DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 046 24 SP 004 954

AUTHCR McGeocn, Dorothy M.
TITLE The Campus Laboratory School: Phoenix or Lodo Bird.
INSTITUTICN ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Communication (DHEW/OE), Washingtcn, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-8-0490
PUE IATE Jun 71
CCNTRACT OEC-0-8-080490-3706(010)
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation, Educational History, *Educaticnal Imprcvement, Inservice Teacher Education, *Laboratory Schools, *Student Teaching, *Teacher Education, Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

The development of the campus laboratory school is traced frcm its crigins in Europe in the seventeenth century and in the United States normal school schools of the 1820's. These schools served for practice, as models of the desired teaching methods and provided opportunities for student teaching. Even before 1900 the function of the schocls was being debated, and the need was recognized tc use them as experimental schools to test and demonstrate new techniques and materials. The student body in campus schools tended tc be highly selected and inadequate in number to serve expanding programs of teacher education. In the late 1960's much student teaching was transferred tc public schools and the ccncept of teacher education was changed to increase the collaboration between schocls and colleges, with a resultant demand fcr mcre responsibility for the classroom teachers in student teaching and accreditation. The new emphasis is on a joint enterprise by public schocls, universities and colleges, the ccmmunity, and related public agencies. The means of disseminating the results of experimentaticn and research must be improved if campus schools are tc have a useful future, and there must be opportunities for curriculum development and professional leadership. There is a need for flexible facilities which can be adapted to a variety of uses, and laboratory facilities devoted primarily tc inservice education. The activities should be defined and limited to those which can make a unique contribution to the program of the sponsoring agencies. (MBM)

Brief Title:

THE CAMPUS LABORATORY
SCHOOL

THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL: PHOENIX OR DODO BIRD

by
Dorothy M. McGeoch
Director of Clinical Experiences
The State University College
Potsdam, New York

Published by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Sponsored by: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); Association of Teacher Educators, national affiliate of the National Education Association; National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association

June 1971

SP 004 954

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

In times when school personnel preparation is variegated and diffused --administratively, experientally, geographically, and chronologically--it is almost startling to read about laboratory schools as an entity. Once the typical locus of professional observation and laboratory experiences, research, and experimentation, laboratory schools in recent years have been severely maligned by many, rejuvenated for distinct roles not carried out in public schools in several places, and defended as-were-and-are by few indeed. Dorothy McGeoch provides a sound perspective needed in thinking through the present and future of laboratory schools.

Like all aspects of higher education, laboratory schools must make unique contributions and thereby pay their way. But they should not be subjected to hasty and ill-conceived reconstitution and discontinuation. Dr. McGeoch's long involvement in professional teacher education has given her knowledge, ideas, and vision useful in analyzing and interpreting laboratory schools unique roles.

This monograph is useful in itself, and it is a point of departure for people seeking further reading in depth and diversity. The author extends a challenge to develop laboratory schools whose contributions are research, experimentation, and dissemination. She rejects defensiveness, and advocates leadership "in developing a wide variety of new centers and facilities." When she notes the adapt-or-die situation facing laboratory schools, she provides a strong challenge indeed to the friends of laboratory schools.

Dr. McGeoch's ideas presented in this paper, however, are not necessarily those of the Clearinghouse or any of its sponsors--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association of Teacher Educators, and the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Neither, as noted on the basic cover, do points of view or opinions expressed here necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

The references accompanying this paper serve as a guide to those desiring to read more deeply. They may be expanded and updated by using the descriptors (index terms) listed with the abstract of this paper to check recent issues of Research in Education (RIE) and Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE). Both RIE and CIJE use the same descriptors.

Another but less satisfactory way to keep alert to specific topics such as this one is to learn which clearinghouses are most likely to process new documents on laboratory schools. Documents in RIE are listed in blocks according to the clearinghouse code letters which processed them, beginning with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education (AC) and ending with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education (VT). Each clearinghouse's code letters, listed at the beginning of RIE, appear opposite the ED number at the beginning of each entry. "SP" (School Personnel) designates documents processed by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. Documents about laboratory schools are most likely to be processed by this Clearinghouse.

In addition to using the ERIC Thesaurus, RIE, CIJE, and various ERIC indexes, you will find it helpful to be placed on the mailing list of the ERIC clearinghouses which are likely to abstract and index as well as develop publications pertinent to your needs and interests. The newsletters are provided on a complimentary basis on request to the individual clearinghouses.

After becoming efficient in using ERIC searching tools and techniques you can develop your own specified bibliographies. The indexing system can refine your search to the point where you read only entries that meet your specifications. In many cases, reading the abstracts will be adequate for your needs; in other cases you may wish to use the information which ERIC provides to secure documents from either the original publishers or from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. (See Ordering Information).

For readers uncertain how to use ERIC capabilities effectively, we recommend the following which are available in microfiche and hardcopy through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service: (a) How To Conduct a Search Through ERIC, ED 036 499, microfiche, 65¢; hardcopy, $3.29; (b) Instructional Materials on Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). Part Two. Information Sheets on ERIC, ED 043 580, microfiche, 65¢; hardcopy, $3.29. Item "b" is available as a complimentary item, while the supply lasts, from this Clearinghouse. Instructions for ordering ERIC materials are given in "Ordering Information" which follows.

--Joel L. Burdin
Director

June 1971

ABSTRACT

The development of the campus laboratory school is traced from its origins in Europe in the seventeenth century and in the United States normal schools of the 1820's. These schools served for practice, as models of the desired teaching methods and provided opportunities for student teaching. Even before 1900 the function of the schools was 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 campus schools 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 in student teaching and accreditation. The new emphasis is on a joint enterprise by public schools, universities and colleges, the community, and related public agencies. The means of disseminating the results of experimentation and research must be improved if campus schools are to have a useful future, and there must be opportunities for curriculum development and professional leadership. There is a need for flexible facilities which can be adapted to a variety of uses, and laboratory facilities devoted primarily to inservice education. The activities should be defined and limited to those which can make a unique contribution to the program of the sponsoring agencies. (MBM)

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

To expand a bibliography using ERIC, descriptors or search terms are used. To use a descriptor: (1) Look up the descriptor in the SUBJECT INDEX of monthly, semi-annual, or annual issue of Research in Education (RIE). (2) Beneath the descriptors you will find title(s) of documents. Decide which title(s) you wish to pursue. (3) Note the "ED" number beside the title. (4) Look up the "ED" number in the "DOCUMENT RESUME SECTION" of the appropriate issue of RIE. With the number you will find a summary of the document and often the document's cost in microfiche and/or hard copy. (5) Repeat the above procedure, if desired, for other issues of RIE and for other descriptors. (6) For information about how to order ERIC documents, turn to the back pages of RIE. (7) Indexes and annotations of journal articles can be found in Current Index to Journals in Education by following the same procedure. Periodical articles cannot be secured through ERIC.

TOPIC: *"The Campus Laboratory Schools: Phoenix or Dodo Bird."*

DESCRIPTORS TO USE IN CONTINUING SEARCH OF RIE AND CIJE:

*College School Cooperation
Educational History
*Educational Improvement
Inservice Teacher Education
*Laboratory Schools
*Student Teaching
*Teacher Education
Teaching Experience

*Astericks indicate major descriptors.

ABOUT ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) forms a nationwide information system established by the U.S. Office of Education, designed to serve and advance American education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (e.g., research reports, articles, theoretical papers, program descriptions, published or unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Central ERIC is the term given to the function of the U.S. Office of Education, which provides policy, coordination, training, funds, and general services to the 20 clearinghouses in the information system. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject-matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents into the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other educational media.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by three professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); the Association of Teacher Educators, a national affiliate of the National Education Association, and National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of NEA. It is located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SCOPE OF CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES

Users of this guide are encouraged to send to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education documents related to its scope, a statement of which follows:

> *The Clearinghouse is responsible for research reports, curriculum descriptions, theoretical papers, addresses, and other materials relative to the preparation of school personnel (nursery, elementary, secondary, and supporting school personnel); the preparation and development of teacher educators; and the profession of teaching. The scope includes the preparation and continuing development of all instructional personnel, their functions and roles. While the major interest of the Clearinghouse is professional preparation and practice in America, it also is interested in international aspects of the field.*

The scope also guides the Clearinghouse's Advisory and Policy Council and staff in decision-making relative to the commissioning of monographs, bibliographies, and directories. The scope is a flexible guide in the idea and information needs of those concerned with pre- and inservice preparation of school personnel and the profession of teaching.

ORDERING INFORMATION

Documents cannot be ordered without an "ED" or order number. The "ED" number is listed with each citation. Once the reader has the "ED" number, he must order the document directly from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

To determine the cost of a document, the reader should look at "EDRS Price" or "Publisher's Price" in the citation. Information such as "EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29" means that the document may be obtained from EDRS in microfiche (MF) for 65 cents or in "hard copy" for $3.29. A microfiche is a 4 by 6-inch form containing images of the pages of the documents, as many as 60 pages per fiche, each image representing a standard-sized sheet of paper. Microfiche readers, available from many manufacturers, are required to enlarge the images for reading purposes. Hardcopy prints are black and white standard-sized xerox copies.

Payment to EDRS must accompany orders totaling less than $10. A special handling charge of 50 cents must be added to all orders. Applicable local state sales tax should be added to orders or a tax exemption certificate should be submitted.

If an individual or institution would like to subscribe to RIE, a check or money order should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The domestic rate is $21 per year; foreign, $26.25. Single issues sell for $1.75.

ORDER BLANK

(Detailed information on how to order ERIC documents appears above.)

Send to:
ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P.O. Drawer O
Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

Cut this out and send with your order.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP _____

Quantity	ED number	Title	HC Price	MF Price
		Total $		

THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL--PHOENIX OR DODO BIRD

The campus laboratory school was established in response to a clear need. It provided a place in which prospective teachers could observe and practice prevailing methods of teaching. It continued and took on additional functions as educational beliefs and programs of teacher training changed and expanded. Within recent years, however, the processes of adaptation and accommodation have become inadequate. The campus school now finds itself confronted with the possibility of becoming the institutional counterpart of the dodo bird, seemingly invented for the sole purpose of becoming extinct.[1] Still available, however, is the option of aggressively pursuing a policy of radical change, of almost literally being consumed in the fires of modern educational revolution to rise again, like the phoenix, in a variety of new forms and relationships.

The sequence of rise and fall and possible rebirth can best be explained through a consideration of the various functions which the campus laboratory school has been called upon to serve and the present status of those functions. In roughly chronological order, they may be listed as student teaching; demonstration, observation, and participation; research and experimentation; and dissemination or inservice education. These functions will be considered in historical perspective.

STUDENT TEACHING

The establishment of laboratory schools closely followed the recognition of supervised student teaching and may be traced to its European origin in the seventeenth century.[2] By the 1820's normal schools in both Europe and the United States were providing opportunities for practice in situations under the control of the teacher preparing institution.

The director of the Primary Normal School in Potsdam, Germany, wrote:

> The annexed school was founded in 1825 . . . for the purpose of affording more practice to the young masters. The most advanced class of the students of the Normal School to be employed in the school for practice, is divided . . . so that each has practical exercise in all the matters taught. . . . The master of the Normal School who has prepared the young masters beforehand is present during the lessons, and afterward communicates his observations and his opinions of the manner in which the lesson was given.[3]

---

[1]Robert L. Lathrop and Dallas K. Beal, "Current Status of Selected College-Related Schools," Campus School to a Research and Dissemination Center, eds. Paul W. Bixby and Harold E. Mitzel (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1964), p. 95.

[2]C. Robert Blackmon (ed.), Laboratory Schools, U.S.A.--Studies and Readings, Southwestern Studies: Humanities Series, No. 3 (Lafayette: University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1970).

[3]Henry Barnard, On Normal Schools, II (Hartford: Case, Tiffany and Co., 1851. Reprinted by Colorado State Teachers College, 1929), pp. 88-89.

When the Reverend Samuel Hall opened this first private normal school in America (March 11, 1823) it is recorded that from the beginning a few children were admitted to his school for demonstration and practice purposes.[4] The first state normal school in the United States, at Lexington, Massachusetts, also had a laboratory school. Its principal, Cyrus Pierce, in a letter to Henry Barnard, on January 1, 1841, wrote:

> This school consists of thirty pupils of both sexes, from the age of six to ten, inclusive, taken promiscuously from families in the various districts of the town. . . . This school is under the general supervision and inspection of the Principal of the Normal School. After it was arranged, the general course of instruction and discipline being settled, it was committed to the immediate care of the pupils of the Normal School, one acting as superintendent, and two as assistants, for one month in rotation, for all who are thought prepared to take part in its instruction . . . twice every day, the Principal of the Normal School goes into the model school for general observation and direction, spending from one half to one hour each visit. In these visits I either sit and watch the general operations of the school, or listen attentively to a particular teacher and her class, or take a class myself, and let the teacher be a listener and observer. After the exercises have closed, I comment upon what I have seen and heard before the teachers, telling them what I deem good, and what faulty, either in their doctrine or their practice, their theory or their manner. . . . In regard to the materials of which it is composed, and the studies attended to, the model school is as nearly a facsimile of the common district school as one district school is of another.[5]

The school at Lexington served both as a school for practice and also as a model of a well-run school under typical conditions at the time. This trend continued for the next twenty-five years with an increasing number of teacher-training institutions establishing laboratory schools. A resolution adopted without debate by the First Annual Convention of the American Normal School Association in 1859 stated:

> Resolved that this education of teachers should not only be theoretical, but also practical; and that to this end there should either be a school of observation and practice, in immediate connection with the normal school and under the same Board of Control, or there should be in other ways equivalent opportunities for observation and practice.[6]

---

[4] E. I. F. Williams, The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools in State Normal Schools and Colleges, Contributions to Education, No. 846 (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1942), p. 2.

[5] Ibid., p. 4, citing Arthur D. Norton, The First State Normal School in America: The Journal of Cyrus Pierce and Mary Swift, 1926, pp. LIII-LIV.

[6] Ibid., p. 10, citing Proceedings of the First Annual Convention of the American Normal Association, p. 107.

Continued Emphasis on Student Teaching

Student teaching continued to be the prime function of the campus school throughout the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth. The methods practiced reflected at various times the influence of the Pestalozzian movement as developed by Sheldon at Oswego and the Herbartian interpretations of De Marco and the McMurrays. Later, the philosophy of progressive education became firmly rooted in the laboratory schools--but not significantly elsewhere.

Some doubts as to the efficiency of the laboratory school rose before the Civil War and from 1860 to 1900, while campus schools increased and teacher education gained prestige, the proper function of the laboratory school was debated. Harper reported, "There seems to have been a general feeling that practice school conditions should duplicate as closely as possible those the student would meet in the field. It was also pointed out that model and experimental schools should be developed to test and demonstrate new and better techniques and teaching materials."[7]

By the 1890's, "colleges and universities were coming into the teacher education picture in steadily increasing numbers and showing a special interest in the training of teachers."[8] However, they did not immediately establish campus schools. In fact, a third of the twentieth century had elapsed before a significant majority of secondary teachers engaged in student teaching and then most often in off-campus schools.

The emphasis on student teaching for elementary school teachers did not diminish during the period that normal schools were rapidly being transformed into four-year institutions. The American Association of Teachers Colleges was founded in 1917 and nine years later the organization adopted as one of its standards for accreditation of teacher education programs the following statement:

> Each teachers college shall maintain a training school under its own control as a part of its organization, as a laboratory school, for purposes of observation, demonstration, and supervised teaching on the part of students. The use of an urban or rural school system, under sufficient control and supervision of the college to permit carrying out the educational policy of the college to a sufficient degree for the conduct of effective student teaching, will satisfy this requirement. (Standard VII. A)

The Association reported during the following year that almost 90 percent of its 150 members maintained a training school or affiliated urban or rural schools for student teaching purposes.[9] The membership

---

[7]Charles A. Harper, A Century of Public Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1939), pp. 118-19.

[8]Harry Hutton, "Historical Background of the Campus School in America," Bixby and Mitzel, op. cit., p. 19.

[9]H. W. Rockwell, "Report of the Committee on Accrediting and Classification," Yearbook of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1927, pp. 118-24.

in the Association was still almost entirely composed of the former normal schools, however, and by the time other types of institutions began to join, the emphasis had changed dramatically from student teaching in campus laboratory schools to the development of cooperative agreements with a variety of public schools for that purpose.

Enter the Off-Campus School

E. I. F. Williams, in the first comprehensive study of laboratory schools in the 1930's, summarized some of his data as follows:

> Both campus and off-campus laboratory schools are used quite generally by state normal schools and teachers colleges to provide laboratory school facilities; 68.0 percent of 131 institutions which reported employ both types. Of the remainder 21.1 percent have campus schools only, and 9.9 percent, off-campus schools only. . . .
>
> The campus laboratory school is employed for observation, participation, demonstration and student teaching. More institutions (95.4 percent) use it for student teaching than for any other function. . . .[10]

Williams' recommendations at the conclusion of his study included the following statements concerning the roles of the campus and off-campus schools:

> The campus school should serve as a laboratory for observation, participation, class demonstration, and for initial classroom teaching of small groups. . . .
>
> The off-campus school 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 experience under normal public school conditions. . . . It should provide the student teacher with his final laboratory experience in responsible room teaching. (Emphasis added)[11]

Influence of Standard VI

The emphasis on student teaching experiences in a variety of situations in both college-controlled and cooperating schools was made explicit in the revised Standard pertaining to laboratory experiences in teacher education adopted by the American Association of Teachers Colleges in 1948. Standard VI was the result of several years of intensive study and became famous as the first attempt in the field to set qualitative goals rather than to mandate minimum levels of compliance. The facilities needed to implement the program of professional laboratory experiences were defined as "sufficiently extensive to provide for each student contact with 'normal' situations, varied enough to provide

---

[10] Williams, op. cit., pp. 130-31.

[11] Ibid., pp. 224-25.

contacts with different pupil groups, and different curriculum and administration organizations, and located for student convenience and staff accessibility."

The descriptions of the two types of facilities show clearly the concern for "normal" and "representative" situations. The Standard is considered be be most fully implemented:

1. When one or more college-controlled schools are available for laboratory experiences related to a school and its community. Control refers to a reasonable influence by the college over policies relating to selection of staff and to procedures in curriculum development. In general, this school (or schools) should be a representative school in the sense of having a non-selected group of children or youth and a definite community setting, a staff of able teachers qualified to guide professional laboratory experiences and a program that is dynamic and forward looking. The school should be one in which the staff, the administration, and the community are willing to cooperate in making the school a situation serving the dual function of providing the best possible program for children and of providing desirable experiences for prospective teachers. In some cases this will mean a college-owned campus laboratory school, in others an off-campus school or schools developed cooperatively by the college and the local school system, in still others a combination of campus and off-campus facilities.
2. When a range of other school situations is available. No one school can provide the needed range of experiences with children of varied socio-economic backgrounds, with different major educational philosophies, with varied types of instructional materials, with different patterns of administrative organization. No one school can provide the suggested range of professional laboratory experiences for a large student body. Schools or particular situations within a school should be selected for the differentiating philosophy, curriculum design, administrative organization, and community setting presented. Like the college-controlled situations named in the preceding paragraph, these schools should be staffed by teachers qualified to help students study the particular point of view or organization represented, see what is involved in its implementation, and analyze critically its effects upon children, teachers and the community.[13]

Detailed specifications such as those above suggest something of the conditions which prevailed in the campus schools at the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century. In general, their student populations were "special" rather than "representative"[14] and quite inadequate

---

[12]John Flowers and others, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Oneonta, New York: American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1948), p. 330.

[13]Ibid., pp. 330-31.

[14]William Van Til, The Laboratory School: Its Rise and Fall? (Terre Haute: Indiana State University and the Laboratory School Administrators Association, 1969), pp. 2-3.

in numbers to serve the expanding programs and enrollments of the institutions of which they were a part. At times, as many as ten student teachers might be assigned to a single classroom while even greater numbers of participants and observers came and went with distracting irregularity. Laboratory school teachers were overworked, underpaid, second-class citizens who organized their complex little empires with enormous skill and total inflexibility. Everything had to proceed on schedule or degenerate into total chaos.

A study of 185 campus schools reported in 1952 showed that between 85 and 95 percent of the schools reported as major activities observation, participation and demonstration as well as student teaching. A little more than a third even professed to be engaged in some research activities. At this time the great majority of teacher-preparing institutions were using both campus and off-campus schools for student teaching and, while over a third were planning to increase student teaching in the campus schools, about a fourth were also anticipating an increase in the use of off-campus facilities.[15]

In fact, during the next five years the influence of Standard VI in promoting a significant increase in provisions for more observation and participation and for increased emphasis on full-time student teaching over a longer period became very apparent. Enrollment in programs also grew, and, with it, the need for laboratory facilities supplied by cooperating public schools and student teaching centers.

Williams recommended in 1942 that off-campus schools should be close enough to the campus to allow students to live at college and that teachers colleges should enter into written contracts with the off-campus schools which would assume "sufficient continuous control to inaugurate and maintain a consistent program of laboratory experience comparable to that of the campus school."[16] Ten years later, however, the norm had become the cooperating public school or school system which agreed to "take" student teachers in return for token payments to teachers, tuition-free courses, or other more or less tangible marks of prestige.

Control of off-campus facilities was replaced by the concept of cooperation as the need for the use of many schools became greater. Throughout the next fifteen years cooperating schools and cooperating teachers in those schools assumed responsibility for increasing numbers of student teachers while circuit-riding college supervisors frantically tried to maintain some semblance of contact with students at ever widening distances from the colleges.

---

[15]Winfred R. Rucker, "A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1952).

[16]Williams, op. cit., pp. 226-27.

Cooperation and Control

Student teaching did not suddenly depart from the campus, however. During the fifties most institutions which maintained campus schools favored both a campus and an off-campus experience, particularly for students preparing to teach in the elementary school. The campus school was expected to provide effective supervision and a chance to work in a superior school program while the off-campus experience represented the real world and a final preparation for a teaching position.

In a study completed in 1964, student teaching was still rated as of greatest importance by 63 of 188 campus schools surveyed. One hundred and two institutions, however, indicated that student teaching was decreasing in the campus school while 19 had already ceased to assign any student teachers there. The major reason given for the decrease in student teaching was the expansion of other functions and the consequent overtaxing of facilities.[17]

Five years later a national survey of campus laboratory schools found ample confirmation of the trend toward student teaching in cooperating rather than campus schools. In 1969 approximately 85 percent of the 190 institutions used public schools for student teaching while less than half considered student teaching to be one of the important activities of the campus school.[18] But it was not the transfer of student teaching to public schools which was the most significant influence on the future of the campus school in 1970. Rather it was a radically changed concept of the role and responsiblity of schools and institutions of higher education in the education of teachers.

For many years the prevailing pattern was one which involved the use of the public school for the implementation of a phase of the program of teacher training administered and controlled by the college or university. Administrators who accepted students were expected to carry out the college requirements. Manuals for cooperating teachers defined responsibilities and limitations of their roles in some detail. For example, school personnel were encouraged to evaluate the student teacher but grades were given by the college supervisor whose authority was thus tacitly affirmed.

Even the student teaching centers which were set up by many institutions were largely under college control. Such centers were described in the 1955 Yearbook of the Association of Student Teaching as follows:

> A college selects a school system usually at some distance from the campus and uses it regularly in the teacher-education program,

---

[17] Ivan H. Kelley, College-Controlled Laboratory Schools in the United States--1964 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964).

[18] Curtis M. Howd and Kenneth A. Browne, National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools--1969 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970).

placing a large number of student teachers in the school system. The college frequently sets up regular seminar courses to prepare the public school staff for their part in the program. Sometimes formal contractual arrangements are made. At other times the arrangements are less well defined and rest upon mutual understanding.[19]

Widening Collaboration

To some teacher educators in schools and colleges, however, the need for mutual responsibility and authority in cooperative endeavors became increasingly clear. Their views were reflected in a new type of student teaching center in which joint control of policies and procedures was practiced.

> The generalized goal of cooperative centers is improvement in the quality of the student teaching experience. A major assumption in developing centers is that neither the colleges nor the schools can do an effective job alone; that, in fact, the best results will eminate from cooperative effort. Another assumption is that new patterns of cooperation are needed to bring about desired educational change. Such assumptions give rise to the most specific objectives of cooperative centers: (a) to facilitate communication between the college and the schools, (b) to broaden the base of responsibility and decision making, (c) to develop a professional team engaged in teacher preparation, (d) to organize more efficiently to carry out policies and procedures, (e) to provide in-service education of supervisory personnel, and (f) to provide a framework in which experimentation and analysis of teaching may take place.[20]

Among the notable examples of cooperative student teaching centers are those developed by Wayne State University and the Detroit Public Schools,[21] by Central Missouri State College and Kansas City Public Schools,[22] by the University of Maryland and Montgomery County Schools[23] and by Kanawha County, West Virginia and six cooperating colleges and universities.[24]

---

[19]Alex F. Perrodin (ed.), Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education, Thirty-Fourth Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: the Association, 1955), p. 23.

[20]E. Brooks Smith and others, Partnership in Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968), p. 54.

[21]Ibid., pp. 64-71. [22]Ibid., pp. 72-73.

[23]Roy A. Edelfelt (ed.), Innovative Ideas in Student Teaching (Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1969), pp. 107-8.

[24]Ibid., pp. 128-29.

Collaboration cannot stop with only schools and teacher preparing institutions, however. Other groups are involved as is shown by a statement in the frame of reference of the Guidelines for Professional Excellence proposed by the Association for Student Teaching in 1970.

> 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 collaboration where both the insitution 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.[25]

In 1971 it is pretty well accepted in theory, though not always in practice, that teacher education is no longer the sole responsibility of the college. And with shared responsiblity 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 dominent, voice in setting standards for admission to the profession.

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 responsiblity for student teaching should be shared by public schools, the institutions preparing teachers, and the profession."[26]

But it is not only in student teaching that the autonomy of the institution of higher education is being challenged. The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, as a spokesman for the profession, is demanding a stronger voice in the accreditation of programs of teacher education and in certification policies.[27] Schools systems are again, after years of depending on colleges and universities, becoming involved in teacher preparation programs in which the institutions of higher education are invited to participate but not to control.

---

[25] 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. 1-2.

[26] Association of Classroom Teachers, The Classroom Teachers Speak on the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program (Washington, D.C.: Association of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association, 1970).

[27] A Position Statement on Certification and Accreditation, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, May 5, 1969.

In this climate, there is no place for a college-controlled laboratory school as a student teaching facility. In fact, it is probable that student teaching as it is now conceived will change radically through the collaborative efforts of school and college personnel. Margaret Lindsey has projected school laboratories which will serve as the teacher education centers and in which--

> . . . 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 observer and participator in scientific inquiry to originator and designer 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.[28]

Surely such a school laboratory as is envisioned here is a worthy successor to the laboratory school which figured so prominently in the hopes and dreams of the teacher educators of the past.

---

[28] E. Brooks Smith and others, Partnership, p. 294.

DEMONSTRATION, OBSERVATION, AND PARTICIPATION

Campus schools provided convenient facilities for student teaching. Prior to limited participation or responsible teaching, however, students were expected to observe the master teacher at work. Both carefully prepared demonstrations of desirable practice and more or less structured observations were prescribed as a means of demonstrating to teachers-in-training specific aspects of a model program. These functions were clearly evident in the official designation of many facilities as model or demonstration schools.

> The model schools were likely to be different from the district schools for they were designed to exemplify ideal conditions in physical plant, equipment, instructional materials, methods and discipline. . . . The model school was conceived and developed to illustrate teaching procedure 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.[1]

The demonstration function assumed increased importance when new methods of teaching were introduced. At Oswego, where the introduction of the Pestalozzian philosophy under Sheldon became strongly influential in the second half of the nineteenth century, both a model school and a practice school were maintained. In the model school high quality teaching was demonstrated by skilled teachers and model object lessons were developed.[2]

The Herbartians made the demonstration school at Illinois Normal University the focus of the teacher education program. Students were required to make a concentrated study of previously prepared master plans, to observe the demonstration teachers as they taught these lessons and then to teach the same lessons with careful attention to the details of the prepared plans.[3] Demonstration schools, modeled on the school at Normal, were opened in many normal schools in the Midwest as the influence of the Herbartians spread.[4]

Williams' study in 1934-35 showed that the number of state normal schools and teachers colleges using campus schools for observation (94.5

---

[1]Lois C. Blair and others, The Purposes, Functions and Uniqueness of the College-Controlled Laboratory School (Lock Haven, Pa.: Association for Student Teaching, 1958), p. 4.

[2]Harry Hutton, "Historical Background of the Campus School in America," Campus School to a Research and Dissemination Center, eds. Paul W. Bixby and Harold E. Mitzel (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1964), pp. 10-13.

[3]Blair and others, op. cit., p. 6.

[4]E. P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1939), pp. 454-55.

percent) was almost as great as that for student teaching (95.4 percent). Four-fifths of the institutions studied used their schools for participation and about three-fourths for class demonstration.[5]

In attempting to provide further information concerning the demonstration function Williams quoted a study by Rugg in 1935 which stated that more than seven hundred respondents in teachers colleges agreed "practically without reservation" that there should be many opportunities for prospective teachers to observe good teaching and affirmed their belief that demonstration plays a valuable role in the professional education of teachers. As a result of further study Williams concluded that "definite plans must be made so that it is possible for supervisors in the laboratory school and instructors in subject-matter and professional courses to schedule such teaching conveniently"[6] and that "demonstrations are less emphasized in laboratory schools than are other major functions of the school."[7]

Extension of Direct Experiences

Fifteen years after Williams' study of the function of campus schools, Standard VI of the American Association of Teachers Colleges was adopted. One major influence of the new Standard was to increase greatly the extent and kinds of direct experiences. The emphasis was clearly on a wide variety of facilities including community agencies of all kinds as well as schools. There can be no doubt, however, that the programs of observation and participation developed in the campus schools in response to the principle that laboratory experiences should be an integral part of each of the four years of college made a distinct contribution to the quality of the teacher education programs of which they were a part. The Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, published in 1955, emphasized the role of the college controlled laboratory school in providing observation, participation, and demonstration experiences. Dr. Paul Grim, in a symposium on the future of laboratory schools, described the operation of the campus school in each of these areas:

> . . . a laboratory school should . . . provide opportunities for students in training to study children at first hand. . . . Individual pupil case studies and studies of pupil groups are examples of this use of the campus laboratory school.
>
> . . . the campus laboratory school should always provide for the observation of creative teaching. . . . Whether the laboratory school gives large group demonstrations or provides for small groups to observe children and actually come into the classroom informally, still the emphasis should be on superior teaching. Master teachers can be employed and trained for this work. They should share with

---

[5] E. I. F. Williams, The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools in State Normal Schools and Colleges, Contributions to Education No. 846 (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1942), p. 111.

[6] Ibid., p. 114. [7] Ibid., p. 116.

college classes and instructors the planning of their demonstrations. In some institutions one-way vision screens facilitate observations and child study.

And last, the campus laboratory school can provide convenient opportunities for students to engage in activities with children as they study the learning process and plan simple teaching techniques. This type of professional laboratory experience typically comes early in the students' program and gives him a background for checking educational theories, hypotheses of learning, and his understanding of human growth and development. The emphasis during these participation activities is upon understanding rather than on teaching techniques.[8]

There was no doubt that the campus school could, and often did, serve well in the areas described by Grim. But the pressure of increasing student enrollment again proved a seriously limiting factor. Studies of the load of campus school teachers reveal startling statistics. A typical program may be summarized as follows:

The campus school teacher is responsible for a class of 20 to 25 elementary school pupils and teaches a methods class in reading or arithmetic nine weeks each year. She works with a full-time or part-time student teacher each quarter and may have two at the same time. Five junior participants are assigned one hour each day to her classroom and she plans with them one or two periods each week.

Seventy-five to one hundred undergraduate students observe through the one-way vision glass each week. In addition to the constant unscheduled observations an average of three demonstration classes are planned for college students each week. Sometimes the campus school teacher meets with the college instructor before the demonstration or attends a class session to answer questions afterwards. Visitors to the observation room, other than students, average 10 to 15 each week. . . .[9]

Emphasis on Skills

But it was not only the absurd overload which influenced the observation, participation, and demonstration functions of the campus schools. A new emphasis on the development of teaching skills was promoted by the application of research on teaching and the development of technological resources which make that application possible.

The analytical systems supply descriptive feedback of teaching behavior along the dimensions of the particular system used and provide

---

[8] Alex F. Perrodin (ed.), Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education, Thirty-Fourth Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: the Association, 1955), p. 141.

[9] Dorothy M. McGeoch, Function and Future: The Public Campus Laboratory Schools in Wisconsin (Minneapolis: Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1968), p. 25.

a basis for decisions about alternate behaviors which might be more effective in terms of the desired goals. Microteaching has combined the feedback capabilities of the videotape recorder with a focus upon the mastery of specific teaching skills. Minicourses, simulation sequences, and situation analysis techniques also have been developed to promote defined competences.

The Elementary Teacher Training Models sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education were developed to demonstrate the competency-based approach to teacher education and are clearly dependent upon extensive technological resources for their implementation.

The facilities which are being developed or advocated for the individualized performance modules and demonstration of competency include an instructional laboratory in which microteaching experiences and multimedia simulation programs replace the usual program of observation and participation. In fact, the new Standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education specifically state:

> Because it is now possible to simulate many of these situations or to display a selection of real problems electronically--and because the prospective teachers' efforts can be recorded, viewed and reviewed--it is now feasible to give much effective clinical experience outside the classroom.[10]

For the campus school which considers its principal function is "to serve as a center for observation and demonstration and for the participation of college students with children in a pre-student teaching program,"[11] the new emphasis on skill development presents a distinct challenge--and a threat.

One conception of the type of facility which might serve to provide the training component for the new teacher education programs is described by B. O. Smith in Teachers for the Real World. He sees a training complex which is established as 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.[12]

---

[10] National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1970), p. 5. [Also cited in Recommended Standards for Teacher Education, developed by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and adopted by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Published by the Association, 1970. p. 5.]

[11] Curtis M. Howd and Kenneth A. Browne, National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools--1969 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970), p. 3.

[12] B. Othanel Smith, Teachers for the Real World (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969), p. 95.

No one can foresee all the functions such a complex will ultimately perform, but in its formative period it should serve as a place for:

--developing, preparing, and storing materials for training (practice specifications, video recordings of teaching, transcripts of classroom discourse, etc.)
--training new professional teachers in the skills entailed by the list of minimal abilities (See Chapter 6.)
--workshops, institutes, and conferences for the preparation of auxiliary teaching personnel
--institutes, workshops, and training laboratories for the continuing education of teachers.
--courses, seminars, and workshops in subject matter fields relevant to the teachers' preparation or to the preparation of teacher aides and other auxiliary teaching personnel.[13]

College-controlled campus school to cooperatively-operated training complex? It's certainly not likely to be an easy road to rebirth--but perhaps it is a necessary one.

[13] Ibid., p. 96.

EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH

There can be no doubt that, in the campus school, experimentation and research have been more talked about than practiced. There has been no lack of talking. Indeed in recent years research has been ardently embraced as the way to salvation for the campus school. The progress made along that way has not been impressive.

The early campus schools had no need to be experimental. They attempted to provide a model of exemplary practice which was then reproduced as exactly as possible by the teachers-in-training. In the last half of the nineteenth century a continuing debate concerning the role of practice and model schools occurred. Some felt that they should duplicate as closely as possible conditions students would meet in the field while other proposed that experimental schools should be developed to test new methods and materials.[1] In 1890 Albany State Normal substituted "experimental" for "model" in the name of its campus school. In the succeeding years a few genuinely experimental schools were opened--and closed--but the great majority of campus schools continued to demonstrate approved methods and provide practice in acquiring proficiency in them.

As has been said, there were some famous experimental laboratory schools; the Dewey School in Chicago, Meriam's school at the University of Missouri, and the Ohio State University School are examples. Probably the best illustration of the problems of the experimental campus school, however, is the story of the affiliated schools of Teachers College, Columbia University. Horace Mann School was opened the same year as the college, 1887, and was planned as an experimental school. Its use in teacher training resulted in a greater emphasis on demonstration and practice, however, and the Speyer School was founded to experiment with curriculum adaptations for a generally poor urban population. Then, in 1917, Lincoln School was founded with very substantial financial support, the most modern facilities, and a distinguished staff. Lincoln School, and its successor, Horace Mann-Lincoln, was intended to be a truly experimental school, unhampered by the need to provide student teaching facilities or to demonstrate current practice.

As the years went by, however, there was convincing evidence that an established school with a continuing faculty and student body carries within itself the seeds of its own dissolution as an experimental school. What had been genuinely experimental became instititionalized in practice and the new rigidities were no more adaptable than the old. Teachers College closed its laboratory school in 1949 and Dean Hollis Caswell explained the decision. "It was our judgment that a school lacking a normal community setting and with a student body highly selected with

---

[1] Harry Hutton, "Historical Background of the Campus School in America," Campus School to a Research and Dissemination Center, eds. Paul W. Bixby and Harold E. Mitzel (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1964), pp. 17-18.

regard to intellectual ability, social background, vocational goal, and probable college attendance, held little promise for experimentation of wide significance. . . ."[2]

Studies of Campus School Functions

The periodic studies of the functions of campus laboratory schools give some indication of their aspirations if not always of the significance of their efforts. E. I. F. Williams in 1934-37 did not specifically study the extent and kind of experimentation in the 131 schools of his sample but the evidence he had led him to conclude that few laboratory schools were used for experimental purposes.[3]

Rucker's study in 1952 found research rated in importance below observation, student teaching, demonstration, and participation but 37 of the 105 institutions reporting indicated an increase in research activities.[4]

Studies by Kelley in 1964[5] and Blackmon in 1967[6] confirmed the place of experimentation and research as less important than the teacher education functions (demonstration, observation, participation, and student teaching) but generally more important that inservice training or dissemination. Five years later a survey of 194 institutions by Howd and Browne[7] revealed that student teaching was no longer a major function of most schools but somewhat more than 60 percent listed experimentation as important or very important and about half made the same judgment concerning research activities. In spite of this apparent interest, however, there is little evidence of significant research projects being carried

---

[2]Hollis L. Caswell, "The Place of the Campus Laboratory School in the Education of Teachers," Teachers College Record, 50:449; April 1949.

[3]E. I. F. Williams, The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools in State Normal Schools and Colleges, Contributions to Education, No. 846 (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1942), p. 217.

[4]Winfred R. Rucker, "A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1952).

[5]Ivan M. Kelley, College Controlled Laboratory Schools in the United States--1964 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964).

[6]C. Robert Blackmon, "The Research Function in Selected College-Controlled Laboratory Schools" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Florida, College of Education, 1962).

[7]Curtis M. Howd and Kenneth A. Browne, National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools--1969 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970).

on in campus schools. Blackmon, in summarizing his study of a group of campus schools which had indicated that they accepted research as an important function, concluded:

> 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.[8]

Blackmon's point of view concerning the importance of the research function to the survival of campus schools seems to be shared by many. Why, then, has not more been done?

Lack of Progress

An obvious reason for lack of significant research activity in the campus school is that too many other functions continue to be served. Even with student teaching removed, observation, participation, and demonstration activities, in addition to responsibility for a group of children, make up a formidable load for campus school teachers. There is little time for anything else.

There is also generally little help available. Campus school teachers have been selected for teaching performance and ability to work with preservice students rather than for skill in research. Faculty members of the college or university have not used the campus school as a basis for research projects to any great extent nor have they worked cooperatively to set up campus school initiated projects.

Finally, the substantial resources in facilities and specialized personnel required to develop authentic centers for research and experimentation have not been available to most campus schools. Instead, the resources and influence of government agencies and educational foundations have gone into the development of a maze of new institutions and projects. The federal network of research and development centers and regional laboratories have sponsored widespread research activities in teacher education. State sponsored projects such as New York's New Design have made possible experimental programs in many public school systems. Influential experimental schools such as those in Lexington, Massachusetts, and the Nova Schools in Melborne, Florida, have been largely supported by foundation funds. An increasing number of colleges and universities have followed the earlier example of the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute for School Experimentation of Teachers College and have set up cooperative research projects with public schools.

---

[8] 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.

With the development of projects and research financed by the national government and foundations and with the shift in curricular innovation to the public schools, a new type of professor and administrator in teacher education has come to the fore. The new type educator is committed to research in his own study or in university libraries. His laboratories are the school systems of the land. The new professors assiduously seek funds from governments, foundations, and university sources. Proponents of the laboratory school must face the unpleasant fact that many among the new type of professor and administrator in teacher education genuinely believe the laboratory to be obsolete, passé, and dead duck. Many sincerely believe that funds now expended for laboratory schools would be better invested in their own research and projects.[9]

Potential Developments

But there are some who believe that there are some forms of research and experimentation which are best carried on in a college-related school. Ohm expressed this point of view in an address to the Laboratory School Administrators Association in 1960.

One of the emerging directions is the concept of the laboratory school as a center for developmental research. The view suggests that rigorous research of the type now possible and necessary in education and related fields requires a combination of training, skills, and time not generally available in the staff of a laboratory school. It also proposes that externally derived research results are not readily applicable to practice. A large area of unexplored territory exists between the bright idea or significant conclusions and its eventual incorporation into improved practice. The undiscovered problems of bringing practice in line with present knowledge is the proper domain of the laboratory schools. The area requires its own rationales, techniques, and special resources. Laboratory schools are uniquely situated to serve as a focus for the resources needed to do developmental research.[10]

Madeline Hunter, principal of the University Elementary School at the University of California, Los Angeles, speaks for a school noted for its commitment to a research function when she says:

Without laboratory schools . . . there remain two major unsolved problems in education. One is the ever-widening gap between knowledge generated by educational research and practice in the classroom. The other problem is the critical need for an experimental laboratory to refine or field test theory in an environment uncontaminated by the very necessary restrictions imposed on public schools. An

---

[9]William Van Til, The Laboratory School: Its Rise and Fall? (Terre Haute: Indiana State University and the Laboratory School Administrators Association, 1969), p. 14.

[10]Robert Ohm (ed.), The Laboratory School Administrators Newsletter, 2; January 1960.

installation created for and dedicated to the resolution of these two problems constitutes the raison d'etre of the laboratory school of the future.[11]

But if the campus-related school is to serve the function described by Hunter, it must have the means of disseminating the results of its experimentation and developmental research to schools and teacher-preparing institutions. The history of the laboratory school as a signicant influence in promoting innovation and inservice education does not, however, provide evidence of outstanding accomplishment.

---

[11] Madeline Hunter, "Expanding Roles of Laboratory Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 52:14; September 1970.

DISSEMINATION

The only function to consistently rank below experimentation and research in studies of campus school priorities is that which is variously called curriculum development, professional leadership, inservice education, and production of materials. While some such activities have certainly been performed by most campus schools over the years, there has been little discussion of them in the literature until fairly recently. The 1955 Association for Student Teaching Yearbook mentioned some dissemination activities in case studies of outstanding schools but did not list them as an important function of campus schools in general.[1]

Description of Activities

The bulletin on the college-controlled laboratory school published three years later, however, makes specific suggestions concerning several types of dissemination activities. The laboratory school is seen as a source of help for teachers-in-service:

> The laboratory school can have many high quality instructional materials available for teachers-in-service to examine. Before teachers are ready to try a variety of teaching materials for the first time, they may want to observe some teaching procedures in which a variety of materials are used to gain an understanding of the principles involved. . . . Planned visitations and observations in the laboratory schools can provide some direction, security and "know how" for teachers desiring to upgrade the quality of education in the public schools.[2]

Visitations by foreign students and intervisitations among students and laboratory school teachers from different teacher-preparing institutions were also recommended. Professional leadership activities of campus school teachers which are discussed include leadership in study groups; writing and publishing; participation in conferences, workshops, and professional organizations; and inservice on committees of the faculty. In relation to publishing, the authors comment:

> Much writing and publishing should be done by laboratory staff members because the very nature of their work keeps them aware of the many problems facing children, youth, college students, college teachers, and teachers-in-service. . . . Such writing cannot be expected, however, unless time is available.[3]

---

[1]Alex F. Perrodin (ed.), Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education, Thirty-Fourth Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: the Association, 1955), p. 33.

[2]Lois C. Blair and others, The Purposes, Functions and Uniqueness of the College-Controlled Laboratory School (Lock Haven, Pa.: Association for Student Teaching, 1958), p. 33.

[3]Ibid., p. 39.

It may be assumed that the same limitation might be expected to apply to such activities as serving as a "production center where films, slides, maps, charts, graphs, tape recordings, posters, murals, replicas and models of various kinds are produced and catalogued;" "exemplifying a high type public relations program through radio and television for informed citizenry in its own community;" and "telecasting by closed circuit for the benefit of people on campus."[4]

A final recommendation deals with a variety of services to the schools in the area and contains the following warning: "If providing these services is a chosen function of the laboratory school, time and staff must be made available, remembering, of course, that the laboratory school teacher must be well informed in the areas of service rendered."[5]

Leadership in Service Area

The need for the campus school to provide leadership for the service area of the college was also strongly supported by Barrington. He recommended that colleges and their laboratory schools "adequately inform educators in their service areas of the changes which have taken place in teacher education, in order that teachers and administrators may think in terms of present-day teacher preparation instead of the program which they, themselves experienced."[7] Additional recommendations concerned the expansion of provisions for such services as conferences, workshops, and consultation service for the educators in the service area; follow-up of graduates; and affiliation with or organization of study councils or nationwide cooperative organizations of schools. "Such affiliation would provide access to a nationwide systematic pooling of educational practices developing in classrooms, schools, and committees throughout the land. . . ."[7]

Apparently, there was little response to these calls to develop dissemination activities. Kelley's study[8] in 1964 listed inservice education as seventh among seven functions and Blackmon's[9] three years later also showed it at the bottom of the list of important functions. In looking ahead to what ought to be in the future, however, Blackmon's respondents placed inservice education slightly above student teaching as a desirable function in the future.

---

[4]Ibid., pp. 41-42. [5]Ibid., p. 40.

[6]Thomas M. Barrington, The Introduction of Selected Educational Practices into Teachers Colleges and Their Laboratory Schools (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1953,), p. 93.

[7]Ibid., p. 93.

[8]Ivan H. Kelley, College-Controlled Laboratory Schools in the United States--1964 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964).

[9]C. Robert Blackmon, "The Present and Future Status of College Controlled Laboratory Schools," Laboratory Schools, U.S.A.--Studies and Readings, edited by C. Robert Blackmon (Lafayette: University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1970), pp. 64-85.

The Howd and Browne study in 1969[10] reported the ranking of "leadership in inservice education" by 194 campus schools. One hundred and six indicated that this function was important or very important while only 31 of the 194 schools reported that they were not used for this purpose. Howd and Browne also surveyed three types of publications produced during the five years previous to 1969. No research studies had been published by about one-fifth of the schools; 18 percent had published more than 5 studies and the remainder (68) had brought out 1 to 5 publications. In the category of books, text books, and workbooks, the faculty of 40 percent of the colleges and universities reported no published works and only one institution had more than ten such publications to its credit. Articles in professional journals were a somewhat more common means of expression by campus school faculty. Only 21 institutions reported no articles published while 32 had 10 more more articles in professional journals.

An an influence on its own service area or on education generally, the campus school presents a picture of modest aspiration and even more modest accomplishment. Aside from the few famous experimental schools early in the twentieth century, there have been only isolated instances of laboratory schools serving significantly to influence education even within a local service area. Lathrop's and Beal's study of fifteen campus schools in 1964 summarized their findings in this field:

> As an overall judgment it must be said that in most instances in-service efforts of campus schools have been only marginally developed. . . . In fairness, however, it must be noted that the visiting team did not find any campus school with sufficient facilities to release large amounts of faculty time to develop and publish materials on a continuing basis. Several of the schools were duplicating some materials that could be distributed to area public schools and placed in the hands of teachers, and a few of the schools provided released time to teach courses to area teachers, particularly in science, mathematics, and English. Typically, however, such efforts were modest. The campus school has traditionally been regarded by its collegiate affiliate as parochial in its professional responsibility and has never been equipped to mount extensive in-service education programs.[11]

Recent Developments

Regional laboratories and research and development centers have recently engaged in the type of dissemination activities which might well have been considered the function of a university-related school. Workshops, institutes, consultants, instructional systems, demonstration classes, and pilot schools have been used to promote inservice education and improved

---

[10]Curtis M. Howd and Kenneth A. Browne, National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools-1969 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970).

[11]Paul W. Bixby and Harold E. Mitzel (eds.), Campus School to a Research and Dissemination Center (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1964), p. 82.

school practice. An example of a promising innovation is the self-instructional training units (minicourses) made available to schools for use in developing critical teaching skills in teachers. "Each minicourse consists of a self-contained package of the instructional and model films, handbooks, evaluation forms, orientation schedules, and daily activity schedules."[12] For the most part, support and personnel have been centered on these new networks rather than on the traditional campus schools.

One notable exception is the University Campus School of the University of California, Los Angeles, and its League of Cooperating Schools. John Goodlad has described the basic rationale for the collaborative arrangement.

> Ideally, the university faculty sees itself as advancing knowledge and, simultaneously, society sees the university as performing service. Translating these concepts into educational terms, the university should involve itself in real school situations in such a way that it advances knowledge on one hand and performs service on the other. The two functions may very well be conceived separately, but the operation is economical and efficient when both functions are achieved simultaneously with relatively little more effort than would be required for the fulfillment of one function alone. By these means, and others like them, the promise of a breakthrough to faster implementation of new research-based educational ideas may be realized.[13]

Another means of relating the service and research functions of the university in cooperation with the schools is exemplified by the Twelfth Street School Project of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, and the City of Milwaukee Public School System.

> The project has as its central focus the development of a central city elementary school into a "center for innovation and research." Its purposes include curriculum development, intern and student teacher education, and staff in-service education. When one adds the fact that the school is eventually to serve as an overall model for other city elementary schools, the picture is complete; the surface resemblance to the university-based laboratory school is striking. . . . In fact, now there is evidence to indicate that some of the basic ideas that have long served as a rationale for the existence of laboratory schools are being reborn.[14]

---

[12]Keith Acheson and James L. Olivero, "Educational Laboratories and Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 21:330-31; Fall 1970.

[13]E. Brooks Smith and others, A Guide to Professional Excellence in Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching, 1969), pp. 18-19.

[14]Jack N. Fleming, "The Jointly Sponsored City School System--University Laboratory Schools: Advantages and Problems," Laboratory Schools U.S.A.--Studies and Readings, ed. C. Robert Blackmon, Southwestern Studies: Humanities Series, No. 3 (Lafayette: University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1970), pp. 155-56.

PORTENTS FOR THE FUTURE

The campus laboratory school has entered the 70's confronted by many internal problems and external threats. Its effort to survive by taking on additional functions while operating with constantly decreasing resources has obviously failed. In attempting to be all things to all men, the campus school has lost its effectiveness in those areas where it might have made a unique contribution.

The analysis of functions has shown that other agencies have been developed to perform many of them. Jointly controlled and administered student teaching centers are now available to unite school and college in providing practicum experiences. Teacher education laboratories are increasingly the focus of skill development activities such as simulation exercises and microteaching which are replacing classroom observation and participation. Regional laboratories, research and development centers, and public school systems, supported by government and foundation funds, are engaged in a wide variety of research, development, and dissemination activities. All of these may be considered as replacements for the campus laboratory school and generally they represent an improved adaption to the requirements of the times.

There are still needs to be met, however, and a reconstructed and redirected university-related school may well be the most effective agency in a particular situation for doing what needs to be done. There are no definite guidelines for such reconstruction but certainly some directions are clearly indicated. Among these are definition of function, relation to university and other educational agencies, and staff and facilities.

Any laboratory school must serve a clearly defined and valued function in relation to the purposes and programs of the institution or institutions to which it is related. Basically, such a school must be considered in terms of what it does, and what it does is a reflection of what its parent institution allows or requires it to do. In practice, however, the close relationship between institutional purpose and campus school function has not always been evident.

> Some campus schools have developed their own priorities with little reference to or interference from the rest of the institution. Some colleges of education accept passively the status quo or seek alternate ways of supplying needs which they do not perceive as being met by the campus school. Potentially, the institution has the power to shape the campus school to its own ends. Actually, traditional loyalties, established practice, and tenured staff members may make any desired shaping exceedingly difficult.
>
> There is . . . some indication that for some university faculty the campus school may occupy a position like that of the valued heirloom. It is loved, carefully protected, and rarely used! Indeed, for such persons, statements of value seem to be based on long accepted biases rather than current positive experiences.[1]

---

[1]Dorothy M. McGeoch, Function and Future: The Public Campus Laboratory Schools in Wisconsin (Minneapolis: Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1968).

Lathrop and Beal summarized their reactions to a series of visits to fifteen contemporary campus laboratory schools as follows:

> If the campus school is to survive it must reexamine its objectives and functions, relating them to the broader purpose of the academic setting in which it exists. For many laboratory schools such a realignment of functions will mean a de-emphais on responsiblity for the education of a continuous population of elementary or secondary school pupils, de-emphais of "live" observation for teacher candidates, and substantially greater commitment to experimentation, innovation, demonstration, and research. In most schools such a realignment of purposes will be agonizing, requiring re-establishment of long dormant relationships with academic faculty and school personnel.[2]

But the new university-related school must also relate to the wider community of schools, professional organizations, and state agencies. As teacher education becomes a shared responsibility the campus school becomes a laboratory for the wider community.

> To fulfill the commitment of contributing to the wider educational communty, the expanding role of the laboratory school encompasses 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.[3]

Finally, organization and financial provisions must be made which will enable the campus-related school to serve with distinction the functions which it is designed to serve. Nothing can be gained by the definition of unquestionably desirable goals which have little reaction to the realities of an understaffed, undersupported, two-hundred-and-fifty pupil school.

In many instances, there will be no continuing school population. Rather, flexible facilities which can be adapted to a variety of uses may be developed. At one time, the facilities and related support services may be used to demonstrate a particular type of organization and program for a limited group of pupils. The demonstration project would illustrate, for a specific period of time, teaching strategies and instructional resources developed within a defined conceptual framework.

---

[2]Robert L. Lathrop and Dallas K. Beal, "Current Status of Selected College-Related Schools," Campus School to a Research and Dissemination Center, eds. Paul W. Bixby and Harold E. Mitzel (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1964), p. 94.

[3]Madeline Hunter, "Expanding Roles of Laboratory Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 52:18; September 1970.

At another time, or in other locations, a research oriented facility with sufficient size, flexibility, and support to carry out controlled experimentation in a variety of fields, would be developed. Teachers and research specialists would be recruited for a particular project and employed for the length of time specified by the research design. The children or youth in the study would also remain in the experimental setting only for the duration of the project. Through shared control and responsibility of a university and community agencies, research studies appropriate to the situation could be selected and opportunities for dissemination of findings developed.

There is also a need for laboratory facilities devoted primarily to inservice education with experienced teachers working in the school with some regular staff members as part of a flexible retraining program. Staff members would be selected for their ability to work in a team relationship within the school and to serve effectively as leaders of in-service activities in the field. A staff of sufficient size so that individuals could work in both teaching and consultative roles would be necessary and coordination with state and local educational agencies would, of course, be required.

There are many other possibilities. The common element, however, is the need to define roles and limit activities to those which can make a unique contribution to the total educational program of the sponsoring agencies and which can be adequately supported with the resources available.

Bixby and Mitzel, in what is undoubtedly the most significant series of reports on university-controlled and university-related elementary and secondary schools ever compiled, summarize the minimum conditions which must be met if a cooperative college-public school research, development, and demonstration center is to gain a position of leadership in the improvement of educational theory and practice:

1. Goals must be restricted and restated so that they fit better today's challenges both to elementary and secondary education and teacher education.
2. Organizational patterns for combining higher education resources with those of forward looking public schools must be cooperatively developed in order to enhance the efforts of both as they carry out their separate but closely related and independent missions.
3. Programs must be created and carefully evaluated that will again be models to be studied and hopefully emulated by public and private schools.
4. Staff must be recruited who have the ability and the desire to comprehend a "different" approach to a college-related research and development center.
5. Buildings and equipment that anticipate the future, including the maximum use of newer communication and instructional media, must be designed and built.
6. A research component must be structured in such a fashion that it cannot be pushed aside by the needs of the daily operation of the school.[4]

[4] Bixby and Mitzel, op. cit., pp. 99-100.

The campus laboratory school of the 70's is indeed confronted by many external threats. Redefinition and reconstruction of function, relationships, and organization can result in new and potentially effective structures. Various radically new projects already in existence attest to this fact. It is probable, however, that the internal problems of the present campus schools are a greater menace than all outside influences. William Van Til in his wise and witty analysis of the rise and fall of the campus laboratory school expresses his concern about the role of those he calls the friends of the laboratory school.

> 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 apppropriate frontiers for the laboratory school today. . . .
>
> But I doubt that many friends of the laboratory schools are so engaged on behalf of the laboratory school. Even many teachers and administrators of laboratory schools do not seem to be so engaged. Possibly historians of the year 2000 may record that the laboratory school was not killed but that its friends listened to the death wish and committed suicide without putting up a fight for life.[5]

The time for justification and defense is past. Not even the most devoted partisans can preserve the campus school as it has been, and is, quite generally, today. Those who value the contributions which can be made through collaborative efforts in research, demonstration, and dissemination of educational innovations must assume leadership in developing a wide variety of new centers and facilities. In institutions, as in nature, to fail to adapt is to die. For the campus laboratory school the decision cannot be postponed. What shall its model be--the phoenix or the dodo bird?

---

[5]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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Position Statement of Certification and Accreditation, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, May 5, 1969.

Acheson, Keith, and James L. Olivero. "Educational Laboratories and Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 21:330-31; Fall 1970.

Association of Classroom Teachers. The Classroom Teachers Speak on the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program. Washington, D.C.: the Association, a department of the National Education Association, 1970.

Barnard, Henry. On Normal Schools. Hartford: Case, Tiffany and Co., 1851 [Reprint by Colorado State Teachers College, 1929].

Barrington, Thomas M. The Introduction of Selected Educational Practices into Teachers Colleges and Their Laboratory Schools. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1953.

Bixby, Paul W., and Harold E. Mitzel (eds.). Campus School to a Research and Dissemination Center. University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1963.
ED 003 774. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

Blackmon, C. Robert. "The Research Function in Selected College-Controlled Laboratory Schools." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Florida, College of Education, 1962.

--- (ed). Laboratory Schools, U.S.A.--Studies and Readings. Southwestern Studies: Humanities Series, No. 3. Lafayette: University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1970.
ED 045 569. Not available from EDRS.

Blair, Lois C., and others. The Purposes, Functions and Uniqueness of the College-Controlled Laboratory School. Lock Haven, Pa.: Association for Student Teaching, 1958.

Caswell, Hollis L. "The Place of the Campus Laboratory School in the Education of Teachers," Teachers College Record, 50:449; April 1949.

Cubberley, E. P. Public Education in the United States. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1939.

Edelfelt, Roy A. (ed.). Innovative Ideas in Student Teaching. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1969.

Flowers, John, and others. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Teacher Colleges, 1948.

Harper, Charles A. A Century of Public Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1939.

Howd, Curtis M., and Kenneth A. Browne. National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools--1969. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970. Publisher's Price: $1.50. ED 036 490. Not available from EDRS.

Hunter, Madeline. "Expanding Roles of Laboratory Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 52:14-19; September 1970.

Kelley, Ivan H. College-Controlled Laboratory Schools in the United States--1964. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964.
ED 025 449. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

McGeoch, Dorothy M. Function and Future: The Public Campus Laboratory Schools in Wisconsin. Minneapolis: Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1968.
ED 029 814. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1970.

Ohm, Robert (ed.). The Laboratory School Administrators Newsletter, January 1960.

Perrodin, Alex F. (ed.). Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education. Thirty-Fourth Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: the Association, 1955.

Rockwell, H. W. "Report of the Committee on Accrediting and Classification." Yearbook of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1927.

Rucker, Winfred R. "A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1952.

Smith, B. Othanel. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.
ED 027 267. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$6.58.

Smith, E. Brooks, and others. A Guide to Professional Excellence in Clinical Experience in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching, a national affiliate of the National Education Association, 1970. Publisher's Price: $1.50.
ED 043 560. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-Not available.

---. Partnership in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching, a national affiliate of the National Education Association, and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.
ED 022 726. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$13.16.

Van Til, William. The Laboratory School: Its Rise and Fall? Terre Haute: Indiana State University and the Laboratory Schools Administrators Association, 1969.
ED 034 703. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

Williams, E. I. F. The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools in State Normal Schools and Colleges. Contributions to Education, No. 846. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1942.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education; Contract number OEC-0-8-080490-3706-(010). Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.