

**Yale
New Haven
Teachers
Institute**

**Annual
Report
1978**

Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute
238 Hall of Graduate Studies
320 York Street
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Telephone (203) 436-3316
James R. Vivian, Director
Mary Long, Administrative Assistant

The 1978 Teachers Institute was supported by grants from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Connecticut Humanities Council, the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, the New Haven Foundation, the New Haven Public Schools, Yale University, and by matching funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Yale New Haven Teachers Institute

Annual Report 1978

Of all the ways in which the City and the University do collaborate -- on health care, on economic development, on sports activities, on cultural programs -- it is most important that we collaborate on education. The Mayor and I had the pleasure of announcing together the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, whereby colleagues from the school system and the University collaborate in seminars on teaching methods and on designing curricula for use in the middle and high schools.

Education for excellence, for intelligent and humane citizenship, is the heart of a free society and nothing in education is more important than the incentive to take education seriously and responsibly and the capacity, through an education, fully to develop one's potential as a human being. To the extent that Yale can foster this attitude and this capacity in New Haven, Yale must and will. Yale's great contribution over the last three centuries to America has been, as a national resource and a national institution, to foster that attitude and that capacity for the country. Yale believes in that mission and nothing will shake it. And that mission begins at home. Yale lives in and with New Haven. The City is not going to move and neither is the University. We together are the permanent parts of this place. And our young people, New Haven's and Yale's, are the future. Our future. The future that, through the young people, we seek and share together.

A. Bartlett Giamatti

January 6, 1979

UNIVERSITY ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
THE TEACHERS INSTITUTE

Sydney E. Ahlstrom
Professor of American History and Modern Religious
History

Walter B. Cahn
Professor of History of Art, Chairman of History of
Art Department

Michael G. Cooke
Professor of English, Master of Trumbull College

Charles T. Davis
Professor of Afro-American Studies and English, Master
of Calhoun College, Chairman of Afro-American Studies

Charles Feidelson
Bodman Professor of English Literature, Chairman of
American Studies Program and Modern Studies Program

Howard R. Lamar
Dean Designate of Yale College, William Robertson Coe
Professor of American History

J. Hillis Miller
Frederick W. Hilles Professor of English, Chairman
of English Department

Jules D. Prown
Professor of History of Art

Alan Shestack
Director of Art Gallery, Professor (Adjunct) of
History of Art

Keith S. Thomson
Director of Peabody Museum, Professor of Biology,
Curator of Fishes of Peabody Museum, Director of
the Sears Foundation for Marine Research and
Oceanographic History

Henry A. Turner
Professor of History, Chairman of History Department

YALE-NEW HAVEN TEACHERS INSTITUTE
1978 ANNUAL REPORT

BACKGROUND

Beginning in 1970 members of Yale's History Department engaged in a program to improve the social studies curricula of New Haven's public secondary schools. With grants from the American Historical Association, the Department created the Yale-New Haven History Education Project (HEP) through which teachers developed curricula in American history, world area studies and urban studies. By 1973, when the AHA stopped funding History Education Projects, Yale, the New Haven Public Schools and others had recognized the accomplishment and potential of the local HEP. From 1973 through 1976 the University continued the project with the aid of local foundations, private benefactors and the State of Connecticut.

In 1976 and 1977 the project was supported in large part by equal grants from Yale and the New Haven Public Schools. When the Public Schools began to fund HEP in spite of budgetary restraints, school officials demonstrated a notable commitment to the program's objectives. Yale's perennial support of HEP indicated the commitment of administrators and faculty members to share the University's resources with the Schools and to improve the quality of public education in New Haven. In 1977 the Secretary of the University, Henry Chauncey, Jr., referred to HEP as "the most solid, the most vital" Yale program benefitting New Haven students.

In January 1977 the administrations of Yale and the New Haven Public Schools met to consider how the University might more fully serve the needs of New Haven schools. They agreed that the History Education Project would provide an excellent model for expanding the relationship between the University and the Schools and began to discuss how HEP might be enlarged to include other disciplines and more teachers. At the same

time, the University learned from the National Endowment for the Humanities that a program modeled on HEP would be consistent with NEH guidelines for Extended Teacher Institutes and began preparing an application to NEH for funds to create a Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, in which secondary school teachers from New Haven would develop new curricula for English, history and art history.

Teachers and the Public Schools administration had a leading role in designing a program they hoped would provide major assistance to the Schools' curriculum planning and significantly influence teaching and learning in the humanities. In the spirit of "mutual regard and collaboration" which Yale President A. Bartlett Giamatti later encouraged in his Inaugural address, Yale and the Public Schools made substantial commitments to the Institute at a time of fiscal stringency for each; over three years, Yale and the Schools agreed to provide about half of the Institute's total cost. The NEH proposal was submitted in November 1977, and the Institute was organized with financial support from the Edward W. Hazen Foundation and Yale. Ten New Haven teachers worked with the Institute director to plan a program which would begin in April 1978, after notification of NEH funding.

In March, however, Yale learned that it would have to resubmit the NEH proposal and that an NEH grant would not become available before the fall. By this time, seventy-five, or over half of all secondary teachers of English, history and art, had applied to become Institute Fellows. Their enthusiasm provided evidence that teachers regard the program as a viable plan for addressing the educational needs of their students. To assure that the momentum which had been building during the organization of the Institute would continue, the University made an intensive search for emergency funding to proceed with its plans for a 1978 program.

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY

In talking about the Institute and developing the NEH proposal, teachers and administrators from the University and the Schools had quickly reached a consensus. All agreed that the relationship between the University and the Schools must be both prominent and permanent within any viable larger relationship between Yale and New Haven, and that, of the many ways Yale might aid New Haven, none is more logical or defensible than a program which shares Yale's educational resources with the Schools. Because of changing student needs, changing educational objectives set by the school system and each level of government, and changing scholarship, school curricula undergo constant revision. All agreed that curriculum development is the area in which Yale can most readily assist the Schools. For this reason, Yale and the Schools had continued HEP long after AHA funding was exhausted.

But if HEP provided the precedent for the Institute's design and confidence about its promise, in many aspects the Institute differs. HEP had the limited goal of assisting a small number of teachers in one discipline to prepare new materials to be taught in their own courses. The Institute works with a high percentage of teachers in three disciplines to prepare interdisciplinary materials which will become a major portion of the total school curriculum. Where HEP treated only the social studies, principally history, the Institute combines history, art history and English. Annually HEP served fewer than twenty social studies teachers; of the 140 social studies, art and English teachers in the Public Schools, the Institute will involve sixty in the first year of NEH funding and eighty in both the second and third years. To develop an ongoing relationship with individual teachers, the Institute will accept many at least twice. By enrolling the majority of teachers on a recurring basis the Institute will attain a central role in their curriculum development.

The Institute places confidence in teachers to identify how Yale and the school system can best assist them to meet their students' needs. Through the Institute, Yale faculty and school teachers join in a collegial relationship. The Institute also is, in effect, the only interschool and interdisciplinary forum for teachers to work together on new curricula, sharing materials, ideas and approaches to achieve better coordination of curricula for grades seven through twelve. While the Institute is concerned with development of the formal curricula, the general performance objectives for each subject area and level, it is more especially concerned with the preparation of each teacher and with the development in depth of materials and approaches to help insure that students meet such objectives.

Through the Institute teachers adapt current scholarship in English, history and art history to appropriate levels for students in New Haven's public middle and high schools. The benefits of the Institute to New Haven students, sixty per cent of whom come from families receiving public assistance, must be no less direct than those to participating teachers. Because the disciplines represented in the Institute relate to courses required by the Schools, all secondary school students in New Haven stand to benefit from Institute curricula. That Yale faculty and school teachers gain personally from involvement in the Institute is of secondary importance. The fundamental concern of the Institute is to improve the education of New Haven students, particularly those who are least successful in school. That is why teachers must propose to develop materials they will use in their courses.

In applying to the Institute, teachers state their priorities for curriculum development, the topics on which they want to work, and the relationship of their topics to courses they will teach in the coming school year; they thus have primary responsibility for identifying the subjects the Institute treats.

Each teacher accepted to the program becomes an Institute Fellow and, in collaboration with other Fellows and members of the Yale faculty, prepares a curriculum unit. Fellows are members of the Yale community with full access to the Yale libraries and other campus facilities and resources. Twelve teachers coordinate Institute activities for all New Haven middle and high schools and meet weekly with the Director to address issues important to planning and running the Institute. Other teachers make known their views through the Coordinators.

With a keen awareness of problems attending efforts at meaningful curricular change, the Institute departs from conventional modes of curricular development.* Classroom teachers, who best know their students' needs, work with Yale faculty members, whose main expertise lies in current scholarship. The Institute does not develop curricula on certain topics only because they are important in terms of recent scholarship; rather, it brings such scholarship to the assistance of teachers in areas they identify as priority concerns. In short, the Institute involves no "curriculum experts," in the usual sense, who would themselves develop new materials, train teachers in short-term workshops to use these materials, and then expect the materials significantly to change classroom teaching. Instead, the Institute seeks to demonstrate that collaboration between an urban university and its neighboring school system--between school teachers and university scholars--can produce curriculum materials of high quality pertinent to student needs, and can have a major impact on school curricula.

After discussions with staff members of NEH, the Organization of American Historians History Education Center, the U.S. Office of Education and others, Yale and the Schools recognize that

* See especially Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, chapter 4, which discusses the manner in which the "new" math was developed and introduced in the classroom.

there is no similar program in any other American city. In concept, format, schedule and participants, the Institute differs from conventional curriculum development projects. Though the Institute's special concern is to provide a model of university-schools collaboration, and though the Institute values most the idea of a teacher's using a curriculum which he or she personally develops, units prepared under the direction of Yale faculty will certainly be of interest to teachers elsewhere. Institute units will be publicized through such agencies as the ERIC Clearinghouse and disseminated in multilith form to the extent the budget allows. The Institute will also seek a publisher for a selection of units potentially useful to teachers elsewhere. Most important, the program will be promoted as an example of how major cultural institutions can assume a larger responsibility for improving public secondary education. This model may be particularly attractive to other colleges and universities which, while seeking a fuller use of their campuses in the summer, wish to make their resources available in their own communities to address important problems in the American society.

THE 1978 INSTITUTE PROGRAM

Though there was only a month between hearing from NEH that reapplication would be necessary and notifying applicants concerning their selection, several funding agencies expressed immediate interest in assisting Yale and the Schools to proceed with a 1978 program, while awaiting a decision on the NEH application. Through grants of \$25,000 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, \$10,000 from the New Haven Foundation, and \$10,350 from the Connecticut Humanities Council, with matching support of \$12,500 from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and with the remaining costs borne by Yale and the Schools, the Institute accepted forty of the seventy-five applicants as Fellows. These teachers came from eleven New Haven public, middle and high schools. Of the forty, thirty-eight wrote curriculum units to be taught in the 1978-79 school year; two for medical reasons did not complete the program.

In applying to the Institute, teachers had stated their priorities for curriculum development. When the forty Fellows were accepted, four seminars were organized, corresponding to the principle themes of the Fellows' proposals: language and writing, 20th Century Afro-American culture, other American history and literature of the 20th Century, and colonial American history and material culture. Each seminar was led by an Institute faculty member from Yale. Between April and August Fellows participated in seminars, read books and articles related to their topics, and attended a series of fourteen lectures and workshops given by Yale faculty. The units Fellows wrote were printed in four volumes for distribution to all New Haven secondary teachers who might use the units in their classrooms. Through a New Haven Public Schools in-service program on October 18, the Institute began to acquaint teachers who were not Institute Fellows with the units Fellows had prepared.

In late July, toward the end of the program, the Institute asked Professor Howard Quint of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst to observe Institute activities for two days and prepare a critical report. Evaluating the program, he wrote,

The privilege of creating one's own curriculum together with the hope that it may be used not only by the Fellow directly concerned but also by other teachers is probably the most rewarding aspect of the Teachers Institute program. New Haven teachers deeply resent having to teach from packaged curricula devised by outsiders, whether they be curriculum experts or faculty from schools of education. These outsiders, they maintain, do not and cannot know about the make-up of individual classes. Only the classroom teacher possesses this knowledge and can tailor his or her instruction to the particular needs and interests of the class. In producing their own curriculum units the Fellows not only had the advice and criticism of Yale faculty members but also that of their peers who participated in the seminars. More than one Fellow remarked how much they appreciated the give and take with their fellow seminarians who, as often as not, faced exactly the same kinds of classroom problems that they themselves confronted. In short, they could talk shop, something that rarely occurs, they said, during the course of the regular school year when each teacher seeks merely to survive and tends to be isolated from his colleagues because of the school's demand on his time. Teachers in the same disciplines but in different though comparable schools rarely were acquainted with each other. From all of this the conclusion is inescapable that most teachers with imagination and a desire to bring about change and improvements in the school system spend lives of quiet intellectual desperation, loneliness, and frustration. The Teachers Institute has remedied this situation to a considerable degree since it has served to break down the sense of isolation experienced

by most of the Fellows. Moreover, it has brought them into contact with several members of the Yale faculty who have presented them with new ideas as well as technical and scholarly assistance.

Fellows and faculty evaluated the Institute in writing; their evaluations provide an overview of each activity and an assessment of the value of the Institute to participants. Early in the program, the faculty distributed bibliographies to assist their seminar members in selecting readings for research. Most of the Fellows found the bibliographies "excellent" or "very helpful." One Fellow wrote, "The bibliography was extremely helpful, and a great deal of my reading was selected from it. My overall reaction to the readings was very positive, if slightly overwhelmed." Another wrote, "The bibliographies by the faculty have been very useful and adequately cover much of the topics discussed. They are especially useful in giving information about newly published material."

The series of talks by Yale faculty was intended to be of general interest to all Fellows, to emphasize interdisciplinary relationships in scholarship and teaching, to dispell common misconceptions about frequently taught subjects and to interest Fellows in new areas of study. The topics of the talks corresponded to the themes of the Fellows' projects; they were chosen so that each Fellow would find in one or more talks information pertinent to the unit he or she was preparing.

In evaluating the talks, Fellows stated that they were valuable for both personal growth and academic background. Most Fellows enjoyed the talks, and many felt they learned as much from talks out of their fields as from those more closely related to their major subjects. Many saw the talks as relating to courses they teach, irrespective of their unit topics. One wrote, "The lectures were delightful. They broadened my aware-

ness in familiar areas as well as in areas I had not yet ventured. Most of the speakers were well aware of their audiences and their needs." Another wrote, "One lecture proved that a title should not discourage Fellows. The lecture was free-flowing, informative, and easily identifiable with a classroom discussion. Several lectures were especially memorable because they not only related to my topic, they made me a student anxious to pursue new areas of information. They also opened new possibilities for future projects." A third Fellow wrote, "The talks given by Yale faculty were excellent. Over half of the talks were directly related to my unit. Even those not directly related were highly interesting, stimulating and generally informative." Another wrote, "The lecture period, for me, served to stimulate thinking and help me redefine standards of academic excellence."

The reading period was intended to afford each Fellow time to read at least 1000 pages of current scholarship to research his or her unit topic. About half of the Fellows felt pressed for time to complete their research, some because they decided far to exceed the required minimum, others because they deferred too much of their reading until the end of the school year. One Fellow wrote, "As a first-time participant in the Institute, I did not judge my reading time very well. I will be very much aware of the reading time for next year's Institute." Another wrote, "I feel I never really had enough time to do all the reading I wanted, but I certainly read more than I had planned. Moreover, and I suppose this is a good reaction, I never felt completely finished with my topic. I feel I only scratched the surface."

Of all program activities, the writing workshops prompted the greatest diversity of opinion and some of the strongest statements. They were intended to explore the teaching of writing in each discipline the Institute covers and to bring

all Fellows, whether or not they were in the seminar on language and writing, into conversations about student writing. They also were intended to discuss what teachers, other than English teachers, see as their role in teaching writing. One Fellow wrote, "The writing lectures were of no value to me. I have been involved with developing writing curricula for some thirteen years. I am thoroughly convinced that writing should be taught in all content areas and I suspect this was an underlying premise when these lecture-workshops were designed. However, I had the distinct impression that most history teachers thought the writing lectures were designed only for English teachers (again!)." Another wrote, "The writing workshops were extremely helpful and offered a very common sense approach to creativity." In a more typical comment, a third Fellow wrote, "The writing workshops were very good. They gave me some new ideas about goals and expectations."

The Institute schedule, adapted from the HEP schedule, recognizes the numerous demands on teachers' time and the need of many for employment during the summer. It aims to avoid compressing Institute work into too short a time and to enable even the busiest teachers to participate. Were the Institute to schedule, more conventionally, a six-week daily program in the summer, far fewer teachers would apply. That half of the eligible teachers in 1978 applied to become Fellows suggests that the schedule does accommodate the other demands on their time. In a realistic comment, one Fellow wrote, "The scheduling could never satisfy every Fellow. Given the number of activities of the Institute, and the individual schedule of Fellows, not much could be done to improve upon the schedule." Another wrote, "Although I moaned and groaned about the deadlines, I think that the schedule was not bad." Several Fellows made suggestions which have been incorporated in the 1979 schedule: lengthening the reading period and lessening the conflict of

the Institute schedule with the end of the school year.

The format of each seminar differed, depending on the teaching style of the seminar leader and the desires and number of Fellows in the group. Some considered common readings; all considered the work in progress on the Fellows' individual units. Professor James A. Winn characterized the seminar on language and writing in his introduction to the units Fellows wrote.

On a series of uniformly muggy summer afternoons, twelve dedicated and passionate New Haven teachers sat around a table to wrestle with their common problems. On each of those occasions, one or two teachers presented their work in progress for the scrutiny of the others; to describe the resulting discussions as extraordinary seems inadequate: they were wide-ranging, free-swinging, eye-opening, and soul-baring. No synthesis or consensus emerged from these sessions; indeed, many of the differences in theory and practice between the participants may now be more sharply defined and more deeply felt than they were in June. But I can state confidently as the seminar leader that the marks and dents of all that vigorous shop-talk are visible on every unit. And I can make one last appearance in my role as mediator by alleging that each of these units will work for its author and other similar teachers.

Variety in the Fellows' approaches and views also characterized the seminar on Twentieth Century Afro-American culture. Professor Charles T. Davis wrote in his introduction to the units developed in his seminar:

The Afro-American culture of the twentieth century stimulated a seminar of New Haven teachers to offer a rewarding diver-

sity in points of view, varied positions characterized always by the disposition to blend historical and literary approaches. Such diversity was understandable since it reflected, in part at least, a wide range of existing attitudes toward one of the most controversial topics of our time--how to interpret and to assess the cultural achievement of blacks in America. A sense of difference came, too, from the responsible reactions of the teachers to their differing instructional situations, which might be a class in a regular high school, or in a specialized secondary school, or in a middle school, all possessing students who were black and white in varying proportions with staggering differences in competence in basic skills in reading and writing. Among so many reasons and opportunities for highly individualistic approaches to a modern black civilization in America, there was one area of agreement that served as an inspiration for all of the teachers: the importance of their endeavor. What sustained their commitment to a common purpose was not so much my influence as the seminar director but the fresh memory of the face of New Haven as it exists now in the city's public schools.

The diversity of unit topics in Twentieth Century history and literature and in Colonial American history and material culture was such that Fellows were divided into small working groups which, Professor Henry A. Turner wrote, "permitted each Fellow to present drafts of his or her curriculum unit for extensive criticism and suggestions by the others. The result was a high level of interchange between the Fellows."

A theme of the Institute faculty's evaluations of the 1978 program was their admiration for their colleagues who teach in the New Haven schools. One wrote:

I found working with these teachers a rewarding experience.

One of them in our final sessions expressed a moving commitment to the belief that education was crucial to the lives of her students (in this case, high-school seniors already working at full-time jobs), that, indeed, her teaching could make a tangible difference in the quality of their lives. All these teachers were dedicated to their work. They expressed their dedication in their work for the Institute. It was an enriching experience for me to learn something of the problems and possibilities of teaching in New Haven schools, and certainly it left me with an enduring respect for the teachers.

The Fellows, in turn, evaluated the Institute faculty in a highly positive way. One wrote, "I found the faculty and staff to have been of the utmost cordiality and support. My seminar leader was insightful, helpful and extremely supportive in what we were trying to do. I must admit that I did not expect the faculty to have been as cooperative as they were. My expectations changed greatly in this area." Another wrote, "When I came to the project I felt a little timid; I was prepared to be overwhelmed or patronized. Instead, I have thoroughly enjoyed my experience with everyone with whom I have come into contact." A third wrote, "The faculty were expert in their performance. My seminar advisor was invaluable as a resource and necessary as an advisor. His professional manner of offering critical comment was both essential and appreciated."

There was a consensus among the Fellows that the seminars were excellent, the best part of the program. In a typical comment, one teacher wrote, "Our seminars were terrific. Each Fellow gave a rather informal presentation on the progress of his or her project and there was much interaction. The only point I would change is that the number of seminars should be increased." Another wrote, "The seminars were the most benefi-

cial aspect of the Institute. I especially enjoyed working with teachers of other schools and exchanging opinions, problems, and ideas. Teachers from various schools in New Haven rarely get an opportunity to work and discuss problems together. The seminars were most enlightening and useful." Another commented, "I feel the faculty contact provided by the seminars contributed by giving me a sense of a working community and promoted confidence in my personal attempts at scholarship. My experience with the seminars was glowing; each member of the group had a very dedicated and workman-like attitude toward their work and at the same time was very generous and constructive in advice and interest in the work of other members." Another Fellow wrote, "The seminars were lively, sometimes heated debates on most of the topics. Their usefulness depended heavily upon the free exchange of opinions and open discussion. I learned a great deal. My seminar leader was supportive throughout and invaluable when it came to suggesting academic sources which bolstered particular points of view. More of these meetings, please." A larger number of seminars will be scheduled in 1979.

The overall conclusions Fellows stated in their written evaluations were uniformly positive. They point up the extent to which, in its first year, the Institute began to realize some of its more important goals for opening Yale resources to New Haven teachers, for developing a collegial relationship among Yale faculty and school teachers, for creating an interschool and interdisciplinary forum for teachers to work together, for encouraging in teachers a renewed sense of the importance of their role in the society, and for developing new curricular materials of high quality pertinent to student needs. One Fellow wrote, "I think the great strength of the Institute is that it provides an opportunity for teachers to talk to each other, to share ideas, and to be stimulated to think about their work in new ways, while having access to the great

resources at Yale." Another wrote, "I am very glad to have participated in the Institute this year. It gave me a chance to do some work within a supportive structure, opened up some new areas of academic interest, and made me think of myself as a student and scholar again for the first time in several years." A third Fellow wrote, "By the end of the Institute I felt extremely positive about what I had produced and what the Institute had produced in me. I appreciated coming together with other bright and dedicated teachers to discuss not only school questions, but also intellectual ideas. It pleases me to discover that such teachers exist." Another wrote, "I feel that the Institute provides focus and stimulation to the curriculum planning being done by teachers in the New Haven school system. My students will not only profit from the new insights and knowledge I acquired this summer, they will also profit from my renewed enthusiasm, a revitalization that I will be bringing back to my classroom this September. What I see as the greatest strength of the Institute is the combined potential of Yale's resources and the adaptation of these resources by the teachers of the New Haven school system." Another wrote, "The Institute gave me the occasion and stimulation for the production of my most ambitious new unit in ten years." Another Fellow wrote, "I know that my unit is a good one. I worked with Yale's best in developing it. It was worth my time and your money."

Such testimony encourages the view that the Institute can significantly improve the teaching and learning of the humanities in New Haven schools and demonstrate the importance of the university-schools cooperation to the future of our nation's city schools. Perhaps Professor Charles Davis said it best in introducing the units written by Fellows in his seminar.

After the reading, the discussion, the writing, the revision,

and the rewriting were over, all teachers agreed that what they had completed was only a beginning, and they spoke freely of commitments to new seminars and to new projects in the near future. Their achievement and their attitudes offer a basis for satisfaction and hope--in the teachers themselves as they grew in knowledge and learned to apply newly-acquired skills; for Yale and the city of New Haven, as they profited from a small demonstration of a successful experience in learning; and for all Americans who have faith still in the future of the city.

NEH FUNDING

In September 1978 the National Endowment for the Humanities announced a \$210,000 grant to support the Institute for three years and offered to match \$45,000 in gifts from other sources. The Institute now must raise \$95,000 to provide a full program in the humanities for three years. Should these funds be secured, the Institute will accept sixty teachers in 1979 and eighty in 1980 and 1981. In cooperation with the Peabody Museum of Natural History, the Institute is planning to expand into the sciences with at least one seminar annually. The cost of this expansion is \$45,000 over three years. Planning for subsequent years includes work in two other areas to which the Schools attach highest priority, mathematics and the performing arts.

On October 18 at the press conference announcing the NEH award, President Giamatti termed the Institute "one of the most imaginative, innovative, interesting and, I hope, long range" Yale programs. "Yale has a very real stake in primary and secondary education in the United States of America and a very real stake particularly in this area. This is the kind of joint effort between the City and the University that we hope will become more frequent and productive in coming years. Yale's educational and human resources are the most essential contributions the University can make to the whole community in which we live. The Institute is precisely the kind of effort that we wanted to make." Frank Logue, Mayor of New Haven, said, "This joint effort is a combined activity that is in the mainstream of both our enterprises. It takes the resources and skills that Yale has and applies them to a highly direct and real problem of what it is you can do to take the young people who are in our schools today and not only teach them, but may-be inspire them. While the Institute comes out of the mainstream

of what Yale does and what the City does, it can make a brand new contribution to help our kids learn significant and profound things, and have a curriculum design that makes them eager to learn."

The curriculum units Fellows wrote in 1978, which average six weeks in length, are being taught in the 1978-1979 school year to 3500, or over one-third, of New Haven's middle and high school students. If the Institute obtains full funding, by the end of three years all 9100 secondary students will take courses in which teachers present Institute curricula.

James R. Vivian

January, 1979

INSTITUTE FACULTY

Seminar on 20th Century Afro-American Culture

Charles T. Davis

Master of Calhoun College, Chairman of Afro-American Studies, Professor of Afro-American Studies and English

Seminar on Language and Writing

James A. Winn

Assistant Professor of English, Acting Director of Undergraduate Studies - British Studies

Seminar on 20th Century History and Literature

Henry A. Turner

Chairman of History Department, Professor of History

Cynthia E. Russett

Lecturer of History

Richard W. Fox

Assistant Professor of History

Seminar on Colonial American History and Material Culture

Marni Sandweiss

History Department

CURRICULUM UNITS WRITTEN BY INSTITUTE FELLOWS

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

- Fred J. Acquavita
Trowbridge School
"A Language Arts Program With
a Student-Centered Approach."
- * Chris Angermann
High School in the Community
"Letters and the Postal
Service: An Interdisciplinary
Approach."
- Jane Baljevic
Hillhouse High School
"Sequential Curriculum for
Advanced Writing Workshop."
- * Franklin C. Cacciutto
Lee High School
"Poetry and Growth."
- * John Colle
Hillhouse High School
"A Course in Basic Skills."
- Anthony F. Franco
Fair Haven Middle School
"Skill Building for Educa-
tional and Vocational
Advancement."
- Jeremiah Gadsden
Hillhouse High School
"Ninth Grade English: Aims,
Skills, and Procedures for
Stretching a Student's
Capacity to Think."
- Paul Limone
Sheridan Middle School
"Effective Methods for Teaching
Paragraph Development."
- D. Jill Savitt
Betsy Ross Middle School
"Literacy: The Puerto
Rican Papers."
- Jessie O. Sizemore
Lee High School
"Interpreting Ideas in
American Literature."
- * Antonia Storlazzi
Roberto Clemente Middle School
"Content Reading Skills
(7th grade social studies)
Who? What? Where? How?
So What?"
- Barry Yearwood
Jackie Robinson Middle School
"The Sequential Teaching of
Writing Skills at Grade Eight."
- 20th CENTURY AFRO-AMERICAN
CULTURE
- Ivory Erkerd
Roberto Clemente Middle School
"A Middle School Approach to
Black Literature: An Intro-
duction to Dunbar, Johnson,
Hughes, and Angelou."
- Robert A. Gibson
Hillhouse High School
"Booker T. Washington and W.E.B.
DuBois: The Problem of Negro
Leadership."
- Caroline Jackson
Lee High School
"Harlem Renaissance: Pivotal
Period in the Development of
Afro-American Culture."
- Pamela Price Kabak
Lee High School
"The Black Man in Late Nineteenth-
Century Literature: A Comparison
of the Short Stories of Page and
Cable with Those of Their Black
Counterparts, Chesnutt and Dunbar."
- * Betty Lapucia
Betsy Ross Middle School
"Migration North to the Promised
Land."

* This teacher served as a School Coordinator for the Institute.

Alice Mick/Lula White
High School in the
Community/Lee High School
"Italians and Blacks in
New Haven: The Establishment
of Two Ethnic Communities."

Robert Johnson Moore
Lee High School
"Parallel Studies in American/
Afro-American Literature."

Henry Rhodes
Jackie Robinson Middle School
"The Social Contributions of
the Harlem Renaissance."

Verdell M. Roberts
Jackie Robinson Middle School
"Two Controversial Cases in
New Haven History: The
Amistad Affair (1839) and the
Black Panther Trials (1970)."

20th CENTURY AMERICAN HISTORY AND LITERATURE

Issues in American Domestic Affairs

- * Andrew Bram
Wilbur Cross High School
"The American Economy."

Jay M. Brown
Troup Middle School
"I Hate All...."

- * Joan Rapczynski/Florence
Zywocinski
Wilbur Cross High School
"Prohibition as a Reform."

Burt Saxon
Lee High School
"Economics in the Secondary
School: A Fusion Curriculum."

Aspects of American Foreign Policy

Henry J. Brajkovic
Wilbur Cross High School
"The Foreign Policy of Franklin
D. Roosevelt to the Entry into
World War II."

- * Linda J. Churney
Lee High School
"America's Wars, 1898-1945."

- * Richard A. Silocka
Hillhouse High School
"Empire Beyond the Seas."

American Folk Culture

- * Edward H. Fitzpatrick
Trowbridge School
"A Unit on American Folklore."

Topics in Women's History and Literature

Lou Bohman/Marilyn Lipton
Wilbur Cross High School
"Women Writing: 1890-Present."

- * Maureen C. Howard
Wilbur Cross High School
"Woman: Her American Experience."

Bernice Thompson
Wilbur Cross High School
"Woman Emerging in the
Twentieth Century."

COLONIAL AMERICAN HISTORY AND MATERIAL CULTURE

- * Benjamin A. Gorman, Jr.
Fair Haven Middle School
"Colonial Connecticut--Learning
to Look and Understand."

- * Joseph A. Montagna
Jackie Robinson Middle School
"History of Connecticut Through
1690."

- * Valerie Ann Polino
Sheridan Middle School
"The Architecture of New
England and the Southern Colonies
as it Reflects the Changes in
Colonial Life."

INSTITUTE SCHEDULE

TALKS by Institute and other Yale faculty; followed by discussion on adaptation of material into curricula: April 18 - May 30.

William R. Ferris, Associate Professor of American and Afro-American Studies, "American Folklore."

Robin Winks, Professor of History, Master of Berkeley College, "The Idea of Imperialism."

Jules D. Prown, Professor of the History of Art, "Early American Art and the Teaching of History."

Michael G. Cooke, Professor of English, Master of Trumbull College, Associate Chairman of the Department of English, "Freedom, Fate and Folly in Modern Black Fiction."

Robert F. Thompson, Professor of the History of Art, "The Black Atlantic Visual Tradition."

Charles T. Davis, Professor of English, Master of Calhoun College, Chairman of Afro-American Studies, "The Genesis of Afro-American Literature."

John Hollander, Professor of English, "Observations on the Decay of Language."

Henry A. Turner, Professor of History, Chairman of the Department of History, "The Holocaust."

William Kessen, Eugene Higgins Professor of Psychology, Chairman of Psychology Department, "Chinese Schools and American Schools; A Comparative Study."

Robert G. Crowder, Professor of Psychology, "Method and Theory in the Psychology of Reading."

Cynthia E. Russett, Lecturer of History, "Women's History and Feminist History: What Are They?"

CONFERENCES: April 18 - May 19. Institute Faculty work individually with Fellows in selecting readings and refining curriculum unit topics.

READING PERIOD: April 18 - June 20. Each Fellow completes required and other readings, drawn from bibliographies prepared by Institute faculty.

FINAL UNIT TOPIC and list of readings chosen by each Fellow due May 19.

CONTENT OBJECTIVES DUE June 20. Each Fellow submits detailed content objectives based on seminars, talks and readings, and prepared according to the prescribed format.

CONTENT OBJECTIVES returned with faculty comments by June 30.

SEMINARS conducted by Institute faculty between May 22 - July 7; discussion of talks, readings and drafts of content objectives. Seminars also explore the classroom activities and approaches best suited for teaching the subject matter.

WRITING WORKSHOPS discuss the teaching of writing in each discipline: May 29 - July 14.

James A. Winn, Assistant Professor of English, "Student Papers."

Paula C. Johnson, Associate Professor of English, "Syntactic Maturity."

Thomas Russell, Instructor in Graduate Studies, Bland Mouths or "Which translation of Hamlet are we using?"

CURRICULUM WRITING: July 1 - August 1. Fellows working individually and in small groups under the direction of Institute faculty.

ROUGH DRAFT of full curriculum units due July 21, including revision of content objectives based on seminar discussions and written comments by Institute faculty.

ROUGH DRAFTS of units returned with comments by Institute faculty and discussed in seminars July 25.

FINAL UNITS DUE August 4. Units submitted according to prescribed guidelines and format. Written evaluation of Institute program due.

Copy editing, typing and reproduction of final units: August 5 - August 30. Planning for school year workshops to discuss implementation of units prepared during the summer.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF FELLOWS

The obligations of Fellows, upon which payment of the stipend depends, include attendance at all talks, participation in the seminar held in their subject area and in writing workshops, selection and reading of current scholarship pertinent to the unit being developed, preparation of content objectives based on these readings and of a final curriculum unit in accordance with the prescribed format, submission of written evaluations of the summer and school year programs and participation in school year Fellows workshops.

The curriculum unit consists of three parts: 1) content objectives stated in narrative form and based on current scholarship; 2) a sequence of lessons showing in outline form how, daily or weekly, the content will be presented; followed by at least three sample lessons treating both content and method; and 3) a description of resources to be used in implementing the unit, including a teachers' bibliography, a reading list for students and an annotated list of materials for classroom use.