This article, “Academics versus service: Balancing competing missions in laboratory schools offering full-day programming”, focuses on the reinvention of the institutional mission statement of the Child Development Laboratory (CDL) School at Urbana-Champaign, premised on a half day program, hosted on the University of Illinois campus to become the Early Child Development Laboratory (ECDL) encompassing teaching, research, and outreach to provide a service component of day care in creating a full time day program to gain funding. The premise of the article describes how reinvention of the institutional mission to incorporate service in an effort to gain funding while staying true to the three pillars of the mission statement to avoid closure. Laboratory schools are designed to train future teachers, provide a platform for experiential education, educational research, and professional development. The ECDL School serviced young children in an effort to provide a population of study for future early education teachers. “Since the early 1920’s, university based child development laboratory programs have played an integral role in the study of child development and advancement of early childhood education” (p. 113). The rise of laboratory schools has been due to the great experiential educational experience they add to the education of teachers through diverse settings, in structure and function, to the programming comprising the laboratory schools. Laboratory schools provide a controlled setting to observe and study child development towards better efficacy in teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

A recent decline in laboratory schools has occurred due to being susceptible to budget cuts. In an effort to circumvent budget cuts, the Child Development Laboratory (CDL) at Urbana-Champaign added service outreach to the institutional mission statement to promote teaching, research, and outreach. Reinvention of the mission statement to add service was a move thwarted to increase financial support. The University of Illinois that hosted the laboratory school was faced with an increase demand for University childcare. The laboratory school was changed to provide child care within the parameters of academic functions. Thus, children would receive care typical of a daycare facility but would be provided in an academic based delivery to meet the research and enrichment goals of the laboratory school to create effective early childhood educators. [Chris Lambert]
In a changing society, laboratory schools could potentially offer a solution for teaching in a multicultural environment. Since laboratory schools first began on college campuses, the practical experiences college students gained while pursuing an education degree was found to be most beneficial. It gave student teachers first hand experience teaching in a classroom while being supervised and mentored by an educator currently working in the field. Having this experience also gave these college students an even playing field when competing for jobs against more experienced teachers. Being at a higher education institution, teachers also have the resources and partnerships with the higher education institution to implement new ideas and strategies in terms of how student teachers are being trained. Although there are many benefits to having a laboratory school at a higher education institution, the challenges lie in finding effective supervisors who are successful teachers and covering the cost of these laboratory schools.


This article tackles the idea of the laboratory school and the college in which it is afflicted with and the mission statements lining up. Also how the Laboratory school can help with the over all goals of the college it is sponsored by. Carnhan talks about how mission statements for colleges are needed to help keep the school in track for what their goals are. Which in turn if the college sponsors a laboratory school, they both need to have the same goals. The article starts off with what a mission statement is and what it needs to be made of. As the article goes on, it asks the questions of the laboratory school and if the school is doing what it needs to do to help the college. Overall this article ask the question of, is the laboratory school and the college working together and if they are not then what needs to be done in order to make the two schools line up.

(Christian Medders)
This article discusses the progression of university laboratory schools, from their beginnings to their current application. While lab schools have existed for roughly 200 years at American, European, and Japanese institutions, they flourished from 1850 to 1950. By the 1920s, almost every university with a prominent education program had a lab school and childhood development centers were being built to educate younger children. The main objectives of the lab schools were to provide hands-on experience for prospective teachers, to conduct educational research, and to educate the children. The schools usually had a small class size, made up of university faculty’s children and local, affluent children. This created a problem regarding a representative sample; the students did not represent the average population of the United States. The lab schools also had an issue with the lack of specialized educators. Following World War II, the lab schools began to fall, declining from 212 in 1964 to 166 in 1973, and to only about 100 by 2000. The article goes on to focus on the Early Childhood Development Center (ECDC) at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. It was one of the few lab schools to open during the 1990’s. The ECDC differs from older lab schools in a two main ways. One difference is that it is collaboration between the local school district and the university, allowing the school to receive public funding and enroll low-income students. The students are chosen to attend the school based on their income and language, to create a 50-50 ratio. This allows for a fairly close representation of the South Texas population. Other curriculum differences are the emphasis on dual-language instruction and parental involvement. The ECDC has been evaluated by state mandated tests, with the school receiving a score of exemplary in 2000 and 2001. [Brittany Wilson]


http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/nals/vol5/iss1/1 [Lanie Kendrick]

In this article, Jennifer Cross, Tracy Cross, and Andrea Frazier examine a study conducted on the need for gifted education for a special group of students attending a residential school housed within a laboratory school. The needs assessment was conducted to determine the best way to handle the influx of new students into the lab school. Students and teachers from both schools were interviewed on their opinions about a specific education program for gifted students. The study was held after the dean of the college of education requested one hundred gifted students
be added to the enrollment of the laboratory school, which covered grades K-12 and admitted students of all learning types. The residential high school known as the Academy, which served gifted students, was only for students in the 11th and 12th grades. The study focuses mainly on whether students and faculty viewed gifted education differently between the two schools, and also whether the same level of support for gifted students from peers and faculty was being maintained. Incorporating more specialized education for gifted students, as was done in the Academy, into the lab school became a huge challenge that would impact how gifted students were managed in other lab schools as well.


In this article, Cucchiara discusses the history of laboratory schools and the challenges that they have faced over time as well as the modern revitalization of laboratory schools on college campuses. The laboratory schools of the nineteenth century focused heavily on teacher training and experimentation. However, the populations that these schools served tended to be middle to upper class. Therefore, the skills that the teachers were honing and the research being done were not easily transferrable to the majority of public schools. In addition, laboratory schools had so many different functions of education, future teacher training, and research, to name a few, that they were in competition with one another. This eventually led to the closing of many laboratory schools, but some have persisted into the twenty-first century. These modern schools have some elements of teacher training and professional development, but their greater focuses have been on providing education to students of low-income families of the urban communities surrounding the central university. Many of these schools faced challenges with low test scores and accreditation, but one shining light in this group has been the University of California at San Diego’s Preuss School. This school provides disadvantaged students with the resources of the college campus in order to give them a quality, college-preparatory education, and its success has been exceptional with high test scores and 95% of students going to college. The Preuss School goes to show that it is possible to educate low-income students to high levels to the disbelief of many. Cucchiara concludes in this article that history of laboratory schools must be used as a guide, and that in order for modern laboratory schools to succeed, they must have one central mission and no competing factors that have inundated schools of the past. [Kyle Hodges]

“Laboratory Schools as Places of Inquiry: A Collaborative Journey for Two Laboratory Schools,” by Kay Cutler, et. al, examines the benefits and challenges of implementing collaborative inquiry at university laboratory schools. More specifically, the purpose of this article is to describe how collaborative inquiry (CI) was put to use at Kent State University’s laboratory school and South Dakota University’s laboratory school in an effort to advance these schools’ belief that laboratory schools are places where children, teachers, and others can and do engage in research daily. To illustrate the usefulness of CI, the authors begin their article by explaining what CI is and how these schools will be using it to improve their laboratory schools and help maintain them as bridges between educational theory and practice. Next, there is a brief blurb about each school’s population and its preferred educational approach (both school’s adhere to or are influenced by the Reggio Emilia approach to early childhood education). Following this information, the authors provide the steps the faculty members took at each school in order to begin collaborating together. The challenges and benefits of collaborative inquiry between the two laboratory schools were presented next, including the issue of time zones and the advantage of creating professional development embedded in practice at both institutions. The authors concluded that the research done at laboratory schools to improve education is achieved more easily and more beneficially when CI is involved, and they recommended implementing CI at other laboratory schools. [Candace Cooper]


This article highlights the contribution and role of teachers at the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago. Experiences of four teachers: Anna Camp, Katherine Camp, Althea Harmer, and Mary Hill are shared and analyzed. There is an emphasis placed on the time period in which these actions and creations were occurring. Understanding the basic context of the Progressive Era is crucial in viewing the distinctive relationships created between the female teachers and the school’s founder John Dewey. This article emphasizes that these women were highly educated, some receiving support from their families that placed a high value on intellectual pursuits for women, while others decision to enter the profession of education was not supported by their families. The article points to the fact that these teachers could not simply follow the conventional ways of teaching and thus were often stretched to deeply think about the material and their area of expertise. In the classroom, for example, Althea Harmer shaped the study of domestic arts and sciences into lessons involved using the scientific method and as
a result instilled exceptional problem solving skills within her students. The author concludes that the teacher’s role was more than just teaching at the Laboratory School (“They had embarked on a short-lived adventure with long-lasting consequences for themselves, and for all those interested in educational innovation.” p.62). [Rebecca Borovsky]


This is an informational article related to the importance of laboratory schools, their decline, and why parents are still choosing to enroll their students in said laboratory schools today. Data charts as well as summaries are provided within the article, making it easy to understand to and to use the information. I found this article particularly interesting because I am a former teacher and enjoy studying the different educational options for students and why parents seem to favor some over others. The data and empirical charts make understanding the results of the study viewer friendly. This article explains the strengths of laboratory schools including their strong and direct focus on academics as well as the associated weaknesses. It was concluded that the academic reputation of the school, the small class size, and the quality of the teachers are the highest ranking reasons why parents choose particular laboratory schools for their children over general education classrooms in the grade school through high school environment. It was also concluded that the three main reasons parents choose not to enroll their students in laboratory schools is due to their unhappiness with teachers, dissatisfaction with the academics, and their unhappiness with administration. Recommendations for laboratory school are provided at the end of the article and allow us to delve deeper into the topic of laboratory school improvement and sustainability.


Gilbert examines the history of laboratory schools and focuses on their relation to teacher education programs. Gilbert notes that the institution of laboratory schools was established in Lexington, Massachusetts in 1839. The inaugural laboratory school was state funded and was conducted on
a college campus in order for college students to practice teaching elementary school children. Essentially, the first laboratory school was a laboratory for a simulated form of learning for the college student who provided education for a child. The laboratory school provided dual learning for the college students and elementary school students and met great success. The positive results of this laboratory trial led to laboratory schools evolving. The curriculum and ages taught at the laboratory schools expanded and became affiliated with areas of college different from teacher education. Gilbert states that the success of the laboratory schools as an opportunity for students to practice teaching “can and should be the ideal partners for teacher education programs.” [Ivy Sibley]


As state appropriations have gotten smaller, more laboratory schools have disappeared. In this article, Gresham discusses how one university, Stephen F. Austin State University, took it upon themselves to find a way to keep their school open. This was accomplished by working with the local school district and establishing a connection between them and the university. Once this relationship was formed, instructors at the school could also serve as faculty members for the university. This allowed for a split in the salary between the two entities, thus providing monetary relief for both. Many universities with laboratory schools use this system to cut down on costs. It is important to note that when teachers in the school also serve as faculty members, then tuition dollars can be spent on their time with university students. The split had to be done because it would be unfair to make students pay for teachers that had no responsibilities for the university.

All of this would not have been possible though without support from the state board of education and their interest in laboratory schools. Part of this article goes through the process by which university administrators had to find members on the board that would be on their side. In this particular case it was a benefit that the local school district was overcrowded, which meant the state board was looking for ways to expand. As enrollment began to decline though, laboratory schools were once again on the chopping block. When this happened universities had to get creative and found the relationship with the local school district.
Written by Hattie Mood Harrison, a student in the Master of Education program at the University of South Carolina in 1949, this book outlines the history, curriculum, and guidance practices of the University High School in Columbia, South Carolina. University High School, a partnership between Columbia Public Schools and the University of South Carolina, was established in 1932. Its purpose was to serve as a demonstration school and an opportunity for students to practice teaching before graduating from the university. The average enrollment at University High School was 250 students, but was up to 287 in the year the book was written due to the recent mandate for 12th grade across the state of South Carolina. University High School drew its student population from the entire geographic district in Columbia: two junior high schools and two high schools. Students were allowed to apply for University High School after sixth grade with approval from their parents, but were required to stay all through all six years of education in order to maintain justification for funding. Harrison conducted a study during the active years of University High School to assess the administration, curriculum program, and students’ course selection assistance. The results of this study found that University High School provided an equal opportunity for education, similar to that of the other public high schools in the district. She recommended that a guidance program be implemented as the current system (in 1949) was inadequate. She also suggested a mapped out curriculum plan for students, available information about the curriculum for students to access, and the addition of exploratory courses at University High School. [Lauren Epps]


This article titled, “Felton hoping to STEAM ahead as charter school,” describes the mission of Felton Laboratory School and its aspiration of transitioning into a charter school. The school was established in 1925 and was first called Felton Training School with only four teachers and one room before later being named Felton Laboratory School. Felton has the appearance of a typical elementary and middle school despite its location in Orangeburg on the campus of South Carolina State University. The school has about 120 enrolled students in kindergarten through eighth grade. Felton also retains a private school philosophy that includes a strict dress code, high parental involvement, and small class ratios. The school is funded by the state and university, and applicants are accepted through a lottery process. Since it is a laboratory school,
“faculty from South Carolina State University are allowed to perform various projects there and education majors are involved in its operations” (Hendren, 2013). It is a school with an incredible history and has also won the Palmetto Gold School award for its academic achievements. This could be attributed to “Felton’s state of the art educational practices, as well as the opportunity for hands-on experience” (Hendren, 2013). [Morgan Mays]


In this article, Hunter speaks about the expanding roles of laboratory schools. She says lab schools serve as a place where educators can identify problems in their field of research. They can easily field-test their solutions in real-time, without having to follow the strict guidelines of public schools. These schools also have served as places of inquiry for educators as well, where they have more freedom to make changes and immediately see the consequences of those actions and continue with changes or immediately stop them. Hunter lists several roles that laboratory schools play such as: teacher education, technology, goals and objectives of education, a particular phase of schooling, teaching methodologies, alternate forms of conduct, and staffing patterns. The biggest impact laboratory schools are making are the direct experience, they are experimental labs for educators. The biggest weakness of laboratory schools according to Hunter is the lack of dissemination of the research findings. Hunter suggests they publish more and take it off of their “to do” list. She also says the laboratory school and the school of education have to have a strong relationship with clear communication and a healthy dependence on one another. All administrative staff should be experts, as well as the teachers. Every instructor should be a specialist and not a generalist. Hunter also says for a successful laboratory school, the pupil population should mirror the community public school, it should not be limited to only professors’ children. [Victoria Thomas]


David Israelson captures a valuable description of a laboratory school at the University of Toronto in his article titled “In Lab Schools, Learning in Classrooms Benefits Students and Researchers,” for *The Globe and Mail*. The Dr. Eric Jackman Institute of Child Study Laboratory School at the University of Toronto specifically educates students from nursery age to the sixth grade. The students at this school become familiar and “desensitized” to having adults in the room because of how many visitors each classroom has each year, explains the principal, Jackman Messina. The majority of this article includes quotations from the school’s faculty.
explaining the theoretical foundations for this specific laboratory school for children, and why they personally believe the students receive such a practical, advanced education using their inquiry-based learning approach. Each faculty member is required to contribute their minds in the research process and development in this school and in their specific classroom. Mr. Messina explains a research example that the school is currently studying and molding into their work, and that is the concept of brain elasticity. “Think of the brain as a muscle that can be developed…so that errors should not be considered embarrassing but a natural and necessary part of learning” (Israelson, 2015). The idea that questions are encouraged, welcomed, and crucial to the development of the student ripples throughout the school. The article continues on explaining how the students are able to get into the laboratory school through a competitive waiting list. Israelson ends with stating how comfortable and effortlessly students appear to move on to the seventh grade and beyond due to their experience with inquiry-based learning, specifically as they have already learned how to state opinions, ask questions, and understand the constant change in research and the results that come with that research. [Kayla Scott]


This article focuses on a particular university laboratory school in Pennsylvania at Shippensburg University. The Grace B. Luhrs University Elementary School, or GBLUES, emphasizes the major tenets of university laboratory schools, which is to teach teachers as well as elementary school students. Taking place just below the Teacher Education Department, student teachers are able to participate in the lab school frequently, usually when it pertains most to their curriculum. Lab school students are also able to interact with department faculty as well as the student teachers, giving them a wider range of learning experiences. The article discusses the various stages that the university laboratory school has been through ever since its opening in 1871, but stresses the importance that learning was meant to be an enjoyable experience for the students as well as university students who are studying to be teachers. The article states that lab schools are seen as one of the best ways for student teachers to gain experience in their field in order to better decide on a career path. The article also highlights the strong sense of community gained by having a university laboratory school, since 40% of the parents are university faculty and staff. [Emily Tedesco]

This article, written by the headmaster of Temple University in 1942, offers a view of the laboratory school from an administrator’s perspective. It begins by defining the three main functions of a laboratory school as: “the education of children, the education of parents, and the education of teachers,” and emphasizes that those functions are in order of importance. For each of his selected functions, the author offers a summary of best practices. On the education of children, Ives asserts the significance of using variety in the classroom to reach all students and maintains that standardized tests are not the proper evolution for a child’s development. Considering the education of parents, Ivins contends that keeping parents involved in the education of their children is of paramount importance for their development. For the education of teachers, the author stresses that teachers should be in training throughout their time serving as educators and continue developing just as their students do in the classroom. Ivins concludes his observations by bringing a focus to the future of laboratory schools calling for those involved to increase their responsibilities not only to the college, but also to the community and public education at large. Ultimately, Ivins finds that by contributing to the public good through proper practices within laboratory schools, honor and success will be achieved. [Kinsey Ashworth]


This article was accessed through connect publications, a co-partner with the Lab school at UCLA. The article begins by painting a vivid picture of a boy named Johnny, who raises his hand in class to provide an answer to his teacher’s question. Johnny is then ridiculed, harassed and laughed at by his classmates. The article expands on the Lab school at UCLA and its functions. One of the interventions in the school is Cool Tools. Cool tools is a program committed to fostering learning environments free of physical and verbal harassment equipping students with effective social skills and coping strategies. In this commentary from the Los Angeles Times Jaana Juvonen a behavioral scientist at RAND Corporation provides evidence that promoting psychological safety in schools decreases the levels of anxiety students experience at school and increases their ability to learn and collaborate with their classmates. The article states that many schools across the country use violence prevention interventions such as metal detectors and locker searches, which in many cases actually increases anxiety levels in students. Research and Studies have shown that teaching students effective coping strategies in response to stressful and harmful scenarios increases students’ social skills and ability to learn for the future. Further research must be done to analyze the specific results of effectiveness to comprehensive intervention from faculty and staff for student learning and development. At the end of the article the author poses a question with the purpose of persuading the readers to consider alternate behavioral intervention programs similar to the lab school at UCLA. [Austin Griffith]

This article opens with an overview of the University of Chicago Laboratory School or University Primary School, an innovation by educator and philosopher John Dewey that came to fruition on January 13 1896. From there, the author explores numerous sources that discuss Dewey and the reasons for the laboratory school’s eventual demise. The popular opinion among scholars has been that John Dewey was driven out of the University of Chicago by William Rainey Harper, the president. However, from further research, the author concludes that the laboratory school--an experiment during this time period--failed due to reasons such as poor administration, unhappy teachers and students, and an inability by Dewey and his wife, Alice Dewey, the principal of the school, to take into consideration legitimate concerns of others in terms of day-to-day operations and an overall vision for the school. While the initial design of a laboratory school or school within a college exists to this day, the form and follow through of this particular laboratory school failed, in the author’s opinion, due to the aforementioned reasons. The final conclusion was that because those who respect Dewey have tried to preserve his reputation, the issues the school faced during Dewey’s time as an administrator have been left much in the dark until now.


Lamb provides a historical perspective of laboratory schools by considering their foundation, purpose, and emergence in the American education system. Though the origins of these schools have been traced to the Franciscan Friars, Lamb states that the modern American laboratory school was directly influenced by Herbart and Pestalozzi through theories of teacher education. Specifically, it was Pestalozzi who emphasized theory and practice, which became key components of early normal schools. While the origins of laboratory schools remain unclear, the primary purpose behind such schools has stayed relatively constant. As indicated through their various names, “model schools,” “practice schools,” and “training schools,” served as places where aspiring educators could gain first-hand experience with theories of the time. The first of these schools were private, but by the post-reconstruction era, the majority of state normal schools employed laboratory schools for the purpose of training teachers. By the turn of the century, the role of model schools expanded; as such, these schools were frequently called “laboratory schools.” With the coming of the “scientific movement” in education, laboratory
schools became places to test theories and became an integral component of educational theory and research. [Justin Mellish]


This article begins by setting the stage for the tensions and overall atmosphere of Chicago in the 1970’s and provides the context of education at the time. In order to ease the racial tension, the Chicago race commission was created under Governor Frank Lowden, to identify the ramifications of negative race relations and strategies to resolve tensions. Along with the Chicago race commission, the Education Commission of Chicago, also called The Harper Report, was assembled to study the organization of Chicago’s public schools. The Chicago race commission and Education Commission of Chicago create the context around the education system of the time and its guiding ideologies. The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, later called The Dewey School, was (“once suggested a ‘first rate school run by a first rate staff.’” p. 174) highly proclaimed. The guiding principle of the school was to treat each child individually and as an evolving mind. (“In the Laboratory School, Dewey wrote, the curriculum "ministered constantly to the changing needs and interests of the growing child's experience." p. 175). While the Dewey school was a prime example of a ‘Lab School’, the article also mentions the downfalls of the institution’s teaching styles, including ambiguous teaching outcomes the need for the community to be reflected within the school. With the harsh realities of the social inequality, the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago echoed the liberal views and struggles of the decade. [Nicole Belinsky]


In this essay McBride outlines the important role of laboratory schools – primarily as a grounds for training, research, and leadership on child development. However, critics throughout the 80s and early 90s suggested that there was a growing gap in the profession between these arms of its mission. McBride details how such assertions were compounded by challenges of shrinking resources available at most state colleges and universities, blurring of the roles and missions of lab programs, and a low priority placed by the general public on education and training of child-care providers. Despite these trends, he describes a renewed interest in laboratory schools in the early 90’s as a result of two main factors: an increased demand for child care (resulting from a growth of out-of-home employment among mothers) and a desire for child development research that extends beyond traditional laboratories to individual, family, community, and
societal contexts. To capitalize on this positive momentum, McBride advocates for addressing four key areas to build support for laboratory programs and ensure their continued role in the profession: expanding program services, reevaluating personnel training functions, revitalizing model programs/leadership activities, and expanding research opportunities. [Lindsay Julius]


In this article, Olwell examines the publications of the closing of the University School at the University of Michigan (UM). Olwell used the information in similar fashion to a case study by looking at how the university was changing the imagine of the School of Education from K-12 academia to a new era for research. In the article, it references that laboratory schools were closing across the nation for various reasons such as cost, lack of a logical curriculum, and the evolving role of educational institutions. For the purpose of the article, Olwell states that the reasoning behind closing the school at University of Michigan derived from “…financial responsibility and to enable the university to reach out to urban areas with the internal discussions that stressed fundamental shifts toward research.” (Olwell, 2006) In the late 1960s, Wilbur Cohen, the Dean for the School of Education at the University of Michigan, stressed that the closing of the university school represented a crucial decision in the future of education. After the closing, the Academy for Education Development, Inc. (AED) delegated a committee that reviewed the decision of innovating an inquiry based institution. After discovering several flaws with the program implementation, the committee stressed how the program could potentially hinder the prospective development of the School of Education. Dean Cohen agreed with the committee in which that, the program impeded on the development of children of ethnic minorities or culturally disadvantaged populations. While the university school served as a place for research for medical, nursing, and psychiatry students, the closing of the school represented a change of educational direction and influential strengths. [Adrienne Summer]


In this article, Olwell identifies the reasoning for the closing of laboratory schools, specifically citing the school that operated out of the University of Michigan. The most
documented reason for the closing of the school was fiscal, noting that the money allocation toward the laboratory school affected the university’s ability to fund other sources including research and administrative services. Additionally, the population of students that the laboratory school was benefitting was not racially inclusive, as it served primarily white, middle- to upper-class children. Therefore, it did not realistically address the educational system problems of communities in surrounding cities such as Ann Arbor, Flint, and Detroit, which were highly comprised of Black children and other ethnic minorities. Olwell identifies the purpose of the University of Michigan laboratory school, as it existed in the twentieth century, was to aid in research of teaching methods and educate teachers who were earning their degrees in the School of Education. Most laboratory schools closed between the 1960’s and the 1970’s under the same reasoning as the University of Michigan, per fiscal, urban and institutional secularity concerns. The surrounding community benefitted from the closing of the school in Ann Arbor because the public school system then retained the employees as student teachers and thus the new educators were able to address the direct concerns in the area. [Allie Warrick]

http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=da2347bc-a100-4f66-ab75-11f822ef3936%40sessionmgr4010&vid=1&hid=4211

High school education is an evolving system that is continuously striving to develop students and develop unique ways to promote further education. The article discusses a high school located on Gillete’s College campus and about the positive effects of this real estate. Westwood High School officials conclude that senior students are able to gain practical skills such as welding which can in turn aid in the job hunt post-graduation. To encourage higher education, students are able to enroll in philosophy and photography courses to acquire insight on collegiate learning. Students are encouraged to experience unique opportunities that are accessible due to the campus location and determine what their motivation is to continue expanding their education. The high school is adapting to new learning styles and will be rolling out a new initiative of project-based learning allowing students to benefit from hands on authentic learning. Westwood High School is setting the example for nearby secondary education institutions nearby creating a positive shift toward new developments on other college campuses. [Jason Skidmore]
This article highlights various laboratory schools as they seek to find their place amongst the changing landscape of modern-day education. While at their peak in the mid-1960s, there were more than 200 laboratory schools dotted across the country on various university campuses. However, shrinking budgets, university restructuring, and low enrollment have forced many once-prominent schools to either shut their doors or “find [the school’s] place in a rapidly changing education landscape” (Sparks 2015). Often, this means the laboratory schools convert into private, tuition-based institutions, rather than the public, university-supported research schools of the past. To further demonstrate this point, the article highlights the changes that three once-prominent institutions have made to adapt and survive. The University of Chicago Laboratory School, one of the most storied institutions of this type, was “a victim of the repeated university reorganizations and budget cuts” (Sparks 2015). The school still partners with researchers on the University of Chicago campus, but lost its status as a laboratory school in the 1990s. Similarly, the University School of Nashville, once tied to Vanderbilt University, has also lost its connection to the university, now runs as a private, tuition-based school. Unlike the other two schools, P.K. Yonge, a laboratory school affiliated with the University of Florida has successfully maneuvered through the budget-tightening process and has reemerged as a strong example of a modern-day university-supported laboratory school. The article concludes by shining some hope on the future of laboratory schools as more universities have expressed interest in forming their own partner schools, a positive sign for the future of laboratory schools across the nation. [Marissa Hickman]


The University School Laboratory was established on the Ohio State University campus as an experimental school; a date was not given in the article of when the school first opened its doors. The Department of Education at the Ohio State University collected data from the experimental laboratory school in search of “exemplification of the philosophy of education being evolved” (p.123) by the department. The experiment was consider to be pieces added to a model for “educators at large” that was constantly being refined and was opened to improvement. The University School Laboratory allowed students the opportunity of exploring their own intellectual freedoms while “enabling children to meet life situations adequately and to develop a "way of living"” (p.125). Didactic instruction was perceived as the effective educational style of teaching used at the University School Laboratory which engaged the student’s mind. In assessing the school’s educational success, they found it helpful too incorporate units of studies...
that deal directly to the student’s everyday life. “Instead of making a fixed curriculum of units to be studied in the various grades, this faculty has set up, with the help of the children, a list of criteria by which they evaluate units before definitely deciding which to pursue”(p.136). The facility where the classes were being held were inadequate and an inconvenience to students. Teacher had to improvise which made “it is impossible to state at this time to what extent the purposes of the school are actually being fulfilled”(p.143). [Tyra Young]


This article focuses on the pros of primary and secondary schools hosted on a university campus for the purpose of training teachers and testing educational theories. The article expounds upon the notion that laboratory schools provide an avenue that connects the theories of education and its reality. Traditional educators only see the day-to-day issues that happen in schools, while their laboratory counterparts are up-to-date on teaching theories that may be able to combat the same day-to-day issues teachers face.

The article then goes on to discuss eleven techniques that explain how laboratory teachers are able to implement their learned theories into practice in order to test for differentiating outcomes. West and Gadsden also discuss how these teachers can create and utilize different school services that will lend a hand to the implementation, as well as working in conjunction with different faculty and staff members of the institution.

To further support the position in favor of laboratory schools proposed by the authors, they give an example of a laboratory school (P.K. Yonge School of the University of Florida) that thrived after implementing some of the techniques that were also written about in the article. [Lana Hinds]

END ALPHABETICAL ORDER


This is a classic coming of age story set in the 1940s in the American Midwest. The protagonist of the novel, Jerry Engels, is a student at University High School (“U-High”), a lab school at the University of Chicago. Jerry is constantly falling in and out of love; his every thought seems to be consumed by girls. The novel’s action is mostly split between Chicago, including his high school, and the Indiana Dunes where he spends his summers. The novel reveals much about life within the walls of the U-High: the jealousies of students, in part due to the disparities in socioeconomic statuses; the academic rigor (“Schoolwork was not his strong point, but until he started going to the Lab School he had never considered he was dumb,” p. 31); the curriculum; the tensions between students and teachers; extracurricular and social life such as student government (and the politics related to that), sports and dances; Jerry’s comparisons of the Lab
School with his former public high school; and the other regular problems of a high schooler, especially romance, Jerry’s particular obsession. Rogers published a sequel, *Jerry Engels: A Novel* (2005), that describes Jerry’s graduation from high school and transition to college at Penn State. [Christian K. Anderson]


This article examines the education of African American students while focusing on the conditions at the Alabama State College Laboratory School. It explores the perceptions of those who attended the school while also analyzing the curriculum and teaching methods offered. “Lab High”, as it was referred to by students, offered classes targeting nursery age children to those in the 12th grade. “Lab High” was held in high regard by its students, and only 200 residents of the Montgomery area were selected to be pupils. The article then goes on to address the demographics of the school (“Statistics showed a wide range of “occupations,” from “Laborer” at 23.1% to “Professional/Semiprofessional” at 29%.” p. 177) and how students were chosen. Pierson conducted almost thirty interviews with former pupils of “Lab High” and documented their views on the school, as well as the facilities. During these interviews, Pierson made sure to focus on the overall educational experience (curriculum, teaching methods, extracurricular activities). Pierson plans on conducting further research that will delve further into African American educational experiences. [Laura Brabham]


This document authored by Dorothy M. McGeoch, Director of Clinical Experiences for The State University College in Potsdam, New York, discusses the evolution of university laboratory schools along with the advantages and disadvantages. McGeoch traces the development of laboratory or campus schools from their origins in Europe to their adoption and use in the United States. The article explains that laboratory schools were implemented to fill a need to train prospective teachers and their core functions included “student teaching; demonstration, observation, and participation; research and experimentation; and dissemination or inservice education” (p. 9). Laboratory schools were also called normal schools since they served as a model to set the norm for all schools. Normal schools gave budding teachers a chance to
practice their trade. The article explains that by end of the nineteenth century, normal or campus laboratory schools were making their way to college and university campuses. One disadvantage that became apparent was the disproportionate distribution of teachers to students. Due to a shortage of students, one classroom may have been assigned as many as ten student teachers. University observers and those with oversight responsibilities would come and go during class adding to the many distractions students faced while attempting to get an education. This led to increasing partnerships with off-campus schools to provide student teachers with other learning venues. This developed into an opportunity for teachers to learn skills on campus while under direct supervision but also receive real world experience when assigned to an off-campus school. Eventually, conflicting agendas and lines of authority led to redefining the role of campus laboratory schools with the Department of Education taking on more responsibility for the training and education of teachers. [Tammy Hyer]


Lamb provides a historical perspective of laboratory schools by considering their foundation, purpose, and emergence in the American education system. Though the origins of these schools have been traced to the Franciscan Friars, Lamb states that the modern American laboratory school was directly influenced by Herbart and Pestalozzi through theories of teacher education. Specifically, it was Pestalozzi who emphasized theory and practice, which became key components of early normal schools. While the origins of laboratory schools remain unclear, the primary purpose behind such schools has stayed relatively constant. As indicated through their various names, “model schools,” “practice schools,” and “training schools,” served as places where aspiring educators could gain first-hand experience with theories of the time. The first of these schools were private, but by the post-reconstruction era, the majority of state normal schools employed laboratory schools for the purpose of training teachers. By the turn of the century, the role of model schools expanded; as such, these schools were frequently called
“laboratory schools.” With the coming of the “scientific movement” in education, laboratory schools became places to test theories and became an integral component of educational theory and research. [Justin Mellish]


This will be my article! (Christian Medders)


“Child Development Laboratory Schools as Generators of Knowledge in Early Childhood Education” provides an overview of the potential for the 21st-century university laboratory school to become a place that generates and develops a more comprehensive student development theory that aims to support child development and the education field in general. While this article emphasizes its research in attempting to address how laboratory schools can achieve the ability to generate such outcomes, its research about 20th-century university laboratory schools provides rich detail and historical context. In order to provide conclusions on how university laboratory schools could attempt to move forward and generate more accurate and current early childhood and student development theory, the authors provide a framework of the previous practices, goals and policies of university laboratory schools. For example, the article discusses how in the 20th-century, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation funded such institutions so that they would “engage in research (on child development), training (of researchers, teachers and service providers) and service (for families and communities).” Upon detailing these goals, the article utilizes these objectives as a framework to discuss their conclusions for the modern university laboratory school. The article also continues to detail the numerous challenges that previous and current laboratory schools have or are predicted to face within the economic, academic and social historical landscape. While this article serves to address the potential of modern university laboratory schools, its research, examples, model for student development and conclusions for the current laboratory school are developed upon the original intention and framework of 20th-century laboratory schools. [Elizabeth Szewczyk]
This online newspaper periodical discusses the laboratory schools at the University of Toronto and some of the problems they face. It begins while explaining that a 14-year-old kid is giving a lecture to his 9th grade classmates on the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme while they are all listening attentively. The purpose of this introduction is to show the level of intelligence that the students of the University of Toronto Schools (UTS) possess. These famed Canadian laboratory schools have been around for over a hundred years due to the level of academic excellence that is expected from their students. The article explains that almost all of the students at the schools go to college after and out of those students, 95% of them become Ontario scholars and 10% of them go to ivy league schools in the U.S. The article also reveals many of the notable alumni, two of which were nobel laureates, and 22 Rhodes Scholars. This shows that many of the students at this specific set of laboratory schools are very successful after graduation. Some of the problems that the schools face are things like budget cuts from the university which directly impacts the schools. With less funds, the schools have had to raise tuition. There is also a problem of the building that the schools are housed in. It needs to be repaired so the administrators in the schools are not sure how long the university will allow them to stay there. Overall, the article explains that the principle of the schools is very optimistic on their continuation due to how successful its academics and students are. [Joseph Reed]
incredibly selective when searching for teachers for the school, choosing only those who already
saw problems with traditional teaching methods. The issues concerning finding suitable
instructors for this experimental school are well detailed in the article. Despite initial recruiting
issues the Lincoln School’s teachers published hundreds of studies during the twenty four years
it was open, on subjects ranging from curriculum development to modern teaching techniques,
thus fulfilling the school’s initial mission as well as Flexner and Caldwell’s vision for the
laboratory school. [Sam Sawyer]

Taught in a University Laboratory School Setting." Online SubmissionERIC, EBSCOhost (accessed
August 21, 2016). [Jenny Connor]

Weih and Ensworth’s study was conducted at a laboratory school associated with a Midwestern
university with about 13,000 students. At the time of the study, the laboratory school had 387
students, pre-kindergarten through high school, with 53 additional children in a child
development program. The study itself examined the effects of university students teaching a
lesson on literary authors to the laboratory students. Also, in order to enhance the university
students’ experiences, several full time staff members of the laboratory school gave a series of
presentations in to give them advice on classroom instruction. At the conclusion of the lessons
and presentations, the researchers surveyed three groups: the university student teachers, the
laboratory students and the laboratory school teachers.

Weih and Ensworth’s hope for this project was to demonstrate the impact that a laboratory
school can have on a university and vice versa. They found that overall, the student teachers, the
laboratory students and the school teachers all had positive experiences from participating in the
study. The group that seemed to benefit the most from this exercise was the university students.
They were able to have some real classroom experience before starting their official student
teaching and improve upon their lesson planning. Many of the university students commented on
how they felt more prepared for their future careers in education and that they would like to work
the laboratory school again in the future. With this study, Weih and Ensworth were able to
highlight one-way laboratory schools can be beneficial to universities.

Wilcox-Herzog, Amanda S. and McLaren, Meridyth S. "Lessons Learned: Building a Better

In this article, Wilcox-Herzog and McLaren emphasize why laboratory schools are essential to
childhood development, and crucial to the advancement of educational leaders. They support
their claims with references to the components key to a sturdy and successful foundation, with
frequent mention of their own application of a laboratory school. The article is teeming with affirmations regarding the conceptual structure of laboratory schools, lauding their essence: the tripartite mission. According to Wilcox-Herzog and McLaren, the only minor shortcoming of the infrastructure is that the mission is slightly unbalanced, accentuating the teaching portion to a faulty degree, thereby faintly excluding the community. With some restructuring, they suggest that laboratory schools should and can attend more to outreach and research, as well as a more meticulous consideration of internal leadership. As the title of the article suggests, they address the eight lessons learned to build a better laboratory school, structured around the successes of the mission. Ultimately, the article aligns with the notion that not only are laboratory schools a progressive methodology, useful to the growth and well-rounded development of children, but they also encourage these schools as a practical way to train and educate potential teachers, and finally, they claim that laboratory schools are rather crucial to the core of American education.

[Lindsey Conklin]