

**Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute
1985 Annual Report**

This report describes: our 1985 program for Fellows, drawing heavily on the written evaluations submitted by participants; our plans for and progress in program evaluation; recent national recognition; activities and plans in dissemination of the Teachers Institute; and the progress of our campaign for operating and endowment support.

1985 Teachers Institute Program

Between October, 1984, and January, 1985, the fifteen teachers who served as Institute Representatives for their schools were particularly effective in canvassing teachers for the subjects they wished Institute seminars to address in 1985, and in working with teachers in applying to these seminars. By the application deadline of February 15, the School Representatives, working closely with Institute Coordinators, had identified 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 one another's units.

The applications from teachers who wished this year to be Institute Fellows were reviewed by three groups. Subject supervisors and department chairmen from the Schools 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 a seminar bibliography encompassing 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 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 12, the Institute accepted as Fellows 80 New Haven middle and high school teachers, 55 in the humanities and 25 in 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. Overall, Fellows represented more than 20 percent of all New Haven secondary school teachers in these fields.

The Institute program in the humanities was supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, Aetna Life and Casualty Foundation, the Harlan E. Anderson Foundation, the Bay Foundation, the Connecticut Bank and Trust Company, the Anne S. Richardson Fund, and the Ford Foundation. The Ford Foundation grant, together with grants from the New Haven Foundation, the New York Times Company Foundation, and the Xerox Foundation, supported our program in the sciences. The 1985 Institute seminars and the faculty members who led them were:

American Musical Theatre, led by Thomas R. Whitaker,
Professor and Chairman of English

Poetry, led by Traugott Lawler, Professor of English

History as Fiction in Central and South America, led by Roberto
Gonzalez-Echevarria, Professor of Spanish and Chairman
of Spanish and Portuguese

Twentieth Century American Fiction, Biography, and Autobiography,
led by Robert Stepto, Professor of English and Afro-American Studies

Odysseys: The Autobiographical Dimension of 19th-Century American
Social History, led by Jean-Christophe Agnew, Associate Professor
of American Studies and History

Time Machines: Artifacts and Culture, led by Jules D. Prown,
Professor and Chairman of History of Art

Skeletal Materials--Biomineralization, led by H. Catherine W.
Skinner, Lecturer in Orthopedic Surgery and Biology

The Measurement of Adolescents, led by William Kessen,
Eugene Higgins Professor of Psychology and Professor of Pediatrics

On February 25, the University Advisory Council on the Teachers Institute, acting in its capacity as our course-of-study committee, approved these Institute offerings for 1985. The Council noted that this year's program would include an exceptionally strong group of offerings, and that four seminars were to be led by faculty members who had led Institute seminars in previous years.

Each seminar held a first, organizational meeting on 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 that they had indicated on their applications 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 "well planned," "very helpful," and "particularly useful."

One Fellow's comment shows how the bibliography served not only as an introduction to the general seminar subject, but also as a guide to beginning research on a specific unit topic:

The bibliography distributed by our seminar leader was broken up into several sections relating to the various unit topics. The bibliographic section pertaining to my unit topic provided a good starting point for my research.

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 19, each Fellow met individually with his or her seminar leader. The Institute requires at least two such individual conferences during the unit-writing period. As one faculty member wrote,

Individual scheduled meetings with Fellows were held in my office and centered initially on defining and sharpening the focus of the proposed units. These discussions were lively and productive.

One Fellow wrote of his individual work with his seminar leader,

My seminar leader was exceptionally helpful in the making of my unit. He offered ideas and material and was always available for constructive criticism.

At the second seminar meeting on April 9, Fellows discussed their revised unit topics and considered and agreed upon a list of common readings for the regular weekly meetings that would begin on May 14. 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 21.

In order to prepare Fellows for the writing of their curriculum units, Institute Guidelines and mechanical specifications for curriculum units were distributed at the beginning of the program in March. The Guidelines describe the Institute writing process, which has numerous steps for Fellows' formulating, reformulating, and enlarging their individual units. From year to year, Fellows' comments express ever-greater appreciation of this process. This year, Fellows had especially favorable things to say about the format and Guidelines for preparing units.

The process isn't my style, but I've got to admit that it worked!

This was my first time in the Institute. As I look back I can see how beginning with the prospectus, I shaped and changed and developed my ideas and unit.

The guidelines for presenting the unit were clear. Each due date served as a catalyst to keep us working at the proper pace.

The guidelines were extremely well defined. The prospectus, first draft, and second draft were well timed and a good warm up for the final unit. I found all three worked well and they organized my writing and thinking skills.

The guidelines were clear and helpful in writing this unit. The process for unit writing from prospectus to first and second draft was helpful because I could pace myself better and could also receive valuable feedback from the seminar leader.

The process of prospectus, first draft, second draft, and completed unit is cumulative and makes the final product seem relatively effortless, if the beginning stages are well accepted.

The guidelines are good, clear and precise. The process is well-thought-out and the unit grows, changes and grows some more from prospectus to final draft. It is a steady process that helps us write and formulate the units.

In 1982 a comprehensive analysis of our program revealed that the more times teachers have participated in the Institute, the more likely they are to say that the process of writing an Institute unit has improved their own writing. This year, returning Fellows expressed a clear and emphatic sense of the purpose and value of the Institute writing process. One Fellow wrote,

I am more and more convinced that the Institute's writing process is incredibly valuable and well thought out. Not only are writing and research skills sharpened; ideas become clearer and more refined.

Another wrote,

Don't tinker with the guidelines for presenting the unit. As a writing teacher totally committed to teaching writing as a process and as an eight-year participant of the Institute, I believe we have the ideal guidelines. If a Fellow follows each step, the unit flows and grows very naturally, practically writes itself.

This year, rather than holding writing workshops for first-time Fellows at the beginning of the program as we have done in the past, we made writing assistance available periodically throughout the curriculum-writing period.

Fellows had the opportunity to meet individually with Institute Coordinators before the successive drafts of their units were due. A week prior to each of the due dates, we scheduled specific times during which Coordinators met with Fellows and assisted them in using Institute Guidelines for their units. One Fellow wrote,

Without the encouragement and support of the Institute Coordinators I would not have been able to complete my unit. They were always available to address my questions and concerns as they related to my unit.

Because this mode of writing assistance proved so helpful, we plan next year to schedule such opportunities every week, beginning a week prior to the Fellows' submission of their prospectuses.

We also initiated, in one seminar, a pilot program to further assist Fellows in writing their curriculum units. Editorial assistance was given to Fellows in this seminar both individually and in group meetings that were scheduled in addition to the seminar's regular meetings. In this way, we adapted to the Institute an intensive writing program that was developed recently in the Yale Graduate School. The additional sessions were conducted by guest writing specialists and were devoted to group analysis of writing samples, largely the curriculum unit writing of the Fellows themselves. Also, these seminar members were encouraged to meet individually with editorial assistants who were available throughout the curriculum writing period. The comments of Fellows in this seminar show that its innovative writing aspect was successful.

I cannot praise the writing staff enough. What a feeling it gave me to know that someone took so much time to help me say what I wanted to say. All of the staff were extremely positive and very helpful.

The writing staff were wonderful. One marvels at their sensitivity. Their interest in writing and teaching is obviously great. They made me feel excited about the process. I learned something about teaching--and myself.

The writing staff were well-informed about our needs. Using our own writing as examples for the sessions was extremely helpful. It also created a strong bond between the presenters and the participants. The writing assistance complements and enhances the seminar and the completed paper. It was a worthwhile experience.

Fellows who participated in this seminar were enthusiastic about the prospect of making this kind of writing assistance available to all Fellows in the future. "Add this process to all seminars," recommended one Fellow.

The process of working individually with an editor appeared to be the most highly valued element of the trial program.

This was my first experience with an editor. I learned a great deal about the writing process. The editor-writer relationship is an extremely intimate one (no pretenses). The positive attitude boosted my confidence greatly. My unit is much better as a result!

One on one was more intimate and concentrated on the writer-editor relationship. I was extremely comfortable and found I was able to do more work.

Having several sessions with time to incorporate revisions, elaborations, work on transitions was important to give me the feeling of it being a real process, not just a set of corrections to be made by someone in a higher position. This was definitely an example of collaborative, collegial work.

The individual sessions worked well because they could be open and honest--author to editor.

Most helpful to me were my meetings with the individual tutor. She was so accommodating with her time--she was willing to give me as much time as I needed. She took what I had written and taught me how to make it better. She explained various methods and techniques and by working with her I feel I learned a great deal. She is an excellent teacher.

The comprehensive analysis of the program in 1982 showed that a high proportion of Fellows think that the Institute's curriculum-writing process has helped them not only with their own writing, but also with their teaching of writing, no matter what subject they teach. Several Fellows who participated in this special writing program drew a connection between the focus on their own writing in the program and their teaching of writing in their classrooms. Two Fellows wrote:

Not only does it enhance the seminar and the unit, the program of writing help taught me techniques that I may be able to use with my students.

I loved working with the writing assistants. They provided lots of information both in general and for my individual unit and were highly encouraging and positive about the entire writing process. Their enthusiasm for our work inspired me to spend more time on the writing of my unit than ever before. This is the first time in many, many years of unit writing that I can say that I am proud of my writing! Additionally, I plan to incorporate some techniques that I learned about writing into my work with students.

For these reasons, and because expository writing is central to all disciplines in the humanities, the Institute Coordinators are now considering ways of incorporating such a writing assistance program throughout the Institute in the future.

The first two months of the program afford a period for intensive reading in advance of the weekly seminar meetings. Thereafter, Fellows continue to read about both the general seminar subjects and their specific unit topics. Many Fellows said, as they have in the past, that the time for reading is "never long enough." "There is never enough time to complete the reading," wrote one Fellow, and continued, "I'm still reading." However, another Fellow wrote,

The reading period was entirely adequate because I finally started reading when I was supposed to.

A third Fellow mentioned the role of his seminar leader during the reading period:

I read and used over half of the books recommended. I discussed, quite often, my choice of reading with my seminar leader and he was quite helpful, especially with the refinement of my topic.

During the first two months of the program, all Fellows also met together for a series of talks each Tuesday afternoon after school. As in the past, although some Fellows were impatient with the talks and wished that we could schedule a greater number of seminar meetings instead, many of the Fellows recognized the purpose for which the talks are planned, and felt that the talks accomplished this purpose. They described the talks as "pertinent," "very informative," "thought-provoking," "intellectually stimulating," and "exciting." "The talks continue to serve as an intellectual renewal," wrote one. "The talks helped to broaden and stimulate my thinking," wrote another.

A third wrote,

The principal value of the talks was letting us sample the wide range of topics offered. I feel they give room for thought about future seminar topics and presenters. I appreciate the thought, humor, and insight which were parts of most presentations.

A Fellow participating in the program for the first time characterized the talks as "one of the nicest parts of the Institute":

I was delighted with all the talks. Each in its own way was a joy and I would be hard pressed to choose which one to serve as a model. One of the frustrations of being in New Haven and not of Yale is the knowledge that so many authorities in so many fields are right here and we never get near them. The opportunity to hear these folks talk about their areas of expertise is a marvellous intellectual experience.

Many returning Fellows commented that, as one wrote, "The talks were the best yet."

The lecture series was outstanding this year.

The lecture series was pertinent and outstanding this year. The talks by the various professors were generally interesting and stimulating.

I felt that the talks stimulated my thought process and prepared me for the upcoming seminar meetings. The subjects of the lectures were informative and stimulating. I felt that the response by teachers was far more receptive than last year.

As always, the central activity of the Institute was the seminars. Eleven weekly meetings were scheduled in addition to the March and April meetings mentioned above. The seminars have two overall objectives: the further preparation of teachers in 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. Many Fellows, in describing their seminar experience, focused on their seminar leader as the main element in the seminar's success. One Fellow described his seminar leader as "tremendously knowledgeable and able to communicate his knowledge easily." Another described his as "informed and dynamic, very open to suggestion and discussion of ideas." Others wrote:

Our seminar leader was enthusiastic and helpful. There was always sufficient individual meeting time made available to meet. There was enough room always for changing ideas, discussing ideas, and supporting new ideas.

I sincerely believe that our seminar leader acted as a pure teacher by giving the seminar participants a wealth of background information and then letting the group trade their own ideas on the particular subject. My expectations were high and they were fulfilled.

In characterizing his seminar leader, another Fellow described how, in practice, the two objectives of his seminar were accomplished.

Our seminar leader was excellent! The content of each meeting and his comments and encouragement helped me to understand the materials and to be able to relate them to the unit I was writing. The members of the seminar were well chosen and seemed to be concerned and creative teachers. My individual contact with my seminar leader was both informative and encouraging.

Many Fellows described, in particular, the collegial rapport on which the Institute depends:

My seminar was excellent, and our small group was quite compatible. We really enjoyed each other's company.

If there is such a thing as a perfect seminar, then I experienced it this summer. Our leader was learned, sensitive, enthusiastic, with a wealth of scholarship and expertise which he generously injected into the seminar. My peers in the seminar were all extremely well-read, marvelously opinionated, very active participants in the seminar process. From the very first meeting we were an extremely cohesive group, very supportive of each other, and eager to learn from each other. I came away feeling I had made seven new friends.

Our seminar owes its success, in large part, to two factors: our leader and the format. The seminar was participatory--we took part, rather than sitting back and taking things in. We became increasingly responsible for seminar content and topics.

My seminar leader was a first time participant; however, he was so well prepared you would never have guessed. I was really impressed by his dedication to the Institute and his caring attitude toward all members of the seminar. We Fellows were a very diversified group which could have been a formidable challenge for a member of the University faculty but the seminar leader wove us seemingly effortlessly into a strong integrated functioning group.

Describing his seminar leader as "wonderful," another Fellow wrote,

Our professor was obviously totally committed not only to the whole idea of this Institute, but to the teaching field in general. To work with someone who is so obviously excited about his field and about teaching is uplifting to other teachers. He was thoroughly approachable and seemed sincerely delighted by our work. It was also wonderful for me to work with someone of his caliber on filling in some gaps in my own studies in my field. I have to say that I didn't expect a Yale professor to be such a warm, down-to-earth human being. There was none of the ivory tower evident and had there been I would not have felt nearly so positive about the whole experience.

Yale faculty members also wrote about what they gained from leading a seminar in the Institute. One said, "Teaching this seminar was one of the most enjoyable and profitable experiences of my professional career," and explained:

The seminar differed from my Yale classes in being much more freewheeling, with much more referring of literature to people's experience of life; and it was more collegial.

I feel I made a number of good friends. I got both intellectual and social refreshment from exchanging ideas and experiences with middle- and high-school teachers. I like their humane, unpretentious approach to literature; they are really much more realistic than most college English teachers about why we read literature and what we seek in it. The great strength lies in reciprocal value: Yale teachers learn from New Haven teachers, and New Haven teachers learn from Yale teachers.

Another faculty member also described the unique exchange that occurs in Institute seminars:

In certain respects the seminar discussion went deeper and wider into the subject than any of my Yale seminars. The participants were extraordinarily candid and thoughtful in their contributions to class. This seminar was marked by a consistently lively give-and-take in which teachers listened seriously to one another and rethought their views as time passed. They were unafraid to draw upon their own personal experiences in approaching the texts, and one could literally see the impact of the texts upon their sense of their own experience.

He concluded,

I benefitted immensely from the seminar. The discussions deepened my understanding of and appreciation of texts and a tradition that I teach (in somewhat different ways and with somewhat different results) at Yale. Not only did I learn a great deal about Afro-American culture, but my sense of it as a living tradition was strengthened. My seminar experience this time did more than add to the net amount of knowledge on both sides of the table. It restored and revived (at least in my case) the promise of cross-cultural conversations in this community.

As described in our 1984 Annual Report, we have reorganized the structure of teacher leadership in the Institute for this year, making Institute Representatives in each school responsible for the day-to-day operation of the Institute within the schools. Fellows' evaluations reveal that this new structure has proved effective. Fellows described their School Representatives as "supportive," "available," and "very helpful from the beginning to the end."

The Institute Representative was quite rewarding to have around. The answers to my questions were always prompt which was a great incentive for me to keep working to complete the task which I had before me.

Having more people involved in the mechanics of the program means a better sense of teacher "control."

I feel our Representative did a fine job. Conversations were frequent; attention was paid. I appreciate how readily material was available.

The School Representative first interested me in joining the Institute. His enthusiasm and the topic offered were the key factors in my decision to join the group.

Our Representative was very supportive and enthusiastic. In fact I might not have taken the seminar without her encouragement and support. She was always there to answer questions and assist in ideas.

Our Institute Representative kept us aware of Institute materials and services that were available to us; and gave support to us, who were new-comers in the program, when the going sometimes got rough.

The Representatives' new role has enabled the smaller group of Institute Coordinators to continue to oversee the day-to-day operation of the Institute while becoming more deeply involved in long-range planning, fundraising, program evaluation, and national dissemination. This has been particularly beneficial because of the increased demands on the Institute to assist other institutions that are developing similar programs, and because of the new evaluation activities we are undertaking. (See this report's sections on Program Evaluation and National Recognition and Dissemination.)

In their role with respect to the operation of the program in New Haven, the Coordinators prepared a monthly newsletter, distributed sometimes to Fellows only and sometimes to all teachers in the schools. As one Fellow wrote, the newsletter "kept us informed of all the current activities within the Institute, and reminded us of upcoming dates and deadlines." The Coordinators also decided that we should prepare a topical index to all the units Fellows have written in the Institute since 1978, a project that is now nearing completion.

Guided by their review of Fellows' evaluations of this year's program, the Coordinators have already met to tackle the schedule for the coming year with careful attention to the school calendar. Many Fellows had pointed out that a conflict between the due date for the first draft and the ending of the school term presented special difficulties in curriculum writing. This conflict resulted from a change in the school calendar after the Institute calendar had been set. Accordingly, Coordinators adjusted the due dates for the various drafts so that any changes in the school calendar will not create such a conflict in the future. To encourage Fellows to begin their writing earlier, the due date for the prospectus has been set three weeks earlier. The first draft will be due two weeks earlier, so it cannot conflict with end-of-term duties. The second draft will be due one week earlier, to allow Fellows more time for revision before the final version of the unit is due.

In keeping with our reorganization and enlargement of the structure of teacher leadership in the Institute, during the period of seminar meetings between March and July we added to the group of six Coordinators four more

teachers, so that there would be at least one Coordinator in each of the seminars. In this way, we established a liaison between the seminars and the group of Coordinators, enabling them to evaluate the progress of the seminars and give progress reports at the Coordinators' weekly meetings, to report to seminar members information about the program schedule and Institute activities, to resolve any scheduling or administrative problems, and to facilitate the smooth operation of the seminars. When, in 1977, we originally devised our administrative structure to reflect the primacy of teachers, we hoped, at the most practical level, to use peers to solve problems of absence of lateness, in order to avoid placing Yale faculty members in positions of authority. Fellows' evaluations of their Seminar Coordinators indicate that they have performed their role sensitively, providing teacher leadership without diminishing the collegial relationship within each seminar. Three Fellows wrote:

Seminar Coordinators were low-key, encouraging, informative and always one of our group. They never placed themselves in any other role or position to differentiate themselves from us. They inspired and led by example, commitment and willingness to listen to suggestions.

The teacher who served as the coordinator for my seminar was good in the collaborative role. He communicated very well with his fellow members.

Our seminar coordinator was incredibly helpful to me. She listened to ideas, always answered questions, gave great suggestions, and was supportive when I almost felt like giving up. She was very sympathetic to my needs particularly since I am a first-year Fellow.

The Fellows' final curriculum units, due July 31, 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 the individual units. The Guide has been widely circulated in all schools so that Fellows and other teachers can identify and request the units they will use in their classrooms. On October 8, as we did for the first time last year, we held a reunion for all Institute Fellows and seminar leaders. As before, this event was greeted with warmth and enthusiasm. It provided an 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 Seminar Coordinators, who now have responsibility for the public presentation of each seminar's units to groups of teachers in the Institute and in the schools. Thus, a seminar's work is now presented by one teacher, the Seminar Coordinator, rather than by teams of seminar members as in the past, a method that proved cumbersome to arrange. Concomitantly, we have placed greater stress upon the role of the Representative within each school in promoting Institute unit use on a daily and ongoing basis. It is now a prominent part of the School Representatives' responsibility to become familiar with all Institute-developed units and to inform all teachers in their schools about Institute materials available in the subjects they teach.

In their evaluations, this year's Fellows described in detail the ways in which they expect their work in the program to strengthen their teaching and their students' learning. Their responses show that they believe their participation in the Institute will have an impact not only in their own classrooms, but in those of other teachers as well. The following comments typify their views--the pride they take in their units and the enthusiasm that they want to pass on to their students and to their colleagues in the schools:

I'm going to implement my unit shortly after school begins; it'll be a pleasure to use the knowledge and confidence (of and in a topic I've avoided in the past) I've gained in seminar. I feel the Institute's impact is growing in my school--more people are involved in the Institute directly or reading (and using) units.

My unit will be implemented after the first marking period. I believe that the Institute program helps strengthen the academic achievement of my students. My unit is a big plus, and I believe can be very helpful and useful to other teachers as well.

I can't wait for school to open! The material in my unit is thoroughly new in approach; tailored to the academic needs and intellectual maturation of my students; contains detailed lesson plans that will cover about two of the four marking periods of the coming school year. I am going to love sharing this unit with my students. I'm sure they will be enthusiastic about the materials and the approach newly available to them. Teaching this year should be more stimulating than ever.

I am extremely excited about it. I believe that many teachers will want to use it.

I plan to use my unit as an entire year project with my eighth grade classes. The Institute program was incredibly helpful in aiding me in developing an entire school year curriculum for eighth grade that will benefit not only my classes but Music, Dance, English, and Social Studies. I don't think any teacher could ask any more from one course of study.

The research I was able to do through the Institute was invaluable in preparing sources now available for students which I would not ordinarily have time or resources to do on my own. Since this unit fits beautifully into an area not thoroughly covered in the World History textbook, I would project heavy usage by other World History teachers in the system.

I will use the unit probably two days a week for an eight week period. The Institute's program gives me a chance to learn and study in depth a subject I might either leave out

of my teaching, or struggle with in a hit or miss way. The more you know about a subject, the more confident you are about teaching it and the more interesting you will make it for students.

This year's unit more than any other I've written, has changed my philosophy about and approach to teaching world cultures. It has widespread applicability for most of what I teach and I can imagine, even now, other units in which I will use the technique and approach described in this year's unit. I am sure that several other teachers in my school, who are not Institute Fellows, will also learn to use the technique as I am in a variety of team teaching positions.

I feel certain that other teachers will use the unit which I developed as they have in the past. It will certainly enrich the reading and writing assignments of students taking American literature. The unit will be used as part of the American literature program and will take about three or four weeks. Using other units and my own will greatly improve and enrich the English curricula.

Fellows' comments show that they believe their work in the Institute will have a significant effect upon teaching and learning in the schools. This year, however, their comments also express more strongly than in the past a feeling that the Institute's stipend is modest in view of the program's demands on their time.

I think that the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute is an excellent program which will ultimately benefit the students of New Haven. The only criticism I have concerning the Institute is in regards to the amount of stipend. I don't think that the current amount is commensurate to the amount of time involved in researching and writing a curriculum unit.

I feel that the honorarium checks are too low considering how much time and work goes into writing of the unit. I think that the State will make paid summer programs available where teachers will be paid more money for less work. I would like to see the Institute remain competitive. I realize you are offering a terrific opportunity, but teachers need more money.

Another Fellow put it even more urgently:

The Institute should consider the amount of time and labor put into the projects, seminars, and talks compared to the "honorarium" paid to the teachers. It is grossly inadequate. It is great to work with Yale faculty, and having access to the Yale Library is wonderful. Money is not everything, but it helps pay the mortgage. Honor teachers with an honorarium that is worthy of their labor.

There has been an increase, albeit very small, in the number of professional development opportunities available to teachers in this area. Although such opportunities are still extremely limited, and open to only a few participants from our city, New Haven teachers nevertheless are hearing of less time-consuming programs that offer higher stipends. We will therefore be especially concerned in our future fundraising to attempt to increase the amount of the Institute's stipend. Fellows in our program should be compensated as generously as possible, in order to keep their participation both demanding and professionally important. On the other hand, we do not want to raise the stipend to a level that would yield a budget which we could not support on a long-term basis. Nor do we want, for financial reasons, to have to reduce the yearly number of Fellows in the Institute. We want to continue to be able to accept all New Haven secondary school teachers who wish to take part and who can demonstrate that their work in an Institute seminar will have direct application in their school classrooms. While our stipend may be comparatively low, teachers may receive the stipend repeatedly, as the Institute becomes part of their professional lives. We believe, in short, that a continuing Institute can better serve both Fellows and students than a program offering more money to participants on a one-time basis.

In view of the present level of the stipend, it seems clear that teachers participate in our program, a program they find so demanding, primarily for reasons other than the remuneration they receive. In summing up their experience in the Institute this year, Fellows expressed the reasons they take part, and wish to continue to take part, in the program. As in the past five years, one-third of Institute Fellows were participating for the first time. Four of these new Fellows wrote:

Although my seminar was an incredible challenge to my time, energy, and creativity, I am glad to have the opportunity to work with a Yale professor and other New Haven educators as well as my own colleagues. I was given a rare opportunity to explore new ways to better teach and introduce new material into my classroom. I know that my school, my students, my colleagues, and myself will benefit from the Institute experience. I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Since I was new to the Institute this year, I didn't have a clear idea of how the program functioned. I found it to be a very challenging and enriching experience which I hope to share with my students and other teachers.

This was an opportunity for me to update my background information on poetry. I graduated from college in 1964 and I have only been in the classroom for nine years. Except for professional journals and New York Times Book Review, I have not had much opportunity to read the essays, lectures, criticisms, etc. being written today on poetry. This year's seminar had a great impact upon me by affording me an opportunity to greatly increase my knowledge of the subject of poetry--a subject I teach each year I'm in the classroom.

The Institute is beneficial for all teachers. It does help teachers' ability to teach their subject and it is helpful when teachers are enrolled in a graduate program. I recommend it highly. I expected the program to be a challenge, and it was indeed. This is my first time ever being in an Institute program. It was quite an experience and I worked hard and enjoyed it.

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 rewarding part of their professional lives:

The Institute is an important source of strength for the New Haven public schools. Its strength is that it provides for teachers (1) contact with academically sound ideas and examples, (2) a chance to work together, and (3) new material for their classrooms. I have been a Fellow for several years. Each year I have been able to better use the process and improve my functioning as a teacher.

The greatest strength of the Institute for me is the intellectual stimulation. I think all teachers feel the need for refueling from time to time. Teaching can be very exhausting. You can feel depleted and used up. The seminars have been revitalizing for me.

I did the Institute last year and this. Both times I have left the Institute with a feeling that I have learned a great deal, not only about the subject matter, but about teaching and learning, about other teachers and schools in New Haven and about Yale facilities. Probably the most important aspect is that in each case the seminar has been like opening a door to a whole new area of learning and way of understanding the world which has allowed me to continue learning relevant to my teaching. I very much appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Institute and feel it to be a great benefit both professionally and personally.

I thoroughly enjoyed my time with the Institute this year, from the talks through the final draft. I gained a lot: knowledge, insight, ideas, and confidence. It's akin to my first (and best) year in the Institute: a wonderful seminar leader, challenging readings, lively discussions, and lots of hard work! While my expectations were high for this year, they were surpassed!

The Institute is an important institution in the lives of at least 80 teachers in New Haven every year. The sense of well-being and honor we gain as Fellows affects us

personally, is transfused into our students and is even spread to other teachers and staff. The Institute makes teachers feel like we should--like professionals.

The requirements seemed very burdensome, especially researching both the seminar subject and the unit topic, and meeting the due dates in preparing the curriculum unit. On the whole though, the Institute greatly enhances one's teaching ability and program. I think that I am a much more interesting teacher because of my involvement with the Institute. I expected to work very hard, to read a great deal of good literature and to be intellectually enriched. Thus the Institute fulfilled all my expectations and even more. I enjoyed this year's program more than previous years' because of my experience and confidence. I knew that I was capable of fulfilling the requirements and doing a good job. Moreover, since I knew that many teachers at my school had used my previous units and that they had found them rewarding, I felt more motivated to continue and meet the challenge.

In closing, I would like to applaud and thank the Institute for all it has done to improve my own teaching abilities and improvements to education as a whole. I thoroughly enjoy and love the Institute and annually look forward to its arrival in spring with excitement and enthusiasm. I view it as one of the most rewarding associations I have formed. Its goals, objectives, and programs express a respect and recognition of the work and abilities of teachers that does not appear elsewhere.

It happened again! Eight summers with the Yale-New Haven Institute have been completed with the usual feeling of pleasure--pleasure in the Institute process itself and with the finished product, the unit I will be introducing in my classroom in September. During the past eight years I have had many opportunities and experiences that I feel have been most instrumental in keeping me growing as an individual and as a teacher. As a twenty-three year veteran of the New Haven Public Schools, I might very well be in bad shape: a victim of burn-out professionally, dead wood, of little value to my faculty or to my students. Because of my participation in the Institute, I feel very good about myself and about my ability to function as a good teacher in the classroom and as a leader in instructional excellence on my faculty.

Program Evaluation

As the movement for university-school collaboration continues to gain momentum across the country; as this movement becomes more sharply focused on excellence in teaching in public schools; and as numerous collaborative programs, many with the Institute's assistance and following the Institute's model, are being established in other communities, it is vitally important that we deepen our understanding of the ways in which such programs can strengthen teaching and learning in public schools. If, in fact, this movement is to be sustained, in New Haven and elsewhere, collaborative programs must present persuasive evidence of their results. Yet little has been done to develop the most appropriate and fruitful approaches for studying collaborative programs. The Institute therefore has a responsibility as one of the most visible collaborative programs, as well as an opportunity as the program of longest duration, to attempt to make a significant contribution to educators and policy makers working in this vein.

From its inception, the Institute has acted on the belief that continuous evaluation by participants and others is indispensable to the ongoing development of this educational experiment and to assuring that the program remains responsive to the needs of New Haven teachers and their students. By 1984, however, the teachers in the leadership of the Institute, among others, came to believe that, although we had learned a great deal from evaluation practices used in the past, the return from these practices was diminishing. The results were increasingly predictable. Moreover, these practices have been insufficient to describing fully the complicated, varied, and subtle educational changes resulting from the program. As we continued to present the program to other educators from across the country, this became increasingly apparent.

To assist us with the further evaluation, national dissemination, and development of the program, we formed in 1984 a National Advisory Committee composed of fifteen distinguished educators and philanthropists. We also reorganized the University Advisory Council on the Teachers Institute to focus on the same three topics, and formed a committee on evaluation. At the same time, we restructured the teacher leadership within the program to allow the Institute Coordinators to devote considerable attention to evaluation, dissemination, fundraising, and long-range planning.

During the 1984-1985 school year, each of these groups--the National Advisory Committee, the University Advisory Council, and Institute Coordinators--have worked on planning a series of studies on the ways in which university-school collaboration can strengthen teaching and learning in schools. In particular, the studies will investigate further the bearing of such programs as the Institute on the preparation, morale, effectiveness, and retention of public school teachers.

In our planning for program evaluation, we have been assisted also by the Educational Testing Service. Winton H. Manning, Senior Scholar at ETS, visited New Haven to meet with Institute participants. In a subsequent report on "Evaluating the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute," Mr. Manning wrote,

It is my belief that valid and scientific evaluation of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute will inevitably press the frontiers of what is known about how to do evaluations of educational programs but that it should nevertheless be undertaken....The Yale-New Haven program has gained new ground by surmounting old barriers between school and college, thereby accomplishing many good and worthwhile things for teachers and students. It would be appropriate to the spirit of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, if in designing a strategy for evaluating the program, new territory would also be added. Good and worthwhile things for all teachers and all schools would surely follow from approaching the challenge of evaluation with the vigor and originality thus far displayed in building the program itself.

Through Mr. Manning's good offices, we were also able to meet with Theodore Chittenden, Samuel Messick, William Turnbull, Irving Sigel, and Guida Wilder, of ETS, to review the preliminary analysis of our 1982 questionnaire and to discuss our plans for future evaluation of the program. It is our expectation that we will continue to be able to call on the remarkable talents of this group.

With the concurrence of the ETS group, we proposed for consideration to the National Advisory Committee, and have now initiated, a series of studies, to be completed over the next three years, that call on suitable multivariate analysis and, even more heavily, on carefully formed narrative accounts of the ways that Institute seminars affect teachers, students, curriculum, and what Seymour Serason has called "the culture of schools."

Following is a preliminary overview of our evaluation activities. These activities are supported by a three-year grant from the Rockefeller Foundation specifically designated for the interrelated activities of evaluation and national dissemination.

Surveys on Curriculum Unit Use

In 1981 we surveyed all New Haven teachers, both those who have been Fellows and those who have not, concerning their use of the curriculum units Fellows prepare. In the spring of 1985, we conducted a similar but more detailed survey, and presently are completing a report on its results. The principal aims of the survey were twofold: to determine the proportions of current teachers in each of the academic disciplines the Institute encompasses who have participated in the program, and to reveal the extent and patterns of use of Institute-developed materials by Institute participants and other teachers in the schools. We were particularly interested in learning whether there are significant differences in the use of units between Fellows and non-Fellows; among humanities, science, and other teachers; and between middle and high school teachers. We also wanted to compare the use of curriculum units by their authors with their use by other teachers. A third question was the pattern of unit use over time--whether a significant number of units

written in the earlier years of the Institute have remained in use. Finally, we wanted to compare the results of the survey in 1985 with our findings in 1981.

Initial analysis of the results of the 1985 survey has revealed the extent of use of Institute-developed materials by Institute participants and other teachers in the schools during the 1984-1985 school year. The number of school classes in which Institute-developed curriculum units are taught has more than doubled since 1982. Institute-developed units are taught in more than fifteen hundred school classes attended by more than thirty thousand students. A third of all New Haven secondary school teachers--whether or not they have been Fellows of the Institute--use Institute-developed units. Furthermore, 71 percent of the teachers who have used the units have used two or more, and 43 percent have used three or more. The overwhelming majority of these teachers (over 97 percent) stated that the curriculum units they had used were both innovative and successful.

Review of Curriculum Units Written between 1978 and 1985

Even though the curricular materials Fellows write are only one aspect of their participation in the program, we obviously are interested in the academic and pedagogical standing of these units. As a first step in reviewing the curricular materials teachers have developed in the program, we prepared a topical index to all of the units. Now we are determining the categories within which we will select units for peer review by university and school teachers. We will also analyze these units for their conformity with Institute Guidelines and for the teaching strategies their authors propose.

Review of Written Evaluations

The testimony of participants at the conclusion of each year's program has been highly constructive, resulting in a number of refinements in the program. We have used these written evaluations annually to plan the coming year's program, but we have not before studied this body of information as a whole. During the coming year we will review retrospectively the responses University and School teachers have written since 1978. We are particularly interested to reveal by content analysis the themes in these evaluations and any changes in the themes over the life of the Institute.

System-wide Study

In 1982 we administered lengthy questionnaires for a more comprehensive examination of the influence of the Institute on teaching and learning in New Haven middle and high schools. The development of these questionnaires was based on what participants had written in their annual evaluations of the program and on an extensive search of pertinent education literature. A high proportion of New Haven teachers responded to this questionnaire and indicated that the Institute has significantly increased Fellows' knowledge of their disciplines, raised their morale, heightened their expectations of their

students' ability to learn, and in turn has improved student learning. In January, 1986, we will readminister this questionnaire with minor refinements made at the suggestion of the ETS group. This will provide us with data about changes in the schools over the life of the Institute and will serve as a baseline for further studies.

Field Study

To probe more deeply the value of the program to the institutions and the teachers involved, we also will construct narrative accounts of the Institute's work. We hope in this way to study and describe the collaborative process of the Institute--the collegueship of University and School teachers in organizing, conducting, and participating in the program--better to depict the educational innovation it represents.

Although the plans for this study are just getting underway, we can, at this stage, broadly outline its form and goals. This study is being designed to yield a richly detailed description of the process of participation in the Institute and of the effects of that process within the New Haven school system and in the careers of the Fellows. This form was chosen specifically for its capacity to produce a systemic view of the Teachers Institute. Our goals are better understanding of 1) the effects of the Institute seminars on the curriculum of Fellows and non-Fellows in the New Haven schools, 2) the effects of Institute participation on intellectual and professional morale of the Fellows, 3) the effects of Institute participation on the Fellows' expectations of their students, and on students' levels of enthusiasm and performance, and 4) the contribution of the Institute to the retention of excellent teachers in the New Haven school system. Our research methods, principally observation and open-ended interview, are intended to complement the objective and essay questionnaires of other studies. We hope that, by observing the processes of unit conceptualization, building, dissemination, and use, we can fill in some gaps in our present knowledge of the way the Institute works. We also anticipate that open-ended interviews with Fellows, seminar leaders, and teachers who are not participating in the Institute will generate new ideas--new themes and questions which would not have arisen in more formal inquiries. This will be a study, in keeping with other aspects of the Institute program, in which the Fellows, the principal subjects, will be active collaborators, contributing to conceptualization of the research and to the research itself.

National Recognition and Dissemination

Recent Dissemination Activities

During the past year, the Institute has continued to play a leading role in the national movement for university-school collaboration. Our dissemination activities during the year have been supported by the Atlantic Richfield Foundation, the NEH, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

In October, 1983, President Reagan launched the National Partnerships in Education Program and proclaimed the school year 1983-84 as the National Year of Partnerships in Education. As a result of the President's initiative, the Department of Education surveyed over 9,300 school districts nationwide to identify existing partnerships. Of the 46,000 partnerships they identified, only 5.2 percent are partnerships involving colleges and universities. Within this relatively small number, the Department in 1985 cited the Teachers Institute as "exemplary" and "among the most substantial and effective." In short, colleges and universities at present play only a small part in the national partnership movement, and, among partnerships involving colleges and universities, the Teachers Institute retains a prominent position.

As a result, we were invited last summer to present our program at the second National Symposium on Private Sector Initiatives, sponsored by the White House. Also last summer, we presented our program at the National Capital Quest Conference of the American Federation of Teachers, in Washington. We attended a "summit" meeting in Chicago of the American Association for Higher Education and advised them about the role they might play by keeping university-school partnerships on their national agenda. We participated in the annual meeting of the College Board Models Program, and in meetings at the University of Michigan, which is developing collaborative activities similar to our program. We helped to plan the 1985 Summer Institute of the Council of Chief State School Officers, a five-day meeting devoted to examining the ways in which collaboration can advance teacher preparation. The meeting was intended to follow up on the 1983 national conference on "Excellence in Teaching," a meeting of the Chiefs with college and university presidents, which our Institute organized to address the role of higher education in strengthening teaching in American schools. At the 1985 conference, the Institute's Director spoke on the wrap-up panel, summarizing what had been said during the week, and describing developments in university-school collaboration since the 1983 meeting. More recently, the Director spoke at a statewide conference of liberal arts colleges in Massachusetts, held at Brandeis University.

We also have continued to meet with individuals from other communities working to establish programs similar to ours. For example, we hosted visits to New Haven by the President of the Community College General Education Association, who is investigating the role his organization can play in fostering collaboration between schools and two-year institutions, and by representatives from Canisius College and the Buffalo Schools, which have developed a collaborative program modeled on our Institute.

Our book, Teaching in America: The Common Ground, has been republished by the College Board and is currently being widely advertised and distributed through them. The book was prepared initially for distribution at the 1983 national conference organized by the Institute and held at Yale. The College Board has sent copies of the book for review to education journals, fliers on the book to officials in education, and press releases to major newspapers.

Perhaps most notably, on October 10 in Washington, the Director presented testimony on the Institute before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities. The Committee is considering legislation that would authorize

a major national program of teachers institutes in the humanities in all the states. The sponsors of the legislation, in their invitation to us and in their own testimony, singled out our program in New Haven as a most successful example of precisely the kind of program they envision the legislation might establish in many communities across the country.

Dissemination Plans

With the opportunities we now face because of the widespread interest in our Teachers Institute, the National Advisory Committee has already been of decisive assistance in advising us on how we might contribute most effectively to universities and schools in other communities. At its first meeting, in February, the Committee was virtually unanimous on this subject: as the first program of its type, they said, the Institute is now in an extremely strong position. Several commented that we should play from that strength and be more assertive. We have, one member said, a public responsibility to allow others to understand the program, but we should not compromise the integrity and quality of our own program by attempting to respond to all of the many requests for our services. Several Committee members strongly urged us to concentrate on what we can accomplish by bringing people to New Haven, and thought we should establish specific criteria for others to meet if they wish to work with us.

One member noted that our choice of the verb "disseminate," instead of "replicate," was important. There was general agreement that we should emphasize dissemination of the process of what the Institute does, not its written product. The principal reason for publishing curriculum units for a wider audience, the Committee advised, is to illustrate the process. The idea of Fellows reworking their past Institute units for national publication was seen as most worthwhile in this respect, and for the value of such revision to the individual participant.

With the Committee's advice in mind, and with the support of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Rockefeller Foundation, we therefore 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. As indicated in the discussion that follows, some of these plans are more fully formed, while others are more tentative and will be the subject of upcoming meetings of the National Advisory Committee, the University Advisory Council, and the teachers who serve as Institute Coordinators.

Program Literature

We want to continue to furnish a list of available materials on the Teachers Institute to anyone who inquires about our program. Except for some volumes of curriculum units that are in short supply, we will 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 other presentations of the Teachers Institute, guides to the curriculum units teachers have written, the 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 Institute brochure that outlines our schedule and activities, and the book that describes the concept, operation, and results of our program, Teaching in America: The Common Ground.

We want also to prepare new literature on the Institute that is more specifically designed to assist other institutions that are establishing similar programs. In developing this literature we will seek the guidance of diverse institutions that already have drawn or presently are drawing on our experience to design their own programs, including, for example, Duke University, Lehigh University, the University of Hartford, the University of California at Berkeley and at Santa Cruz, Canisius College, Virginia Polytechnic, the University of Michigan, the University of New Mexico, and the University of Washington. Individuals at these institutions can help us to identify which aspects of our advice to them have proved most helpful, and to determine what other kinds of materials and assistance would be particularly useful.

The new materials we prepare should include an in-depth analysis of the collaborative process of the Institute, as well as a brief history so that its present state will not look from outside like a fixed canonical model. Something of the dynamism that we cherish in the Institute may be conveyed that way, and people might find at least a wry comfort in the knowledge that we have had our difficult and even false turns.

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

Conferences

Since the Teachers Institute organized the 1983 national conference attended by Chief State School Officers, college and university presidents and chancellors, and foundation officials from 38 states, we have made numerous presentations at national, regional, state, and local conferences. Our presentations have helped bring the Institute to the attention of educators across the country and have been informative to Institute staff and participants because of the perspective we have gained on our work in New Haven.

Though on the one hand we want to continue to be as responsive as we can to requests for presentations at such meetings, on the other we must use our limited time and resources to greatest effect. Because our principal aim is to work most closely with colleagues at other institutions who are seriously interested in establishing similar programs for their own communities, we will--while continuing to make such presentations on a more selective basis--place greater emphasis in the future on sustained personal contacts 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 that are developing their own programs. We have found this to be the most effective means of contributing to the establishment of similar programs elsewhere, and we will pattern our future dissemination activities more systematically along these lines. In terms of our own resources, it has in the past seemed more efficient for a small team of Institute participants--usually including the Director, a school teacher, and a University faculty member--to meet with a large number of individuals in another community, than for us to invite a small team from another community to meet with numerous Institute participants here.

In the future, however, before Institute consulting teams travel, we will require that other communities form teams that include representatives 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 actually to use our advice; this might also encourage other institutions to undertake a more explicit planning process.

Meetings at Yale

Because of the growing number of requests for our assistance, we have considered scheduling as a regular part of the Institute calendar sessions in New Haven with Institute participants for representatives from other institutions. We may establish an annual, two-day workshop for individuals working in the Institute's vein. We have not determined the exact formula for such a workshop, but we feel that there should be a minimum of glamour and a maximum of sleeves-rolled-up, down-to-earth engagement with as many aspects of the central business of the Institute as feasible. The opportunity for "petitioners" to meet one another at these workshops we regard as a distinct bonus. For people who could not come to New Haven, we might create a video cassette on the Institute. Only in a more limited number of cases, then, would we make a site visit.

As more institutions across the country begin to work along these lines and as teachers institutes are established in other communities, we want to develop ways for these programs to share information. We have much to gain from each other. We plan, therefore, to hold in late 1986 a national 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. This may serve, in effect, to inaugurate the series of annual workshops mentioned above.

The support of the National Endowment for the Humanities during the coming year, combined with the three-year support awarded by the Rockefeller Foundation, will be instrumental both in carrying out and in further developing these dissemination activities.

Campaign for Operating and Endowment Support

In its report released in January, 1985, the University Council on Priorities and Planning highlighted the importance of the Institute's endowment campaign and of the long-term continuation of the program. President Giamatti had commissioned the Council to examine Yale's relations with the City of New Haven. The Council chose to address three areas of the "town-gown" relationship; the dominant of these was public education. The Council wrote:

Yale's principal mission is education. Thus it seems only natural that Yale concentrate its community efforts upon helping the local public schools meet the enormous challenge of preparing a significantly poor and undereducated population to compete successfully in America's increasingly technical job market. The benefits of a stronger school system extend, moreover, beyond students assisted directly. Improved public schools provide greater neighborhood stability, make the community a more attractive place to live and create a positive environment for business investment. Both the City and Yale gain appreciably once this process has set in.

The Teachers Institute, in the Council's words, "appear[s] to offer the greatest prospect for making structural improvements in New Haven's public school system." The Institute assumed a prominent position in the Council's discussion of the University's involvement with public education. The Institute, the Council wrote, "deserve[s] to be expanded and sufficiently funded with the University's active assistance to ensure that [it] remains a permanent component of Yale's efforts to improve public education in New Haven." First among the Council's recommendations was their statement that a \$4 million endowment should be established for the Institute.

In their February meeting, the Institute's National Advisory Committee considered our fundraising campaign. With respect to endowment, they stressed the importance of individual giving, which, as one member pointed out,

accounts for 90 percent of all charitable giving in the United States. Committee members emphasized that, for Yale alumni, this endowment campaign would represent an unprecedented kind of appeal. One member said he thought that alumni would definitely be interested in endowing the Teachers Institute because of the importance of New Haven to Yale. Another member stated that individuals who are not Yale alumni should also be interested in endowing the program because of its national importance. During the course of a very full day of discussion, a number of Committee members made strong statements about the importance of the Institute's having an endowment. They spoke of the endowment as demonstrating Yale's long-term involvement in collegiality with school teachers and as insuring Yale's and New Haven's continuing leadership in this area. We believe that individually and as a group our National Advisory Committee can continue to lend great influence and practical assistance to our endowment appeal.

Based in part on the National Advisory Committee's advice, we sought and have received from the College Board a two-year grant which will support the conduct of our endowment campaign. With that support we are undertaking intensive research on individuals who may be major gift prospects. As the Vice President of the College Board has stated,

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute is remarkable because of its sustained commitment to its work. It is a commonplace that waves of reform wash across American education with predictable regularity and disappointing results. Fundamental social change comes not from momentary enthusiasm but from long-term staying power... [A] sign of the Institute's long-term commitment is its effort to raise an endowment so as to become financially self-sustaining.

On March 13, President Giamatti, the Mayor of New Haven, the Superintendent of the New Haven Public Schools, the Chairman of the New Haven Board of Education, the President of the Greater New Haven Central Labor Council, a leading representative of the New Haven business community, and the Institute Director all met to take stock of where we had come during the first seven years and to plan for the future of the Teachers Institute. This meeting provided a strong affirmation that the Teachers Institute represents not only a partnership of the University and our local public school system, but also a partnership with the City administration, business, and labor in our community. All agreed to take a number of steps together to broaden the base of support for the program, as well as to combine our effort to seek operating and endowment funds to ensure its future.

Following this meeting, the University committed an increase in its annual, direct support for the Institute, and the New Haven Public Schools are seeking to increase their direct support for the coming year. We are working now to secure additional operating funds for the interim period until the endowment has been raised. In October, 1985, we were awarded a three-year, \$250,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation to support the Institute's work in the sciences and mathematics through 1988. Also, we have been encouraged by the National Endowment for the Humanities to seek renewed support for

1987-1989. We are now considering such a proposal in the humanities, to complement the support we have received from the Carnegie Corporation. With the three-year program support awarded in 1984 by the Ford Foundation, with the new Carnegie Grant, with the possibility of renewed support from the NEH, and with the increased support we are seeking from our community foundation and other foundations and corporations that have provided annual support, it is possible that we would be able to continue at an undiminished level for the next three years our work both in the humanities and the sciences. In this way we might concentrate on endowment fundraising and add substantially to the Institute's endowment fund that we established this year with a \$50,000 grant from the Carolyn Foundation.