0632-1

Implications of Recent Reports on Teacher Education Reform for Departments of Foreign Languages and Literatures

Dale L. Lange

DEPARTMENTS of foreign languages and literatures are key players in the development of teachers, but they do not necessarily recognize this themselves. The intent of this article is to examine the implications of three major reports on teaching that have appeared in recent years. The reports of the Holmes Group (*Tomorrow's Schools, 1990*; *Tomorrow's Teachers*, 1986), the Carnegie Forum (*A Nation Prepared*, 1986), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (*Toward High and Rigorous Standards*, 1990) all carry important implications for the development of teachers for public education, including foreign languages. The goals and propositions of each of these reports are summarized in the Appendix to this article. The Holmes Group document originates in the concerns for school and educational reform of the education deans of major research universities. The Carnegie Forum report was funded by the Carnegie Foundation for the purpose of responding to *A Nation at Risk* (1983). The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is a direct outgrowth of the recommendations contained in *A Nation Prepared* (1986).

The chairs and faculty members of departments of foreign languages and literatures (hereafter, DFLLs) need to recognize that significant changes in teacher development are occurring and that these changes will affect them. Further, chairs and faculty members must recognize their responsibility for the preparation of teachers. In examining the reports of the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, I perceive three themes of central importance to DFLLs as they fulfill their responsibilities: (1) improved subject matter preparation; (2) the setting of standards; (3) minority recruitment. In the following pages, I outline what seem to me the implications that must be drawn from these themes, implications that are as important as the "educational" component of any teacher development program.

At the conclusion of my discussion of the implications of these reports, I will describe the response of one institution—the University of Minnesota—to the issues the reports have raised.[1]

Theme I: Improved Subject Matter Preparation

Implication One: Departments of foreign languages and literatures recognize the importance of developing the language competence of those who teach in the public schools. Because the traditional emphasis in such departments is the reading of literature, with much less stress on the productive aspects of language, a conflict has developed between that tradition and public education, particularly in the area of competence for licensure. Some teacher development programs in universities, requirements of state departments of education, and recommendations of national organizations are directly requiring or stating competence levels in language beyond reading—in listening, speaking, and writing. In one major state, Texas, the levels of oral language competence were set lower than levels recommended by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Guidelines for Teacher Education (*Program Guidelines for Foreign Language Teacher Education*) because neither inservice nor preservice candidates could meet that initial standard. The ACTFL standard for initial licensure is the Advanced level of language proficiency, while that of Texas was set

The author is Professor of Second Languages and Cultures Education and Associate Dean in the College of Education at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

at Intermediate-High (see Byrnes et al. for the generic definitions of these proficiency levels).

Actions that foreign language departments can take include the following: (1) becoming aware of these standards; (2) using them as a broad curricular framework; (3) making the primary focus of the major the continued development of language in all courses; (4) hiring teachers who know and understand the literature and research in, and who have experience in, classroom second language learning and acquisition. An example of each of these procedures follows:

1. Department chairs can take leadership by bringing the content and competence portion of the *Program Guidelines for Foreign Language Teacher Education* to the attention of departmental faculty members for discussion. The content and the competencies include language, linguistics, and culture.

2. The use of these guidelines can stimulate review of the departmental curriculum to ascertain the viability of the undergraduate curriculum in meeting the needs of all students, but especially those who intend to teach. Attention to development in the four areas mentioned is necessary for those who plan to teach in public schools, as well as for those who intend to pursue degrees and eventually teach in higher education.

3. Courses in literature and culture *should* build on established language competence. For example, all advanced courses in language, literature, and culture should be taught in the target language so that growth in comprehension can be maintained. Discussions in such courses will also enhance speaking capacity, while reading and writing competence will increase as these modalities are used to process content. Continued language development for students requires the cooperation of faculty members in recognizing the importance of their focus on language development across the curriculum. Discussions of student progress, examples of student writing, suitability of readings, samples of recordings of individual students or of class discussions can stimulate faculty members to underscore their concern for such development.

4. Faculties of any DFLL need an individual whose specialty is language learning and acquisition; that person is probably the coordinator of the first two years of language instruction. However, such expertise cannot be limited to one faculty member. In order to stress that language is central to literature and culture study, departmental policy should be established that requires faculty members other than the coordinator to demonstrate their ability and willingness to work with language development as part of their normal duties in all courses.

Implication Two: DFLLs must recognize that their language majors reflect the requisites of those who teach in the public elementary and secondary schools. To be quite honest, language learning in elementary and secondary schools focuses on language and culture; it barely touches on any systematic study of literature. Instruction at this level is intended to develop student ability to use and comprehend language, as well as to foster an awareness of the cultures associated with the language. As a result, chairs and faculties of DFLLs may wish to reconsider the program for the traditional language major. For those who plan to teach in public schools, departments may direct the major toward competence in listening, reading, writing, and speaking in a variety of cultural topics and individual interests. In this way, the major will generate a broad cultural awareness across the curriculum and *not* concentrate solely on literary study. The study of language itself will expand beyond the mere examination of language qua language to include study and inquiry about its social, psychological, political, personal, and everyday applications as well. Thus language can be used as a means of individual and personal expression through all aspects of the major.

In a vital sense, the traditional language major is incomplete by definition. Such majors tend to focus narrowly on language and literature. While language development is crucial to understanding any topic, the emphasis on literature restricts students to the study of literary history, theory, and analysis. The development of quality second language teachers requires the extension of the major into other aspects of culture where language serves to access the social sciences (e.g., history, sociology, political science, economics, education, anthropology), the arts (e.g., music, art, architecture), the sciences (biology, physics, chemistry), and mathematics (algebra, geometry, calculus). DFLLs, by reconsidering the language major for teachers, would acknowledge the importance of language in all aspects of human life. The examples that follow delineate ways in which an expansion of the major can take place.

1. A couple of minor, but very useful, ideas lead in this direction. One idea is the inclusion of a course on children's and adolescent literature of the target-language culture(s) in the departmental curriculum. Such a course is particularly helpful to teachers as they work with students because it brings teachers into contact with important elements, of both the culture(s) and the literature(s) of the language, that are more directly linked to the needs and interests of children and adolescents in elementary and secondary schools.

Another relatively simple idea would be to incorporate a course on the popular media within the associated culture(s): newspapers, journals, magazines, television, and radio. Such a course would treat matters of national or international significance from the perspective of those cultures in comparison with the mother culture. It would allow students to discuss and write about matters of interest to them, encouraging them to create and transmit thoughts, ideas, opinions, and personal feelings. A course

of this kind would help establish a broader than literary background.

2. A much larger project would include intensive summer programs for majors. Such experiences could expand students' appreciation of the target culture by using language to study the arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities. These areas have been pursued in English by students as part of their general educational background; it makes sense to build on such knowledge by using the target language for instruction and cultural activities. A series of summers could be devoted to this idea. One summer would include an investigation of artistic and humanistic responses to the dilemmas of existence, as expressed in the relationship of art, architecture, literature, theology, and philosophy, in an intensive three-week course. Faculty members in departments other than those of the DFLL who know and can use the language could contribute to such inquiry. In the second summer, majors could expand their background in the social sciences. Integrated studies in anthropology, economics, linguistics, political science, psychology, and sociology might focus on contemporary aspects of the culture(s). And, in the third summer, majors would undertake an interdisciplinary study of scientific problems within the culture(s), by examining the role of biology, chemistry, ecology, mathematics, and physics in society. Any of these experiences would build the broad cultural background that majors will eventually need as teachers in order to help students wrestle with cultural understanding. At the same time, these experiences would increase their language capacity.

3. A final recommendation would be the development of courses within the different disciplines mentioned above, in which the target language served as the vehicle for instruction. Such courses would provide the means by which foreign languages could be used within the liberal arts and sciences curriculum at the college and university level. As with the intensive summer programs and other recommended courses, the background of students majoring in the language can be expanded to meet language proficiency requirements for teaching. Clearly, all these recommendations are intended to strengthen the major.

Implication Three: DFLLs must take leadership to find experiences for the development of cultural awareness for students who intend to teach in public education. As already indicated, the importance of language competence for teachers in public education cannot be overestimated. But such competence by itself is insufficient. Teachers need broader knowledge and actual cultural experience in order to make the language and the culture come alive together. There is no question about the confidence that teachers demonstrate in representing both the language and the culture as a result of such background and experiences. Because initial teacher licensing guidelines (*Program Guidelines for Foreign Language Teacher Education*) and voluntary advance teacher certification (*Toward High and Rigorous Standards*) will require high levels of language proficiency and cultural awareness, DFLLs must consider a requirement for experience in a target-language culture for those who intend to teach, be it work or study while living abroad. It is not suggested here that all universities create new programs. That makes no sense; but the requirement of living, working, or studying in another culture does. Colleges and universities that prepare teachers should discuss the establishment of consortia for this purpose. At the moment, DFLLs can help students fulfill such a requirement by directing them to academic-year or summer programs with established reputations. However this matter is handled, DFLLs should give it priority in meeting their responsibility for the preparation of second language teachers.

Chairs and faculties of DFLLs can meet the expectation of cultural experience *in situ* through a few simple means, although the ultimate establishment of programs is by no means simple. Further, costs for such programs must be held to a minimum. The following arrangements should certainly be considered:

1. A consortium of DFLLs could be created within a conference such as the Big Ten, Pac Ten, or Southwest Conference to examine how programs of study or work abroad could be made available to students. In some cases, chairs from different universities may already meet on an organizational basis. Consideration of such programs would allow colleges and universities to recognize the importance of working together as a means of conserving resources.

2. Arrangements might be made with existing programs (Middlebury College, Vermont; Millerville University, Pennsylvania; University of Minnesota, Global Campus, Minneapolis; University of Mississippi, for example) to accept students from a consortium of colleges and universities. In this strategy, established programs could be used to fill the need.

3. The professional language teachers' associations (AATF, AATG, AATSP, ACTFL, and ADFL) should consider the development of evaluative criteria for the establishment of new international programs or the examination of established programs for both pre- and inservice teachers. These criteria may be applied not only to programs established by United States colleges and universities but to those in France, Germany, Mexico, Japan, and the People's Republic of China.

Implication Four: DFLLs and departments and colleges of education must recognize their joint role in the development and certification of foreign language teachers for public education. Both entities play a role in recommending candidates for licensure. DFLLs certify competence in language, culture, literature, and linguistics through the major. The education college or department assures compliance with state certification guidelines and certifies the initial

teaching competence of its licensure candidates. In most instances, the two bodies rarely communicate, and when they do, the communication could best be described as benign animosity. This situation might change if some relatively easy steps were jointly taken.

1. Both departments could be involved in the selection of candidates for the foreign language teacher development program. Such an approach would allow the two entities to cooperate on a most important task, that of examining the entrance qualifications of those who intend to teach.

2. Faculty members involved in languages and those in pedagogy might decide who should be recommended for licensure. This project would give both groups confidence in the quality of those who are actually licensed to teach language.

3. More difficult kinds of cooperation include joint observation of student teachers in schools or joint discussions on the nature and direction of the major and its relationship to teacher development.

4. While the several reports suggest connections from education to the liberal arts, it is actually an association that is required. Both groups might participate in a cooperative arrangement to recognize each other's worth. The kind of cooperation mentioned can be fostered through the professional development school concept set forth by the Holmes Group and by others (Goodlad; Levine), although it may be labeled differently (school-university partnerships; professional practice schools). The professional development school is a public school where college and university and school faculty members—in this case those in foreign languages—work cooperatively on the development of both pre- and inservice teacher training. These same professionals jointly explore the many issues of teaching and learning that arise in the school. It is in such a framework that public school teachers and education and language faculty members will come to understand, value, and appreciate the contribution each makes to the preparation of teachers and to the examination of educational problems.

Theme II: Setting Standards

Implication Five: DFLLs must participate in the setting of professional entrance standards for those who will teach foreign languages in public education. The reports of the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards feel that higher standards for entrance and continuance in teaching must be determined. The Holmes Group would initiate a new set of standardized tests for general literacy, academic subjects, pedagogy, and foundations of education, the main components of teacher development programs. The Carnegie Task Force would establish a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to serve as a national licensing agency, overseeing essentially the same areas of competency. That board has been created and is in the process of constructing a system for teacher evaluation, including knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

The input of the higher education faculties who deal with pedagogy and content, in this case education, language, literature, and linguistics, appears to have diminished value. Instead, outside control seems to prevail. Questions arise immediately: Is this diminution of control appropriate? Who should have the power? What is to be tested for language competence? communication, cultural awareness, linguistic knowledge? How will it be tested? by procedures other than fill-in-the-blank, multiple-choice, and true-false exams? Who determines the competence? Who creates and manages the tests? Who will set the standards? How will the tests be used? Responses to these questions are neither simple nor simplistic. Nor should they be weak because testing programs of any sort drive curricula and programs, thereby taking control of the curricula away from individual institutions. These important issues require careful observation and advice from those who have competence in the evaluation of content and pedagogy in foreign languages. Those observations and contributions can be handled in some of the following ways:

1. DFLL chairs should be aware of the activities of both the Holmes Group (501 Erickson Hall, Michigan State Univ., East Lansing, MI 48824-1034) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (300 Riverplace, Suite 3600, Detroit, MI 48207).

2. DFLL chairs and faculty members may wish to ask professional organizations (AATF, AATG, AATSP, ACTFL, and ADFL, among others) to monitor and inform them about matters relating to the assessment of competence in content and pedagogy. For example, it is expected that the evaluation system of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will be multifaceted, of a portfolio nature. It will be designed to evaluate general pedagogical content and specific pedagogical competence. And, not to be outmaneuvered, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) is revising the National Teachers Examination. This set of tests for foreign languages is based on assumptions about language and about testing that underlay the MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students in the 1960s. If those tests are completely revised according to the same assumptions, whatever is produced will certainly be inadequate. The significant impact on DFLLs in the creation or revision of any evaluation system is the system itself, because it will become the standard toward which all programs will strive. Therefore, the importance of the professional associations as actors on behalf of

DFLLs in the discussion, standard setting, management, and recommended use of such evaluation systems cannot be overstated.

Theme III: Minority Recruitment

Implication Six: DFLLs must take part in the recruitment of persons of color for preparation as teachers of language. In order that persons of color be fairly and appropriately represented as teachers and administrators in the public schools, DFLLs need to take bold and immediate action in cooperation with the education department or college. If we wish to improve education in this country, we must provide appropriate role models for all students, including students of color. Those role models must come from within the populations of persons of color: African American, Asian, Hispanic, and Native American. A cooperative plan among departments of education, DFLLs, and the community, which needs to begin *immediately*, could be composed of the following elements:

1. Develop a clear commitment to recruit and maintain students of color in programs preparing language teachers.
2. Locate such students in the secondary schools who may be interested in teaching language.
3. Work with local businesses and foundations to find incentives by which students could continue their education through scholarships, fellowships, work opportunities, and grants.
4. Create a monitoring and counseling system to observe and support students' progress both while in school and in the college or university setting. Majors in languages might be willing to volunteer time to help in this endeavor.
5. Nurture these students jointly within the department of the major and in the department of education.
6. Incorporate staff development activities on the inclusion of persons of color in the department within regularly held departmental meetings.
7. Place students of color in integrated schools for their clinical experiences program.
8. Publicize the licensure of these individuals in minority communities and to school principals.
9. Work out arrangements with schools for the placement of certified persons of color.
10. Arrange placement of students within other two- and four-year colleges and universities.

It should be clear that the suggestions of the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards bring us to the professionalization of teaching. An example will demonstrate the approach used by one teacher development program. I describe below the key elements of this relatively new program for the preparation of teachers of a second language (ESL, French, German, Spanish, Hebrew, Latin, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese) at the University of Minnesota. The reader who wishes further details should see Lange's article "Blueprint."

The University of Minnesota currently offers a post-baccalaureate teacher education program that leads to the master-of-education degree. This program contains the following elements:

Admission: Applicants are carefully chosen from those who have a bachelor-of-arts degree and a minimum GPA of 2.8, have obtained acceptable scores on the Miller Analogies Test and a test of verbal reasoning, and have achieved an established level of language proficiency (advanced on the ACTFL proficiency scale). Those with cultural experience are given preference. Approximately thirty-three percent of applicants have been rejected in the four years this program has been running.

The Program: Applicants participate in a fifteen-month, graduate-level intensive program with basic course work in the summer before the academic year. The courses include all state mandates (human relations, physical education, exceptional children), philosophical and social foundations of education, learning theory, adolescent psychology, measurement, and an introductory research course that includes some work in statistics. The academic year is devoted to coursework on the learning, acquisition, and teaching of languages. It includes clinical experiences (introduction to a school district, its culture and its curriculum in areas other than second languages, initial teaching experiences of tutoring and microteaching, and two academic quarters for student teaching) in a school especially chosen for this purpose. Any remaining coursework is completed in the program's second summer.

Prelicensure Projects: Two projects are required during the experience in schools. The first is a curriculum project, in which students bring together objectives, plans, materials, instruction, and evaluation related to their interests but for which there is no established textbook. The second is a research project that is negotiated with the cooperating teacher on a classroom matter. Whether their work is quantitative or qualitative, students must follow a process by stating the nature of their problem, reviewing pertinent theoretical literature, designing a study for the collection of data, analyzing the data, and discussing results.

Program Examination: All students are required to take a three-hour, written, comprehensive examination on the relationship of theory to classroom practice. The recommendation for licensure is not made until this requirement is completed.

Master-of-Education Degree: The degree is awarded only after a year of teaching experience in which candidates videotape and analyze their progress in three class sessions, one each for fall, winter, and spring. A detailed set

of criteria has been established for this analysis. This is the capstone project for the degree; it can only be completed after a year of teaching. It serves as one means of teacher induction into the teaching profession.

This example demonstrates the dedication and leadership of one university in the professionalization of the public school teacher. In achieving its goals, the program responds to many of the concerns raised by the Holmes, Carnegie, and National Board for Professional Teaching Standards reports. In that light, it serves as a model to be examined by other institutions of higher education as they pursue the renewal of teacher development programs. The most difficult aspect is the recruitment and retention of students of color. This persistent problem is faced by all colleges and universities who are preparing teachers. Currently, there is one person of color in the Minnesota program. In other years there have been at least two.

As teacher education in the United States changes, assumptions about teaching are also changing. The responsibility of developing teachers has never been solely that of a department of education. It has been a tripartite one involving the schools, the department or college of education, and departments that offer field content, in this case DFLLs. The three themes and the six implications from the Holmes Group, Carnegie Forum, and National Board for Professional Teaching Standards for DFLLs have demonstrated the importance of their contribution to teacher development. I hope that this article will stimulate further discussion, action, and collaboration. The most important outcome of such activities would be the mutual respect for one another's work and the contribution to the development of teachers.

Notes

[1]This article is based on a presentation given at the ADFL Seminar East, University of Georgia, Athens; "The Curriculum Crisis for Language Learning and Teacher Education: Where Do We Go From Here?" June 2, 1989.

Appendix

Summaries of Holmes Group, Carnegie Forum, and National Board for Professional Teaching Standards reports

Holmes Group

Tomorrow's Teachers (1986): The group's first publication concentrates on teachers, teacher development, and the context of teaching. The major goals are stated as follows:

1. To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid.
2. To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work.
3. To create standards of entry to the profession—examinations and education requirements—that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible.
4. To connect our own institutions to schools.
5. To make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn. (4)

Tomorrow's Schools (1990): The group's second publication examines how professional development schools bring together teachers, teacher development, and university faculty members from both a pedagogical and a content perspective to work collaboratively on pre- and inservice teacher development and inquiry on teaching and learning, broadly conceived. That collaboration is achieved by:

1. Promoting much more ambitious conceptions of teaching and learning on the part of prospective teachers in universities and students in schools.
2. Adding to and reorganizing the collections of knowledge we have about teaching and learning.
3. Linking experienced teachers' efforts to renew their knowledge and advance their status with efforts to improve their schools and to prepare new teachers.
4. Creating incentives for faculties in the public schools and faculties in education schools to work mutually.
5. Strengthening the relationship between schools and the broader political social and economic communities in which they reside. (1–2)

Carnegie Forum

The Carnegie report sees all its recommendations as constituting a whole in which the parts work cooperatively. These recommendations are similar in some ways to the Holmes Group's goals. They are as follows:

1. Create a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, organized with a regional and state membership structure, to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet the standards.
2. Restructure schools to provide a professional environment for teachers, freeing them to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress.
3. Restructure the teaching force, and introduce a new category of Lead Teachers with the proven ability to provide active leadership in the redesign of the schools and in helping their colleagues to uphold high standards of learning and teaching.
4. Require a bachelor's degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching.
5. Develop a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education leading to a Master in Teaching degree, based on systematic knowledge of teaching.
6. Mobilize the nation's resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers.
7. Relate incentives for teachers to school-wide student performance, and provide schools with the technology, services and staff essential to teacher productivity.
8. Make teachers' salaries and career opportunities competitive with those in other professions. (*Nation Prepared* 55–56)

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

The National Board continues the work of the Carnegie Forum through the development of statements or propositions about what teachers know and can do. It is on such propositions that a system of teacher evaluation will be constructed. The National Board is thus directly responding to the first goal of the Carnegie Forum report. The propositions and explanations are summarized below:

1. *Teachers are committed to students and their learning*. Teachers recognize individual differences in their students and adjust their practice accordingly. Teachers have an understanding of how students develop and learn. Teachers treat students equitably. Teachers' mission extends beyond developing the cognitive capacity of their students.
2. *Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students*. Teachers appreciate how knowledge in their subjects is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines. Teachers command specialized knowledge of how to convey a subject to students. Teachers generate multiple paths to knowledge.
3. *Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning*. Teachers call on multiple methods to meet their goals. Teachers orchestrate learning in group settings. Teachers place a premium on student engagement. Teachers regularly assess student progress. Teachers are mindful of their principal objectives.
4. *Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience*. Teachers are continually making difficult choices that test their judgment. Teachers seek the advice of others and draw on education research and scholarship to improve their practice.
5. *Teachers are members of learning communities*. Teachers contribute to school effectiveness by collaborating with other professionals. Teachers work collaboratively with parents. Teachers take advantage of community resources.

(*Toward High and Rigorous Standards* 13–30)

Throughout this document, the National Board indicates its concern for the recruitment, development, and retention of persons of color as professional teachers.

Works Cited

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. *Program Guidelines for Foreign Language Teacher Education*. Draft. Hastings-on-Hudson: ACTFL, 1987.

Byrnes, Heidi, et al. "ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 1986." *Defining and Developing Proficiency: Guidelines, Implementations, and Concepts*. Ed. Heidi Byrnes and Michael Canale. ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood: Nat. Textbook, 1987. 15–24.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Carnegie Educ. Foundation, 1986.

Goodlad, John I. *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Lange, Dale L. "A Blueprint for a Teacher Development Program." *Second Language Teacher Education*. Ed. Jack Richards and David Nunan. New York: Cambridge UP, 1990. 245–68.

Levine, Marsha, ed. *Professional Practice Schools: Building a Model*. Vols. 1–2. Washington: Amer. Federation of Teachers, Educ. Issues Dept., 1990.

A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education, by the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Washington: GPO, 1983.

Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools. East Lansing: Holmes, 1990.

Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing: Holmes, 1986.

Toward High and Rigourous Standards for the Teaching Profession: Initial Policies and Perspectives of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. 2nd ed. Detroit: Natl. Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1990.