tasks should be indicated by the respondents whenever asked to do so.

Questionnaire

1. What, if any, was your school division's policy regarding the appointment of a principal-elect, and his responsibilities? Please be as specific as you can. Use the back of this page if necessary.

2. In your opinion why do you think you were chosen as principal-elect?

3. Were you given time off from regular duties to work on the facility? If so, how much?

4. Using your own estimation, how much of your own time was spent on the project?

(a) How much time in hours in total?

(b) How much time in hours per week?

5. What would be the most ideal and realistic division of time for a principal-elect?

6. What grade levels were to be housed in your new facility?
(Check the appropriate level)

K - 6 _____ 7 - 9 _____ 10 - 12 _____

Others (please specify) _____

Total number of rooms _____

7. Please read over the accompanying list of Phases in the Construction of a New Facility in Manitoba. In your opinion are there any other phases which should have been included in the list? If so, please add these new phases to the bottom of the list.

8. In the completion of these phases (including your additions), what sequence of completion was actually followed for your particular facility? Please number them in order of completion in the proper spaces provided on the accompanying list of phases.

9. One possible step or phase has purposely been left out-- "The Appointment of a Principal-Elect." Using your numbering system from question 8, between which two phases did your appointment occur?

Between Phase _____ and Phase _____

10. Regarding your answer to question 9, do you consider this a suitable time for appointment? Why or why not? Explain fully, using the back of this page if necessary.

11. In your opinion, what would be the ideal completion sequence of the phases (including your additions)? Number the ideal order of completion in the proper spaces provided on the accompanying list of phases.

12. Using your numbering system from question 11, in your opinion what is your recommended placement of the step or phase "The Appointment of a Principal-Elect?" This appointment phase should ideally take place between phase _____ and phase _____.

13. In which phases did you as principal-elect, take an active role? Please rank them below in order of your involvement, with 1 indicating your most active involvement. (Please indicate a minimum of 4 phases.)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

14. In which phases do you feel a principal-elect should take an active role? Please rank them below with 1 indicating the most active involvement. (Please indicate a minimum of 4 phases.)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

15. If you actively participated in the gathering of information for and in the development of, the educational specifications for your new facility, please write out all of the specific tasks you performed in these phases. (Use the back of this page if necessary.)

16. If there were any specific tasks relating to educational specifications which you would like to have performed, but did not, please write out these tasks below.

17. If there were any specific tasks relating to educational specifications which you would have rather not performed, please write out these tasks below.

18. Referring back to question 13 and using only your first 4 phases, please write out all the specific tasks which you performed in the completion of these phases. Be as specific as you can. Use the back of this page if necessary.

(a) Most Active Phase

Specific Tasks

(b) Second Most Active Phase

Specific Tasks

(c) Third Most Active Phase

Specific Tasks

(d) Fourth Most Active Phase

Specific Tasks

19. Continuing to refer to specific tasks, were there any tasks in any phase which you would like to have performed but did not? Please list them below, be as specific as you can and indicate your

reasoning for your choices.

Specific Tasks Which You Would Like to Have Performed

20. Were there any tasks in any phase which you did perform but would rather not have performed? Please list them below, be as specific as you can and indicate your reasoning for your choices.

Specific Tasks Which You Would Rather Not Have Performed

21. In which phases did you play mainly an executive role? An executive role is defined as having the responsibility to put the majority of specific tasks in that particular phase into effect, to direct, or to control. You may have been accountable for the execution of the tasks; and/or you may have planned procedures and policies; and/or you may have arranged for and co-ordinated the tasks.

Phases

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

22. In which phases did you play mainly an advisory role? An advisory role is defined as having the responsibility to give advice, counsel, and recommend as opposed to giving binding instructions. You may have performed in a consultant relationship or you may have merely made recommendations.

Phases

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

23. In which phases did you play mainly a supportative role? supportative role is defined as supplying or furnishing data or other such information to aid others in their decision making.

Phases

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

24. What role did you play in the development of educational specifications phase?

Would you have liked to change this role? If so, to what?

25. In retrospect, are there any other phases in which you would have liked to change your role, e.g., from advisory to supportative, advisory to executive, etc.? If so please indicate your changes below.

Phase	Actual Role	Preferred Role	Your Reasoning for Change
-------	-------------	----------------	------------------------------

26. In your opinion, what were the 3 most important phases in your role as a principal-elect and why? Do you feel they were the most important?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

27. In your role as principal-elect, what things caused you the most difficulty, tasks, phases, individuals, circumstances, etc.?

28. What advice would you give to any person newly appointed as a principal-elect?

APPENDIX B

POSSIBLE PHASES IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND
CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW EDUCATIONAL
FACILITY IN MANITOBA

Actual Sequence of Completion	Phases	Ideal Sequence of Completion
_____	A Preliminary Study - to determine the need for a new facility is undertaken and completed (Tasks are related to determining the need for a new facility).	_____
_____	The School Board accepts the need for a new facility and authorizes a Letter of Intent be prepared and submitted to the Public Schools Finance Board (PSFB)	_____
_____	A committee is established to prepare the Letter of Intent. (Tasks are related to determining who will be involved and to what extent, . . .)	_____
_____	Information in support of the Letter of Intent is assembled. (Tasks are related to: a study of the community; determining features of the present school system; determining all the specific requirements demanded by the P.S.F.B.	_____
_____	The Letter of Intent is prepared and submitted to the P.S.F.B.	_____
_____	The P.S.F.B. approved the building project as per the Letter of Intent and advises the School Division to prepare the Preliminary Building Plans.	_____
_____	An Architect is chosen	_____

Actual Sequence of Completion	Phases	Ideal Sequence of Completion
<hr/>	A Curriculum committee or a Core Staff is chosen to aid in the development of the Curriculum as possibly in the development of the facility.	<hr/>
<hr/>	Information relating to Curriculum Design is gathered and assimilated by the Curriculum Committee or Core Staff. (Information such as: Provincial Guidelines; Educational Trends; Physical Growth and Emotional Development of Children; Educational Philosophies; Nature of Learning Theories; The Organization and Administration of Education)	<hr/>
<hr/>	Detailed planning for the Design of the Curriculum is undertaken and completed. (Tasks are related to analyzing the information gathered; establishing a program; and developing an educational philosophy for the new facility.)	<hr/>
<hr/>	Information relating to the preparation of the Educational Specifications for the new facility is gathered and assimilated. (Information such as: the community to be served; the type and number of students to be housed; the type of programs to be offered; the philosophy to be employed; the spatial requirements location and specific needs of various areas and rooms in the facility; the specific requirements of the service systems, e.g., custodial, delivery, etc.; very specific considerations for all areas in the facility, e.g., colors, intercom, lighting, landscaping.)	<hr/>
<hr/>	The Educational Specifications are developed and articulated.	<hr/>

Actual Sequence of Completion	Phases	Ideal Sequence of Completion
_____	The Preliminary Building Plans or Preliminary Working Drawings are developed and submitted to the Capital Facilities Committee (CFC)	_____
_____	The Preliminary Building Plans are approved by the P.S.F.B. and the Minister of Education. The School Board may now authorize the architect to prepare Working Drawings and Specifications.	_____
_____	The actual Working Drawings and Specifications are prepared. (Tasks would be related to determining the specific types of material and equipment to be used.)	_____
_____	The Actual Working Drawings and Specifications are submitted to the P.S.F.B. After approval the School Division may submit its project for tender.	_____
_____	The Building Project is tendered.	_____
_____	Following a review of the bids the (C.F.C.) approves a bid and authorizes the School Board to award the tender and begin construction.	_____
_____	The Facility is constructed. (Tasks would be related to the actual construction of the facility, e.g., supervision.)	_____
_____	A full compliment of staff members is hired.	_____
_____	The new facility is prepared for use. (Tasks are related to ordering texts, supplies, furniture, and equipment.)	_____
_____	The new facility is opened for use.	_____