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Strengthening the Common Core of the Introductory Psychology Course

Participants at the 2008 APA National Conference on Undergraduate Education held at the University of Puget Sound articulated several high-priority recommendations later published in *Undergraduate Education in Psychology: A Blueprint for the Future of the Discipline* (Halpern, 2010) and embodied in the *Principles for Quality Undergraduate Education in Psychology* (APA, 2011). Conference participants made two strong recommendations about the importance of the introductory psychology course (henceforth Intro Psych). The first was that the Intro Psych course should be a prerequisite for all other psychology courses. The second was that the Intro Psych course should mirror the core model for the psychology major.

To address these recommendations, APA’s Board of Educational Affairs (BEA) established a Working Group to Strengthen the Common Core of the Introductory Psychology Course. BEA charged the Working Group to:

1. Examine the common core of the Intro Psych course at the college level including the content, outcomes, possibility of a laboratory component, and implications for a major vs. a non-major directed course.

2. Recommend potential action steps to BEA on strengthening the common core.
Background

Psychology has been an active scientific area for over 100 years. The field has made significant technological and methodological innovations, with new areas evolving and pre-existing areas merging. Yet most Intro Psych textbooks are still comprised of the same 14-16 chapters (Griggs & Jackson, 2013). Correspondingly, the structure of the Intro Psych course has remained relatively consistent.

Although there have been major studies of the psychology curriculum over the years (e.g., Brewer et al., 1993; Perlman & McCann, 1999; Stoloff et al., 2010), none of the reports focused on the content or organization of Intro Psych. In one notable exception, Homa and colleagues (2013) examined the objectives and content of Intro Psych courses and found considerable variance nationally, with some focused more on psychology as a science and others focused on psychology as a means of self-understanding and improvement.

Psychology is a growing discipline that concerns the enormous complexity of human behavior in its cultural context, and psychological research contributes in important ways to solving a wide range of problems. For example, many of the most pressing contemporary social problems (and likely problems of the next century) reflect, to an appreciable extent, modifiable cognitions, emotions, and behaviors. These problems include prejudice and discrimination, exploitation and violence, depression and dysphoria, child neglect and parental divorce, and the rising medical costs associated with behavioral and cultural factors. More young people die or become disabled from unfortunate behavioral choices (e.g., drug use, gang violence, drinking and driving) than from all diseases combined (Gurung, 2014). In addition, many intriguing scientific
problems facing humankind – ranging from the neural basis of thought, emotion, and a
sense of the self; the cognitive operations underlying effective problem solving and
optimal decision making; the sociocultural factors that make education effective and
enjoyable; the best means of dealing with life’s stressors; and humankind’s place within
the tree of life – are questions that fall within the purview of psychology.

At the same time, psychological science has a demonstrated track record of
enhancing human functioning at both the micro and macro-levels (e.g., APA, 2005;
2010). The procedures for optimizing human potential are the subject matter of
psychology: successful parenting and aging, athletic and artistic flow, extraordinary
memory and reasoning, and maximizing the development of intelligence, environmental
conservation, are but a few topics that have been subjected to scrutiny in psychological
laboratories.

However, the contemporary Intro Psych course structure tends to not accurately
reflect the discipline as it stands today. Specifically, most textbooks still treat different
areas of psychology (e.g. social, personality) as if they are distinct and studied in
isolation of other areas. In fact, psychological research today rarely utilizes material
covered in just one chapter of an Intro Psych textbook (Cacioppo, in press). This silo-like
representation is also seen when psychology is divided into ‘domains’, referred to in such
documents such as the *National Standards for High School Psychology Curricula* (APA,
2011) and *Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major* (APA, 2007). Domain
may not be the best way to demarcate the contemporary nature of our field.
In this report, we summarize previous efforts to create a common core for the Intro Psych course and address the question of whether such a core is desirable. We first review historical attempts to create a common core and research on what is taught in Intro Psych. Then, based on a yearlong review of extant information on the Intro Psych course from a variety of sources (e.g., Homa et al., 2013, publisher surveys, expert teachers), we advance five recommendations regarding Intro Psych. These recommendations are intended to help teachers of Intro Psych design a high-quality foundation to the discipline of psychology as it exists today.

**Historical Attempts to Create a Common Core**

There have been many calls for national guidelines and/or a common core relating to different aspects of Intro Psych. More than 70 years ago, Wolfle (1942, p. 687) suggested Intro Psych should have five goals: (a) teach facts and principles of psychology, (b) develop scientific method or habits of critical thoughts, (c) provide better ability in making personal adjustments, (d) prepare students for later courses, or interest them in psychology, and (e) teach what psychology is and is not, or eliminate popular superstitions. More recently, Smith and Fineburg (2006) drew attention to the lack of consistency in Intro Psych and suggested using the *Standards* and the *Guidelines* to help shape Intro Psych.

The *National Standards for High School Psychology Curricula* (henceforth *Standards*; APA, 2011) first published by APA in 1999 and revised in 2005 and 2011, define psychology content for the high school classroom. The *Standards* are structured as seven overarching content domains (i.e., scientific inquiry, biopsychological, development and learning, sociocultural context, cognition, individual differences, and
applications of psychological science), with each domain including standard areas that
cover the breadth of Intro Psych. Each domain’s standard areas include relevant unit
topics such that by teaching at least one unit from each domain, students in high school
psychology courses receive a representative picture of contemporary psychology. The
Standards could consequently also be used to organize, plan, and direct college-level
Intro Psych (Smith & Fineburg, 2006).

The Guidelines for the Psychology Undergraduate Major (henceforth Guidelines;
APA, 2007) capture “a set of optimal expectations for performance at the completion of
the baccalaureate degree by students who major in psychology. The document outlines 10
goals and suggested learning outcomes that represent reasonable departmental
expectations for the undergraduate psychology major across educational contexts” (APA,
2007, p. v). The most recent revision of the Guidelines -- APA Guidelines for the
Undergraduate Psychology Major 2.0 (hereafter Guidelines 2.0) -- incorporates changes
that reflect emerging best practices and integrate psychology’s work with benchmarking
scholarship in higher education. Guidelines 2.0 abandoned the original distinction
between psychology-focused skills and psychology skills that enhance liberal arts
development. Instead, the new guidelines describe five inclusive goals for the
undergraduate major that represent more robust learning and assessment activities (APA,
2013). Similar to the Standards, the Guidelines 2.0 also help to shape a common core for
Intro Psych.

Conceivably, Intro Psych could mirror the core model for the psychology major
but there is little consistency in requirements for the major (Stoloff et al., 2010). The
undergraduate psychology major differs markedly from one institution to another, in
areas such as semester hours needed, the implementation of capstone courses, or even required and elective class topics. Dunn and colleagues (2010) suggested a curricular model for the psychology major and recommended that Intro Psych mirror the same model. But their recommendation from the 2008 APA National Conference on Undergraduate Education remains just that – a recommendation without implementation or other action.

**Should Intro Psych have a Common Core?**

Intro Psych enrolls between 1.2 million and 1.6 million students annually (Steuer & Ham, 2008); it is the second most popular college course in the nation, second only to English Composition (Adelman, 2004). Intro Psych is required for the psychology major in 98% of U.S. colleges (Stoloff et al., 2010) and is taken by 60% of high school students (Adelman, 2004). Intro Psych serves not only as a prerequisite for other courses in the discipline, but for most college students as their only formal exposure to psychological science.

“Given the ubiquitous relevance of psychology to other majors and fields, most jobs, and the world in general, as well as the many contributions an understanding of psychology can have to personal growth and development, all students need to receive a common core of content” (Dunn et al., 2010, p. 59). The recent expansion of methods to deliver Intro Psych in new ways, such as UPACE, hybrid/blended, online, and Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), allows the breadth and depth of Intro Psych content to evolve rapidly and to fit easily the new formats.

A core provides a singular message to students and the public about what constitutes the field of psychology. A common core for all institutions offering the course
will ensure greater consistency in what majors and students taking the course as a general education requirement receive. “Internal and external pressures on the discipline … suggest a need for a common, coherent core curriculum for the undergraduate psychology major” (Dunn et al., 2010, p. 53). Having a common core for Intro Psych will map nicely onto calls for a common curriculum (for the major), the use of quality benchmarks (Dunn, McCarthy, Baker, Halonen, & Hill, 2007), and the APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major 2.0 (APA, 2013). Having a common core in Intro Psych should also help students prepare for the forthcoming behavioral components in entrance exams for medical school (i.e., MCAT 2015).

There is also an additional compelling reason to have a common core. Currently, psychology lacks a universal assessment of knowledge. Assessment, whether across instructors or across time, at the department level or across institutions, necessitates a similar, if not standardized, experience. It will benefit the field to have a universal assessment. At the Intro level, it would be beneficial for psychology to have a standard set of assessment questions, perhaps tied to the National Standards, which can be used to assess student knowledge. Having a standard assessment would allow departments to compare their students directly to other programs. It would also be extremely useful as a research tool for studying effective pedagogies. Departments or faculty could pick and choose specific modules they want to assess, but there is no easy way to compare student accomplishments if there is no consistency of content.

A common core could also be used across institutions. Fields such as physics have common content assessments such as the Force Concept Inventory (Hestenes, Wells, & Swackhamer, 1992). The discipline of psychology has no such measure, and we
lack thorough knowledge of the extent to which Intro Psych students are achieving learning outcomes.

**What is being Taught in the Intro Psych Course?**

Before one can strengthen a common core, one needs a common core. Before proposing a viable model for such a core, the Task Force searched for evidence of what is currently being covered in Intro Psych.

There is a surprising dearth of information on this point. The majority of research focuses on content analyses of Intro Psych textbooks. Textbooks have little similarity in content, and vary in length, and comprehensiveness (Griggs, Bujak-Johnson, & Proctor, 2004; Landrum, Gurung, & Spann, 2012). Miller and Gentile (1998) found little consensus among instructor ratings regarding important topics and those topics covered in the class. The Task Force found only one published article on whether Intro Psych courses share learning objectives or a common core.

Homa et al. (2013) examined student learning objectives and course content in 158 Intro Psych syllabi. Student learning objectives were mapped to the 2007 version of the *Guidelines*. Over 50% of the syllabi contained objectives specific to the science and application of psychology (knowledge base, research methods, application). Analysis of content coverage revealed that instructors spent significantly more time on topics related to physiological and cognitive psychology and spent significantly less time on topics related to the history and scope of psychology, research methods, and developmental psychology. Importantly, this was across instructors in all specialty areas. Instructors spent a disproportionate amount of time on certain content areas. Additionally,
instructors whose expertise was in social and clinical/counseling psychology spent more
lecture time on their own areas than most other content areas.

Based on the review of the material described above and in line with the BEA
charge, the Task Force advances the following five recommendations:

1. Establish a Common Core for Intro Psych
2. Offer a National Assessment Plan for Intro Psych
3. Provide Similar Content for Intro Psych for Psychology Majors and Non-majors
4. Provide a Research/Lab-like Experience in the Intro Psych Course
5. Foster Special Training Opportunities for Intro Psych Instructors

**Task Force Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1. Establish a Common Core for the Intro Psych Course**

The Task Force examined existing domain models for psychology (e.g.,
Standards, Guidelines) and created a new set of domains that build on extant models to
better reflect the contemporary state of the field.

Both the *National Standards for High School Psychology Curricula* and the
*Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major* demarcate the field into sections
from which an instructor should cover topics. The domains approaches (APA, 2007;
2011) do include all the traditional areas in psychology (or chapters in an Intro Psych
book), but there is no explicit call for integration when using domain models even if an
Intro Psych course includes at least one topic from each domain.
Cacioppo (2007) presents one alternative, a novel representation of modern psychology. In his view, many of the most exciting advances in psychology today are emerging at the intersections – across traditional training areas within psychology and across disciplines. Comprehensive understandings of the mind and behavior are requiring a combination of perspectives. For instance, it is widely recognized that the level of testosterone in male rhesus monkeys predicts their sexual advances toward females in the colony. However, research has also shown that the level of testosterone in these male monkeys is influenced by the availability of receptive females (Bernstein, Gordon, & Rose, 1983). That is, the hormonal influence on behavior and the social environment in which that behavior is being expressed are mutually influencing the other. One cannot develop a comprehensive understanding of their behavior by focusing on only a biological or a social perspective (Cacioppo, in press). The implication is that the centrifugal forces that not long ago threatened to splinter the discipline appear to be receding in favor of new centripetal forces fueled by the search for more comprehensive and predictive theories.

No longer simply a collection of independent domains based on historical or administrative distinctions, psychology in the 21st century appears to becoming an integrative multilevel science. Specifically, there has been a trend in the direction of partitioning the science of mind and behavior into different levels of organization, with each contributing to our understanding of human behavior. The biological perspective in psychology concerns the material substrates for the mind and behavior; the cognitive perspective emphasizes the information processing representations and operations; and
the social perspective stresses the role of the presence of conspecifics, imagined or real, and of the sociocultural context.

Additionally, there are cross-cutting perspectives that offer valuable insights into the mind and behavior. The study of the nature and influence of changes over time (e.g., growth, decay) in neural substrates, information processing operations, and social influences represents a developmental perspective in psychology; the investigation of the causes and consequences of failures in neural substrates, cognitive operations, and social organizations and what such failures mean for understanding the healthy system represents a biopsychosocial health perspective; and attention to the variation around the central tendency to gain leverage in formulating and testing psychological theory represents a sociocultural and individual variations perspective. These cross-cutting vectors are illustrative rather than exhaustive, of course, as there are other cross-cutting perspectives, as well. Among these are Applications, Research Methods, and Social Responsibility (Cacioppo, 2007).

The point is to underscore that each domain has substantive implications for the others in the pursuit of comprehensive psychological explanations and applications. The in-depth study of any one of these domains is essential, but a comprehensive understanding of the mind and behavior is more likely to be achieved by an integration of what we know and can learn across multiple levels/perspectives than by focusing on individual domains.

Psychology is no longer a gathering of individual, isolated areas, as a cursory look at many Intro Psych textbooks suggests to students. The Intro Psych course should reflect the reality of an integrative multilevel science. Furthermore, Intro Psych can serve
as a stand-alone structure or as the foundation for the psychology major. We build on this metaphor and represent recommendations for teaching the course using an architectural analogy.

The content of Intro Psych can be conceptualized using the schematic of a classic Greek structure. Consistent with national recommendations for the major and with reviews of the contemporary nature of the field, the BEA Working Group recommends that instructors of Intro Psych cover:

1. **The scientific method**, the true foundational basic building block and core of our discipline. Consistent with Goal 2 of the *Guidelines 2.0*, students in Intro Psych should learn skills involving the development of scientific reasoning and problem solving, including effective research methods. Students should learn basic skills and concepts in interpreting behavior, studying research, and applying research design principles to drawing conclusions about behavior.
2. **At least two topics** from each of the main pillars of the field.

- **Pillar 1: Biological** (e.g., Neuroscience, Sensation, Consciousness, Motivation)
- **Pillar 2: Cognitive** (e.g., Cognition, Memory, Learning, Perception)
- **Pillar 3: Sociocultural and Individual Variations** (e.g., Social, Personality, Intelligence, Emotion, Multicultural, Gender)
- **Pillar 4: Biopsychosocial Health** (e.g., Abnormal, Health, Clinical)

3. **Each of the following** should be covered for each topic. Just as concrete is composed of different elements, each pillar is composed of different elements that are now common themes across the field.

- **Ethics**: What are the major ethical considerations of conducting research or applying the topic or phenomenon?
- **Diversity**: What are variations across individual and roles, including those based on age, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, race, ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion, disability status, language, and socioeconomic status?
- **Development**: What is the developmental nature of the phenomenon under study, whether it be a neuron, human, or behavior?
• Variations in Human Functioning: What are the positive and negative extremes of the phenomenon under study? Highlight failures/successful examples.

• Applications: How does the content of the course apply to everyday life?

4. The structure is capped by an Integration Module that ties together the different areas into a coherent whole and represents the integrative nature of contemporary psychology. In contrast to focusing on just cognition or biology or just social situations, modern psychology integrates different approaches. Similar to the call for capstone courses for the major (Dunn et al., 2009), the Task Force recommends that students in Intro Psych receive explicit examples of how the different pillars of psychological science are integrated. For example, conflict in close relationships can be better understood by personality characteristics, social or situational factors, developmental histories of each partner, and underpinning biological factors.

In offering these recommendations for a common core in Intro Psych, the BEA Working Group has tried to strike a nuanced balance providing flexibility yet guidance. We aimed to avoid either a prescriptive, overly standardized approach on the one hand, or the extant idiosyncratic approach on the other. We cherish academic freedom and recognize the diversity of faculty members, teaching situations, and student audiences. At the same time, a mature science should be able to agree upon and communicate its unifying core while embracing diversity.
Recommendation 2. Offer a National Assessment Plan for Intro Psych

Although our recommended model does not specify explicit content topics, the components of the pillars need to be assessed. As stated previously, there is limited research on what exactly takes place in the Intro Psych class. Most information on the Intro Psych course comes from publishers’ market research (e.g., pubtracker) and textbook extrapolations. In order to establish how our students perform or where reform is needed, we first need basic information on how the course is taught, how students perform on learning outcomes, and how reliable and valid the assessments are.

The Guidelines 2.0 and the Assessment Cyberguide for Learning Goals and Outcomes in the Undergraduate Psychology Major (APA, 2009) provide learning outcomes. The Guidelines 2.0 also identify potential assessment instruments for each of the outcomes. Regardless of whether instructors use the learning outcomes in the Guidelines 2.0 or their own, the Working Group believes that a nationally coordinated focus on the assessment of Intro Psych learning outcomes in general is sorely needed. That can be better accomplished once a common core becomes accepted and established across the discipline.

Recommendation 3. Provide Similar Content for Intro Psych for Psychology Majors and Non-majors

The Intro Psych course should contain the same content and experiences for all students at a given institution regardless of why students are taking the course (Halpern, 2010). Although some psychology departments may be tempted to create an Intro Psych
course specifically for psychology majors, there is no evidence in the literature that suggests that this is differentially effective.

Departments that want a more robust Intro Psych course for their majors may instead modify other requirements and sequencing. For example, although most psychology departments require their majors to take Research Methods early in their undergraduate experience (Stoloff et. al., 2010), departments that want to provide more early experiences might be better served by creating another course such as one that addresses career preparation (Atchley, Hooker, Kroska, & Gilmour, 2012; Brinthaupt, 2010; Thomas & McDaniel, 2004), preparation for the major (Atchley et.al, 2012; Dillinger & Landrum, 2002), or writing in the major (Goddard, 2003).

**Recommendation 4. Provide a Research/Lab-like Experience in Intro Psych**

Introductory courses in most sciences are joined with required laboratories to foster a deeper, integrated understanding of the science. It is not sufficient to learn the laws and equations of chemistry or physics. To understand fully these sciences, students need hands-on experience with classic and contemporary methods. In fact, offering Intro Psych with a lab component has been shown to be effective at increasing scientific literacy (Thieman, Clary, Olson, Dauner, & Ring, 2009). However, most institutions do not offer a lab component for the Intro Psych course. In a sample of 364 institutions, only 6% offered a lab component (Stoloff et. al., 2010). Instructors of introductory psychology courses have not required laboratory experiences in part because of limited resources and in part because the methods and content were thought to be self-evident.
Laboratory experiences in introductory psychology may be particularly important because students arrive with so many misconceptions about the discipline. For instance, many students begin Intro Psych believing that psychology is mostly about psychotherapy and relationships, when in fact it is also about the brain, information processing, genetics, behavioral plasticity, and social determinants and moderators. Students also tend to arrive believing they already know the causes of behavior. For example, it is commonly said that birds of a feather flock together, but of course it is also commonly said that opposites attract. Everyone knows that two heads are better than one but also that too many cooks spoil the broth. Students are often surprised to learn that they hold many logically inconsistent beliefs about the causes of behavior.

The BEA Working Group is well aware that many smaller colleges or departments will not be able to fund separate lab courses or complex research assignments; nonetheless, there are a number of creative ways to integrate more scientific research throughout the course. One option is to use virtual experiments as class assignments. For example, APA maintains the Online Psychology Laboratory (OPL). Simple assignments using OPL can give Intro Psych students a hands-on taste of doing research.

A second option is to provide lab-related activities through existing departmental resources. For example, students at the University of Chicago are introduced to the discipline through a Foundations in Psychology course in which faculty work with each student to design a simple study for which they do a literature search, collect data, conduct rudimentary statistical analyses, and prepare a poster for a science fair similar to those seen at our national meetings. Other innovative models for integrating lab-like,
hands-on experiences for Intro Psych students can be developed with existing faculty, graduate students, and even advanced undergraduates under supervision.

**Recommendation 5. Foster Special Training Opportunities for Intro Psych Instructors**

Psychological science has changed dramatically over the past few decades, and Intro Psych should reflect the evolving science of psychology. Faculty members who teach Intro Psych may need to adjust both the content of the course and their methods of teaching it. In particular, it is important for faculty to understand and implement new technologies (from clickers to mTurk) in their courses. The teachers of Intro Psych have a variety of existing resources for their continuing education (e.g., Society of Teaching Psychology conferences, APA programming, *Teaching of Psychology, Current Directions*), but we believe the larger challenge involves convincing faculty members of the importance of changing their textbooks or teaching styles instead of relying on what has worked reasonably well in the past.

Below is an initial list of resources for supporting the ongoing learning of faculty members and TAs to teach a contemporary Intro Psych course.

1. *Seek out training in interdisciplinary science (or attendance at conferences that focus on integrative science)*. Interdisciplinary science was the focus of the 2011 APA Education Leadership Conference, and related training is likely to become more available in the future. Some interdisciplinary meetings are quite narrow (intersection of fields) and others are quite broad. Attendance at the latter types of conferences is more likely to foster integration.
2. Complete an Intro Psych-focused teaching practicum or teaching assistantship 
during graduate training. Consider developing a “Teaching of Psychology”
course for TAs that is linked to Intro Psych so that the TAs’ time with the students
serves as a practicum for their teaching.

3. Attend conference sessions throughout one’s career relevant to the teaching and
learning of psychology. At present, a variety of excellent training opportunities
are available at the APA and APS national conferences and multiple regional
teaching conferences. The Society for the Teaching of Psychology held two Best
Practice conferences on Intro Psych. Stanford University is now offering a
summer conference that focuses exclusively on Intro Psych. Within these
conferences, workshop and exchange opportunities that allow for the sharing of
creative ideas about teaching Intro Psych would also be useful. Perhaps a larger
challenge is to convince more professors and TAs to attend these types of
teaching conferences.

4. Maintain current knowledge of psychology through journal articles focusing on
the theory and scholarship of the practice of teaching. Some journals already
include regular features about teaching Intro Psych (e.g., APS Observer, Teaching
of Psychology, as well as more specialized journals such as the Psychology of
Women). In addition, a variety of review journals offer integrated updates of the
field and can serve as excellent continuing education opportunities. Some of
these journals include Annual Reviews of Psychology, Current Directions, and
Psychological Bulletin. Once the findings of this BEA Working Group are
disseminated, a series of relevant journal articles seems appropriate.
5. **Make use of the many on-line psychology teaching resources.** Information sharing has become increasingly efficient through the various websites and internet-based options available to psychologists. For example, the APA Division 2 Project Syllabus could be used to model creative ways of organizing Intro Psych. The expansion of a catalogue of useful internet-based resources is likely to be of value to Intro instructors ([http://intropsychresources.com/](http://intropsychresources.com/)).

6. **Create and use mentoring networks within national organizations and local communities of learning.** Mentoring relationships can be useful for enhancing creativity. The APA's Membership Board has created a group to put together a set of recommendations for creating mentoring programs with APA divisions as the target audience. Mentoring can also occur more locally, within colleges and universities, for example.

7. **Attend the many teaching-related workshops and conversations within one’s local teaching community.** Faculty from different fields and disciplines share common challenges in teaching introductory courses, and interdisciplinary workshops that focus on good pedagogy for the teaching of the social/natural sciences can be quite valuable. Cornell College, for instance, is part of a multi-institutional consortium that provides regular workshops on pedagogy, and “conversations about teaching” are held routinely on the local campus. The University of Chicago, for another instance, has a Center for Teaching and Learning ([http://teaching.uchicago.edu](http://teaching.uchicago.edu)) that provides a wide array of classes, workshops, resources, certification programs, and seminars to promote excellence in teaching. Most institutions of higher education have programs to develop and support
excellence in teaching. However, many graduate students and faculty are unaware of these programs, and many of those familiar with the programs do not attend them.

8. Read books on the scholarship of teaching and learning. A variety of publishers (including APA Press) publish excellent sources on teaching. In the future, a book that provides examples based on the model that emerges from this BEA Working Group may prove of value.
References


