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This study critically examined the former Holmes Group and its decade of reform (1985-1996), with the reorganized Holmes Partnership (1997). The mission of the Holmes Partnership's 70 research universities is to reform teacher education. The Holmes Group is credited for the creation of the teacher education reform agenda. The Holmes Partnership is charged with implementing the agenda, via partnerships with P-12 schools. The study's objective is to critically examine the Holmes Partnership's goals, to reinforce and critique some of these, and to suggest new directives. As an experienced educator, and student of teacher education, this investigator is in the unique position to make recommendations, having served as the assistant to the president of the new Holmes Partnership. This study is further grounded on a comprehensive review of several literatures, including:

1. Historical analysis of the Holmes Group, contrasted with the Holmes Partnership

2. Analysis of the context of institutes of higher education
3. Implications for colleges of education

4. Analysis of P-12 reform (teacher education should intersect with the mission of P-12)

5. Review of contemporary reports, highlighting trends and issues in teacher education

The study begins with an historical review of the former Holmes Group and its decade-long reform movement. This historical review provides a needed backdrop and context for the newer Holmes Partnership.

Principal finding of the study were the need to extend teacher education programs beyond the traditional four years, due to the expanding knowledge on teaching and learning, the need for greater subject competency, and the increasing complexity of teaching. Current programs are known to be incoherent, and may not match the realities of P-12 schools. Certification of teachers should be delayed until successful completion of an one-year internship in their first teaching position. Teachers should be trained to collaborate with peers, social service agencies, trained to be reflective in their practice, to become their own experts as they learn data collection skills, analysis, and problem-solving. Colleges need to be transformed into self-correcting learning organizations by systematic evaluation and stakeholder empowerment.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study, "Analysis of the Transformation of the Holmes Group to the Holmes Partnership" is to critically examine and contrast the Holmes Group and its approximately decade-long reform movement (1985-1996), as it has been reformulated into the recently reorganized Holmes Partnership (1997). The focus of the Holmes Partnership's current 70 U.S. member research universities, including historically black colleges, is to reform teacher education. Whereas the Holmes Group is credited for the creation of the teacher education reform agenda, the Holmes Partnership has charged itself with the task of implementing the agenda, or doing the work, via special partnerships formed between the Holmes Partnership's members and P-12 schools. This analysis is done in the light of a number of related educational conditions, contexts, and events during this period.

Specifically, the objective of this study is to critically examine the Holmes Partnership's goals and
strategies, to reinforce some of these, to critique others, and to suggest yet additional new directives. As an experienced educator, and a student of teacher education, this investigator is in the unique position to conduct this study, and to make recommendations, having served as the assistant to the president of the new Holmes Partnership. As the assistant, I was also both a participant and an observer in the Holmes Group in its final year. Finally, I was as well a participant and observer in the process that transformed the Holmes Group into the new Holmes Partnership, and continued in that capacity as the assistant to the president into the Holmes Partnership's first year.

Study Design and Method

Along with my personal association and experiences with the Holmes Group, the Holmes Partnership, and its key national leaders, this study was further grounded on a comprehensive review of several literatures, including:

1. A historical analysis of The Holmes Group, especially contrasted with the new Holmes Partnership;

2. A critical analysis of the condition of institutes of higher education, with an examination of implications for colleges of education generally;
3. A critical analysis of P-12 school reform because teacher education reform intersects with the reforms in P-12 schools;


Although evidence of the Holmes Group's accomplishments as a whole is sparse due to poor documentation during its first decade of existence, this investigator has nevertheless attempted to capture what data and information was available from historical documents and examine and evaluate those. To accomplish the review of the Holmes Group, and to shed light on their goals, I drew from multiple sources and perspectives, which included the three Holmes Group's reports, known as the Holmes Group trilogy: *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990), and *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995).

I also thoroughly examined an internal, non-published document provided to me by the Holmes Partnership office, called *The Holmes Group: A Sampling of Member Initiatives and Accomplishments* (1994), and the research monograph *The Rise and Stall of Teacher Education Reform: The Holmes Group 1985-1995*, authored by Michael Fullan, Gary Gulluzo, Patricia Morris, and Nancy Watson (1996) which served as a culminating evaluation of the Holmes Group. These two important documents helped me evaluate to a limited degree
what progress had been made over time toward the original
goals of the Holmes Group. In an attempt to triangulate
general perspectives about teacher education reforms to some
degree, I also compared the findings of the Fullan et al.
(1996) study, and the non-published Sampling of Member
Initiatives Holmes Group document listing self-reported
accomplishments with data gathered from another sampling of
teacher education programs, the landmark longitudinal study
(approximately 1987-1995) Research About Teacher Education
(RATE), sponsored by the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education.

This extensive review and critical analysis of multiple
documents was especially important since the Holmes Group
lacked a deliberate and purposeful evaluation process that
would measure the progress members were making in
implementing the Holmes Group reforms. My ability to
evaluate the organizations and hence make judgements were
also based on the tedious process of gathering bits and
pieces from additional documents, including the membership
applications and supporting materials submitted to the new
Holmes Partnership by its members as a part of the
application process for membership. Questions of
clarification during my research, and calls for additional
materials and information were quickly and professionally
answered by the Holmes Partnership staff. Due to my
association to the Holmes Group, and to ensure multiple perspectives, both pro and con, I also made sure to examine and include helpful insights from several not so friendly critiques of the Holmes Group by various scholars, many of which were outside observers of the Holmes Group.

The first objective was to conduct a historical analysis of the Holmes Group. The history of the organization provided important context and meaning for this study. The nature of an organization, such as the Holmes Group, emerges from the interaction between key leaders, the social environment, and from the activities or proposed goals and objectives (Patton, 1990). Therefore, historical analysis is a method of discovering from records what happened in the past, or in the case of the Holmes Group, what didn't happen as well. My intent was to provide context, and critical analysis. Specifically, I interpreted their agenda, goals, and objectives, and then proceeded to compare them with the outcomes of their reform efforts. This led me to my findings, and later, my recommendations. Historical analysis is a qualitative method that was useful since it established a background, and to some degree, a baseline for future investigators to compare with future findings (Marshall & Rossman, 1995).

Naturally, historical analysis cannot always use direct observation. Interviewing primary sources, such as key
people, another research method, was not utilized since many of the original architects of the Holmes Group were no longer in their positions. Therefore, a more extensive review of various secondary sources in the form of documents and publications was conducted.

For Chapter 2, "History of the Holmes Group's Goals and Accomplishments," the Holmes Group trilogy, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990), and *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995), served as the primary sources that documented the concepts indigenous to the organization, as well as the supporting rationale for its reforms, goals, and objectives. In addition to these documents, more was needed that provided a scholarly critique of the reforms.

The following criteria were used to select journal articles:

1. The time frame of journal articles for historical review had to coincide closely with the existence of the Holmes Group, 1985 to 1996.
2. The articles were as representative as possible, allowing for multiple perspectives from college faculty and P-12 school leaders. College faculty, however, were over-represented due to their presence in higher education journals.
3. The remaining articles focused primarily on a critical analysis of the Holmes Group trilogy, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), *Tomorrow's Schools*, and
Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995). Articles that contained criticism especially of the Holmes Group were selected to avoid advocacy and ensure balance in terms of strengths and weaknesses.

4. Multiple sources were selected that provided a review over time of the progress of the Holmes Group and teacher education programs in general. The latter allowed for a cross-analysis of the progress of the Holmes Group members and teacher education programs in general.

The initial computer search yielded well over a hundred articles that referenced the Holmes Group. Further scrutiny and searches reduced the list to approximately 25 articles written solely about the Holmes Group, out of which approximately 14 met the earlier stated criteria and were selected (See Appendix A). A significant part of this study in Chapter 2 analyzed the progress, and lack of progress the Holmes Group made toward implementing their reforms. Therefore, a portion of the selected articles were cited for the evidence of goal accomplishment they provided on the Holmes Group and teacher education programs in general, such as Research About Teacher Education (RATE), the Fullan et al study (1996), and internal documents of the Holmes Group (See Appendix B).
This allowed me to make judgements on the extent the reforms had been implemented in teacher education programs in general (See Appendix C), based on the Fullan et al. (1996) study, RATE, and the Holmes internal document, "The Holmes Group: A Sampling of Member Initiatives & Accomplishments (1994). This internal document provided no conclusions on the extent of reform implementation. Therefore, by inductive analysis, I reviewed each of the members' reports that were submitted (60 out of a possible 94 members), and identified implemented reforms in the form of categories that emerged from the data, then calculated the overall frequency of their occurrence, and reported these data in Chapter 2.

The Holmes Partnership exists in the much larger context of higher education. It was critical to this study to assist in the identification of key trends and issues affecting higher education and teacher education programs in general. My original computer search was for the topic "future universities," which yielded close to 100 articles solely about that topic, out of which approximately 22 were reviewed for this study. The following criteria was used in the selection of these 22 articles:

1. Articles were recent, published no later than the 1990's. An exception was made for the Research About
Teacher Education (RATE), a longitudinal study from approximately 1987 to 1995.

2. Articles were representative of private and public colleges and universities, four year, and graduate level, American and European, representing multiple perspectives to enhance validity.

3. Articles that pertained to colleges of education and teacher education programs included trends in P-12 schools, since P-12 schools and teacher education programs intersect.

4. Articles that pertained to trends in teacher education that included perspectives outside the traditional domain of teacher education programs and P-12 schools (See Appendix D).

Once again, by inductive analysis, approximately 16 themes emerged from these sources after tedious analysis and categorizing. These included changing tenure and promotion policies that encourage quality teaching and community-based research, changes in undergraduate programs, changes in demographics, decentralization, distance learning, reengineering organizations, empowerment, establishing learning organizations, and total quality management. The context of higher education was included in this study due to its impact on teacher education programs in general.

In my inductive analysis of the eight RATE studies conducted from 1987-1995, approximately 30 attributes or
issues emerged from these comprehensive longitudinal studies. Examples were program content, the length of teacher education programs, lab facilities, early field experiences, professors' use of time, student teaching, raising entrance and exit standards, faculty experience, diversity, demographics of teachers, enrollment, certification, scholastic background of teaching candidates, PDS and partnerships. Reviewing RATE provided a valuable profile of teacher education programs in general, while also documenting the trends and issues over time in higher education, specifically, in teacher education programs.

The purpose of this study is to provide critical analysis of the Holmes Group over time as it was transformed into the newer Holmes Partnership. Since the Holmes Partnership and the members it represents does not exist in a vacuum, a critical analysis is provided which sheds light on the condition of institutes of higher education, and the implications of this for colleges of education generally. Next, since P-12 school reform intersects with reforms in teacher education, a critical analysis of specific P-12 school reforms are examined, and implications for teacher education programs are also discussed generally.
Positionality

The concept of positionality has emerged in part from recent feminist scholarship (Banks, 1993). Prior to the feminist movement, Mydral (1944) claimed that valuations permeate research and that there was no method to eliminate bias in social sciences and suggested that human interests and normative assumptions should be identified and examined. Positionality refers to certain qualities that we bring to our work, i.e., our gender, race, and age to name just a few (Tetreault, 1993). This investigator acknowledges that science is not value-free. Code (1991) commented that "knowledge is neither value-free nor value-neutral; the processes that produce it are themselves value-laden; and these values are open to evaluation" (p.70). She added that we need to ask such questions as "Out of whose subjectivity has this ideal [of objectivity] grown? Whose standpoint, whose values does it represent?" (p.70).

Therefore, this author believes it is important at the outset to reveal his positionality. For the past two years, I served as the graduate administrative assistant to Nancy L. Zimpher, Executive Dean of the College of Education, at The Ohio State University. Dr. Zimpher also serves as the current president of the Holmes Partnership. Part of my daily responsibilities while working as an assistant to the
dean included the facilitation of certain activities of the Holmes Group and the newer Holmes Partnership.

I am a Protestant male of German/British descent, 42 years of age, a product of a middle-class family, dominated by educators. I have lived in a small southern Ohio town of Washington Court House all of my life, interacting with mostly people with cultural and race backgrounds similar to my own. My parents are from West Virginia, the first generation to receive college degrees. Politically, I would be considered middle of the road—neither conservative nor liberal. I have over ten years of teaching experience in the fifth and sixth grades, and two years experience as a community education administrator. I also have ten years of business experience, the majority of those years spent as the executive vice president of a small machine tool manufacturer, with the remainder spent as a corporate training and development consultant.

I have traveled extensively in North America, Europe, and the Middle East. I have friends from various cultural and racial backgrounds, influenced greatly as a child by the openness of my parents toward cultures different than our own, and due to our family involvement in the American Field Service, an international student exchange program. To this day, I am convinced that my exposure to multiple cultures
has given me helpful insights in dealing with the diverse perspectives, needs, and interests of organizations.

**Rationale for the Study**

At age six, facing my very first grade assignment, my parents realized how my school performance and attitude could be negatively impacted if I were to be placed with a teacher that was not competent and caring. Fortunately, I was not. Parents and students have long known the importance of quality teaching, and the positive effect that it has on student learning. In this regard, this study is based on the following assumptions: the quality of student learning is related to the quality of teaching; the quality of teaching in many respects is related to the quality of teacher education. The quality of teacher education is related in many regards to the quality and effectiveness of the partnership between P-12 schools and teacher education institutes. The rationale for this study derives from these major assumptions.

Most of us remember, according to the report *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*, published by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF, 1996), "at least one outstanding teacher who made a difference in their lives" (p.2). The notion that most individuals can only remember one or a few outstanding
teachers over a twelve-year span of their public education is disturbing, and cannot be considered a ringing endorsement of P-12 public school teachers and the professors who prepared them to teach.

Veteran teachers also serve as powerful role models for those who would aspire to teach. This apparent lack of outstanding teacher role models is just one of several factors that has contributed to a self-perpetuating cycle of mediocrity in our schools that led the authors of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) and many others before and since then to call for reform in education.

I believe that this study is significant for several reasons. First, the opinion of this investigator, and The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) (1996), is that the most important element in education reform is a caring and competent teacher for all children. Whether or not our nation's children will experience more than just a few outstanding teachers is largely dependent upon the success or failure of reforming teacher education, and upon such major reform organizations as the Holmes Partnership. Its predecessor, the Holmes Group, in its ten-year run, was successful in creating the reform agenda, but was not successful in implementing it, at least according to
the 1996 study conducted by Fullan et al. and the various documents I have reviewed.

The transformed Holmes Partnership is currently positioned as the major player in the reform of teacher education. Overall, it is in the best position to ensure the nation an adequate supply of outstanding teachers. The approximately 70 members now belonging to the Holmes Partnership represent some of the nation's largest and most prestigious teacher education programs, located in many of this nation's premier research institutes of higher learning. Since these institutes are in partnerships with major P-12 school districts, the Holmes Partnership has the potential of simultaneously affecting needed change in both systems.

Due to its potential impact on the nation's teacher education programs and children, this investigator believed that current goals and strategies for achieving them and how these evolved should be carefully scrutinized. It should be underscored as well that until now, there has never been a historical review and critical analysis conducted on the history of the transformation of the Holmes Group into the Holmes Partnership.

The stakes are high at this time in regard to our nation's schools, and all Americans are equal stakeholders in the process of reforming teacher education and P-12
schools. NCTAF (1996) indicated the nation's unwillingness to invest at the front end in education has caused greater costs and problems at the back end. For example, illiteracy is contributing to welfare dependency and incarceration. At least half of prison populations have literacy levels below the standards needed for sustained employment. Almost 40% of juvenile delinquents have learning problems that were not diagnosed during their P-12 school days. For the most part, international test scores place American students near the bottom of the pack. The nation can ill afford to lose any of its youth to illiteracy or jail. The indirect costs of an inadequate education are staggering. State prison systems and federal systems cannot build prisons fast enough to keep up with demand. It should not be construed that this investigator in this study makes the assumption that schools are solely responsible for curing society's ills. Families bear the major responsibility for being a positive influence on their children. But in cases of dysfunctional families, schools are assuming an even greater role in child-rearing and this study considers how the role of teachers may be changing and whether or not teacher education programs are changing in order to prepare teachers for new and expanded roles. Today's teachers must be equipped to deal with an increasingly diverse student population that has myriad special needs and a variety of
learning styles, making teaching an increasingly complex endeavor.

The looming and important question which this study addresses is whether or not teachers are being prepared for these challenges and others. A thorough review of several literatures allowed for a critical examination of the new Holmes Partnership's goals and strategies. This scholarly work, along with the investigator's first-hand experience with the organization, enabled the study to examine whether the current Holmes Partnership's directions are in line with today's needs, and whether or not new recommendations should be considered.

Public education, with teacher education as its linchpin, serves as democracy's bulwark, a socialization process designed to develop a responsible, competent, and caring citizenry. It is vitally important for the new Holmes Partnership to get the program right in this critical phase, or society's wheels may just spin off. It is also the hope of this study that any knowledge gained here and from future studies of the Holmes Partnership will lead to new learning, improved practice, and most importantly, improved student learning.

This study begins with an historical review of the Holmes Group and its decade-long reform movement. This historical review provides a needed backdrop and context for
understanding the newer Holmes Partnership which has evolved from the former Holmes Group, and guides recommendations for the future.

What makes the Holmes Group and now the Holmes Partnership distinct is the critical view from within, and I wish to share a few words about this at the outset. In one of the Holmes Group's major publications, *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995), the authors suggested that institutions that prepare educators should either adopt the reforms as published therein or forfeit their right to prepare educators. Although this strong statement was not one of their first declarations, it did reflect the Holmes Group's continuing spirit and fervor. What has made the Holmes Group call for reform unique was that their stinging criticisms were coming from within their own ranks via their publication of three reports, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990), and *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995).

Other contemporary education reports calling for reform, such as the *Carnegie Report—A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986), had not predominantly involved educators (Carnegie Forum, 1986). In the case of the Holmes Group however, teacher educators called for the reform of their own institutions. According to Wheeler and Giese (1988), "never before had a group of education deans,
representing many of the nation's leading research institutions come together for the purpose of creating a plan to reform teacher education" (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p.11). This study examined this evolving plan and its implications for action today.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the study and a brief overview of the Holmes Group, which in 1997, became The Holmes Partnership. Chapter 2 provides the reader with a historical review, and the various goals of the confederation, and their accomplishments, which are particularly important since this study and the literature review that follows are aligned with these goals.

The general context for reform is reviewed in Chapter 3 including trends and issues in higher education, P-12 schools, colleges of education, and teacher education. Chapter 4 discusses the new Holmes Partnership, contrasting its new goals and priorities with those of the former Holmes Group.

Based on the comprehensive review of several literatures, Chapter 5 reinforces and supports most of the Holmes Partnership's new strategic actions, but not without criticism. Chapter 5 also provides the Holmes Partnership with new recommendations for future directives, based on
issues and concerns not addressed by the Holmes Partnership's new goals and strategic actions.
CHAPTER 2

History of the Holmes Group's Goals and Accomplishments

Although the Holmes Group did not incorporate until 1985, it drew part of its inspiration and direction from its namesake, Henry W. Holmes, dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education in the 1920s. *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) referred to Holmes as follows:

Claiming that "a more serious conception of the place of the teacher in the life of the nation is both necessary and timely," Holmes urged educational and political leaders to join him in changing the systems supporting poorly trained, paid, and esteemed teachers. He pleaded with his colleagues in schools of education to prepare teachers who had "the power of critical analysis in a mind broadly and deeply informed." But he found few supporters and while he constructed a strong program at Harvard, it was short-lived. Like a number of educational leaders before and since, Henry Holmes failed in his efforts to make school teaching and teacher education more professional (p. 24).
The Holmes Group believed that their reform effort would be more successful than other past reform efforts and their belief that they would succeed was rationalized in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986):

> The hope, we believe, lies in our better understanding of the obstacles that blocked earlier reform efforts, and in our reform plans themselves, which are grounded in principles of effective institutional change. It is buoyed by the social circumstances that now make educational change a prominent, critical issue. This optimism, however, is countered by a deep concern that the nation will again opt for the traditionally simple solutions that have consistently failed. These failures will be repeated unless we learn from past reform efforts. (p. 25)

Backed by the Johnson Foundation, an original planning meeting was held in 1983 at the foundation's Wingspread Conference Center. Attending the conference were 17 deans who had expressed a willingness to discuss how to address low standards, weak accreditation policies, and the low priority given to teacher education programs within major research universities. Their beginning efforts to develop and implement new and rigorous standards in teacher education were later backed not only by the Johnson
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Foundation, but also the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the New York Times Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Education. A short time later, a meeting was held at the same site with 23 deans in attendance. A goal was established to have at least one major research university involved in the reforms for every twenty-five thousand teachers. In the spring of 1985, after much discussion of the issues, and a review of the group's first report (which would later be known as Tomorrow's Teachers), the decision was made that more time and thought was needed around matters such as special education, bilingual education, vocational education, early childhood education.

**Governance of the Early Holmes Group**

In the fall of 1985 the Holmes Group became official by filing articles of incorporation, and soon thereafter adopted by-laws. With the intent to enhance effectiveness and communication, the Holmes Group was divided into five regions, with each territory headed by a regional coordinator who also served on the Holmes National Coordinating Committee. These regional coordinators, along with the president and vice president, were the first members of the Holmes Board of Directors. According to Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) four standing committees were formed: Curriculum Development, State Planning and Policy,
Testing and Evaluation, and Membership. Judith Lanier, of Michigan State, served as the president and as the chair of the Board, but in 1989 the roles were split, and Frank Murray, of the University of Delaware, became the Chair (Fullan et al., 1996). In the current Holmes Partnership, Frank Murray serves as the executive director and Nancy L. Zimpher, of The Ohio State University serves as the new organization's president and chairperson. Chuck Williams, of the National Education Association (NEA) serves as the vice-chairperson of the board of directors.

The Early Position of the Holmes Group

The enlarged group of education deans reaffirmed the belief that the status quo in teacher education was not acceptable, and that the Holmes Group needed to be serious-minded about the road to reform. *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) emphasized that all undergraduate students must have a strong general education, majoring in an academic subject, and not in education. Another postulate and one that drew fire and is debated even to this day was that baccalaureate graduates would not be certified as teachers but that a master's degree in education would be required. Furthermore, the report argued that a teacher candidate must complete a year of rigorous academic and clinical study and
one year as an intern under the direction of a master teacher after earning a baccalaureate degree.

The original Holmes Group realized that these directives were not for everyone, and suggested in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) that institutions who had reform agendas that were different than these to join organizations other than the Holmes Group. However, this investigator has not seen any evidence that could be interpreted as encouraging members who did take issue with the original goals of Holmes to leave the organization.

**Criteria for membership.**

It was the hope of the authors of *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) that membership in the Holmes Group would serve as a "quality check." They stated:

> It is the intention of The Holmes Group leadership that just as the development of a national test for professional teachers will provide a quality check for individual teachers, membership and participation in The Holmes Group eventually will serve as a quality check for research universities and their graduate professional schools or colleges of education (p. 77).

The assumption was that teaching candidates would be attracted to Holmes institutions that met the Holmes Group's criteria, and in turn, school administrators would be
attracted to teacher applicants who had met the Holmes Group's new and rigorous criteria.

The criteria for membership can be thought of as the first quality control measure or the gatekeeper which an institution must pass through in order to join the Holmes Group. Thus, it is important to this study to consider the Holmes Group's initial criteria for membership so that they can be compared with the present Holmes Partnership's criteria.

Criteria for charter membership, as spelled out in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) included:

- whether the institution is identified as having a reputation of "excellence" in their research;
- whether or not the institution offers a doctoral program in education;
- the past record of investment in research and development activity on the part of the institution as a whole;
- the percentage of minority enrollment at the institution;
- the chief academic officer (president) and the education dean at the institution must support The Holmes Group's agenda. Additionally, they must describe their general plans for encouraging development and
implementation of the reform efforts at their institution (pp. 76-77).

Institutional commitment to achieving Holmes Group goals would be demonstrated by the following:

- active efforts to implement the reform agenda;
- ongoing related research and development activities;
- systematic documentation of implementation processes and outcomes;
- conscious networking and shared work across institutional boundaries (within the university, between the university and elementary and secondary schools, between the university and the state department of education, and between the university and other professional institutions and organizations);
- provision of adequate institutional support for the effort;
- changing policies regarding the entry requirements for professional teachers, so that a quality graduate professional degree is required;
- payment of initial membership fee (amount not specified) (Tomorrow's Teachers, 1986, pp. 76-77).

It appears that the Holmes Group attempted to implement an accountability feature by requiring annual progress reports relative to these criteria. Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) states:
Once institutions have met membership requirements, continued participation in the Holmes Group called for an annual progress report, participation in the regional and national projects and activities of the Holmes Group, and payment of annual membership dues. (p.76-77) (Currently, annual dues for a Holmes Partnership institute member is $5000.00)

The payment of annual dues and participation in regional and national Holmes activities have apparently been easier than completing annual reports. The only published report the Holmes office could provide for this study that included annual reports from member institutions was The Holmes Group: A Sampling of Member Initiatives and Accomplishments (1994) with an introduction by then president Judith E. Lanier.

After review of the Holmes documents available to me, it remains unclear what process, if any, was undertaken over time to examine whether the members were abiding by the criteria that defined an active Holmes member. The lack of such a process seems to this investigator to indicate implied consent by those participating. For regardless of the tone and fervor of the original Holmes founders who believed that teacher education programs that did not adopt the Holmes Group agenda should forfeit their franchise (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995), it apparently
became acceptable by default to belong to the Holmes Group even though an institution might not have been in compliance with the reforms they argued for so persuasively. Thus, the proposed criteria appear to be suggestions rather than requirements. This, in my opinion, weakens the volition and mission of an organization. One wonders why some institutions chose to belong to the Holmes Group if they did not intend to align their programs with the Holmes reform agenda. Results from one survey, for example, indicated a reason to belong to Holmes was for prestige reasons, in order to be associated with the top research universities in the U.S. (Fullan et al., 1996).


Reviewed first are the specific goals of the three Holmes reports, also known as the Holmes Group trilogy, beginning with their first publication, Tomorrow's Teachers (1986). This publication identified the following goals:

1. To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid. Teachers must have a greater command of academic subjects and of the skills to teach them.
2. To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work. If teachers are to become
more effective professionals, we must distinguish between novices, competent members of the profession, and high-level professional leaders.

3. To create standards of entry to the profession--examinations and educational requirements--that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible. America cannot afford any more teachers who fail a 12th-grade competency test....

4. To connect our own institutions to schools...schools must become places where both teachers and university faculty can systematically inquire into practice and improve it.

5. To make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn. This will require less bureaucracy, more professional autonomy, and more leadership for teachers...(Tomorrow's Teachers, 1986, p.3-4)

Reactions to the Holmes Group reports provides a historical perspective about how the Holmes Group's reforms were perceived once they were introduced. Jeanne Pietig (1987), in analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) reported that the greatest strength of the first report was its comprehensiveness, since the report delved into such topics as teaching candidates' liberal arts education and the failure of
schools to provide first-year teachers with the necessary support to succeed. Pietig also credited the report for its attempt to make those teaching teachers more respectable. She claimed only a few faculty members were willing to call themselves teacher educators. She added, "For surely the first step to improving the professional status of teaching and teacher education is to accord teaching more status in colleges and schools of education" (p.33).

Pietig (1987) also spoke to the weaknesses of the first report. She felt that membership in the Holmes Group was selective and represented primarily the major research universities and was not representative of all institutions involved in teacher education. Pietig believed if the original study group had been more representative of teacher education institutions, a different set of proposals would have been offered. She concluded that only one model of teacher education was the result of the Holmes Group's efforts, based primarily on the programs of major research universities. She stated that she knew of no research that suggested that research universities are better at preparing teachers, and suggested that the Holmes Group should have considered some of the exemplary programs of four-year institutions. However, the Holmes Group work was about reforming themselves, suggesting that future teacher
education programs should be informed by the growing base of knowledge on teaching and learning. Knowledge of teaching and learning has expanded, much to the credit of the research universities, and the greater insights into the complexity of teaching and learning has made it increasingly difficult to implement a teacher education program in the four years of baccalaureate studies. Pietig (1987) was also critical of the original Holmes Group for excluding teachers, which was detrimental to one of the Holmes' own objective of improving teachers' professional autonomy and authority.

Wheeler and Giese (1988) studied the additional issue of deans transferring their enthusiasm for the Holmes Group to their respective faculties. Their study examined the strength of the commitment of the faculty belonging to institutions that had adopted the Holmes agenda. They surveyed teacher education faculty in 98 Holmes institutions and they received 415 useable responses from 50 of the 98 professional teacher education programs. Therefore, their findings should be considered with some caution since only half of the Holmes Group members responded to the survey. One finding was that most faculty agreed with the decision to join the Holmes Group, but viewed the decision to join administrative in nature, and not one that necessarily involved the faculty. In 24 out of 50 programs, the teacher
education faculty was not involved in the process of joining and supporting the Holmes Group reform movement. In addition, they report that most faculty did not support moving teacher education to the graduate level, which was a major plank in the Holmes Groups platform.

Obviously, just because the institutions adopted the Holmes Group did not mean the agenda was wholly or even largely acceptable to the teacher education faculty, and most importantly, it did not mean it was incorporated into the institutions' programs (Wheeler & Giese, 1988). This brings into question just how seriously the Holmes reforms were taken on the campuses of their member institutions.

Long (1990) weighed in on his reaction to *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), by citing questions the report did not answer for him. He credited the Holmes Group for the national attention the group was able to muster to focus on teacher education. That was a step in the right direction. However, the first question he posed was:

How can schools and teacher preparation programs obtain the funds necessary to make excellence a realistic objective?... To ignore...the price tag is in the end to be counterproductive because to raise hopes that cannot be fulfilled promotes frustration and paralysis of action. (p.319)
Long (1990) questioned "How can the preparation of vocational teachers and the courses they teach be improved?" (p.320). Long noted that 95% of high school graduates had received some vocational credit from course work taught by part-time teachers who did not have a baccalaureate degree, placing these instructors beyond the reach of the Holmes Group's reforms, an oversight on the part of the Holmes Group. Long also questioned the wisdom behind separating a teacher candidate's liberal education from their education courses and stated that the study of education should be at the center of the liberal arts curriculum and not be delayed until the future teacher is 22 years old.

Perhaps the most striking point Long (1990) made was when he asked, "What kind of training is needed by professors who are involved in preparation of teachers?" (p.321). He added, "Of all the questions relating to the improvement of teacher education, this is the one most ignored" (p.322). Higher education is perhaps the only level of education where the operative assumption is that professors have no need to be trained to teach (Long, 1990).

From Long's perspective, perhaps the title of the first Holmes report should have been, Tomorrow's Professors, instead of Tomorrow's Teachers. "Education of children really begins not with the training of elementary and secondary school teachers, but with the training of their
To further establish perspectives about education and teacher education reform around the time the initial Holmes report *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) was released, I reviewed other literature including an article that was published in the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Bulletin, by Hoyt (1991). He contended that between the two reports, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) and *Educating Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986) (the Carnegie teacher education report), there were 138 specific proposals for educational reform. Hoyt set out to determine the extent to which educators agreed with the 138 reforms.

His sample consisted of 98 NAASP leaders, out of which three-fourths were principals and the balance were state directors for NASSP. Those who were principals further collected data from 115 teachers, with an age range of 40 to 55 years, and a teaching experience range of 10 to 25 years. The list of NASSP leaders was thought to be representative, but the teacher sample was not a random sample. Hoyt shared the following findings:

Of the 138 reform proposals, members of both the NASSP sample and the teacher sample marked either the "agree" or "strongly agree" response to 107 of them. This is clear evidence that members of these two samples agree
with authors of the Holmes Group and Carnegie reports on more than 77% of the reform proposals... (p.69)

Examples of the more popular and controversial reforms supported by the Holmes Group that received support were:

- Support differentiated staffing of teachers at three levels.
- Establish and work with professional development schools.
- Require internships/residencies for all incoming teachers. (p.69)

On the negative side, those issues supported by the Holmes Group but not receiving support from principals or teachers were:

- Abolish the undergraduate degree in teacher education.
- Require all intending teachers to complete an undergraduate degree in the liberal arts.
- Provide pedagogical preparation to prospective teacher only at the graduate level (Hoyt, 1991, p.69).

While there was substantial agreement, there were concerns nevertheless. Hoyt (1991) stated:

It is hard to understand why any educational reform body would propose reforms without first reviewing their acceptability to the practitioners (emphasis is mine) who would be charged with implementing them were
they to be adopted. Yet, during the entire decade of the 1980s, this was essentially the pattern (p. 74).


Specifically, the authors of Tomorrow's Schools (1990) felt their principles were starting points. "The principles are not heavily prescriptive; neither are they lightly held" (p.6). These six principles would seem to allow for refinement over time. They are:

1. Teaching and learning for understanding. All the schools' students participate seriously in the kind of learning that allows you to go on learning for a lifetime. This may well require revision of the school's curriculum and instruction.

2. Creating a learning community. The ambitious kind of teaching and learning we hope for will take place in a sustained way for large numbers of children only if
classrooms and schools are thoughtfully organized as communities of learning.

3. Teaching and learning for understanding for everybody's children. A major commitment of the Professional Development School will be overcoming the educational and social barriers raised by an unequal society.

4. Continuing learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators. In the Professional Development School, adults are expected to continue their learning also.

5. Thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning. This is essential to the professional lives of teachers, administrators, and teacher educators. The Professional Development School faculty working as partners will promote reflection and research on practice as a central aspect of the school.

6. Inventing a new institution. The foregoing principles call for such profound changes that the Professional Development School will need to devise for itself a different kind of organizational structure, supported over time by enduring alliances of all the institutions with a stake in better professional preparation of school faculty (p.7).

The professional development school was a linchpin in the Holmes Group reforms. A professional development school (PDS) can be a laboratory school for university research, a
demonstration school, and a clinical setting for preparing student and intern teachers. Specifically, it is a "school for the development of novice professionals, for continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching profession" (Tomorrow's Schools, 1990, p. 1).

The report stated that they were promoting an idea, and that it would be difficult to point to one concrete example where all of the desired qualities of a PDS exist. The report also emphasized this is just the beginning of a long process that would call for many additional actions and revisions.

Tomorrow's Schools (1990) challenged universities, colleges of education, and public schools to join hands in a common mission, "to start conversations about long-term directions and prospects for cumulative change and collaborative work among institutions that have for too long run separate courses" (p.ix).

Prior to the introduction of the six principles that would guide how a PDS should organize itself, Tomorrow's Schools (1990) stated, "Thus this report is a challenge--a call to action, rather than a template for a single conception" (p.6). The language, to me, appeared to be a genuine sign of flexibility, openness, and an encouragement
for various PDS models to emerge, thus allowing for a developmental process that might lead to a more definitive model based on standards from best practices.

What constitutes PDS standards then, continue to evolve today and was openly debated at a 1997 Phoenix conference of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, and reviewed in the March 19, 1997 issue of Education Week (Ponessa, 1997). Mary Diez, chairperson of the education department at Alverno College in Milwaukee, was concerned that creating a universal PDS model might cause schools to become overly focused on the structure and lose sight of the purpose. She also thought the PDS model was more of a benefit to higher education than P-12 (Ponessa, 1997).

However, Nancy Zimpher, president of the Holmes Partnership disagreed, stating that the PDS model was not so tight that it lost sight of its purpose. She also added that if a PDS was only serving the interests of higher education, it was not meeting the "full letter and intent of professional development schools." Therefore, based on their argument, P-12 does benefit from a PDS, but higher education should also realize a benefit. If both sides stand to benefit to some degree, this would appear to me to be a promising start, and I would suggest the priority for higher education should be how P-12 educators could benefit more from the PDS.
The Center for Innovation in Urban Education at Northeastern University in Boston advocated an anti-bureaucratic collaboration model that would give parents and community members a voice (Ponessa, 1997). This would provide a greater benefit to the larger community of P-12. Nancy Zimpher argued a benefit is realized by both higher education and P-12, creating a setting for reciprocal or "simultaneous renewal," one of the Holmes Partnership's goals.

The authors of *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990) were not offering a concrete example for a PDS, and believed through time, that many revisions would be made. Also, Marsha Levine, the director of the professional-development school standards project for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher-Education (NCATE), said that her group has produced a set of draft standards which may alleviate Mary Diez's concerns that PDS's could lose sight of their purpose. NCATE recognized the formative nature of the PDS when they developed their PDS draft standards. On the one hand, too much structure can limit the development of creative solutions to school problems. However, no structure or standards would likely result in a PDS with no rigor. Therefore, NCATE has proposed standards that balance these concerns with two important functions, to identify
unique qualities of the PDS, and to support the development of quality PDSs (NCATE, 1997).

NCATE has also recognized the developmental nature of PDSs, and have based their standards on three stages of development, which include pre-threshold, threshold, and quality attainment. In the final stage of development, quality attainment, certain attributes should clearly be in place, such as (a) a learning community, (b) collaboration, (c) accountability and quality assurance, and (d) organization, roles and structure, and equity. So, in other words, a more concrete model of a PDS may be the end result of the national standards that would be adopted by NCATE (NCATE, 1997). The NCATE (1997) list of critical attributes of a PDS mirror the six principles listed in Tomorrow's Teachers (1990), with the exception of accountability and quality assurance, elements the Holmes Group historically has had difficulty implementing, according to my review.

Weaknesses of the PDS, according to Wilson and Davids (1994), is the extra burden placed on already overloaded teachers, the lack of additional funding, the inability of the PDS to bring reforms to scale for the whole P-12 district, and a view that the PDS does not sufficiently confront deeply-rooted structural problems of P-12 schools. Wilson and Davids also noted that reform efforts are misdirected when focused on school repair. The focus should
be on the crumbling foundation of the school, noting that schools are still 'assembly lines'. Students move through school at a fixed rate, not according to their academic needs. The line is never stopped long enough to fix the flawed system that has as its outputs significant levels of student failure and dropouts. The obsolete assembly line system, in my view, is failing the students, and it almost seems to be designed with that intent in mind. Reformers, according to Wilson and Davids, are not confronting more deeply-rooted system problems.

Five years after *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990), the Holmes Group released *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995), which focused on the reform of teacher education institutions.


A review of the goals embraced by *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995) is in order.

- **Goal One** - To make education schools accountable to the profession and to the public for the trustworthy performance of their graduates at beginning and advanced levels of practice. Competence in subject matter requires that education students experience first-rate learning in the liberal arts....Sometimes they segregate education students from others studying
the same discipline or provide them with less challenging content.... Tomorrow's School of Education (TSE) will therefore refuse to admit or recommend for a teaching license any student whose studies in the arts and sciences have been diluted in any way whatsoever. Likewise, the education courses for those who will teach must be of high quality. (p.12-13)

- Goal Two - To make research, development, and demonstration of quality learning in real schools and communities a primary mission of education schools. We will bridge the pernicious gap between researchers and practitioners by conducting much of our work in real schools and communities. School and university faculty will collaborate regularly in sustained educational inquiry over time, much of it in schools educating at-risk youth....(p.13)

- Goal Three - To connect professional schools of education with professionals directly responsible for elementary and secondary education at local, state, regional, and national levels to coalesce around higher standards. Educators need professional development of programs and throughout their careers. (p.14)

- Goal Four - To recognize interdependence and commonality of purpose in preparing educators for various roles in schools, roles that call for teamwork
and common understanding of learner-centered education in the 21st century. Because success in the future will depend on an ability to collaborate on behalf of every youngster's learning, we will no longer prepare educators for isolated roles. Instead, we will get them ready to work together on behalf of children in learner-centered schools and communities. (p.14)

- Goal Five - To provide leadership in making education schools better places for professional study and learning. We will ensure that our faculty are competent teachers and researchers, comfortable in both college and school settings, and committed to an education of quality for all children in an interdependent world....(p.15)

- Goal Six - To center our work on professional knowledge and skill for educators who serve children and youth. We will sharpen our focus and concentrate our programs so that we offer studies more closely aligned with the learning needs of children and youth in a democratic society....Education schools trying to be all things to all people fail everyone. (p.15)

- Goal Seven - To contribute to the development of state and local policies that give all youngsters the opportunity to learn from highly qualified educators. The value of the education school rests, in part, on
its ability to contribute knowledge, information, and policy analysis that leads to informed decisions about educational policy....Schools of education must promote standards of quality in their home states and oppose forces that allow youngsters to be educated by less than fully competent, caring professionals. (p.15)

Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995) stated that institutions should either adopt the Holmes Group's reform agenda, or forfeit their right to prepare teachers. This tone did not go unnoticed by the Holmes Group's critics, such as Labaree (1995) and Delattre (1995).

If an institution of higher education did not feel responsible for or connected to the criticisms leveled at America's teachers, this report served as a reminder to those in higher education that they are liable as well, since the training of teachers rests on their shoulders.

To a degree, this report argued that America's teachers are a reflection of the institutions that prepared them. The report acknowledged that the greater society itself can negatively influence the schools and their performance, "but no amount of excusatory rhetoric can exonerate the universities from a share of the responsibility for the shortcomings of public education" (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995, p.6). This report emphasized that any reform effort needs to take into account those in the
schools and at the university entrusted to teacher education.

Reform that has transpired, according to Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995), has been minor and schools of education have acted in a manner that would only preserve the status quo. The report calls for action, suggesting that students demonstrate their ability to teach and their knowledge of learning, as opposed to the tradition of sitting passively through their required courses and being awarded a degree and a license to teach.

The report favored systemic reform over piecemeal reform. Piecemeal reform has been ineffective because of the connections that exist between the system's numerous parts, such as curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, professional development, texts and materials. All of the parts are linked, and attempting to change one part is sometimes obstructed by the system as a whole (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995).

Margaret Wheatley (1992) acknowledged the need for a systemic approach:

In new science, the underlying currents are a movement toward holism, toward understanding the system as a system and giving primary value to the relationships that exist among seemingly discrete parts. Donella Meadows, a systems thinker, quotes an ancient Sufi
teaching that captures this shift in focus: "You think because you understand one; you must understand two, because one and one makes two. But you must also understand 'and'. When we view systems from this perspective, we enter an entirely new landscape of connections..." (p. 9)

Piecemeal reform has been ineffective because of its proponents' failure to see the interconnectedness with the whole. All of the parts, such as colleges of education, trends in higher education, Professional Development Schools, certification, and continual learning, to name a few must be linked, beginning with colleges of education and the elementary and secondary schools they serve. Linking the reform of the school of education to P-12 is in the self-interest of higher education. To do otherwise would run the risk of schools of education becoming irrelevant (Tomorrow Schools of Education, 1995). Labaree (1995) saw the PDS as an example of self-interest of higher education, acting as the only thing that protects the school of education from the university's dominant culture, as opposed to the PDS acting as well an agent to reform P-12.

To this point, I have briefly reviewed the specific goals and principles as listed in the three Holmes reports, Tomorrow's Teachers (1986), Tomorrow's Schools (1990), and
Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995). I have attempted to capture a sampling of the reactions pro and con to these reports, limited as they are. I come back to Labaree (1995) at this closing juncture to draw from his cross-analysis of all three Holmes reports.

In essence, Labaree (1995) considered the three reports contradictory. On the one hand, Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) praised the rich scientific research produced by higher education (research not derived from the clinical experience of practicing teachers), and strongly recommended teachers be versed in its findings. In Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995), Labaree noted a change in the focus of higher education researchers, when the report suggested the schools' research efforts would be better served at the clinical level of practice, in the professional development schools. Labaree considered this a contradiction, and suggested that a balance between the theory and practice is more acceptable. He wondered how the focus of research can be praised in one report, and "demonized" in the next, and wondered what purpose this shift served.

Labaree questioned how the same researchers, recognized as authorities in Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) are now supposed to be viewed in Tomorrow's Schools (1990) as equal partners and collaborators with P-12 practitioners, now devoted to research in the school setting, abandoning other
forms of graduate research. Labaree suggested not all research is suitable for the professional development schools. Labaree also questioned if faculty could serve both roles simultaneously: collaborator and authoritarian. He felt the report ignored the cultural differences between institutions, stressing there is a strong need to work through those differences.

As Brookhart (1989) stated, "School-university collaboration is multicultural education. It involves the interaction of two distinct settings or workplaces, each of which has different norms or expected orientations..." (p.123). These cultural differences should be brought to the surface where they can be addressed, where roles can be negotiated based on a mutual understanding of the other's cultural perspective.

Clearly, Labaree uncovered some potential role confusion which could well manifest itself at the inter-institutional level between the college and the P-12 sector. For example, although teachers have been involved to some degree in the reform of teacher education programs and collaborative research, decision making has remained the right of the university, according to the Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, and Watson (1996) study of the members of the Holmes Group.
Labaree agreed that there are institutions no longer deeply concerned with the training of teachers, as the Holmes Group charged, but Labaree claimed these institutions, for which the Holmes Group staked their claim, is very small. Labaree stated "it becomes clear that the institutions that might benefit from these reforms are few indeed and the ones that might be harmed are many" (p.201).

Finally, Labaree (1995) wondered who the intended audience was for all three of the Holmes Group reports. He claimed that the strong rhetoric used in the reports was common to reform movements, whereas the author has written off the likelihood of convincing the target group, and has decided to go over its head.

Labaree later referred to the Holmes Group's willingness to tap into the power and credibility of outside organizations in the hope of gaining their assistance in implementing the reforms. These partners included the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), American Association of School Administrators (AASA), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), National Education Association (NEA), National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), to name a few (Labaree, 1995).
I differ with Labaree in his thinking that the Holmes Group went over the heads of college educators when the group partners itself with so-called "outside" organizations. Is it wise to treat these organizations as outsiders? Sarason (1996) questioned the concept of outsiders when he implied that schools are open systems:

Does it make sense to talk about schools as if they are part of a closed system that does not include groups and agencies outside that system? Why is it that when we use the phrase "school system" we think in terms of pupils, teachers, principals, school buildings, boards of educations, superintendents, etc., and we automatically relegate other groups and agencies to an outside role. We are, of course, begging the question: What do we mean by a system? (p.10)

Ignoring the input and support of these so-called "outsiders" can be costly, according to Sarason (1996). Viewing an organization as a closed system can limit our thinking, preventing us from seeing all of the possible alternatives, and obstacles. In addition, Sarason reminded us of our educational history that the most potent source for change or reform in education has come from the so-called "outside", through court decisions handed down on such issues as desegregation, special education, and school access for the handicapped. Sarason stressed the strongest
pressures for change come from the so-called "outside" of the system, a proven ally for those on the inside trying to promote change (Sarason, 1996). In this case, seems from this investigator's perspective strategic good sense for the Holmes Partnership to employ such a change strategy. Applying Wheatley's holistic view of a system, the new Holmes Partnership intends to be more effective at promoting systemic change by taking into consideration the whole system and all of its discrete parts.

Evidence of Goal Accomplishment in the Past Decade

As noted, documentation of goal accomplishment is thin, due to the lack of a process to periodically measure the progress of the members of the Holmes Group. To further complicate a historical review, no baseline was established at the conception of the original Holmes group, so we can never be quite sure how far along the institutions were in the reform process at the time they joined the Holmes Group, or know for sure how much they have progressed. It also cannot be said with any certainty that reforms at the various institutions are all linked to the Holmes movement.

Despite these past limitations, there are sources to consider that can provide a descriptive picture of the past progress of the Holmes Group since it began. One of these
In the preface of this publication (1994), then president Judith E. Lanier stated, "This is the first time we have sought to share summaries of our accomplishments with one another. While we decided not to impose a common format for this reporting, we may wish to consider one in the future..." (p.1). From this perspective, the lack of a common format in this synthesis of accomplishments seriously hampered any analytical review since institutions were permitted to submit or omit whatever they chose. However, the sampling did provide, as limited as it was, those accomplishments the member institutions felt were most noteworthy, giving us some indication of the importance they placed on various Holmes issues and reforms.

At the time of this January 1994 publication of accomplishments, there were 94 Holmes members, out of which, 60 submitted reported their accomplishments to date, a 63% return. Again, due to the lack of a common instrument, some of the information reported was more in the form of future visions and goals; I ignored that information since they were not accomplishments. Some reported their reforms

---

1 In comparison, the new Holmes Partnership has 72 current members in 1997, as compared to 94 in 1994, approximately 23% less members, according to the Holmes Partnership 4/25/97 records.
were in process prior to their membership in Holmes, while others indicated their reforms were in conjunction with other reform movements, such as Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools, and Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal. Others reflected programs that were more project-oriented, lacking in coherency, with no direct connections to each other or to the Holmes Group's reforms.

After reviewing the 60 scenarios offered by the Holmes members, those initiatives mentioned most frequently in the sampling included:

• 92% reported various methods of promoting diversity, i.e., Holmes Scholars, recruitment initiatives to attract a more diverse student and faculty population, and providing for diversity awareness throughout the curriculum.

• 80% reported involvement with Professional Development Schools (PDS), averaging 5 per institution.

• 42% reported an emphasis on collaborative inquiry between college faculty and P-12 teachers. However, when this research was discussed, it was conducted primarily by teaching candidates, such as at Duke University. "Each student intern and cooperating teacher work together to define a problem....Each pair then develops ways to address the problem, to implement their plans, and to assess the results. Each pair
presents their action research findings..." (p. 30). Although the expressed desire was to involve university faculty, the experience, according to their description, seemed largely between the cooperating teacher and the student. A question that needs to be addressed in future studies is the degree of involvement of university faculty in collaborative research with P-12 faculty. A few mentioned that collaborative research was a funded priority of their college of education.

- 42% of those contributing to the sampling reported adoption of the 5-year teacher education program that results in the awarding of the Master's degree. However, there was variance between the institutions, with some offering only the 5-year program, others offering it only in certain subject areas, and yet others offered it as an option, reflecting an amount of uncertainty at that time on this particular issue.

- 42% reported the use of "teacher facilitators/lead teacher mentors/clinical educators/adjuncts," in other words, utilizing veteran P-12 teachers in the college and P-12 environments to help train novice teachers.

- 38% reported the use of student cohorts in their teacher education programs.
The Holmes Group: A Sampling of Member Initiatives and Accomplishments (1994) listed the following Initiatives as Mentioned Less Frequently (five or less responses):

- Clinical labs on campus;
- Constructivist approach to learning;
- Case-based teacher education;
- Urban education (may be under-reported by itself, but included in another reported area, such as their diversity program);
- Use of doctoral students as clinical educators;
- Use of the reflective practitioner model in teacher education and professional development;
- Elementary education programs requiring an academic area of concentration;
- Rise in admissions standards, more use of multiple assessments such as writing exercises, and portfolios.
- An integrated teacher education program, grounded in a conceptual framework.

There were also innovations that stood out due to distinctive qualities. The University of Delaware re-established Future Teacher of America Clubs, with its primary purpose being minority recruitment (p.27). Virginia Tech reported a similar program (p.137).

Penn State University listed as an objective the creation of an urban elementary education degree. The
University of Texas at Austin approved a 9-semester-hour socio-cultural option to the traditional foreign language requirement (p.121). A few of the Holmes members reported they required teaching candidates to observe or teach in a multi-cultural school as part of their preparation. Georgia State University has added to its teacher education programs a two-week placement program which gives students an opportunity to observe a school when it first opens its doors in the fall (p.34).

Georgia State University also created the Professional Education Council, which consisted of faculty from the College of Education and the College of Arts and Science. This council made decisions affecting the teacher education programs. They also moved their secondary teacher education program to the College of Arts and Sciences, while the College of Education maintained responsibility for pedagogical instruction. The university noted that a "commitment to teacher preparation has increased significantly" (p.34).

The University of Hawaii at Manoa reported its College of Education had reformed its educational administration program to be a cohort, field-based degree. It required a full-time commitment and a year and a half to complete. Teachers enrolled in this program received their full salary from the State Department of Education while they were
completing their studies (p.37). The University of Illinois at Chicago reported a new school administration Masters of Education program that joined teachers and administrators in participative decision-making (p.41). Iowa State University also used a cohort model in their two-year, campus- and field-based elementary-secondary preparation program which also utilized mentors (p.44). The University of Virginia made changes in their educational administration program as well, as reported to the Holmes Group, and modeled one course after the medical school, called the "Administrative Rounds," on which they elaborate:

In Administrative Rounds, interns identify an intense, persistent problem in their internship school and pursue resolution of that problem during the full-year internship. Each intern hosts the cohort group at the intern's school once during the year, at which time all interns discuss the problem under study at that school...Interns are now paid a partial salary by the schools, supplemented by University scholarships/awards. (p.132)

The preparation of P-12 administrators could, and probably should be the next program in need of reform after teacher education.

The impact of the five-year teacher education master’s program as advocated by the Holmes Group was mentioned as
well in the sampling of the members' accomplishments. According to information submitted by the School of Education at the University of Kansas, "the number of fifth-year students has increased from 46 in 1986 to approximately 150 in the fall of 1993" (p.45).

Kent State University commented on the Holmes Group in general, providing the Holmes Group with perhaps its strongest endorsement:

While it is difficult to separate impact of the Holmes Agenda from other factors influencing curricular change and faculty activities..., there is no doubt that membership in the Holmes Group has had a very positive impact on the vision we have developed about our School of Education for the 21st Century. Our participation in the Holmes meetings has given us unique opportunities to communicate with colleagues in other institutions in ways that have both enriched our faculty resources at Kent and also provided an opportunity for our faculty to significantly influence others through their leadership in Holmes Group activities.... (p.49)

One school noted enrollment limitations as an accomplishment. The University of Minnesota pointed out in the Holmes sampling that each of their teacher education programs now had a limited enrollment, restricting the college's production of new teachers to 10% to 12% of the
state's annual total, allowing the university to select only
the most qualified candidates, one example of a quality
control (p.68).

One institute, The Ohio State University, reported a
magnet school as one of their accomplishments. Ohio State
University informed the Holmes Group of its Northland
Teaching Academy. The academy is an urban teacher
recruitment program situated in an urban high school The
academy is financially backed by the university and the
Columbus Public Schools. High school students who express
an interest in teaching are selected for the program on the
basis of their grades and an essay. Each year, the academy
students elect to take an education theory course. In their
senior year, they complete an internship with a Columbus
teacher. Students who graduate with at least a 3.00/4.00
grade-point average receive a tuition loan to The Ohio State
University College of Education's five-year program. After
completion of the program, the new teacher can have one year
of his or her loan forgiven for every year taught in the
Columbus Public Schools. The endeavor was made possible by
a 1989 proposal by Nancy Zimpher, dean of The Ohio State
University's education college, Kenneth Howey, a professor,
and John Grossman, president of the Columbus Education
Association, and a corporate gift of $75,000 from
Metropolitan Life Insurance.
The Northland Teaching Academy's mission is to prepare and encourage college-bound students to enter teaching, especially students of color, in the Columbus, Ohio school district, a major urban district...(p.97).

Technology and distance learning were reported as emerging trends. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln reported:

To make doctoral education more accessible to educators in the state, Teachers College has developed a joint doctorate in educational administration with the University of Nebraska at Omaha and a distance learning program which enables students in western Nebraska to complete some doctoral work via interactive television. (p.76)

Prairie View A & M University indicated that two of their PDSs are connected to the College of Education through interactive video facilities (p.104). The University of Utah reported to the Holmes Group that "approximately one-third of the faculty in the college employ technology as a teaching tool in their courses" (p.130). The University of Virginia indicated "as part of the teacher education program's technology strand, selected third-year students tutor fourth-grade pupils in an after-school computer club (p.132).
Some institutes reported that their college faculty were active participants in P-12 governance, and P-12 faculty were also active in the college's governance. At the University of Louisville, for example, P-12 teachers and administrators assisted in planning and teaching, but in addition, "members of our faculty are represented in the governance structure of the P-12 schools, and faculty members from the schools take part in University department deliberations" (p.58). West Virginia University reformed its teacher education program through its collaborative teams consisting of "faculty members from across five schools and colleges of West Virginia University and teachers and administrators from public schools" (p.142). The important feature was that all members of the teams were treated as equal partners who shared in all of the planning. The University of North Dakota utilized a steering committee at its Lake Agassiz Elementary School PDS and a similar format at its other PDSs; the steering committee is chaired by the principal, with 10 teachers and four college faculty members (p.89). A similar model is used by The Ohio State University, having implemented a Professional Development School Board that includes most stakeholders, such as teachers, teacher union heads, college faculty, school board members and school administrators (p.96).
Institutes from one state, Texas, reported to the Holmes Group that the Holmes Group reform movement was hindered by their state government, reinforcing the need for the new Holmes Partnership to exert itself in policy-making at the state level. Both Texas A & M and The University of Texas at Austin indicated that Texas Senate Bill 1994, signed into law in 1987, "did not permit initial teacher certification to be earned on the graduate level" (p.121). This legislation prevented the Holmes Group members from Texas from developing the Holmes five-year extended teacher education program.

At the conclusion of this report, The Holmes Group: A Sampling of Member Initiatives and Accomplishments (1994), from which these samplings were taken, there were no summative remarks or any form of evaluation. The reader, and the Holmes Group members, were left on their own to draw conclusions as to how well the organization was moving toward the achievement of their goals. Due to the lack of a common instrument in this first attempt by the Holmes Group to document its accomplishments, it was virtually impossible to determine the group's overall success.

However, in April 1996 the Holmes Group underwent more in-depth analysis and evaluation of the group's progress during its first decade (from 1985-1995) in a report commissioned by the Ford Foundation (Fullan et al., 1996).

**The Rise and Stall of Teacher Education Reform**

Whereas, *The Holmes Group: A Sampling of Member Initiatives and Accomplishments* (January 1994), was an informal collection reporting on accomplishments, internally solicited from Holmes Group members, the study conducted by Fullan et al. (1996), was formal in nature and design. The purpose of the Fullan et al. study, reported in *The Rise and Stall of Teacher Education Reform: The Holmes Group 1985-1995*, was to "examine the work of the Holmes Group over the past decade, both in its own right and in the broader context of teacher education reform" (p. ii). Two survey instruments were developed to collect data from deans and faculty members (only four faculty from each institution and therefore not necessarily representative of the whole faculty) in each Holmes Group member institution, resulting in a 70% return, slightly higher than the return rate in *The Holmes Group: A Sampling of Member Initiatives and Accomplishments* (1994). Data was also integrated from five site visits to those Holmes institutions identified as those making "significant progress" with the Holmes agenda. Visits were also made to professional development schools at these sites where school personnel were also interviewed.
Additionally, over 60 interviews were conducted with key informants, both from inside the Holmes Group, and outside the organization's members. Literature that was relevant to the Holmes Group and to teacher education reforms in general were also reviewed by this research team.

Specifically, the Fullan et al. study was guided by three questions:

1. How appropriate were the goals and principles of the Holmes Group in relation to teacher education needs?

2. What progress have member institutions made with the Holmes Group agenda?

3. What impact has the Holmes Group had on the field of teacher education beyond its own member institutions?

Overall, the report concluded that the Holmes Group had been successful at creating an agenda for teacher education reform. But within the last five years of its existence, the Holmes Group had gone into stall, lacking the power to regain its momentum. Some of the research team's thoughts have served as the impetus for this longitudinal study planned by the Holmes Partnership, suggesting that its members must be held accountable to the Holmes agenda.

The report noted that it was easier for the Holmes Group to create its goals than it was to implement them. The group began to draw fire, being labeled as a debating society, being charged they were strong on talk but weak on
action, and that only the "in-group" was involved in the group's decision-making, making it politically difficult for other stakeholders to buy into decisions they felt were not their own. The report also found the group lacking in its ability to influence policy-making at the state and national levels, and was unable to find one Holmes institution that had fully implemented the Holmes agenda.

On the positive side, the report credited the Holmes Group for bringing the issue of teacher education to center-stage for public inspection and debate, for its implementation of Professional Development Schools, and for providing direction and networking for local reform, and strengthening minority representation in college faculty (Fullan et al., 1996).

The report questioned in general whether society has the will to meet the challenge of reforming teacher education. Assuming it does, there is then the issue of aligning multiple voices representing various reform movements. If legislators and other policy-makers conclude that the educators cannot even agree on a reform package, where will they turn for input? Most likely they will base educational policy on what is politically expedient, rather than on research and practice. Additional insights from this study include:
• Fewer than one-sixth report their college conducts evaluation studies of their programs.
• Graduates of extended programs are more likely to stay in teaching than are graduates of four-year programs.
• Some Holmes members experienced a drop in enrollment after switching to the extended teacher education program.
• The career ladder was not widely favored by the teaching community.
• The proposal for Professional Development Schools was very popular with universities and P-12 schools.
• School administration was seen to be an important part in the quality of teachers' lives, although Holmes had de-emphasized the role of administrators in school reform. There was general agreement that administrator preparation programs needed to be improved.
• Among Holmes Group members there was a lack of agreement on the proposal to eliminate the undergraduate degree in education.
• In the Holmes Group agenda, more attention was given to creating PDSs than to reforming schools of education.
• The group lacks specific proposals for enhancing and improving relationships between schools of education and arts and science.
• The agenda focuses more on the development of new teachers, than it does on professors, administrators, counselors, and psychologists.

• PDSs need to be made part of the larger picture of school reform, recognizing most schools are not PDSs, and that non-professional development schools may be suitable sites for research as well.

In the Fullan et al. (1996) study of the Holmes Group's first decade, the team divided the key findings into three categories: the Holmes Group in local contexts; the Holmes group as a national entity; and the Holmes Group in the broader policy context of teacher education reform. The report admitted that the latter category, the broader policy context of teacher education reform, was not investigated fully.

The findings - The Holmes Group in local context.

The report uncovered that several institutions joined the Holmes Group to share in the prestige of belonging to a group consisting of America's top research universities. Others felt membership provided not only a platform or agenda, but external validation that their respective college of education was on the right track in respect to teacher education reform.
Most surprising was the fact that the research team was unable to find one Holmes member that had completely implemented the Holmes agenda, even though the Holmes Group had been in existence for a decade. In addition, 92% of the responding members had belonged to Holmes for a minimum of five years.

In the beginning days of Holmes, one was likely to see the chief academic officers (presidents) of universities participating in the Holmes Group meetings. In the Fullan et al. (1996) study, deans had become the most active participants, more active than university faculty. Naturally then, the deans, being more in touch with Holmes, as compared to university faculty, felt the Holmes movement was having a greater impact in their respective colleges of education. Over 95% of deans and faculty in their study supported to some extent the goals and principles in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) and *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990). Only 12% believed that the Holmes Group had given colleges state-based visibility; 31% reported it had provided no state-based visibility.

Clearly, Fullan et al. (1996) reinforced what most scholars had said; the most successful element of the Holmes agenda was its ability to establish stronger relationships with P-12 schools via the Professional Development Schools.
Over 75% of the deans and faculty indicated that P-12 teachers were participating in the reform of pre-service programs, and over half of the college faculty reported they had collaborated with teachers in action research projects. On the downside, the research team noted that although teachers had been involved, decision-making was still the right of the university.

In *The Holmes Group: A Sampling of Member Initiatives and Accomplishments* (1994), 42% reported implementing some form of the extended teacher education program. In a 1996 study, Fullan et al. found that only 36% reported progress on this front. This being one of the group's major goals, it appeared that the majority of its members did not support this recommendation, although several university officers felt this reform would enhance the professional outlook of education.

Another local context issue was meeting the needs of a diverse population, also a goal of the Holmes Group. However, less than 20% felt their teacher candidates were "well-prepared" for the diversity challenge, indicating room for improvement.

Other responses worth reviewing were that only 51% of the deans and 37% of the university faculty reported "considerable progress" on a conceptual framework to steer the teacher preparation program. Fullan et al. (1996) also
reported that research and inquiry had been slow to develop. Surprisingly, only 10% reported using research and inquiry to evaluate their respective teacher education programs doing so with regard to evaluation of teacher education programs (p. 34). Further, only 40% of the deans and faculty attributed the reforms at their institutions to the Holmes agenda (Fullan et al., 1996).

Professional Development Schools (PDSs) appear to have had the most lasting impact on the Holmes Group members. According to the research team, each of the respondents reported having at least one PDS. Fullan et al. (1996) concluded that the PDS concept was not living up to the Holmes criteria for PDSs. One of the more serious obstacles was funding. Most PDSs received no additional funding, making it difficult to pay for teacher release time which would have enhanced collaboration between P-12 and schools of education. Differences in institutional culture between P-12 and the college continued to exist, inhibiting what Goodlad referred to as "simultaneous renewal" and what the Holmes Group desired, viz., "interconnectedness" between P-12 and universities. Brookhart's (1989) research revealed cultural differences that inhibited mutual growth and understanding between the two similar, but yet quite different, cultures. The research team of Fullan et al. concluded that the PDSs by themselves were not sufficient in
changing both cultures. College faculty lacking tenure were less likely to engage in PDS research since it did not contribute to the university system of earning tenure. As was the case in the Holmes Group sampling of accomplishments report, much of the research at PDSs was done by teacher candidates, not college faculty or school teachers. Much of the contact between P-12 and the university was done through clinical faculty, hired by the college to work with the PDS.

The research team of Fullan et al. (1996) went so far to say that on the state level, some states have worked side by side with colleges of education in adopting more rigorous teaching standards, while other states have worked against such standards, making it their goal to place teachers into practice as quickly and cheaply as possible through alternative certification procedures (Fullan et al., 1996).

The Holmes Group as a national entity.

Fullan et al. (1996) found that the majority of deans (62%) and a slight majority of faculty (53%) stated that the Holmes Group had achieved its national goal of initiating teacher education reform. In their review of the data, eight themes emerged that related to the Holmes Group as a national entity. They included: prestige, timing, focus, momentum, equity and diversity, research, ideas versus action, and organizational and leadership issues.
The prestige of having as Holmes Group members America's leading universities helped move the Holmes agenda along. However, at the national level, many institutions that were not invited to the Holmes Group table resented this treatment, and even more so when it became evident that several Holmes Group members were not fully engaged in implementing the Holmes agenda, but many non-members were quite progressive at reforming their teacher education programs (Fullan et al., 1996).

In the 1980s, when educational reform was in the forefront, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) provided much needed direction. The Holmes Group's timing and focus were critical to their initial success. However, as the group entered the 1990s, it began to lose its focus as goals became suggestions or principles, and members not committed to the Holmes Group agenda remained on board in name but not in spirit. The result was a loss in momentum, exacerbated by the four and five years it took to publish *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990) and *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995), respectively. Other voices for reform were beginning to receive attention. Meanwhile, the Holmes Group was unable to move their agenda forward. They were bogged down on issues, such as the extended teacher education program (Fullan et al., 1996).
However, on the issue of equity and diversity, the Holmes Group initially had a slow start, but quickly advanced this portion of their agenda, bringing on board Historically Black Colleges and implementing the Holmes Group Scholars program that supported minority graduate students in the field of education. At the time of the Fullan et al. (1996) report, over 20 Holmes Scholars had earned their doctoral degrees, and 13 were employed in tenure-track academic positions, often recruited by other member Holmes Group institutions.

The research team credited the Holmes Group's emphasis on teacher education research for the growth in this area. The Holmes Group was found to be lacking in the area of research into their own reformed teacher education programs, which presents a real concern, largely considering the fact that Holmes Group members were research institutions. This absence of documentation reinforced the notion that the Holmes Group was stronger on ideas than on action. More time and effort should have been spent on reform implementation, lobbying efforts at the state and national levels, and less emphasis on "finding the right word, as though the right word would move reform along" (Fullan et al., 1996, p.53).

The organizational leadership of the Holmes Group failed to move from an "agenda-creating body to an agenda-implementing body," according to the research team (Fullan
et al., 1996, p. 53). Also uncovered was an organizational weakness, the lack of full-time staff dedicated to agenda implementation and coordination. Much of the administrative work was divided between college staffs and graduate students at Michigan State University, The Ohio State University, and the University of Delaware, causing at times a diffusion in responsibility, breakdowns in communication, and difficulties in database management and accessibility.

The research team made the following suggestions on what would have helped their local reform efforts:

- Increased emphasis on networking,
- More timely communication from the Holmes Group,
- More attention given to reform obstacles and strategies to overcome such,
- Focus national meetings on agenda implementation,
- Document progress

The Holmes Group in the broader policy context.

The Holmes Group was not active as a national organization at the state and national level, although some of its individual members, specifically the deans, were active at these levels. As Fullan et al., (1996) reported, the Holmes Group and its reform agenda did not exist in a vacuum. The team identified a parallel trend of the 1980s. While the Holmes Group was developing more rigorous teacher education programs, some states, such as Texas and South
Carolina, had developed policies that de-emphasized the preparation for the profession.

Texas was mentioned in the Holmes Group sampling of its accomplishments as one state that chose to prohibit teacher certification programs at the graduate level. Fullan et al., (1996) cited a South Carolina example of a state-mandated teacher evaluation system, which required teachers to display 51 behaviors in a 50 minute (or less) class period as an example of bad policy. However, the Holmes Group never responded to public policies that were at odds with the Holmes Group agenda and its objectives.

Revisiting the original questions of the study.

The research team addressed the core issue of the overall effectiveness of the Holmes Group by considering the appropriateness of the Holmes Group's goals, the progress made on their agenda of reform, and the impact the organization had on the outside. These three issues were framed in three questions.

The first question was "How appropriate were the goals of the Holmes Group?" (Fullan et al., 1996, p.62). The research team's conclusion was that the goals, which were to increase the content knowledge and the understanding of pedagogy, and to strengthen the clinical education of teaching candidates, were appropriate and, I would agree. On the issue of the five-year extended teacher education
program, less than half implemented this reform. The research team thought it made sense for the Holmes Group to allow for these adjustments on the local level.

I did not support the team's conclusion that it only made sense to allow for adjustments of the Holmes Group's reforms on the local level, at least not on such a major reform as the extended program. Modifications contributed to confusion on what the Holmes Group stood for, which weakened the organization's cohesiveness and sense of purpose. I was surprised that the research team supported broad modifications at the local level, in light of their statement that "the apparent shifts in the Holmes agenda did contribute to a perceived loss of focus; early clarity gave way to some confusion about what the Holmes Group stood for" (Fullan et al., 1996, p.64). However, in defense of the Holmes Group, they were not in a position to make mandates since they had no authority over their members, and no means to hold them accountable.

The second question the research team of Fullan et al. (1996) asked in order to judge the effectiveness of the Holmes Group was, "What progress have member institutions made with the Holmes Group agenda?"

The team reported:

Consistent with the theme of our report, that is, that the agenda for reform of teacher education has barely
been scratched, we could not say that substantial implementation has been accomplished, nor would we expect that on any scale. (p.64)

The team sounded somewhat apologetic for the Holmes Group in their conclusion, and I was surprised by their phrase, "nor would we expect that on any scale." On the contrary, I would expect an organization that proclaimed to be reform-driven, allied with America's best scholars and research universities, to have made significant progress in a ten-year span. In less than a decade after President Kennedy called for landing a man on the moon, NASA delivered. This was possible due to their belief in the mission, their planning and execution, and coordination of a multitude of interests, from manufacturers, suppliers, engineers, and politicians. Granted, NASA did have access to the resources that it needed to achieve its objective. There was little evidence that the Holmes Group attempted to secure funding or political support at the state or federal level.

The final question the research team of Fullan et al. (1996) addressed was, "What impact has the Holmes Group had on the field of teacher education beyond its own member institutions?" (p.65). Although it is not possible to single out only the impact of the Holmes Group from other influences, the team concurred with their study's interviewees that the Holmes Group had a "considerable
impact" on the discourse on teacher education. I did not conclude that the impact was "considerable," for the reasons that follow. According to the team's own survey results, only 40% of the respondents attributed the reforms at their own institutions to the Holmes Group movement. If less than half of the Holmes Group members felt impacted by the Holmes movement, how could one infer the Holmes Group had a "considerable impact" on non-members? A better explanation, from my perspective, would be that non-members and members of the Holmes Group were affected by the local reform and legislative efforts that were underway before the release of the Holmes Group's *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), spurred on by the release of *A Nation at Risk* (1983)."


I concurred with the conclusion of Fullan et al. (1996) that the Holmes Group and the teacher education reform effort had stalled. I find it remarkable, as did the research team "that most teacher preparation programs still lack coherence" (p.71), considering the wealth of knowledge available on coherent models from such scholars as Darling-Hammond (1996), Zimpher and Howey (1989), and Goodlad (1990), to name a few. The Holmes Group offered a framework for a teacher education program based on five core areas of knowledge, which were:
• human development and young peoples' learning,
• subject matter, technology and pedagogy for young peoples' learning,
• instructional management for young peoples' learning,
• inquiry, reflection, and research and development in the interest of young peoples' learning
• collaboration in support of young peoples' learning


Fullan et al. (1996) believed the first recommendation to jump-start the reform effort would be for colleges to get their programs right, letting P-12 deal primarily with getting school reform right. The secondary and perhaps later responsibility of colleges could be P-12 school reform.

Their second recommendation would be the "establishment of a system for continuous professional development of teachers" (Fullan et al., 1996, p.72). I would expand teachers to include teacher educators and arts and science professors.

Their third recommendation was the "development of a better knowledge base for teaching" (Fullan et al., 1996, p.72). PDSs must become stronger vehicles in contributing to this knowledge basis via action research and reflective inquiry.

The fourth recommendation from Fullan et al. (1996) was to arrange the clutter at the policy and standard setting
level with carefully aligned partnerships that, together, can speak in one coherent voice and have the necessary political clout to implement the agenda. This is an area the new Holmes Partnership is addressing, and takes part of its name from this important strategy.

I concur with the Fullan et al. (1996) study that the Holmes Group was successful in the sense that they developed and promulgated an agenda for teacher education reform. That in itself is a major accomplishment considering the many institutions that had to agree on such things as the Holmes Group's publications. However, it was the intent of the Holmes Group to create change, and to evaluate that effort. It is necessary as well to summarize the downside of the Holmes Group as reported by Fullan et al. (1996).

The downside was as follows:

• Not one Holmes member institution had fully adopted its own agenda, perhaps because the agenda was flawed. Not one Holmes Group member fully implemented the reform agenda, although 80½ of the deans and 71½ of the faculty believed the goals of the Holmes agenda had been achieved to a moderate extent, creating a gap between rhetoric and reality.

• The Holmes Group had little if any influence at the state and federal levels of government.
• Only 42% of the Holmes Group faculty found the first Holmes Group publication to be helpful.
• Only 16% of the Holmes' deans found membership in the Holmes Group to be helpful at the university level in negotiating with provosts or with the college of arts and science.
• Only 40% of the Holmes' faculty attributed reforms at their institution to the Holmes Group.
• Only 51% of Holmes deans and 37% of its faculty reported considerable progress on a conceptual framework to guide their teacher education programs.

Other Change Strategies

Historically, the impact of teacher education has been questioned. This study could have addressed other change strategies, such as:

1. P-12 school reform
2. higher standards
3. more rigorous testing
4. more intensive professional development
5. different governance systems
6. shared leadership training between teachers and administrators.

This study did not review such change strategies because the operating assumption in the Holmes Partnership includes both teacher education and P-12 school reform in a holistic
manner. The Holmes Partnership agenda also understands that teacher education is a seamless process, from preservice to the critical induction years, and beyond. Therefore, the Holmes Partnership has integrated many of these change efforts into their agenda.

The Holmes Partnership Change Strategy

As this and other studies have reinforced, the Holmes Group was successful in creating an agenda but were not as successful in implementing it. The lack of progress was attributed to the lack of a critical mass of faculty and outside alliances that could assist in overcoming the obstacles to reform. The change strategy of the new Holmes Partnership is to work for reform through its national partners and local P-12 school partnerships. Through these partnerships, the objective is to encourage stable leadership. On the local level in particular, the objective is to form on-going leadership or renewal teams, representative of higher education and P-12 school interests, dedicated to simultaneous renewal of both entities.

Summary

The Holmes Group’s objectives were labeled as goals, and then later were referred to as principles. This was seen by some as a weakening in the organization’s resolve to hold its members accountable to its own reform package.
This may have contributed to a lack of clarity in the stated purpose of the Holmes Group. The Holmes Group did succeed in putting forth an agenda, the first of its kind developed by insiders to education, not outsiders. However, it might have been more effective to include so-called outsiders, such as legislators, to expand upon the level of support.

In my view, the new Holmes Partnership, in order to implement its’ goals, must lead, and lead vigorously, holding its members’ feet to the fire, or lose the Holmes Partnership seal of approval. If the Holmes Partnership develops the standards and the programs that society needs and demands, market forces can become powerful allies in the process of change and reform. Institutes who don't raise the standard to the level that the Holmes Partnership proposes may find potential P-12 employers seeking out the Holmes Partnership institutes instead.

First, the Holmes Partnership must ensure that their agenda is acceptable to the public, and to themselves. Currently, parts of the agenda are over ten years old. Most importantly, the findings of Fullan et al.(1996) suggested that many stakeholders at the higher education level do not find the Holmes Partnership reform agenda totally useful or relevant. The new Holmes Partnership has begun to revisit the original Holmes Group agenda, and this is discussed in detail in chapter four. First, however, the general context
for change is examined as the new Holmes Partnership does not exist in a vacuum influenced only by its internal organizational behavior.

In chapter three, I provide a review of general trends and issues in higher education, followed by a review of trends and issues in P-12 schools. Second, I will also provide a summary of the specific trends and issues affecting colleges of education. Finally, I look briefly at the future of state and land-grant universities, since these are predominantly represented in the Holmes Partnership, and those issues that are related to teacher education programs will be discussed as well.
Chapter 3
The Context for Change

Chapter 3 summarizes the context for change for institutes of higher education, P-12 schools, colleges of education, and teacher education programs.

Trends in Higher Education: A European Perspective on Future Universities

"Think global, act locally", has been one of the driving thoughts of the 1990s. Even the Holmes Partnership at their 1997 annual meeting had as a topic of discussion "International Issues," exploring such questions as "What does the Holmes agenda mean to international partners? What are the benefits for Holmes?" (Gateway Conference article, Holmes Internet website, June 1997). Naturally, cultures affect and influence each other, and will continue to do so even more as the world becomes more connected to each other via technology and our common interests. I thought it would be helpful in thinking about the future of the Holmes Partnership to look beyond our borders and see what general
trends and issues were in our more historical European universities.

To gain some insight into the trends and issues that might shape the future of European colleges and universities, I explored the following sources. The first source, *Universities of Tomorrow*, was written by Professor Sir Graham Hills (1994) of the United Kingdom. Hills' work is a sanctioned study of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, located in the European Centre for Higher Education in Bucharest, Romania. He wrote that the "future is likely to owe surprisingly little to a past rooted in religious foundations, the sanctity of knowledge, and the dependent status of students" (p.2).

The other source, *Upside-Down Thinking: About the 21st Century Academic Workplace* appeared in the American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) journal (Edgerton, 1993). Edgerton interviewed Charles Handy, a visiting professor at the London Business School. Handy had been described by Fortune magazine as an "intellectual bombthrower" (p.3).

Hills (1994) reported the 'collective' thinking represented at the European-United Nations meeting on the future of higher education. Topics such as mission, staffing, program content, student choice, and technology
were central topics. In regard to mission, Hills was critical of the slowness of higher education to accept the position that "knowledge transfer and knowledge accumulation are a less important aspect of the student's experience than acquiring the skills of learning, of understanding, and of presentation, none of which can be acquired in the lecture hall" (p.9). Formerly, it was the role of higher education in Europe to gather information, improve upon it, and pass it on, but the new role is to train students to utilize and manage a universal data base of knowledge. Hills also mentioned the industry practice of hiring a full-time core staff, and outsourcing services that can be delivered by part-time staff or consultants.

Handy underscored the practice of outsourcing and a core staff as a real possibility for higher education (Edgerton, 1993). An example of that applied in the Holmes Partnership membership might be a college hiring master P-12 teachers to become student teacher supervisors and instructors, as opposed to the traditional use of college teacher educators.

The United Nations study on higher education in Europe (1994) addressed the content of higher education's programs. The study listed skills that future citizens must learn, such as computation and keyboarding, simulation, analysis, mathematics, management, finance, legal understanding,
social adeptness, and good behavior, i.e., ethics training, civic responsibilities. The study argued for a continued emphasis on education and training; for example, a humanities student would also be expected to be computer literate and a scientist would be expected to develop literary skills. This emphasis on skills, along with the education, is what the study felt contributed to the manufacturing prowess of countries such as the U.S. and Japan, and the European countries as well. Imagination is not sufficient without an "intellectual toolkit" to utilize imagination (Hills, 1994).

The study reported a preference for a common U.S. model, and the former Scotland model, where students first earn a general degree before specializing. In the United Kingdom, the practice is to specialize first, which Hills (1994) believed at times lead to disappointment, a wasting of resources, and early obsolescence in student knowledge. The study advocated the content of education be pyramidal in shape, broad-based at the beginning or the bottom, and leading to the higher point of specialization. It was felt this delay in specializing would allow a student to mature, becoming more certain of their interests prior to advance work. This position resembles the extended program that
many in the Holmes Partnership advocates for teacher preparation.

With the advancement of technology in the form of telecommunications and the internet, students are more inclined to have knowledge brought to them. The Open University in The United Kingdom, which started as the Open University of the Air, which broadcasts over radio, is a case in point. Currently, students can access higher education services via television and through electronic networks. Handy exclaimed, "If you go to the Open University in Britain, there's nobody there...well, that's not quite true. There are core managers and the core administrators and an enormous printing business" (Edgerton, 1993, p.7). Handy also mentions a new business school started at Cambridge. Students are only on campus one semester in three. Their time is spent in the field, and meeting with tutors, one at work, and the other at the university (Edgerton, 1993). This model has potential for use with the Holmes Partnership PDS, or as an immersion model for teaching candidates to participate in an extended multicultural experience.

One radical departure from traditional higher education is that the right to choose has been given to the student. Acting on the advice of tutors, teachers, parents, or friends, students can pick and choose from a menu of
packaged courses, creating an integrated program based on
the accumulation of credits. Hills (1994) stated, "Credits
themselves could be transferred and the doors opened to a
user-friendly system of higher education, almost infinitely
flexible in content, time, and space" (p.12). Students can
also choose the mode of delivery in their learning, by
traditional lectures, tutorials, and laboratory experiences.
Another choice is known as open learning at the Open
University, where students learn at their own rate, through
interactions with 24-hour computer learning stations.

Hills (1994) and the study saw this system as one that
is responsive to market forces, providing students the
opportunity of building "broader platforms on which to build
their uncertain futures" p.(13). Hills argued that
traditional higher education is too rigid, and that student
choice was the best guarantee that higher education would
evolve, which would consequently better insulate higher
education from coercion by the government and other pressure
groups.

Although it is not common in the U.S. to allow students
to choose most of their courses and build their own major,
it does occur to some degree, such as at Brown University,
the prestigious private Ivy institution. At Brown, students
are not required to take any core courses, and they may
choose to enroll in any class on a pass/no credit basis.
This has created an incentive for students to try courses they might not have tried due to the fear of hurting their grade-point average (Caruso, 1997). On the issue of teacher selectivity, such an option might encourage those who have selected education by 'default' to sample courses outside education, thus allowing them to switch more appropriately to another field. This would spare the profession from gaining one more teacher who lacks the attributes for successful teaching.

Hills (1994) and the U.N. study anticipated the criticism for student choice. He did not believe the outcome would be students running the universities anymore than airline passengers run the airlines. He did believe that student choice would accelerate change by their rejection of what was no longer relevant in the market.

Far more radical was the proposal offered by Hills (1994) that "financial support by government of public universities be channeled through the students, allowing them to purchase their education at the university of their choice..."(p.23). In the U.S., this idea has been suggested mainly for the P-12 schools in the form of tax vouchers. Hills argued that it was unwise to subsidize the supplier, that most of the management inefficiencies could be traced to that single factor. He stated "new funding proposals will not settle all issues, only most of them" (p.24). He
argued passionately that higher education should not be immune to the principles of total quality management, which begin with identifying the customer, and ends with customer satisfaction. If the Holmes Partnership wants to hold its members accountable to organizational goals, it could take an even bolder step and propose standards that would hold members accountable to their customers, according to the primary total quality management principle, which is customer satisfaction. Instead, the Holmes Partnership reform agenda is silent on such concepts as total quality management, or reengineering, as if to imply that there is no room for improvement in how its members delivers its services to students. This could well reinforce in the minds of teaching candidates that when it comes to reform or continual improvement, the status quo is still acceptable.

On the topic of student learning, Handy makes an argument against passive learning. He stated, "we force-feed our students, tell them what to do, where to go, what to learn, how to learn it, what to read, what tests to take. Their role is to react" (Edgerton, 1993, p.6). Handy continued by making the case that data should not be handed over to the student. Handy believed that anybody can interpret data. The more relevant educational issue is knowing what data to collect, and how to collect it. Handy posited "the skill that you need is one of reframing, of
looking at things in a different way, of seeing what the real problem is and coming up with imaginative and unthought-of answers to questions that teachers of ten years ago didn't know existed" (Edgerton, p.6). Handy believed this type of student-initiated learning, where the teacher serves as facilitator presents a chaotic situation for teachers and professors I might add, since they are not prepared to teach in this type of learning environment. Specifically, Handy wants to see the "student as worker, rather than student as just a student...I want the student to be... solving problems... and creating initiatives" (Edgerton, p.6). Student as worker, serving in teams as Handy suggested, would be difficult to organize and evaluate, but Handy believed learning should move that direction anyway. University schedules should be more reflective of most organizations, i.e., people working all the time, taking breaks at different times instead of all at once. Students, working on real-life problems in their studies cannot arbitrarily stop this form of study in May, and hope to pick it up again in stride in September (Edgerton, 1993).

Handy believed the core task of education is "to improve people's capacity to make a difference in the situations they find themselves, using a whole range of skills" (Edgerton, 1993, p.6). The role of the professors
in this learning environment would be to serve as coaches and mentors, rather than subject experts. Handy suggested that the university subject experts be contracted out, pulling them back when needed. Large lectures would be out and interactive course technology would be contracted, catering more to the individual. In some organizations, the experts would be on the outside of the organization, pulled in through the use of media.

Overall, Handy, concluded that the key to learning is in the development of a learning vehicle, which in itself becomes the educational task. The key university people become educational designers, and then educational managers (Edgerton, 1993). The experts are in the wings, which could cause upheavals in the power structure of higher education. For teacher educators, and other practitioners in colleges and departments of education, power struggles would be inevitable in this scenario as they strive to achieve the same status as their expert peers who focus primarily on the scholarly pursuit of research and publishing.

The Higher Education Context

Listen to the voices. Many sound ominous warnings and the need for higher education to be more responsive to reform. "Either address change and take advantage of the unique opportunity it offers you to successfully serve your
enterprise, or face consequences that can range from the loss of your organization's important role in the enterprise to the loss of your job..." (Morino, 1988, p.74). "External forces are dramatically changing the public's aspirations and expectations vis-à-vis higher education institutions. And the system's perceived inability to respond effectively is seriously eroding public confidence" (Smith, 1991, p. 26). Some have referred to a "credential crisis," citing the fact that many college graduates can no longer be assured of employment after graduation, causing students to return to graduate school to improve their credentials. Ballantine (1993) stated:

> the image of college and university as a sure route to the better life is losing ground. This narrowing gap between high school and college credentials is directly related to the failure of the economy to provide more and higher-paying jobs for the larger number of college graduates." (p.284)

Katz and West (1992) encapsulated many of the trends and issues facing higher education as it prepares to enter the 21st century. Whether or not higher education can achieve excellence will be dependent upon the development of learning organizations that balance instruction, research, and community service. Success will be determined by how effectively higher education responds to such forces as
demographic change, the empowerment of constituents, constraints on leadership, and the pressure to cut costs.

Perhaps it was not this complicated in higher education's earlier days when its main mission was primarily the transmission of knowledge to students, as it was done in the 12th and 13th centuries at colleges such as Oxford and Cambridge University in England, where many of today's traditions of higher education can be traced. In that environment, other than time spent in instruction, time and attention was devoted to maintaining a balance between church and state. In the 19th century tension was evident when research became a mission of higher education, alongside instruction. Tension was the result of conflicting interests between professors, and the division of time between instruction, students, and research (Ballantine, 1993).

In the 1980s, it became evident that higher education's environment had changed, and it had become less friendly in the process, according to Penrod and Dolence (1992). Access to the public's higher education institutions was tightening due to higher admission requirements and reductions in state funding and tuition increases. College costs had risen faster than the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI). Two-thirds of the states had reduced their appropriations to higher education. More of
the public were being critical of not only increase in costs, but some sought more accountability, seeking to link state funding with student outcomes and other institutional measures of performance. No longer were resource providers being swayed by arguments that cuts in funding would result in "immediate and irreparable diminution in the quality of education." From the eyes of the external forces, the public wanted more value for their education dollars, and policy-makers added to the pressure by calling for an increase in higher education productivity.

Adams and Palmer (1993) summarized higher education's response to rising costs and reduced funding. They found that higher education raised tuition, accessed retirement funds, and utilized their reserve accounts. Approximately 70% left vacant positions unfilled.

Adams and Palmer (1993) added that higher education could begin to address these woes by expanding their markets globally and by placing more emphasis on diversity. They pointed out the foci of recruitment and admission drives are traditionally the 18-to-24-year old students in the United States. More emphasis could be placed on capturing the over-25-year-old students who already represent approximately a third of today's college students. "Diversity," according to Adams and Palmer, "must be reflected in multiculturalism, a wide range of student ages, and part-time as well as full-
time students" (p.24). In order to make it to the year 2000, higher education must accomplish more with less, becoming "lean and mean," while also expanding upon their mission of teaching, research, and community service. Technology, generally under-utilized by higher education, may prove to be a cost-effective tool.

The mission of higher education was challenged.

In a Carnegie Foundation report, authored by Boyer (1990), cited frequently here because it represented the thinking of more than one scholar, Boyer stressed the need for linking the work of higher education to the social and environmental challenges of the community. He felt that more emphasis should be placed on community service and teaching, and that to do so, a redefined faculty reward system would be required. These recommendations closely paralleled similar recommendations of the Holmes Partnership, such as linking higher education, its faculty, and research to a P-12 community school by making it a Professional Development School (PDS), and by making such field work more rewarding to college faculty by redefining the criteria for tenure, placing more emphasis on teaching and service.

Penrod and Dolence (1992) agreed with Boyer, and emphasized that the mission of higher education, teaching, research, and public service must be reasserted. They added
that the mission of higher education could be enhanced by a more business-like culture that stressed service, quality, and cost containment, adding that paperwork and procedures could be reduced and simplified, and that employees at lower levels should be empowered to make routine decisions.

To expand on his notion of scholarship, Boyer (1990) suggested that graduate students could connect with society through field-based programs, as in medicine, business, law, and education. Boyer and his colleagues were impressed with the clinical experiences and apprenticeships in these programs, thus, Boyer would probably applaud the Holmes Partnership's emphasis on field work, i.e., the PDS.

Boyer (1990) also pointed out the need for graduate schools to make teaching a priority. Too many times the best graduate students were rewarded by not having to teach and were given research assistantships instead. The solution, according to some, is to create a Doctor of Arts degree just for those interested in college teaching. Boyer argued that a new degree is not needed if current graduate programs would change, placing more emphasis on teaching. Able (1972) attributed this disdain for teaching to graduate training, and suggested graduates be formally prepared for college teaching as an element of their program.

Stanley (1989), of the Ford Foundation, suggested that scholars direct their inquiry more at society, just as the
Holmes Partnership suggests more research be directed in the context of P-12 schools. He also suggested scholarly writing should be written so that it was more accessible to serious lay readers. This could be done by making complex issues more understandable. This in itself, according to Stanley, was providing a service to society. Stanley's suggestion has value regardless of whether the audience is scholars or practitioners. If research findings are to be utilized, they must be presented in a form that makes them more accessible to practitioners, in our case, P-12 teachers.

Before leaving Boyer (1990), allow me to review his main theme: that discovery alone should not stand above the other forms of scholarship and that teaching, integration, and application must be considered equals. In doing so, Boyer believed that the next generation of scholars was assured, that they will be more "vibrant" and "more responsive" to the needs of our society. Putting these forms of scholarship on more equal footing will be dependent upon the leadership at the top. The president of the institution must support not only aggressive recruiting, but must also assure that these students, once enrolled, will be given the full support of the institute (Boyer, 1990).

Boyer (1990) enlarged not only the concept of scholarship, but also the vision, and thus, the mission of higher education when he stated "to sustain the vitality of
higher education in our time, a new vision of scholarship is required, one dedicated not only to the renewal of the academy, but ultimately, to the renewal of society" (p.81).

Young (1994), former chancellor of the University of Arkansas-Little Rock, echoed Boyer's sentiments. He stated that curriculum reform must include an extension into the field of experience, into the communities the university is committed to serve. Many states have more than their share of problems and critical needs, in the areas of economic development, environmental protection, human services, human resource development, and education.

Young (1994) suggested the gap between learning and the real world can be bridged by utilizing the talents of young scholars, which also carries with it the lesson that along with one's personal interests, a scholar still has civic responsibilities and obligations. "The need for leadership," according to Young (1994), "and for the capacity to analyze problems and develop solutions, has never been clearer" (p.11). Action research directed at real problems within the context of P-12 schools, linking research with community service, is a Holmes Partnership strategy that closely resembles the position taken by Boyer (1990) and Young (1994). In the urban environment, there is no shortage of problems that higher education could direct their time and expertise toward.
Urban renewal and the mission of higher education.

If one viewed the urban arena from a systems theory perspective, you could not ignore the plight of urban America. For as the city goes, so goes suburbia. Urban decline is an interest to those in sociology, human services, criminal justice, and education, to name a few. For education, one of the most significant problems has been attracting new and diverse teachers into the urban city schools to service the educational needs of the urban dwellers, according to the Research About Teacher Education (RATE) studies.

Urban America, in recent history, has not been the focus of higher education's mission. Boyer (1990) suggested that the interests of higher education are no longer the interests of the nation. Harkavy and Puckett (1994) believed that the work of higher education is the least impressive on research topics where the communities' need for new knowledge and understanding are the greatest.

Harkavy and Puckett (1994) would not have higher education retreat from its urban responsibilities, but would challenge universities to engage in urban renewal for four reasons. The first reason was that engaging in urban renewal was in the best interest of the institution. Ensuring the campus area was safe, clean and attractive was a way to attract and retain faculty and students. The second
reason would be the costs borne by the institution, be it financial or political, for remaining inactive as the conditions in the urban environment worsen. Increasingly so, the public will evaluate the university on the basis of how the society has benefited from the institution.

The third reason for universities to engage in urban renewal was the opportunity that presented itself to advance knowledge, teaching, and human welfare through an academically-based community service that was focused on improving the social condition in the local community (Harkavy & Puckett, 1994). As Boyer (1990) proposed, this type of involvement would lead to the integration of research, teaching, and service, very similar in purpose to the Holmes Partnership's Professional Development Schools (PDS).

Finally, Harkavy and Puckett's (1994) fourth reason for higher education to engage itself in urban renewal was to promote a sense of civic consciousness by involving the faculty and students in the community. Traditionally, higher education has stood for building values in society, standing as a moral force or organization in society. As Harkavy and Puckett stated, "the separation of universities from society, their aloofness from real-world problems, has deprived universities of contact with a necessary source of genuine creativity and academic vitality" (p.300). The more
enlightened academics viewed the city as their laboratory, rich in data, waiting to be plucked and sorted. Society's phenomena could be witnessed firsthand.

Higher education's dilemma whether or not to fully engage itself in real-world problems is not a choice at all, just as it is not a choice for the Holmes Partnership to partner with P-12 and their real-world problems. Instead, involvement is a life-sustaining necessity that assures the university relevance and usefulness in the eyes of society, the source of its life-sustaining funding. In a world of systems and sub-systems, one can not survive without the other. Harkavy and Puckett (1994) posit, "The complex problems of urban society necessitate a radical reorientation and reinvention of the urban American university to become once again, a mission-oriented institution devoted to the use of reason to improve the human condition" (p.301).

Tenure: Its impact on teaching.

When considering the trends and issues in higher education, certainly how faculty earn tenure has become a debated issue in the academy. Tenure itself has been at the center of discussion, but primarily, what has been examined at length is how tenure is earned. It is logical to conclude that whatever the university rewards would be an indication of what the university values from its faculty.
Clearly, the literature indicated that teaching and community service were not valued as highly as research and publishing in the tenure and promotion systems in research-oriented institutes ("Restructuring the University Reward System", 1997). According to the Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum Task Force in Restructuring the University Reward System (1997) the emphasis on research in the tenure and promotion systems of higher education was the by-product of the last 50 years of government research awards.

The Sid W. Richardson Foundation's two-year study surveyed 156 universities, randomly selected from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and Teacher Education Council of State Colleges. Based on the 800 returned questionnaires from a representative sample of university administration and faculty, the study concluded that faculty perceived research was more of a determining factor to achieving tenure and promotion rather than excellent teaching or service.

In the realm of teacher education at the university level, many professors who supervise preservice teachers are not tenured, and do not feel their work is valued by the institution (Research About Teacher Education (RATE) IV, 1991). Only a quarter of those teacher educators responding in RATE IV who supervised preservice teachers reported having tenure, another indication that the preparation of
teachers was not highly valued, a concern of the Holmes Partnership.

Tenure, and the lack of emphasis placed on teaching and service, is being debated in many institutions of higher learning across the United States, not just the Holmes Partnership. Boyer, in his Carnegie study Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate (1990), stated that tenure did not reward quality teaching. He believed that university students are assured that teaching is important on campus in slick marketing brochures, and that general education was the backbone of the undergraduate experience, but in reality, excellent teaching and student-centeredness were not well-rewarded in the tenure and promotion process. Therefore, it would seem that teaching, in general, either in general education, or in the preparation of new teachers, is still not held in high esteem.

In terms of the research emphasis on tenure, Schon (1995) advocated action research as a new form of scholarship, based on reflective practice to be considered as well. He favored this form of scholarship, as does the Holmes Partnership. Legitimizing action research as a form of scholarship, as opposed to the more traditional methodology found in research universities, could be helpful to teacher educators in three ways: one in securing tenure,
second, in distributing knowledge based on practice, and, lastly, integrating scholarship with community service.

Boyer (1990) reported that 83% of U.S. research university faculty agreed that it was difficult to earn tenure if they did not publish, while only 24% of the liberal arts college faculty agreed, evidence of obvious variation among institutions. Demonstrating an apparent disregard for teaching in the research universities, Boyer reported that 45% of liberal arts faculty reported that student evaluations of teaching were very important for earning tenure but only 10% of faculty in research universities shared this perspective. The Holmes Partnership consists mainly of research universities, not liberal arts colleges. Perhaps without such liberal arts colleges to serve as models, it will remain difficult for the Holmes Partnership to emulate a culture that values teaching as much, if not more than research.

Nor does it appear that the present tenure and promotion system encourages collaboration between professors in their teaching and research roles. Consider the scenario of the "invisible professors". One professor devotes his/her energy to collaborating with practitioners in the field, and becomes well-known in that arena, but virtually invisible, or unknown in the academic research community. The same can be said for the professor who spends much time
in scholarly matters such as research and publishing, becoming largely invisible to the other professor who is field-oriented. In some professions, this may not be significant, but in the fields of education, agriculture, and medicine, collaboration between all stakeholders is critical to theory and practice ("Restructuring the University Reward System", 1997).

Improving collaboration in higher education between those who prefer research and publishing and those who work in the field, such as the teacher educators in the PDS will continue to be a struggle for the Holmes Partnership. It should not be a matter of one or the other; research, teaching, and service go hand in hand. Effective tenure and promotion strategies, especially for those in teacher education, would provide incentives to professors to collaborate across departments, and to conduct more action-oriented research in the natural environment, resulting in school and community service. Revised tenure and promotion strategies would strengthen teacher educators who are conducting action research and would also provide a community service in Professional Development Schools as the Holmes Partnership continues to advocate (Tomorrow's Schools, 1990).
Undergraduate education.

A trend in the 1990s on the campuses across the nation was the attention given to undergraduate education. The Holmes Partnership, for example, emphasized more subject content at the undergraduate level, reserving professional courses for an extended graduate program (Tomorrow's Teachers, 1986). The debate across campuses has centered on three main issues: the core curriculum, the quality of campus life, and the priority assigned to teaching, or in other words, how faculty spend their time (Boyer, 1990).

At the undergraduate level, it has been argued that the traditional departmental major, so prevalent on campuses, may be becoming less relevant, and that more consideration should be given to a broad-based field of study. Pelikan, former dean of the Yale Graduate School, advocated a complete overhaul of undergraduate education (1983). His rationale for a more broad-based study was due to the growing demand for interdisciplinary research. This format, in his view, would provide a better footing for the student at the graduate level. Boyer (1990) argued that students should be encouraged to work across subject areas, integrating knowledge in order to gain a broader perspective, and larger insights, arguing that the need for interdisciplinary perspective has increased.
Integrative thinking should be encouraged even in dissertations, according to Boyer (1990). As it stands now, doctoral students are discouraged from interjecting their own ideas, and instead, are directed to remain focused on an isolated topic. Doctoral candidates should be encouraged to editorialize and be given more credit for independent thinking, perhaps dedicating a portion of their dissertation to this end. Along with representatives from the candidate's field of study, Boyer proposed that other fields should be represented at the oral exam in order to promote an integrative process. Graduate students should be directed to mentor with faculty known for quality instruction, thus better preparing graduate students for instruction at the higher education level.

Providing quality doctoral programs for the future education professoriate is a priority for the Holmes Partnership. Since the 1984 Carnegie Foundation survey, Boyer (1990) reported that career prospects for the professoriate may be improving, based on the results of his 1989 survey and the fact that vast numbers of professors who started their careers after World War II will soon face retirement. Already, some are predicting a shortage of professors by the beginning of the 21st century, especially in the humanities and the social sciences. To prepare for these opportunities, Boyer (1990) believed these scholars
must be provided a liberal education. In addition, they must be able to communicate, to think creatively, have the ability to integrate ideas, to connect thoughts to action, and be able to inspire students.

Finally, Boyer (1990) suggested that the professoriate cannot be effective in the future by working in isolation. It will require a team approach, a community of scholars, to address the intertwined social, economic, and political problems that exist in modern society. These problems are interrelated, and to be solved, future scholars must be willing and able to understand the interdependent workings of their world. Future preparation of the education professoriate for the Holmes Partnership members might involve preparation that integrates knowledge and practice from multiple disciplines, and would require instructional preparation in effective teaching.

Common demographic trends and issues for higher education.

Many of the nation's largest universities, if they were corporations, could be listed among Fortune magazine's 500 largest firms (Katz & West, 1992). I mention this fact because their size and the multitude of interests that must be satisfied can cause them to become entrenched, hindering the organization's ability to respond to the winds of
change. This would not be a good sign for higher education, for the winds of demographic change are sweeping across the campuses. Success or failure will depend upon whether or not higher education recognizes and understands market forces and responds appropriately. Those who ignore external forces in the 21st century may find it increasingly difficult to compete in an age of limited resources and might cease to exist.

Consider the demographic forces. Population growth in the 1990s is projected to be the least of any decade in the 20th century, shrinking the market of the traditional college-bound youth. California, Florida, and the sunbelt states are expected to continue to experience population growth, while other regions of the U.S. such as the Midwest and New England are projected to experience little growth.

Since 1970, enrollment in higher education has increased more than 50% resulting in approximately 3,500 institutions (156 universities, 1,953 four-year colleges, 1,378 two-year colleges and technical schools). For some institutions of higher education, demographic changes may mean continued growth similar to the pattern since 1970, depending on regions, while others may have more capacity than demand, which will result in the need for further cost-cutting measures (Ballantine, 1993). With the increasing cost in tuition, access to higher education will become an
issue, accompanied by pressure to curb costs while increasing quality.

One possible area for cost-cutting is degree programs. More than 100 new degree programs have been added every decade since the 1950s. The potential to reduce capacity and programs is significant (Katz & West, 1992; Penrod & Dolence, 1992). As major hospitals have done in some metropolitan areas, private and public colleges and universities may find it helpful to cooperate rather than to compete with one another. Adams, when writing about the future of higher education (1993), stated, "One-third of the graduate students at Carnegie-Mellon University enrolled in a cognitive psychology class are actually students at the University of Pittsburgh" (p.24).

In the 21st century, experts expect the composition and size of the U.S. labor pool and college student body to be significantly different than the past. Overall, there will be increasing participation of women, minorities, and international students. As opportunities decrease for 35- to 54-year-old people, there is a likelihood that some of these students will return to higher education to improve their credentials or to prepare for new careers. To fill their seats, higher education must look beyond the traditional group of high school graduates for their future customers. Presently, two-fifths of the student population
attend college part-time, and a third are over 25 years old. Higher education must expand their definition of diversity to be more multi-cultural to include not just more minorities, but, a wide-range of students who vary in age, who attend either part-time or full-time, or originate from other countries (Adams and Palmer, 1993).

A somewhat overlooked factor in the literature is that higher education may be competing with business and industry for the same students, even before high school graduation, especially if unemployment rates continue to remain low. This is one more reason why higher education will have to be more aggressive in the marketplace, understanding trends and needs, and responding accordingly.

Another emerging trend has been the popularity of the two-year community colleges. On the surface, community colleges would appear to be a natural source for students for four-year institutions. In 1992, half of the 14 million students attending college did so at a community college, including a significant number of minorities, which could be a significant recruiting pool for the members of the Holmes Partnership. This appears not to be the case as only 12% of

---

1 Approximately 400,000 international students attend U.S. institutions for higher learning, representing 193 different countries (Adams and Palmer, 1993). Organizations, such as The Holmes Partnership is considering a potential international role (Murray, 1996).
all community college students ever graduate from a four-
year institution (Ballantine, 1993).

Conflict theorists would argue that community colleges
take on the properties of a barrier, blocking marginal
students, often minorities, from attending four-year
programs, when they should be providing remedial assistance
to its students. Community colleges have begun to cater
more to corporate and vocational training, thus weakening
the more traditional liberal arts programs that attempt to
prepare students for the four-year institution (Ballantine,
1993). This trend makes it even more difficult for four-
year institutions to achieve diversity in their student
ranks, and ultimately, in the under-represented professions,
such as education. The issue of accessibility and retention
will compound as minorities are expected to make up nearly
40% of the traditional age group for college-bound students,
from 18 to 24 years old. Remediation and counseling should
be given a higher priority, especially at the community
college level, since this is the entry level for many
marginal, or at-risk students.

Katz and West (1992) referred to this as "strategic
enrollment management" and suggested that future
universities must be capable of recognizing students in
trouble and respond accordingly in a meaningful way. Katz
and West added that higher education must be capable of
providing service levels that make institutes of higher education competitive, which would require the institute to be re-engineered from the ground up. There is little evidence to suggest that the Holmes Partnership or its members have recognized the need to re-engineer from the ground up in order to improve the services and the teacher education programs offered to constituents.

**Infrastructure and management trends in higher education.**

Although it is not a part of the infrastructure, forces labeled as student-consumerism or student-choice could break the mold of infrastructures as we know it today. It is interesting to note that this force has been noted both in Europe and the U.S. (Boyer, 1990; Hills, 1994; Penrod & Dolence, 1992). To remain competitive, business and industry responded to consumers' calls for increased quality in products and services. Generally, this has caused an increase in expectations from higher education's customers, specifically its students and those who would hire them.

To remain competitive, higher education must first reinvent itself, then constantly seek improvement thereafter (Pedigo, 1994). In the years between 1975 and 1985, administrative functions increased by 60% as compared to a faculty growth of 6%. As administrators spent more time facilitating expanding government regulations, faculty
drifted away from institutional goals and placed greater emphasis on research, publication, and personal pursuits. Institutions are beginning to realize that layers of administration and regulations can be reduced or terminated with little sacrifice in overall service (Pedigo, 1994). Some institutions are experimenting with outsourcing or privatizing, which is the contracting out for administrative services to third parties, citing that fewer administrators are needed to oversee third party contracts. Outsourcing is also seen as a means of strengthening ties with local business, which could lead to partnerships for joint research projects, improved administrative productivity, and technology transfer (Penrod & Dolence, 1992).

To improve productivity in academe, some institutes are resorting to a strategy known as "growth by substitution", which reallocates resources from a less productive program to a new project. This, according to Penrod and Dolence (1992), "flies in the face, of the prevalent historic academic philosophy: 'Any service we offer, must be offered in perpetuity'" (p.13).

Katz and West (1992) referred to the "fast-cycle capability" to enhance productivity. The main principle is to build speed into the operating system of higher education and into the attitudes of its personnel. "Fast-cycle capability optimizes organizational activities by designing
and enforcing organizations that perform without bottlenecks, delays, and errors" (Key & West, p.13). There is no evidence to suggest that the Holmes Partnership is interested in such 'productivity' issues that cause bottlenecks, delays, and errors for the constituents of higher education, but perhaps they need to show more interest here. In the business culture, productivity is an issue for every employee, and management is held accountable. In education, it is unclear who is held accountable for productivity issues. Improving productivity in higher education can lead to savings in time and resources that could be re-allocated to resource-starved programs, such as the PDS.

Multifunctional teams are one example of decreasing the time required on complex projects (Katz & West, 1992). For example, a multifunctional team could be utilized in the implementation of a Holmes Partnership PDS. This concept was borrowed from enlightened manufacturing which shortened delivery times on new products, increased productivity, and reduced operating costs. Various department representatives are integrated into one task force, as opposed to one department completing its task, then throwing it over the wall to the next department. This concept places new demands on human resources for campuses, requiring its employees to be broadly educated and trained. Rewards would
be linked with the results of the multifunctional teams, measured by the impact on campus objectives, attainment of defined objectives, the quality of the service rendered, and the speed in which it was accomplished.

Future universities' infrastructures will be noted for their flexibility. Today's multi-layered hierarchies and governance structures, according to Katz and West (1992), "can diffuse accountability for decisions and actions, and retard the speed and flow of critical information and decisions" (p.14). The need to decentralize is a growing trend in higher education. Katz (1992) stated the case for decentralization by explaining that the decision makers in the hierarchy of higher education can become overloaded by the upward delegation of tasks and decisions. The problem is compounded as the issues and the surrounding environment become more complex.

The bureaucratic model, which some institutes of higher education resemble, is known for such concepts as specific job descriptions, division of specialized labor, narrow delegations of authority, and a complex procedural environment (Hoy & Miskel, 1991; Katz & West, 1992; Owens, 1991). Problems resulting from this model are "(a) procedural redundancy; (b) substantial organizational layering; (c) a high reliance on paper and forms to document decisions, transactions, and approvals; and (d) diminished
employee job satisfaction" (Katz & West, p.14). These problems, along with higher education's unique system of shared governance, creates additional complexities and delays when attempting to implement a set of goals such as the Holmes Partnership's reform agenda.

Management and infrastructure trends in higher education are numerous and more could be listed. Penrod and Dolence (1992) provided an adequate summary to the challenges facing not only the members of the Holmes Partnerships, but the management and infrastructure of higher education in general. They concluded that higher education must be responsive to the rising expectations of consumers and decreased funding, but added that total quality management programs fall short of the desired goal.

A commitment to true transformation will require institutional analysis far more critical than that required by an accreditation visit.... Unless colleges and universities significantly shift their modes of administration, the confidence of our constituents and the general public will in all probability continue to erode. (p.19)

As the Holmes Partnership seeks to reform teacher education programs, they must also consider the possibility that their management and service delivery systems need transformed as well.
Technology trends and issues for higher education.

Adams and Palmer (1993) proclaimed that the age of technology exploded across the country, but higher education has not remained current with the methodology of delivering knowledge. RATE IV (1991) and subsequent studies have confirmed that teacher education programs have not tapped the potential of technology, nor is technology listed in the Holmes Partnership's recent action plan that listed their immediate priorities. Arnold and Palmer stated:

At forward-thinking institutions today, education involves multimedia, computer-assisted devices, interactive processing, and the broadcast of education to off-campus students, as well as the re-education of older students. (p.24)

At the same time, we have all experienced at some time or another the frustration of automated answering systems at large and, more recently, even smaller businesses and organizations. As technology is considered and implemented, it is important to balance the use of technology with personal contact with constituents (Penrod & Dolence, 1992). John Naisbitt (1982) referred to this as "high tech-high touch." The more high-tech an organization such as higher education becomes, the more high-touch it must become, providing personal contact and a sense of community to its current and potential clients.
According to West and Daigle (1993), The California State University is one of several institutions attempting to "make information technology and distance learning integral parts of the system's instructional program, rather than keep them only as adjuncts to it" (p.31). As cost effectiveness and productivity grow in importance, more attention will focus on technology as a primary vehicle to transform higher education.

It is no wonder California State University has a keen interest in tapping the potential benefits of technology. It is the largest institute of higher education in the U.S. The California State University covers 1,000 miles, consists of 350,000 students, employs 18,000 faculty, and awards 60,000 bachelor's and master's degrees annually. The hope is that technology can play an instrumental role in meeting the demands of a projected 180,000 additional students in the midst of impending faculty shortages, facility deficits, and long-term fiscal retrenchment in state resources. Their desire is to service the needs of a diverse population. They are also driven to satisfy the occupational needs of their state-wide information based economy (West & Daigle, 1993).

Named Project DELTA (Direct Enhancement of Learning Through Technology Assistance and Alternatives), the program at California State and similar projects at M.I.T., Harvard
and Yale may have significant ramifications for how higher education defines the work of its faculty, how it is organized and rewarded, and for how teaching and learning are carried out. West and Daigle (1993) listed three goals: (a) improving instructional quality and effectiveness, (b) increasing student access to higher education by making access more convenient, and (c) promoting greater productivity and accountability in the use of public funds (p.32). Their products to date included providing higher education services to rural high schools, the creation of a multimedia database and network to encourage collaborative teaching between CSU campuses, and the creation of a joint M.B.A. program among four CSU campuses in conjunction with a corporate partner for delivery of higher education services to student's homes and worksites (West & Daigle, 1993). In the summer of 1997, according to information received from CSU, they offered their first courses through the virtual university over the Internet.

Issues requiring additional refinement over time will be student and academic support services, student learning evaluation systems, and accreditation procedures, and a fear from faculty that the goal of technology is to replace faculty. To alleviate some faculty concerns, faculty members were placed in charge of the aforementioned Delta
project. West and Daigle (1993) reported that the most significant challenge remains one of persuading skeptics that the advent of new technology does constitute a "quantum leap in human communications and learning" (p.34). Higher education has been slow to change as compared to industrial bureaucracies; perhaps due to higher education's false sense of security that its environment is largely protected from the outside.

West and Daigle (1993) readily admitted they are not the first to advocate distance learning. However, they have furthered the concept and provided a model for others to study. As CSU's Chancellor Munitz said, at the time of creating Project DELTA, "There are union issues; there are curriculum issues; there are tuition fee issues. But we are just tired of being told all the reasons why new strategies cannot be tested" (p.32).

Hickman (1997), director of projects and services for the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business stated, "Students want this. Employers want this. It's going to happen. University-based business schools that don't get ahead of this trend risk losing market share" (Record Herald, p.6).

John Hopkins, Cornell, Duke, Rice, Yale, University of Chicago, and Stanford are some of the private colleges who have either recently created or expanded their distance
learning capabilities. John Hopkins School of Medicine, in cooperation with an affiliate of Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc. (known as Caliber Learning Network), is testing the offering to doctors of a popular course known as "Managed Care" via distance learning (Blumenstyk, 1997). Just as doctors have continuing education requirements, the education alumni of the Holmes Partnership institutes have professional development needs as well, which could be met more efficiently through distance learning. Prestigious private colleges are now willing to risk their reputations for quality by pursuing distance learning. The use of technology could enhance the capacity of the Holmes Partnership to serve its members and its P-12 partnerships and help solidify the network that the partnership is. Distance learning, could also benefit the professional development needs of educators. The educational delivery systems of higher education are obviously not immune to innovation, or obsolescence, and are beginning to move in new directions with technology.

At this point in the review, the focus narrows, paying special attention to those trends and issues that may affect the future of state and land grant universities in the United States, many of which are members of the Holmes Partnership.
The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities—Their Perspective on the Trends and Issues of Higher Education that will Shape the Future University

The focus of this review narrows at this juncture and considers the context of change of higher education, as seen primarily by institutes belonging to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), as represented by the Kellogg Commission. The NASULGC is not representative of the Holmes Partnership, but their insight on trends and issues is relevant to this study for two reasons. First, Holmes' core membership has always been the major research universities, which is similar to those twenty-three institutes represented on the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Institutes. Second, ten of the twenty-three institutes (43%) represented on the Kellogg Commission are members of the new Holmes Partnership.

The efforts of the Kellogg Commission are relatively new and its work has not been completed. In 1995, the NASULGC was concerned with the significant forces of change, and how change might impact its members. The NASULGC sought the support of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to form a multi-year national commission to study the future of public higher education. The Kellogg Commission held its first meeting in January 1996. Selected as chairman was E. Gordon
Gee, then president of The Ohio State University. Ironically, Gee has since chosen to leave the arena of public education for private education, becoming the president of the prestigious and private Ivy League school, Brown University (Caruso, 1997).

Since its inception, the Kellogg Commission has produced two documents. The first publication was *The Student Experience: Data Related to Change* (1996). The second document, *Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience* (Kellogg Commission, 1997), was one of five working papers that are expected to be produced. The remaining four working papers will focus on access, engaged institutions, a learning society, and campus culture. Consequently, this review cannot be an analysis of their entire agenda.

Each paper the commission intends to produce is an open letter to the presidents and chancellors of state universities and land-grant colleges. According to *Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience* (Kellogg Commission, 1997), "The Kellogg Commission has no intention of imposing detailed agendas or restructuring plans on anyone" (p.xi). But on the other hand, the commission will provide "a general sense of the direction in which we should move" (p.xi). So it would seem the commission's intent is
to produce an agenda, but not a detailed one. In the same 1997 document, the commission identified its major challenge:

But unless public colleges and universities become the architects of change, they will be its victims. Our key challenge is two-fold. We must maintain our legacy of world-class teaching, research, and public service. At the same time, in a rapidly changing world, we must build on our legacy of responsiveness and relevance. (p.v)

Some would even question this legacy, believing the universities have more of a legacy for "world-class" research, and not "world-class teaching and public service" (Boyer, 1990; Harkavy & Puckett, 1994; Schon, 1995; Young, 1994). This attitude may have inhibited a more critical analysis of the mission of higher education.

The challenges, as seen by the Kellogg Commission, included an enrollment boom, new competitors, constrained public funding, resistance to the rise in tuition, eroding public trust, and limited institutional flexibility (Kellogg Commission, 1997). These challenges were based on data gathered for the Kellogg Commission's first working paper, The Student Experience: Data Related to Change (1996).
The paper's bibliography only cited twelve different sources. Three sources, e.g., the U.S. Department of Education, are cited more than once, reflecting the different years reports were published. Considering the volume of literature uncovered in my own review on the future of higher education, the extensiveness of their initial review is suspect. It is questionable from my perspective if the commission's first two papers adequately represent the body of knowledge in this area.

Furthermore, their perspective is limited by the fact that the stakeholders, the students (customers in Total Quality Management), are not members of the commission (Kellogg Commission, 1997). This is in light of the statement in the same 1997 document that these universities were established to put students first. The report stated, "We start with students, and invite you to join us" (p.v). The Student Experience: Data Related to Change (1996), stated, "Teaching students is the heart of the educational mission of public universities" (p.3). Ironically, the commission was convened, but without the inclusion of student participants.

Student experience trends and issues.

The first topic the commission chose to consider was the student experience, and did so through its first working
paper, *The Student Experience: Data Related to Change* (1996). Based on the commission's analysis of trends and issues, four topics emerged from their data that related to the student experience:

- enrollment levels and characteristics of students;
- changes in curriculum to meet the needs of students;
- major fields of study, including degree recipients and degree completion;
- use of financial resources to support the learning environment. (p.3)

**Enrollment.**

The Kellogg Commission states that enrollment is expected to increase in public higher education during the next decade, at all levels, undergraduate through graduate, as projected by the U.S. Department of Education (1996). Currently, the majority of college students are white, under 25 years of age, slightly more female, and attend classes full-time. However, an emerging trend is an increase in the diversity of the college population. Students were older, 15% were 35 years old or older, in the fall of 1993. From 1976 to 1993, students of color increased from 14% to 20%. Over 227,000 undergraduate students reported a disability in 1993. Over a third of college students in 1973 reported being employed during their college tenure whereas 46%
currently work, apparently to help pay for college expenses (Ballantine, 1993; Kellogg Commission, 1996).

**Changes in curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of students.**

According to an American Council on Education (ACE) survey, half of the responding institutions reported that from 1985 to 1995, more emphasis was being placed on writing, the expanded use of computers in classroom instruction, and new education requirements (El-Khawas & Knopp, 1996). Also, a majority (61%) have programs to improve teaching skills. Less than half (44%) changed their tenure and promotion policies to increase the importance of teaching. Almost all (89%) required students to complete a core of general education courses. A senior capstone course was required by less than a third (26%) of the institutions.

In 1993, over three-quarters (78%) of four-year public universities were still offering remedial courses, with an average 11% of the undergraduates enrolled. Math, reading, writing, and study skills were the most popular remedial courses.

Not highlighted by the Kellogg Commission, but included in *The Student Experience* (Kellogg Commission, 1996) was a greater curriculum emphasis by public research universities being placed on:
• multicultural diversity (50%) ,
• critical thinking (32%) ,
• new ways to involve students in research (28%) ,
• new ways to involve students in internships (24%) ,
• more emphasis on foreign language proficiency (20%) ,
• greater flexibility for adult learners (19%) ,
• greater emphasis on science and technical issues (17%) ,
• more attention to active modes of learning (13%) ,
• more courses offered through the Internet (8%) ,
• more emphasis on values and ethics (8%) .

The Holmes Partnership will especially take note of the top four items that received a greater emphasis in curriculums, since they correlate with the Holmes Partnership reform agenda, as well as the item calling for more attention to active modes of learning. The possibility exists that the philosophy of the Holmes Partnership has indirectly impacted the state and land-grant universities' curriculums, although that cannot be said with certainty.

Majors and degree completion.

In the past quarter-century, business degrees remain the most popular undergraduate program while education has remained the most popular graduate program. Men earn the majority of the degrees in engineering and physical sciences in general, while women complete the most degrees in education and the health sciences. However, women earn half
of the degrees (49%) in business programs. White women, who had not taken any remedial courses, who had a 3.0 cumulative average or better, and who had majored in humanities or the social sciences were more likely to graduate. The average student took between four to five years to complete undergraduate work; 63% complete within five years. Based on an 8% increase in the number of college students working from 1973-1993 (17% to 25%), the Kellogg Commission concluded insufficient financial resources as a primary reason for the delay. This appeared to be a thinly veiled attempt to argue for more funding (not that more funding is not a worthwhile goal). On the other hand, a significant majority (75%) do not work at all according to the commission's own sources, i.e., The Student Experience. Their conclusion is even more surprising since another source the commission cites provides reasons other than insufficient financial resources for the delay. According to El-Khawas (1994), a study by the American Council on Education, cited a change in major (33%) as the primary reason for delay. Other reasons for the delay were:

• have taken courses at other institutions (33%),
• enroll with an undecided major (31%),
• graduate with more credits than needed (21%),
• take remedial courses (8%).
• have delays getting into courses required in major (7%),
• complete dual majors (6%) (El-Khawas, 1994).

Insufficient financial resources is also likely to be a reason for some to delay completion of their educational studies. But there is evidence that indicates that it may not be a primary cause as the Kellogg Commission believed.

Last, it is interesting to note the median time between earning a four-year degree and a doctorate has increased from 8 to 11 years during 1970-1995. The median in the physical sciences was 8.4 years but in education, it was closer to 20 years. The commission did not account for the disparity (Kellogg Commission, 1996). One could speculate that one reason would be the difference in salaries. Education, paying less, would require more years of experience for a teacher to reach a salary level where they could afford a doctorate. Or perhaps teachers are initially, more satisfied with their master's degree, only discovering years later they would like to return to work toward a doctorate.

**Funding issues of higher education.**

Under "Student Experience," financial and funding trends were the last issues considered by the Kellogg Commission (Kellogg Commission, 1996). Following the
dollars will provide insight on what is valued the most in organizations, including higher education.

According to the Kellogg Commission report *Student Experience* (1996), between "1977 to 1993, educational and general expenditures per full-time equivalent (FTE) student at public universities, in 1995 constant dollars, grew 50\% for research activities (from $2,704 to $4,051) but only 13\% for instruction (from $5,744 to $6,470)" (p.9).

A 1996 NASULGC survey, institutions revealed the adjustments being made in order to meet their budgets. The top three that were highlighted by the Kellogg Commission included:

- increased instructional workload (41\%),
- more use of non-traditional instructional delivery systems (39\%),
- increased class size (37\%) (Kellogg Commission, 1996, p. 24.)

A sampling of other adjustments not highlighted by the Kellogg Commission, but included in their summary, entailed:

- program cut or consolidated (30\%),
- course selections reduced (29\%),
- research support decreased (28\%),
- increase in fees (5\%) (Kellogg Commission, 1996, p. 24)

Increasing fees was obviously not a popular option.

Listed second was "more use of nontraditional instructional
delivery systems," which could be an opening for more use of technology as in distance learning and computer interactive learning, trends made evident in my review (Blumenstyk, 1997; Edgerton, 1993; Hills, 1994; West & Daigle, 1993). However, what can be concluded is that the top five adjustments in the budgets had an adverse effect on instruction.

Finally, less than half of the research universities rated their institutions as "excellent" or "very good" in the adequacy of the library resources, electronic infrastructure to support academic programs, and equipment for teaching—a deficiency apparently not unique to teacher education programs. Administrators at public research universities indicated electronic infrastructure and computing operations as items that required more funding than ten years ago, followed by faculty salaries, and institutionally funded student aid (Kellogg Commission, 1996).

The Kellogg Commission's Vision for the Future
Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience (Kellogg Commission, 1997) is the Kellogg Commission's second publication, which shared the commission's vision for the future, along with its guiding principles and action statements. In it, the commission proposed a new
university, one "without walls." The report continued, stating:

But it will also be open, accessible, and flexible in ways that can barely be imagined today. In this new university, the emphasis will be on delivering instruction anywhere, anytime, and to practically anyone who seeks it. (p.vi)

On the contrary, the commission's vision that "can barely be imagined today" is already in existence today, and has been for a while, in Great Britain, in the form of the Open University (Edgerton, 1993; Hills, 1994). It is also becoming more evident in higher education in the U.S. in some of our most elite private institutions (Blumenstyk, 1997).

In the commission's Returning to our Roots, (Kellogg Commission, 1997) two major obstacles to change in higher education are listed. One is higher education's lack of desire for systemic reform. Second is higher education's inefficient system of university governance. The 1997 report stated:

Meanwhile, despite recent improvements, our governance arrangements creak with anachronisms...most of us continue to struggle with a campus culture that willingly sacrifices efficiency in favor of valuable traditions of collegiality and shared governance. As
the Commission on the Academic Presidency reported early in 1996, higher education is not as nimble as the times require. (p.7)

In light of the reforms needed and this time of rapid changes, the commission's remarks are an understatement.

Second, the commission mentioned higher education's response to change is to create new programs, rather than launching "fully into a comprehensive change process" (p.23). The commission readily admitted that "very few [campuses] report comprehensive activity" (Kellogg Commission, 1997, p. 23).

In *Returning to Our Roots* (Kellogg Commission, 1997), the document requested that institutions reject three ideas that have no relevance in the future of state and land-grant institutions. They were:

- College education ends with a degree.
- The student experience should be reserved for the fortunate few between the ages of 18 and 25 willing to attend full-time.
- The university experience extends only as far as the campus boundaries. (p.ii)

All three notions have serious market implications. One, continuing educational services can be offered to those already with a degree, regardless of where they received
that degree. Second, there are other segments in society who require higher education, other than the traditional 18 to 25 years of age group. Lastly, a university that offers distance-learning is a university without boundaries. Overlooked is the potential increase in competition between institutions, brought on by distance-learning and universities without walls and boundaries as called for by the commission. This is where a major network of institutes such as the Holmes Partnership can have major role. Distance-learning will place every institute with that capability in everyone's backyard. On the flip side, it will also place a distance-learning competitor in the backyards of every institute of higher education.

In Returning to Our Roots (Kellogg Commission, 1997), The Kellogg Commission believed their institutes can become responsive by becoming genuine, student-centered, learning communities, "that provide students, faculty, and staff with the facilities, support and resources..." (p.9). Learning is further addressed in the report, recommending that students conduct research with faculty members and graduate students, and that analytical thinking must be stressed. Learning should be active, not passive. A learning community should also "create the conditions in which pluralism and different perspectives are respected and
encouraged" (p.14). For students, the most significant changes a learning community might create would be a greater emphasis on active learning and research, backed by demonstrations of student competence. Teaching would be as highly valued as research, reflecting different instructional strategies, such as collaborative learning and team-learning. Again, many of these recommendations are similar to those that the Holmes Partnership had advocated years before.

One of the most significant changes the commission mentioned is providing "just in time" instruction into communities and worksites, or in other words, distance learning, which is again called for in the commission's Statement of Principles to Guide Academic Reform, listed under "Meeting New Needs". Under "Flexibility and Responsiveness" the commission called for developing new partnerships and collaborations, including those with P-12 schools, an idea the Holmes Partnership had already advocated, and implemented.

Unfortunately, the commission only called for "improving" the governance structures of higher education, falling short of calling for comprehensive reform. The cumbersome governance systems of higher education often impede reform. According to the commission most institutes were not engaged in comprehensive reform of their governance
structures. From my perspective, institutionalizing the changes the commission recommended will take nothing less than systemic reform. This would include a major overhaul of higher education's governance system which creaks with old age. Otherwise, higher education will continue to fill old winesacks with new wine, which will impede the implementation any major reform.

Trends in Higher Education - Implications for Colleges of Education

Without omnipotence, one cannot say with certainty which trends will come to pass, or exactly what their impact will be. Certainly, we can be assured that there are trends yet to emerge. After careful review of the literature, I have summarized and listed those trends in particular that I believe will sustain themselves or emerge and which would impact colleges and departments of educations.

Infrastructure, governance, mission, and policy.

• To gain a competitive edge, colleges of education will likely have to reinvent themselves, often starting with a clean piece of paper (Hamel & Prahalad, 1989; Pedigo, 1994).

• There is a need to commit to transformation, which will require far more critical analyses than that required by an accreditation process (Penrod & Dolence, 1992).
It is questionable however, if higher education has the will, the inclination, or the incentive to do so.

• Proponents of change within the college of education must ally themselves to external forces to produce systemic change. It is the history of education that significant change was due to external forces, not internal (Sarason, 1996). Changes in teacher education programs have been influenced somewhat more by external mandates, than internal ideas (RATE V, 1992).

As some continue to argue for vouchers and student-choice for P-12 students, others in Europe have argued for vouchers for college students as the only way to stimulate a true transformation in higher education. The benefit to higher education would be that the state would be placed at arm's length from higher education since funding would no longer come directly from the legislature (Hills, 1994). It remains to be seen what stimulus will affect systemic reform, but I believe most likely, the stimulus will be external to the institution.

• Colleges of education, to satisfy increasing expectations, must build speed into their operating systems and into the attitudes of its personnel, known as "fast-cycle capability." They must perform without bottlenecks, delays, and errors in all areas, e.g., in the area of constituent services (Katz & West, 1992).
Non-productive or redundant education programs will be eliminated (Penrod & Dolence, 1992). A productive program is one that satisfies market demand and serves a justifiable purpose for the college. An example of a redundant and unproductive programming is a university investing in remedial courses for freshman, a mission probably best left to community colleges.

Colleges of education, driven by economics, may eliminate positions and maintain only a core staff, outsourcing when necessary for desired services, programs, and expertise on a short-term or long-term basis (Edgerton, 1993; Hills, 1994; Penrod & Dolence, 1992).

Colleges of education will continue to face numerous uncertainties in their environments, as well as increased decision-making complexity. These hierarchies must be flattened and decentralized to prevent overloading the top, while hastening restructuring, goal implementation and responsiveness (Katz & West, 1992). The college will continue to experience constraints in funding and public resistance to the rise in tuition. Public trust may continue to erode, depending on how colleges respond to rising expectations (Kellogg Commission, 1997). Funding will
continue to be linked to outcomes (Penrod & Dolence, 1992).

The mission of colleges of education will be redefined, placing more emphasis on public service, excellence in teaching, and relevant action research that is integrated with public service (Boyer, 1990; Kellogg Commission, 1997; Schon, 1995; Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995). For example, local governments and, in particular, P-12 school districts could produce and maintain a research needs list, whereas research assistance and expertise from the college could be matched with those needs. Teaching, public service, and research would be integrated. Action research projects, facilitated by professors, provide college students an opportunity to engage in real problems, provides professors teaching opportunities in a natural environment, and also provides a service to the community (Boyer, 1990; Edgerton, 1993). In the past, colleges have seen the elements of their mission, i.e., teaching, research, and public service, as three separate entities, being forced to choose one role or the other. In the future, these lines will blur.

The college will increase its relevancy to the community by engaging itself where society's need is
the greatest, such as in urban or rural settings. Society can become a source of vitality and creativity for the college (Hawley & Puckett, 1994). The college will serve as society's bellwether (Boyer, 1990). To be an effective bellwether for society, researchers must become more effective communicators, making scholarly writing more understandable and accessible to the community. This in itself is a public service (Stanley, 1989).

- Success of the college is dependent upon how well its leaders structure campus environments that encourage excellent teaching, research, and public service. (Katz, 1992; Kellogg Commission, 1997).

- Policies, for example, those related to tenure and promotion, should reflect incentives that support the overall mission of the university. They should serve to encourage collaboration and teamwork, across departments/colleges and between professors in both more traditional and forms of action research. Results of such multi-disciplinary action research project teams should be evaluated for tenure and promotion purposes (Edgerton, 1993; Kellogg Commission, 1997; Penrod & Dolence, 1992).

- Tenure and promotion policies will undergo much change in colleges of education. First and foremost, tenure
policies will be linked more with public service via action research and excellent teaching, strengthening the roles by providing tenure to student teacher supervisors and others who work in conjunction with P-12 schools and Professional Development Schools (Boyer, 1990; RATE IV, 1991; Restructuring the University Reward System, 1997).

- External forces will attempt to limit or eliminate tenure, perhaps limiting tenure to twenty to twenty-five years. Differentiated roles will be offered to future professors upon employment, and subsequently, their evaluation and opportunity for tenure will be based on their chosen role in the colleges of education. Depending on the mission of the college and the professor's desire, she/he could choose from different job roles, such as either 50% teaching, 25% research, and 25% public service or 50% teaching and 50% public service (Edgerton, 1993; Restructuring the University Reward System, 1997).

Implications - the increasing influence of technology.

- Colleges of education, faced with funding constraints, and pressures to control costs, will become more focused and aggressive in their markets.
policies will be linked more with public service via action research and excellent teaching, strengthening the roles by providing tenure to student teacher supervisors and others who work in conjunction with P-12 schools and Professional Development Schools (Boyer, 1990; RATE IV, 1991; Restructuring the University Reward System, 1997).

External forces will attempt to limit or eliminate tenure, perhaps limiting tenure to twenty to twenty-five years. Differentiated roles will be offered to future professors upon employment, and subsequently, their evaluation and opportunity for tenure will be based on their chosen role in the colleges of education. Depending on the mission of the college and the professor's desire, she/he could choose from different job roles, such as either 50% teaching, 25% research, and 25% public service or 50% teaching and 50% public service (Edgerton, 1993; Restructuring the University Reward System, 1997).

Implications - the increasing influence of technology.

Colleges of education, faced with funding constraints, and pressures to control costs, will become more focused and aggressive in their markets.
Via technology, the marketing arm of the colleges of education will move beyond traditional campus boundaries (Kellogg Commission, 1997). Markets will expand. Enrollments will generally expand (Kellogg Commission, 1996; RATE IV, 1991). Colleges, large and small, via distance-learning, will be able to assert themselves in national and international markets, introducing new levels of competition.

Innovation-driven colleges will invest in their capacity to offer multi-media, computer-assisted learning, interactive processing, and distance learning to off-campus students (Adam & Palmer, 1993). As pressure mounts to control costs, adapting technology to automate learning will become a viable option. For colleges of educations desiring lab schools, a classroom camera and the Internet can link any P-12 classroom to higher education for observation, interaction, and analysis purposes.

Distance-learning is now a reality. Institutes that ignore it are bound to lose market share. It may become better known as the university without walls. (The Student Experience, 1997). As more students become proficient with accessing information from the Internet and compact disks, student expectations will force colleges to offer educational services via the
Internet and other electronic means (College Offers an Internet MBA, 1997). Technology's impact on the delivery of educational services in future years is a sleeping giant. As the trend for outsourcing for expertise and reducing the professoriate to core levels continues to build, a market opportunity is likely to present itself. Perhaps only the larger colleges of education will be able to provide their students with the necessary instructional expertise, without the need for outsourcing. These colleges, and others known for their special expertise, may be in a position to market their expertise to other colleges of educations in the form of packaged educational courses via the Internet or compact disks. (Edgerton, 1993; Hills, 1994).

Furthermore, with the continued emphasis on providing a quality liberal arts education, some colleges of education could resort to outsourcing for the best educational software on any subject, as produced by the best known expert professors. For colleges of education concerned with the quality or relevance of the courses taught to education students outside the college or department of education, developing or buying packaged programs on foundation subjects will become an alternative. Packaged courses can then be facilitated, tutored, or even self-taught, without the need for expensive, 'top-gun' expert professors, as is
the case at the Open University of Great Britain (Hills, 1994). The Holmes Partnership, who already represent some of the nation's best, could tap their members expertise and collectively sponsor the development of packaged educational courses, providing these to their members at cost, and non-members for a profit. The network again has great potential here.

- Technology will assist colleges in delivering services to a more diverse (not just minorities), non-traditional student population, such as college graduates and teachers, who require continuing education, students over 25 years old, those working full-time or part-time, students with disabilities, and those preparing for new careers in education (Adams & Palmer, 1993). Minorities will be aggressively recruited at an earlier age, as early as junior high school (Boyer, 1990). Colleges of education must become more savvy in the ways of marketing, which is unfamiliar territory for those colleges that have traditionally sat back and waited for students to come to them.

- Colleges of education must utilize technology to become more strategic in managing their enrollment, tracking recruits, applicants, students, and graduates, developing the capability to intervene just in time
when students are faced with academic problems (Katz & West, 1992). An often quoted adage of business says it is easier and less expensive to maintain a present customer than it is to find a new one.

In some cases, colleges of education might seek ways to cooperate with competing colleges, such as sharing instructors, or offering mutual courses open to students of either institution (Adams & Palmer, 1993). Again, the Holmes Partnership would be very helpful here. The major reason delaying the completion of a degree is related to students transferring to other institutions (El-Khawas, 1994). Neighboring colleges of educations could seek to facilitate that process by sharing services and reducing costly redundancy. Technology can provide the means for cooperation for colleges who are not neighbors.

Constituent empowerment, which is also referred to as student consumerism, is an emerging trend. Its potential on colleges of education is not yet clear. The prestigious and private Brown University is an example of student consumerism. Brown University generally does not require any core courses from its students. In addition, it permits students to sample courses that are outside the students’ major area, (Caruso, 1997). This is probably less workable in a
professional program such as education due to the linking of coursework to certification. However, considering the caliber of students being admitted to Brown, there may be less need to require core courses if the students arrive with a high level of proficiency in core areas, such as mathematics, language, and the humanities. Those colleges, such as Open University, that offer students more choices on how to learn, empower students. It gives students choices on whether or not to be tutored, lectured, or even self-taught, with the assistance of technology. Student consumerism appears to be more related to the demand for quality, choices, and responsiveness from their colleges of education. I believe that these can be addressed by reengineering first, followed by the implementation of the principles of total quality management to ensure continuous improvement.

Implications - how teaching and learning are being shaped.

• There is general agreement in the literature that a professor will serve more as a coach or facilitator in their future roles in teaching, freed from rote teaching (Boyer, 1990; Edgerton, 1993; Kellogg Commission, 1997). It will become more important to
teach students how to learn than simply to transfer knowledge. Students will conduct their own action-research, will view real problems through multiple lenses, and arrive at innovative solutions. Students must be more analytical and reflective in their practice (Schon, 1983).

• Colleges have responded to funding constraints by expanding the use of non-traditional instructional practices and increasing the size of classes (The Student Experience, 1996). Professors will need additional training on alternative teaching strategies that are more conducive to larger classes, such as cooperative learning and project teams. The key element in future college classrooms will be in developing a relevant and meaningful learning task around a class project which will drive the course (Edgerton, 1993).

• Students will face uncertain economic times making a broad-base liberal arts education more important, followed by specialization, similar to the extended teacher education programs some Holmes members have developed which delay the professional courses until graduate school. All students must not only be broadly educated, but also acquire specific skills, such as computing skills and analytical skills (Hills, 1994).
• Students of the future college will experience multicultural diversity and internships in their programs. Other emerging trends would indicate students may see a greater emphasis on foreign language development and ethics training (Kellogg Commission, 1996).

Summary.

It may be the hope of some that these trends will not play a major role in the future, but there is no guarantee that they will not. Should only a few take on a significant role, major changes would still be in order; ignoring them could well have major consequences.

Administration tends to ask what the cost of innovation will be, seldom asking what the cost will be if they do not innovate. Senge (1990) speaks of the lack of innovation in the public sector:

Gradually, I came to realize why business is the locus of innovation in an open society. Despite whatever hold past thinking may have on the business mind, business has a freedom to experiment missing in the public sector and often, in nonprofit organizations. (p.15)

For the new Holmes Partnership to solidify its role in higher education, it needs to position itself as the leader of innovation and quality.
At this juncture, consideration will be given to the context of P-12 reforms, and the implications for teacher education.

P-12 School Reform and Its Implications for Teacher Education

Before considering the implications of P-12 reform for teacher education, a limited review of P-12 reform is in order. The privately-held New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC) has funded several reform proposals, two of which I will highlight. One break-the-mold model was the Modern Red Schoolhouse, which featured multi-age homerooms, self-paced learning, elimination of traditional grade structures, and a differentiated staff. A second one is The Odyssey Project, which grouped students by five age ranges. Progression by the students through the groups was outcome-based. Teachers served as facilitators, and parents were required to assist in the school's activities. The school is on a year-round schedule (NASDC, undated).

Another model that shares similar attributes as the Modern Red Schoolhouse is the K-12 Celebration School located in Osceola County, Florida. This model is a joint-venture of the Celebration Company (a subsidiary of the Walt Disney Co.), Osceola County, and Stetson University in DeLand, Florida. This school is based on the work of such
scholars as Howard Gardner, author of the book *Multiple Intelligences*; William Glasser, author of *Schools Without Failure*; and University of Minnesota professors David and Roger Johnson, proponents of cooperative learning. The end result is a school that groups certain grade levels together, such as kindergarten through second grade, third grade through fifth, grades six and seven are grouped, as well as eighth and ninth, and tenth through twelfth. This allows slower learners more time, without holding back the more advanced learners. It also encourages the older students to become tutor-mentors to the younger students. The schedule is flexible and seamless, not following the more traditional one-subject-per-block approach (Ross, 1997).

To ensure that the faculty of the Celebration School the opportunity for continual learning, the school is also creating a Celebration Teaching Academy, which will open its doors to teachers from around the nation in 1998. Along with Stetson University, the teacher education programs will be designed by faculty from Harvard, The Ohio State University, Johns Hopkins, and Auburn. Its goal is to become a hotbed of new but proven teaching innovations (Ross, 1997).

Accelerated Schools was the creation of Henry Levin of Stanford, based on the premise that many reforms have failed the 'at-risk' student population, which some estimate as
one-third of the student population and increasing. Its goal was to change behavior, not school systems, and to reduce the achievement gaps between students. Methodology included ability grouping based on student interests, cooperative learning, and fast-paced learning. Site-based management that involved parents and teachers in school governance was practiced, along with multiple student assessments, including portfolios and standardized tests. Higher education was an active partner (Levin, 1991).

The School Development Program was another well-known school reform program, developed by James Comer of Yale, based on the assumption that most public schools were not equipped to work with poorly socialized youth from a low socioeconomic level. At its core were child development principles. Once students close the socialization gap that exists between them and better home-socialized students, they will be more likely to succeed in school. Governance involves the school's stakeholders, including parents, faculty, and social service and mental health personnel. The child was never considered to be the problem and discovering the underlying causes to poor school performance was the goal. "Discovery Rooms" were used by staff to better understand and access the interests of students. Social and behavioral science principles were utilized to
assess the school's climate as well as the child's home environment (Comer, 1988).

The Edison Project, is a private-sector venture founded by Chris Whittle, who proposed that public schools be re-engineered, only saving its best parts. At the heart were longer school days, peer learning groups, electronic learning systems, and the utilization of students' direct assistance to teaching. Teachers were actively engaged in on-going research to best meet students' needs. Teachers worked more with parents, worked longer hours year-round, integrated subjects, and spent more time one-on-one with students. Whittle said Thomas Edison did not set out to improve the candle, but rather intended to invent something new, so Whittle's intentions were to transform the American educational system. Armed with its vision, The Edison Project intended to develop exemplary teachers (The Edison Project, undated).

The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) was founded by Theodore Sizer of Brown University. His reform platform was not based on a concrete model, and posits that a good school is created by the community as a whole. The teacher is a coach and the students are workers. Educational goals were simplified and limited in number, allowing students to master them by learning at their own rate. It was also recognized that instructional methods must vary since
students are unique individuals. The students' work is authentic and the learning process was both active and collaborative. Assessments were varied but student demonstrations and exhibitions were emphasized. Critical thinking skills were emphasized as well (Sizer, 1991, 1992). Professional development of the teaching staff over the span of a year was the key to the school's change process. One study of five Sizer schools found little evidence of systemic reform. Sarason reported Sizer's model was a good first effort, and suggested that Sizer take what he had learned and apply this new knowledge to create a refined model (Sarason, 1996).

The Holmes Partnership could encourage its members to create in their various states something similar to the Ohio based "Building Excellent Schools for Today and the 21st Century," better known as BEST, which is a unique statewide alliance dedicated to improving the P-12 educational opportunities of all public school students. Members of this alliance represent parents, business groups, educators, students, corporations, professional trade organizations, higher education, and non-profit entities. Annual BEST conventions recognize the best educational practices in Ohio P-12 and higher education settings, along with BEST communities, or those cities or communities who have deliberately set out to improve education through the
involvement of all the community's stakeholders community (Venture Capital in Ohio's Schools, 1996).

Most importantly, the BEST organization is establishing an Internet website that would feature those BEST practices that were recognized at annual conventions, making these innovations available for replication in other P-12 districts and institutes of higher education. The website best practices concept could assist the Holmes Partnership's professional development schools in sharing their best practices with other schools or colleges across the nation.

It is beyond the scope of this review to describe all P-12 school reforms, restructuring initiatives, best practices, and other factors that are influencing change. More exist than briefly mentioned here, such as the Next Century Schools, Total Quality Management Schools, and the Individual Centered Schools, created by Gardner, based on his research and findings of students' seven multiple intelligences. He argues that learning is enhanced when the teacher approaches learning from the individual student's preferred and natural learning style and understanding various intelligences allows them to do this (Howey, 1996).

Although many of these reforms have their own unique components, certain commonalities have emerged, and it is proposed that these concepts especially be considered for teacher education programs in order to better prepare
education students for the ever evolving changes of P-12 schools (Howey, 1996).

In the area of instruction, Howey reported that P-12 reforms were characterized by teacher-team planning, inquiry and conceptual learning, use of paraprofessionals, use of electronics, a focus on individual and group meta-cognitive abilities, attention to student beliefs and misconceptions, and reciprocal teaching and learning between the students. Learning was active, cooperative, and self-monitored, capitalizing on the collective intelligence and diversity of the students. Learners interacted with their local community and became more aware of their civic responsibilities. Parents assumed an active and regular role in learning, alongside the staff and students (Howey, 1996).

Reformed schools, in general, model shared decision making between stakeholders, such as parents, staff, and social service agencies (Howey, 1996). Students were often organized into cohorts and assigned to common teachers for multiple years. The differentiated staff, also advocated by the Holmes Partnership, participated in team teaching and linked many of their learning tasks to local community issues and resources that students could easily relate to. Classrooms have evolved to learning stations, organized around cooperative learning structures and hands-on
learning. Students were assisted by cross-age tutors, and parent volunteers (Howey, 1996). Another emerging trend in P-12 was service learning, where students, as required by the curriculum, engaged in community service projects under the direction of a teacher (Sewall, 1997).

A question for this investigator was whether or not the nation's teacher education programs were preparing future teachers for those P-12 schools who have implemented such reforms. Howey (1996) posited that the nation's teacher education programs have been largely divorced from reform movements and that their programs are not compatible with P-12 reforms. Furthermore, many of these reforms, although not all, have no direct ties with higher education.

A major concern, in my judgement, is that many teaching graduates may not come into contact with many of these reforms until their first day on the job. Second, it is doubtful that the culture of teaching can be changed simply by P-12 restructuring or reform initiatives alone. Without the benefit of a purposeful and deliberate teacher development effort running parallel with P-12 reforms and initiatives, simultaneous renewal of P-12 and higher education may remain an elusive goal for the Holmes Partnership.

Tomorrow's teachers need new skills today. These new skills relate to shared decision making, technology
integration, moral reasoning, authentic and multiple student assessment, team teaching, collaborative inquiry, interdisciplinary planning, and student counseling skills. Teachers would also need skills to facilitate and coordinate the involvement of parents, volunteers, and especially social service professionals, in order to deliver better instruction to students (Howey, 1996).

More and more, teaching has become a complex endeavor, taking place in uncertain environments. Teaching requires teachers to make numerous and frequent professional judgements about providing the most appropriate instruction to students (Borko & Shavelson, 1983). Higher education must position itself and its programs to meet the needs of tomorrow's teachers today, for tomorrow has arrived.

Sarason (1996) suggested that perhaps higher education is not in a position to understand reform and the process of change at the P-12 level if they are not involved in it themselves at their level. Will Rogers once said "you can't teach what you don't know any more than you can come back from where you ain't been". This becomes a critical test for the Holmes Partnership as they have made it their linchpin of reform to affect simultaneous change and renewal at both levels, P-12, and higher education.
The primary goal of the Holmes Partnership is to provide "high quality professional preparation" for public school teachers. Programs must be attentive to the individual needs of a diverse student population while maintaining rigor, and the content should represent research and best practice (The Gateway Conference, 1997).

In Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995), the Holmes report was clear on two points. First, "the education school should cease to act as a silent agent in the preservation of the status quo" (p.7). "Changes, by and large, flitter at the margins, touching only the edges of teaching and learning" (p.7). Lack of progress is attributed by the report to the lack of three elements: collective will, a critical mass of faculty supporting change, and a lack of alliances with external forces that could assist in overcoming obstacles (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995).

Second, although colleges of education produce a significant number of graduates for the nation's teaching positions, it does not seem to receive its share of financial support or respect from the university. The report indicated that "in a good number of cases,
universities allocate insufficient resources to programs preparing these people (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995, p.6). One example that indicated a lack of sufficient resources was the general lack of lab facilities where teachers could explore the complexities of teaching and learning in a somewhat controlled and properly equipped environment. Only a third of the respondents reported in the 1990 Research About Teacher Education (RATE) as having any type of viewing facility (RATE IV, 1991). Two years later, the availability of such facilities or laboratories had not improved (RATE VI, 1994), and by 1994, respondents reported the modest resource base for teacher education continued to decline in most situations (RATE VII, 1994).

Professional Development Schools (PDS), the key element of the Holmes agenda, is yet another example that seemed to indicate a lack of university support for college of education initiatives. A general consensus existed that there was a lack of sufficient resources to support P-12 initiatives such as the PDS (RATE VI, 1994; RATE VIII, 1995).

On the brighter side, with more colleges of education engaged in the reform process, their influence beyond their own college of education may be increasing in the university as a whole. University administration may be developing a more positive impression of colleges of education (RATE VI, 166
1994). However, the general impression was that colleges of education do not enjoy the same levels of respect and support that are afforded to the university's other professional programs, such as law and medicine. Due to a college of education's long history of low standing within the academy, it is difficult to engage in self-renewal during constant devaluation (Goodlad, 1990).

Future colleges of education must discontinue the practice of keeping P-12 schools at arms-length from the academy. Society is changing and P-12 schools are faced with a multitude of reforms at the local level, reforms that few teachers are prepared to face. Therefore, for future colleges of education to remain relevant, colleges must change their teacher education programs in substantive ways so that teachers will be better prepared to teach in diverse and actively reforming schools (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995).

Today's teachers are expected to teach a diverse student body how to be more thoughtful in their work. Teachers must develop students' abilities to problem-solve, find multiple and creative solutions, to synthesize and integrate new information, and to work cooperatively with others. Clearly, this is a tall order for today's teachers, who require additional knowledge and teaching skills.
Darling-Hammond, 1996). The question becomes whether or not colleges of educations are responding to these new needs, and if not, what the consequences would be. Tomorrow’s Schools of Education (1995) stated "Students will attend education schools that offer them what they need and bypass the others" (p.89).

Perhaps the most important point to make in response to these new educational needs is that systemic reform cannot occur without a full partnership of all the stakeholders, including colleges of education, their P-12 counterparts, professional organizations and associations. The new Holmes Partnership refers to this as "simultaneous renewal," or working and reforming in concert with one another, one of their primary goals (The Gateway Conference, 1997). The new name, Holmes Partnership, makes reference to these partnerships, and can be thought of as Holmes in partnership with all of the key education players.

At the core of future colleges of education, Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995) emphasized the need for development in three areas: knowledge development, professional development, and policy development. Knowledge development has always been at the heart of a research-based university, but the report stressed the need for future research to be closer to the lives of the children, to be
made relevant and accessible to practitioners, utilizing the PDS as a data-rich research site (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995).

Scholarly inquiry and programs of research are listed as one of the six new goals of the Holmes Partnership. The intent is to conduct and disseminate educational research and engage in other scholarly activities that advance knowledge, improve teaching and learning for all children and youth (The Gateway Conference, 1997). However, a research practice that relies primarily on a PDS for data may not result in findings that are representative of non-PDS school sites where most students and teachers work (Labaree, 1995).

Bias is also a concern if a faculty member of an education school is acting in a dual role, both as the reformer and the researcher of a PDS. For PDS research to maintain its credibility, the use of independent investigators should be utilized to validate or invalidate any findings that are the result of research done by researchers who have an interest in the outcomes of the PDS, namely, education faculty engaged in the daily work of the PDS, whose college is in partnership with the PDS. However, it should be noted that the PDS is not the sole focus of research.
Teacher education programs in the past have emphasized foundation and methods courses, but future colleges of education will expect the prospective teacher "to delve deeply into the intellectual side of teaching and learning. Thinking, judging, deciding, adapting--all are part of the ethos of teaching" (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995, p.22). The same Holmes Group report advocated a more active and assertive role for future colleges of education in the legislative arena. The report claimed future schools of education and their faculty will be better positioned for this role, since they will be more in tune with the issues facing P-12 due to their active involvement in the PDS, both on a research level and a practicing level. The Holmes Partnership has made it one of their six primary goals to initiate and to analyze policy that relates to P-12 schools and teacher education (The Gateway Conference, 1997).

As alluded to earlier, Holmes Partnership reports and others have been critical of colleges of education for maintaining the status quo during a time of reform, finding that for the most part, changes have not been systemic (Sarason, 1996; Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995). In other words, in my judgment, changes have been more evolutionary, meaning gradual over time, less revolutionary as some would have it. Fullan (1987) described evolutionary
change as the most common form of change, change that comes about often without any deliberate intervention. Taking an evolitional perspective, consideration will be given to some of the issues and trends that have impacted colleges of education from the late 1980s to 1997. This review is made possible by three sources: a) the on-going study of Research About Teacher Education (RATE) since 1987, b) the National Database for Teacher Education Program Follow-up, The Ohio State University, since 1987, 3) The Benchmark Project 1990-1995, which compared graduates of four-year and extended teacher education programs. The hope is that the following data will prove helpful in the strategic planning and shaping of teacher education programs.

**Student demographics and the necessity for diversity.**

Overall, enrollment trends in colleges of education are up, in large, medium, and small institutions, assisted by the increasing popularity of a teaching career, and the growing number of post-baccalaureate students (RATE IV, 1991). Students, however, are still predominantly white women, average age 25 years (Loadman & Klecker, 1993; RATE VI, 1994), 41% are reliant on their family for financial support of their college education, with additional dependency on loans, grants, employment, personal savings, and work study (RATE III, 1990). Approximately 37% reported
their average grade in high school was an A. Prospective teachers generally graduated in the upper third of their high school class. Most maintained a B average in college in education and non-education courses (RATE VII, 1994). The findings validated the above-average academic standing of those students who had enrolled in teacher education programs, dispelling the myth that education students are under-achievers.

Of those recently graduated from teacher education programs, the majority were certified for their assignment (Loadman & Klecker, 1993); elementary teachers were more likely to be assigned to a position for which they were fully certified, and of the 70% of teacher education graduates employed in teaching positions, 78% were teaching within 50 miles of their home and/or the college they attended. Geographical location was the most cited reason for not teaching (Loadman, Klecker, Brookhart, & Freeman, 1994). This explained in part teacher shortages, which appeared to be more linked with teacher preference for specific localities, and their unwillingness or inability to relocate, rather than the lack of teachers overall.

Prospective teachers typically chose colleges that were near to their rural or suburban homes, their preferred destination for employment (RATE III, 1990), as opposed to urban school systems. Approximately 20% preferred teaching
in an urban district, and less than 7% would teach in a
district with a significant number of students not fluent in
English. Due to the preference of teaching in rural and
suburban schools, urban P-12 students are more likely to be
taught by less experienced and less qualified teachers
(Darling-Hammond, 1996), due to districts’ tendency to hire
the less qualified to fill numerous teaching vacancies. To
address the shortage of qualified urban-school teachers,
President Clinton has proposed the establishment of federal
scholarships for those who choose to teach in urban
districts (NBC News, 1997).

The average percentage of African-Americans enrolled in
teacher education during a four-year period averaged
approximately 4.5%, while about 2.5% of education students
were Hispanic (RATE IV, 1991). This stands in stark
contrast to higher education generally. In a ten-year
period between 1978 and 1988, African-American enrollment in
higher education across all disciplines dropped from about
29.7% in 1978 to 28% in 1988, even though the African-
American population had increased.

Hispanic representation in higher education increased
in the same time period, from 27% to approximately 30.9%.
There was also increased competition between professions to
recruit minorities. The researchers stated that 75% of
African-Americans who score in the highest quartile on the
SAT choose other fields, such as engineering, health and medicine, computer science, and social science. Less than 1% chose education (Howey & Zimpher, 1996). This finding underscores the need for an organization such as the Holmes Partnership to better market the value of entering the teaching profession in the eyes of minorities. It also needs to address the salary difference between teaching and those professions minorities are choosing over teaching.

Almost half of the colleges have scholarships available to attract high caliber diverse candidates (RATE II, 1988), however, but only 14% of the responding institutes indicated having a systematic recruitment program. RATE VII (1994) did show that 30% of the student respondents had received scholarships.

Of considerable concern is the fact that teacher education programs will be asked to bridge a widening gap between a predominantly white female teaching force and minorities. However, these teachers have had little contact with different cultures (RATE VII, 1994) or student populations who are diverse in their language, socioeconomic class, and race (Grant & Secada, 1990).

Research has provided us with the implications of cultural sensitivity and competence, or the lack of it. For example, African-American boys tend to perform comparably with boys and girls of other races until the fourth grade,
the approximate time when instruction begins to shift from much interaction between students and teachers to less interaction and more lecture. Out of fear, intimidation, a lack of understanding, or racism, active African-American boys often receive different treatment from their teachers, and end up being suspended more often and placed in special education classes disproportionately to their population (Freeman, 1997).

Another contributing factor may be that teachers, whose naïve beliefs of different cultures have never been challenged, may have lower expectations for minority students, viewing them as lacking in ability or motivation, or members of dysfunctional families consequently resulting in the under-performance of the students (Sleeter, 1993; Zeichner & Melnick, 1995). Graham (1994) dispelled such myths, and found after reviewing 133 empirical studies, that African Americans "appear to maintain a belief in personal control, have high expectations, and enjoy positive self-regard" (p.55). African Americans' on-going struggle for an equal educational opportunity is an example of the value they have historically placed on education.

Harris (1992) reported, that in 1936, only 37% of what was spent on whites was spent on African American students. Harris concluded that the gains in their access to an equal education was due largely to their own lobbying efforts,
based on the importance they placed on education, and their proven motivation and desire to acquire it.

A key to understanding diversity is to challenge the naive beliefs prospective teachers bring to college through a socialization process during their teacher preparation, dispelling the common myths about minorities, and sensitizing college students to their own prejudices. (Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996). Preservice teachers' preconceptions of minorities and other educational issues are of particular concern due to the thousands of hours they spend in classrooms observing teachers teach, from preschool to college (Anderson, 1989). These assumptions should be critically analyzed early on in teacher education programs since they are formed in the absence of coursework on teaching and learning. During that extensive period of time, preservice teachers have developed many assumptions about teaching and minorities. This experience is unique to the teaching profession, as compared to law and medicine (Carter, 1984), where candidates of these professions have a limited exposure to these occupations, and perhaps less preconceptions.

Less successful teachers have little knowledge about the cultural and home backgrounds of their students (Kramer-Schlosser, 1992). Immersion programs that place preservice students in cultures other than their own appear to be
successful in developing culturally sensitive and interculturally competent and caring teachers (Sleeter, 1992; Zeichner & Melnick, 1995).

Goodlad (1990) stressed the value of case studies for multicultural education. Hoffman (1996) stressed that in order to go beyond the superficial learning of cultures, case studies can be used to "question unexamined assumptions concerning concepts such as culture, self, and individual identity". In her workshops, Ladson-Billings (1996) utilized the situational context in case studies to get at the question, "Is this racism?" (p.253), ultimately demonstrating that race is not a phenomenon that "happens to Blacks, but as a dialectic that ultimately ranks, constructs, and positions everyone" (p.252). Beyond case studies, coupled with multicultural education, is my strong recommendation that education students be immersed into minority populations for a month or even longer in order to impact their naive and misinformed cultural beliefs (Sleeter, 1993). The presentation of knowledge, without the critical analysis that engages the student to construct and to build their own levels of understanding, is not sufficient to change teacher thinking (Anderson, 1989; Putnam & Borko, 1996). A program's coherency, or lack of it, can also be a factor in how students construct and connect knowledge that is new to them.
Based on six years of studying excellent teachers of African-Americans, Ladson-Billings (1995) listed the similarities of successful teachers as: (a) teachers who were not ashamed of their professions, (b) they saw themselves as part of the students' community, (c) they saw their work as a form of artistry, (d) they believed all students could succeed, (e) relationships between the teachers and students were equitable and fluid, (f) they developed a learning community and encouraged collaborative learning, encouraging students to act as teachers, helping one another, and (g) teachers taught with a passion and their content and the social order was open to challenges and critical analysis.

Ladson-Billings added that many believed these characteristics are traits of any good teacher, which she agreed, but questioned why these characteristics are not readily evident in schools with African-American students. The Holmes Partnership rightfully recognized the disparity in diversity and the necessity of addressing it directly. They did so by making it one of their six primary goals, to work on diversity and cultural competence in P-12 and higher education (The Gateway Conference, 1997). In addition to improving the diversity of teacher education programs and their teaching candidates, professional development programs need to focus on the cultural sensitivity of veteran
teachers as well. This nation and its schools can ill-afford the time it would take to rely solely upon teacher attrition to staff schools with culturally competent educators. Nor can we afford a delay in reforming teacher education programs so that graduates are assured of an experience that develops cultural competence and sensitivity.

Certain organizations, according to Howey (1996), bear mentioning due to the impact they are having on teacher preparation. They are the standards proposed by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) organized by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF).

NCATE provides a voluntary accreditation process based on standards that only half of the U.S. teacher education institutions have chosen to adopt. The primary goal of INTASC is to make the initial licensing of teachers consistent with the new teaching standards that have come from NBPTS (Howey, 1996).

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) (1996) has proposed the "three-legged stool of quality assurance-teacher education accreditation,
initial teacher licensing, and advanced professional certification", resulting in what NCTAF calls a "professional continuum for teacher development". NCTAF proposed that after qualified teaching candidates were recruited, ideally, they would receive their preparation in a NCATE accredited institution. After successful completion of the program, the beginning teacher would receive an initial intern license based on INTASC standards for subject and teaching knowledge. Prior to receiving a continuing license, the teacher would be actively involved in a new teacher induction process for one or two years, receiving mentoring and evaluation. To receive a continuing license, the teacher's performance would be evaluated once again according to INTASC standards, using multiple assessments, such as portfolios and videotaped lessons, similar to NBPTS assessment methods. In time, the teacher could then qualify for NBPTS advanced certification (p. 67).

In a time when the public demands and deserves qualified teachers, it seems unexcusable that up to 10% of the nation's teachers are permitted to teach without a license, and that inner-city students, with a concentration of minorities, only stand a 50-50 chance of being taught by a fully-licensed mathematics or science teacher. The fact that some states such as Texas, New Jersey, and Virginia have reduced the amount of professional education coursework
required, and require no advanced degree or intensive internship is simply numbing (Darling-Hammond, 1996). Our nation's pets are cared for by qualified, licensed veterinarians. America's school children deserve the same, if not greater level of protection to ensure a supply of qualified, and licensed teachers for P-12 students (NCTAF, 1996). It is bewildering that at a time when teaching has become more complex and demanding, some states are actually reducing the admission requirements to teaching. As an analogue, one could conclude that as medicine becomes more complex, and doctors are less in supply, it would only make sense to eliminate part or all of their professional education, and then turn them loose where they are needed the most: urban and rural America.

Both the Holmes Partnership and the NCTAF share common recommendations. Both, for example, stand for establishing professional standards boards in every state, extended graduate level teacher preparation programs, internships in professional development schools, and differentiated roles for teachers (NCTAF, 1996; Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995). Specifically, NCTAF's recommendations are:

1. Get serious about standards, for both students and teachers. Students must meet world-class standards and rigorous standards for teacher education programs must be enforced.
2. Reinvent teacher preparation and professional development.

3. Overhaul teacher recruitment, and put qualified teachers in every classroom. States and districts must ensure that only qualified teachers are in the classrooms, barriers to teacher mobility be reduced, and that financial incentives be provided to correct teacher shortages in areas such as mathematics and science.

4. Encourage and reward knowledge and skill by creating a career continuum for teachers based on rewards for their demonstrated knowledge and skill.

5. Create schools that are organized for student and teacher success. Schools would be restructured to become true learning organizations for both students and teachers (NCTAF, 1996).

NCTAF (1996) posits that there is a limited and shrinking number of American workers who are supporting the rest of the country, the youth, the elderly, the ill, and the non-productive. We cannot afford to allow any youth to slip between the cracks. The lack of systemic reform and necessary resources, can lead to even lower levels of literacy. As NCTAF (1996) points out, low levels of literacy are reliable predictors of welfare dependency and incarceration, which means additional financial burdens to
productive citizens. All Americans are ultimately affected by the cost of an inadequate education.

NCTAF, combined with the program accreditation process of NCATE, the initial teacher license standards of INTASC, and the advanced license standards of NPBTS, increases the likelihood that teacher education programs will begin to conform to these external influences. Programs that do not adapt may become obsolete, out of touch with current market needs and demands. As the Holmes Partnership and NCTAF would have it, teacher education programs that don't respond to the call to reform and to meet professional standards should be closed.

It does appear that the majority of colleges of education responded to the call to reform teacher preparation programs by raising admission standards and exit standards, and by making core curriculum revisions (RATE I, 1987; RATE II, 1988). However, only 14% of the responding institutions have extended their programs (RATE II, 1988). But on the average most education students take between four to five years to graduate (RATE I, 1987), and approximately 66% of the education students attended college full-time (RATE II, 1988). The majority of the larger institutions developed partnerships with local school districts to improve teacher education, but only the minority of the small and medium institutions had done the same (RATE II, 183.
The most important reforms, according to college of education administrators, were in the areas of raising admission and exit standards, more involvement of the liberal arts professors, and creating partnerships with schools. Reforms ranked least important were extending teacher education programs, forming student cohorts, and improving the liberal arts curriculum (RATE V, 1992).

Although 90% of college faculty reported a considerable sense of efficacy in their part in local reforms, and almost 70% reported committing more time to program development, but only moderate progress was reported nonetheless. According to faculty, this was due to their difficulty in sustaining a collaborative reform effort with their P-12 partners to implement any major changes, a concern of the new Holmes Partnership (RATE VI, 1994).

College involvement in urban school districts also appeared to be a serious issue as about 25% of the responding faculty were actively engaging, while almost half reported a moderate involvement (RATE VII, 1994). Overall, there was little evidence from the RATE studies to support much progress on such topics as the improved socialization of prospective teachers, laboratory development, improvement of instruction, or utilization of technology (RATE VII, 1994). More striking, only 22% of faculty members reported having any form of an evaluation system for their teacher
education programs (RATE VI, 1992). Two years later, the same trend emerged, again indicating a general lack of any rigorous evaluation or programmatic research of teacher education programs within the responding institutions (RATE VII, 1994).

Recruitment and selection of teaching candidates.

As universities attempted to improve their means of recruitment, many lost sight of those students already in their system who received very little support or guidance until they were engaged in student teaching (Goodlad, 1990).

The need to feel valued is universal. A teacher education program that professes to its candidates the importance of valuing P-12 students and their individual needs should be capable of demonstrating this same behavior by valuing its own college students and their individual needs as equally important. Teaching candidates are more likely to value their future students if they have been valued by their teacher educators. This is the heart of teaching.

Recruitment gains can be negated by colleges that lack programs to retain students, due to the neglect of students' academic and socialization needs, viz., failing to understand and act on the needs of students. The use of the National Teacher Examination (NTE), has increased the likelihood that some students will require remedial help.
The use of such tests is expected to impact minorities, reducing the number of minority teachers, just when they are needed the most (Grant & Secada, 1990). Remediation, along with a more rigorous selection process, was one approach used at Grambling University to dramatically increase the number of Grambling students passing the NTE on the first try from 5% to 85% during a five-year period (Spencer, 1986).

Some have argued for the abolishment of both certification tests and the lengthening of teacher education programs due to their negative impact on minority teacher recruitment. Extended programs have been criticized for their additional expense, making it more difficult for minorities to finish their education (Sleeter, 1993). Rising tuition costs can be a concern for most any student, especially minorities. Extended programs can compound the problem. Considering the additional investment students must make, not successfully completing a program would be an even greater loss. Therefore, a strong argument can be made for stronger retention policies and support services for those students who are already in the midst of a teacher education program, as well as more financial support for all qualified preservice students.

The best and most qualified teaching candidates would probably require less or no remediation at all, but there
appears to be little evidence of colleges purposefully attracting the most qualified teaching candidates. Few applicants are turned away, and most are selected on the basis of standardized tests of achievement. Few are selected on the basis of desired teacher qualities (Goodlad, 1990; Howey & Zimpher, 1996). Goodlad adds that it has been easier to use standardized tests than to consider the whole person and argued that colleges should seek candidates who possess desired teaching qualities. Goodlad argued that courts will accept such a process as long as it is based on comprehensive criteria. Some argue standardized tests alone cannot measure one's diligence or desire, and that standardized tests be replaced with criteria that would assist in the evaluation of demonstrated competencies and behaviors (Haberman, 1988).

Others have proposed that in addition to knowledge and skill acquisition, certain desirable teaching qualities or dispositions should be included as outcomes in teacher education programs, and suggested an on-going screening process where at first, candidates themselves could decide before admission if they even possessed such traits (Goodlad, 1990; Howey & Strom, 1987; Raths & Katz, 1982). Howey and Strom listed such teaching qualities as being adaptable, questioning, critical, inventive, self-renewing, and oriented to moral principles. Teachers with such
qualities would be capable of considering multiple perspectives, would seek to make their beliefs congruent with their practice, would exhibit creative problem-solving, and could accommodate the learning needs of a diverse student population (Howey & Strom, 1987).

These qualities would emphasize more than technical competence that we read about in today's reforms, and have the potential of raising the teacher to a higher level of professionalism. Technical competence alone does not guarantee the success of a teaching candidate. Law schools and medical schools, which are frequently held up as models for colleges of education, are also coming to the same conclusion. Professionals must be equipped with a deeper understanding of "the human situation," in order to establish a bond with their clients that is based on a foundation of trust and caring (Beyer, Feinberg, Pagano & Whitson, 1989). Technical competence, coupled with the recognition and further development of the proposed teaching qualities, would appear to increase the effectiveness of any teaching candidate.

Research has suggested that teaching candidates and teachers develop their competence by moving through their development in discrete cognitive stages, similar to a child's stages that Piaget made famous (Sprinthall, Reiman, & Thies-Sprinthall, 1996). One characteristic of moving
through these stages was that teaching candidates and teachers move from a concrete, self-centered, dogmatic view to one that is more desirable in teaching, i.e., one that is more abstract, and inquiry based, and more student-centered (Howey & Zimpher, 1996).

Berliner (1988) also referred to different stages of development for teachers. He listed five stages of teaching: novice, advanced beginner, competent teacher, proficient teacher, and expert teacher. It becomes the role of teacher education programs to facilitate the advancement of teaching candidates and beginning teachers through these stages to a fuller self-realization of their teaching potential. However, it has been suggested that if this development is left in the hands of traditional schools, then teaching as telling will continue to be the dominating pedagogy, that teachers will not progress developmentally, and will remain in the tadpole stage (Buchmann, 1987).

Once in the program, it would become the responsibility of teacher educators to counsel out those candidates who did not progress to the satisfaction of the college (Howey & Strom, 1987). However, teacher educators who serve as the gatekeepers to teaching are passive, reluctant to terminate any teaching candidate, due to the lack of a universal agreement of what makes a good teacher. Most students selected into programs are never terminated and progress to
certification, making selection and admission even more critical. Clearly articulated admission criteria utilizing the qualities of a good teacher may deter those who have lukewarm interests in teaching, aiding in the self-selection process (Katz & Raths, 1984).

Raising selection standards and including multiple assessments of teaching candidates has implications for teacher education programs, such as the increased costs in screening applicants, and in conducting longitudinal validation studies. At the same time, a decrease in funding could occur due to a declining enrollment, the potential result of a more selective process (Pugach, 1988).

If teacher education programs were a sandwich, the outer slices would be its entrance and exit standards. They're soft and easy to manipulate. In my judgement, there has been a tendency for the reform movement to avoid the meat, viz., the tougher issues found in the core of the program, including its purpose, content, length, resources, the professional development of those who would deliver it, when and where it is best delivered, and simply why, or its theoretical underpinnings, and its overall coherency. This lack of focus on the core of the program and its content is perhaps one reason why teacher education has so little impact on its education students.
Program quality.

Although most college administrators did not rank extending the teacher education program as important (RATE V, 1992), almost 86% of teacher educators gave their verbal support to extending the education experience into the first year of teaching, at least in the urban context. For the most part, however, those arrangements rarely existed, and when they did, the college of education was rarely involved (RATE VII, 1994). Even though most college administrators did not value an extended teacher education program, research is beginning to report positive effects of five-year programs, and perhaps this will interest teacher education programs in the five-year plan.

Andrew (1997) conducted a follow-up study of the education graduates of eleven teacher education institutes from 1990-1995, eight of which had implemented a five-year program combining undergraduate and graduate studies. The top four programs in overall effectiveness were five-year programs, lending support to the Holmes Partnership's position that advocates extended programs. Principals rated teachers who graduated from five-year programs as more effective on instructional, leadership, and interpersonal-professional items. He also found that extended program graduates were more likely to enter education and planned to be teaching five to ten years later, as compared to
graduates of four-year programs. When four-year program graduates were asked how to improve their teacher education programs, 24% saw a need for more time spent student teaching, but less than 7% of the five-year program graduates saw this as a problem.

Andrew (1997) also asked graduates to list the most effective and least effective components of their teacher education programs. It is interesting to note that the two most effective components, student teaching and cooperating teachers, are both outside the institution of higher education. Teachers who responded to the survey conducted by Loadman and Klecker (1993) indicated that student teaching and cooperating teachers were rated most effective as well. Also listed as effective in Andrew's study were curriculum/method courses, human development and learning courses, tutoring, and early experience courses.

Rated as moderately effective were university supervisors, legal education, professional conferences, joint projects with faculty, courses on philosophy of education and structure/politics, action research in schools, and portfolios. Rated least effective were involvement in professional student organizations and social and historical foundation courses (Andrew, 1997). In the study conducted by the National Database for Teacher Education Program Follow-up, rated lowest was the area of
academic advising (Loadman & Klecker, 1993). Academic advising might be an area in which the Holmes Partnership could consider other delivery options, such as retaining veteran teachers to assume part-time advising roles for the college.

Andrew (1997) noted that teachers felt the quality of their teacher education programs overall could be improved by extended student teaching, a more practical orientation to course work, more exposure to classroom management and special education methods. They saw little need for additional time on technical applications, alternative assessments, legal issues, individual student needs, community and parent issues, or diversity. Loadman and Klecker (1993) reported that teachers ranked themselves low in computer skills and working with students with special needs. These needs, as expressed by teachers, would indicate a need to extend the program as well, in order to accommodate the need for extended student teaching and more exposure to classroom management. However, teaching, based on the growing base of knowledge about teaching and learning, is more than a craft to be learned. In addition to serving an apprenticeship such as student teaching, today's teacher must be versed on the theory and practice that undergirds the profession.
Almost ten years ago, teacher education students believed their teacher education programs were providing them a quality education, but some reported having doubts about their ability to teach (RATE II, 1988). Between 1990 and 1994, an emerging trend in the RATE studies clearly indicated that students' doubts were subsiding. In RATE IV (1991), 69% of the prospective teachers who had just completed student teaching rated themselves at level two of Berliner's five levels of teaching proficiency. By RATE VII (1994), approximately 66% were rating themselves at level three, a higher proficiency level. Approximately 75% felt they were adequately to extremely well-prepared to teach in an urban context, and rated their faculty as competent. From RATE I (1987) to RATE VII (1994), there was a tendency for prospective teachers to report that their teacher education courses were as difficult as non-education courses, and perhaps more time consuming.

**Early field experiences and student teaching.**

Prospective teachers were more likely to have participated in early field experiences instead of lab activities, ranging from a total of 65 classroom hours for secondary majors to 100 classroom hours for special education majors. Approximately 20% of these field experiences were unsupervised by the college, making the quality of the experience a concern. In addition, the
majority of cooperating teachers received no special training or additional payment.

According to RATE I (1987), college supervisors had little contact time with their student teachers. Approximately 70% of student teachers rated their college supervisors as either helpful or very helpful. However, 85% of the student teachers rated their cooperating teachers as either helpful or very helpful, higher than they rated their college supervisors (RATE IV, 1991).

Although 80% of the cooperating teachers believed they were prepared, only 50% of the teacher education programs reported having any specified requirements to act as a cooperating teacher. A mere 17% required cooperating teachers to take a course. As for the college supervisors, only 25% had obtained tenure, while on the average, over 40% of the professoriate was at full professor rank (RATE IV, 1991). It is understandable why college supervisors believed their role was not valued by the college administration.

Clearly, student teaching continued to be a popular component of teacher education. Approximately 90% of student teachers reported having several opportunities to practice various teaching methods, including observations of veteran teachers, and receiving feedback on their own practice teaching. Practically all student teachers (96%) said they understood the criteria that would be utilized by
the supervisor for assessment, and 80% felt the criteria were appropriate.

Although 80% believed they had adequate time to student teach, their experiences were mostly limited to traditional schools. Only 25% of the programs who responded reported the opportunity to provide their student teachers with more than one teaching experience. Less than 20% required an urban experience, where teachers were needed the most. Most student teaching was not graded, but when grades were assigned, most received either an A or B. When graded on pass/fail, 99% passed (RATE IV, 1991). This placed a greater importance on admission and exit standards to ensure the quality of teaching candidates since most candidates never fail. A teaching candidate may never fail the program, but the program fails the candidate if it did not provide a sound preparation backed by knowledgeable and experienced faculty.

General issues of teacher education programs.

Before leaving the RATE studies, it is noted that as late as 1987, 7% of the college of education faculty had no experience whatsoever in the elementary and secondary classrooms (RATE I, 1987). Approximately 85% of the faculty were confident they could successfully teach in today's classrooms, and self-reported that they were knowledgeable of the reforms occurring at the P-12 level, even though most
had not been in a classroom on a regular basis for 15 years, and only 20% reported having an on-going commitment to a PDS. The time that was spent in a PDS by faculty was largely devoted to traditional services, such as in-services and student-teacher supervision, not on reforms, restructuring, action research, or teaching. Again, only 2% of the college faculty were assimilated enough into the P-12 school's culture to warrant their own desk (RATE VIII, 1995).

One should wonder how the Holmes Partnership's goal of simultaneous renewal can occur if so little time is devoted to P-12 school reform by college faculty (RATE VIII, 1995; Sizer, 1991). The fact that most teacher education faculty were not involved at the PDS level brings into question just how in tune the faculty is with P-12 reform? The lack of the faculty involvement might be one indicator why some teacher education programs are not compatible with the P-12 school reform movement. In the absence of a credible presence of higher education, it would seem logical that the P-12 culture and thinking would dominate, for better or worse. Without purposeful teacher development, an area higher education can provide its expertise, the forces of socialization at the P-12 level will be those that prevail, not the reform efforts. Programs that have achieved success elsewhere cannot be replicated in districts that lack the
know-how or resources. New curriculums lack significant meaning or impact if teachers cannot implement them well (NCTAF, 1996). Since both P-12 and colleges are assumed to be mutually dependent, both suffer from any separation from one another. The business of the new Holmes Partnership is to bridge the gap between theory and practice, or more specifically, the gap between higher education and its P-12 constituents.

Goodlad's (1990) look behind the scenes of teacher education programs was enlightening, and disturbing. On the one hand, future teachers are charged with an overlooked, under-emphasized, but still daunting task of enculturating America's diverse youth into the mainstream of the American democracy, with the goal of turning out proficient, productive, caring citizens. This is a moral endeavor of the highest kind.

These same teachers may not be motivating their students to a calling of their own, to be greater than themselves, to be of service to each other, their country, and humankind, which is the heart of the teaching mission. Teacher educators and the programs they represent may not be motivating or inspiring their potential teachers to this greater purpose either. Lastly, legislatures may not be as respectful and supportive as they could be to the vital and moral role teachers play in America's maintenance.
A sense of calling should be at the core of any profession. If one selects education as their profession, it should be with the clear understanding that they have answered a call to a moral endeavor, a profession critical to the country's survival.

The expectation is clear that teachers today are expected as Goodlad (1990) said to "design schools capable of compensating for the erosion of families, religious institutions, and communities. Such teachers require preparation that goes far beyond immersion in the school, current classroom practices, and the subjects they will teach" (p. xiv). For this reason, institutions should carefully consider whether or not the content of their teacher education programs match with the realities, needs, and expectations of P-12, and society as a whole. They probably do not.

This brings into question whether or not the traditional undergraduate four-year program can adequately address such needs, the expanding knowledge base, and increased calls for teacher proficiency in their subject areas. The Holmes Partnership has concluded that the four-year teacher education program is no longer adequate, and based on my extensive review, I agree. In order to accomplish what needs to be covered in an effective teacher education program, four years is no longer adequate.
Goodlad (1990) suggested that teacher education programs "must provide extensive opportunities for future teachers to move beyond being students of organized knowledge to become teachers who inquire into both knowledge and its teaching" (p.58). Goodlad (1990) and Anderson (1989) also spoke of the importance of teacher educators to model the pedagogical strategies that they teach, and to socialize future teachers to the moral norms of the profession.

Goodlad (1990) reported that future teachers who are not prepared in cohorts are isolated from one another during their preparation and are less equipped to collaborate with their peers once they enter the profession. He advocated that if reform is the desired goal, then teachers must first collaborate, then be prepared to act as change agents, not to see P-12 for what it is, but to view it from the perspective of what it can be, and to be prepared to rock the boat. Future teachers must be willing to challenge the beliefs of other teachers, for example, convincing their peers that all students can learn, and to resist the temptation to blame students for the lack of learning (Anderson, 1989). Collaboration facilitates exchange and enhances the likelihood of change. Unfortunately, many student teachers are placed into non-collaborative teaching
environments, not receiving the benefit of working with more
than one veteran teacher.

Many times, the backgrounds of the P-12 students and
teachers are similar to those of the student teachers, which
in many cases, ensures a successful experience for the
student teacher. At the same time, it robs student teachers
from experiencing the challenges of working with diverse
learners. Student teachers can benefit by diverse school
assignments by the discovery and application of new teaching
and learning strategies they gain by working with a diverse
student body. Research has proven that student teaching
assignments are too short in duration, too narrow in
exposure, and the quality of the experience is overly
dependent on where the student teacher is placed (Denemark &
Nutter, 1984).

If the goal of teacher education is to create
reflective practitioners who think systemically, student
teachers must be given a more thoughtful opportunity to
participate in the smaller communities within the school
district. Cinnamond and Zimpher (1990) stated that being
reflective means developing the ability to consider one's
responses, based on the social, ethical, and practical
consequences. It also means to question what is known and
unknown, and to develop a more constructivist perspective

Teachers construct new knowledge through observations, data collection and reflective analysis. It means making observations, collecting data, maintaining reflective journals, making comparisons, gaining new insights, and relying and referring to research results (McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996). To develop this perspective, student teachers need to be exposed to multiple problematic scenarios in lab or clinical settings so that student teachers can test their actions and beliefs (Cinnamond & Zimpher, 1990; Howey, 1990). Expanded use of micro-teaching, simulations, case studies, interactive media, and planned field experiences prior to student teaching reduces the risk and fear of failure and provides student teachers with a more effective and controlled lab experience, and a more complete exposure to the complexities of teaching and learning (Berliner, 1985).

Shulman (1986) called attention to the value of using case studies in teacher education programs, based on the premise that preservice teachers can learn the complexities of teaching from well-documented cases. The purpose is to utilize cases to develop such teaching skills as analysis, problem solving, and decision making. Henry Holmes, the namesake of the Holmes Partnership, former dean of the
Harvard Graduate School of Education, tried to interest his faculty in the use of case studies in teacher preparation due to the success the method was having in the colleges of business and law (Merseth, 1996). However, there is still little evidence that suggests that these tools are being widely utilized by teacher educators (Gliessman, 1984; Katz & Raths, 1984; RATE IV, 1991).

Student teaching could also be improved with the use of negotiated agreements with cooperating P-12 school districts that clearly define the triad, including the role of the student teachers, the teacher educator supervisors, and the cooperating teacher. The structured Professional Development School (PDS), as the Holmes Partnership proposed, has increased the likelihood that a student teacher will be placed in an appropriate learning community where critical thinking and reflectivity are the norms. But even the PDS will need more time to evolve before its mission and purpose are fully realized. In addition, cooperating teachers should not be expected to assume the role of coach or role model without additional training and remuneration (McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996).

Until recently, teacher education programs located in urban environments seldom filled the unique needs of those urban P-12 systems found in the backyards of higher education (Goodlad, 1990). Recent programs such as the
Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education (UNITE) and their college of education members have dedicated themselves to the redesigning of programs that would better equip teachers to teach in urban schools and other impoverished environments (Howey, 1996). UNITE (Howey, 1996) provided several characteristics of programs preparing teachers for the urban context, such as:

- Concentrating on the diverse literature about urban communities, urban youth, and urban schools.
- Understanding the socio-cultural dimensions of different urban communities in terms of how they affect learning in and out of school.
- Addressing the literature counseling psychology that addresses coping with forms of anti-social behavior.
- Involving veteran urban teachers in the designing of coherent teacher education programs.
- Provide socialization procedures that would promote collaboration with other youth workers and youth agency representatives (Howey, 1996).

Based on the needs that are becoming more evident in urban and rural districts, preparing teachers to act strictly in the role of an educator can be too confining and no longer sufficient in an America faced with a host of challenging social problems. According to Rosenberg (1996), director of the National Center for Injury Prevention and
Control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and others (Hawkins et al., 1994; Lowry et al., 1995; O'Carroll et al., 1986) violence has reached epidemic proportions among America's youth. "Of the 22 industrialized nations, the United States has the highest homicide rate among young males 15 to 24 years of age" (Rosenberg, 1995, p.102). In this regard, Rosenberg advocated an integrated approach, calling for parenting classes, school-based mentors and conflict resolution training. He also stated that the lack of support systems is the cause of violence, not race. He stated "I would add that to raise one child requires an intact village. For many, the villages are no longer intact" (p.107). Rosenberg commented, "They do not have the benefits that you and I have, or the extended families or intact families, or the social clubs, or coaches, or wives; they do not have that social infrastructure" (p.107). Many teaching candidates and for that matter, veteran teachers need training on how to work cooperatively with other youth agencies as we all attempt to reconstruct the village, more specifically, the support systems that enable learning for children.

Based on my review, recognition of this social ill of epidemic proportion is strangely absent in teacher education programs, and the literature of the Holmes Partnership, but yet it remains a problem many future teachers will face.
Perhaps the thinking is that this problem is best left to the police, social workers, and the courts. This ignores Rosenberg's point that it takes an intact "village" to raise a child. Teachers, those who would prepare them, and the institutes they represent, cannot escape the fact that they are at the epicenter of these social ills. Teacher education programs must decide whether or not to become part of the solution and help reconstruct the support systems, or continue to be rocked in their classrooms by the lack of them.

To enter this new reality, teachers must often be prepared to break from their traditional role of teacher and become social workers, agents of change and reconciliation. As prisons are filled to over-capacity, and new ones are built, one must conclude that adjudication alone cannot succeed. For as much as this problem is ignored in teacher education, it is probably safe to assume that teachers probably are not equipped to teach in climates where these problems exist.

The need for more coherent programs.

Goodlad (1990), Howey and Zimpher (1989), and Katz and Raths (1992), stressed the need for coherent programs of teacher education, a goal of the Holmes Partnership (Tomorrow's Teachers, 1986). Goodlad observed that teacher education programs seem to muddle along, without a clear
sense of purpose. The programs' components were neither indirectly or directly connected with one another, severely lacking in coherency. Barone, Berliner, Blanchard, Casnova, and McGowan (1996) agreed, adding that method courses are not interrelated, let alone integrated, making it difficult for preservice students to develop any kind of a personal educational foundation. They suggested a more integrated approach to method courses, demonstrating to preservice teachers how learning can occur across various subject areas.

The lack of program coherency may account for what Katz and Raths (1992) refer to as a lack of impact on teacher education students, made evident when the opinions and beliefs of preservice students and beginning teachers fail to change, even when their beliefs conflict with proven research (Anderson, 1989). To remedy this lack of impact, Anderson suggested that programs must be established on a knowledge base and be organized in a way "that results in significant conceptual change toward a cognitive, constructivist perspective" (p.85-86). She added that research has informed us that providing students with "unrelated information is unlikely to effect significant learning" (p.86). Anderson (1989) saw the need for education students to engage in "extended, in-depth
examination of a few core, critical ideas that are likely to form the basis of a personal theory or conception" (p.86).

Howey and Zimpher (1989) also saw the need for coherent programs based on frameworks grounded in theory and research. They stated:

Programs have one or more frameworks grounded in theory and research as well as practice; frameworks that explicate, justify, and build consensus around such fundamental conceptions as the role of the teacher, the nature of teaching and learning, and the mission of schools in this democracy. (p.242)

Frameworks provide coherence and direction for preservice study and even into extended experiences in P-12's, where induction programs for beginning teachers might be found, according to Howey and Zimpher (1989). A program that evolves around a single coherent theme may impact the potential teacher's beliefs and practices (Barnes, 1987). However, Buchmann and Floden (1990) contend that programs can be too narrowly defined, too coherent, not allowing for alternative perspectives. A compromise is for a program to offer students a choice of more than one theme, such as Michigan State University has done (Howey & Zimpher, 1989).

Another example of a conceptual framework would be one that identifies the primary tasks of teacher education, one that would include how to transform knowledge from
instruction, a commitment to teach all children, and to assist teachers to reflect on their preconceptions about teaching and learning (Feiman-Nemser, 1990).

**Extended programs.**

Education differs with the professions of medicine and law in the length of their preparation programs. The Holmes Partnership not only calls for more coherent programs, professional development schools, and a career hierarchy for teaching, but it also called for graduate-level professional studies (*Tomorrow's Teachers*, 1986). The Holmes Group approach emphasizes subject area competence to be achieved at the undergraduate level, followed by the professional preparation in pedagogy at the graduate level. But not all agree, and the majority of Holmes Group members never implemented the five-year program (*The Holmes Group*, 1994).

Tom (1986) felt that the problem with teacher education programs was not their length, but their inherent lack of coherency and quality. Hawley (1986) and Tom (1986) argued that the undergraduate approach to preparing teachers was still viable if combined with a solid induction program for beginning teachers. However, I would agree with Katz and Raths (1984) that traditional four-year teacher education programs lack the time to provide an adequate preparation, primarily due to the rapidly developing and expanding base of knowledge on teaching and learning, coupled with the
necessity to develop in teachers increased competency in their chosen subject area. The expansion of this knowledge base of teaching and learning was recognized almost twenty years ago, and has obviously expanded since then (Gage, 1978; Good, 1979). Katz and Raths (1984) concluded a five-year extended program was necessary and inevitable, and should be coupled with a year of supervised internship. The authors of *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) arrived at the same conclusions. As is the case with the students of law and medicine, a greater level of competence is expected to ensure safe practice and to maintain the public trust. Nothing less should be expected from those whom we entrust with America's young minds.

Most extended teacher education programs are five years in length, and result in a masters degree (Darling-Hammond, 1996). However, this alone cannot ensure quality and a supply of teachers, unless the teacher education program extends itself as a supportive agent into the beginning teacher's first year on the job (Katz & Raths, 1984; *Tomorrow's Teachers*, 1986). The induction year into teaching is notoriously weak and unorganized, as compared to other professions, even the skilled trades. The majority of the beginning teacher's anxiety can be traced to the expectation that a beginning teacher should make the
transition from novice to professional practically overnight (Lortie, 1975).

It is the recommendation of the Holmes Partnership, and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) that student teaching and the more intensive internship be spent in professional development schools (PDS). Part of this intensive internship would be spent under the direction of empathetic teacher mentors, who are considered masters at teaching and relating to other teachers, and who understand the important role of serving as a mentor to a beginning teacher, or intern (Zimpher & Grossman, 1992). By increasing the collaboration between all teachers, beginning teachers would benefit from the shared expertise of all veteran teachers, and not just their mentors (Darling-Hammond, 1996).

In the late 1970s, countries such as Britain, Australia, and New Zealand were already making policies to ease the difficulty of transition that beginning teachers experience, such as reducing the teaching load and offering counseling meetings that were facilitated by more experienced teachers, to name just a few (Tisher, 1984). Policies and programs in America to assist beginning teachers could reduce the number of beginning teachers who leave teaching, estimated to be as high as 50% within the first five years on the job (Grissmer & Kirby, 1987; 211
Schlechty & Vance, 1983). Haberman (1987) estimate that half of the beginning teachers in urban schools leave even sooner, within three years. Retaining more of the teachers who enter the profession would obviously ease the pressure to recruit.

**Teacher educators.**

Certainly, expectations cannot rise for P-12 teachers without expectations rising for those who serve as their role models, viz., the teacher educators. Noticeably absent in most reform literature is a call to improve the instruction that takes place at the higher education level. As little as 18% of methods faculty supported the idea of advanced certification for college faculty, similar to that which is proposed for P-12 teachers by the NBPTS (RATE VIII, 1995). Barone et al. (1996) stated that "strong professors live in schools, know classroom life, and appreciate the needs, wants, and abilities of today's children" (p. 1121). They also recommended that preservice students be exposed to active and engaging instruction that is both integrative and holistic, helping students link new information with existing knowledge, thus helping them to construct their own personal meaning of classroom experiences.

A decade ago, most secondary education methods faculty had elementary and secondary teaching experience, but 7% had no experience in either (RATE I, 1987). Approximately 80%
had earned a doctorate, and frequently, they taught foundation courses outside their graduate academic training. Approximately 75% of the faculty were white, middle-aged men (RATE II, 1988; RATE III, 1990). In the RATE V (1992) sample, faculty were predominantly white (92%), 63% were at the senior rank, and 56% were men.

Methods faculty considered themselves knowledgeable of P-12 reforms, and felt comfortable instructing prospective and veteran teachers on topics such as team teaching, integrated curriculum, cooperative learning, and portfolio assessment. This is quite surprising as most had not taught in a P-12 classroom on a regular basis for about 15 years. Even more surprising is that a significant majority of faculty (85%) felt either confident or very confident that they could successfully teach in today's P-12 classrooms (RATE VIII, 1995).

Professors teaching at the baccalaureate level colleges spent more time teaching than professors at masters and doctoral level colleges where research was considered a priority (RATE III, 1990). But when it came to tenure and promotion, research productivity remained part of the criteria even at colleges where research traditionally had not been considered the priority. This resulted in 56% of the faculty indicating their dissatisfaction with their lack of time to engage in research (RATE VI, 1994).
Although a majority of faculty had not seen an increase in their workload, almost 33% had. A contributing factor could be that 20% of the methods faculty reported an ongoing commitment to a professional development or partnership school (RATE VIII, 1995). The downside to their involvement was that much of their time was spent in traditional areas, such as supervising student teachers and conducting in-services. Some of the core activities of a professional development school (PDS) are action research situated within the context of the school, and providing assistance to schools facing restructuring and reforms. However, according to RATE VIII (1995), there was little evidence these pursuits were being undertaken.

Further evidence that suggested the difficulty of engaging faculty in the PDS is that only 20% considered themselves regular participants. RATE VIII (1995) further indicated that only 2% of the faculty were enculturated to the point that they had been assigned their own desk at the PDS.

**College faculty development.**

The Holmes Partnership lists faculty development as one of their goals, to provide superior doctoral programs for future teacher educators, and to provide advanced professional development of school-based educators (The
Gateway Conference, 1997). This is an important element of an effective teacher education program. UNITE (Howey, 1996) ventured into the realm of faculty development when it suggested in its charter and final report that if colleges of education expect a role in P-12 reform, then higher education must be dedicated to reform in its own backyard. UNITE considered faculty development as a major area. In its final report, UNITE stated the professional development of educators must be embedded in their ongoing activities, focusing on their roles as child advocates, mentors, clinicians, teachers, and curriculum designers. Their professional development effort must be institutionalized, consisting of a critical perspective that improves the education of teachers for the urban context.

Faculty development at the higher education level might be further institutionalized by the Holmes Partnership by the adoption of standards or at least guidelines for faculty development, similar to the standards developed by the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) for elementary, middle level, and high school teachers and principals (Nationals Staff Development Council, 1995). According to the NSDC, three elements must be taken into consideration to ensure the successful implementation of a professional development program: context, process, and content. Context focuses on the system or culture that is targeted for
development. Process addresses how knowledge will we acquired. New knowledge or new skills serves as the content (National Staff Development Council, 1995).

Professional development, especially in higher education, has failed at times due to confusion over the goals, neglecting the how in implementation, and the failure to understand that it is the instrument of change, and that it is the core of any attempt to improve education (Fullan, 1987). Wise (1996) reminded us that "attempting change in one part of the system...will work only as well as the changes made in other parts of the system" (p.1).

To generate change, the Holmes Partnership has made professional development a linchpin in their reform agenda, and simultaneous renewal a specific goal. After all, changing practitioners' beliefs and practices is at the core of staff development. The question left unanswered, at least for now, is whether or not the partnerships created by the Holmes Partnership will indeed spark cooperation, and the level of simultaneous renewal that is needed for not only P-12, but also for higher education. Both have historically been resistant to systemic change.

I would agree with Sarason (1996) and Fullan (1987) that staff development, school based staff development, or systemic change will not occur in a significant or planned way without the participation of outside support and
pressure. The partnerships the Holmes Partnership have formed hopefully will provide the needed outside support and pressure. And those who have the most at stake, (in my view, the customers, meaning the students, parents, and employers,) are perhaps the least empowered in the reform process, but they represent a potent ally in the struggle to challenge the status quo in education. It takes a partnership. History will determine if the Holmes Partnership was that partnership.

The reputation and viability of the Holmes Partnership and its members are at stake. More importantly, higher education and P-12 must be careful not to squander what could be their last opportunity to reform themselves before the public and its policy-makers assume more control, by considering options such as stronger mandates, and alternative teacher education programs.

The initial strategic actions the Holmes Partnership has chosen to engage first will either plant the seeds for successful renewal, or the seeds of another educational reform failure. At this early stage, the new strategic actions appear to be good seed for reform and continuous improvement. However, it is at the point of implementation where the Holmes Group broke down once before. Unless the Holmes Partnership has learned from the past, they are likely to repeat it.
After ten years, there was no evidence that any Holmes Group institute adopted all of the reforms and difficult changes that were advocated by the former Holmes Group (Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, & Watson, 1996). As it has been said, the more things change, the more they stay the same. Organizational structure determines behavior. Without systemic change, "people, however different, tend to produce similar results" when placed in the same system (Senge, 1990, p.42). This not only gives insight on the overall lack of systemic reform in teacher education programs, but also explains how the best and brightest of new teachers are socialized by these type of systems to often conform to the system's level of mediocrity. However, even though the reforms were of their own making, some were beyond their control, such as additional funding for the PDS model, or state legislative policies concerning teacher certification and funding, or decisions made at the local school level concerning beginning teachers, to name a few.

This suggests two concerns. First, the lack of systemic reform reinforces experts' findings (Kellogg Commission 1996, 1997; Sarason, 1996; Senge, 1990), that education as a whole remains extremely resistant to systemic change. Stated more succinctly, teacher education programs have an inherent inability to affect systemic change, or to learn from their past. They are not self-correcting; they
lack an ongoing and systematic evaluation system (RATE V, 1992). The lack of program evaluation cripples efforts to judge what exactly does constitute effective teacher education. How do we know?

In its inception, the members of the Holmes Group were to be held accountable to the Holmes Group reform model, but instead, were practically guaranteed their membership regardless if any change ever occurred. The new Holmes Partnership, in its new strategic actions, have called for the creation of mechanisms of accountability to ensure its members adopt the Holmes Partnership models, making it a condition of continued membership.
Chapter 4
The New Holmes Partnership: Its Goals and Strategic Actions

The new Holmes Partnership, formerly known as the Holmes Group, reorganized and approved its bylaws at its January, 1996, inaugural meeting in Washington, D.C. At that meeting, discussion centered around lessons learned from a decade of reform by the former Holmes Group, past accomplishments of the Holmes Group, and the challenges to creating learning communities in colleges of education and P-12 schools. Similar to the former Holmes Group, the new Holmes Partnership remained a national consortium of research universities, but in partnership with P-12 school districts. In the view of the new Holmes Partnership, it was best suited to reform teacher education programs for the following reasons. First, these institutes educate a significant number of future teachers, administrators, and professors of education. Second, these institutes lead the research into learning, teaching, and schooling. An organization that represents such major research universities and their resources could have a dramatic impact on how teachers are prepared, especially if the
organization could focus its members' efforts. As the Fullan et al. (1996) reported, the original Holmes Group was largely successful at creating the reform agenda, but were not successful at implementing it. The Holmes Partnership addressed this weakness by forming partnerships with external forces by creating partnerships with external forces such as P-12 schools in the form of local partnerships, and national organizations as national partners (Murray, 1996). The new Holmes Partnership was fulfilling a Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) goal "to connect our own institutions to schools." Through time, practice, and research, the Holmes Partnership has committed itself to learn more about the strengths and weaknesses of their local partnerships.

The Holmes Partnership continues to make progress in lining up local partnerships with P-12 school districts and national partners such as The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, The American Federation of Teachers, The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, The National Education Association, The National Policy Board for Educational Administration, and the National Staff Development Council. The hope is that these partners, aligned with the new Holmes Partnership will lessen the noise and clutter of multiple voices in educational reform, and a more coherent voice will be heard
in the public arena on the topic of educational reform. Only one year after the Holmes Partnership was formed in January, 1996, members, national partners, and local partnerships gathered for their first working conference in January, 1997, which was dedicated to taking action on the strategic goals of the Holmes Partnership.

Through the use of partnerships, teacher educators are expected to become more in tune with the expertise practitioners can offer, and more aware of school practices. Practitioners, in turn, would become more enlightened to school practice through inquiry and action research methods, alongside the university faculty. This is expected to lead to an overall improvement, or simultaneous renewal of each domain, higher education, and P-12 schools. Whereas the Holmes Group became focused on creating the agenda, the new Holmes Partnership is now hopefully positioned to carry out much of the work; to implement the agenda through a carefully crafted network of local partnerships and national partners.

The necessary funding for the new Holmes Partnership came from the support of its members' dues at $5,000 each. Additional financial support in the form of grants came from the U.S. Department of Education, and from the foundations of Ford, Carnegie, Johnson, DeWitt, Wallace, Rockefeller, and the New York Times. Additional resources will most
definitely be needed to support the overall reform implementation, especially in the Professional Development Schools (PDS). I suggest, for example, the expense of a PDS, state governments could borrow from a federal government concept of designating federal impact zones, meaning P-12 schools located near military bases or large federal installations would receive additional funding, direct from the federal government, due to the influx of additional people employed by the federal government. State governments could award additional state funding to those PDS sites which have assumed the added responsibility of research, coupled with the development of new and veteran teachers.

The crucible, where the common interests of higher education and P-12 schools meet is in the Professional Development Schools (PDS), the linchpin in the Holmes Partnership's reform agenda. These particular schools are based on a partnership between P-12 and a college of education. Working in concert, P-12 and college faculty would take part in research to better understand school practices in order to build the more perfect learning communities, where classrooms are structured to be productive, caring collectives of educators, students, and parents working together, so that all participants, students
and faculty, are learning and improving (Tomorrow's Schools, 1990).

The Priorities of the Holmes Partnership

To implement the Holmes Partnership agenda, priority was given to certain areas. First, membership in the Holmes Partnership dictated a commitment from the university, not just from the college or department of education. The Holmes Partnership considered it important to its success to gain the financial assistance of the university, as well as its support in the development of new policies that would alter programs, change the role of faculty and their reward structure, and to increase the number of minority faculty and students on campus, especially within the colleges of education. Another emphasis was to work with the professors in the arts and sciences to model to education students a variety of instructional techniques, such as those that stimulate inquiry and problem solving. Just as important was the priority of designing coherent teacher education programs that would share the knowledge learned from the past decade of research in the areas of cognition, teaching and school organization (Murray, 1996).

To guide the new Holmes Partnership, the organization renewed its commitment to the original goals and principles.
as specified in the original Holmes Group trilogy *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990), and *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995). The original goals and principles of the trilogy were used as the foundation to develop the six overarching goals that would guide the new Holmes Partnership organization.

**The Holmes Partnership six goals.**

- **Goal One - High Quality Professional Preparation.**
  Provide exemplary professional preparation and development programs for public school educators. These programs must demonstrate rigor, innovation, and attention to the needs of diverse children and youth. Their design, content, and delivery must reflect research and best practice.

- **Goal Two - Simultaneous Renewal.**
  Engage in the simultaneous renewal of public K-12 schools and the education of beginning and experienced educators by establishing strong partnerships of universities, schools and professional organizations and associations.

- **Goal Three - Equity, Diversity, and Cultural Competence.**
  Actively work on equity, diversity and cultural competence in the programs of K-12 schools, higher
education, and the education profession by recruiting, preparing, and sustaining faculty and students who reflect the rich diversity of cultural perspectives in this country and our global community.

• Goal 4 - Scholarly Inquiry and Programs of Research.
Conduct and disseminate educational research and engage in other scholarly activities that advance knowledge, improve teaching and learning for all children and youth, inform the preparation and development of educators, and influence educational policy and practice.

• Goal 5 - Faculty Development.
Provide high quality doctoral programs for the future education professoriate and for advanced professional development of school-based educators. Redesign the work of both university and school faculty to enable accomplishment of The Holmes Partnership goals--better preparing educators in improving learning for children and youth. Promote conditions that recognize and reward education professionals who better serve the needs of all learners.

• Goal Six - Policy Initiation.
Engage in policy analysis and development related to public P-12 schools and the preparation of educators. Advocate policies that improve teaching and learning
for all students, promote school improvement and enhance the preparation and continuing professional development of all educators (The Gateway Conference, 1997).

Within months of the Holmes Partnership's first annual meeting in January, 1997, the board of directors, acting on what they had learned from their national partners and local partnerships, began to translate and prioritize their overarching organizational goals into specific strategic actions. The strategic actions were developed in Miami the summer of 1997 by the Holmes Partnership board of directors, facilitated by the Interactive Management and Design Team of The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

The new Holmes Partnership strategic actions.

Strategic action: Learn from stakeholders.

The new Holmes Partnership has made it a strategic action to create models of representative stakeholder groups that would provide their constituents a meaningful voice in teacher education programs (The Holmes Partnership, 1997). In time, I would foresee that these so-called 'external' forces, such as unions, higher education, parents, and school boards will be considered an integral part of the whole system. Surely teachers are now viewed as partners.

An area of mutual concern by P-12 educators and teacher educators was identified by the current leadership of the
Holmes Partnership as the lack of funding models. Both parties are in a constant, sometimes competitive pursuit of limited resources, which often pits one against the other in state legislatures when a more unified front is needed. Both P-12 and colleges of education are typically poor in resources, and lacking in consistent and equitable funding models.

**Strategic action: Defining a high quality professional preparation.**

The research team of Fullan et al. (1996) had also recommended the establishment of a system for continuous professional development of teachers. It would appear from the literature that the best kind of professional development would be a concerted effort of both the Holmes Partnership and P-12 to end teacher isolation and encourage collegiality, collaboration, and more specifically, give teachers the opportunity to observe and to reflect upon the teaching practices of successful peers. This could be the first step in building a learning organization where its participants learn how to sustain one another while adapting best practices.

Without the benefit of direct input from its stakeholders, coupled with the lack of longitudinal data on the performance of teacher candidates and graduates of teacher education programs, these institutes of higher
learning can hardly be considered learning organizations. Without longitudinal data that would indicate a program's strengths and weaknesses, it is difficult to substantiate the elements of a high quality program.

It is hard to believe that research-centered universities do not already have more systematic evaluation processes in place. By the turn of the century, teacher education programs will have to track the performances of their teacher candidates in order to remain NCATE certified. "More emphasis will be placed on the quality of candidate work, candidate subject matter knowledge, and demonstrated teaching skill" (NCATE News, 1997, p.1). Less emphasis will be placed on input and process measures. This data should prove helpful to any organization that is attempting to learn from its program's strengths and weaknesses as it attempts to become a learning organization, or one that is "skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights" (Garvin, 1993, p.80). Garvin added that "without accompanying changes in the way that work gets done, only the potential for improvement exists" (p.80).

As proponents of reflective thinking and critical analysis, the Holmes Partnership has a decade of past experiences as the Holmes Group which warrant analysis in order to understand fully why that reform agenda was less
than hoped for. Through planned deliberation, they could turn the first ten years of implementation woes into a "productive failure", or one "that leads to insight, understanding, and thus an addition to the commonly held wisdom of the organization" (Garvin, 1993, p.86). Those who deeply understand their past failures are in the best position to assume future leadership.

The apparent lack of consensus between the former members of the Holmes Group on the elements of the reform package after ten years indicated the need for this new Holmes Partnership to revisit the agenda, which they did at their summer 1997 board meeting in Miami. The inconsistency between members on what constituted an effective teacher education program led to problems in the implementation stage for the original Holmes Group. Key elements the new organization must clarify are the nature of extended programs, accountability measures, PDS models and standards, the role of practitioners in teacher education, internships, preservice student assessment, what type of pedagogical training takes place in the PDS, teacher career ladders, and how to bring teacher education reforms including PDSs to scale in the process of training all teachers (The Holmes Partnership, 1997).
Strategic action: Defining local partnerships

Local partnerships range in size from small to large, and due to that range, one partnership's attributes may not be shared by another partnership. Consequently, due to their differing nature, a smaller local partnership may experience obstacles to reform unlike those experienced by a larger partnership. It is becoming more apparent that the roles and responsibilities of local partnerships need to be tightened. Much remains to be learned about the partnerships between P-12 and higher education before a clear model or models emerge. Some important lessons were learned from the Partnership for Increased Student Learning: Massachusetts Coalition for School Improvement. One lesson learned was the importance of always including teachers in the reform process. Research has shown that not involving teachers has often led to ineffective implementation, due to the lack of understanding, or a lack of commitment on the part of the teachers to implement a reform that has been thrust upon them without their involvement (Sarason, 1996; Sinclair & Harrison, 1988). Teacher involvement is now a staple of the Holmes Partnership.

Another obstacle faced by this Massachusetts P-12-higher education partnership were university faculty who found it difficult to participate on equal footing with their P-12 peers. The partnership also learned to avoid as
much as possible on the over-reliance on experts, which had the tendency to minimize the role and ability of P-12 professionals, blocking them from recognizing their own resources and research skills. The partnership also recognized that packaged reforms could not be imposed on a school, that some variation must be accepted in order to address the needs of local settings, a factor the Holmes Partnership understands to be necessary as well. Most importantly, the coalition found that the more schools gathered data on what blocks learning, the more likely it would lead to desired changes in the school organization. The Massachusetts partnership discovered that school conditions might be a contributing factor to certain student behavior, behavior that teachers wanted to change (Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988).

As local partnerships become common and more firmly grounded, additional research will uncover strengths and weaknesses. This will enable partnerships to become the learning organizations that they need to be in order to deliver effective teacher education programs. One should not expect this process of partnering and simultaneous renewal to be smooth. If reforms are going to be debated openly, as they should, on topics such as territorial disputes, obsolete reward systems, trivial agendas, and educators' schedules that are already overburdened, no doubt the
primary reform vehicle, in this case the local partnership, will experience some bumps and dings along the way (Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988).

**Strategic action: Promote an ongoing critical study process.**

The Holmes Partnership appears to be transforming itself into a learning organization, based on their recent strategic action, to "create and sustain structures that promote an ongoing critical study process, to move beyond sharing only our best practices to critiquing our struggles and practices" (Holmes Partnership, 1997, p.2). Along with critical study, this strategic action would ask such critical questions as "whose interests do our practices serve, and whose interests do they not serve?" (p.2). In essence, everything should be questioned. Dissonance should be encouraged, even demanded, in order to reduce noisy interference during the critical stages of implementation.

Another irony exists in that the PDS, the linchpin of the Holmes Partnership reforms, is designed to be a learning organization, but largely facilitated by those in higher education who have not yet turned their own houses into learning organizations. Colleges of education might be more effective in their PDS and reform work if they first learn how to transform their own teacher education programs.
(Fullan et al., 1996) into learning organizations before attempting to facilitate the reforms of P-12. Only then can higher education approach P-12 with a deeper understanding of the obstacles to restructuring.

A key role higher education can play in helping P-12 and PDSs become learning organizations is to integrate teachers as researchers into the college's research program, which now is a stated strategic action (Holmes Partnership, 1997). The research team of Fullan et al. (1996) considered it a priority that PDSs must become stronger vehicles in contributing to the knowledge base for teaching, via reflective inquiry and action research.

**Strategic action: Vertical coordination of research**

On the national level, the Holmes Partnership has proposed that one of their strategic actions should be the vertical coordination of research and development programs across their partnerships on topics that relate to teacher education and P-12 reform, perhaps making the research more systematic, efficient, and less redundant. This has the potential of helping partnerships become learning organizations while also giving them the opportunity to learn from other partnership models and other teacher education programs and P-12 schools. It also emphasized the importance of including P-12 teachers in the research, which
enhances their understanding of the nature and practices of their school setting.

**Strategic action: To build real capacity.**

The Holmes Partnership (1997) listed as a strategic action to "build capacity" to better support its local partnerships. It suggested in its clarification statements that one way to add capacity is to "create professional academies to train ourselves, since the agenda is so complex" (p.4). This effort might improve the organization's understanding of the rationale and content of its own agenda.

On the other hand, it also suggests the need to simplify the agenda, perhaps rewriting it into different phases of implementation. Most businesses would be hard pressed to implement such a massive and complex agenda unless they did it in phases. I would recommend a three-year business plan for the Holmes Partnership, and a three-year business plan for each local partnership of the organization. The plan would establish a timetable for implementation of the Holmes Partnership agenda, and a means to ensure accountability. This would allow their personnel the time, space, and training necessary to focus on the understanding and implementation of one phase at a time, and also to raise the revenue necessary for some of the reforms. In changing an organization, maintaining focus is paramount.
The attention span of staff, faculty, and the general public are not infinite.

Before bringing teacher education reforms to scale however, the Holmes Partnership (1997) must first, according to their new strategic action, define local partnerships, identify the key components, and then provide "outreach services to help local partnerships..." (p. 2).

Providing outreach services is yet another new strategic action, or goal, to "provide more technical support to their local partnerships" (p. 2). In the business culture, this is known as value-adding, or increasing capacity to serve clientele. The stronger, more visible partnerships could serve as a benchmark, and provide assistance to the developing partnerships.

**Strategic action: Redesign P-12 teachers' workplace**

The new Holmes Partnership has also reported as a strategic action their desire to be a reform force in the redesigning of the teachers' workplace in P-12 schools. Instituting professional workplace standards that would emphasize such necessities as adequate planning time for teachers has been recommended (Holmes Partnership, 1997). Imagine a teacher's workplace designed to standards that would create a learning organization for adults and children, one that allows time for reflective analysis, collaboration, and student-paced learning. If it holds
true, as Senge (1990) would have us believe, that "when placed in the same system, people, however different, tend to produce similar results" (p.42), then one might conclude that educators and children could become better teachers and learners by association with a true learning organization.

A learning organization model could provide impetus to the Holmes Partnership's desire to bring PDS's to scale, while also enhancing their ability to transfer knowledge to non-PDS sites. Overall, a learning organization and its personnel are empowered to investigate the factors that either enhance or inhibit the mission of the organization.

An ideal learning organization would be proficient at:

2. Experimentation with new ideas and strategies. To lessen fear, faculty are not evaluated during experimentation of approved projects.
3. Learning from their own experience and past history. Having the courage to address past failures, celebrating the valuable lessons they learned.
4. Learning from the best practices of others. Not all learning comes from reflection. Benchmarking provides an organization an outside perspective. Open dialogue with constituents can provide much needed insight.
5. Rapidly transferring new knowledge throughout the organization.

Reports and visits to other organizations are two means to share knowledge. Most beneficial would be learning by immersion. Faculty exchange programs could proliferate new knowledge throughout an organization, and from one organization to another (Garvin, 1993, p.81-84).

The ultimate goal for a learning organization, according to is to move from a superficial knowledge to a deep understanding, to know not just how things happen, but knowing why they occur. However, learning has to be the explicit priority of the organization in order for this understanding to occur, and action must follow understanding. Deeper understanding of school practices in the teachers' workplace can lead to planned improvements.

**Strategic action: Arrange the clutter, hire a media manager.**

A recommendation the research team of Fullan et al. (1996) made after studying the first ten years of the Holmes Group was the need to arrange the clutter at the policy and standard-setting level by carefully aligning partnerships. The Holmes Partnership, now joined by their national and local partnerships, are in a unique position to be the national voice in the media for teacher education reform. By providing coherency and direction to multiple reform
efforts, the Holmes Partnership's political currency is enhanced, thus providing them the clout needed to implement local, state, and national reforms. One of the Holmes Partnership’s primary strategic actions is their plan to employ a person(s) charged with the responsibility of redefining the media message of the Holmes Partnership and its national and local partnerships on teacher education issues. This position would also facilitate sharing between partnerships (Holmes Partnership, 1997).

I also agree with the recommendations of Fullan et al. (1996) that the Holmes Partnership should centralize its administration and management operations. The Holmes Partnership should continue to maintain a full-time executive director, and employ an assistant. A full-time staff and stand-alone office would help facilitate the day-to-day operations and communications of the organization, as opposed to its current model of split management responsibilities and competing interests between the University of Delaware and The Ohio State University.

**Strategic action: Planning for Book IV.**

As the Holmes Partnership contemplates their next breakthrough idea for a future book as a strategic action, partnerships being a possible topic, I would propose an additional one, "*Tomorrow's Professors*". This could be a breakthrough on all fronts, shedding much needed light on
the professoriate as a whole, not just teacher educators. The foundation to the book could be the trends in higher education that would seem to indicate, according to my literature review, the need to modify, at least in part, how tomorrow's professors are educated. For example, tomorrow's professors will need multiple instructional strategies to reach a student body that is becoming more diverse. Strategies such as cooperative learning, or inquiry based learning based on community based problems will become the norm. Currently, many doctoral students do not receive the necessary training, and in many cases, will not even be required to teach alongside an effective professor mentor. This topic has the potential of drawing a larger public audience than just education professionals, reinforcing the Holmes Partnership's role as a national leader in education reform.

In doing so, the Holmes Partnership would have completed the circle of reform by expanding their titles to include professors. First was Tomorrow's Teachers (1986), then Tomorrow's Schools (1990), and last, Tomorrow's Schools of Education (1995).

The missing element by and large are the professors, those entrusted to teach tomorrow's teachers. They are largely absent from the teacher education reform literature.
Considering there is little support for methods faculty to stand for advanced certification as many veteran teachers are (RATE VIII, 1995), the new Holmes Partnership proposes to study this as a strategic action. In the national arena, where educational issues are at center stage, this has the potential to be a breakthrough.

**Tomorrow's Professors** would allow the Holmes Partnership to examine such issues as diversity, showcasing its successful Holmes Scholar professor-recruitment program. It could also propose innovative tenure and promotion policies that reward both research, and community service, or propose strategic actions that would serve to enhance the prestige of teacher educators on and off campus. Just as the Holmes Group proposed a new vision in **Tomorrow's Teachers** (1986), the Holmes Partnership is uniquely qualified to propose a new vision for the professoriate.

**Strategic action: Require equity, diversity, and cultural competency standards.**

The Holmes Partnership could set the standard in cultural competency by requiring it from their teacher educators, those who serve as powerful role models for teaching candidates. Research indicates that immersion programs are sometimes needed to challenge stereotypical attitudes (Sleeter, 1992; Zeichner & Melnick, 1995). Teacher education professors, teachers, and even
administrators, could be the first to accept immersion programs as a standard, and be granted the necessary leave to live that experience on domestic and/or international sites. Teacher education professors would be in a much better position to aid teaching candidates and beginning teachers in developing culturally relevant curriculum, another strategic action of the new Holmes Partnership.

The Holmes Partnership wants to ensure that all students achieve success in school, and in their clarification the Holmes Partnership remarks that not all students learn the same way, or at the same rate. I would propose to be included in the Holmes Partnership program of research a question on how the structure of P-12 schooling affects student educational outcomes. Educators believe that not all students learn at the same rate, but many schools continue to assign groups of students to arbitrary grade levels based on their age or height, and not on their academic needs. What affect do graded classrooms and school structures have on student achievement, student and teacher frustration, student and teacher burnout and dropouts? How does school structure enable and inhibit learning? What affects do teachers' attitudes on diversity have on student performance?

Research sponsored by the Holmes Partnership on these topics would demonstrate the Holmes Partnership's commitment
to P-12 students. It would also provide insightful data to not only the PDSs, but to the remainder of the P-12 districts that lack partnerships with higher education.

**Strategic action: International issues should be addressed.**

Those who would partake in an international immersion program would be better equipped to assist the Holmes Partnership in understanding potential new roles that international partners, especially from developing countries, could have within the Holmes Partnership. In my view, the Holmes Partnership's domestic agenda must be further implemented before laying claim to having a model worthy of export.

**Strategic action: Establish standards for college faculty, similar to NBPTS standards for P-12 teachers.**

Considering that NBPTS is a national partner of the Holmes Partnership, an opportunity presents itself to at least initiate open debates on the topic at future Holmes Partnership meetings.

**Strategic action: Engage faculty in implementing the agenda.**

In another strategic action, the Holmes Partnership (1997) stated that it must consider how to "engage and sustain the work of higher education faculty and administrators in the implementation of the Holmes Partnership."
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Partnership agenda" (p.5). A required immersion experience would be one suggestion on how to engage teacher education faculty in living the doctrine of the Holmes Partnership. The immersion experience, for example, for an Arts and Science professor could be spent in a different culture, but it could also be spent in a PDS for the purpose of gaining a deeper understanding of the PDS mission, and the needs of future teachers.

**Strategic action: Establish accountability mechanisms.**

I would recommend taking the standing committee idea a step further to ensure accountability. Currently, it is the university that joins the Holmes Partnership, not just the college or department of education. I would recommend that in addition to the usual application process, that the university and the Holmes Partnership enter into a binding, three-year business plan, complete with mutually acceptable penalty clauses. Therefore, I would propose that this body of representatives be a contractual compliance committee charged with the responsibility of overseeing that reforms were being made in accordance to the standards and timetables established by the Holmes Partnership.

**Strategic action: Re-examine the goals of the Holmes scholar program.**

Although the Holmes Scholar program has been successful in the preparation and recruitment of minorities into the
professoriate, more needs to be done. The values that drive
the Holmes Scholar program should be integrated and infused
throughout the Holmes Partnership's mission. Diversity must
be more than a window dressing or an add-on feature at a
conference. It must meet a higher standard than society's
norm of political correctness. Not only should the Holmes
Partnership insist on cultural competency from its teacher
candidates, it should expect nothing less from its own
professors, both today's and tomorrow's. Holmes Scholars
could elect to adopt educators from higher education and P-
12 for the purpose of immersing them in the scholars' home
culture for an extended period of time, such as a break
between quarters or semesters.

Strategic action: Development of culturally relevant
curricula.

Understanding diversity from a deeper perspective can
be accomplished through purposeful immersion programs. The
Holmes Partnership, in its desire to utilize and expand its
capacity and level of services to its members, could tap the
diverse resources of its membership and become the catalyst
to create meaningful teacher educator and P-12 teacher
immersion programs. An appreciation for diversity should be
readily evident in the lives and classrooms of education
professionals, and integrated throughout P-12 curriculums
and teacher education programs. Future teachers are
prepared for immersion programs only if their program has adequately prepared them for it, demonstrating the different learning styles, teaching methods, and cultures of a diverse student body. For educators to develop culturally relevant curricula, it is hard to go where they have not been.

Strategic action: Couple reform with student outcomes, and ensure that all students achieve success in our schools.

Finally, the Holmes Partnership has advocated as strategic actions the necessity of coupling their reforms with student outcomes, and ensuring that all students achieve success (The Holmes Partnership, 1997). At the level of higher education, NCATE has already taken the initiative to ensure that accreditations in the next century for teacher education programs will be directly linked with student outcomes, or the performance of teaching candidates.

As part of the Holmes Partnership proposed program of research, I would propose additional research on the question of whether or not these program reforms in teacher education can be linked to the improved performance of P-12 students. This research would help the Holmes Partnership (1997) answer such critical questions as "what evidence or support do we have to justify our actions?" (p.2).

It is conceivable from my perspective that this could be the most important strategic action for the constituents of higher education and P-12 schools. In my view, whether
or not the new Holmes Partnership is considered a success after its first decade will depend largely on this strategic action. However, constituents of the Holmes Partnership might not be willing to wait ten years for results. The Holmes Partnership should be prepared to demonstrate in annual business reports their progress on enhancing student learning, or support will wane, and the reform effort will be written off as another education reform failure. As stated in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), "Teaching can improve its professional status only by improving its effectiveness—by raising the level of children's achievement and deepening their engagement with learning" (p.43).

**In Summary, Comparing the Goals of *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) with the Strategic Actions of the New Holmes Partnership (1997)**

Comparing the Holmes Partnership's strategic actions with the former Holmes Group's first stated goals as stated in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) provides insight on how the organization has evolved over a decade. There is one fundamental difference in the two organizations. The Holmes Group is credited for establishing the reform agenda, but not with fully implementing it, which was the finding of Fullan et al. (1996), and my conclusion as well. The Holmes
Partnership, sensitive to that finding, has made it their mission to implement the reform agenda, but this time recognizing the strategic and political importance of aligning itself with external forces (local P-12 partnerships and national partners) to assist in the implementation. This could consequently, lead to simultaneous renewal of both P-12 schools and colleges of education. In so doing, the Holmes Partnership had addressed two criticisms of the Holmes Group. They had moved from agenda creation to agenda implementation. Second, they recognized that historically, most reforms in education required external forces. The Holmes Partnership realized the complexity of their reform agenda would require the direct participation and support of all stakeholders, in a word, it would be a political process. It would require a systemic approach if simultaneous renewal was the desired outcome. No longer could they afford to focus on teacher education alone. The mission of producing quality teachers is a challenge, not just for higher education, but also for the stakeholders in P-12 and the public at large.

As the Holmes Partnership positioned itself to implement the agenda inherited from the Holmes Group, it became clear that the organization had learned from the past, based on input from the members at its first annual conference, local partnerships, and national partners, and
input from scholarly critiques. This led the Holmes Partnership's board of directors, at its summer 1997 board of directors meeting in Miami, to translate its six overarching goals into its strategic actions. As an organization, it had taken its first step in becoming a learning organization, for these were not just strategic actions, but they were modifications of the original goals of the Holmes Group. Some of the strategic actions resembled the original goals in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), while other actions were new directions. Comparing the Holmes Partnership strategic actions with the Holmes Group's original goals in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986, p.4) leads to the conclusion that the organization has evolved into a new entity with its own identity and direction.

Those strategic actions, previously reviewed in this chapter, that are new directions for the Holmes Partnership, are listed below, followed by the remaining strategic actions that are similar to the original Holmes Group's goals, and now reinforced by the new Holmes Partnership.

**New strategic actions of the new Holmes Partnership.**

1. Promote an on-going critical study process,
2. Vertical coordination of research,
3. To build real capacity,
4. Arrange the clutter, hire a media manager,
5. Planning for book IV,
6. Require equity, diversity, and cultural competency standards,
7. International issues should be addressed,
8. Establish standards for college faculty, similar to NBPTS standards for P-12 teachers,
9. Engage faculty in implementing the agenda,
10. Re-examine the Goals of the Holmes Scholar program,
11. Development of culturally relevant curricula,
12. Learn from stakeholders,
13. Establish accountability mechanisms,
14. Develop funding models.

The authors of *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) drew significant criticism for their neglect of equity, diversity, and cultural competency standards, along with special education. Its only mention was the organization's concern that recruitment of minorities into education could be hampered by entrance exams, and by competition with other professions, such as business and the medicine.

**Strategic actions which reinforce the original goals of the Holmes Group** *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986, p.4)

1. Defining a high quality professional preparation. This is an attempt to clarify the original goal, "To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid."
2. Defining local partnerships. Although partnerships were a later development of the Holmes Partnership, it evolved from the original goal, "To connect our own institutes to schools."

3. Designate planned variation among PDS sites. The PDS concept is briefly described in Tomorrow's Teachers, comparing it to teaching hospitals. Its description and characteristics were greatly expanded in Tomorrow's Schools (1990), the second Holmes Group publication.

4. Redesign P-12 Teachers' workplace. This was a primary goal in Tomorrow's Teachers (1986), and is reinforced as a strategic action of the new Holmes Partnership, "To make schools better places for teachers to work." In the goal's clarification, it stated "they will also be schools in which students will learn more." Later, the authors stated, "Teaching can improve its professional status only by improving its effectiveness—by raising the level of children's achievement and deepening their engagement with learning." Clearly this is the most important strategic action from my perspective.

Today's Holmes Partnership, is clearly not the same organization as yesterday's Holmes Group, as demonstrated by the preponderance of new strategic actions listed above. Sarason (1996) believed that even a reasonably effective reform effort can falter if it is so rigid that it cannot
refine its original model. By reviewing the original goals and history of the former Holmes Group with the new strategic actions and goals of the new Holmes Partnership, it is the conclusion of this study that the Holmes Partnership has demonstrated a self-renewing quality not prevalent in other reform movements. It has become self-renewing because of its ability to learn and adapt. The new organization has modified its strategic plan by holding on to the best of its past, while capturing the best thinking of today, through its deliberate listening, analysis and reflection. The Holmes Partnership has proven its willingness to experiment with new ideas, to learn from past history, and to celebrate the lessons it has learned, all important steps in becoming a learning organization (Garvin, 1993).
Chapter 5

Recommendations for Future Directions of the Holmes Partnership

The purpose of this study was to critically examine and contrast the Holmes Group and its approximately decade-long reform movement (1985-1996), with the more recently reorganized Holmes Partnership (1997). Specifically, the objective of this study was to critically examine the Holmes Partnership's goals and strategies, to reinforce some of these, to critique others, and to suggest yet additional new directives. I make these as an experienced educator, and a student of teacher education. I also make these recommendations having served as the assistant to the president of the new Holmes Partnership. As the assistant, I was a participant and observer in the Holmes Group in its final year, and was also engaged in the transformation of the Holmes Group into the Holmes Partnership. I continued in that capacity as the assistant to the president into the Holmes Partnership's first year. Along with my administrative association with the Holmes Group, the Holmes Partnership, and its key leaders, this study and the
recommendations that follow were grounded on a comprehensive review of several literatures, including:

1. Historical analysis of the Holmes Group, contrasted with the new Holmes Partnership

2. A critical analysis of the context of institutes of higher education, including trends and issues

3. Implications for colleges of education generally

4. A critical analysis of P-12 reform (because teacher education intersects with the mission of P-12)

5. A review of other contemporary reports, highlighting trends and issues in teacher education

Overall, this study found the goals and directions of the new Holmes Partnership to be grounded in research, deserving of support, but not without weaknesses. Suggestions on how these directions can be reinforced are included next. Then, new recommendations and directions are provided in areas this study found the new Holmes Partnership to be lacking.

Directions the Study Supports But Which Need Reinforcement

Concerns for the PDS.

An analogy is appropriate here. A fire chief once instructed his three novice firefighters that their mission was to put out fires. The chief proceeded with assignments. One would clean the trucks, one would patch hoses, and the
last novice would answer the phone. Upon review, the chief asked each to repeat their mission. The first novice proudly stated, "Clean the trucks." The second novice said, "Patch the hoses," and the last one said, "Answer the phone." The chief responded with a scolding, "No, your mission is to put out fires!" After only a few minutes of receiving their assignments, the mission had been lost in the work.

To the credit of the Holmes Partnership, they are determined to do the work, and the assignments have been given, but it appears that elements of their mission were lost in the work but can be recovered in time through clarification, action research, and benchmarking. Due in part to the accountability mechanism having never being implemented, the Holmes Partnership and its members have lost sight of some very important elements of their original mission goals and strategic actions.

One major plank in the reform agenda that must be addressed is the Professional Development School (PDS), the linchpin in the Holmes Partnership reform package, or the reform vehicle as I call it. One of the most telling findings of this study, substantiated by the RATE VIII (1995) studies, is the general mindset that the PDS is an outreach invention of higher education where teacher educators still spent most of their time in traditional
activities, such as supervising student teachers, not resembling a mutually beneficial partnership between P-12 and higher education. More disturbing is that the PDS is thought of as a place to prepare beginning teachers, not as one that promotes inquiry into school practices, or continual learning of its veteran teachers. The absence of inquiry and continual learning could be due in part to the lack of participation of higher education faculty. Based on the current tenure and promotion policies of most campuses, college faculty are not rewarded for their work in the PDS, or any other form of community service (Boyer, 1990).

If the goal of the Holmes Partnership is for simultaneous renewal, the PDS will be no better off than the fire department in the analogy. The success of the PDS is dependent upon its parts. Simultaneous renewal depends not only on the socialization and preparation of new teachers, but it is also dependent upon inquiry into practice that leads to professional growth for the faculty, both teachers and teacher educators, and continuous improvement in school practices, which translates to improvement in student learning. Without these components, it is not a learning organization, and it is no better than a ship without its anchor. If inquiry is not prevalent in the PDS, it would be safe to assume that inquiry, is not stressed in the preparation of teaching candidates. Veteran teachers must
also be a part of inquiry, and professional development of veteran teachers in this regard should be embedded at the school site. Inquiry is also the instrument of choice to uncover deficiencies that professional development can then address. The mission, just as important as putting out fires, that must drive the PDS should be directly linked to the instructional needs of all learners, adults and children. The public demands, expects, and deserves nothing less. Support for any educational reform that is not contributing to student learning will be short-lived.

In addition, the PDS concept, which this study supports, needs further reinforcement in how it engages with parents and family service agencies. This study did not uncover significant evidence to suggest that the PDS in general was integrating parents and family service agencies directly into the educational mission and processes of the PDS, thus causing them to remain far too insular. Again, if it is not evident at the PDS, it's probably not being taught in the teacher education program. At a time when schools are being held accountable for results, and we have full knowledge that student learning is affected by factors outside the school, the PDS should serve be the guiding light on how a school can reach beyond itself to more fully engage the external forces that affect student learning. In my judgement, teachers need to expand their role to that of
a social worker, lining up the support and resources necessary to enhance the students' opportunity to learn at both locations, at home and at school.

In a systemic approach to renewal, based on the interlocking of goals of the Holmes Partnership, effectiveness suffers when vital elements of one part of the reform begins to breakdown. "The chain is only as strong as its weakest link." Furthermore, systemic reform is not enhanced when one entity of the PDS local partnership does not equally put forth improvement strategies that are relevant to their organization. Both P-12 schools and higher education must bring improvement strategies to the table, and then walk hand in hand to implement them. The concept of simultaneous renewal, and the importance of the PDS, appears to be areas that are not totally understood, and needs further clarification from the Holmes Partnership. Madison Avenue invests millions to convince us of a new need. As successful as the Holmes Partnership's publications have been, they are simply not enough. The mission of the Holmes Partnership needs to be ever present in the eyes of its constituents, clarifying the organizational mission, which reinforces the strategic action. This underscores the need for a proven media consultant. In addition to major planks of the reform agenda not being understood, I would speculate that many would-be employers of teachers do not have a clue
on what would be the advantages or disadvantages of hiring a teacher who graduated from a Holmes Partnership institute. This indicates the need for not only public awareness, but perhaps a pilot marketing program in one region that would attempt to sell employers on the benefits of hiring a teacher graduate from a Holmes Partnership institute.

To strengthen the PDS, standards are needed, perhaps similar to those being proposed by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Standards are needed if the most basic elements of the PDS are to be established consistently, but they should allow some variation for local needs, and the testing of various PDS models.

A national conference would be helpful to discuss such standards, and to emphasize programs of research that would link higher education and P-12 schools. These programs of research would ensure that inquiry be mutually directed toward school improvement at both levels to enhance the goal of simultaneous renewal. A conference might also reduce the variation in models being proposed by multiple reform movements, such as the Holmes Partnership, The Renaissance Group, The PDS Network, coordinated by the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching, and Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education (UNITE), and Goodlad's National Network for Educational Restructuring
(NNER). Scholars promulgate the benefits of collaboration between teachers and teacher educators. The nation would benefit by the collaboration and collected expertise of these reform entities.

In this proposed PDS national conference, I would recommend that certain topics for debate. First, would be the notion commonly held that schools, including PDS sites, are where "students move through courses and grades at a fixed pace, like products moving along an assembly line that can't be slowed long enough to remedy the flawed process that lead, inevitably to flawed products" (Wilson & Daviss, 1994, p.10). It is this study's recommendation that local PDS partnerships of the Holmes Partnerships need to focus on this crumbling, obsolete school concept, and be less concerned in making repairs. They must be driven to start anew, to re-engineer from the ground up. This would have the potential of alleviating some problems the PDS is experiencing, such as finding the time in the current lock step schedule for teachers to collaborate, or freeing resources from other areas to better support the PDS, and to finally find a systematic means to share new understandings gained in our PDS with non-PDS sites, such as through teacher exchanges.

Funding models should also be discussed at a national PDS conference, and I would recommend the formation of a
model that would consist of direct funding from state legislatures in support of a PDS, similar to federal impact zones. Certain school districts that contain major federal installations within their boundaries are declared impact zones and obtain direct federal funding to help offset the expense to the district of the extra students of those parents employed at the federal installation. Local PDS partnership sites could be declared impact zones as well, but in this case, to support the added expense of training and developing teachers. One such expense is the need in PDSs for sophisticated, technology rich laboratories, designed for distance learning and conferences, and equipped for micro-teaching, simulated teaching via videos and interactive case-based compact disks to name a few. As recent as RATE VII (1994), there was little evidence that teacher education programs were being afforded the same access to technology that other colleges such as medicine and business were being afforded.

I would recommend that the Holmes Partnership assist its members in holding central administrations accountable for the lack of adequate facilities and resources. Such facilities would allow programs to intersperse laboratory activities throughout a program to reinforce pedagogical concepts. Distance learning would allow programs to better serve the professional development needs of their graduates.
and constituents who are not located on or near a PDS. In many cases, teacher educators consider themselves fortunate if they find a working computer in their office on their first day.

**Faculty development.**

The next critical area that represents a major goal for the Holmes Partnership is faculty development, again a goal this study supports, but one that needs reinforcing, and should be more of a priority. As an industry first engages the quality process, among other things, it considers the early inputs of the manufacturing process first, such as the raw materials, to ensure that it is receiving the highest quality. The Holmes Group chose to focus their attention on teachers, schools, and colleges of education in their early publications, but not those who initially train the teachers, the professors.

Boyer (1990) emphasized that higher education should seek and reward quality teaching, and that more emphasis be placed on community service in the promotion policies of professors. This investigator proposed the next breakthrough book for the Holmes Partnership should be *Tomorrow's Professors*. This book would advocate cultural competency, through required diversity training and cultural immersion experiences. The book would also advocate the same sound ideas recommended by the Holmes Partnership for
P-12 teachers be applied to teacher educators themselves as well. This study recommends strongly that doctoral candidates 'student teach' alongside a proven master professor in higher learning, and that this mentoring be extended into the beginning professor's first year of employment. The mentor professor would be given a reduced teaching load to allow for time to work with the novice professor. The novice professor would be given a light teaching load to make time for reflection, inquiry into practice, and supervision with his or her mentor. The university would demonstrate its commitment to quality teaching by financially rewarding 'mentor professors' for their services, and such service would be counted toward tenure. In time, beginning professors would be required to meet standards similar to the standards P-12 teachers would meet for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

Teachers, and those who would teach teachers, should be required to complete similar requirements, and both should follow a licensure process that distinguishes between novices and veteran educators. *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) advocated the goal, "To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work" (p.4). One could easily interchange
the word professors for teachers in the stated goal, and it would remain a most appropriate and reasonable goal. *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) suggested correcting the careerlessness of P-12 teachers with titles which would be earned by demonstrated knowledge over time, such as "Career Professional," or the body of the competent teaching force, known as "Professional Teachers," or "Instructors," which would be the beginners assigned to mentors that would guide the beginner to an improved understanding of their practice over time.

This study uncovered little evidence that this differentiation of competence was being implemented at the P-12 level on a wide-scale. The argument that this career lattice would correct the careerlessness and the stagnation of professional development for teachers is as sound today as it was in 1986, and should not be lost in the current efforts of the Holmes Partnership. In general, any of the Holmes Partnership recommendations will be taken more seriously by those in P-12 schools, if the same standard is applied simultaneously to higher education, as in "simultaneous renewal."

*Getting the program right.*

Regardless of the attempts at the P-12 level to reform, their efforts will fall short of expectations unless teacher education programs do their part in preparing graduates for
the reformed schools they are likely to encounter. Expectations that new or veteran teachers will acquire these reform practices via osmosis are mistaken. Reformed practices such as collaboration, integrated subjects, ungraded classrooms, action research, parental involvement strategies, site-based management, multiple student assessment strategies, interagency cooperation, and cooperative learning just to name a few must be addressed in preservice teacher education. Research indicates that many teacher graduates are still not being prepared for these innovations (Howey, 1996). Many of these teaching innovations are best learned and practiced in a lab or a clinical setting such as the PDS, facilitated by trained clinical educators. However, it remains difficult to attract professors into clinical roles when their work goes largely unrewarded and not respected by the university (Boyer, 1990). The ideal situation is for prospective teachers to experience these innovations within the context of the PDS during their student teaching experience, and then engage them further into their first years of teaching. However, there is little support to provide this necessary and seamless teacher preparation into the beginning teacher's first year, even though the Holmes Partnership advocates it (Howey, 1996; RATE IV, 1991).
Extending teacher preparation into at least the first year for a beginning teacher is critical, and the Holmes Partnership should stress this goal for immediate implementation for several reasons, including the fact that initial research findings are suggesting that teachers who have graduated from extended programs are more effective on the job (Andrews, 1997). First, extending the program is a logical extension of the conceptual development of teachers into the contextual setting. Second, it could be the final opportunity to remove teachers who lack the skills and disposition for the initial entry into the profession. Extending programs could also renew those veteran teachers who would be trained to mentor the novice teachers. Even more important is the role of extended programs in the simultaneous renewal process. Extended programs are vehicles which can improve the effectiveness of local partnerships between P-12 and higher education. Both partners are on common grounds and have a vested interest as they work together to ensure the full licensure of a novice teacher. Both stand to benefit from the innovations introduced by novices and college faculty, and shared with the more experienced teachers.

A key element the Holmes Partnership advocates are more potent and coherent teacher education programs, organized in such a way that student experiences build developmentally
over time (Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Howey & Zimpher, 1996). Teaching candidates would progress through a program that would emphasize the necessary dispositional behaviors thematically throughout the teacher education program. But there is no significant evidence that teacher education programs have been made to be more coherent, even though research has indicated that this alone would increase the impact that programs have on prospective teachers (Raths & Katz, 1982; Katz and Raths, 1992; Tomorrow's Teachers 1986). Tomorrow's Teachers also underscored the importance of coherent programs, and until members are held accountable to the Holmes Partnership reforms, it is not likely that programs will become more coherent without the outside influence and support that the Holmes Partnership can offer its members.

However, many of the required undergraduate courses housed in the arts and sciences are outside the control of the colleges of education, slowing efforts to make teacher education programs more coherent. It further complicates implementation of other reforms, such as organizing students into cohorts where they learn to collaborate by learning and working together throughout their program, only to be possibly split and divided when enrolled in their arts and sciences courses (Tomorrow's Schools of Education, 1995). On the other hand, there is no strong evidence to suggest
the use of cohorts is widespread even in teacher education programs, and for that matter, they were not even considered important by educators a few years ago (RATE V, 1992), even though they are critical to the process of teacher professional socialization, future collaboration, and self-renewal (Borko & Putnam, 1996).

My study uncovered no proven model on how best to bridge this gap between the arts and sciences with the teacher education program. It continues to be a formidable obstacle for the Holmes Partnership to overcome so that more coherent and interconnected teacher education programs become the norm, and not the exception. Not having direct control over a portion of the coursework would make one wonder how the program can ever ensure quality. This problem is similar in nature to the expectation for teacher education programs to model themselves after NCATE standards when half of the U.S. teacher education programs choose not to partake of NCATE, making quality control on a larger scale largely impossible.

If teacher education programs are to be held accountable for their outcomes by the Holmes Partnership, or any other entity, then it only makes sense the college be given more control of the process to ensure quality. This would include a significant increase in influence over the arts and sciences courses required by teacher education
programs. Technology could assist in this endeavor by designing electronic interactive foundation courses in the content areas, based on the best thinking of subject experts, working in cooperation with teacher educator experts, combining content with pedagogy. Also, if teacher education programs have any hope of gaining respect as a professional program on a university campus, it must be placed on equal footing with such campus counterparts as law and medicine, both of which are the masters of their own houses, bypassing an entire layer of university bureaucracy, the graduate school. The Holmes Partnership needs to exert itself in this endeavor in the public policy arena. Gaining respect on the university campus can translate to improved funding and policies that would enhance the mission of teacher education. Colleges of education, with the backing of the Holmes Partnership at the legislative levels, need to take these stands, since there is no one else, including the university, standing up for the college of education.

In getting the program right, no longer can a teacher graduate on the basis of accumulated seat-time. Prospective teachers must be able to demonstrate the skills and dispositions needed for a beginning teacher, in areas such as student assessment, action research, and multiple instructional strategies for diverse student populations, to name a few. A prospective teacher should possess a
portfolio of experiences that demonstrate a progressive and
deep understanding of teaching and learning over time.

Future teacher education programs will also be
inundated by changing demographics. Some areas of the
United States, such as the sunbelt states are expected to
continue to experience population growth, while other areas
such as the Midwest and New England are projected to
experience little growth. Colleges in the Midwest or New
England states will likely experience more capacity than
demand, placing additional stress on teacher education
programs to cut costs. This situation could force
neighboring colleges to cooperate more and to compete less,
to share resources, and reduce redundancy in their programs.
It also could pressure colleges to do a better job at
monitoring and maintaining the students already enrolled.

In the growth areas of the United States, demand will
likely exceed capacity and resources. Institutes of higher
education in tune with the benefits of technology will no
doubt expand their distance learning capabilities to become
more cost effective, and in turn, will gain a competitive
edge on those institutes that do not invest in technology.

Student demographics will impact higher education as
well. As opportunities decrease for people between the ages
of 35 and 54, there is a strong likelihood that some of
these individuals will return to higher education to improve
their credentials or to prepare for new careers. Colleges are accustomed to serving mostly younger constituents who are under the age of 20. Colleges that begin to diversify their recruiting efforts to attract older, and more diverse students will be in a much better position to secure their enrollment.

Minorities, who are traditionally under-represented in the teaching profession, will continue to be aggressively recruited by business. Teacher education programs will need to recruit potential teachers as early as junior high and high school, similar to the effort at The Ohio State University. Of considerable concern is the fact that teacher education programs will need to bridge a widening gap between a predominantly white female teaching force and minorities. This also has profound implications for how teachers are prepared. Teacher education programs must ensure a high level of cultural competency from their teachers, through training, and immersion experiences into unfamiliar cultures. The Holmes Scholar Program has been a lighthouse effort in recruiting and maintaining minorities, and expansion of this program and similar ones will be needed.

As the diversity of students widens, professors will also need to better equipped, trained to be culturally competent, and be capable of teaching to a diverse student
body. This calls for multiple teaching strategies and a strong emphasis on active learning, centered around real problems.

**New Directions Recommended for the Holmes Partnership**

The following recommendations are made due to their importance and their apparent absence from stated Holmes Partnership goals and strategic actions. These recommendations represent areas of concern this study found critical to the success of the Holmes Partnership, but overlooked.

**The challenge of program evaluation and accountability.**

The most critical problem facing the Holmes Partnership is the lack of any formal means to evaluate the teacher education programs of the Holmes Partnership members, and consequently, hold them accountable. This study did not uncover any institute that was regularly evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of any given teacher education program, based on the performance of its graduates. One model with experience at measuring the attitudes of teacher graduates that could serve as a starting point would be the National Database for Teacher Education Follow-up Studies (Loadman, Brookhart, & Freeman, 1994). Sections of that instrumentation concerns itself with respondents' perceived
quality of teacher training and self-assessment of their knowledge and skills.

A major weakness of the Holmes Partnership is the lack of a sophisticated survey instrument that would gather baseline data to establish benchmarks to document movement towards major goals by the local partnerships comprising the membership of the Holmes Partnership. The recommendation of this study is that such an instrument be created, and that it would be responded to eventually by members of the Holmes Partnership on an annual basis. This would appear to be more objective and structured than requiring members to submit annual business reports that could become too subjective. In addition, each year at least 10% of the membership would be visited by an Holmes Partnership evaluation team consisting of faculty from various colleges, whose purpose would be to interview program participants and verify the data collected by the instrument. To further ensure accountability, the university could form a compliance committee consisting of stakeholders from the college of education, the local partnership, and the university central administration. This committee would be charged with overseeing what I would propose to be a three year business plan that reflects the Holmes Partnership's reform agenda, with timetables when certain reforms would be implemented. A contractual agreement would be entered into
between the Holmes Partnership, and the central administration of the university, complete with penalty clauses for non-compliance. This would help ensure the continuance of the reform movement over time as leadership changes. Complete certification over time could lead to the "Holmes Partnership Seal of Confidence," for the program. Limited compliance would result in a lesser state of approval or certification, perhaps called, "Holmes Partnership in Progress," and little or no compliance over time would result in probationary status, or termination.

More stakeholder involvement.

Many reform efforts have failed due to the lack of involvement of representative stakeholders (Sarason, 1996). As a result of the addition of local partnerships by the Holmes Partnership, more stakeholders are becoming involved, more so than the time when Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) was introduced, according to Pietig (1987). However, more needs to be done by the Holmes Partnership to empower the voices of P-12 at the higher education level. According to Fullan et al (1996), decision making has remained the right of the university. There is very little evidence to show that P-12 educators have a voice and a vote on college of education governing committees. In addition to teachers, the Holmes Partnership must cast a wider net to incorporate P-12
administrators, counselors, and school psychologists into the PDS arena. Vocational teachers have also been overlooked in the demand for higher standards for teachers (Long, 1990).

Another form of stakeholder involvement are those teacher education programs in close proximity of each other, especially in the urban context. These stakeholders of teacher education programs could explore opportunities where programs could cooperate, and not compete, reducing costly and redundant programs, similar to the process competing major hospitals did in urban markets. As corporate citizens, together, they could sponsor joint research projects aimed at improving conditions in their own backyards. Holmes Partnership members could initiate such cooperative ventures, document their process and outcomes, and model it for other urban areas where multiple teacher education programs exist within an hours drive of each other. The Holmes Partnership should demonstrate that educators can collaborate with each other at all levels. We all have a stake.

Teen violence, an issue for all teachers.

Violence is at epidemic levels among U.S. youth. The U.S. has the highest homicide rate among youth who are fifteen to twenty-four years old (Rosenberg, 1995). Teen and school violence is largely absent from any of the goals
or strategic actions of the Holmes Partnership. Perhaps the feeling is that these ills are best left to the sociologists, courts, and police, but this attitude will not prevent teachers from having to deal with these issues face to face, and they will not be prepared. Rosenberg (1995) suggests a more integrated approach in the schools, with conflict resolution training, parenting classes, and mentors for at-risk children. There is little evidence to suggest that tomorrow's teachers are being prepared for today's teen violence. It is not just an urban problem, made evident by recent school shootings in non-urban schools. Nor is it just a rural problem. It is America's problem. Tomorrow's teachers need to assume more of the role of a social worker, agents of change and reconciliation.

The Holmes Partnership, and higher education in general, needs to direct inquiry toward the immediate needs of society, promoting a sense of civic consciousness in its faculty and student body (Boyer, 1990; Harkavy & Puckett, 1994; Stanley, 1989). A person of ethics and morality does not stand on the sidelines, but engages the problem, because to do nothing would not be ethical. Ethics must be brought back to teacher education, as the Kellogg Commission (1996) suggested for higher education in general. The Holmes Partnership can spearhead it by creating a code of ethics
for educators, similar to the Hippocratic oath taken by medical graduates.

**The need to benchmark.**

This study has recommended the need for systematic evaluation of teacher education programs and local Holmes Partnerships. The next step would be to benchmark, a common practice in business and industry. Regular assessment of where partnerships stand on reform implementation can assist in making comparisons. Benchmarking has been defined as a never-ending process that measures and compares the work of one organization to another. It brings an external examination to internal functions (Kempner, 1993). Kempner also concluded that once baseline data is collected, the recommendation of my study, benchmarking can assist Holmes Partnership institutes in making comparisons, and to discover, examine, and adapt best practices. It is important to note that there probably is no institute that is world-class in all categories. But even an institution considered to be average overall may well have practices worthy of emulation. Benchmarking challenges institutions to recognize and improve upon their weaknesses.

This "enables the organization to learn, and continue to learn best practices for improving its operations, whether the improvements are in the teaching of
Final Recommendations Based on Trends in Higher Education

In light of the Holmes Partnership's strategic actions, as comprehensive as they are, there remains a gap in their recognition of a few key trends in higher education. As the Holmes Partnership focuses on implementing its agenda, it must also keep an eye to the future for developing trends, or fall victim to tunnel vision. What may be the most under-estimated and misunderstood trend is the sea of rising expectations of constituents, which was first manifested in business and industry, and is now beginning to creep into the public sector. To satisfy the increasing expectations, colleges of education must build into their operating systems and into the attitudes of its personnel "fast-cycle capability". The college must learn how to perform without bottlenecks, delays, and errors in all service areas (Katz & West, 1992).

Another emerging trend is the expectation that enrollment will increase and become more diverse in public higher education (U.S. Department of Education, 1996). Currently, the majority of college students are white, under 25 years of age, slightly more female in number, and they attend class full-time. The student population now appears
to be increasing in age, with approximately 15% being 35 years old or older in the fall of 1993. From 1976 to 1993, students of color increased from 14% to approximately 20%. Over 227,000 undergraduate students reported a disability in 1993. Since 1973, there has been an increase in the number of students employed during their college tenure, up to 46% (Ballantine, 1993; Kellogg Commission, 1996). While the Holmes Partnership has addressed diversity to some degree in the teacher education program and the Holmes Scholars, they have not fully addressed how technology can assist in making education more accessible to a more diverse, non-traditional, student body. As cost effectiveness and productivity grow in importance, more attention will focus on technology as a primary vehicle to transform higher education, i.e., distance learning (West & Daigle, 1993).

Certainly, as higher education strives to maintain excellence, its success will be somewhat dependent upon its ability to build learning organizations that promote instruction, research, and public service, while dealing with on-going trends such as environmental uncertainty, the increasing influence of constituents, and limited resources (Katz & West, 1992).

As trends would have it, higher education is being forced to manage itself less like a civil service organization and more like a business culture, emphasizing
service, quality, and cost containment (Penrod & Dolence, 1992). Many necessary reforms are hindered by the present governance system of higher education, that tend to sacrifice efficiency in favor of tradition. Unfortunately, reforming the governance system of higher education has not captured the imagination of the Holmes Partnership. An opportunity presents itself in one strategic action that would aim to increase the voice of stakeholders (teachers, students, principals) in teacher education. Unfortunately, it was not evident to this investigator that the Holmes Partnership would advocate a voting role for stakeholders in the governance systems of higher education, which is disappointing, since these external forces could expedite reform. Rather than launching into needed comprehensive change, the majority of higher education elects to add new programs to the old program, putting new wine into old winesacks (Kellogg Commission, 1997, p.7).

Yet, the Holmes Partnership is providing valuable leadership, although it is going largely unnoticed in the mass media. This important trend is the call for higher education to redefine their missions, to place more emphasis on public service and excellence in teaching. As far as research is concerned, it must be more closely linked with the needs of society (Boyer, 1990). Due to this trend, tenure and promotion policies will undergo much change, and
will reflect the emphasis being placed on public service and teaching, not just research (Restructuring the University Reward System, 1997). This can only strengthen and enhance the role of teacher educators who are already actively pursuing their public service, teaching, and research responsibilities in the Professional Development Schools, the linchpin and one of the lighthouses of the Holmes Partnership reform agenda.

The Holmes Partnership does not operate in a vacuum and must be on its guard for emerging trends such as the rising expectations of constituents, full utilization of technology which is already making education more accessible to a diverse student body, and the need to make the governance and operational systems of higher education more responsive to market forces and constituents. Penrod & Dolence (1992) informed us that it will require nothing less than a full-court press:

A commitment to true transformation will require institutional analysis far more critical than that required by an accreditation visit.... Unless colleges and universities significantly shift their modes of administration, the confidence of our constituents and the general public will in all probability continue to erode. (p.19)
Our nation and our children can ill afford another failed educational reform agenda. The Holmes Partnership has provided those of us in education and the children we serve hope for the future.
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Appendix A

History of the Holmes Group's Goals and Accomplishments: Key Journal Article Selections
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Holmes History - Key Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>The Case for Extended Programs of Initial Teacher Education (Katz &amp; Raths)</td>
<td>Extended teacher education programs. Establishes the argument for extending programs not unique to Holmes Group (HG)</td>
<td>College faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>A Critical Analysis of the HG's Proposals for Reforming Teacher Education (Hawley)</td>
<td>General critique of the HG's proposals</td>
<td>College faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Tomorrow's Teachers (HG)</td>
<td>Called for reform of teacher education programs</td>
<td>HG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>The Case for Maintaining Teacher Education at the Undergraduate Level (Tom)</td>
<td>Critical of HG's call for an extended professional program for teacher licensure</td>
<td>College faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Strengths and Weaknesses of the HG report (Pietig)</td>
<td>General critique of the HG's proposals</td>
<td>College faculty, also non-research universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Teacher Education Perpectives of Holmes Group Membership (Wheeler &amp; Giese)</td>
<td>General critique of the HG's proposals</td>
<td>College faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Scholarship and its Survival (Pelikan)</td>
<td>Critical of HG's call for an extended professional program for teacher licensure</td>
<td>College faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Tomorrow's Schools (HG)</td>
<td>Called for the establishment of Professional Development Schools (PDS)</td>
<td>HG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Article Title and Author(s)</td>
<td>Key Point(s)</td>
<td>Key Point(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>What They Did Not Discuss in the HG Report (Long)</td>
<td>Believed professors needed to learn to teach and that HG did not emphasize this enough</td>
<td>College faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Administrators &amp; Teachers Express Their Support, Opposition to Reform Proposals (Hoyt)</td>
<td>P-12 school teachers and administrators opposed to certain elements of the HG agenda, such as the abolition of the undergraduate program</td>
<td>P-12 teachers and administrators based on national survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Tomorrow's Schools of Education (HG)</td>
<td>HG. Called for an end to the status quo in reforming teacher education programs</td>
<td>HG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>The Holmes Impairment (Delattree)</td>
<td>College faculty. General critique of the HG's proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

History of the Holmes Group's Goals and Accomplishments: Key Journal Article Selections

Note 1. Approximately 13 resources as listed above. Approximately 25 resources eliminated by criteria.

Note 2. Time frame of journal articles for historical review coincided closely with the existence of the Holmes Group, 1985 to 1996.

Note 3. Articles were as representative as possible, allowing for multiple perspectives from college faculty and P-12 school leaders. College faculty were over-represented due to their natural presence in higher education journals.

Note 4. In addition to the Holmes Group's own supportive publications, remaining articles focused primarily on a critical analysis of the Holmes Group trilogy, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), *Tomorrow's Schools*, *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1987), *A Disabling Vision: Rhetoric and Reality in Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1992), and the extent to which their ideas were criticized or supported by P-12 teachers and school administrators.
and *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995). Articles that contained more criticism than support for the Holmes Group were selected.

Note 5. To enhance validity, multiple sources were selected that provided a longitudinal review of the progress of the Holmes Group and teacher education programs in general. This allowed for a cross-analysis of the progress of the Holmes Group members and teacher education programs in general, Holmes Group members and non-members.
Appendix B

Evidence of Goal Accomplishment of the Holmes Group and Teacher Education Programs in General: Key Journal Article Selection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reform Progress - Key Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>The New Holmes Partnership (HP) Midwest Holmes Meeting agenda. (HG) Chicago, Nov. 3-4</td>
<td>Listed all HG objectives, as derived from HG goals.</td>
<td>HG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The HG: A Sampling of Member Group Initiatives &amp; Accomplishment (HG members)</td>
<td>Self-reported data from HG members documenting progress toward reform</td>
<td>HG members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>The Rise and Stall of Teacher Education Reform: The HG 1985-1995 (Fullan et al)</td>
<td>Considered how appropriate HG goals were, progress made, and impact on teacher education</td>
<td>An objective study conducted by college faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Evidence of Goal Accomplishment of the Holmes Group and Teacher Education Programs in General: Key Journal Article Selection

Note: There were 11 resources as listed above. None were eliminated.
Appendix C

Holmes Group Progress Evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holmes Group Objectives, Derived from Goals (1985-1996)</th>
<th>Holmes Group Members' Progress &amp; Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Progress Evaluation in Teacher Education Programs in General | l=significantly evident  
2=somewhat evident  
3=not significantly evident |
<p>| <strong>To inform the public of what constitutes quality teaching</strong> | 2 Media professional would enhance conveyance of the message |
| <strong>Publicly advocate the importance of professional educators and practices in meeting learning needs of all students</strong> | 2 Media professional would enhance conveyance of the message |
| <strong>Develop high standards of quality and assessment for educators' recruitment, preparation, licensure, hiring, certification, and continuing education</strong> | 2 |
| <strong>Universities and schools in community</strong> | 1 PDS is the lighthouse, but little credit has been given to the Holmes Group for this success |
| <strong>Advocate the creation of professional standards boards in each state and ensure that they are reflective of professional development schools</strong> | 2 |
| <strong>Support standards development and implementation relative to professional development schools, and collaborate with NCATE</strong> | 2 The Holmes Partnership sees the need to tighten the definition of a PDS, but to allow some variation for future innovation |
| <strong>Organize students into cohorts</strong> | 3 Best way to ensure collaboration and renewal but this has not caught on |
| <strong>Students will be admitted to Tomorrow Schools of Education (TSE) at both initial and advanced levels</strong> | 3 |
| <strong>Admission procedures will go beyond grade point averages and standardized test scores</strong> | 3 Diversity is another lighthouse, but little credit has been given to the Holmes Group for their success; much more to do |
| <strong>Financial assistance to admitted students to ensure diversity</strong> | 1 |
| <strong>Faculty members assigned to cohorts over time</strong> | 3 |
| <strong>Demonstrate concern for advanced students by closely monitoring their teaching assistantships so as to banish exploitation</strong> | 3 |
| TSE will provide reports to students keeping them apprased of their academic progress | 3 Unfortunate this is not more prevalent; it would allow for some students not suited to teach to eliminate themselves |
| TSE will maintain contact with school administrators and boards to promote the interests of the leaders it has educated | 2 |
| Develop a collaborating faculty of very high quality in Professional Development Schools (PDS) | 2 Collaboration by college faculty with P-12 educators is lagging behind, thus not fulfilling the PDS mission in this regard |
| TSE will provide opportunities for graduate students to continue their professional growth | 2 |
| TSE will help graduates prepare for the examinations of the National Board for the Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) | 3 More emphasis found in preparing graduates for the National Teacher Exam (NTE) |
| TSE will cultivate the faculty so as to make them comfortable with their place within the orbit of professional education of educators and to encourage their support of the TSE and its programs | 3 The university could make teacher educators more comfortable by putting them on a more equal footing with other professors, for example, more equitable tenure and promotion policies |
| Develop criteria for faculty so that the university has tangible standards for evaluating the kind of faculty work that verges away from more traditional activities | 3 More emphasis is needed on teaching and community service, as compared to research. The three could be better integrated |
| TSE must welcome a full range of scholarly approaches among its faculty members | 2 Action research on real problems in the learning community deserves more credit |
| Members of the arts and science faculty must be drawn into the work of the PDS | 3 These professors would benefit from immersion programs into the PDS |
| Integrate the field-based portion of the faculty fully into the TSE faculty so that they no longer have the standing of second-class citizens | 3 |
| Design, stimulate and create standards-based modes of professional development, increasing teachers' and other educators' development at all stages | 2 |
| Design, stimulate and create standards-based PDSs | 2 PDS national conference would facilitate this. NCATE's recent work on standards are a starting point |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continue to define a common core of knowledge and proficiency for teacher preparation and professional development</th>
<th>1 The need for a subject-content oriented undergraduate program followed by a professional program and internship leading into the first year of the beginning teacher is becoming more established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the curriculum for educational leadership includes preparation for leadership in PDSs</td>
<td>3 Administrators can play a key role in school renewal, but only if they are prepared to be an instructional leader. It's not evident that administration candidates are being prepared for such a role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Holmes institute commits to having at least one PDS and to developing a plan for having enough PDSs to prepare all its students</td>
<td>1 Bringing it to scale for all students will be a funding challenge. This could encourage collaborative efforts between neighboring teacher education programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigate collaborative leadership development across professions (i.e. education, architecture, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated roles will be developed, where faculty having their tenure with the schools collaborate with faculty tenured with the university in making significant contributions to programs of teaching and inquiry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE must invest in planning and professional development for both school and university faculty as shared assignments are explored</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students given teaching and other service-related assignments will be carefully selected and supervised, and provided the support for success</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE will increase efforts to recruit and retain students, staff, and faculty of color</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE will make a top priority of increasing the numbers of the regular faculty committed to working in the PDS as a primary site for their teaching, scholarship, and service</td>
<td>3 The incentives in the tenure and promotion policies have to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE will revise its policies for promotion and tenure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE will create a professional force of educators bound to each other and to public education. All will cherish a body of skills mastered by all, and will cherish professional values that unite them, not divide them.</td>
<td>3 No evidence of shared values between teacher educators and P-12 teachers. A common code of ethics/values could be created, similar to the Hippocratic oath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit to the development of a TSE that makes contributions to educational knowledge, professional development and educational policy that sets and maintains standards of excellence for the country's educators and their students.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish enduring, formal partnerships in which both universities and schools adhere to and follow PDS principles, and together develop the range of human and financial resources needed to sustain a PDS.</td>
<td>2 The principles or elements of the PDS need to be re-examined and refined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to change policies of universities and states that impede the development and retention of a highly qualified education workforce.</td>
<td>3 There is a strong need for a coherent voice at the state and federal level to influence policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold our own institutes accountable for progress on this agenda.</td>
<td>3 Baseline data must be established by the Holmes Partnership members to chart their progress. Instrumentation is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare people in interdisciplinary teams.</td>
<td>3 Interdisciplinary approaches between teachers and administrators need emphasis during graduate training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our institutes will model democratic values and will be organized as communities of learning.</td>
<td>2 Higher education remains the decision-maker. P-12 representatives must be brought into the fold of the governance systems of teacher education programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will prepare &quot;teacher leaders&quot; who can be change agents.</td>
<td>2 Teacher leaders must be formally recognized and established in P-12 schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will place students only in schools that model democratic values.</td>
<td>2 Too many times, placements are based on convenience factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to support the Holmes Scholar program.</td>
<td>1 Another lighthouse of the Holmes Group effort, but has received little credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design a prototype doctoral degree program for teacher educators, including a development mentorship for teacher educators in training</td>
<td>Ironically, there is little interest in higher education to train new professors to teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call public attention to the coming crisis in teacher supply</td>
<td>The Holmes Group may have contributed to shortages by cutting enrollments and raising standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a distance learning network to support the development of models of learning that involve more interactivity, more connectivity among schools, more collaboration among teachers and students</td>
<td>Technology can only enhance local partnerships by enhancing the interconnectedness between P-12 and higher education. Look for more courses to go on-line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set standards for the use of technology and dissemination about best practices</td>
<td>Establish a best practices website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 3

Holmes Group Progress Evaluation

After 10 years, 51% of the Holmes Group’s objectives had not materialized. About 36% were found to be in the early stage of implementation. The Holmes Group was successful at creating the agenda, but not implementing it.
Appendix D

The Context for Change—Trends in Higher Education and Colleges of Education: Key Journal Article Selection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Holmes History - Key Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-1995 approximately</td>
<td>Research About Teacher Education (RATE)</td>
<td>Profiles on key attributes of teacher education programs, mixed sample, representative of programs in general, not just HG members</td>
<td>Conducted by college faculty and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (Boyer; The Carnegie Foundation)</td>
<td>A critical analysis of higher education's tenure and promotion policies, and lack of emphasis on community service and quality teaching</td>
<td>An objective outside critique and study, sanctioned by a foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Universities of Tomorrow (Hills)</td>
<td>Critical analysis of trends and issues in European higher education</td>
<td>A United Nations study, focused on European higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Venture Capital in Ohio Schools: Building Commitment and Capacity for School Renewal (Ohio Dept. of Education)</td>
<td>Reviewed national school renewal and reform efforts in P-12 schools</td>
<td>P-12 schools, important perspective since P-12 interests should intersect with teacher education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Commission/Event</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF)</td>
<td>Called for teacher education reform, similar to Holmes Group agenda</td>
<td>Government and business leaders, some educators; generally, an outside perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities</td>
<td>Addressed demographic trends, need to become more relevant in the community</td>
<td>Higher education, many members are also Holmes Group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Restructuring the University Reward System (Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum)</td>
<td>A critical analysis of higher education's tenure and promotion policies, and lack of emphasis on community service and quality teaching</td>
<td>Mostly higher education, a few business leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**

The Context for Change-Trends in Higher Education and Colleges of Education: Key Journal Article Selection

Note 1. Total resources, approximately 22, major ones listed above. Approximately 80 resources eliminated by the criteria.

Note 2. Articles were recent, published no later than the 1990's. An exception was made for the Research About Teacher Education (RATE), a longitudinal study from 1987 to 1995, approximately.
Note 3. Articles were representative of private and public colleges and universities, four year, and graduate level, American and European.

Note 4. Articles represented multiple perspectives to enhance validity.

Note 5. Articles that pertained to colleges of education and teacher education programs included trends in P-12 schools, since P-12 schools and teacher education programs intersect. 5. Articles that pertained to trends in teacher education included views outside the domain of teacher education programs and P-12 schools.
Appendix E

Comparison of Holmes Group/Partnership Goals with the Goals of the National Commission on Teaching & America’s Future (NCTAF).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holmes Group Goals</th>
<th>NCTAF Goals—Similar to the Holmes Group/Partnership</th>
<th>Holmes Partnership Goals—Similar to the Holmes Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source: (Tomorow's Teachers, 1985)</td>
<td>Source: (NCTAF, 1996)</td>
<td>Source: (Gateway Conference, 1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid

Critique—some progress made; teacher education programs lack coherency, lessening their impact

All children will be taught by teachers who have the knowledge, skills, and commitments to teach children well.

All teacher education programs will meet professional standards, or they will be closed.

High quality professional preparation. Programs must demonstrate rigor, innovation, and attention to the needs of diverse children. Their design must reflect research and best practice.

Equity, diversity, and cultural competence. Recruit, prepare, and sustain faculty and students who reflect the rich diversity of cultural perspectives.

Faculty development. Provide high quality doctoral programs for the future education professoriate

Critique—much stronger emphasis on diversity than past; Faculty development lagging behind
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To connect our own institutions to schools.</th>
<th>Simultaneous renewal. Establish strong partnerships of universities, schools and professional organizations and associations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critique-the lighthouse in the Holmes Group reform effort, by the creation of PDSs, partnerships between P-12 schools and teacher education programs. Generally have not received much credit for this successful reform</td>
<td>Critique-the hallmark of the new Holmes Partnership as it builds on its success with its PDS partnerships; helps ensure a change process for simultaneous renewal at both levels, P-12 and teacher education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make schools better places for teachers to work and learn</td>
<td>Quality teaching will be the central investment of schools. Most education dollars will be spent on classroom teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique-much work left to be done here. Generally, the structure of P-12 schools has not changed significantly</td>
<td>Critique-it would appear that the Holmes Group's reform agenda influenced the commission's recommendations; the hope is that change will occur at the state level; lacking in a mechanism to ensure implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy initiation. Advocate policies that improve teaching and learning for all students, promote school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critique-best hope is through its local partnerships and national partnerships; lacking in a state and federal process and mechanism to influence policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification and work</th>
<th>Teachers' salaries will be based on their knowledge and skills.</th>
<th>Critique—not evident in P-12 schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All teachers will have access to high-quality professional development and regular time for collegial work and planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| To create standards of entry to the profession—examinations and educational requirements that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible | Both teachers and principals will be hired and retained based on their ability to meet professional standards of practice | Critique—entrance and exit standards have been raised generally |

**TABLE 5** (seen on preceding pages)

**Comparison of Holmes Group/Partnership Goals with the Goals of the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (NCTAF).**

**Note:** The similarity of the goals between the Holmes Partnership and NCTAF would seem to indicate that the Holmes Partnership has had an impact on thinking beyond their organization. The fact that the goals are similar is a compliment to the Holmes Partnership, that many of their
views are shared by those outside of their organization. It also reinforces the need for the Holmes Partnership and NCTAF to work together.
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