OPENING THE CLASSROOM DOOR: THE VALUE OF PEER-TEACHER CLASS VISITS

Charles Moran, Jill R. Deans, Mary Reda, Katy Ryan, Rebecca Totaro, Brion Dulac, Kathryn Southwood, Alison Stavchansky, Michael Teig, Samantha Wood

Class visits have long been an important part of pre-service teacher education. Indeed, Marvin Henry traces the history of what he terms "field experience" in pre-service education to 17th century France and, possibly, 17th century America (69). We accept that the trainee learns from a visit to an experienced practitioner. In the world of *in*-service education, however, class visits are few and far between; and when these visits do occur, they tend to be supervisory and evaluative in nature (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 95). It is the extraordinary practicing teacher who sees another teacher at work (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 96; Tobin 141; Willerman 5; Wragg 77). Supervisors, who are *ex officio* required to visit classes, know how much they learn about teaching and about themselves as teachers from these visits (Tatel 48–9). Seeing a teacher work in context—in a particular classroom, with a particular curriculum/agenda, with particular students—is a powerful learning experience, recorded with all senses in raw, unprocessed form. Likewise, being visited and seeing oneself through the eyes of the visitor can be a powerful learning experience. In contrast, when we read about teaching or listen to someone talk about teaching—the preferred modes in in-service seminars—we are working with highly-processed information presented in a restricted code.

On the basis of our experience, which we will describe and analyze below, we argue for the value of peer visits in the training of in-service teachers, and in particular, because this is who we are, in the training of in-service teachers of first-year college writing courses. We will argue that when we visit one another's classes to observe, rather than to evaluate and/or report, we not only learn directly, as apprentices; we are ourselves moved to reflect upon our own teaching practices. Further, we will argue that in *being* visited we are moved to reflect as well. In fact, given our experience, we believe that peer visits offer an unusually direct road to one of our program's goals: the training of the reflective practitioner. That this road is not often taken is understandable in K through 12 education, where peer visits would involve the expense of substitute teachers. But, in first-year college writing courses the expense is negligible. In asking ourselves why peer visiting is not more widespread in college writing programs, we discover a range of possible reasons, the least attractive of which is this: that although we may believe in the value of structured peer-interaction among our student writers, we do not, as a profession, seem to value what we may learn in structured peer-interaction with other teachers of first-year writing.

In this article we make the case that the peer visits need to be nonevaluative, believing with William Proefriedt that "the sort of knowledge teachers find most useful in their work emerges within informal friendship structures and is transmitted within a context in which they share their difficulties and provide reciprocal support" (24). With Willerman, et. al, we reject the terms *peer coaching* and *peer supervision* (1) because of the power-relations implicit in these terms. Even the terms chosen by these authors, *formative assistance* and *peer observation and assistance* (1), for us carry too much of the proactive helping-relationship with them. Our visits have been scheduled, to be sure: they have not been spontaneous, which might be the ideal situation, but they have not been framed or perceived as visits by a helper. They have been framed simply as visits by a peer, a person who has come to observe and learn. The visits as we have structured them

have led to our reflecting on others' and our own teaching practices.

For our theoretical framework we draw first on the work of Michael Polanyi. We are attracted to Polanyi because we believe that we are dealing with what he has termed "tacit knowledge," knowledge that is embodied in action, and not available to the conscious mind. As Polanyi writes, "We can know more than we can tell" (4). Teachers have tremendous amounts of tacit knowledge. As we read Polanyi, we find ourselves accepting his argument for the value of tacit knowledge. Yet we believe, here working *against* the grain of Polanyi's argument, that it is a condition of the teaching profession that our knowledge tends to remain all too tacit. We see nonevaluative peer visits as a way of making this tacit knowledge available both to teacher and observer, bringing what is tacit into the light, as it were, a potential subject for reflection. We side here with Lee Odell, and suggest that we complement our tacit knowledge—what Odell calls "intuition and habit" (4)—with substantial "looking at." This looking at, Polanyi warns us, can often be destructive: "an unbridled lucidity can destroy our understanding of complex matters" (18). As the pianist's performance is not initially improved by drawing her attention to the motion of her fingers, so the teacher's performance may not initially be improved by bringing her tacit knowledge forward. But, Polanyi continues, "The destruction can be made good by interiorizing the particulars once more" (18). Polanyi goes further, leaving open the possibility that the original performance may be improved upon by

> explicitly stating the relation between its particulars. Where such explicit integration is feasible, it goes far beyond the range of tacit integration. Take the case of a machine. One can learn to use it skillfully, without knowing exactly how it works. But the engineer's understanding of its construction and operation goes much deeper. (19-20)

Polanyi gives us the language we need to talk about our knowledge and its relationship to mind and to body. He gives us, too, an argument for the value of teachers' knowledge, knowledge that is expressed in action, embodied. Polanyi suggests that we can bring this tacit knowledge to consciousness, and, if we do it right, we can improve and deepen our performance through a re-interiorizing, a reintegration. But how to accomplish this reintegration? Here we draw on the work of Donald Schön, who himself leans heavily on Polanyi's arguments for the value of tacit knowledge—what Schön calls "knowing-in-action" (*Reflective* 50). Schön's main project, like Polanyi's, is to argue for the value of knowing-in-action. The strand of Schön's thought that has particular relevance to our study is his understanding of how tacit knowledge can best be brought to consciousness and/or communicated to others. Schön writes, "If we want to discover what someone knows-in-action, we must put ourselves in a position to observe her in action. If we want to teach about our 'doing,' then we need to observe ourselves in the doing, reflect on what we observe, describe it, and reflect on our description" (*Knowing* 30). In the study that follows we have followed Schön's prescription: we have observed one another in action, we have described what we have seen, we have seen our own teaching through others' eyes, and we have reflected upon what we have seen, both in others' practice and in our own. We locate our research in the tradition of "teacher research" as defined by Lytle and Cochran-Smith: "systematic, intentional inquiry by teachers about their own school and classroom work" (84). Our research can also be seen as a species of educational action research, as described by Feldman and Atkin (127–8) and Noffke (4–5): our project has been collaborative; it has placed primary value upon the teachers' tacit knowledge; it has encouraged teachers to reflect upon their own practice; and it has had as its institutional goal the participants' continued self-development and professional growth.

The Context: Program and Design of Study

At our public university, the first-year writing requirement is taught primarily by Teaching Associates, graduate students who are pursuing M.A., Ph.D., and M.F.A. degrees in English and other disciplines. These teaching associateships are granted through a competitive application process. As part of the program's teacher-training, Teaching Associates are placed in "Course Director groups"—groups of approximately ten teachers that meet ten times during the semester with an English department faculty member in a one-hour seminar. The meetings serve as a forum for exploring issues of teaching writing. Meetings typically include formal presentations on issues such as grading or teaching editing skills, free-form problem-solving, and brainstorming. In all of these, the emphasis is placed on both practical classroom issues and professional development.

For our study, we included in our schedule of meetings a visit to the classroom of another teacher in our group. Realizing that we learned from each other in speaking about our teaching, we assumed the experience of seeing another teacher "in action" would be productive as well. We formed self-selected pairs and replaced one of our scheduled seminar-meetings with these class visits.

Our class visits were carefully, but informally, structured. Before we began the visits, we spoke of making "transcripts" of the class visited: recording observations, rather than evaluating. The observations might take the form of noting differences between what we saw and felt in the class visited and what we considered our own teaching practice. We decided to look for what we admired, even envied, and/or what we might take back to our own classrooms. These observer's notes were to be shared only with one's partner, and not with the Course Director. Each pair of teachers negotiated within this loose framework. Some requested particular types of feedback, asking the visitor to pay attention to certain aspects of class dynamics. Other issues, such as whether the visitor would or would not join in as participant-observer, were negotiated individually.

After visits were exchanged, we returned to our Course Director meetings for a further set of reflections. During these meetings we produced two sets of written notes: first, our reflections on the experience of visiting a colleague's class, and second, our reflections on the experience of being visited by a colleague. These written reflections were duplicated and shared within the group. From these written reflections, our "data," we moved to the writing of this article, exploring more fully the possibilities and implications of our experience. We thus occupy several overlapping positions in this text: we are authors and researchers, we are teachers still learning from our experiences, and we are the data that the study is attempting to understand.

Because we initially chose to record our reflections under two headings—"on visiting" and "on being visited"—our findings fall most easily under these same headings. We present our findings, therefore, in two sets: our description and analysis of the reflections of the visiting teacher, and our description and analysis of the reflections of the teacher who was visited.

Reactions to the Physical Environment

When we visited our peer's classroom, we reacted first to felt physical differences between the classroom we were visiting and our own. In these observations, we often made comparisons, suggesting that we were seeing our own classrooms, and our relation to those classrooms, anew, and understanding that we might have options—for instance, in the way we arranged furniture and established spatial relationships. For example, Brion saw in Wes's arrangement of the furniture a reflection of Wes's teaching style:

> nice big windows—two walls are windows. . . big snow flakes falling outside, like being inside some College Writing holiday snow-globe . . . . Wes, casual in sweater . . . not too rigid, but organized loosely.

Katy observed Michael's furniture-arrangement and its relationship to teacher-student distance, authority, and learning:

> Watching the distances of the circle allowed me to reflect on the significance of space in classrooms. Too much distance between students and teacher might create an impenetrable gap, while too little might compromise the necessary distinction between the instructor and students.

Katy saw, too, the way in which Michael moved in this space, and she reflected upon the differences between his practice and hers:

> Michael remained seated while he lectured, although he frequently stood up to emphasize a point. Again, the physical arrangement of my classroom prevents me from sitting at all, so it was interesting to watch Michael negotiate his teacherly status from behind a desk.

Mary observed Alison's classroom environment as determined in part by the conditions outside of the room:

> One of the first warm, glorious Spring afternoons [in] a stuffy room—crowded with extra desks, a podium, an overhead projector, a view of the bus stop and the streams of people leaving campus for the day, and an hour-and-fifteen-minutes of College Writing. I entered Alison's class thinking this was a combination of factors I would resent as a student and dread as a teacher.

Yet Alison and her students did not seem to notice these conditions. Clearly Alison had created a system that helped her students concentrate on their work, not on the conditions that Mary saw to be "crowded" and "stuffy," conditions that drew her attention to the space and life outside.

Beginnings and Endings

Visiting teachers also noticed the way in which the teacher opened and closed a class period. Beginnings and endings seemed suddenly and surprisingly important. Mary noted,

> From the first minutes in the room, I sensed the difference between us—[Alison] was there early, talking to individual students, passing out papers, doing administrative "stuff." The students, sitting in rows, seemed to be, for the most part, quietly reading assignments or drafts, writing, getting ready for class. It seemed like Alison took care of the individual problems before class—a really smart move, so that class time was not taken up with these details. I tend to dash in at the last minute, feeling a bit disorganized.

Alison observed Mary, finding not the last-minute dash that Mary saw in her own practice, but this:

> Mary began the class by asking her students to introduce themselves to me and share a current writing topic. Their greetings revealed an ease and intimacy in the class, and I quickly became a member of this writing community.

Katy focused on endings rather than beginnings, and compared the way she and Michael closed their classes:

> It was important for me to witness Michael's conclusion to the class. He brought the small groups back to the earlier circle and concluded on a very positive note. Unlike my class, which often dissolves into a random exit, Michael's class had a very clear, enthusiastic closure.

And Mary saw the conclusion of Alison's class in this way:

> In the last few minutes, Alison gave back mid-process drafts and offered suggestions for revision into final drafts. Not only did her students seem attentive, some

were even taking notes! When class was done, a few students remained, continuing to read the comments on their drafts (Again, this surprised me, as I projected my own behavior—expecting them to leave ASAP—rather they seem genuinely invested, interested in their work and Alison's comments.)

Through their observations of their peers' classes, teachers deepened their understanding of the extent to which the opening of the class period can set the tone of the room for the class-hour, and the closing of the class period can set the mood of the students and the teacher toward the class for the days between. Generally the focus in training programs, and the focus of corridor teacher-talk, is upon the activity or lesson that forms the body of the class. Teachers in our group found that observing their peers' initial and closing moments resulted in ideas for making these times instructional and functional as well as transitional.

Observing Classroom Interaction

Our teaching is a function of our sense of who our students are: what we think they can and cannot do, what we think they need to learn to do. If our teaching is to change, it can be argued, our sense of our students' capacities must change first. In our study, peer visitors saw students interacting in ways that caused them to revise and re-cast their conceptions of their own students' abilities and potential. For example, after describing Mary's reading-and-response activity, Alison observed,

> The class was structured as a workshop, students reading drafts out loud and commenting on each other's work, giving advice for the next revision. . . I was impressed by the spontaneity and the interest and respect shown by each member of the class for the others.

Comparing her own class to Mary's, Alison continued:

> My response activities are for the most part highly structured, where students respond in specific ways to each other's writing. I can't help but notice that Mary's approach assumes a more capable student than does mine and that her students enthusiastically meet her expectation. I'm always stating my belief that students will fulfill the expectations I set for them, yet my visit to Mary's class makes me see that in some important ways I've underestimated their capabilities.

Mary, after visiting Charlie's class, noted that he "calls on his students, rather than waiting for volunteers to participate, and records their contributions on the blackboard." Comparing this to her own practice, she noted, "I try to avoid this out of a fear that this will intimidate or alienate quieter students who don't participate verbally." "But," she continues, "instead of appearing like individuals were 'on the spot,' it genuinely felt that all students in the room were affirmed as contributing, valuable members of a community." Michael's visit to Katy's class resulted in a similar observation: "I thought initially that Katy might be talking over the students' heads in her analysis of Swift's *A Modest Proposal*, but it struck me that 1) she was bringing a very complex theoretical/literary/practical/personal kind of discourse into the classroom and 2) that I may in some ways talk down to my students or not push their thinking with quite this sophistication." Michael, thereafter, resolved to "steal" the activity, to make it his own by adapting it to meet his own students' needs: "Things I am going to steal: Swift's *A Modest Proposal* and as much of her discussion of it as I can recall. Or maybe not this but a more critical look at other texts. That is, not just offering certain texts as models but modeling them."

The significance of these observations of classroom interaction, like those of the physical classroom and of the ways in which teachers chose to open and close their classes, lies in the extent to which the visiting teacher sees something in another teacher's practice, makes a comparison with her own practice, and then reflects upon the difference. Through the observation, what was tacit has become conscious, available for

practice, and then reflects upon the difference. Through the observation, what was tacit has become conscious, available for reflection. Through reflection, the particulars are reintegrated into what is now a new system, one that incorporates the manifold and subtle changes that are the result of the reintegration. Our experience tells us that each of us at some point adjusts to our interaction with a particular group of students—a species of feedback loop. We adapt as well to our classroom's physical environment, making do with what we have or are given, forgetting that further adjustment is possible and may be valuable. Observing another teacher's practice allows us to break out of our own, realizing that one small change in desk arrangement, lighting, first greeting, or choice of reading material can substantially change our practice: the system that includes teacher, classroom, curriculum, and student. The significance of such changes in practice is enormous, given the "trickle up" effect of any change, however apparently minor, in the complex system that includes our teaching and our students' learning.

Reflections of the Visited Teaching Associate

Anxiety and Stress

When asked to reflect on the experience of being visited, many teachers spoke of the anxiety that the impending visit created. Most felt that the anxiety served a useful purpose: it made them prepare more thoroughly for class and thereby contributed to what they felt to be the success of their visited class. Responses here were highly individual, personal, and contradictory, often including both trepidation and renewed conviction and confidence. In her reflection on being visited, Katy foregrounded the anxiety that she felt on the day before the impending visit:

> Predictably, I over-prepared and over-analyzed my plan for the day. I do think the anxiety of "being watched" had a payoff: I learned about myself as a teacher from Michael's observations and I learned about myself as a self-conscious human being from the experience . . . . In

> the end, the visit actually bolstered, rather than diminished, my confidence.

Similarly Kathryn found that the occasion of the visit brought out the best in her:

> I was in top form and had really thought through the steps of my class plan. . . . Sam heightened my senses and energy and I need to remember that.

As Kathryn's notes suggest, associated with her anxiety was her heightened awareness of individual classroom practices. Mary, for example, gained significant appreciation for the success of certain activities and her students' participation level:

> Alison's presence made me more aware of what was happening, that good things were happening, even if they weren't matching the unrealistic expectations in my head. After class, Alison asked me if my students were always this interactive . . . which reinforced my sense that I really don't appreciate the dynamics of my class.

Ultimately, Mary could be highly specific about what in her own practice became available for her to reflect upon:

> I noticed how I sit, stand, to whom I address myself, how I present myself, the class, the materials.

Kathryn felt that she was better able to see her own practice after Sam had visited her class:

> I was very aware of demonstrating to her [Sam] through my body language, etc., a few things I had mentioned about her own body language the day before: about how to use the board, when to abandon it, how to join the circle or move around inside it. My awareness was heightened here—I knew I was demonstrating the very

things we had been talking about and that it felt great because it felt right.

Peer Visitor as Occasion/Stimulus for Reflecting on Practice

Kathryn's last statement illustrates concretely how instructors were able to move from an awareness that the classroom was not quite the same—altered by the presence of the visitor—to reflections on aspects of their own practice. Jill, after considering the feeling of being watched, first examined this feeling theoretically:

> Yes, visitors keep us on our toes, but not according to a disciplinary mechanism. The dynamic is far more cooperative. Every individual in the classroom—student, instructor, visitor—should be fully committed to the success of the class. This shared commitment enables a fluid exchange of criticism and support among all members of the learning community and directs the class forward.

After reflecting on the experience of being observed, Brion was able to reaffirm an existing practice: "What is one of my better traits? Working one-on-one in class and in the smaller peer groups." After her experience, however, Mary was self-critical: "Having another teacher watching me made me more aware of the mixed messages I send. I was shocked to realize that I spent the entire class sitting down." Both instructors were in a position to structure their practice according to these reflections. Brion's comment—"Being observed, I think, made the class a little bit more fun and easygoing"—suggests that he might continue his practice of working with his students individually or in small groups; while Mary's reflection suggests that she might change her practice. "Teaching lost its 'automatic-ness' for me," she writes, appreciative of Alison's non-evaluative scrutiny. In this way, Mary and Brion were able to isolate embedded practices and make appropriate adjustments.

So it seems that the peer-visit, as opposed to a supervisor's visit, is a situation that stimulates reflection-on practice—both on the part of the teacher and the visitor. Tatel has noted that supervising teachers learn from class visits (48-52); she has conspicuously not noted that those supervised learn as well. Given our experience, we find ourselves arguing that the visit from the peer creates enough dissonance to facilitate reflection, but not so much as to cause panic. Schön argues that reflection-in-action is often "stimulated by surprise" (*Reflective* 50). We would suggest that the visit of a supervisor, given the supervisor's position and the evaluation that is an inevitable consequence of that position, is more likely to lead to shock than surprise. "How am I doing?" is a natural question during a supervisor's visit. "What am I doing?" is a natural question during the visit of a trusted peer. Though peer-visits certainly created some anxiety, not one of our teachers felt fear or panic at the visit of a peer. Peer camaraderie (based in part on the politics of being an emerging teacher) seemed to facilitate the transition from reflection to action. "That I know Katy" was a comfort to Michael who cheerfully admitted "stealing" material from her. Indeed, the peer visit seemed to increase the teachers' sense of the value of their own practice. Jill argued that knowing that others might borrow from her practice enhanced her self-esteem as a teacher: "That others could extract materials and knowledge from watching my class leads me to believe that I too should be able to gain specific knowledge from considering the same experience." Not only is our knowing-in-action worth stealing; it is also worth our reflecting upon.

Case: An Extended Reflection on Authority

Visiting each other's classes led Jill and Rebecca to an extended reflection on a shared concern: how does a young, female Teaching Associate establish appropriate authority in a student-centered classroom? As Jill and Rebecca reflected, they theorized the issue in such a way as to expose embedded knowledge on authority, making this embedded knowledge available at the conscious level for interrogation and subsequent reintegration with practice.

When Jill observed Rebecca's class, she found common ground in Rebecca's style and method:

> Rebecca moved from video to video and point to point just as I would have. It was uncanny, really, to hear her pause, comment, and even struggle as I do.

Rebecca, when she visited Jill's class, found common ground in Jill's classroom presence:

> She is smaller than many of her students (something I can identify with).

This empathic cross-identification sparked deeper thinking from both instructors about the kinds of authority they invoked and accepted in their classes. As she watched Rebecca relate to her students, Jill saw Rebecca's authority as different from her own:

> Student after student appealed for leniency because their drafts were late. We had had a snowstorm and virtually everybody assumed school would be canceled. She didn't flinch—nor did she make a general announcement as I would have done. She met each student as an individual in crisis who needed her help. What drives me to a more stereotypically 'masculine,' hard-line with my students?

When Rebecca visited Jill's class, she also reflected upon the ways in which she might be undercutting her own authority:

> It just takes the initial risk—the courage to say you believe in the assignment. I always run the risk of explaining without being fully committed to the project and then revealing my mixed feelings through facial expressions or verbal statements such as "This will feel like grade-school until . . . . Then it's too late."

After she had been observed by Rebecca, Jill pushed her questioning further: "I feel as though I've become a hard-ass. I don't give extensions for snow. I don't let them dawdle and find their way into an assignment." In her reflections, Rebecca responded, "Am I too lenient? I've had my share of problems with student pushing on limits." Jill brought earlier reading and reflection to bear:

> I've studied some attractive feminist pedagogy that encourages us to break down our authority in order to facilitate the democratic classroom. But I am still half-a-foot shorter than most of my students . . . many of whom seek refuge in a mother or big-sister figure. Can I escape such roles? What might I replace them with? I have to ask whether breaking down my authority, as a young woman teacher, might not be a little redundant.

Returning for a moment to Polanyi, it is possible that Jill's and Rebecca's teaching will not be initially improved by their reflections on the ways in which they exercise authority in the classroom. Yet they have, in these reflections, affirmed the value of their practice even as they questioned it. Their practice is based upon knowledge, is substantial, and is worth considering, reflecting upon, studying. According to advocates for educational action research (e.g., Lytle and Cochran-Smith, Feldman and Atkin), one of the positive effects of action research projects is that "teachers are recognized as the experts that they are in the domains of their own experience" (Feldman and Atkin 131). While Jill and Rebecca may still be uncertain about the kind of authority they want to maintain in the classroom, they can claim mastery over the knowledge they have shared, an empowering knowledge that does not threaten but rather emphasizes the two teachers' concern for creating the best learning situation for all their students.

Summary and Conclusion

Based on our experience of the past semester, we as a group feel that peer-visiting of the sort we did was tremendously valuable to us as teachers. We learned from visiting each other's classes, and we learned from being visited—at a pace and depth that surprised us.

We understand, even better after this experience than before, that teaching practice cannot be simply or easily transferred from one person or institution to another. Teaching and learning are complex, over-determined systems. We do not mean to say that the inclusion of a peer-visiting component will work wonders in every in-service teacher-training program. We do think, however, that most first-year college writing programs would benefit from exploring the territory. For those that do want to explore this territory, we conclude with a few features of our peer-visiting program that we believe to be important and related to our local success.

1. First, the visits should be nonevaluative and entirely detached from the institution's teacher evaluation structures. Charlie Moran, our Course Director and a Professor of English, did not see any of the transcripts that the teachers working with him wrote for one another, nor did he attempt to find out through other means what might have happened in the visited classes.

2. Second, the visits must not be extra work, a new "good idea" inflicted upon already-overloaded teachers. As we have noted, the class visits we undertook were in lieu of other equivalent teacher-training activities that were normally required of all teachers in the program.

3. Third, the visitors need direction. They need to be encouraged to do a non-evaluative transcript and to include in this transcript anything that they see the teacher do that they admire or even envy. They need to be told to look for choices this teacher has made that they have made differently. It would be useful if

they had models for this kind of document—from the supervising teacher or from the program. The visitors in this particular case did not explicitly follow the directions they were given: they generally talked before the visit with the teachers they would visit, and the teachers asked them to focus on substituted particular questions and issues that they wanted feedback on.

4. Fourth, the visitors should be paired, so that the one visiting will soon be the one visited. This pairing promotes a collaborative relationship between the two peer teachers.

5. Fifth, and finally, it has proven useful for all participants to do some reflective writing on the experience of observing and of being observed. This writing has been shared with the full group, including the Course Director, and so it has been written for that small public.

An important stimulus for our reflective writing has been the composing of this article. This has given us a local and unique motive to reflect not only on our teaching, but upon our reflections and upon the in-service staff-development process that we have described. We do not believe, however, that this last step, the preparation of a journal article, is a necessary part of the staff-development process. It will be sufficient if the teachers' reflections are circulated within the peer-group, perhaps to serve as the incentive for further nonevaluative peer visits. We do need to say that the writing of this article has helped us understand what we have learned: to bring our tacit knowledge forward through reflection. Looking over the piece we have written, we see our reflections as both the sign and the means of our own learning. We trust that our experience will have value to others, as it has to us.

WORKS CITED

Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, and Susan L. Lytle. "Communities for Teacher Research: Fringe or Forefront?" *Teacher Learning: New Policies, New Practices*. Eds. Milbrey W. McLaughlin and Ida Oberman. New York: Teachers College P, 1996. 92-112.

Feldman, Allan, and J. Myron Atkin. "Embedding Action Research in Professional Practice." *Educational Action Research: Becoming Practically Critical*. Ed. Susan E. Noffke and Robert B. Stevenson. New York: Teachers College P, 1995. 127-137.

Henry, Marvin A. "Change in Teacher Education: Focus on Field Experiences." *Reforming Teacher Education: Issues and New Directions*. Ed. Joseph A. Braun, Jr. New York: Garland, 1989. 69-93.

Lytle, Susan L., and Marilyn Cochran-Smith. "Learning From Teacher Research: A Working Typology." *Teachers College Record* 92.1 (1990): 83-103.

Noffke, Susan E. "Action Research and Democratic Schooling." *Reforming Teacher Education: Issues and New Directions*. Ed. Joseph A. Braun, Jr. New York: Garland, 1989. 1-10.

Odell, Lee, ed. *Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1993.

Polanyi, Michael. *The Tacit Dimension*. Gloucester MA: Peter Smith, 1983.

Proefriedt, William A. *How Teachers Learn: Toward a More Liberal Teacher Education*. New York: Teachers College P, 1994.

Schön, Donald A. "Knowing-in-Action: The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology." *Change in Higher Education* (November/December 1995): 27-34.

——. *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Stones, E., & S. Morris. *Teaching Practice: Problems and Perspectives: A Reappraisal of the Practical Professional Element in Teacher Preparation*. London: Methuen, 1972.

Tatel, Edith S. "Improving Classroom Practice: Ways Experienced Teachers Change After Supervising Student Teachers." *Teacher Learning: New Policies, New Practices*. Ed. Milbrey W. McLaughlin and Ida Oberman. New York: Teachers College P, 1996. 48-52.

Tobin, Lad. *Writing Relationships: What Really Happens in the Composition Classroom*. Portsmouth NH: Boynton/Cook, 1993.

Willerman, Marvin, Sharon L. McNeely, and Elaine Cooper Koffman. *Teachers Helping Teachers: Peer Observation and Assistance*. New York: Praeger, 1991.

Wragg, E.C. *An Introduction to Classroom Observation*. London: Routledge, 1994.