

Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky, Thursday, April 30, 1964.

A special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky was called by the Chairman, Dr. Ralph Angelucci, for 5:00 o'clock, Eastern Standard Time, on Thursday, April 30, 1964, in the Board of Trustees Room in the Administration Building on the campus of the University. The following members of the Executive Committee were present: Dr. Angelucci, chairman, Judge James A. Sutherland, secretary, Mr. Robert Hillenmeyer, and Dr. H. B. Murray. Mr. Smith Broadbent was unable to attend. In addition, Mr. Floyd Wright, a member of the Board of Trustees, President John Oswald, Dr. A. D. Albright, Dr. William R. Willard, Mr. Robert Kerley, and Dr. Ellis F. Hartford were present. Members of the press and the following representatives of the parents of the University High School, Mrs. Martha Gurnee, Mr. Harry Miller, Dr. William Maxson, Mr. Harry Scott and Mr. Charles Rhodes, also attended.

A. Meeting Opened

Dr. Ralph Angelucci called the meeting to order at 5:12 p.m. He commented on the new Board of Trustees Room, which was being used for the first time, and expressed appreciation to Dr. Oswald for providing such a beautiful room for use of the Board.

B. University High School Discussed

Dr. Angelucci indicated that there was no agenda for this special meeting but that it was called to hear a statement from Dr. Oswald.

Dr. Oswald stated that, shortly after his arrival in September, the Board of Trustees asked him to look into several matters in the University which had been of continuing concern to the Board. Among these was the University High School--what function the school now served, the financing of the school, and what should ultimately be done about it.

A committee composed of Dean Lyman Ginger, Dean of the College of Education, Mr. James H. Powell, Director of the University High School, Drs. Morris Cierley and Ellis Hartford, former directors, and Dr. James Kincheloe, former Superintendent of the Fayette County Schools, was appointed with Dr. Kincheloe serving as chairman. The following report resulted from the deliberations and study of this committee:

"Re: University School

"The University School was established over forty years ago as a laboratory for preparing teachers. At the time of its establishment most schools in Kentucky were small and most teachers poorly prepared. The enrollment in the College of Education was very small and one section of each class in the University School was considered enough to train students in the College of Education. The school was considered a model, with well-trained teachers, an outstanding program and modern facilities. Educators came from over the Commonwealth to observe it in operation.

"The University School for many years served well as both a teacher education laboratory and model school. A superior educational program was provided for hundreds of students over the years. Services of observation and student teaching were provided for the College of Education. The school served as a research base for the College.

"Great changes have occurred in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the University, and the College of Education. The number of small schools in Kentucky has been drastically reduced through consolidation. The University School no longer resembles closely in size or programs most of the schools in which College of Education graduates will teach. The University needs have rapidly expanded. Space for classrooms and offices has become particularly acute. The University increasingly has had to evaluate all phases of its total operation in terms of their contribution to programs of excellence. The enrollment in the College of Education has increased tremendously and the University School, because of its size, has been unable to provide the services of observation, demonstration, experimentation, and student teaching for an expanded College enrollment. The size of the University School and its limited course offerings more and more have restricted its use in research. Most of the student teachers already are performing their student teaching in schools representing a wide area, some as far as 100 miles from the campus.

"Some changes have been made recently in the University School in response to pressures brought about by these changes. The Kindergarten closed in 1961 and a year later the elementary grades were discontinued.

"In 1962 and 1963, a faculty committee of the College of Education studied the role of the University School and its relations with the College of Education. Alternative recommendations were presented to the College faculty and considerable time was spent in discussing possible courses of action. The general conclusions were as follows:

1. A quality preparation program for teachers requires a laboratory school.

2. A laboratory school of the scope and quality necessary is tremendously expensive for a University to operate.
3. A limited school with limited program and facilities does not achieve the purposes for which it is established.
4. Unless the College of Education can have a quality laboratory school, it should explore a cooperative operation with one of the local public schools.
5. In view of the limited program and facilities of the University School, it might be changed to serve as a special school--for example, a special school for the handicapped.

"The committee's report resulted in the exploration of several new directions for the University School. Expansion to such a size that would enable the school to achieve its purposes with distinction was considered. This was found at the time to be economically impossible. Use of the University School as a research facility was explored and proposals prepared. This was not found to be feasible. Cooperative joint operation with a public school system was discussed for a considerable period of time.

"After all of this study and analysis, it appears now that immediate action to be effective at the end of this school year would be advisable. Maintaining sufficient enrollment for accreditation during an interim period of operation would certainly be a problem. Keeping sufficient staff and securing adequate replacements for staff members would be almost impossible. An interim operation would, additionally, create problems of morale for staff, students and parents. Consequently, termination seems the only plausible conclusion to be reached.

"In summary, the University School has had a long and distinguished history as an integral part of the program in the College of Education. However, the advent of an expanding enrollment in the College and the University along with several other factors has restricted the expansion of the University School's services to the College. Exploration of new roles and functions for the school have proved unproductive. Consequently, it now appears that the present maintenance and operation of this school is an excessively expensive part of the University in terms of its contribution to programs of excellence.

"Moreover, the University generally is facing mounting college enrollments. These enrollments demand additional resources in faculty, physical facilities and services. It is the University's first and primary responsibility to provide these college students with the best possible educational opportunities and programs that the Commonwealth of Kentucky can afford.

"It is recognized that action to close the school will be a matter of concern to some individuals in the Lexington area, especially those who have

had a relationship to the school and those parents who now have children enrolled. Of prime importance, however, is that all matters relative to existing students and staff of this school be handled equitably. The group of students most affected will be those who would be in the senior year next year.

"It is the purpose of this meeting to inform the Executive Committee of the Board and, through them, the Board of Trustees that at the May 12, 1964, meeting of the Board, I intend to recommend to the Board that the University High School be terminated at the end of this school year. Prior to the meeting on May 12, I shall meet with any interested persons concerning the University High School and will also have the opportunity to explore with the parents of next year's seniors the possibilities of some special arrangement that might permit that class to complete their final year under the auspices of University High. "

After reading the report to the group, Dr. Oswald commented that he had suggested that perhaps an interim operation of the school might be possible to allow parents to make plans for their children. The committee had, however, strongly advised against such a procedure and, as a next possibility, Dr. Oswald said that he would be willing to explore with the parents and students the operation of the school for one additional year for the present junior class in order that they might have their senior year there and be graduated from the University High School. He cautioned that it would be necessary to explore accreditation for such a plan with both the State Department of Education and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In addition, he felt that at least 2/3 of the present junior class must be willing to return in order to make such a project feasible. He warned also that the students should be fully conscious that this would not be a normal senior year since there would be an almost complete absence of any extra-curricular activities.

In answer to a question as to where the students would go next year, Dr. Oswald replied that, if the present junior class remained in the University School, there would be only 101 students to be absorbed by other school systems and that these would be over such a widely scattered area that no system or district would suffer by an influx of additional students.

Judge Sutherland questioned whether this was a school in which students from all over the state might enroll or whether it merely served the immediate area. Dr. Oswald replied that, in theory, any student from Kentucky would be eligible for admission but because there was no housing in connection with the school only those living within commuting distance actually attended.

Dr. Angelucci asked for a cost analysis and the following information was given. The operation of the University High School costs approximately \$192,000 a year--\$159,000 direct cost for teachers, \$5,500 for social security taxes, and \$38,000 for operation of the plant. Of this amount only \$15,390 of income is received from tuition fees, leaving \$177,000 paid from state appropriations. The cost per pupil is \$1,040 in comparison with a figure of less than

\$400 per student in public high schools of the state. When the cost of the University High School is figured per college student using the facilities for student teaching it amounts to approximately \$7,000 per student. At present, approximately 25 student teachers are trained at University High, only 6% of the total being trained. The other 94% are trained in nearby public schools.

In reply to questions relative to space needs, Dr. Oswald indicated that the investment in the building was \$800,000. It would cost \$40,000 a year debt service on a similar building at this time. Since there are many substandard buildings on the campus being used for college classes, it is considered unwise to continue to use such a building for the education of high school students, the value of which is now only peripheral to the University's function.

When questioned as to the desirability of continuing the University School for research purposes, Dr. Oswald responded that this had been seriously considered and would not be feasible without the expenditure of additional money to expand the plant and modernize it and double the enrollment. Neither is it feasible to attempt a possible training program for persons from Eastern Kentucky areas, financially or research-wise.

Mr. Hillenmeyer indicated that he had received many phone calls and that most of the questions which had been raised with him had been answered but he would like to know what plans were being made for the present teaching staff. Dr. Oswald replied that this was one of his most serious concerns and that, while they did not have actual tenure, the University had a moral obligation to those who have served the school for many years. He felt that this latter group could be used in the present College of Education program and those who were relative newcomers to the staff would have no difficulty in finding employment in other schools and that every effort would be made to assist them in finding such employment.

The space which would be released with the closing of the school would be studied by the Building and Campus Development Committee and recommendations would be made by this group for the best possible use in view of the entire University--not just the College of Education. The utilization of this space by college classes might mean the difference between quality programs and mediocre programs for certain divisions of the University.

Parents have expressed the wish to discuss the closing of the school prior to any final decisions being made and Dr. Oswald and Dean Ginger have arranged for a meeting on Tuesday evening, May 5, with parents and students so that the entire picture may be presented to them and they may have an opportunity to present their arguments against closing the school.

When the representatives of the parents who were present were asked if they wished to raise any questions, Mr. Harry Miller expressed the feeling that it was difficult to dispute the arguments presented by Dr. Oswald but that it was his feeling that the University School had been an outstanding school

through the years and had trained many of the leaders of the community, calling particular attention to Dr. Angelucci as one of the graduates of the school. He felt that it was a shame to close a "quality" school at a time when secondary education was so important. Dr. Oswald responded that he was not closing the school of ten years ago but the present school which could no longer be considered a "quality" school because of limited enrollment and limited course offerings.

When questioned as to why the school was no longer considered a "quality" school, Dr. Oswald responded that it was an evolutionary process and it was happening in other parts of the country. Dr. Albright indicated that the movement has been away from university connected schools unless the school could perform at least three functions: demonstration, experimentation and research. Studies indicate that smaller proportions of good students come out of small schools than large ones. Dr. Angelucci indicated that he remembered a study made several years ago which showed that the graduates of Henry Clay High School did better in college than the graduates of any of the other local high schools.

C. Meeting Adjourned

Dr. Angelucci thanked the parents for their interest and for attending the meeting. Since no action was necessary on the report presented by President Oswald, who indicated that the meeting was called for the purpose of informing the Board of Trustees and the public that he would recommend the closing of the University High School at the May 12 meeting of the Board, Dr. Angelucci declared the meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Sutherland
Secretary