

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

**Xerox University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-26,322

McNABB, Norman W., 1924-

AN ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT PATTERNS,  
STAFF RELATIONSHIPS AND PROBLEMS WHICH LED TO  
THE CLOSING OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS AT PUBLIC-  
SUPPORTED TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN  
THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN 1964-72.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1973  
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1973

NORMAN W. McNABB

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT PATTERNS, STAFF RELATIONSHIPS  
AND PROBLEMS WHICH LED TO THE CLOSING OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS  
AT PUBLIC-SUPPORTED TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS  
IN THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN 1964-72

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY  
NORMAN W. McNABB  
Norman, Oklahoma

1973

AN ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT PATTERNS, STAFF RELATIONSHIPS  
AND PROBLEMS WHICH LED TO THE CLOSING OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS  
AT PUBLIC-SUPPORTED TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS  
IN THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN 1964-72

APPROVED BY

William R. Smith,  
C. J. Ferguson  
Philip B. [unclear]  
Amelia B. Butler

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

To my committee, Dr. Glen Snider, Dr. Omer Rupiper, Dr. Bob Bibens and Dr. Gerald Kidd goes my sincere thanks for their concern and patience. A special thanks to Dr. Glen Snider, Chairman, for his encouragement, understanding and assistance on many problems associated with the completion of this dissertation.

Sincere appreciation is extended to the Laboratory School Administrators, the College of Education Administrators and the State Department of Education personnel in the fifty states for their assistance in providing the data in this study.

Special thanks is due my secretary, Mrs. Merry Clegg, who assisted me in the preparation of the data and typed the information in form.

To my wife and four children who have suffered many neglected fatherly consequences through this endurance, goes my reassuring love and appreciation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES. . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM. . . . .	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH. . . . .	13
III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE . . . . .	26
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. . . . .	34
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	97
APPENDIXES. . . . .	101

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Closed Between 1964-72. . . . .	39-42
2. Percentages of Financial Support to the Public-Supported Laboratory School by Source for Schools Closed . . . . .	44-46
3. Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Charging Charging Tuition Which Closed Between 1964-72 . . . . .	47
4. Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Closing Between 1964-72 That Were Considered a Part of the Local Public School System. . .	48
5. Disposition of Faculty (Staff) at Closed Public-Supported Laboratory Schools . . . .	49
6. The Responsibility for the Decision to Close and Major Reason for Closing the Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Between 1964-72 . . . . .	51
7. Stated Functions of the Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Closed Between 1964-72. . . . .	53
8. Pupil Enrollment When Laboratory Schools Closed During Period 1964-72. . . . .	55-58
9. Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Closed During the Period 1964-72, Who Reported Philosophical Changes Since Their Inception. . . . .	60-62
10. Accreditation of the Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Now Closed . . . . .	63

Table	Page
11. Date Started and Grades Taught in Laboratory Schools Now Operating in Public-Supported Teacher Education Institutions in 1972. . . .	65
12. Present Functions and Purposes of Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Now Operating . . . . .	67
13. School Enrollment for Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Operating in Fiscal Year 1971-72 . . . . .	69-73
14. Utilization of Instructional Staff of Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Now Operating. .	75-77
15. Source and Percentage of Revenue for Fiscal Year 1971-72 of Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Now Operating. . . . .	80
16. Budget Expenditures, Fiscal Year 1971-72, for Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Now Operating . . . . .	82
17. Academic Rank and Benefits of Staff in Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Now Operating . . . . .	83
18. Major Problems by Number and Percent as Identified by Operating Public-Supported Laboratory Schools in 1972. . . . .	85
19. Eligibility Criteria for Enrollment in Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Now Operating . . . . .	86
20. Accreditation of Public-Supported Laboratory Schools Now in Operation. . . . .	88



AN ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT PATTERNS, STAFF RELATIONSHIPS  
AND PROBLEMS WHICH LED TO THE CLOSING OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS  
AT PUBLIC-SUPPORTED TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS  
IN THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN 1964-72

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Hundreds of colleges and universities all over the nation are engaged in the professional preparation of teachers and other educational personnel for public schools and other educational institutions. Many of these teacher education institutions have been deeply concerned with developing the most challenging programs for the education of educational practitioners in our schools while, without doubt, many are probably producing teachers in programs which have changed but little over the past two or three decades.

There are many characteristics which are indicative of quality in teacher education programs. One of the elements which certainly should characterize any outstanding teacher education program is high quality in the laboratory

experiences provided for those enrolled in the programs of teacher education. If by "laboratory experiences" is meant the sum total of opportunities which are provided by the teacher education institution for pre-service educators to come into contact with children and adolescents with whom they are to later work, then each institution preparing teachers and other educators must give careful attention to the provisions which are present for providing these experiences.

Therefore, many colleges and universities as far back as the last century created laboratory schools, whether by that name or not, in which their students were provided the opportunity to practice teach or to acquire other experiences designed to equip them to function more effectively in a school setting. By the 1920's, laboratory schools were found in teacher education institutions over the nation and were regarded as an essential part of the total teacher education institution. Since the establishment of the first laboratory schools, the purposes and functions have varied from time to time, but institutions which did not possess such schools were forced to find opportunities elsewhere for the students to contact children and adolescents with whom they would later work.

Laboratory or experimental schools began in Europe in the seventeenth century. They developed in the United States in the early part of the nineteenth century. The introduction

of laboratory or experimental schools in the United States was made by institutions whose curriculum was primarily for the purpose of training teachers to teach. Among the leading institutions in the United States generally credited with the start of laboratory or experimental schools were the University of Chicago and Columbia University, both of which emphasized experimentation as their purpose and function, while other earlier schools' purposes aimed at demonstration, observation and practice teaching.

At least five different kinds of laboratory schools were conceived to perform functions in the preparation of teachers according to the educational and social views of educators at that time. The kinds of laboratory schools that were used in teacher education programs in the first half of the century were: (1) the practice school, (2) the model school, (3) the training school, (4) the demonstration school, and (5) the experimental school.

These five types of schools did not always clearly categorize their differences in either type or function. Laboratory schools that were identified as a name-type did not always truly implement the prototype. The names of different kinds of laboratory schools also changed through the years, but the curricular organization, the administration, and the function did not necessarily change accordingly. These types of laboratory schools did not develop chronologically. The frame of reference for the design of many of

these schools represented a philosophy of education whose advocates sought to define and characterize the role of the teacher in society and in the education of youth. Through the years the teacher's role was evaluated and redefined, and the nature of the direct experiences provided for the education of teachers has varied.

#### The practice school

The practice school was a term used by educational leaders to identify these schools in New England during the early part of the nineteenth century. These schools were started primarily in seminaries where teachers would create "a situation such that a school may be connected with the seminary, accessible by a sufficient number of children, to give the variety of an ordinary district."

One of the chief concerns of the educational supporters of direct experiences for the prospective teachers at that time in New England was the perfection of methods of instruction. Most instruction was concerned only with the simple fundamentals of learning and was thoroughly tied to the textbook. Direct experience in the practice school was narrowly confined to specifics and had qualities of apprenticeship for the development of a mechanical skill.

#### The model school

This school developed also in New England in the early nineteenth century but for a different purpose. The

model school was conceived and developed to illustrate teaching procedures through demonstration and observation.

Classes in pedagogy were expected to use teaching and learning activities in the model school as illustrations of the theories taught. The lessons observed in the model school were of a highly mechanical nature and differed little from those in the practice school. These schools were designed to exemplify ideal conditions in physical plant, equipment, instructional materials, methods and discipline.

#### The training school

This term developed in the late nineteenth century by influential educators during that time, and there were consistent attempts by these educators to systemize rules of instruction and thus to build standard patterns in teaching. One of the distinguishing characteristics was a highly systemized method of organization based primarily on object teaching. Thus special rules for the teaching of each subject became the order of the day.

#### The demonstration school

The demonstration school was designed to serve as a focal point of the teacher education institution involving the academic disciplines and the theory of methods areas. Demonstration lessons were carefully selected and planned to give concrete illustrations for the teaching in the disciplines and in the theory and methods area.

## The experimental school

Experimental schools were purposely designed to be atypical and to work on the leading edge of educational theory. Experimentation was the basic function and accepted, standard methods and approaches in teaching of education were challenged through scientific investigations and research activities.

The chief influence affecting the role and purposes of specific laboratory schools was based primarily on the chief administrator's objectives and philosophies at the time of its establishment. Laboratory schools were originally regarded as a basic part of the program for teacher education, although some educators feel that this function and purpose has declined in recent years. More recently, too, most student teaching has been done in off-campus public schools.

### Need for the Study

Many professional educators, school administrators, and institutions have recently made critical evaluations of the roles and functions of the operation and services provided including the cost of the college-controlled laboratory school, particularly in view of the financial burdens most colleges and universities face. The public's view of the management of college and university business is suffering more now perhaps than ever before from the standpoint of public financial support to colleges and universities.

Research done in this study, which is identified in

Chapter II, indicates that many laboratory schools were closed in the decade of the sixties. Some of these schools were located at teacher education institutions long noted for quality programs in this area. What factors caused the closing of these schools? Were the reasons chiefly financial or was it assumed that the purposes achieved by laboratory schools at one time may be as effectively achieved by teacher education institutions working with other kinds of schools?

The expanding demands on the laboratory school, the rising costs of financing a laboratory school, increasing pressures on personnel in laboratory schools, and the integration of professional laboratory experiences with the total college program are some of the current critical problems of the laboratory school. These conditions are apt to become more difficult to resolve in the immediate future; and if recent experiences of laboratory schools are repeated, then the future of those now operating is dim indeed.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to analyze the financial support patterns, staff relationships and problems which caused the closing of laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States between 1964-72. The study also attempted to determine how these factors may influence the future of public-supported laboratory schools by examining those laboratory schools still operating in the United States in 1972. The study attempted

to produce answers to the following questions which were relevant to the purpose of the investigation:

1. What were the major functions of the recently closed laboratory schools and of those still operating?
2. What were the sources of support for laboratory schools; those closed and still operating?
3. What were the costs of the major expenditure categories of laboratory schools now operating and those closed?
4. What functions of closed laboratory schools were assumed by other educational institutions?
5. What happened to the faculties of laboratory schools when they were closed?
6. By what processes was the decision made to close the laboratory schools?
7. Was the laboratory school faculty (staff) regarded as a basic part of the College of Education faculty and staff?
8. What are the primary reasons for laboratory schools closing and major problems facing those schools still operating?

#### Limitations of the Study

Several studies have been completed which relate to the laboratory school, defining a multitude of problems and outlining the inconsistencies of one with another and the



variety of functions served by laboratory schools. This study was specifically limited to an investigation of laboratory schools operated by public-supported teacher education institutions which are now operating and those which closed between 1964-72.

#### Definition of Terms

PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOL--A public-supported laboratory school for the purpose of this study was defined as a laboratory school receiving all or part of its financial support from a public supported state university or state college.

RESEARCH--Careful systematic study and investigation in some field of knowledge with the use of control and experimental groups to establish facts or principles.

DEMONSTRATION TEACHING--The teaching of pupils in the laboratory school by a supervising or critic teacher to illustrate techniques and methods of teaching and class management to one or more students who observe the practices used.

LABORATORY EXPERIENCES--All of the experience, formal or informal, that a student teacher gains from coming in contact with children or adolescents.

OBSERVATION--That phase of laboratory experience which the student gains by going to a school to observe classes or procedures and techniques in teaching or managing a class. This may be individual or group.

PARTICIPATION--That phase of a student's laboratory experience in which he takes part in and assists the supervising teacher in general classroom activities. It usually precedes student teaching.

EXPERIMENTATION--The practice of testing or trying a practice or process under defensible research conditions.

### Design and Procedures of the Study

Descriptive research methodology was used to accomplish this investigation. Descriptive research is defined as "all those studies that purport to present facts concerning the nature and status of anything."<sup>1</sup> The design is classified as descriptive-survey-status research, which according to Good is "directed toward ascertaining prevailing conditions (the facts that prevail in a group of cases chosen for study). This method is essentially a technique of quantitative description of the general characteristics of the group."<sup>2</sup> The nature of the problem indicated the use of the survey method as the most feasible technique for the collection of the data. A questionnaire was developed and this instrument was used to secure the necessary data.

The following procedures were used in the completion of the study:

---

<sup>1</sup>Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates, Methods of Research, Educational, Psychological, Sociological (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), p. 259.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 551.

1. The professional and research literature on the laboratory school in the United States was carefully reviewed and analyzed.
2. A questionnaire was developed and validated to gather the data needed to fulfill the objectives of the study.
3. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Laboratory School Administrators Association, and the 50 State Departments of Education were asked to cooperate in providing relevant data for the investigation.
4. A letter identifying the purpose of this study and soliciting participation in the study, with a questionnaire, was mailed to those laboratory schools indicated by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Laboratory School Administrators Association to be operating and closed.
5. The data obtained from the questionnaires was then organized into tables.
6. The data was analyzed in an attempt to discover findings pertinent to the study. Conclusions were drawn, and recommendations developed relevant to the purposes of the study.

### Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters. In addition to the statement of the problem, Chapter I includes major divisions describing the study, its need, limits, and design and procedure used.

A review of research related to the study is presented in Chapter II. Chapter III describes the design of the study and the procedures involved in its completion.

Chapter IV is devoted to a presentation and analysis of the data. Chapter V provides conclusions based on the findings of the study, and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Many of the studies and writings reviewed relating to laboratory schools suggested that the basic problems these schools identified today were: (1) The matter of adequately financing these schools, and (2) the inability of teachers, educators and laboratory school administrators to agree on the role which these schools should play in today's teacher education institutions. In addition, limited and nonexistent educator-staff support at most public-supported and college controlled laboratory schools was a serious problem over the past decade. This chapter attempts to selectively review the literature regarding laboratory schools with special emphasis on both schools which have been closed and those still operating.

Williams' Study of 1942, based on data he had collected during the period 1933-34 and 1937-38, stated that in 23.7 percent of the teacher education colleges which maintained campus schools, tuition was charged pupils in the schools. He recommended that the campus school should serve as a laboratory for observation, participation, classroom

demonstration, and for initial classroom teaching of small groups. He also contended that the off campus schools should supplement the campus school by providing additional facilities and should complement it by furnishing the student teacher additional types of opportunity to have laboratory experiences under normal public school conditions. He concluded that this would provide the student teacher with his final laboratory experience and responsible classroom teaching.<sup>3</sup>

Butter reported that while one would expect a significant difference between the cost of teaching anthropology and chemical engineering, one would expect similarity between costs in history and political science. While measuring the effective learning in each institution can only be done in an approximate way, to ignore the possibility of improving cost effectiveness inherent in such figures seemed irresponsible.<sup>4</sup>

Bowen reported that far too often any discussion of cost was limited only to the question of expenditure reduction, but cost consciousness goes beyond budget consciousness. The budget only permits faculty to be hired and students to be enrolled, but cost consciousness considers how

---

<sup>3</sup>E. I. F. Williams, The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942), pp. 18-217.

<sup>4</sup>Irene H. Butter, Economics of Graduate Education: An Exploratory Study, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1966.

these parties interact to some purpose. It is the time and talent of faculty and students which are the major costs of higher education, and a conventional budget fails to reflect whether this time and talent is used effectively.<sup>5</sup>

Abrahams indicated that as apprehension over the problem of college financing has become more acute, budgets have become the subject of increasing attention. But, if the subject of the budget is more common on campus, the subject of cost effectiveness remains generally ignored. The measure of cost and performance in higher education is somehow regarded as illegitimate and not a basic concern.<sup>6</sup>

Van Til reported that when the laboratory school is justified to the funding agencies through pleas for support, it should be in terms of the extent of the student teaching participation-observation functions and the research-experimentation functions. He further stated that "there is no dean in recorded history who ever attempted to justify a laboratory school to the funding sources as an institution affording employment to deserving elementary and secondary teachers." The assumption is present, however, that the existence of the laboratory school should be dependent upon the degree to which it contributes positively to the teacher

---

<sup>5</sup>William G. Bowen, The Economics of the Major Private Universities, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

<sup>6</sup>N. L. Abrahams, State Planning for Higher Education, The Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C., December, 1969.

education program. He suggested that one would think that such friends of the laboratory school would be thoughtfully engaged . . . in realistically redefining and adapting the functions and purposes of each individual laboratory school to contemporary realities. . . . one would think that the friends of the laboratory school would be identifying the appropriate frontiers for the laboratory school today.<sup>7</sup>

Van Til emphasized that should other sources persuade the funding agencies that the school is simply a good private school or that little comes from the school by way of research or publication, the source of funding is apt to dry up and that many laboratory schools have had their natural enemies, however benign their appearance. These included, but are not limited to, the following: the laboratory school student who rejects the education he received, the parent perceiving the school as another private school, the professor of education indifferent to the laboratory school, the budget cutter in the legislature or in university governance hunting for cost reductions and lowered taxes. The laboratory school sometimes had natural enemies within its own building, e.g. the laboratory school administrator always accommodated and never led, and the narrowly focused laboratory school teacher who rejected all functions except teaching.

---

<sup>7</sup>William Van Til, The Laboratory School: Its Rise and Fall? (Terre Haute: Indiana State University and the Laboratory School Administrators Association, 1969), pp. 14-15.



Kelly's Study of 1964, which was published in 1967, reported that the philosophies of school administrators and educators toward the functions and purposes of laboratory schools had changed considerably over the decade prior to his study. In addition to philosophical differences, many laboratory schools reported a serious concern of increased costs and future financial problems. Kelly recommended that further investigation be made on the financial costs of operating the campus laboratory schools.<sup>8</sup>

A National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools conducted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1969<sup>9</sup> reported on the status of both public and private controlled campus laboratory schools, and is the only study that has been made on the status of campus laboratory schools since the study of 1964, in terms of the functions and contributions of these schools and the extent to which they are being closed, reorganized and new schools opened. This survey was not concerned with the financial support patterns or staff relationships at the campus laboratory schools. One hundred fifteen laboratory schools were reported in this survey as operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States. Thirty-six campus

---

<sup>8</sup>E. H. Kelly, The Status of the Campus Laboratory School in the United States, Dissertation, Indiana University, June, 1967.

<sup>9</sup>M. C. Howd and Kenneth A. Browne, National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools, The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.

laboratory schools were reported in the survey to have closed between 1964 and 1969, and others reported reducing their scope or possible future closing. Increasing costs of operation and decreasing flow of funding support to the laboratory schools were primary reasons given for these schools closing.

Bowen<sup>10</sup> indicated it was vital that any mention of cost should stop evoking, as a reflex, all of the defensive arguments against expenditure reduction that had been developed over the years. These arguments, and the unwillingness they indicate to direct attention to the serious issues of teaching and learning, are an invitation to budget cutting for they suggest an indifference as to how well the job is done. Educators and institutions of higher education should care how well they perform their missions. If this be true, why, then, is concern with cost effectiveness suppressed, rarely given operational expression and somehow considered illegitimate?

One reason is that the analysis necessary can be interpreted incorrectly. A college is not the same as a business. There is no simple product. The measures of effectiveness may be shortsightedly utilitarian, or they may rely too much on proxies reflecting other factors besides educational effectiveness. This is done frequently by measuring

---

<sup>10</sup>Howard R. Bowen, The Finance of Higher Education, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968).

educational performance by the starting salary of graduates, or cost effectiveness can be used as a weapon of one party against another rather than as a discipline for all. There are technical problems as well. Inputs and outputs must be weighed appropriately. How much of the salary of the professor is really attributable to his teaching, and how much is hidden subsidy for his research? How much weight, on the output side, should be attributed to a student's easily tested technical proficiency in French, and how much to the familiarity with French culture he gets with his French classes?

Smith reported the present notion of student teaching will fade out of existence. In its place will be a matrix of experiences concerned with progression from initial, general, nondiscriminating, and incomplete contact with teaching to deep and broad conceptualization demanded of the professional practitioner; from observed and participator in scientific inquiring to originator and designed of such inquiry; from insecure, imitating, dependent behavior to confident, creative, and responsible behavior. Students in the school laboratory will therefore be at all levels along these continua. College and school personnel working with them cannot be confined, therefore, to those now working with student teaching and internship programs.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>B. Othanel Smith, Teachers for the Real World (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969), pp. 95-294.

McGeoch traced the development of the campus laboratory school from its origin in the seventeenth century and in the United States normal schools of the 1820's. This study indicated that these schools served as models of desired teacher methods and provided opportunities for student teaching. Even before 1900, the functions of the schools were being debated, and the need was recognized to use them as experimental schools to test and demonstrate new techniques and materials. The student body in most campus schools thereafter tended to be highly selected and inadequate in number to serve expanding programs of teacher education. In the late 1960's, much student teaching was transferred to public schools and the concept of teacher education was changed to increase the collaboration between schools and colleges, with a resultant demand for more responsibility for the classroom teachers and student teaching and accreditation. McGeoch's studies stated that the new emphasis is on a joint enterprise by public schools, universities and colleges, the community, and related public agencies.

In her 1971 report, McGeoch contended that in theory, though not always in practice, teacher education is no longer the sole responsibility of the college. And with shared responsibilities must go shared authority. Classroom teachers through their professional organizations are negotiating the conditions under which they will take student teachers and

demanding a strong, if not dominant, voice in setting standards for admission to the profession.<sup>12</sup>

Blackmon interpreted from his study of a group of campus schools that the role of research was one of its more important functions. He stated "the bulk of college controlled laboratory schools and colleges of education associated with them have not capitalized sufficiently upon their potentials for research. In the face of shortages of outstanding teachers, the need for college classrooms, scarcities of appropriate funds and an ever-increasing enrollment, failure to do exceptionally well the thing that those schools can do uniquely might result in drastic alteration or even elimination of many of the college controlled laboratory schools." In connection with the research function and its importance shared by many, Blackmon's point of view is why, then, has not more been done to strengthen existing laboratory schools? Can it be because there is no solid evidence that these schools have indeed made significant contributions to educational research, educational innovation, and teacher education improvement in recent years?<sup>13</sup>

Hunter contended that to fulfill the commitment of

---

<sup>12</sup>Dorothy M. McGeoch, The Campus Laboratory School: Phoenix or Dodo Bird (Eric Clearing House on Teacher Education, June, 1971).

<sup>13</sup>C. Robert Blackmon, Laboratory Schools U.S.A.-- Studies and Readings, Southwestern Studies: Humanities Series, No. 3 (Lafayette: University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1970), p. 94.

contributing to the wider educational community, the expanding role of the laboratory school should encompass vigorous and purposeful professional interaction with other laboratory schools as well as public schools throughout the nation. The staff of the laboratory school becomes a pool from which may be secured consultant assistance in launching new programs, especially in the area of teacher in-service "education" for those programs. While, as part of dissemination, it is the responsibility of the laboratory school to generate exportable products to assist with new programs, the support of a knowledgeable professional can be an essential ingredient.<sup>14</sup>

The establishment of realistic and simulated experimental settings and the planning of coordinated clinical sessions that examine teaching episodes in terms of educational theory can be arranged only through regularized elaboration where both the institution of higher education and the school, with appropriate related organizations and agencies, are jointly responsible and accountable for the education of teachers. In cooperative teacher education programs, all collaborating institutions, organizations, and agencies can bring their total resources to bear upon educational problems as they join together in the mutually beneficial task of the continuing education of teachers.

One method to use in student teaching and teacher

---

<sup>14</sup>Madeline Hunter, "Expanding Roles of Laboratory Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 52:14; September, 1970.

training would be to establish a training complex which is a joint enterprise by the public schools, universities and colleges, the community, and related public agencies. A new institutional mechanism is needed because "university personnel and existing facilities are inadequate" and "the schools do not have the theoretical resources and technical knowledge to sustain a program of training."<sup>15</sup>

At a recent meeting of the Classroom Teachers' National Study Conference on the role of the classroom teacher in the student teaching program, it was stated as a belief of the Association "that the responsibility for student teaching should be shared by public schools, the institutions preparing teachers and the profession."<sup>16</sup>

How do legislators, boards of trustees, and university administrators see the laboratory school? These groups have the task of trying to make a judgment concerning the relative value of each aspect of college or university operations. The fund related agencies must translate their judgment into "dollars and cents" which is even more difficult. Since money is by the economist's definition a scarce commodity, it does not take too much persuasion to convince

---

<sup>15</sup>E. Brooks Smith and others, A Guide to Professional Excellence in Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching, 1970), pp. 1-294.

<sup>16</sup>A. H. Oestreich, The Classroom Teachers Speak on the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program (Washington, D.C.: Association of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association, 1970).

funding sources that the laboratory school is "a fad and a frill" nice to have, but hardly necessary.

There are important reasons why cost effectiveness must become a legitimate subject. Thinking about cost is not simply a matter of paring budgets and making ends meet, of cutting out secretaries or not buying typewriters. It is a fundamental educational issue. Searching for more effective methods of teaching must lead us to examine the neglected question of what we are trying to do and how students learn. For the college or university, as well as for society, the issue is effective use of resources. If time and energy can be saved by adopting more effective cost procedures, those energies can be devoted to a long list of tasks now starved for resources.

Concentration on budget consciousness can even be inimical to cost consciousness. For example, when funds for constructing new classrooms are saved by using existing ones a larger part of the day, the savings achieved, however desirable in themselves, may mute the issue on whether given subjects are best taught in classrooms at all. Classrooms at a college can be scheduled 24 hours a day, and every seat occupied; but if the classes themselves are relatively unproductive of learning, then the institution is grossly inefficient all the same.

Further confusion arises from pressures external to the institution. Growing public resentment over the cost of



education has led State governments to intensify budget procedures. While it may be possible to decide in the State Capitol how many teaching assistants there will be, it is impossible to decide there how to achieve cost effectiveness learning. Line item budgeting may reduce expenses. It will not likely find a better way to teach. But before pressures for budget control are reduced, the public needs to have confidence that cost effectiveness programs are being carried out.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The design and procedure used to achieve the purposes of this study are presented under the following four headings: (1) Design of the Study, (2) The Development of the Instrument, (3) Population of the Study, and (4) Treatment of the Data.

#### Design of the Study

This study was an analysis of the financial support patterns, staff relationships and problems which led to the closing of laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States between 1964-72. The study also attempted to determine how these factors may influence the future of public-supported laboratory schools by examining those laboratory schools still operating in the United States in 1972. The results of this study were intended to provide information which could significantly contribute to the decision which educators, administrators and trustees make as they establish priorities and alternatives relating to the future role, purpose, and operation of the

public-supported laboratory schools.

The review of the literature revealed that there has been a deep concern in public-supported teacher education institutions across the nation during the past decade regarding the financial support of laboratory schools. The changing role and function of laboratory schools in supporting teacher education programs has also been a matter of great importance to these institutions.

The study is fundamentally descriptive research which is defined as "all those studies that purport to present facts concerning the nature and status of anything."<sup>17</sup> More specifically, the design could be classified as descriptive-survey-status research, which according to Good is "directed toward ascertaining prevailing conditions (the facts that prevail in a group of cases chosen for study). This method is essentially a technique of quantitative description of the general characteristics of the group."<sup>18</sup> The nature of the problem indicated the use of the survey method as the most feasible technique for the collection of the data. A questionnaire was developed and this instrument was used to secure the necessary data.

---

<sup>17</sup>Good and Scates, op. cit., p. 259.

<sup>18</sup>Good and Scates, op. cit., p. 551.

The Development of the Instruments

The questionnaire was used as the major tool of this study. Questions were structured so that specific answers, numbers or percentages would be obtained. The sources used in considering the characteristics for the construction of an effective questionnaire were Good<sup>19</sup> and Scates,<sup>20</sup> VanDalen<sup>21</sup> and Mouly.<sup>22</sup> A synthesis of the criteria for a questionnaire was developed from these cited sources and are listed below.

1. It must be brief so that it will take a minimum of the respondent's time, making the demands on him as easy as possible.
2. It should deal with matters that will seem to the recipients to be worth investigating.
3. Clear instructions must be included as to the way answers are to be indicated. It should elicit clear and unequivocal replies, especially if they are to later be subjected to statistical treatment. The purpose of the study should be fully and clearly stated.

---

<sup>19</sup>Good and Scates, op. cit., p. 615.

<sup>20</sup>Good and Scates, op. cit., p. 615.

<sup>21</sup>Deobald B. VanDalen, Understanding Educational Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 249-254.

<sup>22</sup>George J. Mouly, The Science of Educational Research (New York: American Book Company, 1963), p. 263.

4. The wording of every item ought to be understandable and familiar in order to insure the respondent's comprehension of what is being asked.
5. The items should be arranged in a neat and logical order. The questionnaire should be in good mechanical form; that is, printed or typewritten and easy to read.
6. The information in the questions should be otherwise inaccessible to the investigator.
7. A promise of a summary of the results of the study should be included.
8. The questionnaire must not "put words in the respondent's mouth," nor should the question embarrass the individual or cause him to suspect hidden purposes. The questionnaire should elicit responses which are definite, but they should not be mechanically forced.
9. Space should be provided for supplementary communication from the recipients.
10. Some questions may exist mainly to develop the proper psychological set or for the purpose of catharsis.

#### Procedure

Two separate and distinct questionnaires were developed, each designed along the guidelines outlined earlier

to obtain the data deemed necessary for the purposes of the study.

The first questionnaire was developed to be directed to college administrators whose public-supported laboratory schools were reported closed during the period 1964-69. The 1969 National Survey<sup>23</sup> conducted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education indicated that there were 36 schools closed during this period. Thirty of these schools were reported as having been at state teachers colleges, and six were at state universities.

A second questionnaire was developed and directed to the laboratory school administrators at the 115 laboratory schools reported to be operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in 1969 by the National Survey. Seventeen of these laboratory schools were reported to be operating at state universities, and 98 were reported to be operating at public-supported state colleges.

Letters were prepared and mailed with the questionnaires to the laboratory school administrators at the 115 laboratory schools reported operating at public-supported teacher education institutions by the 1969 National Survey. The same procedure was used with some changes in the letter and questionnaire to secure information from the 36 laboratory schools which were reported to have closed between the years

---

<sup>23</sup>M. C. Howd and Kenneth A. Browne, op. cit., National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools.

1964-69 by this National Survey. Letters were also prepared and mailed to the State Departments of Education in each of the 50 states requesting names and addresses of administrators at public-supported teacher education institutions in their state which had laboratory schools operating now or formerly operating as a part of their college or university. Copies of these letters and copies of the questionnaires are shown in the appendix.

The information obtained from the State Departments of Education about laboratory schools operating and closed at public-supported teacher education institutions in their states was compared with the laboratory schools listed on the 1969 National Survey with regard to operating and closed laboratory schools. Information obtained from some state departments conflicted with the information provided by the 1969 National Survey; however, the data on the Survey was used for the purpose of this report as the most recent, up-to-date data available.

The data collected from these laboratory schools, both operating and closed, is presented in Chapter IV. The two sections of Chapter IV consist of: (1) laboratory schools which closed during the period 1964-72 at public-supported teacher education institutions, and (2) laboratory schools reported operating in 1972 at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States. This data is analyzed in detail in Chapter IV of this study.

### The Population of the Study

The population of this study was comprised of 151 laboratory schools operating or formerly operating at public-supported teacher education institutions which were reported in the National Survey on Laboratory Schools conducted in 1969 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. This Survey on the status of laboratory schools in the United States provided the latest and most up-to-date information about laboratory schools with respect to the number of schools now operating at public-supported teacher education institutions, and those laboratory schools which have closed at public-supported teacher education institutions during the past decade. Thirty-six laboratory schools were reported as having been closed during the period 1964-69, and 115 laboratory schools were reported in operation in 1969. A public-supported laboratory school for the purpose of this study was defined as a laboratory school receiving all or part of its financial support from a public-supported state university or state college. Returns from the questionnaires were secured from 100 percent of those laboratory schools reported operating in 1969 and closed during the period 1964-69.

### Treatment of the Data

The responses to the questionnaires were tabulated for all respondents from both those laboratory schools which were reported closed during the period 1964-69, and those



laboratory schools reported operating in 1969. The questionnaires were tabulated separately on schools closed and those now operating. The data tabulated from these two groups were developed into tables and converted into numbers and percentages based on the population reporting.

These percentages were studied in order to gain answers to the questions presented following the statement of the problem. Following this analysis of data, general conclusions were made concerning the present financial support patterns and staff relationships among laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions now in operation and the conditions which surrounded the closing of laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions between 1964-72. Based on this data and information provided in Chapter II, recommendations were made and these conclusions and recommendations will be presented in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data presented and analyzed in this chapter is that obtained from the responses to the questionnaires which were returned by the laboratory schools now operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States, and from the responses to the questionnaires which were returned by the school administrators in the public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States which had closed their laboratory schools during the period 1964-72.

Why the concern and what is the significance of this study on laboratory schools in public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States? The Kelly Study published in 1967<sup>24</sup> was a detailed analysis on the status of laboratory schools in the United States during the period 1964-67. In 1969, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education<sup>25</sup> sponsored a National Survey on Laboratory

---

<sup>24</sup>E. H. Kelly, op. cit., p. 84.

<sup>25</sup>M. C. Howd and Kenneth A. Browne, op. cit., National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools.

Schools which provided an update of information on the number of laboratory schools in operation in the United States.

The Kelly Study drew attention to the fact that a significant number of laboratory schools had closed during the period 1964-67. The 1969 National Survey of Laboratory Schools reported additional schools had closed and others reported they were reducing their scope. Neither of these studies was concerned with financial support or costs and staff relationships. The Kelly Study recommended that a study be conducted on financial support and cost of operating laboratory schools.

The data presented in this chapter will place emphasis on the reasons for the high percentage of laboratory schools closed during the period 1964-1972, patterns of financial support, and the relationship between laboratory school faculty and other college-university faculty with regard to fringe benefits, academic rank and tenure. Summaries in terms of numbers and percentages are presented in tabular form and treated separately for laboratory schools which have closed and those now operating. The data presented and analyzed in this chapter is based on the information obtained from the questionnaire returned from 100 percent of the public-supported laboratory schools reported in the 1969 National Survey of Laboratory Schools conducted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. It is pointed out, however, that some respondents did not complete all of

the questions asked. The data, therefore, is interpreted in the following chapter on the information obtained.

The Kelly Study on the "Status of Campus Laboratory Schools" covering the period 1964-1967 and published in 1967, reported on a population of 178 laboratory schools at public-supported colleges and universities in the United States. A significant number of these schools indicated they were closing or drastically reducing their scope and role during this period, according to Kelly. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reported in their National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools conducted in 1969, that there were 115 laboratory schools operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States. This survey also reported that an additional 36 laboratory schools formerly operating at public-supported teacher education insitituions had been closed between 1964 and 1969.

The State Departments of Education in each state were requested to furnish the names and addresses of colleges and universities in the respective states who operated a laboratory school in connection with its teacher education program, as well as the names of colleges and universities in their states who formerly operated laboratory schools which had been closed during the past ten years. Questionnaires were directed to the 115 laboratory schools operating at public-supported institutions which were reported in the

1969 National Survey, as well as the 36 laboratory schools reported in this survey to have been closed during the period 1964-69, and to those schools reported by the State Departments of Education as operating, or formerly operating, laboratory schools at various colleges and universities in their states.

Subsequent data obtained from the respondents to the questionnaires from this 1972 investigation indicated that only 129 laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States could be accounted for in 1972. This 1972 Study found that 22 of the laboratory schools reported operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the 1969 Survey now reported that they should not have been considered in this population for the following reasons: nine of 22 colleges reported in 1972 that they never had a laboratory school and thirteen reported that they had privately supported schools or had schools not considered to be laboratory schools. All of these reported that they were now closed and therefore were not considered a part of this study. Therefore, the basic population of this study was 129 laboratory schools.

#### Closed Laboratory Schools

The National Survey in 1969 conducted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reported 36 laboratory schools had closed at public-supported teacher education institutions from 1964-69. The findings in this

study revealed that 25 laboratory schools were closed completely between 1969-72, many of which had been in operation for 50 years or more. What were the circumstances which produced this condition?

The major reason given for closing the laboratory schools was inadequate financial support from the fostering institution and the state. A second reason indicated as significantly important for closing the majority of these laboratory schools was that the school had outlived its usefulness and that laboratory experiences were more adequately and effectively provided by the local public school system. All closed laboratory schools reported that the local public school system assumed the laboratory school functions.

Two laboratory schools reported receiving a major portion of their financial aid from sources other than the State, their supporting institution or tuition. One of the schools participated in Federal programs for minority groups and the others participated in a special education program.

Table 1 clearly shows that laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions are likely to remain open only if financial support patterns improve. The financial squeeze experienced by colleges and universities over the nation in the past decade has, without doubt, caused many of these institutions to phase out those programs which are deemed least essential when judged by a present list of priority needs. Since many professional colleges of

TABLE 1  
NUMBER OF PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS CLOSED BETWEEN 1964-72  
(N = 61)

Type of School	Date Opened			Date Closed			Reason Closed
	K-Pre-School	Elem-tary	Second-ary	K-Pre-School	Elem-tary	Second-ary	
State Universities (n = 15)							
Arizona							
Arizona St. Univ.		1912			1968		Space & Fin.
Illinois							
Univ. of Illinois		1865	1865		1970	1970	Finance
Indiana							
Univ. of Indiana		1937	1937		1970	1970	Finance
Iowa							
Univ. of Iowa		1916	1916		1972	1972	Finance
Kentucky							
Univ. of Kentucky		1930	1930		1964	1964	Finance
Maine							
U. of Me-Farmington		1920			1969		Finance
Michigan							
Univ. of Michigan	1924	1924	1924	1970	1969	1968	Finance
Nebraska							
Univ. of Nebraska			1925			1968	Finance
Ohio							
Ohio State Univ.	1932	1932	1932	1968	1968	1968	Finance
Ohio University	1887	1887		1972	1970		Finance
Utah							
Univ. of Utah		1891	1891		1966	1966	Finance
West Virginia							
West Virginia Univ.		1925	1925	1971	1971		Finance
Wisconsin							
U. of Wisc-Madison			1933			1964	Finance
U. of Wisc-Milwaukee		1896	1896	1971	1971		Finance

TABLE 1--Continued

Type of School	Date Opened			Date Closed			Reason Closed
	K-Pre-School	Elem-tary	Second-ary	K-Pre-School	Elem-tary	Second-ary	
State Universities (n = 15)							
<u>Wyoming</u>							
Univ. of Wyoming	1887	1887	1887	1972	1972	1972	Finance
State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)							
<u>California</u>							
Chico State		1887			1970		Finance
Fresno State		1911			1970		Finance
Humboldt State		1914			1970		Finance
San Diego State		1900			1970		Finance
San Francisco St.		1899			1971		Finance
<u>Connecticut</u>							
W. Connecticut SC		1920			1966		Finance
<u>District of Columbia</u>							
D.C. Teachers Coll.		1954			1969		Legislature
<u>Illinois</u>							
N. Illinois Univ.	1895	1895		1972	1972		Finance
S. Illinois Univ.		1920	1920		1972	1970	Finance
<u>Kansas</u>							
Kans. St-Emporia	1907	1907	1907	1971	1971	1971	Staff
K.St. Col-Pittsburgh	1905	1905			1970	1970	Finance
<u>Kentucky</u>							
Berea College		1855	1855		1968	1968	Coop w/PSch
<u>Maine</u>							
U of Me-Fort Kent		1922			1965		Finance
U of Me-Portland		1920			1965		Finance



TABLE 1--Continued

Type of School	Date Opened			Date Closed			Reason Closed
	K-Pre-School	Elem-tary	Second-ary	K-Pre-School	Elem-tary	Second-ary	
State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)							
Maryland							
Frostburg St. Col.	1960	1900		1968	1968		Legislature
Salisbury St. Col.		1925			1969		Finance
Michigan							
Cent. Michigan U.		1920	1920		1969	1969	Finance
East. Michigan U.		1857	1901		1969	1969	Legislature
West. Michigan U.		1860	1902		1968	1968	Legislature
Minnesota							
Morehead St. Coll.		1890	1890		1970	1970	Finance
St. Cloud St. Col.	1898	1898	1898	1972	1972	1972	Legis & Col
U of Minn-Duluth		1902			1967		Finance
Winona St. Coll.		1863			1971		Space
Nebraska							
Chadron St. Coll.		1922	1922		1961	1961	Finance
Kearney St. Coll.		1924	1924		1964	1964	Finance
Peru State Coll.		1925	1915		1967	1967	Finance
New Hampshire							
Plymouth St. Coll.		1870			1970		Coop w/PSch
New Jersey							
Newark St. Coll.		1964			1970		Finance
Trenton St. Coll.		1920			1970		Coop w/PSch
Wm Patterson Coll.		1924	1924		1969	1969	Finance
New Mexico							
W. N. Mexico Univ.		1893			1970		Coop w/PSch
New York							
St U. Col-Cortland		1868	1868	1971	1971		Finance
St U. NY-Fredonia	1968	1968		1969	1969		Finance

TABLE 1--Continued

Type of School	Date Opened			Date Closed			Reason Closed
	K-Pre-School	Elem-tary	Second-ary	K-Pre-School	Elem-tary	Second-ary	
State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)							
North Dakota							
Valley City St. C.	1890	1890		1965	1965		Finance
Pennsylvania							
Bloomsburg St. C.		1870			1966		Space
Cheyney St. Col.		1880			1967		Finance
Clarion St. Col.		1920	1942		1969	1969	Goals Changed
Mansfield St. C.		1900			1965		Finance
Slippery Rock SC		1910			1966		Finance
Texas							
N. Texas St. U.	1914	1914	1914	1970	1970	1969	Finance
SW Texas St. U.	1933	1933	1933	1965	1965	1965	Dup. Serv.
Utah							
Brigham Young U.		1875	1875		1968	1968	Finance
Washington							
W. Washington SC		1910			1967		Finance
Wisconsin							
W. St U-La Crosse		1903			1970		Finance
W. St U-Stephens Pt		1929	1929		1972	1972	Staff & Fin.
W. St U-Whitewater		1924	1924		1972	1972	Finance

education had questioned for years the contribution made by laboratory schools to the preparation of teachers, it became quite easy to close such schools when financial support became inadequate.

Source of Revenue for Closed  
Laboratory Schools

Table 2 clearly shows that virtually all of the 61 laboratory schools closed received almost all of their financial support from the teacher education institution supporting them. It is thus easy to see that the laboratory school in most of these schools had to compete with other segments of the college or university for the limited institutional dollar.

A few schools received support from student tuition and several had received direct financial aid from State sources, although these were minor items for the institution reporting them in terms of total support for the laboratory schools. It is easy to see that these laboratory schools must indeed have had a difficult time justifying their continued existence in an institution whose financial resources were inadequate in terms of supporting the basic programs normally associated with the operation of the institution.

Was Tuition an Important Source of Revenue  
for Closed Laboratory Schools?

Table 3 shows that four of the 61 closed laboratory schools (7 percent), indicated that tuition was charged as a

TABLE 2  
 PERCENTAGES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THE PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOL BY  
 SOURCE FOR SCHOOLS CLOSED BETWEEN 1964-72  
 (N = 61)

Type of School	Supporting Inst. (Percentages)			Tuition (Percentages)			Direct State Aid (Percentages)			Other (Percentages)			Total %
	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	
State Universities (n = 15)													
Arizona													
Arizona St. Univ.		75					25						100
Illinois													
Univ. of Illinois		100	100										100
Indiana													
Univ. of Indiana	100	100											100
Iowa													
Univ. of Iowa		100	100										100
Kentucky													
U. of Kentucky	100	100	100										100
Maine													
U. of Me-Farmington		100											100
Michigan													
U. of Michigan	90	90	90				10	10	10				100
Nebraska													
U. of Nebraska		90			10								100
Ohio													
Ohio St. Univ.	100	100											100
Ohio University	100	100											100
Utah													
Univ. of Utah	70	70					30	30					100
West Virginia													
W. Virginia U.		100											100
Wisconsin													
U. of Wis-Madison		100											100
U. of Wis-Milwaukee	100	100											100
Wyoming													
Univ. of Wyoming	100	100	100										100

44

TABLE 2--Continued

Type of School State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)	Supporting Inst. (Percentages)			Tuition (Percentages)			Direct State Aid (Percentages)			Other (Percentages)			Total %
	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	
<b>Nebraska</b>													
Chadron St. Coll.		100	100										100
Kearney St. Coll.		100	100										100
Peru State Coll.		100	100										100
<b>New Hampshire</b>													
Plymouth St. Coll.		100											100
<b>New Jersey</b>													
Newark St. Coll.		100											100
Trenton St. Coll.		100											100
Wm Patterson Coll.	100	100											100
<b>New Mexico</b>													
W. N. Mexico U.		100											100
<b>New York</b>													
St U Col-Cortland		100	100										100
St U NY-Fredonia	100	100											100
<b>North Dakota</b>													
Valley City St C.	55	55	55				55	55	55	45	45	45	100
<b>Pennsylvania</b>													
Bloomsburg St. C.		100											100
Cheyney St. Coll.		100											100
Clarion St. Coll.	25	25		25	25		50	50					100
Mansfield St. C.		50						50					100
Slippery Rock SC		50						50					100
<b>Texas</b>													
N. Texas St. U.	100	100	100										100
SW Texas St. U.	100	100	100										100
<b>Utah</b>													
Brigham Young U.	95	95		5	5								100
<b>Washington</b>													
W. Washington SC		100											100
<b>Wisconsin</b>													
W St U-La Crosse		100											100
W St U-Stephens Pt	100	100											100
W St U-Whitewater	100	100											100

TABLE 2--Continued

Type of School State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)	Supporting Inst. (Percentages)			Tuition (Percentages)			Direct State Aid (Percentages)			Other (Percentages)			Total %
	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	K-Pre- School	Elem- tary	Second- ary	
<b>California</b>													
Chico State		100											100
Fresno State		100											100
Humboldt State		100											100
San Diego State		100											100
San Francisco St.		100											100
<b>Connecticut</b>													
W. Connecticut SC		75					25						100
<b>Dist. of Columbia</b>													
D.C. Teachers C.		100											100
<b>Illinois</b>													
N. Illinois U.	100	100											100
S. Illinois U.		100	100										100
<b>Kansas</b>													
Kans. St-Emporia	100	100	100										100
K. St. C-Pittsburgh	100	100											100
<b>Kentucky</b>													
Berea College		100											100
<b>Maine</b>													
U. of Me-Fort Kent		100											100
U. of Me-Portland		100											100
<b>Maryland</b>													
Frostburg St. Col.	100	100											100
Salisbury St. Col.		100											100
<b>Michigan</b>													
Cent. Michigan U.		100	100										100
East. Michigan U.		90					10						100
West. Michigan U.		90	90				10	10					100
<b>Minnesota</b>													
Morehead St. Col.	65	65	65						35	35	35		100
St. Cloud St. Col.	50	50	50				50	50	50				100
U. of Minn-Duluth		100											100
Winona St. Coll.		15						85					100

supplemental budgetary contribution to the laboratory school. The tuition did not amount to more than five percent of the laboratory school budget at any of the closed schools. The matter of assessing tuition as a means of continuing the operation of the school was apparently not a serious consideration when the decision was made to close the school, and this source of revenue was apparently a minor revenue source in the budget of these schools.

High tuition, of course, tends to drastically limit the enrollment of students from non-affluent families and a laboratory school enrollment consisting only of students from affluent families would find it virtually impossible to achieve purposes normally established for such schools.

TABLE 3

PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS CHARGING  
TUITION WHICH CLOSED BETWEEN 1964-72  
(N = 61)

	Num- ber	Charged Tuition		Total	Percent- age of Schools
		Yes	No		
State Universities (n = 15)	2	2		2	13
State Colleges (For- merly State Teacher Colleges (n = 46)	2	2		2	2

Relationship of Laboratory Schools  
with Local School District

Almost one-fourth, or 25 percent, of laboratory schools closed at public-supported teacher education institutions reported participating with the local public school system in educational programs. These laboratory schools indicated that they were considered, and they regarded themselves, a part of the local public school system, and many of them were in part absorbed by the local school system when they closed.

Many teacher education institutions developed special arrangements with adjoining public school systems for the provision of some kinds of laboratory school experiences for their teacher education enrollees after closing their laboratory schools.

TABLE 4

PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS CLOSING BETWEEN  
1964-72 THAT WERE CONSIDERED A PART OF THE  
LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM  
(N = 61)

	Number	Yes	No	Total	Percentage of Schools
State Universities (n = 15)	4	4		4	27
State Colleges (Formerly State Teacher Colleges (n = 46)	11	11		11	24



What Happens to the Faculty When  
Laboratory Schools Close?

An important concern in every teacher education institution when the laboratory school closed was the problem: What happens to the staff? Table 5 shows that in state universities which closed their laboratory schools, the staff was usually absorbed elsewhere in the institution. In state colleges, however, this was not the case; and in 83 percent of the instances, the staff of closed laboratory schools was either dismissed or joined the faculties of adjacent public school systems. Many laboratory school faculty members in universities enjoyed rank and tenure and were thus often protected from summary dismissal when the school closed.

TABLE 5  
DISPOSITION OF FACULTY (STAFF) AT CLOSED  
PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS  
(N = 61)

	Joined Staff of Supporting Institution		Other	Total	% Join- ing Sup- porting Inst.
	Yes	No			
State Universities (n = 15)	12		3	15	80
State Colleges (For- merly State Teacher Colleges) (n = 46)	8		38	46	17

### Why Did Laboratory Schools Close?

In determining the reasons for the closing of 61 laboratory schools in public-supported colleges and universities, it was discovered that the primary reason given in nearly all instances was lack of financial support within the institution.

Table 6 makes this fact quite clear. It is well to point out, however, that the availability of public schools in providing the same services, the changing of laboratory school goals, and the feeling that many laboratory schools had outgrown their usefulness, all played a part in decisions to close many laboratory schools. In other words, even with reduced financial support, many schools might have remained open had predominate opinions been present that these schools were still essential to the operation of an outstanding teacher education program.

No clear pattern emerged as institutions reported the level of decision-making which closed the laboratory school. In the university laboratory schools, the decision was made most often by committees and the State legislature, while in state college laboratory schools the decision to close was made most often by a committee with administrative and legislative decisions ranking second.

### Have Functions of Laboratory Schools Changed?

Through the years, campus laboratory schools have emphasized various functions with those in universities

TABLE 6

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DECISION TO CLOSE AND  
 MAJOR REASON FOR CLOSING THE PUBLIC-SUPPORTED  
 LABORATORY SCHOOLS BETWEEN 1964-72  
 (N = 61)

State Universities (n = 15)					
Reasons					
Decision Made by	Financial Problems	Outgrown Useful- ness	Changed Goals	Dup. Serv. of Pub. School	Space
Dean		1			
Committee	5				
Adminis- trative	1				
Faculty	1				
President of School	1				1
State Leg- islature	5				
Trustees					
State Colleges (Formerly State Teacher Colleges) (n = 46)					
Dean	1				
Committee	23			1	1
Adminis- trative	6				
Faculty			2		
President of School	2				
State Leg- islature	6				
Trustees	3				1

identifying research and experimentation as a high priority and a lesser emphasis on student teaching, demonstration and observation. When asked, however, to identify functions at the time of closing, most university and college laboratory schools stated that recognized functions were student teaching, demonstration-observation, experimentation and research, in that order. Research thus actually received less attention than was expected and student teaching, which supposedly had decreased as a function, still received high priority at the time of closing.

Table 7 shows that the most experimentation and research was carried on in the university operated secondary campus schools which closed, while most research and experimentation carried on in college laboratory schools apparently occurred in the elementary schools. Virtually all of the state college elementary schools identified research and experimentation as functions being discharged at the time of closing. It should, of course, be noted that most laboratory schools closed were not operating secondary schools at the time of closing.

The high percentage of laboratory schools still utilizing their schools for student teaching experiences emphasizes once again the apparent inability of many of these schools to alter their functions and cease activities long since regarded as obsolete for these schools.

TABLE 7

STATED FUNCTIONS OF THE PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY  
SCHOOLS CLOSED BETWEEN 1964-72  
(N = 61)

State Universities (n = 15)										
Grades	Demonstration		Observation		Experimentation		Research		Student Teaching	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
K - Pre-School	7	47	7	47	5	33	7	47		
Elementary	15	100	15	100	15	100	15	100		
Secondary	7	47	7	47	7	47	7	47		
State Colleges (Formerly State Teacher Colleges) (n = 46)										
K - Pre-School	14	30	14	30	12	26	14	30		
Elementary	45	98	45	98	40	87	45	98		
Secondary	8	17	8	17	6	13	8	17		

Size of Laboratory Schools Which  
Were Closed During 1964-72

Over 18,000 students were enrolled in grades K through 12 in the laboratory schools that closed at public-supported teacher education institutions between 1964-72. Five thousand five hundred, or 30 percent, were enrolled in laboratory schools at state universities; the remaining 12,500, 70 percent, were enrolled in laboratory schools at other state colleges and 728, or four percent, were enrolled in K - pre-school. Four thousand three hundred, or 23

percent, were enrolled in secondary grades 7 - 12; and 13,000 or 73 percent, were enrolled in elementary grades 1 - 6. The enrollment of the laboratory schools closed varied from an enrollment of 50 in the elementary grades to a high of 1200 as shown in Table 8.

This same table shows that 15 laboratory schools operated by state universities closed between 1964 and 1972. Included in this list were schools long recognized as formerly outstanding laboratory schools like those at Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Ohio State Universities. These universities are still regarded as among the more adequately financed public-supported universities in the nation. Among state college laboratory schools closed were five in California, two in Illinois, three in Michigan, three in Nebraska, four in Minnesota and two in Kansas.

When a segment of a laboratory school was closed, the tendency has been for the secondary school to close first and then the elementary or K - pre-school segments. A contributing factor here undoubtedly was the general realization that secondary schools of such small enrollment must, of necessity, offer only an inadequate curriculum if the student body was a heterogeneous one. Of note was the fact that at the time of closing, only three of the secondary schools had an enrollment over 300. School organization experts agree that secondary schools of this size possess few of the characteristics of good schools.

TABLE 8

PUPIL ENROLLMENT WHEN LABORATORY SCHOOLS CLOSED DURING PERIOD 1964-72  
(N = 61)

Type of School State Universities (n = 15)	Year Closed	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		Total
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
Arizona								
Arizona St. Univ.	1968			168	100			168
Illinois								
Univ. of Illinois	1970			200	100			200
Indiana								
Univ. of Indiana	1970	120	11	350	31	650	58	1120
Iowa								
Univ. of Iowa	1972			50	17	249	83	299
Kentucky								
Univ. of Ky.	1964	90	43	90	43	30	14	210
Maine								
U of Me-Farmington	1969			90	100			90
Michigan								
Univ. of Michigan	1969	50	11	400	89			450
Nebraska								
Univ. of Nebraska	1968			250	100			250
Ohio								
Ohio State Univ.	1968	40	10	150	35	235	55	425
Ohio University	1972	50	8	575	92			625
Utah								
Univ. of Utah	1966			200	41	290	59	490
West Virginia								
West Virginia U.	1971	175	47	50	13	150	40	375
Wisconsin								
U of Wis-Madison	1964					465	100	465
U of Wis-Milwaukee	1971	50	15	200	61	80	24	330

TABLE 8--Continued

Type of School	Year Closed	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		Total
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
State Universities (n = 15)								
Wyoming								
Univ. of Wyoming	1972							
State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)								
California								
Chico State	1970			180	100			180
Fresno State	1970			250	100			250
Humboldt State	1970			250	100			250
San Diego State	1970			250	100			250
San Francisco St.	1971			500	100			500
Connecticut								
W. Connecticut SC	1966			650	100			650
Dist. of Columbia								
D.C. Teachers Coll.	1969			1200	100			1200
Illinois								
N. Illinois Univ.	1972	50	12	350	88			400
S. Illinois Univ.	1972			150	43	200	57	350
Kansas								
Kans. St-Emporia	1971	18	7	161	61	87	32	266
K. St. C-Pittsburgh	1970			250	100			250
Kentucky								
Berea College	1968			120	32	250	68	370
Maine								
U of Me-Fort Kent	1965			80	100			80
U of Me-Portland	1965			92	100			92



TABLE 8--Continued

Type of School	Year Closed	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		Total
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)								
Maryland								
Frostburg St. Col.	1968			44	23	145	77	189
Salisbury St. Col.	1969			100	100			100
Michigan								
Cent. Michigan U.	1969			150	67	75	33	225
East. Michigan U.	1969			180	43	240	57	420
West. Michigan U.	1968			150	45	180	55	330
Minnesota								
Morehead St. Coll.	1970			300	100			300
St. Cloud St. Col.	1971	25	6	200	50	175	44	400
U of Minn-Duluth	1967			168	100			168
Winona St. Coll.	1971			50	100			50
Nebraska								
Chadron St. Coll.	1967			200	70	85	30	285
Kearney St. Coll.	1968			190	70	80	30	270
Peru State Coll.	1967			164	56	127	44	291
New Hampshire								
Plymouth St. Coll.	1971			250	71	100	29	350
New Jersey								
Newark St. Coll.	1970			150	100			150
Trenton St. Coll.	1964							
Wm. Patterson Coll.	1969			159	39	250	61	409
New Mexico								
W. N. Mex. Univ.	1970			250	100			250
New York								
St. U. Col-Cortland	1971			30	14	177	86	207
St. U. NY-Fredonia	1970			750	100			750

TABLE 8--Continued

Type of School State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)	Year Closed	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		Total
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
North Dakota								
Valley City St. C.	1965	20	10	90	43	99	47	209
Pennsylvania								
Bloomsburg St. C.	1966			50	100			50
Cheyney St. Col.	1967			50	100			50
Clarion St. Col.	1969	40	18	180	82			220
Mansfield St. C.	1965			450	100			450
Slippery Rock SC	1966			257	100			257
Texas								
N. Tex. St. Univ.	1969					150	100	150
SW Tex. St. Univ.	1965			193	50	193	50	386
Utah								
Brigham Young U.	1968			200	34	400	66	600
Washington								
W. Wash. St. Col.	1967			180	100			180
Wisconsin								
W. St. U-La Crosse	1971			450	100			450
W. St. U-Stephens Pt	1972			225	100			225
W. St. U-Whitewater	1972			220	100			220

Did Closed Laboratory Schools Alter  
Their Role Prior to Closing?

Eight of the 15 closed laboratory schools which were located at state universities reported they did not change their purpose or role from their beginning to the date of closing, but seven of them did make some changes in role or described functions. In contrast, the data shown in Table 9 indicates that 37, or 76 percent, of the 46 state college laboratory schools had not substantially changed their roles or functions between their beginning and ultimate closing.

Laboratory schools located at state universities reported philosophical change at their schools by delimited curriculum, more emphasis on research, and phasing out grade levels or organizational segments of the programs prior to the school's final closing. Secondary schools usually were the first to go. Laboratory schools located at state colleges placed more emphasis on the student teaching function in the years preceding their closing. It was concluded that those laboratory schools which reported no philosophical change since their inception (45 of the 61 schools or 73 percent), probably had not evaluated their programs during that time and this practice could have been a significant factor in the closing of the laboratory school.

It is well to note that professional college faculties apparently were but little involved in the evaluation from year to year of their laboratory school contributions;

TABLE 9

PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS CLOSED DURING THE  
PERIOD 1964-72, WHO REPORTED PHILOSOPHICAL  
CHANGES SINCE THEIR INCEPTION  
(N = 61)

	Purpose or Role Change	
	Yes	No
State Universities (n = 15)		
Arizona		
Arizona State University	X	
Illinois		
University of Illinois	X	
Indiana		
University of Indiana	X	
Iowa		
University of Iowa	X	
Kentucky		
University of Kentucky	X	
Maine		
University of Maine-Farmington		X
Michigan		
University of Michigan	X	
Nebraska		
University of Nebraska		X
Ohio		
Ohio State University		X
Ohio University		X
Utah		
University of Utah	X	
West Virginia		
West Virginia University		X
Wisconsin		
University of Wisconsin-Madison		X
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee		X
Wyoming		
University of Wyoming		X
State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)		
California		
Chico State		X
Fresno State		X
Humboldt State		X
San Diego State		X
San Francisco State		X

TABLE 9--Continued

State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)	Purpose or Role Change	
	Yes	No
Connecticut		
Western Connecticut State College		X
District of Columbia		
District of Columbia Teachers College		X
Illinois		
Northern Illinois University		X
Southern Illinois University		X
Kansas		
Kansas State-Emporia		X
Kansas State College-Pittsburgh	X	
Kentucky		
Berea College		X
Maine		
University of Maine-Fort Kent		X
University of Maine-Portland		X
Maryland		
Frostburg State College		X
Salisbury State College		X
Michigan		
Central Michigan University		X
Eastern Michigan University	X	
Western Michigan University	X	
Minnesota		
Morehead State College		
St. Cloud State College	X	
University of Minnesota-Duluth		X
Winona State College		X
Nebraska		
Chadron State College		X
Kearney State College		X
Peru State College		X
New Hampshire		
Plymouth State College		X
New Jersey		
Newark State College		X
Trenton State College		X
William Patterson College		X
New Mexico		
Western New Mexico University		X
New York		
State University College-Cortland		X
State University of New York-Fredonia		X

TABLE 9--Continued

State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)	Purpose or Role Change	
	Yes	No
North Dakota		
Valley City State College	X	
Pennsylvania		
Bloomsburg State College	X	
Cheyney State College		X
Clarion State College	X	
Mansfield State College		X
Slippery Rock State College		X
Texas		
North Texas State University		X
Southwest Texas State University		X
Utah		
Brigham Young University	X	
Washington		
Western Washington State College	X	
Wisconsin		
Wisconsin State Univ.-La Crosse		X
Wisconsin State Univ.-Stephens Point		X
Wisconsin State Univ.-Whitewater		X

otherwise there surely must have been a more significant questioning of old, perhaps obsolete, functions such as student teaching.

#### How Accredited?

The most sought after accreditation by public schools generally has been from the Regional Accreditation Associations, although all schools also seek accreditation from the State Education Agency in the state where they are located. Table 10 shows that all but one of the laboratory schools at state universities received regional accreditation at the time of closing, while only 85 percent of those operated by

state colleges received this level of accreditation. On the other hand, only one of 61 schools closed was not accredited by a State Accrediting Agency.

Failure to be accredited, or the threat of loss of accreditation, apparently played a minor role in the decision to close laboratory schools in the past decade.

TABLE 10  
ACCREDITATION OF THE PUBLIC-SUPPORTED  
LABORATORY SCHOOLS NOW CLOSED  
(N = 61)

Type of School	Accreditation			
	State		Regional	
	Number	%	Number	%
State Universities (n = 15)	15	100	14	93
State Colleges (n = 46) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)	45	98	39	85

#### Laboratory Schools Now Operating

Kelly reported in his 1964-67 Study that 178 laboratory schools were operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States; however, many of these schools were reported as closing or reducing their scope. The National Survey conducted on laboratory schools by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1969 reported 115 laboratory schools were operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United

States. In 1972, the number of laboratory schools operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States had dwindled to 68. Twenty-five laboratory schools reported closing between the years 1969 and 1972.

The tables in the following section provide information which will be interpreted and analyzed from the data received on the 68 laboratory schools operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States in 1972. Much of the data is similar to that acquired from the closed laboratory schools since most of the questions were the same or nearly the same for both closed and open laboratory schools. This was done in order to obtain like or comparable data as it pertained to the problem under discussion.

Most laboratory schools in their beginning initially provided educational services to the elementary grades one through six. Although laboratory schools began in this country in the 1860's, most were started in the early 19th century. The majority of the laboratory schools dated their origin between 1920 and 1932. In terms of growth, additional schools and closing of schools, the decades of the 30's, 40's and 50's reflected very little change in the number of laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States even though this country experienced one great depression and participated in two wars during this period.



TABLE 11

DATE STARTED AND GRADES TAUGHT IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS  
NOW OPERATING IN PUBLIC-SUPPORTED TEACHER  
EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN 1972  
(N = 68)

State Universities (n = 8)									
Year Started	Number of Schools		Grades						
			K - Pre- School		Elemen- tary		Second- ary		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1860-1880	2	25	1	13	2	25	1	12	
1880-1900									
1900-1920	4	50	2	25	4	50	3	25	
1920-1940	1	13			1	13			
1940-1960	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12	
1960-1972									
Totals	8	100	4	50	8	100	5	49	
State Colleges (Formerly State Teacher Colleges) (n = 60)									
1860-1880	10	17	6	10	6	10	4	7	
1880-1900	10	17	9	15	9	15	5	8	
1900-1920	12	20	3	5	9	15	2	3	
1920-1940	22	37	17	28	22	37	9	15	
1940-1960	2	3	1	2	2	3			
1960-1972	3	5	3	5	3	5	1	2	
Totals	59	99	39	65	51	78	21	35	

Present Functions of the Laboratory Schools

The traditional role of laboratory schools falls generally into four categories; demonstration-observation-participation, experimentation, research, and student teaching-inservice education. Many educators feel that experimentation and research are one and the same. For the purpose of this study, the terms used in the four categories are as outlined in Table 12. These categories were used since they are common and usually considered by laboratory administrators as being those functions most commonly discharged in laboratory schools.

One laboratory school reported that its function and role had been changed during the past two years from the traditional four area functions to exclusively research. All other laboratory schools reported that the present functions were concerned to some extent with each of the four categories. Several schools reported that committees were undertaking studies at the present time to make recommendations on the future functions of their schools.

The data collected from the responses of the 68 operating schools reported that in order of importance, student teaching was still regarded as the number one function of the school. Next in importance was the category of demonstration-observation-participation, third experimentation, and fourth in order of importance by the majority of schools was the function of research. It appears from this data that the

TABLE 12

PRESENT FUNCTIONS AND PURPOSES OF PUBLIC-SUPPORTED  
LABORATORY SCHOOLS NOW OPERATING  
(N = 68)

State Universities (n = 8)									
Grades	Demonstration		Experi- mentation		Research		Student Teaching		
	Observation								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
K - Pre-School	5	63	5	63	3	38	4	50	
Elementary	7	88	7	88	4	50	7	88	
Secondary	4	50	4	50	3	38	3	38	
State Colleges (Formerly State Teachers Colleges (n = 60))									
K - Pre-School	39	65	28	47	26	43	37	62	
Elementary	53	88	42	70	39	65	55	92	
Secondary	21	35	20	33	18	30	21	35	

existing laboratory schools, if chiefly discharging the student teaching function, are likely to find little justification for their continued operation since this function is generally regarded as inappropriate for laboratory schools. Public schools typically provide a better arena for achieving this purpose.

Student Enrollment at Laboratory Schools  
for the Fiscal Year 1971-72

The student enrollment at laboratory schools operating at state universities varied from a total of 90 for one

school operating the elementary grades only, one through six, to an enrollment of 940 for one school which operated grades K through 12. Four laboratory schools of the eight at state universities operated grades K through 12. These four schools reported a total enrollment of 3,146 which represented 71 percent of the students enrolled in laboratory schools at all eight state universities. One of these laboratory schools operated all grades K through 12, and was the only one reporting a complete role or function change from the traditional four category functions to that of research. It is interesting to note that at state universities where laboratory schools now operate, four of the eight operated all grades K through 12. Six of the eight reported operating the secondary grades seven through 12. All reported having a much heavier enrollment in secondary grades than the elementary grades except one school.

Laboratory schools operating at the 60 state colleges reported the enrollment of students varied from 98 at one school for elementary grades one through six, to an enrollment of 1,934 at one school operating grades one through 12. No school reported K - pre-school grades only. Fifteen schools reported operating the elementary grades one through six only, and 12 schools reported operating all grades K through 12 at their schools. All other schools operated a combination of grades K through six or one through 12. Fifty-nine of the 60 laboratory schools reported operating the

TABLE 13

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS  
OPERATING IN FISCAL YEAR 1971-72  
(N = 68)

Type of School	Grades						Total
	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
<b>State Universities (n = 8)</b>							
<b>Florida</b>							
Florida State University	32	4	350	39	525	57	907
University of Florida	60	7	300	33	540	60	900
<b>Idaho</b>							
Idaho State University	40	17	200	83			240
<b>Louisiana</b>							
Louisiana State University			180	38	300	62	480
<b>Maine</b>							
University of Maine-Machias			90	100			90
<b>Massachusetts</b>							
University of Massachusetts	60	6	560	60	320	34	940
<b>Missouri</b>							
University of Missouri			168	47	189	53	357
<b>Oklahoma</b>							
University of Oklahoma	29	7	150	38	220	55	399
Totals	221		1998		2094		4313
%	5%		46%		49%		100%
<b>State Colleges (n = 60) (Formerly State Teacher Coll.)</b>							
<b>Alabama</b>							
Florence State University	25	12	183	88			208
Jacksonville State Univ.			834	43	1100	57	1934

TABLE 13--Continued

Type of School	Grades						Total
	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
State Colleges (n = 60) (Formerly State Teacher Coll.)							
Arizona							
Northern Arizona Univ.	16	9	170	91			186
California							
Univ. of California-L.A.			500	100			500
Colorado							
Univ. of Northern Colorado			150	25	450	75	600
Connecticut							
Central Connecticut St. Col.			550	100			550
Eastern Connecticut St. Col.	50	12	355	88			450
Florida							
Florida Atlantic Univ.	30	6	184	37	288	57	502
Georgia							
Georgia Southern College	28	5	180	34	320	61	528
Illinois							
Eastern Illinois Univ.	35	6	365	68	140	26	540
Illinois State University	70	6	500	42	625	52	1195
Indiana							
Ball State University			386	48	410	52	796
Indiana State University	150	19	250	32	375	49	775
Iowa							
Univ. of Northern Iowa	30	4	380	48	375	48	785
Kentucky							
Kentucky State College			98	100			98
Morehead State College			300	100			300
Western Kentucky Univ.			160	100			160
Louisiana							
Southern University	24	4	278	50	254	46	556
Univ. of Southwest Louisiana			418	100			418

TABLE 13--Continued

Type of School	Grades						Total
	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Maryland							
Towson State College	50	22	175	78			225
Massachusetts							
Salem State University			350	100			350
Minnesota							
Bemidji State College			210	100			210
Mississippi							
Mississippi State College	20	16	108	84			128
Missouri							
Central Missouri St. Coll.	217	42	239	46	60	12	516
Northwest Missouri St. Coll.			175	100			175
Southeast Missouri St. Coll.	42	13	166	50	121	37	329
Southwest Missouri St. Coll.			203	51	197	49	400
Nebraska							
Wayne State College			200	100			200
New Hampshire							
Keene State College	70	18	325	82			395
New Jersey							
Glassboro State College	50	29	120	71			170
Montclair State College	40	21	150	79			190
New York							
Hunter College			120	33	240	67	360
St. Univ. College-Brockport	30	4	777	96			807
St. Univ. College-Buffalo	68	11	288	45	280	44	636
St. Univ. College-Geneseo					496	100	496
St. Univ. College-New Plaza			48	10	436	90	484
St. Univ. College-Oswego	36	7	450	93			486

TABLE 13--Continued

Type of School	Grades						Total
	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
<b>North Carolina</b>							
Fayetteville St. Teachers C.			150	100			150
Western Carolina University	20	3	400	60	252	37	672
<b>North Dakota</b>							
Minot State College	48	23	164	77			212
<b>Ohio</b>							
Kent State University			281	100			281
<b>Oregon</b>							
Southern Oregon College	40	12	300	88			340
Eastern Oregon College	80	32	171	68			251
Oregon College	80	32	171	68			251
<b>Pennsylvania</b>							
California State College			200	100			200
E. Strousburg St. College	70	47	80	53			150
Kutztown State College			150	100			150
Millersville State College	30	19	124	81			154
Shippensburg State College	16	9	154	91			170
University of Pittsburgh			221	91	23	9	244
West Chester St. College	40	18	185	82			225
<b>Rhode Island</b>							
Rhode Island College	72	19	311	81			383
<b>S. Carolina</b>							
S. Carolina St. College	53	14	327	86			380
<b>Tennessee</b>							
Memphis State University			581	100			581
<b>Virginia</b>							
Longwood College	23	12	170	88			193
Madison College	50	25	150	75			200



TABLE 13--Continued

Type of School	Grades						Total
	K-Pre-School		Elementary		Secondary		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
<b>Washington</b>							
Eastern Washington St. Col.			175	100			175
<b>Wisconsin</b>							
Wisconsin St. U-Eau Claire			175	100			175
Wisconsin St. U-Oshkosh	50	17	175	58	71	24	296
Wisconsin St. U-Plattesville	16	14	96	86			112
Totals	1769		5256		6513		13,538
Per Cent		13%		39%		48%	100%

elementary grades one through six, and only 20 reported operating the secondary grades seven through 12. The total enrollment of the secondary grades seven through 12 represented 48 percent of the total enrollment of all of these schools.

Regular and Part-Time Staff Utilization  
at Laboratory Schools

The regular staff, tabulated in Table 14, included the permanent laboratory school and college staff used full-time or shared on a part-time basis with the college and the laboratory school. The numbers and percentages given in this table were interpreted for time the staff taught at the laboratory school. The supporting staff included both full-time and part-time special instructors and graduate assistants for temporary duty and special programs.

Only one of the eight laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions at state universities did not have a regular full-time instructional staff. Graduate assistants and special instructors were the instructional staff at this school. On the other hand, one other laboratory school at a state university did not share or use supporting staff from its college. The other six laboratory schools at state universities had a regular staff for instructional and administrative purposes and, in addition, used some of their supporting staff on a part-time basis as well as additional part-time instructional staff at their laboratory schools.

TABLE 14

UTILIZATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF OF PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS NOW OPERATING  
(N = 68)

Type of School	Regular Staff								Supporting Staff*																				
	Full-time				Part-time				Full-time				Part-time																
	Lab	Sch	Col - Univ		Lab	Sch	Col - Univ		Lab	Sch	Col - Univ		Lab	Sch	Col - Univ														
																N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>State Universities (n = 8)</b>																													
<b>Florida</b>																													
Florida State Univ.	59	100	4	20																									
Univ. of Florida	50	100																											
<b>Idaho</b>																													
Idaho State Univ.	8	100	3	20	2	20																							
<b>Louisiana</b>																													
Louisiana State Univ.	31	100			3	33	9	50																					
<b>Maine</b>																													
U. of Main-Machias			1	20									8	10															
<b>Massachusetts</b>																													
Univ. of Massachusetts	40	100	5	20	2	10																							
<b>Missouri</b>																													
Univ. of Missouri	32	100	4	25						3	50																		
<b>Oklahoma</b>																													
Univ. of Oklahoma	18	100	2	15	29	5			5	50																			
<b>State Colleges (n = 60) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)</b>																													
<b>Alabama</b>																													
Florence State Univ.	8	100	1	20																									
Jacksonville St. Univ.	92	100	1	40						5	30																		
<b>Arizona</b>																													
Northern Arizona Univ.	7	100	5	25	1		1	50					1	15															
<b>California</b>																													
U. of California-L.A.					10	75	10	25																					
<b>Colorado</b>																													
U. of Northern Colorado	38	100	6	25	1	10				1	25																		
<b>Connecticut</b>																													
Cent. Connecticut St. C	20	100																											
East. Connecticut St. C	7	100	10	25			2	10		2	10		1	5															
<b>Florida</b>																													
Florida Atlantic Univ.	28	100																											
<b>Georgia</b>																													
Georgia Southern Coll.			3	20	6	50							1	10															

TABLE 14--Continued

Type of School	Regular Staff								Supporting Staff*							
	Full-time				Part-time				Full-time				Part-time			
	Lab	Sch	Col	- Univ	Lab	Sch	Col	- Univ	Lab	Sch	Col	- Univ	Lab	Sch	Col	- Univ
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Illinois																
Eastern Illinois Univ.	36	100	6	25												
Illinois State Univ.	132	100	14	33	1	50										
Indiana																
Ball State Univ.	52	100	4	33	4								1	33		
Indiana State Univ.	65	100	3	25	4	50										
Iowa																
U. of Northern Iowa	70	100			1	50										
Kentucky																
Kentucky State College	9	100	2	20	5	5			5	33						
Morehead State College	18	100	3	33									5	5		
Western Kentucky Univ.	9	100	2	20	5	5			5	33						
Louisiana																
Southern University	30	100	1	25												
U. of S.W. Louisiana	17	100	3	10	2	10								1	50	
Maryland																
Towson State College	14	100	5	10	16	25										
Massachusetts																
Salem State Univ.	16	100	13	15			4	10								
Minnesota																
Bemidji State Coll.	8	100					2	50		2	50			2	50	
Mississippi																
Mississippi St. Coll.	6	100	2	10										2	25	
Missouri																
Central Missouri SC	30	100					9	50					4	10		
Northwest Missouri SC	7	100					8	5	5	50					2	15
Southeast Missouri SC	19	100					1	25					15	50		
Southwest Missouri SC	29	100	9	30												
Nebraska																
Wayne State College	13	100	3	25			4	10		4	75					
New Hampshire																
Keene State College	12	100														
New Jersey																
Glassboro State College	12	100	5	25			6	10								
Montclair State College	4	100	4	25												

TABLE 14--Continued

Type of School	Regular Staff								Supporting Staff*							
	Full-time				Part-time				Full-time				Part-time			
	Lab	Sch	Col	Univ	Lab	Sch	Col	Univ	Lab	Sch	Col	Univ	Lab	Sch	Col	Univ
State Colleges (n = 60) (Formerly State Teacher Colleges)																
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>New York</b>																
Hunter College	18	100	4	15	2	20			2	50						
St. U. Coll-Brockport	41	100	1	15	1	25			1	50			1	50		
St. U. Coll-Buffalo	58	100	1	50												
St. U. Coll-Geneseo	46	100	11	25									5	25		
St. U. Coll-New Plaza	38	100	4	50												
St. U. Coll-Oswego	27	100	1	25												
<b>North Carolina</b>																
Fayetteville S. Teach. C																
Western Carolina Univ.					7	50	2	50								
<b>North Dakota</b>																
Minot State College	12	100			6	20			3	15						
<b>Ohio</b>																
Kent State Univ.	12	100			9	50										
<b>Oregon</b>																
Southern Oregon Coll.	14	100	5	33	3	10							1	40		
Eastern Oregon Coll.	9	100					6	20	6	60						
Oregon College	15	100	3	15			1	5								
<b>Pennsylvania</b>																
California St. Coll.	8	100														
E. Stroubsburg St. Coll.	8	100	8	20												
Kutztown State Coll.	7	100	8	20					8	75						
Millersville St. Coll.	87	100	53	20					3	50						
Shippensburg St. Coll.			5	50	5	50										
Univ. of Pittsburgh	12	100	10	25	2	10			1	25						
West Chester St. Coll.	7	100	4	25					4	25						
<b>Rhode Island</b>																
Rhode Island College	29	100	6	20	2	10	1	50								
<b>S. Carolina</b>																
S. Carolina St. Coll.	27	100	2	10			3	30			2	10				
<b>Tennessee</b>																
Memphis State Univ.	27	100	2	20					3	30			2	10		
<b>Virginia</b>																
Longwood College	11	100					7	25								
Madison College	11	100	2	25							1	25				

\*Includes Graduate Assistant and Special Instructor.

Laboratory schools at state colleges generally had a smaller full-time instructional staff and utilized more part-time instructional staff from their supporting college. Forty-three of the 60 laboratory schools in state colleges reported the use of supporting college faculty for instructional staff in their school on a regular basis. Thirty-five of the 60 laboratory schools utilized supporting staff on a part-time basis, and 35 schools reported using part-time staff on a regular basis at their school.

Sources of Revenue at Laboratory  
Schools Now Operating

The percentage of financial support and its source is shown in Table 15. Many laboratory school administrators in response to this question were either reluctant or unable to provide or obtain the source of their financial support. To eliminate confusion, the institutional support which in most cases was from State appropriated funds, was clearly separated from other additional direct State support which was considered separate and above the appropriations from the supporting institution. The column listing other support included two laboratory schools who reported they obtained 100 percent financial support direct from special Federal programs for minority groups.

Additionally, some laboratory school administrators indicated that in their schools, from five percent to 25 percent of their financial support was provided through the local

public school system. Local schools participated in this support through participation in State funding, Federal lunch programs, and through sharing cost of teacher salaries at the laboratory schools.

Fifty percent or more of the laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions reported they received more than 80 percent of their operating revenue from their supporting institution. Many laboratory school administrators indicated that new sources for financial support were being explored by them to continue their existing programs.

Cost of Instructional and Administrative  
Services at Laboratory Schools  
Now Operating

The school administrators at the 68 laboratory schools operating in 1972 were asked to identify by percentages the two main categories of their 1971-72 school budget expense: (1) instructional costs, and (2) administrative and other expenses. At the laboratory schools associated with state universities, seven of the eight listed their instructional costs at 80 percent or more of their total budget. At state colleges, 40 of the 59 reporting schools listed their instructional costs at 80 percent or more of their total budget. The 80 - 20 ratio of instructional costs versus administrative and other costs appeared to be general among most laboratory schools. Four of the laboratory school administrators associated with state teacher colleges indicated

TABLE 15

SOURCE AND PERCENTAGE OF REVENUE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971-72 OF  
PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS NOW OPERATING  
(N = 68)

State Universities (n = 8)																					
Support From	Percentages																				
	100	95	90	85	80	75	70	65	60	55	50	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	10	5	
Institution	1	1	1		1				1		1	1				1					
Tuition																				1	
Direct State Aid*						1					1	2	1			1		1			
Other**									1		2		1								
State Colleges (Formerly State Teacher Colleges) (n = 60)																					
Institution	28	5	3		1	2	1	1	3		3	1	1	1	1	1	2		3	1	
Tuition											1					1		1	1	4	
Direct State Aid*				4		1			1	1		1	2	2	2		3	1		3	1
Other**				1	1	1					1									1	5

\*From State Education Agency or Department of Education.

\*\*From special Federal programs or local public school participation.



that their administrative costs ran more than 55 percent of the total budget. It appeared that budgeting data were either unknown or that administrative maintenance and physical plant upkeep were drastically out of proportion at these schools. It appeared that the physical plant and operational and maintenance costs at many laboratory schools were viewed as just a part of the total costs assessed within the total teacher education institutions.

Do the Faculty at Laboratory Schools Have the  
Same Tenure, Academic Rank and Fringe  
Benefits as the Faculty at  
the Supporting College?

The faculty of laboratory schools associated with state universities all reported that they received and shared the same academic rank, tenure and fringe benefits that the faculty and staff at their supporting institution enjoyed. The faculty at laboratory schools in state teachers colleges did not fare quite as well. Only 50 percent of the full-time faculty at these schools reported that they held academic rank; only 17 percent indicated that they had tenure, and only 33 percent indicated that they received an assortment of fringe benefits shared by the faculty of the supporting institution. Part-time faculty did not receive any of these considerations at any school.

TABLE 16

BUDGET EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEAR 1971-72, FOR PUBLIC-  
SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS NOW OPERATING  
(N = 68)

Per Cent of Expen- ditures	State Universities (n = 8)		State Colleges (n = 60)	
	Instruc- tion	Admin. and Other	Instruc- tion	Admin. and Other
100			2	
95	1		4	
90	3		8	
85	1		7	2
80	2		19	
75			8	
70			5	1
65	1			
60			2	
55				1
50				
45			1	
40				2
35		1		
30			1	5
25				8
20		2		19
15		1	2	7
10		3		8
5		1		4

TABLE 17  
 ACADEMIC RANK AND BENEFITS OF STAFF IN PUBLIC-  
 SUPPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS NOW OPERATING  
 (N = 68)

Type of School	Number				Academic Rank				Tenure				Fringe Benefits			
	Fl-time		Pt-time		Fl-time		Pt-time		Fl-time		Pt-time		Fl-time		Pt-time	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Universities (n = 8)	8	100	4	25	8	100			8	100			8	100		
Colleges (n = 60)	60	100			30	50			10	17			20	33		

What are the Major Problems at Laboratory  
Schools in the Immediate Future?

The laboratory school administrator in each of the 68 operating laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States was asked to list in order of importance the number one, two, three and four problems facing their institution during the 1972-73 school year. Table 18 shows the responses to that question. Only two laboratory school administrators listed no problems at all the next two years.

Three of the remaining eight laboratory school administrators at state universities indicated that their primary problem was lack of financial support. The other four laboratory school administrators at state universities indicated they had other problems of equal importance, and particularly identified inability to develop relevant programs as important. Fifty-two percent of the administrators at laboratory schools associated with state colleges indicated that their primary problem also was a lack of financial support. The other major problem identified by the laboratory school administrators at state colleges was inability to develop relevant programs or inability to change existing programs and functions.

What Criteria Are Used as Eligibility  
Requirements to Attend the  
Laboratory School?

The laboratory school administrators at the 68 schools

TABLE 18

MAJOR PROBLEMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENT AS IDENTIFIED  
 BY OPERATING PUBLIC-SUPPORTED  
 LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN 1972  
 (N = 68)

	State Universities (n = 8)		State Colleges (Formerly State Teacher Colleges) (n = 60)	
	N	%	N	%
Lack of Financial Support	3	38	31	52
Lack of Space			2	3
Lack of College Faculty Support			1	2
Inability to Develop Rele- vant Programs or Change Existing Program	2	25	14	23
Inability to Obtain Qualified Staff			4	7
Lack of Support From Col- lege Administration	1	13	1	2
Lack of State Legislative Support			2	3
Lack of Public Support			2	3
Upgrading Morale of Staff	1	13		
Change of Philosophy			1	2
Obtaining a Racial Balance			1	2
None	1	13	1	2

operating at public-supported teacher education institutions were asked to list in order of priority at least four, if required, eligibility requirements for students to enroll in their laboratory school. Table 19 shows the priority placed on these criteria. A very high percentage, 20 percent at state colleges and 38 percent at state universities, indicated that their number one criterion for enrollment eligibility was: Is the student a child of faculty or staff personnel. The factor of geography was next in priority rank.

TABLE 19  
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR ENROLLMENT IN PUBLIC-SUPPORTED  
LABORATORY SCHOOLS NOW OPERATING  
(N = 68)

Criteria	Type of School			
	University (n = 8)		College (n = 60)	
	N	%	N	%
Faculty-Staff Children	3	38	12	20
Legacy			3	5
Socio-Economic Background			2	3
Heterogeneous			1	2
Geographic	2	25	18	30
Race	1	13	2	3
Application Date	1	13	13	22
Academic Standing in Former School	1	13		
None			6	10
Lottery			3	5

Many laboratory schools have been criticized because their student bodies consisted chiefly of academically talented students whose parents were often college professors. Many have contended that a student body segregated in this manner does not provide the best educational setting for pre-service teachers who will later work in public schools. The contention has also been made that research and experimentation carried on in these schools is not disseminable to public schools in general because public schools with heterogeneous school enrollments, made up of large numbers of children and youth representing all races, socio-economic categories and abilities, look with a jaundiced eye on any experimental activity emanating from laboratory schools.

Are Laboratory Schools Accredited by Both  
Regional Accrediting Agencies and  
Those of the States in  
Which They Operate?

Table 20 shows that 88 percent of the university laboratory schools were accredited by State Education Agencies and all of them were accredited by a regional accrediting agency.

Eighty-three percent of the laboratory schools at state teachers colleges reported accreditation by their State Education Agency, but only 49 percent were accredited by a regional agency. Since regional accreditation is valued highly by most public schools, it would appear that many of these schools lacked characteristics necessary for such

accreditation, although many undoubtedly checked no regional accreditation because they were operating only pre-school and elementary programs which were not accredited by some regional accrediting agencies.

TABLE 20  
ACCREDITATION OF PUBLIC-SUPPORTED LABORATORY  
SCHOOLS NOW IN OPERATION  
(N = 68)

Type of School	Accreditation			
	State		Regional	
	N	%	N	%
Universities (n = 8)	7	88	8	100
Colleges (n = 60)	50	83	33	49

#### Summary

The 1969 National Survey conducted on laboratory schools by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reported 115 laboratory schools operating at public-supported teacher education institutions and 36 laboratory schools which had operated at public-supported teacher education institutions but had been closed. This 1972 Study discovered that 22 of the 115 schools reported operating in the 1969 Survey were actually not laboratory schools or were not public-supported institutions, and all of these 22 schools have since closed. Therefore, this 1972 Study discovered that only 93 laboratory schools were actually



operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in 1969. This 1972 Study showed also that only 68 laboratory schools are now operating at public-supported teacher education institutions and that 61 laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions have completely closed since 1964.

Eight laboratory schools were still operating at public-supported state universities and 60 laboratory schools were still operating at public-supported state colleges in 1972. Each of these laboratory schools listed their most important present and future problem to be inadequate financial support and the increasing attitude among educators that they have outlived their usefulness. The problems laboratory schools face today are apparently the same problems which caused the closing of more than one-half the laboratory schools operating a decade ago.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem of this study was to analyze the financial support patterns, staff relationships and problems which led to the closing of laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States between 1964-72. The study also attempted to determine how these factors may influence the future of public-supported laboratory schools by examining those laboratory schools still operating in the United States in 1972.

In 1969, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reported in their National Survey on Laboratory Schools that 115 laboratory schools were operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States. However, this 1972 investigation discovered that 22 laboratory schools reported operating in the 1969 National Survey reported that they were either not regarded as laboratory schools or were not operating in a public-supported teacher education institution in 1969. Thus, only 93 laboratory schools were actually operating in public-supported teacher education institutions in 1969. This current 1972

Study also discovered that an additional 25 laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions closed during the period 1969-72, leaving only 68 laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions operating in 1972.

Included in this list were schools long recognized as formerly outstanding laboratory schools like those at Ohio State, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Ohio State Universities. These universities are still regarded as among the more adequately financed public-supported universities in the nation. Among state college laboratory schools closed were five in California, two in Illinois, three in Michigan, three in Nebraska, four in Minnesota and two in Kansas.

Why did so many laboratory schools close, and what are the prospects for the continued operation of the remaining 68 laboratory schools now operating at public-supported teacher education institutions? The obvious answer to these questions, from the responses received, is the rising cost of operating a laboratory school compounded by the decline of financial support by the institution to which it was attached. A third factor considered of equal importance by most closed schools was the feeling that the laboratory school had outlived its usefulness, and in most cases only duplicated services which local public schools could provide better.

Of the 25 laboratory schools which closed between

1969-72, approximately one-third reported they did not anticipate their closing when queried in 1969. Some schools recognized the possibility of reducing their scope, but did not anticipate being phased out of operation.

Many of the teacher education institutions which supported laboratory schools apparently concluded that the experimental function many purported to serve was no longer significant, and many concluded that the major purposes they now served could be provided as well or better in public school settings. The decade of the sixties may well be recorded in history as the decade of the decline of the laboratory school, or possibly the period marking the extinction of the campus laboratory school in the nation. The problems which face the laboratory schools today and tomorrow are the same problems which appeared to cause the closing of most of the laboratory schools during the decade of the sixties.

The financial squeeze apparently reached a peak in the three years 1969-72 when 25 laboratory schools closed, although many of the teacher education institutions which supported them apparently concluded the experimental function many purported to serve was no longer significant, and many concluded that the major purposes they now served could be provided as well or better in public school settings. The decade of the sixties may well be recorded in history as the decade of the decline of the laboratory schools, or possibly

the period marking the extinction of the campus laboratory school in the nation.

### Major Findings

Sixty-one public-supported laboratory schools closed between 1964 and 1972, thus leaving only 68 laboratory schools operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in 1972.

The major functions of the recently closed laboratory schools were as follows in order of major importance: Student teaching, demonstration-observation, experimentation, and research. The same functions, in the same order of importance, were given by those 68 laboratory schools operating in 1972 and most of these institutions do not anticipate changing their roles, functions or scope in the near future.

Student teaching was the primary function assumed by public schools for those laboratory schools which closed as well as for those still in operation in 1972. A small percent indicated that some research functions were also assumed.

All laboratory schools which closed received 100 percent of their financial support from the institution with which they were associated. Most of the financial support for the laboratory schools now operating is received from the institution with which they are associated.

The full-time faculties of laboratory schools which

closed at state universities were generally integrated into the university. The full-time faculties which taught at laboratory schools associated with state colleges were often employed by local public school systems.

The process used to close most laboratory schools was generally made through a committee recommendation and subsequent decision.

The full-time faculty at laboratory schools associated with state universities were usually regarded as a basic part of the College of Education faculty. The full-time faculty associated with state colleges was not considered a part of the College or Department of Education faculty.

The major reasons listed for laboratory schools closing were inadequate finances and the duplication of services which were now available at local public schools. The major problems facing laboratory schools now in operation were listed as inadequate finances and the feeling among the college administrators that the laboratory school has outgrown its usefulness.

### Conclusions

1. Laboratory school functions have changed but very little in most laboratory schools over the years, and this investigation showed that the inability of laboratory schools to alter their functions probably contributed to the closing of many of these schools.

2. The major problems which caused the closing of

approximately one-half of the laboratory schools which were operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States during the past 20 years were the same problems which face those laboratory schools now operating at public-supported teacher education institutions in the United States.

3. Since most of the laboratory schools operating in 1972 do not anticipate changing their functions in the next few years and since their patterns of financial support are also in doubt, it is reasonable to conclude that many of these schools may soon close.

4. When it is apparent that teacher education institutions across the United States are struggling under the severe handicap of limited financial support and resources, it becomes increasingly necessary for a laboratory school to justify its continued existence by demonstrating that it is providing a unique service to the teacher education program or to public education.

#### Recommendations

1. Teacher education institutions which have closed their laboratory schools or which are anticipating the closing of their laboratory schools, should plan for utilizing a portion of these resources for special arrangements with local school systems so that these schools can provide needed services to the teacher education program under an acceptable set of conditions.

2. Laboratory schools at public-supported teacher education institutions should be closed unless those institutions are able to develop appropriate arrangements with adjacent public school systems in which opportunities are available for observation-demonstration-participation experiences for pre-service enrollees, or unless they can demonstrate a capacity for conducting experimental activities under a set of conditions which permits general dissemination.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Bowen, Howard R. The Finance of Higher Education. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Bowen, William G. The Economics of the Major Private Universities. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.
- Good, Carter V. and Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Research, Education, Psychological, Sociological. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Hodenfield, G. D. and Stinnett, T. M. The Education of Teachers. Prentice Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Kelly, E. H. The Status of the Campus Laboratory School in the United States. Dissertation, Indiana University, June, 1967.
- Mouly, George J. The Science of Educational Research. New York: American Book Company, 1963.
- Sarason, Semore B., Davidson, Kenneth and Blatt, Burton. The Preparation of Teachers: An Unstudied Problem in Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., London, 1962.
- VanDalen, Deobald B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
- Van Til, William. The Laboratory School: Its Rise and Fall? Terre Haute: Indiana State University and the Laboratory School Administrators Association, 1969.

Articles and Periodicals

- Abrahams, N. L. "State Planning for Higher Education," The Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C., December, 1969.
- Abrams, Peter. "Crisis in the Lab School," The National Association of Laboratory School Newsletter, XIII, No. 1 (Spring, 1971), p. 50.
- Bailey, Steven K. "Emergence of the Laboratory Program," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1970.
- Blackmon, C. Robert. "Laboratory Schools-U.S.A.," Southwestern Studies, Humanities Series No. 3, 1950.
- Blair, L. C., Curtis, D. K. and Moon, A. C. "The Purposes, Functions and Uniqueness of the College-Controlled Laboratory School," The Association for Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 9, 1958.
- Braddock, Clayton. "What's Going On in the Lab Schools," Southern Education Report, III, No. 9 (May, 1968).
- Brighton, Stayner. "Financing Public Schools," A Study Guide for the Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1965.
- Butter, Irene H. "Economics of Graduate Education: An Exploratory Study," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1966.
- Campbell, Alan K. "Financing Education: Matching Resources to Needs," Proceedings of the National Conference of State Legislators, Washington, D.C. (December 4, 1966).
- Hemphill, John K. "Measurement and Operation of Educational Laboratories," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1970.
- Holstine, F. D. "Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experience in Teacher Education," Association for Student Teaching, 33rd Yearbook, 1954.
- Howd, M. C. and Browne, Kenneth A. "National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools," The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.

- Hunter, Madeline. "Expanding Roles of Laboratory Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 52:14 (September, 1970).
- Keppel, Francis. "We Badly Need It," National Education Assessment, American Association of School Administrators and the Organization Relations Division and Publications Division of the National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1966.
- Klopf, Gordon J. and Bowman, Garda W. Teacher Education in the Social Context. Published for Bank Street College of Education by the Mental Health Materials Center, Inc., 104 East 25th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010.
- Kuschman, William. "Let's Talk Sense About Laboratory Schools," Educational Research, 1969.
- McGeoch, Dorothy M. "The Campus Laboratory School: Phoenix or Dodo Bird," Eric Clearing House on Teacher Education (June, 1971).
- Miller, Starr. "Public Schools Can Help Plan a Program of Student Teaching," The Georgia Educational Journal, XLVII, No. 7 (March, 1954).
- Morris, Everett Paul. "The Organization and Administration of Student Teaching (Off-Campus) in Nebraska," The University of Nebraska, 1957.
- Mouat, Lucia. "An Unusual Lab School," Southern Education Report, IV, No. 8 (April, 1969).
- Oestreich, R. H. "The Classroom Teachers Speak on the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program," Association of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1970.
- Olsen, Hans C. "School-College Relations in Preparing School Personnel," National Center for Educational Communications, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Penodin, A. F. "Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education," The Association for Student Teaching, 34th Yearbook, 1955.
- Smith, B. Othanel. "Teachers for the Real World," American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., 1969.

- Smith, E. Brooks and others. "A Guide to Professional Excellence in Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education," Association for Student Teaching, Washington, D.C., 1970.
- Sowards, G. Wesley. "The Florida State University Model Program for Preparation of Elementary School Teachers," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1969.
- Williams, E. I. F. "The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools," Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1942.
- Wilson, Russell E. "Educational Specifications: Dreaming-Planning-Building," The Nation's Schools, LVI, No. 4 (October, 1955).
- Wilson, Russell E. "Planning the Content for Educational Specifications," The Nation's Schools, LVI, No. 5 (November, 1955).
- Wilson, Russell E. "Procedures for Preparing Educational Specifications," The Nation's Schools, LVI, No. 6 (December, 1955).
- Windrow, J. E. "The Functions and the Future of the Laboratory School," The Association for Student Teaching, 1948 Yearbook, p. 83.
- Woodring, Paul. "New Directions in Teacher Education," The Fund for the Advancement of Education by the Ford Foundation, 1957.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO ALL STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION  
IN THE FIFTY STATES

722 Chautauqua  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069  
August 14, 1972

State Board of Education

\_\_\_\_\_ Street Address  
\_\_\_\_\_ City and State

Gentlemen:

Would you please send me the current mailing address of each public-supported college or university in your State which operates a laboratory school in connection with their teacher education program.

I would also appreciate the name and mailing address of colleges or universities in your State who formerly operated a laboratory school which may have been closed during the past ten years.

Sincerely,

Norman McNabb

NMcN:mc

APPENDIX E

LETTER TO LABORATORY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

722 Chautauqua  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069  
August 14, 1972

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ Administrator  
College or University  
Street Address  
City, State

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

For my doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma, I am pursuing a study to determine the financial support patterns and staff relationships of public-supported laboratory schools in the United States. Your support and assistance in this undertaking would be much appreciated.

The completion and return of the enclosed questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience would aid me in completing my goal. It is very important that I have the completed questionnaire returned in early September.

If you should have a written philosophy or a list of goals and purposes of the laboratory school, please enclose this with your questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Norman McNabb

NMcN:mc  
Enclosures

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO LABORATORY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

722 Chautauqua  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069  
August 14, 1972

\_\_\_\_\_ Administrator  
\_\_\_\_\_ College or University  
\_\_\_\_\_ Street Address  
\_\_\_\_\_ City, State

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The 1969 National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools, conducted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, reported that the laboratory school at your college closed during the period 1964-69.

I am conducting a survey as part of my doctoral dissertation to gather information concerning the reasons why 36 laboratory schools were phased out during that period. Therefore, I would be grateful to you if you would complete the attached questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope as soon as possible. If you should have a written philosophy or a list of the goals and purposes of the laboratory school, please enclose with your questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Norman McNabb

NMcN:mc  
Enclosure

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO LABORATORY  
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

722 Chautauqua  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069  
September 15, 1972

\_\_\_\_\_ Administrator  
\_\_\_\_\_ College or University  
\_\_\_\_\_ Street Address  
\_\_\_\_\_ City, State

Dear Sir:

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reported that the laboratory school at your college or university was one of 115 public-supported laboratory schools continuing its operation in the United States.

On August 14, we mailed your school a questionnaire in an effort to collect pertinent data regarding the place of laboratory schools in the present framework of teacher education in the nation.

The questionnaire unfortunately reached you at a time which probably found you busy with the opening of school; and I have, consequently, not received your return. I shall, therefore, deeply appreciate your completing the attached card and returning it to me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Norman McNabb

NMcN:mc  
Enclosure



APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO LABORATORY

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

722 Chautauqua  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069  
September 15, 1972

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ Administrator  
College or University  
Street Address  
City, State

Dear Sir:

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reported in their survey conducted in 1969 that your laboratory school was one of some 36 laboratory schools in the United States that had closed during the period 1964-69.

On August 14, we mailed your school a questionnaire in an effort to collect pertinent data regarding the place of laboratory schools in the present framework of teacher education in the nation.

The questionnaire unfortunately reached you at a time which probably found you busy with the opening of school; and I have, consequently, not received your return. I shall, therefore, deeply appreciate your completing the attached card and returning it to me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Norman McNabb

NMcN:mc  
Enclosure

APPENDIX D

POSTCARD RETURNED BY LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Name of College or University \_\_\_\_\_

Questionnaire was returned to you on \_\_\_\_\_  
(Approximate date)

Have received questionnaire and will return it by \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

The questionnaire has been misplaced. Please send another.

\_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SCHOOLS OPERATING IN 1972

1. In what year was your laboratory school started? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What grades are included in your laboratory school?  
Secondary \_\_\_\_\_  
Elementary \_\_\_\_\_  
Pre-School \_\_\_\_\_
3. What are the functions and purposes of your school?  
Research \_\_\_\_\_ Experimentation \_\_\_\_\_  
Demonstration/Observation \_\_\_\_\_ Student Teaching \_\_\_\_\_  
If other, please explain. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you plan to limit or change the scope of your laboratory school? Secondary \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_  
How? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Elementary \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ How? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Pre-School \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ How? \_\_\_\_\_

- 
- 
5. What was the enrollment of your school for the fiscal year 1971-72?
- Secondary \_\_\_\_\_
- Elementary \_\_\_\_\_
- Pre-School \_\_\_\_\_
6. What is the number of full-time instructional staff at your school? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Does any of your full-time staff teach in your supporting college or university? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- If yes, how many? \_\_\_\_\_ What percentage of their time is spent at college or university instruction (average)? \_\_\_\_\_
8. What is the number of part-time staff at your school? \_\_\_\_\_
9. Does any of your part-time staff teach in your supporting college or university? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, how many? \_\_\_\_\_ What percentage of their time is spent at college or university instruction (average)? \_\_\_\_\_
10. Do any of the supporting college or university staff teach at your school? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, what percentage? \_\_\_\_\_ (of college staff) What percentage of their time do they teach? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Do the staff that share teaching duties receive salaries from both your laboratory school budget and the

supporting college or university budget? Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory school (percentage) \_\_\_\_\_

College or university (percentage) \_\_\_\_\_

If other, please explain. \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

12. Please indicate the percentage of your fiscal year 1971-72 budget for instruction costs \_\_\_\_\_, for administrative and operational costs \_\_\_\_\_.

13. Please indicate the percentage of your budget for the fiscal year 1971-1972 from the following sources: the supporting college or university \_\_\_\_\_, tuition \_\_\_\_\_, direct State aid \_\_\_\_\_, other (please identify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

14. Do your instructional staff carry academic rank?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_.

15. Does your instructional staff have the same tenure benefits as the supporting college or university staff?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_. If no, please explain.

---

---

---



Problem #1

Problem #2

Problem #3

1973-74)		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

19. Is your laboratory school considered a public school?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

20. What criteria are used to determine eligibility for students enrolling in your school? Please list.

- 1. \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. \_\_\_\_\_

21. Is your school accredited by the State? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

22. Is your school accredited by a Regional Accrediting Agency? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SCHOOLS REPORTED

CLOSED IN 1972

1. In what year was the laboratory school closed? \_\_\_\_\_  
Secondary \_\_\_\_\_  
Elementary \_\_\_\_\_  
Pre-School \_\_\_\_\_
2. Was the laboratory school financially supported from your college or university? All \_\_\_\_\_ Part \_\_\_\_\_  
Secondary \_\_\_\_\_ Percentage of support \_\_\_\_\_  
Elementary \_\_\_\_\_ Percentage of support \_\_\_\_\_  
Pre-School \_\_\_\_\_ Percentage of support \_\_\_\_\_  
If other, please indicate how \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Please give the percentage of financial support from your college or university to the laboratory school the last fiscal year of its operation. \_\_\_\_\_
4. Did your laboratory school receive any direct or indirect annual State financial support other than through



your college or university budget? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

If yes, what percentage of support? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Did the laboratory school charge tuition? Yes \_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_ . If yes, per unit \$ \_\_\_\_\_, per quarter  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_, per semester \$ \_\_\_\_\_, per year \$ \_\_\_\_\_.
6. Was the laboratory school considered part of the public  
school system? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
7. Was the faculty (staff) of the laboratory school merged  
with the college or university faculty? Yes \_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_ Some \_\_\_\_ . Please explain. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Who made the decision to close the laboratory school  
(e.g., dean, committee, administrative school staff,  
faculty or other)? (If other, please explain). \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. What were the chief reasons for closing the laboratory  
school?  
1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_
10. What was the enrollment in the laboratory school the last  
year of its operation?

Secondary \_\_\_\_\_

Elementary \_\_\_\_\_

Pre-School \_\_\_\_\_

11. In what year was the laboratory school started?

Secondary \_\_\_\_\_

Elementary \_\_\_\_\_

Pre-School \_\_\_\_\_

12. What were the functions of the laboratory school prior

to its closing? Research \_\_\_\_\_ Experimentation \_\_\_\_\_

Demonstration/Observation \_\_\_\_\_ Student Teaching \_\_\_\_\_

If other, please explain. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

13. Did the philosophy or role of the laboratory school

change since its inception? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ How?

(Please indicate) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

14. Was your school accredited by the State? Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

15. Was your school accredited by a Regional Accrediting

Agency? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_