

Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute 1984 Annual Report

This report describes our 1984 program for Fellows, drawing heavily on the written evaluations submitted by participants; plans for our 1985 program; the results of our annual evaluation by an outside consultant; national recognition and dissemination of the Teachers Institute; our evolving plans for program evaluation; the progress that has been made with our campaign for operating and endowment funds; and the formation of a National Advisory Committee that will assist with the further development, dissemination, and evaluation of the Institute.

1984 Teachers Institute Program

Beginning in the fall of 1983, the Institute Coordinators met weekly with the Director to plan our 1984 program. Coordinators' individual work with teachers in their schools, as well as meetings with school subject supervisors and department chairmen, assisted us in identifying the subjects which teachers wished to address in 1984. By January Coordinators had identified about 115 teachers potentially interested in participating in the seminars. Before the application deadline of February 28, the Coordinators narrowed this list to those teachers who were prepared to commit themselves to participating fully in the Institute and whose proposals for writing a curriculum unit were clearly related to the seminar subjects. As in earlier years, the objective was to shape cohesive seminars where Fellows would benefit from work-in-progress on each other's units.

The applications from teachers who wished this year to be Institute Fellows were reviewed by three groups. Subject supervisors and department chairmen reviewed the applications to determine that each proposal was consistent with school curricula and that each teacher would be assigned courses in the coming year in which he or she would teach the unit developed in the program. Institute faculty members reviewed the applications for their relation to the seminar subject. This afforded each seminar leader the opportunity to design the seminar bibliography to encompass the specific interests of teachers applying to the seminar. Finally, in two half-day meetings and one full-day meeting Institute Coordinators considered the results of the administrative and faculty reviews and made their final recommendations about which teachers to accept. By holding the Coordinators' review over several days, as we have done in the past, the Coordinators were able to contact Fellows for clarification or any necessary revision of applications before final action was taken.

On March 13 the Institute accepted as Fellows 74 New Haven middle and high school teachers in the humanities and the sciences. Consistent with a central aim of the Institute to involve a high percentage of New Haven teachers as Fellows, about one-third of these teachers were participating in the program for the first time. The Institute program in the humanities was supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, Aetna Life and Casualty Foundation, the Anne S. Richardson Fund, and the Harlan E. Anderson Foundation. Our work in the sciences was supported by a new three-year grant from the Xerox Foundation and by a grant from the New Haven Foundation. The 1984 Institute seminars and the faculty members who led them were:

"Greek Civilization," led by Victor Bers, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in Classics

"Elements of Architecture, Part II," led by Kent C. Bloomer Professor (Adjunct) of Architectural Design

"The Oral Tradition," led by Michael G. Cooke, Professor of English

"Geology and the Industrial History of Connecticut," led by Robert B. Gordon, Professor of Geophysics and Applied Mechanics

"American Adolescents in the Public Eye," led by William B. Kessen, Professor of Psychology and Pediatrics

"Hispanic Minorities in the United States," led by Nicolas Shumway, Assistant Professor of Spanish

On February 27 the University Advisory Council on the Teachers Institute, acting in its capacity as our course-of-study committee, approved these Institute offerings for 1984 and, in doing so, noted that we were particularly fortunate this year that four of the seminars were to be led by faculty members who have led Institute seminars in previous years. The Institute also arranged for four New Haven teachers to participate as Fellows Adjunct in regular University courses offered through the Yale Summer Language Institute. As before, the purpose was to increase the Spanish language proficiency of teachers who have a growing proportion of students who come from families where Spanish is the primary language spoken in their homes.

Each seminar held a first meeting during the week of March 19. Seminar leaders distributed general bibliographies and discussed with Fellows the syllabus of readings they would pursue as a group. Fellows described the individual curriculum units, which they had indicated provisionally on their applications, that they wished to develop. This provided all members of each seminar with an overview of the work they would pursue together and the specific projects they would undertake individually. In their evaluations Fellows described the bibliographies as "very complete," "extremely helpful," and "valuable for future reference." A first-time Fellow wrote, "the annotation was very good and gave a novice just the right amount of information in order to choose which book would be best." Another Fellow wrote:

I had no idea as to what reliable sources existed covering this subject. My fears and doubts were quickly allayed, however, as the seminar leader pointed out to us the leading experts in this field and gave us a variety of sources to examine.

A third Fellow wrote:

The bibliography for the seminar I was in proved very helpful as a starting point in focusing on a final unit topic. Most of my early research came from this list. The seminar leader's annotation was adequate, and, as he updated his list periodically, he took a great deal of time and care in helping us to develop our own resources.

Drawing upon the bibliographies, Fellows read widely to gain an overview of the seminar subject and to refine their unit topics. Before submitting a revised unit topic and list of core readings on April 10, each Fellow met individually with his or her seminar leader. The Institute requires at least two such individual conferences. As one faculty member wrote:

I met with each of the Fellows at least twice, and in the case of Fellows having particular trouble writing a curriculum unit, I met them as many as six times during the seminar. I insisted on seeing all of them twice, and in the couple of cases where there were particular problems I requested additional consultation time. Most of the Fellows were anxious to meet with me as often as we both felt was necessary.

One Fellow wrote of this individual work with seminar leaders:

He gave unstintingly of his time for appointments and kept in frequent contact by telephone. He was most generous lending books. Our seminars always went beyond their time limit because he shared so generously with us from his vast store of knowledge.

At a second seminar meeting during the week of April 9, Fellows discussed their revised unit topics and considered and agreed upon a list of common readings for the regular weekly meetings that began in early May.

During the next month, Fellows continued their reading, preparing for the weekly meetings and working toward a brief prospectus of what their units would contain, which they submitted on May 15. One week before this due date, the Institute Coordinators conducted a workshop on writing curriculum units. Teachers participating in the Institute for the first time, about one-third of all Fellows, were required to attend; many returning Fellows chose also to participate. The organization of this meeting was changed somewhat from that in earlier years. The Institute guidelines and mechanical specifications for curriculum units were distributed at the beginning of the program in March with letters of acceptance. Coordinators met in April to examine their own

and other Fellows' experience with writing units in the past and to decide upon a list of points to be emphasized in the workshop. At the workshop, Coordinators worked in small groups with the individuals they had recruited into the program. These meetings of experienced Coordinators and new Fellows--a practice begun this year--afforded a greater opportunity than was available in the past to ensure that all new Fellows understood Institute requirements, and that each would have ample opportunity for any questions to be answered. This procedure also identified the Coordinators as experienced and knowledgeable unit writers whom the Fellows might call upon individually at any stage in the writing process.

Fellows characterized the workshop this year as "helpful" and "constructive." One Fellow wrote, "this is a very important component of the program, particularly for new members such as myself who feel the need for support and guidance in preparing the unit." Another wrote, "the workshop on unit writing was useful to me since this was my first time with the Institute. I needed the guidance and reassurance from the Coordinator."

In the Institute, each Fellow prepares an individual curriculum unit through a writing process which has numerous steps for formulating, reformulating, and enlarging the unit; this process is widely understood and appreciated by Fellows. One Fellow wrote that the schedule "served to pace one's work and did so with legitimate concern for the writer." Another wrote:

I find this process to be perfect for me. I like the graduation of writings and the way the completed unit is structured. I always try to rush things, but this writing process has really been well planned.

A third Fellow wrote:

The guidelines are clear; the process, although it was difficult for me to meet the deadlines, is good in that it is a step-by-step approach and I am always amazed, when I think I have nothing to write, that in fact, I have a lot.

The first two months of the program afford a period for reading in advance of the weekly seminar meetings. Many Fellows commented, as they have in previous years, that this period is "never long enough." As one Fellow wrote, "it always seems to me that the reading period is much too short. I read a great deal before deciding what would be useful and what not. My seminar leader was of greatest assistance in helping to select materials, particularly in informing me which sources were most reliable." Another wrote, "I don't remember when I ever read as much in such a short period of time."

During the reading period, all Fellows also met together for a series of talks each Tuesday afternoon after school. As in the past, some Fellows were impatient with the talks and wished that we could instead schedule a greater number of seminar meetings. Many of the Fellows again this year, however, recognized in the talks the purposes for which they were planned. Fellows characterized the talks as "informative," "enlightening," "stimulating," "broadening," "enriching," and "thought-provoking." One Fellow wrote, "I dragged myself to the talks and then found them terrific." Another wrote:

The principal value of the talks was to answer a hunger in this teacher for hearing information from people who are able to work in depth in various fields. They also stimulate my thinking and affect my approach to a subject. Current topics are particularly interesting. In terms of the program I believe they are an attractive way to involve all the members.

Another wrote, "I believe the talks set the tone for the work that I was preparing to do on my unit. I was both challenged and stimulated, which is one advantage for having the talks early in the program."

As before, the central activity of the Institute was the seminars. Ten weekly meetings were scheduled in addition to the March and April meetings mentioned above. The seminars have two overall objectives: further preparing teachers on the general subjects of the seminars and the adaptation of this new learning, through the curriculum units, for use in Fellows' own and other teachers' classrooms. Fellows characterized the seminars as "excellent and demanding," "informal and helpful," "useful but exhausting," "relaxed, informal, and extremely congenial." One Fellow wrote:

The seminars were conducted as open discussion groups. Each session focused on discussion of one or two books which we read beforehand. It took many sessions before I understood the connections between the reading, the discussions, and my unit, but I believe our seminar leader's teaching style encouraged individual understandings versus group knowledge of specific facts. This meant that everyone was applying their new findings to their curriculum units.

Another Fellow described how, in practice, the two objectives of his seminar were accomplished:

The seminar began by our leader suggesting common readings and lecturing to give us background. The common readings also reflected the particular interests of each individual. Individual presentations of our work in progress were shared. Members of the group acted as a sounding board and offered each other teaching suggestions. I particularly liked the presentations because I learned about a variety of topics from the other members of the seminar.

A Fellow in another seminar wrote:

There was a good balance between discussion of the unit and of the seminar project because the leader was always open to discussing whatever we felt was important to the process. If time did not allow for discussion in the group, he was readily available for conference. The seminar project consumed a lot of time--far more than I had anticipated. However, I immersed myself in that because I

enjoyed it thoroughly and appreciated the opportunity to acquire the information and skills being presented.

Of a third seminar, a Fellow wrote:

I found the seminar thoroughly enjoyable--head and shoulders above last year. It was conducted in a relaxed, informal manner. All the participants were extremely congenial, and we were sorry to see the session come to a close. We were an enthusiastic group; all were encouraged to contribute anything we found to be of value or interest. We kept abreast of each other's unit progress and tried to aid whenever possible.

The collegial rapport on which the Institute depends was again evident in each of the seminars. As one Fellow wrote:

I have always been pleased with the helpfulness of both the faculty and staff. It's exciting to work with other professionals who, using their expertise, help you to grow professionally and intellectually. This is one of the best parts of the program. Another is working with teachers from all over the system. This helps in strengthening curricula and the teaching of all those students involved. I have never yet been disappointed, and I don't expect to be.

Another wrote:

The faculty and administration of this Institute were gratifying. My affiliation renewed some of the hidden qualities that I didn't think I had. My seminar leader was always there when I needed him, which was very encouraging and rewarding.

Yale faculty members also wrote about what they gained from leading a seminar in the Institute. One said, "teaching in the Institute offers the opportunity of trying new ideas or combinations of ideas with a group that is likely to be more interested and mature than a typical group of Yale college students." Another wrote, "the encounter is at least as illuminating for the faculty member pulled toward the Sheridan or Cross classroom as it is for the participating teacher pulled toward the library." He explained why he found this to be the case:

The gains are somewhat different from, say, the the engagement of an undergraduate seminar. Yale undergraduates are fluent, overdosed on the academic attitude, wonderfully enthusiastic, and in charming awe of the professoriate. The New Haven teachers are a chewier, more interesting combination. They know a lot (more than they imagine), they are both in awe of and skeptical about the professoriate, and they have a desire to understand that goes beyond the undergraduates automatic roll through

the next level of schooling or letch for post-graduate study. Different, to be sure, but still in its different way, enlarging. I'm certain that teaching in the Institute has changed my way of teaching Yale students. For sure, the Institute has reinforced my desire to connect the life of the classroom with the life of the "real world" and that is an influence.

A third seminar leader wrote:

In several cases, association with the teachers was pleasurable and intellectually stimulating. But the significant intangible benefit is, in my opinion, the sense that one has helped a part of society for whom we usually do nothing.

The Fellows' final curriculum units, due July 31, typed in a format appropriate for reproduction, were compiled and printed in a volume for each seminar. As in the past, we also prepared a Guide to the Units, based on brief summaries written by the authors of individual units. In the fall, the Guide was circulated in all schools so that Fellows and other teachers might identify and request the units they would use in their own classrooms. On September 25, at the suggestion of Fellows from previous years, we held a reunion for all Institute Fellows and faculty members. This provided an excellent opportunity for brief presentations on the work of each seminar so that all Fellows might be generally acquainted with their colleagues' work in the program. These presentations were made by the leaders of the teams of Fellows which were organized for each seminar, as they were for the first time in 1983, to make presentations to other teachers in the schools from October through February. The reunion was greeted with such warmth and enthusiasm that we plan to make it a regular feature of the Institute calendar in future years.

This year Fellows were notably optimistic about the impact they believed the Institute program would have not only on their own classrooms, but also in courses taught by other teachers. The following comments typify the views of most Fellows:

I think part of the impact of the Institute is to provide a continual infusion of more interesting material into our classrooms. This helps to raise the level of expectation and satisfaction acceptable to students and teachers.

I know my students will directly profit and be enthused by the unit and by the added knowledge which I can now share with them.

I intend to use my unit for all intermediate sixth, seventh, and eighth grade classes and am looking forward to presenting this to my students. If anything, the Institute stimulates my learning process which I, in turn, extend to my students.

I intend to begin my literature class with this unit. I believe it will be appreciated by the students and my fellow teachers. It has become our custom in school to share our units through exhibits, plays, and readings to other classrooms.

I will use my unit not only in my classroom with students but with teachers and staff from the middle schools of New Haven.

Other teachers already have told me that they plan to use my unit.

This will have a great impact in my school as it will give the teachers a chance to work together more closely. I think that other teachers will enjoy using my unit as a whole or in parts.

I will use my unit to teach the students important and interesting things that are not available in their text.

My unit last year was very successful. The Institute has not only given me a place to stretch myself but it has given me a form with which to share this new insight with my students.

I am delighted that I had the opportunity to write a unit of interest to me. I have used the same textbooks in class for so long it is boring! I look forward to each fall when I can present a novel topic selected for my students. As an English teacher, reading and writing activities are a must. The extensive research I put into selecting the books for my unit are ones students will like. I will spend about six weeks presenting my unit to 5 different classes of 25 students each.

As in the past four years, one-third of Institute Fellows were participating for the first time. In summing up their experience, four new Fellows wrote:

I entered the Institute very wet behind the ears. I was overwhelmed at first and confused at exactly what my responsibilities were. Now that I have completed my unit, I am comfortable with most of the process. Next year I will have something to compare it to.

Overall, I am very pleased with my experience. This is my first time at the seminar and I was very impressed, learned a lot, and also acquired new skills in research. It is an excellent avenue for professional as well as personal enhancement that has immediate pedagogical application.

I had no idea what to expect from this program. I did know

it would encompass research and work. I have thoroughly enjoyed every minute of my seminar and research. This is my first year as a Fellow, and I do hope it is not my last.

The Institute is one organization that I wish each teacher would make himself an affiliate of at least once. It took me a while before I finally said yes. It has been a rewarding experience, and I wish I had done so sooner.

In their general observations, returning Fellows, as they have in earlier years, stressed the value of the Institute in terms of intellectual growth, morale, and effectiveness as a teacher, as well as the importance of recurring participation and the way in which the Institute has become a part of their professional lives:

The Institute was stimulating and challenging. Its strength lies in the opportunity for teachers to become creative and purposeful academically. It is exciting to stretch one's horizons and to have the chance to work with gifted teachers and distinguished professors.

I found that the most important thing this program does is make the teacher more aware as the instructor but also as the learner. If we as teachers can pass enthusiasm for learning along to the student we can all benefit. The rethinking process is very important from one year to the next so that we can offer new and useful ways to learn. I got more out of this year's program as a result of previous participation because I knew more about how to go about the research and writing process.

I believe 1984 was a very good year. The program format and schedule were solid, the Institute faculty was strong, and the selection of topics was stimulating. In my seven years of participation I have never been disappointed. The process of the Institute helps me to turn out a good product on paper and a better product in my classroom.

I have been satisfied with the program every year, and this year is no exception. I enjoy participating in the Institute because I can grow as a teacher and a colleague.

I join the Institute each year for personal fulfillment and involvement. It helps to maintain my sanity or insanity. It's a wonderful program and I am proud to be a part of it.

The Institute provides a rich opportunity for regeneration. It is a positive, rewarding experience. Its strength is in the superb resources made available to the Fellows. It is an excellent and much needed opportunity for people to explore their love of learning--for those who seek situations to be challenged. Once again, I've completed the Institute with a sense of personal growth and satisfaction.

This experience made me more aware of my professional commitment to teaching.

The Institute offers the potential for exceptional growth in knowledge of our own areas and in working with colleagues....The more I work with the Institute the more amazed I am that such an organization exists and may even continue to grow. This kind of growth is difficult and slow, and it is encouraging to realize the relative long-term commitment that has been made to it.

Program Refinements and Plans for 1985

Partly in response to evaluations of the 1984 program, we have made several refinements, and our planning for the 1985 program is well underway. Most important, we have taken several steps to enlarge the teacher leadership which has been a main ingredient in the success of the Institute. We have discontinued the position of School Liaison and have distributed the Liaison's responsibilities among a new group of fourteen teachers, who serve as School Representatives, and the Institute Coordinators, whose positions have been revised. Rather than have one individual working out of the office in many schools, we now have at least one teacher serving as a Representative in each school. The Representatives' responsibilities include some of those the Liaison undertook previously, together with some of the former responsibilities of Institute Coordinators. Briefly stated, the Representatives are responsible for the day-to-day operation of the Institute within each school. (The attached description of the Representatives' role provides additional detail.)

This arrangement has freed a smaller group of Coordinators of much of the time they previously spent working individually with teachers in schools; instead, they concentrate on coordinating the work of the Representatives. We already are finding this to be a more efficient arrangement for organizing the program. The larger group of School Representatives also promises that contact with teachers in each school will be more frequent and thorough. This is allowing the Coordinators also to devote considerable time to long-range planning, program evaluation, and national dissemination. This will be particularly beneficial in light of the greatly increased demands on the Institute to assist other institutions that are developing similar programs, and because of our own intention to refine the means for program evaluation and to consider appropriate new evaluation techniques. (See also attached description of Coordinators role.)

The cumulative effect of these changes, together with the sizeable number of teachers who are members of the seminar teams, means that more than half of all Institute Fellows have a year-round involvement with and responsibility within the Teachers Institute. We are delighted, too, that a new arrangement with the New Haven Public Schools will augment the time available for both School Representatives and Institute Coordinators to carry out their responsibilities during the school day. Beginning this fall, Representatives and Coordinators may draw from a newly-created "pool" of Institute

professional days, which are in addition to professional days already available to all New Haven teachers. (An attached statement describes this opportunity at greater length.) The cost of these professional days will be shared equally by the Institute and the school system. These changes have been made possible, in part, by a three-year grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

On October 2, Institute Coordinators took the first of these professional days for an intensive consideration of evaluations of the 1984 program written by Fellows, faculty, and our outside consultant. This was a very fruitful session: Coordinators agreed to prepare a newsletter that will be distributed to all Fellows periodically throughout the year; they redesigned the means for working with Fellows on technical questions about writing a curriculum unit; they agreed to pursue the development of a program of editorial assistance to aid Fellows with their writing during the process of developing their units; and they decided we should explore the preparation of a subject index of all units Fellows have written in the Institute since 1978.

At a subsequent meeting, Coordinators tackled the schedule for the coming year. A few participants would have agreed with the Fellow who stated: "I could write volumes on the untimeliness of many aspects of the schedule--all of it expressed with sincere intentions to improve the Institute and the teachers involved." Though they made some adjustments in due dates for the various drafts of curriculum units--with careful attention to the school calendar for the coming year--in the end they agreed that the present schedule generally accommodates in the best way possible the other demands on teachers' time during the school year and in the summer, largely following the advice of the Fellow who wrote: "leave it as it is." This session was particularly valuable because Coordinators were able to clarify and make more explicit how they approach teachers' written evaluations and whom they have in mind in making any changes in the program. They concluded that they are guided most by the comments of teachers who offer the most, and stand to gain the most, from the program. They affirmed an intention to keep the program as demanding as is feasible.

The new network of School Representatives has proved thus far to be a very effective means for canvassing teachers in each school. The canvas for which teachers might use which volumes of Institute units was particularly thorough, as indicated by the large number of volumes from 1984, as well as from earlier years, requested and distributed in schools on October 2. We also have, earlier than in previous years, a fuller indication of the subjects teachers wish Institute seminars to address in 1985. As of late November, about 100 teachers had expressed interest in seminars on nine subjects. In five instances, University faculty members have already agreed to lead seminars and are preparing descriptions to be circulated to interested teachers. These offerings include, in the humanities, a seminar on narrative in modern American novels, autobiography, and biography, which will examine writings by and about classical American novelists; a seminar on poetry which will examine classical expressions within the genre, as well as means for encouraging students to use poetry as a form of self-expression; a seminar on American culture approached through the use of material objects and art history; and, in the sciences, a seminar on the mineralization process in plants and animals; and another on the use of statistics in social science studies of

adolescents. These seminars will be led respectively by the following Yale faculty members:

Robert B. Stepto
Professor of English and Afro-American Studies

Traugott Lawler
Professor of English

Jules D. Prown
Professor and Chairman of History of Art

H. Catherine Skinner
Lecturer in Orthopedic Surgery, and Biology

William B. Kessen
Eugene Higgins Professor of Psychology
Professor of Pediatrics

Evaluation by Norman C. Francis

In addition to the written evaluations completed by Fellows and seminar leaders, the Institute each year is evaluated also by an outside consultant. In 1984 we were fortunate, for the third year in a row, to engage an individual prominently associated with the national studies and reports on American high schools that have received such widespread attention. Norman C. Francis, President of Xavier University of Louisiana, served on the National Commission on Excellence in Education and is Chairman of the Board of the Educational Testing Service (ETS). President Francis reviewed a very full package of Institute materials in advance of his visit to New Haven on June 26-27, when he met with participants from the University and the Schools.

In a highly gratifying report, President Francis made the following general observation:

The Institute is people-oriented by design and the teacher is the central figure, involved at every step. What has happened to these teachers is impressive and should be known and available to school settings across this nation. It is not simply inspirational, but it is clearly a common sense and practical demonstration of how change can be effected in an urban public school setting when people in institutions work together in a context of mutual respect and with common goals. However, neither breast-beating or the passage of time will improve efforts in public schools, but people can, and the Yale-New Haven Institute has demonstrated this fact.

He spoke also of the caliber of Institute seminars and concluded, "the translation of this experience by the teachers, both in their teaching units and their personal approach in the class, is inescapable."

President Francis' report offers strong encouragement for the national dissemination of the Teachers Institute and for securing the funds necessary to sustain the program in New Haven. He wrote:

Aside from the current and future educational value the Institute has for the New Haven school system, if anything happened to it, the loss would have national impact and not be simply a local loss. Such a demise would be the self-fulfilling prophecy for those who say it can't be done, and a serious blow to those who know it can and are making efforts in their local districts. And as happens much too frequently, others would bumble about trying to invent a wheel that has already been perfected, and, in not knowing, spend precious funds on form that could best be used on substance....The presence of the Institute in the University adds to Yale's national stature as a creative leader in educational endeavors. In essence, fundraising for the Institute, particularly at this time, can and should be aggressively and proudly pursued.

Because of his knowledge and leadership in the area of assessing teacher effectiveness and student progress, we asked President Francis to begin to consider, in particular, the appropriateness of the ways that we have evaluated the program in the past. Since his visit, and with his assistance, we now have a fruitful relationship with ETS. Winton H. Manning, who was Senior Vice President for Research and who currently is Senior Fellow at ETS, is devoting considerable time to reviewing the ways in which we have evaluated the program and in helping us to determine the sufficiency of these evaluations and the possibility of appropriate, additional evaluation activities which we might undertake.

National Dissemination

With support from the Rockefeller Foundation, Atlantic Richfield Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, we plan to extend and to strengthen several forms of national dissemination of our program, including the preparation and distribution of literature about the Institute, participation in conferences organized by ourselves and by others, and, especially, consultation individually and in teams with institutions and schools in other communities.

Program Literature

We presently furnish a list of materials available on the Teachers Institute to anyone who inquires about our program. (See appendix for a copy.) Except for some volumes of curriculum units that are in short supply, we provide these materials upon request at no charge to institutions and schools interested in our program. These materials include national reports and studies citing the Teachers Institute, internal and outside evaluations,

videotape programs, transcripts of these programs and of other presentations on the Teachers Institute, Guides to the Curriculum Units teachers have written, volumes of curriculum units teachers have prepared thus far, and selected articles on the program appearing in local and national publications.

The two basic documents, which we want individuals who wish to meet with us to read in advance, are the brochure that outlines the Institute's schedule and activities, and a book that describes the concept, operation, and results of the program. The book was prepared for distribution initially at the National Conference on "Excellence in Teaching" organized by the Institute and held at Yale in February of 1983. The College Board has published a revised edition of this book, and is advertising it in national publications and through the Board's own mailings and meetings.

We want also to prepare new literature on the Institute, specifically designed to assist other institutions that are establishing similar programs. In developing this literature we will seek the advice of institutions that already have drawn or presently are drawing on our experience to design their own programs, including Duke University, Lehigh University, Brown University, the University of Hartford, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of New Mexico, the University of Michigan, and the University of Washington. Individuals at these institutions can help us to determine which aspects of our advice have proved most helpful, and what additional advice or other kinds of materials would have been particularly useful in our work with them.

Since 1978 we have been accumulating a list of individuals in institutions and schools across the country who have expressed interest in our work. All of these individuals receive our brochure annually; we want now to use this as the first element in a list for future mailings. We will periodically send up-to-date information on our activities in New Haven and on other programs being established with our assistance, and will acquaint a wide audience with the materials and services we can provide.

Conferences

The Teachers Institute organized the National Conference on "Excellence in Teaching," held at Yale in 1983 and attended by Chief State School Officers, college and university presidents and chancellors, and foundation officials from 38 states. Since that time we have made numerous presentations at national, regional, state, and local conferences across the country, including national meetings of the College Board and the Community College General Education Association, and state-wide meetings in Pennsylvania and California. These conferences have been valuable for bringing the Institute to the attention of educators across the country and have given Institute staff and participants a new and informative perspective on our work in New Haven.

These experiences have reminded us that, though there is no Federal system of education in this country, there is a remarkable similarity of problems and opportunities for education at all levels. We want to be as responsive as we can to all requests for our assistance, but we must also use our limited time and resources to greatest effect. Because our principal aim is to work most

closely with colleagues at other institutions that are interested in establishing similar programs for their own communities, we will in the future place much greater emphasis on sustained personal contact and reciprocal visits with other institutions that are striving to develop Teachers Institutes.

Individual and Team Consulting

For the past three years, we have worked individually and in small groups with representatives of other institutions and school systems interested in establishing similar programs. We have found this to be the most effective means leading to the establishment of similar programs elsewhere, and we will pattern our future dissemination activities more systematically along these lines. With regard to our own resources, it is more efficient for a small team of Institute participants--usually including the Director, a school teacher, and a University faculty member--to visit and meet with a large number of individuals in another community, than it is for a small team from another community to meet in New Haven with numerous Institute participants. As we better organize and publicize the availability of Institute teams to visit other communities, we may also schedule as a regular part of the Institute calendar certain times when representatives from other institutions would be invited to New Haven for sessions with Institute participants.

We are considering whether we will establish criteria to be met before we provide consulting teams. We may require that, in order to receive the assistance of individual or team consultants, other communities form their own teams, with representation from both institutions and schools, and that there be an explicit, prior commitment of both partners to planning activities in their own communities. We may also establish several thresholds, so that as other communities become more advanced in their own planning and program development, we would provide an increasing level of assistance. We believe that, in these ways, we might ascertain which communities are most likely to use our advice; this might also encourage other institutions to undertake a more explicit planning process.

As there begin to be more institutions across the country working along these lines and a greater number of Teachers Institutes established in other communities, we want to develop means for these programs to share information. We have much to gain from each other. In addition to the mailings mentioned above, we want to hold during the next three years, possibly in 1985, at least one meeting at Yale where individuals from Teachers Institutes in various stages of development can convene to share their experiences and to offer mutual support and assistance.

Evaluation Practices and Plans

Our evaluation practices thus far have included four principal activities: review by outside consultants, written evaluation by participants, surveys of unit use, and a system-wide analysis of the program using lengthy questionnaires with many responses that are quantifiable.

Review by Outside Consultants

We have annually engaged as an outside consultant a prominent educator to visit New Haven and to prepare a descriptive and critical report on the Institute. In advance of the visit, the consultant is furnished extensive written materials on our program. The consultant then visits New Haven for two or three days to meet with participants at the University and the schools. Some of these visits have occurred during the school year so that the consultant could observe Institute Fellows teaching materials they had developed for their own classrooms. Others have been held while Institute seminars were in session so that the consultant could observe the work of the seminars. We have been particularly fortunate to involve as consultants individuals who have been engaged in recent national studies and reports on American high schools, who have therefore brought a broad and timely perspective to the task. Our previous evaluators are:

Edward A. Lindell, President
Gustavus Adolphus College

Robert Kellogg, Dean of the College
University of Virginia

Ernest L. Boyer, President
The Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching

Theodore R.Sizer, Chairman
A Study of High Schools

Norman C. Francis, President
Xavier University of Louisiana

The observations and recommendations of our outside evaluators are considered by the University Advisory Council on the Teachers Institute and by the Institute Coordinators. Both the visits themselves and the reports have prompted valuable discussions and refinements in the program. The reports are also provided to funding agencies.

Written Evaluation by Participants

We believe that the testimony of participants at the conclusion of each year's program is one of the most important means of evaluation. Certainly it has been the most constructive thus far; our many reports to the National Endowment for the Humanities document not only the Fellows' and faculty's favorable opinions of each Institute activity, but also the accumulating program refinements that have been made based upon these written evaluations. Each year Institute Fellows and seminar leaders respond to questionnaires which are largely the same as those used first in 1978. In the fall we prepare a digest of Fellows' comments that runs to twenty pages or more. In

selecting which statements will be included, greatest weight is given to critical comments. This digest is distributed to Institute Coordinators in the early fall, and the Coordinators review this document and consider any changes that should be made in the program for the coming year. The written evaluation by participants is therefore integral to planning each year's program. It is a means for an ongoing involvement of teachers in the design and conduct of the Institute.

Surveys of Curriculum Unit Use

We have periodically surveyed all New Haven teachers, those who have been Fellows and those who have not, concerning their use of the curriculum units Fellows prepare. The results of these surveys have shown that the impact of the Institute is cumulative and has been growing. We have used these surveys thus far mainly to document overall the number of teachers, classes, and students using Institute-developed materials--to examine the extent of the Institute's influence on school curricula.

System-Wide Study

In 1981 we developed lengthy questionnaires for a more comprehensive examination of the influence of the Institute on teaching and learning in New Haven middle and high schools. At the same time, we began more systematically to examine literature in the field of education related to our program. The aim was to search the literature so that we might formulate questions for our study based upon current research findings. The following statements illustrate some of the areas where there is a reasonable degree of agreement in the education literature and which we therefore probed through the questionnaires.

- There is widespread agreement that much of pre-service teacher education lacks relevance to, and does not adequately prepare teachers for, teaching. Often associated with this view is criticism of an over-emphasis on "education" courses, and of too little emphasis on subject matter in the initial preparation of the teacher.
- There is an extensive literature critical of traditional in-service education for teachers, particularly of intensive, short-term in-service offerings, especially those which teachers have not first requested.
- There are numerous findings concerning teacher morale, "burn-out," and the stressfulness of teaching, particularly in urban school districts.
- A consistent body of research has indicated that teachers' expectations for their students affect students' performance in schools.
- A body of literature points to the severe limitations of the traditional manner through which "experts" prepare curricula for teacher use, try to acquaint teachers with these new materials in short-term workshops, and then expect the curriculum materials somehow to affect

student learning. Some research indicates that it is essential that teachers using curricular materials have a prominent role in their development.

- A growing body of literature maintains that schools cannot be reformed from above or from outside, and that change will occur only with teacher leadership.
- Although there is general agreement that teachers contribute to student learning, there is a large body of research that has failed to uncover significant relationships between teacher variables and student success. This is a particularly important area for further research.

The three reports we wrote on the questionnaires administered in 1982 to New Haven middle and high school teachers describe the general aims of the study and the manner in which it was developed and administered, together with summaries of the principal findings, many of which relate to the above themes in the literature. The responses of the 266 teachers who completed the questionnaires were entered on a computer. For purposes of the reports we analyzed three samples: teachers in the sciences, teachers in the humanities, and all teachers responding.

Refinement of Existing Evaluation Techniques

With support from the Rockefeller Foundation and with assistance from the Educational Testing Service we intend to refine, to extend, and to examine in greater depth the results of each of the forms of internal evaluation described above. For instance, though we have carefully examined Fellows' written evaluations each year in planning the coming year's program, we have not examined this large body of information for changes in teachers' responses over time. Also, we are finding that teachers' responses are more favorable and more predictable each year, and that they contain many fewer suggestions for changes in the program. We will consider how to reduce and redirect the written responses we request at the conclusion of each year's program.

With regard to the surveys of unit use, we have examined the results only in aggregate, and have not subjected this data to comparative analysis. We have not, for example, compared the responses of Fellows and non-Fellows, or of teachers by subject or school. Nor have we sought to interrelate the findings of the written evaluations with the surveys and questionnaires.

We have maintained all the data from the system-wide study in a computer file. The reports we prepared address only partially the several hundred pages of computer analysis that have already been run, and more complex levels of multi-variant analysis of the existing data have not yet been attempted. In addition, we plan to readminister the questionnaire in order to make comparisons over time. We want to supplement and refine the questionnaire before it is readministered. In extending our existing means of evaluation, it will be especially important to expand and update our search of pertinent education literature.

Additional Evaluation Activities

We presently are considering several new approaches for examining the influence of the Teachers Institute on teaching and learning. Following are some of the approaches we presently are exploring.

The Content of School Courses

Because of the Institute's concentration on subject matter, an obvious area to investigate would be changes in the content of school courses that can be attributed to the Institute. Unfortunately this is not as simple to determine as it might, at first, appear. When the Institute began in 1978, we wanted to compile detailed information about what was then taught in school courses as base data for future comparisons; this, however, we were unable to do. There was then, for instance, no formal system-wide English curriculum for the City of New Haven. Even in subjects where there was a formal curriculum, teachers concluded that there often was little relation between the formal curriculum and what teachers actually taught in their classrooms. Moreover, the curriculum was so general that it could hardly provide a basis for comparison with the much more detailed and in-depth curriculum units Institute Fellows write. We therefore incorporated, as part of the application form teachers fill out in applying to the Institute, a question about what the teacher presently teaches. We may want to examine retrospectively all of these application forms to determine whether they contain sufficient information to enable us to describe the infusion of new subject matter through the Institute.

Questionnaires for School Administrators

Though we have administered numerous questionnaires to Institute participants and other teachers, we have not before administered questionnaires for department chairmen, subject-area supervisors, principals, or other school administrators. We will consider whether such questionnaires would yield useful information about the influence of the Institute on teachers and students. Depending on how we designed these questionnaires, we might consider comparing the perceptions of administrators with teachers' perceptions of themselves and their students.

Institute-Developed Testing of Students

We are considering whether to develop criterion-referenced tests related to curriculum units Fellows prepare in the Institute. Because of the large number of units teachers have prepared, 43 volumes to date, this approach would be impractical unless we could select a valid sample of units for such testing. This approach appears to be especially problematical and complex because of the very nature of the curriculum units teachers write. The units are intended to be provocative, but certainly not comprehensive statements of a teacher's

objectives; and strategies for a particular topic. They are limited in length and reflect only a portion of all the teacher learned from the seminar experience. They do not contain day-to-day lesson plans and objectives: rather, selected classroom activities illustrate how the topic can be taught in the classroom. Moreover, it would be mistaken to regard the written units as static; many teachers comment on how they continue thinking about and reformulating their ideas as they teach the topic they developed. In short, the curriculum units, far from being comprehensive and completed, continue to evolve. This would pose serious problems for developing a criterion-referenced test on a given unit unless the author were involved in preparing such a test, and there are serious methodological problems with the teacher whose students are to be tested being knowledgeable about the test.

Normative Standardized Testing

Of all measures of student achievement, certainly the most difficult would be drawing any legitimate correlations between the results of standardized normative testing and teachers' work in our Institute. In fact, from the beginning, we have maintained that there are simply too many variables that bear on student performance to enable us to separate the influence of the Institute. We want, however, to examine this question more closely, at the very least to be able to explain in detail, rather than only to assert, that making such correlations would be specious. Even assuming we were able to separate the Institute from other variables, there remain numerous practical and conceptual difficulties, not the least of which is the fact that the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, administered in grades 7 and 8, has been the only normative testing used throughout the New Haven school system. Only a fraction of the Teachers Institute's work has been with teachers at these grade levels, and whether the Iowa Test measures what these teachers' units seek to achieve would have to be closely examined. Moreover, because the schools will now administer a different standardized test, longitudinal studies using these test results become impossible. We might, nonetheless, explore whether we could make any valid comparisons among the test scores of students in classes of Institute Fellows, teachers who are not Fellows but who used Institute-developed curricula, and other teachers who are neither Fellows nor used such materials. Also, under the new Superintendent of Schools in New Haven, the system will be developing criterion-referenced testing for grades 1-8, and probably other criterion referenced and normative testing. We are exploring with the school system whether effects of the Institute can in some way be incorporated in these new tests the system will design and administer.

Existing School Data

We will also examine whether other records kept by the school system, such as student grades and attendance, might provide a basis for describing the influence of the Institute, even though controlling for other variables would be highly complex. We could not, for instance,

simply examine whether students in Institute Fellows' classes have better grades and better attendance and then attribute the result directly to the Institute. There are also problems of retrieving, compiling, and analyzing the massive body of data that this approach would entail.

In refining and extending our evaluation activities, we want carefully to balance what is possible with the time and resources involved in each approach. In the end, we will undertake only new evaluation techniques that are both appropriate and sufficient, but which do not divert the Institute from its central aims. In this regard, we believe that the advice of the National Committee we have formed will be enormously helpful.

Campaign for Operating and Endowment Support

We have undertaken a campaign to endow the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute to insure that the program will be of lasting benefit to the teachers and students in our community's public schools. The following summarizes our fundraising campaign--the steps we have already taken, our goal, and future plans.

This past June, Robert Roggeveen, Program Officer from Aetna, Timothy K. Weidmann from Yale's Corporate Relations staff, and the Institute Director met in Washington with Division Directors at the National Endowment for the Humanities, which has supported the program generously since 1978. We had a heartening meeting and are beginning to prepare our proposal for a \$1 million Challenge Grant which would match on a one-for-three basis endowment funds we collect between December 1, 1984 and December 31, 1987. This sets the timetable for raising our endowment, and we are therefore seeking interim operating support to run through 1987.

For the period from now through 1987 we have projected an unmet operating need of \$440,000, after counting existing commitments from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Atlantic Richfield Foundation, Xerox Foundation, and the New York Times Company Foundation. In September the Ford Foundation voted to award us a challenge grant of \$110,000 to match one-for-three funds we raise to meet this projected need. We have submitted a proposal to the Geraldine Dodge Foundation for \$110,000 toward this Ford challenge. In January we will submit a proposal also to the Carnegie Corporation. Additionally, the Rockefeller Foundation voted in September to award a three-year, \$150,000 grant to support further evaluation and national dissemination activities, which are not included in the basic operating need of \$440,000 mentioned above.

To raise the endowment fund is a much greater challenge, in part because of the large proportion of foundations and corporations that have policies against giving to endowment. The endowment goal we must achieve will depend on two factors: 1) the amount of annual operating support we can expect to sustain from sources other than endowment; and 2) the amount of the expendable return on the endowment fund. About \$170,000 of the Institute's annual budget (in 1984 dollars) is provided by Yale University and the New Haven Public Schools, leaving about \$200,000 annually to be met by endowment income and,

possibly, other sources. We have been seeking to build a list of corporations and small foundations that might contribute on an annual basis in order to lessen the need for endowment, but our experience thus far indicates that we should not rely to a significant degree on this form of operating support. We therefore projected an endowment need of about \$4 million, assuming the 4.5% rate of expendable income from endowment allowed at the University.

We want next in our endowment campaign to enlist the strongest possible support of those foundations and corporations with a particular interest in New Haven, in order to incorporate in our NEH Challenge Grant proposal, which is due no later than May 1, 1985, the largest possible local commitment to our endowment fund, as well as a realistic statement of how we will meet any remaining local goal. We hope that this will be instrumental in attracting further NEH support in the form of endowment, and consequently the support of foundations and corporations that traditionally have had a less direct interest in our community.

National Advisory Committee

President Giamatti recently formed a National Advisory Committee for the Teachers Institute, composed of fifteen Americans distinguished in the fields of education, private philanthropy, and public policy to assist us with the dissemination, evaluation, and development of the Teachers Institute. (A list of the members is attached.) With the opportunities we now face as a result of the widespread interest in our Teachers Institute, the National Advisory Committee will be of very real assistance in advising us about how we can make the most effective contribution to institutions and schools in other communities. With respect to evaluation, the Committee includes a variety of perspectives that will enable us to examine what each constituency for such collaborative programs regards to be the best evidence of their success. We are confident that the Committee will also provide enormous assistance with our campaign as we begin to extend our endowment appeal to foundations, corporations, and individuals located across the country. The Committee as a whole will meet once or twice annually, and we will consult with the members individually. In advance of meetings, we will circulate working papers which will serve as the basis for discussion. These papers will be prepared by Institute Coordinators and staff together with committees of the University Advisory Council which are examining the same topics that the National Committee will address. The Committee on National Dissemination is chaired by Michael G. Cooke, Professor of English. The Committee on Evaluation is chaired by William Kessen, Eugene Higgins Professor of Psychology and Professor of Pediatrics, and the Committee on local fundraising is chaired by H. Catherine Skinner, Lecturer in Orthopedic Surgery and Biology.

List of Attachments

- Guide to Curriculum Units Fellows wrote in 1984
- Description of Presentations by Seminar Teams
- Responsibilities of School Representatives
- Responsibilities of Institute Coordinators (as revised in 1984)
- Description of Professional Days for Institute Work
- Schedule for Norman C. Francis' visit
- Norman C. Francis' Report on Teachers Institute
- National Advisory Committee for the Teachers Institute
- List of Available Materials
- Press Coverage in 1984

