

No consensus found on major Holmes Group recommendations even among representatives of participating institutions.

An Approach to Assessing Readiness for Educational Reforms

by Dr. Kenneth Hoyt
Kansas State University

Background

Major shifts in direction for educational reform are currently taking place. These include shifts toward: (a) recognizing the key importance of the teaching faculty in implementing reform; (b) formulating reform proposals oriented around simultaneous collaborative changes in both K-12 school districts and in teacher education programs; (c) specifying the importance of the total package of proposed changes rather than a piecemeal approach; and (d) financial empowerment of the organizations calling for change.

Such shifts are clearly evident in three currently popular reports: (1) the Holmes Group report entitled **Tomorrow's Teachers**; (2) the report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy entitled **A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century**; and (3) the report of the National Governors' Association entitled **Time for Results**.¹ Each of these organizations has already initiated actions aimed at implementing recommendations found in its report.

The Need

Lasting educational reform can come about only through consensus decisions and actions by members of key groups/organizations affected by various reform proposals. Each has great power to resist changes with which their members disagree. No matter how powerful or well funded, there is no way that reform proposals found in these reports can be forced on such persons. If consensus is to be attained, representatives of these groups must be able to communicate their extent of agreement with each other. Thus, there exists a great need to develop a means by which such communication can occur.

Pleas to be heard have already been voiced by several of these groups in various issues of **Education Week** appearing in the last year. Examples include those of: (a) vocational education (12/17/86); (b) subject-matter oriented

associations (2/4/87); (c) special education (1/21/87); and (d) state boards of education (10/22/86). Such groups, of course, represent only some of those sure to be greatly affected if recommendations in the Holmes/Carnegie/NGA reports are implemented.

Assessing readiness for reform is quite different from simply voicing objections to various parts of these reports. Many examples of objections and/or warnings raised by particular persons/groups/ organizations have appeared since these reports were issued (Gartner, 1986; Lawless, 1986; McGrath, 1986; Olson, 1987; Tom, 1986; Soltis, 1987). Each is apparently intended to influence readers with respect to readiness to endorse/implement recommendations found in one or more of these reports. The extent to which they are being successful is, of course, unknown.

A number of position statements reflecting reform proposals have been issued, in part, as alternative reform proposals to the Holmes/ Carnegie/NGA reports. (TECSCU, 1986; AASCU, 1986; Travers & Sacks, 1987; UCEA, 1987). Each appeared *after* publication of the Holmes/ Carnegie/ NGA reports and appears to be, at least in part, a reaction to these reports.

The need for a means by which persons representing various groups/organizations can, in common terms, express their degree of agreement with reform steps suggested in the Holmes/Carnegie/NGA reports appears to be great. If progress toward implementing educational reforms advocated in these reports is to be documented longitudinally, an equally great need exists for beginning baseline data representing where we are now. The effort reported here represents one attempt to begin meeting these needs.

A Rationale for Assessing Readiness for Educational Reforms Advocated in the Holmes/Carnegie/NGA Reports

Four elements combine to form the basic rationale for the effort reported here. First, it is assumed that those who disagree with a given reform proposal are less ready to implement it than are those who agree with it. Thus, a beginning step toward assessing readiness can be considered to be the extent to which a person agrees with a given proposal for reform.

Second, it seems apparent that few persons will find themselves either 100 percent in favor or 100 percent opposed to all of the suggested reform steps found in these reports. Thus, it will be necessary to allow respondents to make independent judgments on each specific suggestion for change.

Third, it seems logical to assume that persons officially representing one of these three groups (Holmes, Carnegie, NGA) should be more uniformly in favor of reform steps suggested by the report with which they are identified than persons representing other groups/ organizations. Thus, data from such official representatives should provide a baseline against which data from other groups and/or organizations can be compared.

¹It should be recognized that those parts of **Time for Results** that speak to the need for collaborative, simultaneous reform of K-12 school districts and teacher education programs reflect primarily the contents of the Carnegie Forum's report and, to a lesser extent, the Holmes Group report. The Carnegie Corporation has awarded a \$890,000 grant to the National Governor's Association to help states carry out the reform agenda of the Carnegie Report (Olson, 1986). Thus, while **Time for Results** may well have a greater eventual impact than either of the others, its basic recommendations in this area are found in the other two reports and so do not have to be considered separately here.

Dr. Kenneth Hoyt is a professor in the College of Education at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.

Fourth, of the three groups, only the Holmes Group has an institutional membership structure that allows data to be collected from persons officially serving as institutional representatives. Thus, initial attention appears to be most appropriately focused on Holmes Group members.

The Problem

Two research problems are evident. The first is one of demonstrating the extent to which baseline data can be collected from Holmes Group institutional representatives in a form useful for making later comparisons with other samples and populations. The second is one of discovering the extent to which Holmes Group institutional representatives now appear to be in agreement with reform changes suggested by the Holmes/Carnegie reports.

Four research questions require answers here: (1) to what extent are responses of Holmes Group sample members sufficiently homogeneous so as to justify their use as a single entity?; (2) to what extent do significant differences exist in ways Holmes Group sample members respond to various subscales found in the instrument?; (3) to what extent to Holmes Group samples members differ in terms of their agreement with the nine commitments each Holmes Group member institution is asked to make when joining the Holmes Group?; and (4) to what extent do Holmes Group sample members differ in terms of mean responses they give to items taken only from the Holmes Report, items taken only from the Carnegie Report, and items found in both the Holmes and Carnegie reports?

The Population

The inaugural meeting of all Holmes Group institutions took place January 31–February 2, 1987. Rosters distributed to those attending that historic meeting contained names of 264 persons including 229 from 98 Holmes Group member institutions and 35 persons listed as “invited participants.” These 264 persons constitute the population for this study.

It seems reasonable to assume these persons can be regarded as a special kind of baseline population. Odds appear slight that a Holmes Group member institution would, after having paid \$4,000 to join, name, as their official representatives, persons who are unfamiliar with and/or opposed to the Holmes Group report. That is, the person(s) designated as official representatives of the 98 Holmes Group member institutions or as “invited participants” to the inaugural meeting should surely be expected to be more familiar with and probably more favorably inclined toward the contents of the Holmes/Carnegie reports than typical faculty members. They are in no way a random sample of teacher education faculty in these institutions. Data collected from persons representing this special population should provide an operational beginning baseline from which to measure “readiness for educational reform” as reflected in Holmes/Carnegie suggested reforms.

Data Collection Procedures and the Sample Resulting from Them

Using rosters supplied by the Holmes Group, an initial individually typed letter was sent on February 24, 1987 to the 264 population members requesting their participation. Data collection instruments were mailed along with a common memo to the 198 persons who agreed to do so. Three followups were made as “progress reports” to both respondents and non-respondents. By June 1, 1987 when data collection ceased, useable replies had been received from 144 people.

Each data collection instrument was coded prior to be-

ing mailed. This allowed comparison of respondents with non-respondents on (1) type of position held, (2) geographic region, and (3) sex. Each of the 264 members of the population were categorized in these ways by the investigator prior to data collection. The similarities and differences among members of the population and those providing useable replies are summarized below in Table 1.

Examination of the data found in Table 1 leads to a conclusion that the sample used in this study is remarkably representative of the population from which it came. Striking similarities can be seen between members of the population and members of the sample on each of the three characteristics on which they were compared.

The sample appears to be slightly less representative when Holmes Group member institutions in the sample are compared with Holmes Group member institutions in the total population. That comparison, using region of the country as a basis for classification, is as follows:

Holmes Region	No. of Institutions In the Population	No. of Institutions In the Sample
Northeast	22	15
Southeast	17	17
Midwest	19	16
South Central	23	19
Far West	17	13
Total	98	80

Table 1—Extent to Which Respondents Are Representative of the Population of Pre-Registrants to the Holmes Group Inaugural Meeting

Type of Person	N & % in the Population		N & % in the Sample	
	N	%	N	%
Education Deans	76	28.8	44	30.5
Assoc/Asst. Ed Deans	36	13.6	19	13.2
Ed. Dept. Heads	45	17.0	30	20.8
Ed. Professors	47	17.8	27	18.8
A & S Deans/Assoc.	14	5.3	5	3.5
Central Adm.	16	6.1	7	4.9
Program Contributors	30	11.4	12	8.3
TOTALS	264	100.0	144	100.0
Holmes Region				
North East	50	18.9	27	18.8
South East	49	18.6	30	20.8
Mid West	55	20.8	34	23.6
South Central	47	17.8	25	17.4
Far West	33	12.5	16	11.1
Program Contributors	30	11.4	12	8.3
TOTALS	264	100.0	144	100.0
Sex				
Male	189	71.6	105	72.9
Female	75	28.4	39	27.1
TOTALS	264	100.0	144	100.0

When institutions rather than respondent characteristics are used as a basis for judging representativeness of the sample, it can be concluded that, relatively speaking, institutions in the Northeast region of the nation are slightly underrepresented while those in the Southeast are slightly overrepresented. Even here, the sample does not appear to be very biased.

Table 3—Intercorrelation Matrix for the Ten Sub-scales of the Hoyt RER Scale Using Data From the Holmes Inaugural Meeting Group Sample

Sub-Scale	Cert./ Licnsg	Tchr. Power	Tchr. Actblty	Nature of Tchr Ed	K-12 T.E. Rel	Lib Arts Change	Need for Change Lib Arts	More Minority	Finance Budget	Holmes Commit's
Total	.69	.56	.65	.68	.71	.73	.24	.51	.61	.77
Certification/ Licensing		.35	.37	.27	.51	.41	.02	.17	.20	.55
Teacher Power			.30	.17	.39	.26	.14	.24	.31	.26
Teacher Accountability				.34	.43	.34	-.08	.18	.47	.45
Nature of Teacher Ed.					.38	.76	.15	.32	.32	.64
K-12 Teacher Ed. Relationships						.42	.12	.24	.32	.63
Liberal Arts Changes							.14	.42	.27	.67
Need for Change In Liberal Arts								.13	.17	.14
Need For More Minority Students									.40	.36
Budget/Finance										.31

The Instrument

Instrument development began with construction of detailed outlines of both the Holmes and the Carnegie reports. From those outlines, a list of 138 specific suggestions for educational reforms was compiled.

A separate item, usually using the exact wording of the report from which it was taken, was constructed for each suggested change. Items were worded to avoid any meaning inconsistent with the suggested reform found in the report from which it was taken. Each item was constructed using a Likert type format with five possible responses ranging from "Strongly Agree" (scored as "5") to "Strongly Disagree" (scored as "1").

The 138 items stating specific suggested reform actions were initially grouped into eight sub-scales, each of which contained items reflecting a particular aspect of educational reform advocated by the Holmes and/or the Carnegie reports. Each sub-scale contained information designed to help those respondents unfamiliar with one or both of the reports better understand the context in which they were being asked to respond to its items. Three items appeared to belong in each of two sub-scales and, subsequently, placed in both thus making a total of 141 items.

For purposes of data collection in the effort reported here, the eight sub-scales were collated in a single instrument. Eight items specifically concerned with need for change in liberal arts offerings were added to the 141 thus making a total of 149 items. These eight items became a new sub-scale. The "Teacher Power/Teacher Accountability" sub-scale was split into two sub-scales. Thus, the final instrument contained ten sub-scales. The topic of each sub-scale and the number of items in it are:

Topic Covered by Each Sub-Scale	No. of Items
1. Teacher Certification/Licensing	31
2. Teacher Power	17
3. Teacher Accountability	18
4. General Nature of Teacher Education Programs	14
5. Teacher Ed/K-12 School District Working Relationships	13
6. Changes Affecting Liberal Arts Offerings	11
7. Need for Change in Liberal Arts Offerings	8
8. Encouraging More Minority Persons to Become Teachers	11
9. Changes in K-12 School District Financing/Budgeting	17
10. Commitments Holmes Group Institutions are Asked to Make	9

Of the 149 items, 32 came from suggestions for change made in the Holmes Report, 91 from the Carnegie Forum report, and 26 from suggestions for change made in both reports. This is simply a function of the nature and content of the two reports. The Holmes Report concentrates relatively more attention on the need for reform whereas the Carnegie Report places its primary focus on suggested reform steps.²

Following its use in this effort, two attempts were made to judge the worth of the data collection instrument. One was aimed at computing Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for the instrument as a whole and for each sub-scale. Using data collected from respondents, Table 2 below provides pertinent reliability data:

Table 2—Reliability Data for Form II—Part B Total Scale And Each Subscale Using Responses From Holmes Group Sample

Name of Sub-Scale	Cronbach Alpha "r"	No. of Cases*	No. of Items
Total Instrument	.94	78	149
Certification/Licensing	.82	115	31
Teacher Power	.84	136	16
Teacher Accountability	.73	117	19
Nature of Teacher Education	.74	139	14

²This can be clearly seen in a second instrument compiled from the Holmes/Carnegie reports using an analogous approach. That instrument contains items constructed from statements of need for reform found in both reports. Of 75 items in that instrument, 28 came from the Carnegie Report and 47 came from the Holmes Report.

K-12 Teacher Ed Relationship	.84	139	13
Changes in Liberal Arts	.72	137	11
Need for Change/Liberal Arts	.61	134	8
Enrolling Minority Students	.65	135	11
Budget/Finance	.77	113	17
Holmes Commitments	.71	138	9

*Indicates number of respondents completing all items on the scale.

Data found in Table 2 above lead to a conclusion that sub-scale reliabilities are sufficiently high as to justify comparisons with other samples when the Holmes Group sample is taken as a whole.

Second, intercorrelations were computed between each of the ten subscales and between each subscale and the total instrument. The resulting intercorrelation matrix appears below as Table 3.

Data found in Table 3 make it appear that the subscales are measuring different aspects of reform thus justifying the use of scores from each subscale as well as from the total instrument.

Results

Results will be presented as attempts to answer the four research questions posed earlier.

Question (1) related to homogeneity of the total Holmes Group sample. To answer this question, means, standard deviations, and "F" tests were computed for various kinds of sub-group categories of Holmes Group sample members in terms of responses to each sub-scale and the total instrument (11 in all) for each classification category. Because of the large numbers of comparisons required, Tukey (HSD) corrections for multiple comparisons were made for each classification category. Findings are summarized below.

Table 4—Summary of Number of "F" Tests Computed and Number Found Statistically Significant For Various Sub-Categories³

Classification Category	No. Ways Classified	Total No. "F" Tests	No. Sig. at .05 Level
Region	5	11	0
Age	3	11	1
Sex	2	11	0
Type of Position	2	11	0
Type of Setting	4	11	1
Type of Student Worked With	4	11	0
Type of Expertise	6	11	2
Years Experience	3	11	0
Totals	32	88	4

³Detailed tables available from author upon request

With 88 "F" tests conducted, 4.44 can be expected to be significant at the .05 level by chance alone. Four were found here. These include statistically significant differences in means between:

Classif.	Sub-category vs	Sub-category	On Sub-Scale	Higher Being
Age	Under 40 (4.36)	Over 55 (4.07)	Teacher Power	Under 40
Type of Position	Deans (3.05)	"Other" (3.78)	Need for Change in Liberal Arts	"Other"

Type of Expertise	Ele. C. & I (3.40)	Ed. Psych. (4.02)	Teacher Power	Ele. C. & I
Type of Expertise	Ele. C. & I (3.40)	"Other" (2.96)	Need for Change in Lib. Arts	Ele. C. & I

It seems proper to assume here that these differences, even though statistically significant, probably are, in reality, due to chance. Based on these findings, it is concluded that respondents are sufficiently homogeneous in their responses so as to justify answering Questions 2 and 3 using the total N without any subcategories.

Question (2) asked if differences exist in mean scores among the various subscales in the total instrument. To answer this question requires a separate analysis of data for each of the 10 subscales. Since 122 of the 144 respondents were employed in teacher education, it was decided to include means/standard deviations for both teacher education respondents and for all respondents in answering Question 2. The data appear below in Table 5.

Table 5—Means and Standard Deviations for Each RER Scale When Compared for Teacher Education Respondents versus All Respondents

Teacher Education Measure	Teacher Education Respondents			All Respondents		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Certification/Licensing	122	4.22	.33	141	4.19	.34
Teacher Power	118	4.22	.42	137	4.20	.43
Teacher Accountability	120	3.80	.44	139	3.80	.43
Nature of Teacher Ed	121	3.45	.52	140	3.50	.52
K-12 Teacher Ed Relationships	121	4.32	.43	140	4.29	.43
Suggested Changes in Liberal Arts	121	3.75	.50	140	3.77	.51
Need for Change in Liberal Arts	119	3.99	.35	138	3.20	.50
Need for More Minority Teachers	119	3.99	.35	138	3.99	.36
Finance/Budget	120	3.58	.46	139	3.58	.45
ALL Holmes Commitments	119	4.16	.47	137	4.14	.47
GRAND MEAN	122	3.93	.28	141	3.92	.28

Note: A one way repeated measures ANOVA using mean scores of all respondents on subscales for (a) teacher power; (b) teacher accountability; (c) nature of teacher education; (d) finance and budgeting; and (e) Holmes commitments yielded the following results: $F(4,540) = 112.224$, $p < .0001$.

Note: After Tukey (HSD) correction, statistically significant differences exist between mean scores on the following subscales:

- Teacher Power versus Teacher Accountability
- Teacher Power versus Nature of Teacher Education
- Teacher Power versus Finance/Budget

- d. Teacher Accountability versus Nature of Teacher Education
- e. Teacher Accountability versus Finance/Budget
- f. Teacher Accountability versus Holmes Commitments
- g. Finance/Budget versus Holmes Commitments
- h. Nature of Teacher Education versus Holmes Commitments

Data reported in Table 5 above clearly demonstrate differences exist in respondents' "readiness for educational reform" in terms of mean scores on the sub-scales of the instrument. Three categories of "readiness" appear to exist including:

Highest Mean Scores (4.14-4.29)	Middle Mean Scores (3.77-3.99)	Lowest Mean Scores (3.20-3.58)
Certification/Licensing	Tchr. Accountability	Nature of Tchr. Ed
Teacher Power	Sugg. Chgs. in Lib Art	Need Chg., Lib Arts
K-12 Tchr Ed Rel.	More Minority Teachers	Finance/Budget
All Holmes Commitments		

Items in sub-scales having the highest mean scores appear to represent reform suggestions most acceptable to these respondents. Items in sub-scales with the lowest mean scores are assumed to be least acceptable.

Question (3) asked about mean differences for all respondents with respect to each of the nine items in the "Holmes Commitment" subscales. Each item in this subscale represents one of the nine commitments institutions are asked to make when they become Holmes Group members. These nine commitments can be paraphrased as:

- #1—Phase out the undergraduate major in teacher education and develop in its place a graduate program in teacher education.
- #2—Greatly strengthen the pedagogical curriculum.
- #3—Focus clinical experience on development of practice, not simply to exposing prospective teachers to experienced teachers.
- #4—Support differentiated staffing of teachers at three levels and change graduate teacher education to provide for it.
- #5—Support development and administration by the Holmes Group of a series of professional teacher examinations.
- #6—Require students to demonstrate qualifications at (a) time of admission; (b) prior to internship; and (c) during work in classrooms.
- #7—Significantly increase the number of minority persons in teacher education programs.
- #8—Establish and work with Professional Development schools.
- #9—Strive to change the structure and working conditions within schools to make them compatible with the requirements of a new profession.

Pertinent data required to answer Question (3) appear in Table 6 below.

Table 6—Frequency Distributions, Means, Standard Deviations, And "F" Tests for Holmes Group Commitments 1-9 for All Respondents

Holmes Commitment	N	Frequency Distribution					Mean	S.D.
		Agree	Strongly Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
1	140	27	41	23	24	25	3.15	1.39
2	140	83	55	1	1	0	4.57	.55
3	140	87	51	2	0	0	4.61	.52
4	139	33	51	26	20	9	3.57	1.19
5	139	17	58	46	13	5	3.50	.95
6	140	52	81	5	2	0	4.31	.61
7	140	91	45	4	0	0	4.62	.54
8	140	73	50	13	1	3	4.35	.85
9	139	93	43	2	1	0	4.64	.55

Note: A one way repeated measures ANOVA using Holmes Commitments Nos. 1, 4, 6, 8, and 9 yielded the following results: $F(4,548) = 71.754, p < .0001$.

Note: After Tukey (HSD) correction, there are statistically significant differences between:

- a. Commitments #1 and #4
- b. Commitments #1 and #6
- c. Commitments #1 and #8
- d. Commitments #1 and #9
- e. Commitments #4 and #6
- f. Commitments #4 and #8
- g. Commitments #4 and #9
- h. Commitments #6 and #9
- i. Commitments #8 and #9

Data found in Table 6 make it clear that, both from the standpoint of the relatively large number of respondents marking this time "strongly disagree" and from the standpoint of mean score comparisons, Holmes Commitment #1 stands out as significantly lower in degree of "readiness for educational reform" than any of the remaining eight commitments. Its mean score is lower than the next lowest mean score by an amount statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. In addition, three other categories of "readiness for educational reform" appear to exist including:

Highest Mean Scores (4.57-4.64)	Middle Mean Scores (4.31-4.35)	Lowest Mean Scores (3.50-3.57)
Commitment #2	Commitment #6	Commitment #4
Commitment #3	Commitment #8	Commitment #5
Commitment #7		
Commitment #9		

It is clear that on six of the nine commitments Holmes Group Institutions are asked to make, mean scores of these respondents were in the "Agree—Strongly Agree" range.

Question (4) asked if respondents differed in mean scores when items derived only from the Holmes Group report, from the Carnegie report, and from both reports are contrasted. To answer this question, the 149 items were divided into three groups. Group 1 contained items derived only from the Carnegie Report, Group 2 contained items derived only from the Holmes Report, and Group 3 items were constructed from suggestions for change found in both the Holmes and Carnegie reports. Following this, means/standard deviations were calculated for each group and

comparisons made using a one way ANOVA. Results appear below in Table 7.

Table 7—Means, Standard Deviations, and F Test for Carnegie, Holmes, and Carnegie/Holmes Items In Terms of Responses Given By all Respondents

Category	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Carnegie Items Group	1 3.917	.264	144
Holmes Items Group 2	4.016	.344	143
Both Group 3	3.691	.585	144

Note: A repeated measures one way ANOVA yielded the following results: $F(2,284) = 44.295, p < .0001$.

Note: After Tukey (HSD) correction, statistically significant differences existed between each possible pairing of the three groups.

While these differences in means are not large, they are statistically significant. In terms of "readiness for educational reform" as measured here, respondents appear to be most in agreement with the kinds of suggestions for reform found in the Holmes Report only. They are obviously least in agreement with the kinds of reform suggestions found in both the Holmes and in the Carnegie reports.

Discussion

Respondents varied considerably in terms of the kinds of demographic variables specified in Table 4. Yet, in terms of the ways they responded to items in the instrument, they were remarkably homogeneous. It seems appropriate to assume that this homogeneity probably reflects their common concerns regarding the types of reform proposals found in the Holmes and Carnegie reports. It certainly should not be interpreted to mean that these demographic variables need not be studied further with respect to responses given by members of other kinds of samples. Certainly, it is reasonable to assume that future studies may find classification factors such as age, sex, region of the country, etc. to produce statistically significant differences among respondents. Thus, these demographic variables remain as the basis for a set of reasonable hypotheses to be tested.

Respondents are not equally supportive of all kinds of suggestions for reform found in the Holmes and Carnegie reports. It is interesting to note that the lowest mean "readiness for reform" subscale scores in Table 5 are associated with topics related to change within the college/university structure rather than within K-12 school systems. It is also interesting to note that the mean "readiness for reform" score on the "All Holmes Commitments" subscale (4.14) is among the top three and is between "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" on the five-point Likert scale. Certainly, when all nine Holmes Commitments are viewed as a single entity, it is clear that these institutional representatives were generally in agreement with them.

Respondents differed to statistically different degrees in terms of the strength of their support for the nine basic commitments each Holmes institution is asked to make. The three lowest mean scores found in Table 6 are with respect to: (a) Commitment #1—phase out the undergraduate

degree; (b) Commitment #4—support differentiated staffing of K-12 teachers; and (c) Commitment #5—support development of professional teacher examinations by the Holmes Group. These data make it clear that respondents are not strongly supportive of all nine commitments their institution made when it joined the Holmes Group. These data may cause some to question the exact meaning of Holmes Group membership.

It is not surprising to find that official institutional representatives of Holmes Group institutions are, on the average, more supportive of changes called for only in the Holmes Report than only in the Carnegie Report. It is surprising, however, to find that the lowest mean level of support expressed by respondents was for those reform steps advocated by both reports. This may well be due to the fact that, included in such items, were all of those related to the suggestion that the undergraduate degree in teacher education be abolished.

Conclusions

Based on data reported here, it is concluded that:

1. members of the sample are representative of members of the population from which the sample was formed. Thus, results are considered generalizable to the population of 264 institutional representatives whose names appeared on the official roster of the Holmes Group inaugural meeting.

2. Members of the sample are sufficiently homogeneous in their responses to justify pooling of scores for all respondents without regard to demographic differences existing among them.

3. The data collection instrument, including each of its 10 subscales, is sufficiently reliable to justify its use in group comparisons of the Holmes Group sample with other samples.

4. Readiness for educational reform, as measured here, is uneven among Holmes Group institutional representatives when extent of agreement with the various kinds of reforms suggested is the criterion.

5. The extent to which Holmes Group institutional representatives agree with the nine commitments each Holmes Group institution has agreed to meet varies considerably. Institutional agreement to all nine commitments is not shared equally among institutional representatives.

Final Observations

The most important goal of this effort was to assemble a set of baseline data useful both in comparing Holmes Group institutional representatives with persons representing other groups/organizations and in later longitudinal followup efforts. That goal has been reached at an acceptable level. It is hoped that these baseline data will be used widely by others interested in assessing readiness for educational reform.

It is important to recognize that "readiness for reform," as measured here, pertains only to those reform suggestions found in the Holmes and/or Carnegie reports. If representatives of other groups/ organizations have low mean scores on the data collection instrument used here, this, in no way, means they are necessarily opposed to "educational reform." Rather, it simply means that they are opposed to the kinds of reform advocated by the Holmes and/or Carnegie reports.

It is equally important to note that "agreement," as measured here, is not synonymous with "readiness" for reform. Rather, it is simply one component. To agree with the value of a suggested reform is not necessarily equivalent to being willing to support its implementation.

References

- A nation prepared: teachers for the 21st century.** (1986). Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Backman, C. (1986). Positions on current issues in teacher education. Washington, D.C.: Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities.
- Gartner, A. (September 24, 1986). Reforming teacher education: 2 critical views of recent Carnegie and Holmes Group reports. Washington, D.C.: **The Chronicle of Higher Education**, p. 39.
- Lawless, K. (September 24, 1986). Reforming teacher education: 2 critical views of recent Carnegie and Holmes Group reports. Washington, D.C.: **The Chronicle of Higher Education**, pp. 39-40.
- Leaders for America's schools.** (1987). The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.
- McGrath, C.P. (1986). The great teacher talkathon. **Educational Record**, 67(4), 7-11.
- Olson, L. (1987). An overview of the Holmes Group. **Phi Delta Kappan**, 68(8), 619-621.
- Olson, L. (October 15, 1986). Carnegie backs reform agenda with money, effort. **Education Week**, 6(6), 1, 16.
- Soltis, J. (Ed.). (1987). **Reforming teacher education.** The impact of the Holmes Group report. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Time for results.** (1986). The Governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.
- To secure the blessings of liberty.** (1986). A report of the National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Tom, A. (1986). The Holmes Report: Sophisticated analysis, simplistic solutions. **J. Teacher Education**, 36(4), 44-46.
- Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.** (1986). East Lansing, Michigan: The Holmes Group.
- Travers, E. and Sacks, S. (1987). **Teacher education and the liberal arts.** The position of the Consortium for Excellence in Teacher Education. Swarthmore, PA: The Consortium.