

East Tennessee State University

## Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

---

ETSU Faculty Works

Faculty Works

---

Spring 2023

### Obligations, Obstacles, and Opportunities: Conducting Research as a Laboratory School Teacher

Amanda Frasier

*East Tennessee State University, frasiera@etsu.edu*

Heidi Campbell

*East Tennessee State University, campbellhe@etsu.edu*

Lisa Reis

*East Tennessee State University, reisll@etsu.edu*

Holley Ziglar

*East Tennessee State University, ziglar@etsu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etsu-works-2>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

#### Citation Information

Frasier, Amanda; Campbell, Heidi; Reis, Lisa; and Ziglar, Holley, "Obligations, Obstacles, and Opportunities: Conducting Research as a Laboratory School Teacher" (2023). *ETSU Faculty Works*. 976.  
<https://dc.etsu.edu/etsu-works-2/976>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETSU Faculty Works by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact [digilib@etsu.edu](mailto:digilib@etsu.edu).

# Obligations, Obstacles, and Opportunities: Conducting Research as a Laboratory School Teacher

Amanda S. Frasier, Heidi Campbell, Lisa Reis, and Holley Ziglar

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

---

Scholars have documented that when John Dewey formed an experimental university-based school in Chicago in 1896, he intended that research be a component of laboratory schools (Camp-Mayhew et al., 1936; Durst, 2010). However, the realities of teaching and the bureaucratic structures of higher education present obstacles to engaging in meaningful empirical work. Additionally, the majority of laboratory schools have converted from their original form as public, university-based institutions of innovative teaching and research to private, tuition-based institutions or to public facilities attended primarily by the children of university faculty (Whitman, 2020). However, there are examples of laboratory schools that still engage in research activities (e.g. Cutler, 2012; Weih & Ensworth, 2006; Wilcox-Herzog & McLaren, 2006) and all contemporary laboratory schools still list research among their missions and purposes, though the level and definition of research differs across institutions (Jozwiak & Vera, 2016).

In this piece, faculty from East Tennessee State University's (ETSU) K-12 public laboratory school, University School, reflect on our experiences attempting to engage in research while serving dually as K-12 practitioners and university faculty. Faculty at this laboratory school are tenure-track members of the university and are contractually obligated to engage in scholarship, though their teaching and service obligations mirror those of other non-laboratory public school teachers. This systematic, reflective program evaluation will evaluate the structures and policies in place at our institution to address the question: What are the obligations, obstacles, and opportunities presented when engaging in research as University School faculty at ETSU?

First, we will provide an overview of the context of University School, including the school's relationship with ETSU and the local district (Washington County) in which it is nested, ETSU's status as a research institution, research as reflected in the philosophy and purpose statement of the school, and the contractual research obligations and tenure requirements of faculty teaching at the school. Then, we will review recent obstacles from the past two years (2020-2022) that faculty have encountered when conducting or attempting to conduct research as University School faculty. Next, we will discuss new initiatives and changes that are ongoing at the school, college, and university level to better expedite research

at our laboratory school. Finally, we will offer lessons learned from this analysis to better improve the practitioner-researcher relationship in laboratory schools.

Specifically, this analysis highlights a need for facilitating research both within the school, which will allow teachers to participate in individual and collaborative projects, as well as within the university, which will allow higher education faculty access to the laboratory school as a research site. Other promising avenues for increasing research at laboratory schools, such as partnerships between schools and with external stakeholders, are explored. Possible school and university-level policy responses are proposed. Finally, next steps for potential empirical work are outlined.

## Approach

The authors engaged in a systematic reflection. An empirical strategy was not utilized for the analysis, though the paper was written to inform future empirical work on creating opportunities for research at University School. The section on *obligations* was written primarily by reviewing documents that outline faculty research requirements, including the laboratory school's philosophy and purpose statement (Appendix A) and tenure requirements (Appendices B and C). The *obstacles* section was created iteratively by first brainstorming a list informed by our personal experiences as well as from previous conversations with other faculty, including those from the University School Task Force. We then worked to explain the obstacles we had identified, often consolidating terms as we saw commonalities both across and between ideas. Similarly, we created a list of initiatives that the authors felt presented *opportunities* for facilitating future research.

## Positionality

The four authors in this piece have all worked as instructors at University School. Our experiences and backgrounds influenced our individual perspectives of the obligations, obstacles, and opportunities for research at the laboratory school. Additionally, the institution has moved forward with the creation of a University School Task Force to work

toward facilitating future research opportunities at the lab school. All of the authors are members of this task force. All laboratory school-based members of the task force were invited to participate in this paper. Because empirical data was not collected from all faculty, this piece should not be viewed as a completely inclusive representation of perspectives at University School; however, the authors' diverse backgrounds and experiences allowed for multiple perspectives to be included.

Amanda Slaten Frasier taught high school social studies at University School for two years (2020-2022). She previously had a seven-year tenure in higher education, first as a research fellow and then as teacher education faculty at an R1 institution. Before that, she taught high school English at public schools in Virginia and North Carolina (2007-2012). As faculty at University School, Dr. Frasier secured internal grant funding to complete pre-existing empirical work and engage in new analyses of a pre-existing data set. This work conducted while a laboratory school teacher resulted in single-authored peer-reviewed publications. She transitioned back to a higher education role at East Tennessee State University this year.

Heidi Campbell began her career in education in 2006 and served as a high school social studies instructor at University School from 2012 to 2020. As part of the tenure process at University School, Dr. Campbell was a member of many leadership committees and conducted research aimed at increasing student engagement and content acquisition. During this time, Dr. Campbell presented at state and national conferences with a focus on deepening student content knowledge and analysis of historical events through regular use of primary sources and simulations. In 2020, Dr. Campbell transitioned into school administration and is currently the Testing and Curriculum Coordinator at University School. Her current role includes curriculum review, instructional support, and data analysis.

Lisa Reis has been teaching at the middle school level since 2010. Since beginning her career at University School in 2016, she has served in different roles. She has taught math in grades 6-8 and sixth grade science. She has coached various middle school extracurricular activities including Science Fair, Mathletes, Cross Country, and Heart and Sole. In addition to teaching responsibilities, she has presented on the subjects of math and science locally and nationally, and has collaborated with other faculty on grant-funded projects. Currently, she is teaching seventh and eighth grade math and serving as adjunct for undergraduate teacher-preparation track STEM courses at the university.

Holley Ziglar began teaching in 1995 at the preschool and elementary levels in public and private schools in Tennessee, Kentucky, and North Carolina. She started at University School in 2011 as a graduate assistant and moved into her current role as RTI (Response to Intervention) interventionist in 2012. The

role of 504 Coordinator was added to her job description in 2017. She has presented numerous professional workshops at the local, state, and regional levels since 2002. Her focus is on increasing achievement for all students, which includes finding and providing the best intervention strategies and programs. She currently leads monthly RTI-focused data team meetings with teachers, provides guidance for struggling learners, and oversees the state-mandated universal screening process.

## Context of the Case

University School operates as a public K-12 laboratory school on the campus of East Tennessee State University. According to the Carnegie Classification, ETSU is classified as an R2 institution with high research activity (American Council on Education, 2021). The University houses nine separate colleges, including Clemmer College (where ETSU's Education programs are housed) plus an academic library. As an R2 institute, the university has infrastructure in place to support research initiatives including an Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), Institutional Review Board (IRB), and internal funding initiatives. While the faculty of University School are employees of ETSU, the students are considered part of Washington County Schools, a local public school district.

A recent qualitative review of laboratory schools indicated that around 70% of contemporary university-affiliated laboratory schools operate within the College of Education (Jozwiak & Vera, 2016). As with the majority of laboratory schools, University School operates as a department within the Clemmer College, which is ETSU's College of Education. As such, the Director of the school serves at the college level in the same role as a department chair. Offering a small school environment, the school is structured with one class per grade level from kindergarten through fourth grade. A second class is added at the fifth grade level and remains as such throughout the middle school years. Enrollment numbers continue to expand at the high school level, with a potential class size average of 80-85 students per grade. Total K-12 enrollment for the 2022-2023 school year consists of 597 students.

Admission to University School is granted through a lottery system in which interested families complete an application process. When determining the number of available spaces per grade, leveled priority is given to students who fall into one of the following categories: have a parent or guardian serving as a full-time faculty member at University School, siblings of currently enrolled students, residents of Washington County, and students residing in areas beyond Washington County. After the application deadline, a random drawing is conducted and selected students are invited to interview with school administrators. As a public school of choice, applicants are

screened based on prior academic performance, disciplinary records, and previous attendance rates, though in recent years the school is trending towards accepting students it would have previously turned away.

For the purposes of clarity in this paper, the term “laboratory school” will refer to University School, “college” will refer to Clemmer College (which serves as the College of Education) and “university” will refer to East Tennessee State University (ETSU).

## Obligations to Engage in Research

The laboratory school is driven by a philosophy and purpose that is twofold. The primary function of the school is to provide for the academic, social, and emotional growth of students in grades K-12 while integrating a college preparatory curriculum. In addition to the focus on K-12 education, the laboratory school’s connections with the college are intended to allow for educator preparation opportunities on the campus of the university. Through collaboration between K-12 and higher education faculty, prospective teachers have opportunities to complete various stages of their student teaching residency requirements under the mentorship of highly skilled laboratory school faculty. Additionally, one component specifically stated in the “Philosophy and Purpose” statement of the school is that the laboratory school should function as a research laboratory for new ideas (Appendix A).

In order to carry out the “Philosophy and Purpose” of the laboratory school, there is an expectation for faculty to be open and willing to implement innovative classroom strategies to support areas such as instruction, intervention, and classroom management. K-12 faculty at the laboratory school are contractually required to conduct research and collaborative projects integrating new ideas and programs that advance the field of education. As such, the tenure process for the laboratory school faculty is unique compared to that of other public school educators in Tennessee. Over the course of 5 years, laboratory school tenure-track faculty must meet many of the same criteria required of higher education faculty. Tenure is based on an individual’s accomplishments in the categories of Teaching Effectiveness (85%), Service to the School, University, and Community at Large (10%), and Scholarship including Research and Creative Endeavors (5%) (Appendix B). In order to meet the scholarship requirement for tenure, faculty are required to present or publish at the regional, state, or national level. In addition to publications and/or presentations, faculty may provide evidence of participating in research conducted within the laboratory school or the college that enhances the field of education or leads to publications and presentations (Appendix C).

Including the director and assistant director, the laboratory school currently has 24 tenured faculty and 11 tenure-track

faculty. Additional temporary faculty are hired each year and are not subject to tenure requirements. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to complete a yearly Faculty Activity Report (FAR) indicating current course load, research, and service. There is an expectation that faculty engage in research activities and pursue presentation or publication opportunities on a yearly basis. Research activities may be ongoing and take place over the span of multiple years. While all tenured faculty are required to engage in research or presentation activities, tenure-track faculty often feel increased pressure to seek out these activities as they build their tenure portfolios. FARs are submitted to the Director of the laboratory school and the Dean of the college, with feedback provided to faculty members on their progress toward tenure or fulfillment of expectations.

## Program Analysis

### *Obstacles to Conducting Research*

Laboratory school faculty encounter many obstacles that interfere with collaboration on research with college faculty. The K-12 and higher education faculties are separated in various ways: the laboratory school and its affiliated college are housed in different buildings, have conflicting work schedules and commitments, and may not fully understand the expectations for either K-12 or Higher Education. These separations have created barriers to collaboration between the college and its laboratory school.

**Physical and Temporal Separation.** The physical distance between the laboratory school and its affiliated college is one obstacle to collaboration. The laboratory school is physically separated a half-mile away from the college building. This makes it inconvenient for both faculties to meet regularly. Any communication between the college and laboratory school occurs via email or through Zoom meetings, whereas faculty in the main college building can simply walk across the hall to partner with colleagues.

Additionally, the day-to-day work schedules between higher education and K-12 faculty differ in many ways and inadvertently create conflict. Laboratory school teachers have one hour of planning time, which may or may not be in one full block of time. The rest of the day is actively spent with students, leaving no time to discuss research or meet with higher education faculty. This is very different from the teaching schedule of higher education faculty, which is created to allow time for research. Even higher education faculty with high instructional loads (three courses for assistant professors or four courses for instructors) have time in the work day where they are not actively required to be with students.

As in other K-12 settings, teachers at the laboratory school

wear many hats. The small school structure and the wide range of grades accommodated further complicate faculty obligations as teachers are frequently asked to perform extra duties in addition to their regular teaching load. In addition to the school-day workload, time after school is also limited for K-12 faculty because of sports and extracurricular demands, as well as faculty meetings and professional development opportunities. There are quite a number of school-level meetings that are held each week. For instance, RTI<sup>2</sup> meetings are required by the state to be held every 4.5 weeks (see Tennessee Department of Education, n.d., for more information on this program). These meetings must include administration, teachers, and other related personnel, which can be difficult to schedule due to the time obligations of everyone in the building. Due to limited planning time during the day, most of these meetings are held after school. Because the laboratory school is a small school covering the entire span of K-12 grades, many of the same teachers are invited to multiple meetings, further increasing time commitments. Additionally, after-school clubs and activities requiring a faculty sponsor, subject-specific and whole faculty meetings, and building-level Professional Learning Communities all add to the increased time obligations of laboratory school teachers. All of these time constraints on the laboratory school faculty make it difficult to arrange a set time to meet regularly with higher education faculty.

The yearly work schedules are also another obstacle. The laboratory school follows a year-round calendar with three to four week intercession breaks between quarters. This calendar allows for an earlier start to the school year compared to both the university and neighboring K-12 school districts. The laboratory school is the only school in the local area that adopted this calendar format, and even though the laboratory school is considered part of the Washington County School system, the calendars do not align. As such, some collaborative efforts involving higher education faculty are scheduled when laboratory teachers are on intercession, which leads to their absence and further disconnects the two faculties. Therefore, operating on a school calendar that does not align with either the university or local district in which the laboratory school is housed further complicates efforts for faculty scholarship.

#### **Misalignment between K-2 and Higher Education.**

As an R2 university, the university offers internal grant opportunities which would allow laboratory school faculty to engage in projects independent of other higher education faculty. However, these opportunities can be difficult for the laboratory school faculty to access as these university-wide internal funding mechanisms, with few exceptions, do not allow release time or extra compensation. Other tenure-track higher education positions have time allowances for faculty to engage in research, but due to grant guidelines meant to encourage

university faculty to seek out extramural funding, laboratory school faculty members cannot use these funds to pay for substitute teacher coverage or to compensate for work done outside of contractual time, such as during summer break.

Additionally, some of the structures of grant administration also make it difficult for the laboratory school faculty who may earn a research grant to utilize the funds. While some smaller internal grant opportunities are paid directly to the school and can be managed by the school accountant, larger grants often require indexing at the level of the college. External grants require the same university level processing higher education faculty are expected to go through, a process which would be unfamiliar to most K-12 teachers who often lack that experience. Laboratory school faculty can utilize the institutional support the college puts into place for grants, but they receive no training or information on topics such as grant indexing, making purchases, or writing contracts unless they request this information directly. Additionally, informational meetings on these services are usually held at times when K-12 faculty are either teaching or on contracted leave. Other departments in the college have these supports in place as well as close physical proximity to support personnel who are housed in the same building as their departments.

Finally, using the laboratory as a site of research can pose difficulty to faculty who want to conduct anonymized studies. First, as the only laboratory school in the region, the unique structure of the school makes it easily identifiable even if broad descriptors are used. Secondly, policy requires that all university employees are paid using extra compensation mechanisms. This means that a laboratory school employee's participation in a study is reported to their employer via payroll if they are to receive any compensation for their participation. This could present a challenge to confidentiality when asking laboratory school teachers to participate in research that is compensated. Additionally, it may dissuade university scholars from using the laboratory school as a study site for compensated research because the method of compensation will be different than other study sites. For instance, this could be problematic if a university researcher wanted to conduct a study across all of Washington County schools, as potential study subjects at the laboratory school may be excluded and thus impact sampling.

#### **Recent Changes Creating New Opportunities**

A recent step in better integrating laboratory school faculty into research at the college level is the inclusion of a representative on the college's Internal Research Advisory Committee (IRAC). A representative from the laboratory school was first included on IRAC in fall 2021. While having a representative on the committee is a good first step in raising

the concerns and needs of laboratory school faculty, it should be noted that the misaligned schedules between the K-12 school and higher education are still an issue. Throughout the 2021-2022 year, the committee often met when the representative was obligated to teach, meaning the laboratory school could not be represented at the meeting. Other times, meetings were scheduled during the laboratory school's breaks, forcing the representative to choose between attending the meeting outside her working schedule or not at all. This problem is persisting into the 2022-2023 academic year.

Despite the obstacle with scheduling, inclusion in the IRAC committee is important because it allows for facilitation between K-12 faculty and research funding. As described in the previous section, many of the internal funding mechanisms do not allow for teacher release time or extra compensation. However, there are two college-wide initiatives that can be utilized by laboratory school teachers and both are administered by IRAC. First, the IRAC committee offers competitive unique funding requests which can be used for substitute coverage to allow teachers to engage in scholarship activity. This funding mechanism was utilized by one of this paper's authors in 2021 to complete revisions on a paper that had been accepted by a peer reviewed journal. Additionally, the IRAC committee oversees a competitive Summer Research Assignment program which awards extra compensation for faculty who engage in scholarly activities outside of contracted time. This award goes up to \$5000 and was utilized by a laboratory school faculty member for the first time in 2022.

Additionally, there is a funding opportunity that is exclusive to the faculty at the laboratory school. In 2018, University School alumnus, A. Richard Wilson, created an endowment fund specifically to provide additional funding for faculty professional development and creative classroom projects. The selection committee is composed of one administrator and six faculty representatives from all grades and disciplines. Members serve for a three-year term. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are encouraged each year to apply for the stipend. Teachers may submit an application to cover workshop or conference expenses or to provide materials needed for a specific classroom project. Unlike other internal funding mechanisms, this award does allow for the release of a few days for teachers to attend an event or conduct work.

As interest in conducting independent research has increased among laboratory school faculty; conversations have been initiated across the university to change and clarify procedures to facilitate research for laboratory school faculty. This has included the documenting of challenges with the compensation mechanisms and policies and issuing a request to the Vice Provost of Research to revise and clarify current policies. By utilizing indirect funds from the college's existing external grants,

centralized grant accounting support staff have been established in the college and pathways for laboratory school teachers to utilize these resources have been created. Additionally, the college's Associate Dean of Research has initiated outreach to the laboratory school, including recording videos explaining the IRAC funding available to laboratory school faculty. Continuation of conversations with personnel from across the university will be integral to future improvement efforts.

There are two other fledgling actions that show promise in facilitating scholarship at the laboratory school. The first is the creation of a college-wide task force. The University School Task Force was assembled in the final months of the 2021-2022 school year and is led jointly by two faculty members respectively from University School and the Department of Educational Foundations and Special Education. The task force currently is split evenly between K-12 and higher education faculty from five of the six departments in the college. As such, the task force consists of members from the laboratory school (7), the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (2), the Department of Educational Foundations and Special Education (2), the Department of Early Childhood Education (1), the Department of Counseling (1), and the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis (1). Additionally, starting with the 2021-2022 school year, the laboratory school established a physical presence in the main college building with four high school classrooms currently located on the lowest level. While the impacts of these changes have not yet been determined, there is the potential that both could facilitate scholarship for the laboratory school in the future.

## Implications and Conclusion

Our analysis of the current policies in place in this case revealed the following obstacles to research at the laboratory school: separation of the laboratory school and higher education faculty in terms of both space and time, inaccessible or cumbersome funding and support mechanisms, and differences in policy when using the laboratory school as a research site versus other K-12 institutions. In contrast, the following helped facilitate research at the school: funding mechanisms that allowed extra compensation or time release to laboratory school teachers and the representation of laboratory school interests on a college-wide research committee. Additionally, new initiatives offered promise to further research at the laboratory school including raising awareness at the university level of policies that hinder scholarly productivity at the laboratory school, placing laboratory classrooms in the same building as the college, and the formation of a task force to facilitate improving relations between the laboratory school and its host college.

Overall, more work is needed to understand how the unique contexts and policies of laboratory schools housed in universities may help or hinder scholarly productivity. The problems present in the case of the laboratory school examined here are not unique, and the role of the work of K-12 teachers and research in laboratory school has been similarly described elsewhere (e.g. Van Til, 2022). Additionally, research conducted in laboratory schools has been declining and those schools that still value research in their missions and policies must grapple with the tensions that arise when K-12 faculty are expected to engage in research (Jozwiak & Vera, 2022). If administrators decide that they want to require scholarship to occur at their individual laboratory schools, then policies must alleviate and not exacerbate the inevitable tension that will arise when laboratory school faculty must engage in scholarship, but not otherwise be granted the time or mechanisms necessary to do so.

Laboratory schools that wish to include research as a focus of the school, such as the one in this analysis, must ensure that policies and structures facilitate research in two ways. The first is to create a working system that allows laboratory school teachers to engage in independent and collaborative research. This is particularly important in the case of the school examined here, where K-12 faculty have contractual obligations to engage in scholarly activity. Secondly, the system should allow and encourage higher education faculty to have access to utilizing the school as a study site. As such, laboratory school faculty may be able to meet their research obligations by participating in research directed by or otherwise collaborating with higher education personnel.

There are a few possible policy responses laboratory schools and affiliated universities could undertake. For instance, universities could explore ways to create release time and/or compensation for faculty engaging in research. University administration could facilitate and encourage research initiated by higher education faculty by building connections through meet and greets, assuring that K-12 faculty are able to attend meetings and events with higher education faculty, and incentivizing work between laboratory schools and higher education faculty. Additionally, laboratory schools should also consider the ways in which they can engage in collaboration outside of the university. For instance, Ramos (2022) outlines the promise in creating a *community of practice* across laboratory schools to investigate school responses and experiences during the COVID pandemic. Other laboratory schools have partnered with external corporations and foundations to conduct research (Jozwiak & Vera, 2022). Moving beyond the university to seek external partnerships could be a next step for facilitating research in the case described in this paper.

Overall, this analysis highlights the need for additional work on examining the role of research in contemporary

laboratory schools. Others have examined the following issues in laboratory schools: 1) whether research is part of the school's stated mission; 2) whether K-12 and/or higher education faculty engage in scholarship at the laboratory schools; 3) what type of research is emerging from laboratory schools; and 4) whether research conducted at laboratory school originates with K-12 faculty, higher education faculty, or elsewhere. A next step is to examine how policies and procedures in place at laboratory schools and the colleges and universities in which they are housed help or hinder research in laboratory schools. If research is to remain an important component of laboratory schools, then analysis of school-level and university-level policies could help reveal the best ways to facilitate that goal. Importantly, the efficacy of programs meant to improve research at laboratory schools should be evaluated in order to improve research across laboratory schools as a whole.

## References

- American Council on Education. (2021). *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. <https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/index.php>
- Camp-Mayhew, K., Camp-Edwards, A. & Dewey, J. (1936). *The Dewey School: The laboratory school of the University of Chicago 1896-1903*. New York, NY: D. Appleton-Century
- Cutler, K., Bersani, C., Hutchins, P., Bowne, M., Lash, M., Kroeger, J., ... & Black, F. (2012). Laboratory schools as places of inquiry: A collaborative journey for two laboratory schools. *Early Education & Development, 23*(2), 242-258.
- Durst, A. (2010). 'Venturing in education': Teaching at the University of Chicago's Laboratory School, 1896-1904. *History of Education, 39*(1), 55-73.
- Jozwiak, M.M. & Vera, D. (2022). John Dewey and the university lab school: Lessons learned and implications for today. *International Association of Laboratory School Journal, 12*(1), 3-14.
- Jozwiak, M. M. & Vera, D. (2016). Unraveling the threads that have preserved university laboratory Schools: A qualitative study on sustainability. *International Association of Laboratory School Journal, 6*(1), 13-19.
- Ramos, N. (2022). Collaboration, reflection, and dialogue: How a group of laboratory schools are creating a community of practice. *International Association of Laboratory School Journal, 12*(1), 15-17.
- Tennessee Department of Education. (n.d.) "RTI<sup>2</sup>." Retrieved March 21, 2023, from <https://www.tn.gov/education/districts/instruction/tdoe-rti2.html>
- Van Til, W. (2022). The laboratory school: Its rise and fall? An excerpt. *International Association of Laboratory School Journal, 12*(1), 41-47.
- Weih, T.G., & Ensworth, L. (2006). The impact of a teacher education course taught in a university laboratory school setting. *The National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, 30*, 22-30.
- Wilcox-Herzog, A. S., & McLaren, M. S. (2012). Lessons learned: Building a better laboratory school. *National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, 4*(1), 1-8.
- Whitman, G. (2020). Lab schools: Past, present, and possibility. *International Association of Laboratory School Journal, 10*(1), 21-28.

## Appendix A: University School Philosophy and Purpose

University School of East Tennessee State University serves a dual function.

1. The primary function is to provide a rich college preparatory curriculum that promotes the continuous academic, social, and emotional growth of each child in grades K-12.
2. The secondary function of the school is to help Clemmer College at East Tennessee State University achieve its mission of preparing professional educators by:
  - Providing university students with opportunities to observe innovative instructional practices;
  - Providing university students opportunities to work with and teach K-12 pupils under the direction of skilled mentor teachers;
  - Serving as a research laboratory for the advancement of programs and new ideas in the field of education;
  - Serving in a leadership role for the educational community.

University School and the Clemmer College faculty and administration believe that the two broad functions described above are complementary. When teachers, professors, administrators, and students work collaboratively in the interests of educational excellence, all stakeholders benefit.

Excerpt from "Student Handbook." (July 17, 2022).

University School, East Tennessee State University, retrieved from Student Handbook (etsu.edu)

## Appendix B: The Tenure Criteria for University School

Over the probationary period tenure track faculty should be aware that performance criteria are based upon the following category divisions:

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: 85%

SERVICE TO THE SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY AT LARGE: 10%

SCHOLARSHIP INCLUDING RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS: 5%

Excerpt from: "Departmental Criteria for the Clarification of the Tenure Process." April 2016.

University School, East Tennessee State University. Page 2.

## Appendix C: Scholarship Requirements for University School Faculty

### SCHOLARSHIP INCLUDING RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ENDEAVORS

It should be noted that emphasis is placed on research and creative activities that result in publication and presentation at the regional, state or national level.

Over a six year period, suggested scholarship artifacts leading to tenure include the following but are not limited to:

1. Faculty candidates must present or publish at the regional, state, or national level. Suggested artifacts include:
  - Publications in journals (peer reviewed articles items receive greater consideration)
  - Regional, state, and/or national presentations
  - Performances, art shows, concerts or other similar demonstrations of creative work in area of expertise
2. Candidates may provide evidence of research. It may be research within University School, the College of Education, or University at large. It may include:
  - Ongoing classroom or departmental assessments of data and methods that are used for research based departmental decisions
  - Action research projects appropriate for publication and presentation
  - Other
3. Candidates may submit artifacts that reflect creative involvement of students in performances, exhibitions, competitions that are juried and invited by recognized groups and organizations within the discipline. This may include coaching in extracurricular activities such as athletic events, mock trial, and poetry competitions.
  - Events



- Tournaments
  - Exhibitions
  - Performances
  - Competitions
  - Other
4. Candidates may present evidence of grant writing and procurement of grant funds for one's discipline.
- Grants awarded
  - Grants submitted

Excerpt from: "Departmental Criteria for the Clarification of the Tenure Process." April 2016.  
University School, East Tennessee State University. Page 5.

## Author Biographies

**Amanda Slaten Frasier** is currently Assistant Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and former Instructor at University School in Clemmer College at East Tennessee State University. She holds a Ph.D. in Educational Policy from Michigan State University and is a National Board Certified Teacher. She holds an active teaching license in 3 states in PreK-12 Library, 6-8 Social Studies, and 6-12 Government, History, and English. Her research interests are the intersection of teacher policy and teacher practice, policy analysis, evaluation and assessment, and teacher education and development.

**Heidi Campbell** is currently the Testing and Curriculum Coordinator at University School in Clemmer College at East Tennessee State University. Prior to this role, she served as a classroom teacher and school administrator. She earned an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership from East Tennessee State University and holds active licenses in PreK-12 Administration and Grade 7-12 History, Economics, Geography, and U.S. Government education.

**Lisa Reis** is currently the 7/8 Math Instructor at University School in Clemmer College at East Tennessee State University. She earned her M.A. in K-8 Education from East Tennessee State University and holds an active K-8 teaching license with endorsements in Algebra 1, K-8 Computer Science, and English as a Second Language K-12. She is currently pursuing an Ed.D. in Educational Practice and Innovation with a concentration in STEM Education from the University of South Carolina.

**Holley Ziglar** is currently the K-12 RTI<sup>2</sup> Interventionist, 504 Coordinator, and ELL Services Manager at University School in Clemmer College at East Tennessee State University. She earned her M.A.C.E. from Southern Seminary and M.A. in Elementary Education from East Tennessee State University and holds an active K-8 Tennessee teaching license. She is currently pursuing an Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from Liberty University.