

Another Brick in the Wall: A leadership team's collaborative renewal of the educational environment

Mr Martin Kerby
St Joseph's Nudgee College
mke@nudgee.com

Dr Margaret Baguley
University of Southern Queensland
baguley@usq.edu.au

Abstract

The aim of this research project is to examine the complex pressures on a school leadership team as it seeks to renew the built environment against the background of government funding, heritage concerns, architectural pressures and school and wider community expectations. These often competing demands are further complicated by the need for the school to maintain the full operation of its core business of teaching and learning in the midst of three different building programs within the campus.

This research project will utilise a qualitative narrative study approach to develop an understanding of the phenomenon under discussion. The research will include interviews with key personnel involved in the leadership team at St Joseph's Nudgee College, Brisbane, Queensland. A narrative account utilising the elements of incident, characterisation, time, location and dialogue will be presented to examine the complexities involved in undertaking a project of this nature.

The significance of this research project is its focus on a leadership team facilitating a major building program in order to provide mutually beneficial outcomes for the school and wider community. The transformation of traditional classrooms into collaborative and open learning and teaching spaces emphasises an educational philosophy of learning which inevitably has a profound impact on the entire school community. This information will be of particular interest to educational leaders who are about to embark on school refurbishment initiatives whilst seeking to retain the rich history of their institution and simultaneously provide relevant teaching and learning spaces.

Introduction

In early 2003 during a morning briefing, the first lay Principal at St Joseph's Nudgee College addressed some staff concerns regarding the decision to play soccer on the school's No. 2 Oval instead of its regular placement on an oval on the periphery of the campus. In a college which revels in the claim of being the cradle of Queensland rugby such an improvement in the profile of an alternate and 'lesser' winter sport was seen by a number of staff members as both unwarranted and ill-advised. Even more threateningly, it was viewed by some as the harbinger of a modernisation program destined to challenge traditional modes of thinking. However, the Principal's concluding remark that there were more changes to come passed almost unnoticed – an unequivocal commitment to a modernisation program that would be guided by tradition rather than stymied by it. That the designers of this program were the first lay Principal and his deputy, who was from interstate, only heightened the perception that these ideas might run counter to the nature of the 'real' college. Those who perceived themselves to be the guardians of its traditions saw a threat in this rather innocuous opening salvo.

As Duke (1998) reveals it is a significant challenge to design for the future in an educational context without overlooking the present. In reality, the Principal of the school is the central player responsible for improving educational outcomes for all the learners in their school (Hart & Bredeson, 1996). In addition to the Principal are other school leaders, designers, architects and builders who are each participants in a complex collaborative design process in which each are reliant on the expertise and skills of people in professional fields with skill sets often profoundly different from their own. From the very conception of a

project to the public celebration of the official openings, this melting pot of expertise and personalities is tested by personal and organisational agendas that seek to balance pragmatic and philosophical concerns that can appear mutually incompatible. It is not unknown for a Principal, driven by an awareness that his period of tenure at a school is finite, to eschew practical and future considerations to drive building projects with their own personal timeframe in mind. This might then be exacerbated by professional pressures exerting an influence on other members of the leadership team.

Due to the combined effect of the growing corporatisation of education and shifting demographics the renovation of educational institutions has taken on an added urgency in a competitive marketplace. Yet in many instances schools are hampered by an aging and inappropriate educational infrastructure created by accretion rather than by design. Beyond even business considerations, these factors can be ultimately detrimental to learners and can result in a lack of appreciation for the school surroundings, even in schools viewed as elite institutions whose longevity shrouds them in an aura of educational legitimacy that can be a poisoned chalice to Administrations grappling with the demands of modern education. This is further exacerbated by the specialised nature of secondary education, a characteristic which compels students to regularly move around the campus and in doing so to interact with a built environment which may be in decline visually and of questionable relevance to changing socio-economic trends (Dudek, 2000). Yet to compartmentalise the campus as a mere backdrop for social interaction is as Cotterell (1996) argues, a flawed premise because the student's settings, organisational structures and activities affect and influence their values, attitudes and motivations of a community. It is against this complex backdrop that this paper will provide insights into one leadership team's experience of renewing the built environment in an educational context.

Context

St. Joseph's Nudgee College, colloquially referred to as 'Nudgee' is situated in the north of Brisbane in the state of Queensland. It is an Australian Catholic school for boys whose philosophy is based on the Edmund Rice tradition. Currently the college's enrolment stands at 1450 boys in Years 5 – 12, including 300 boarders. The campus covers 137 hectares and is one of the largest in the state. The architecture of the college is diverse and reflects a range of pressures – both past and current – which caters for a demographic shift in the socio-economic status of the student clientele. The campus is akin to an open air museum offering a physical reminder of the changing nature of the school; from its traditional past firmly rooted in the Irish/Australian experience and a modern search for identity in a new millennium (Baguley, Riordan & Kerby, 2010).

In 2002 the current and first full time lay Principal Daryl Hanly assumed the leadership of St Joseph's Nudgee College. He instigated a strategic plan to oversee the modernisation of both the curriculum and building programs with a focus on the twin pillars of the students' overall learning and well being and staff effectiveness and well being. This initiative seeks to retain the exterior façade of St Joseph's Nudgee College, built in 1891, and transform its traditional interior and external spaces into areas which allow for effective and engaging teaching and learning, and opportunities for spontaneous interactions amongst the school community.

The College leadership team needed to be cognisant of the needs of millennial students (born between 1979 and 2001), which are profoundly different from their own school experience. They had to balance this knowledge with an awareness that the school community, both past and present, are vocal stakeholders in more than just the evolution of Nudgee as an educational institution but as the guardians of a tradition difficult to articulate, often impossible to quantify, pervasive in an influence strengthened by its vagueness rather than weakened by it. The characteristics of millennial students are described by Leather and Marinho (2009, p. 45) as including good expertise with technology, enthusiasm to collaborate and multi-task, appreciative of learning mobility, able to express their opinions easily and readily volunteer if there is a personal reward. These qualities are often at odds

with a campus infrastructure which has evolved rather haphazardly during the course of numerous building programs since 1891.

Though flirting with the construction of a new 'super' building, which sought to alleviate the difficulties imposed by some of the building errors of the past by repeating the flawed thinking that brought them about in the first place, the Administration chose to renovate rather than reinvent. The real achievement therefore, of this Administration, of more enduring worth to the College than any individual building project could possibly have aspired to, was their preparedness to sublimate their own natural desire to alter the landscape and to bring to an end the tradition of marking an epoch with a new building surrounded by the declining remnants of old ones. The irony of this architectural humility is that their influence as agents of sustainable change has far outstripped what they might have achieved by any ego driven project. Though ground breaking in terms of the College; this change in philosophy has mirrored those in other educational institutions.

Theoretical Background

Traditional and hierarchical models of organisation, are not as responsive to events and actions in uncertain and dynamic times (Brown, 1991; Douglas, 2000; DuBrin, 1997; Garvin, 1997; Kayser, 1994; Montuori & Purser, 1999). Due to the rapid change of technology and communication systems, organisations have been transforming their structures and leadership strategies in order to better respond to change. The increasing rate and access to knowledge has subverted the traditional leadership model, in which power was situated at the apex of a triangular model.

The role of a school leader is also becoming increasingly complex (Bottery, 2004; Cranston, Ehrich & Billot, 2003; Parkes & Thomas, 2007), and therefore collaborative processes are being increasingly utilised in a range of school settings (Chalmers, 1992; Engestrom, 1994; Erickson, 1989; Henry, 1996; Littleton, Miell & Faulkner, 2004). In the education sector, Malone (2005) describes collaboration as shared planning, with administrators talking to each other daily, sharing information and making decisions through a collaborative process. This project therefore provides insights into the importance of designing engaging learning spaces for school communities (Dudek, 1996, 2000; Fisher, 2005, 2007; Wall, Dockrell & Peacey, 2008), with a specific focus on the management of change by a school leadership team. Although the decisions relating to change in a school are ultimately decided by the Principal, change is also "an innate component of education, as with all organisations that involve people" (Crum & Sherman, 2008, p. 575).

Emmons and Wilkinson (2001) reveal that the environment has a direct impact on learning. This view is also supported by Knirk (1987) and Gifford (1976) who propose that students learn better in a well-designed classroom and can be easily distracted by a poorly designed space. It is evident that the built environment of schools has reflected the values and pedagogical changes of the particular time they were created; as teaching methods change there is a greater need for flexibility (Chiles, 2003). As Newton (2008) notes, increasing environmental awareness and the rapid pace at which technology is pervading and enriching students learning requires appropriate design responses. Education is changing classrooms into learning and information environments. However, Pouler (cited in Scheer & Preiser, 1994, p. 175) reveals that space is not neutral but political and cannot avoid being part of a complex network of power relationships. This view is particularly relevant to education and teaching specifically which is viewed as a contested practice.

Dudek (2000) notes that traditional school buildings often reflect the types of teaching approaches which were dominant during the period of construction. As a result there is, unsurprisingly, a dichotomy between traditional buildings and teaching methods against lightweight modernist school buildings with more progressive experimental approaches. With little regard paid to 'future proofing' buildings numerous schools being rendered incapable of catering for changes in pedagogical approaches due to restrictions on room sizes, inadequate external spaces and/or poor environmental psychological comfort in terms of factors such as heating and lighting. As Dudek (2002, p. 58) states: "Outdated and inadequate school buildings can create problems for class teachers which hinder

educational development no matter how carefully teachers may treat the decoration of their classroom interior.” The nature of school environments therefore can affect the health and wellbeing of pupils and staff (Dudek, 1996, 2000; Wall, et al., 2008). Leather & Marinho (2009) contend that although planning and design is primarily concerned with physical space, the way that this is physically manifested reveals what the Administration “believe about student learning and what students need to support that learning” (p. 44).

Stone and Cuper (2006) contend that a contemporary model of leadership in education is one which exemplifies collaboration, integration, encouragement, learning, modelling, challenging, building consensus, and displaying professionalism. However, implementing change can be difficult if existing cultures are strongly entrenched (Harris, 2002; Raelin, 2003; Spillane, 2006). Raelin (2003) posits that this is due to the traditionally hierarchical structure of schools which fostered an individualistic and heroic model of leadership and elevated authority “as the primary basis for control” (p. 91).

Methods and Techniques

Narrative research has been chosen as the qualitative methodology for this paper. This method enables the researcher to gain important insights into the phenomenon under investigation through close association with participants and activities in particular settings. This approach also has the scope to deal with complex human issues (Webster & Mertova, 2007). Narrative has been described as a mode of thinking and is considered to be one of nature’s important meaning-making tools (Bruner, 1996; Polkinghorne, 1995; Richardson, 1995). As Holley & Colyar (2009, p. 681) state: “Narrative is the telling (or retelling) of a story in a specific time sequence.” The text is therefore structured to allow for various perspectives to come together to form a narrative story. Weiland (2003, p. 212) reveals that a well constructed narrative uses a number of elements to develop a story which represents the data collected. This include: incident, characterisation, time, location and dialogue. In this way the author can also include artistic and moral dimensions within the narrative.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with three key leadership figures in the school including the Principal, the Deputy Principal, and the Director of Finance and Business. An interview schedule was used to obtain consistency but also allowed for scope if the participants wished to extend on their responses. The interviews were transcribed and patterns and categories were sought in the data to generate consistent themes from the interviews. The researchers analysed the transcriptions independently from one another to pinpoint themes in the data which they compared and then constructed a key number of themes. Salient points from the interviews were utilised to create a narrative which includes various perspectives of the school building program, the effect of the participants in this process, the timeline of the project, the geographic location and the presentation of the participants’ voices in the narrative account. Focalisation has been used to determine the event which will be told and also to provide a coherent yet omniscient voice to the narrative account by allowing the researchers’ to become the narrators. In this way the participants can voice their own experiences yet also shift between internal and external points of view (Holley & Colyar, 2009).

This research has been granted ethics approval from the University of Southern Queensland’s Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval No: H10REA124).

Trustworthiness and Reliability

A major concern for rigor in qualitative research is what Cresswell (2007) describes as ‘evidentary adequacy’, which refers to time in the field and the extensiveness of the evidence used as study data. In this study one of the researchers is currently teaching in this context and has been for the last ten years. He has also worked closely with the participants in the study moving from a teaching to a leadership position in the school. His co-researcher has provided an important role in providing objectivity to the data due to her separation from this site of study. Polkinghorne (1988) contends that the validity of narrative is closely associated with meaningful analysis and that trustworthiness is evident in the quality of the

notes or transcriptions. Huberman (1995) proposes that the measures of access, honesty, verisimilitude, authenticity, familiarity, transferability and economy can be used to validate the validity and reliability of narrative research.

In this study access has been granted to the readers through one of the researcher's relationship with the school and the participants. In addition, sections of the narrative data have been included in the paper to provide the reader with first-hand accounts of the experience on which the researchers have based their findings. Honesty has been achieved by providing the narrative accounts to the participants for member checking. The researchers have also sought to understand the complexity of the phenomenon under investigation through constant clarification. The common theme of the building program provided verisimilitude to the accounts. In this way the reader may also experience this phenomenon as being plausible and may recognise a similar event or generate new understandings of the experience of being involved in a school refurbishment. Authenticity is often intertwined with verisimilitude (Webster & Mertova, 2007). In this study the researchers have achieved authenticity by ensuring the narrative contains the voices of each of the participants, is coherent and has been written through a process of critical reflection. Transferability is evident in the amount of detail and accessibility provided which could allow a similar study to be replicated in another setting.

The Narrative Account

After 110 years of Christian Brothers assuming the Principalship of the College with a monotonous and often destructive regularity, it fell to Daryl Hanly to mark the evolution of the Order by being installed as Nudgee's first lay Principal. Though coming from outside the immediate community after a successful career in State Education, he had grown up in regional Queensland where he had been educated by the Brothers, so though his arrival was indeed a harbinger of the future, he was by no means an outsider. In contrast to each of the previous 24 Administrations however, his alone will be remembered as a coalition rather than for the dominance of one leader whose followers were, at least nominally, subject to a vow of obedience. The relationship between Hanly and his deputy Graham Leddie have given to the College two qualities it has traditionally lacked in its leadership – a strategic plan and the length of tenure to realise it. As Leddie noted, in at least one respect, it was "not rocket science" to identify some of the pressing needs. Hanly recalled:

...arriving at the College in early January 2002 and being struck by the contrast between the state of the classrooms and the incredible state of the grounds. People were working in the English Village with holes in the floor covered by masonite, while the classrooms lacked access even to overhead projectors, let alone data projectors. Yet there was the incredible talent of the staff, who irrespective of the surrounds were producing good learning outcomes.

Some of the challenges were an interesting blend of practical and philosophical concerns. The previous Administration had sought a rationalisation of the budget deficit to 800 000 dollars, one that required cuts in spending. What appeared a practical decision actually hinted at a significant philosophical issue that would come to be seen by some sections of the community as the looming clash between the 'Old Nudgee' and its 21st Century incarnation. For the cuts were to be borne entirely by the Learning and Teaching departments, while the Sports and Activities area escaped almost unscathed in terms of a fiscal tightening of the belt. There were other, more immediate concerns, the most pressing being what Hanly referred to as an historical debt of 6.9 million dollars owed to the Christian Brothers, who were now seeking repayment. The second was the unusual relationship with the Nudgee International College, which had become mythologised as a 'cash cow,' a view firmly cemented by their donation of over 4 million dollars to the College. Yet in reality they had actually taken out loans to fund the donations, and in a final irony the College would in time be asked to cover those debts. As Hanly notes:

I was really browned off that we would have to ask parents for money to pay for debts which were not ours. It would have left us with a 6.9 million historical debt, 4.25 million to cover the donations and a possibility of a further 6 million to cover their other debts

and at that stage there was not even a viable business to make it worth our while. In time though, we got ourselves into a strong enough financial position to convince lenders that we could borrow money.

Hanly's initial reaction to the campus was supported by Buchanan Architects who produced a Conservation Management Plan in 2006 in which they identified the loss of "considerable heritage integrity" due to the "removal and/or adaptation of significant fabric, and through the blocking of significant early visual linkages across the site" (cited in Urbis, 2010, p. 26). The loss of heritage integrity is, in part, the result of building developments perceived as opportunistic, reactive enterprises driven by finance and circumstance. The first major step in correcting these errors was the creation of the College Master Plan (Urbis, 2010) which has as its core vision, the creation of a "vibrant public realm that allows Nudgee to function as a village" (p. 11) The key objectives are:

- Visionary – creating a compelling vision for the campus;
- Capacity – Ensuring that the campus uses its facilities to maximum capacity;
- Diversity – providing a school campus that meets a variety of needs, ranging from educational activities, sport and recreational facilities through to environmental protection;
- Access – solving current and future access issues;
- Certainty with flexibility: realising a vision that creates a certainty about the future of the campus whilst retaining sufficient flexibility to alter aspects of the plan as demand changes across generations and;
- Achievability – providing a long term deliverable strategy.

Though the alteration of the built environment is an important background to this paper, the primary focus is on the role of the leadership team which pursued, in concert with the building program, a renovation of the curriculum at the same time. The leadership team adopted a tripartite vision focussed on diversity and offering an academic and/or vocational education coupled with an emphasis on spirituality, sport and cultural pursuits. The College Master Plan (Urbis, 2010, p. 15) asserts that over the past few years a "richer vision" has been realised in the synthesis of the pursuit of academic excellence and an "in depth and inclusive cultural program." This balancing act is pursued within the framework of Edmund Rice Education. It is believed that the "physical fabric" and the "pedagogical infrastructure" is, as a consequence, being reshaped and further developed.

Despite the grandeur of the original buildings and the beauty of the Chapel (constructed in 1916), the reality is that many of the campus buildings were, as the authors of the College Master Plan described dispassionately, in "various states of disrepair and are not appropriate to emerging shifts in education philosophy and practice". In addition they identified the end result of this lack of coherence as a campus which offered "only moderate levels of visual delight, and fluctuating levels of legibility, imageability and memorability" (Urbis, 2010, p. 48). Though some of the issues probably appeared insurmountable, as creative people the leadership team recognised, similarly to Duke (1988), the importance of "reframing problems as opportunities and breaking free of conventional assumptions" (p. 692), and in doing so have begun a process of authentic and sustainable change. Hanly observed that:

In the past it had looked as though, irrespective of the architectural style of the College, they just plonked a building in any likely space. It had initially been my dream to build a signature building in a style consistent with the original, three storeys high with an entertainment deck on the roof with views to the ocean and the city. We eventually went with the architectural firm who came back with the view that we needed to change the dream.

The first step in the program was the refurbishment of the Duhig Building, the oldest surviving classroom block, dating from 1919. The second was the decision to introduce Years 5 – 7 which provided a new cohort of fee paying students able to access the already existing infrastructure. A boarding house was converted into a year 5 – 7 building at a final cost of just over 4 million dollars. It was part of an evolving decision to make use of the already existing structures on the campus, which was to prove an essential component of

the entire campus wide renewal. The other building projects were also renovations rather than new constructions - the Science Block (Purton Building), the Original Building (Treacy Building) and the performance space (Tierney Hall).

Michael Cosgrove, the Director of Finance and Business at the College was confronted by the immense task of “turning around” the school’s financial performance in order to generate the funds required to underwrite four major building projects. The challenge was exacerbated by what he saw as the failure of previous Administrations to implement a strategic plan or to ensure long term financial security of the College. His participation came to encompass almost every stage of the renewal, beginning at conception, through to costing and finally to the operational Administration of up to fifty workmen present on a school campus during term time. Finally the project required a change in the very manner in which the College approached issues pertaining to the built environment.

As Cosgrove stated, “Too often in the past things weren’t done properly. I’ve seen holes in walls where sheets of unpainted fibro were banged in over the top. We’ve moved away from the old model. The buildings we’ve done will stand the test of time. They’re durable, they won’t date and hopefully in twenty years time someone will be saying that it was good that these things were done properly.” Cosgrove understood all too well Duke’s (1998) argument that good learning environments require a solid investment of resources, but he was equally cognisant of Alexander’s (2001) observation that how school buildings are designed and used actually transmit the educational and social values of that institution. For despite leading the Finance department Cosgrove understood that he was involved in a philosophical change as well as a practical alteration to the manner in which things were done. He saw the construction of a new performance space, in part funded by the Rudd government’s stimulus program to the tune of 2.2 million dollars, as evidence of the school’s commitment to delivering a balanced curriculum. Though acknowledging that the performance space, built over the shell of Tierney Hall, a structure built in 1975, leap frogged other projects due to the immediate availability of government funds, it was still part of “a very big jigsaw puzzle, but one with a master plan underlying it.”

Deputy Principal Graham Leddie was also well aware that many of the issues confronting the Administration were the result of long term neglect of College infrastructure, a shortcoming exacerbated by the regular turnover of Principals. “We suffered from something akin to the pharaoh principle – Administrations had only a finite period to achieve things and more often than not it took the form of an individual building. The decisions were short term, pragmatic ones with little reference to a strategic plan. That’s where it really began for us – the creation of a strategic plan which allowed us to look beyond a specific project to the needs of the campus over the next twenty or thirty years.”

Leddie benefitted from having served on the staff as Head of Geography, a relatively junior position, and then later as Dean of Studies. The effect of having attended a prestigious southern school himself was possibly also an influential factor in his vision for the campus. He was thus able to identify the impact of the built environment on both staff and students. “It is something that I have always been passionate about. As Dean of Studies I looked to improve classroom and staff areas, essentially those areas where people work, play and interact with others. The need was pretty obvious, it wasn’t rocket science to see that we’d done something wrong along the way – we weren’t maintaining our buildings, we weren’t putting back anything into the infrastructure, we weren’t looking after tomorrow.” Leather and Marinho (2009) might as well have been referring to the College specifically when they argued that many academic building designs reinforce old paradigms of teaching rather than creating genuine alternatives. Likewise Stuebing (1994) found in a longitudinal study for Apple Classrooms of Tomorrow (ACOT) based in K-12 classrooms that a change in the physical environment of the classroom also led to a change in teaching and learning. Cognisant of the truth of such assertions though unfamiliar with the researchers specifically, the Administration pursued a building program alongside a curriculum overhaul that recognised to be authentic in their desire for change demanded an integrated approach in a school system which is, Lackney (1994) describes as a living entity of interrelated dimensions.

The preparedness of the Administration to seek outside input was particularly evident in the tender process. Five architectural firms were interviewed, and of these, four gave their assent to the College plans for what would have, in Leddie's words, been a 'super building' three times the size of the largest building on campus. The fifth, and ultimately the successful tender, was offered by a company prepared to work collaboratively, but as a critical friend, with the College Administration. By offering alternate views, Leddie saw the benefits in being challenged. "The architect we chose did a little bit more homework and challenged the school by encouraging us to look at the options from different perspectives. That has been one of the strengths of the entire project – the relationship between the College, the architect and the builder. There is integrity in the way they have done business and a confidence that allows us to challenge each other in order to get a better product." That the academic agenda was not lost in the clash of egos at the design table, a concern identified by Leather and Marino (2009, p. 47) says much for the individuals involved, but just as equally for the relationship that bound them together. Though it seems obvious in the assessment of a successful program to note that these relationships are vital, it transcends even the normal benefits of a beneficial working environment.

Designing a building typically becomes a personal mission for those directly involved because the result is a physical legacy that will have an impact on its community for generations. The design process is enhanced by personal relationships – mutual trust, shared commitments, and open communication. Understanding each other's individual interests is the foundation of a personal relationship. It is important for the participants to take time getting to know one another and to develop this relationship prior to commencing design. (Butz, 2002, p. 57).

Such a collaborative relationship derives its strength from personal relationships, not contractual responsibility. It was indeed fortuitous that these relationships were developed early in the process when the 'key irreversible decisions' were made (Butz, 2002, p. 62).

Conclusion

It is imperative in any campus renewal for the major stakeholders to acknowledge "that the building is being designed for how learning will occur in the future, not how it has been constrained by past philosophies and building" (Butz, 2002, p. 59). Yet this is always going to be problematic in a culture such as an "elite" boarding school defined as much by tradition as it is by its core business of providing a relevant and authentic education. Hanly used an interesting metaphor of his grand nephew on a swing to highlight the balancing act required between the old and the new in a community so aware of its history, yet one competing for students in a competitive marketplace:

In his attempt to move forward, he leaned forward. He quickly learned that to go forward on a swing you need to lean back. This action is indeed counter intuitive. And so it is with progress. The farther forward we wish to go, the more we need to lean back – to dip into our past to take out the quintessential elements that are the soul of who we are as Nudgee. (St. Joseph's Nudgee College, 2007, p. 3.)

As this study reveals, the change managed by the school leadership team was effective due to a range of factors. These included intimate knowledge and respect for the heritage and tradition of the College; open and collaborative communication with a range of stakeholders; recognition that the built environment, although conducive to learning must be complemented with an effective and relevant curriculum; and most importantly high levels of trust, communication, expertise and rapport amongst the leadership team resulting in a significant outcome which each individual could not have achieved on their own and which is the result of the submersion of ego and elevation of a strategic vision.

References

- Alexander, R. (2001). *Culture and Pedagogy: international comparisons in primary education*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Baguley, M., Riordan, T., & Kerby, M. (2010). Pragmatism and Philosophy: Enriching students' lives through a critical investigation of spatial literacy in shared spaces. In D. Pullen & D. Cole (Eds.). *Multiliteracies and Technology Enhanced Education: Social practice and the global classroom* (pp.100 – 114). Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.
- Bottery, M. (2004). *The Challenges of Educational Leadership*. London: Sage.
- Brown, L. (1991). *Groups for Growth and Change*. New York and London: Longman.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The Culture of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Butz, J. (2002). Educator and Architect Partnerships for Success. In N. Van Note Chism & D. Bickford, D. (Eds.). *The Importance of Physical Space in Creating Supportive Learning Environments*, 92, Winter, pp. 53 – 62.
- Chalmers, R. (1992). *Collaborative School Management: One Principal's Experience*. Milton, Qld: The Jacaranda Press.
- Chiles, P. (2003). Classrooms for the Future: 'an adventure in design' and research. *Architectural Research Quarterly*, 7(3/4), pp. 244 – 261.
- Cotterell, J. (1996). *Social Networks and Social Influences in Adolescence*. New York: Routledge.
- Cranston, N., Ehrich, L. & Billot, J. (2003). The secondary school principalship in Australia and New Zealand: an investigation of changing roles. *Leadership & Policy Studies in Schools*, 2(3), pp. 159 – 88.
- Cresswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crum, K., & Sherman, W. (2008). Facilitating high achievement: High school principals' reflections on their successful leadership practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(5), pp. 562 – 580.
- Douglas, T. (2000). *Basic Groupwork*. New York: Routledge.
- DuBrin, A. (1997). *Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.
- Dudek, M. (2000). *Architecture of Schools: The New Learning Environments*. Architectural Press: Oxford.
- Dudek, M. (1996). *Kindergarten Architecture*. E & FN Spon: The Alden Press, Oxford.
- Duke, D. (1998). Challenges of designing the next generation of America's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(9), pp. 688 – 693.
- Emmons, M., & Wilkinson, F., (2001). Designing the electronic classroom: applying learning theory and ergonomic design principles. *Library Hi Tech*, 19(1), pp. 77 – 83.
- Engestrom, Y. (1994). Teachers as collaborative thinkers: Activity - theoretical study of an innovative teacher team. In I. H. Carlgren, G. & Vaage, S. (Ed.), *Teachers' minds and actions: Research on teachers' thinking and practice* (pp. 43 - 61). Briston, PA: Falmer.
- Erickson, F. (1989). Research Currents: Learning and Collaboration in Teaching. *Language Arts*, Vol. 66(4), 430 - 441.
- Fisher, K. (2007). Pedagogy and Architecture. *Architecture Australia*. September/October. Retrieved October 8, 2008 from <http://www.archmedia.com.au/aa/aaissue.php?issueid=200709&article=13&typeon=3>
- Fisher, K. (2005). Research into Identifying Effective Learning Environments. *Evaluating Quality in Educational Facilities*. OECD/PEB, pp.159 – 167.
- Garvin, C. (1997). *Contemporary Group Work* (3rd ed.). USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gifford, R. (1976). Environmental Numbness in the Classroom. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 44(3), pp. 4-7.
- Harris, A. (2002). *School improvement: What's in it for schools?* New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Hart, A. & Bredeson, P. (1996). *The Principalship*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill, Inc.

- Henry, M. (1996). *Parent-School Collaboration: Feminist Organisational Structures and School Leadership*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Holley, K. & Colyar, J. (2009). Rethinking Texts: Narrative and the Construction of Qualitative Research. *Educational Researcher*, 38(9), pp. 680 – 686.
- Huberman, M. (1995). Working with Life History Narratives. In H. McEwan & K. Egan (Eds.). *Narratives in Teaching, Learning and Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kayser, T. (1994). *Building Team Power*. New York: Irwin Professional Publishing.
- Knirk, F. (1987). *Instructional Facilities for the Information Age*. Syracuse, NY: Educational Resource Information Centre: Clearinghouse on Information Resources.
- Lackney, J. (1994). *Educational Facilities: The impact and role of the physical environments of the school on teaching, learning and educational outcomes*. Centre for Architecture and Urban Planning Research, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee: Milwaukee, WI.
- Leather, D., & Marinho, R. (2009). *Designing an Academic Building for 21st Century Learning: A Dean's Guide*. Change, May/June, pp. 42 – 49.
- Littleton, K., Miell, D., & Faulkner, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Learning to Collaborate, Collaborating to Learn*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Malone, Z. (2005). *Middle school concept aims to make education more personable*. Retrieved 8 April, 2008, from www.goedwardsville.com/site/news.cfm?brd=2291
- Montuori, A., & Purser, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Social Creativity Volume 2* (Vol. 2). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Newton, C. (2008). Designing Smarter Schools. *Research Review*, August. Retrieved October 8, 2008 from <http://uninews.unimelb.edu.au/view.php?articleID=5369>
- St. Joseph's Nudgee College, (2007). *Nudgee College Annual*. Brisbane, Qld.
- Parkes, S., & Thomas, A. (2007). Values in action: observations of effective principals at work. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(2), pp. 204 – 228.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisiewski (Eds.). *Life history and narrative* (pp. 5 – 23). London: Falmer.
- Raelin, J. (2003). *Creating leaderful organisations: How to bring out leadership in everyone*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Richardson, L. (1995). Narrative and sociology. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.). *Representation in ethnography* (pp. 198 – 221). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Scheer, B., & Preiser, F. (1994). *Design review: Challenging the urban aesthetic control*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Spillane, J. (2006). *Distributed Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stone, R., & Cuper, P. (2006). *Best practices for teacher leadership: What award-winning teachers do for their professional learning communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Stuebing, S. (1994). *Environments that Support New Modes of learning: The Results of Two Interactive Design Workshops*. Access on January 15, 2009 from <http://images.apple.com/euro/pdfs/acotlibrary/rpt19.pdf>
- Urbis, (15 March, 2010). *Nudgee College Master Plan*. Brisbane.
- Wall, K., Dockrell, J., & Peacey, N. (2008). *Primary Schools: the built environment*. Primary Review Research Survey 6/1. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Faculty of Education.
- Webster, L. & Mertova, P. (2007). *Using Narrative Inquiry: As a research method*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Weiland, S. (2003). Writers as readers in narrative inquiry: Learning from biography. In R. Josselson, A. Lieblich, & D. McAdams (Eds.), *Up Close and Personal: The teaching and learning of narrative research* (pp. 199 – 214). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.