

**Annual Report of  
The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute**

**1986**

## Contents

Teacher Leadership in the Institute. . . . .	1
1986 Institute Program . . . . .	2
Planning for 1987. . . . .	18
Meeting of the National Advisory Committee . . . . .	20
Program Evaluation . . . . .	20
Survey on Curriculum Unit Use. . . . .	21
Annual Evaluation by Fellows . . . . .	22
1987 Survey of Fellows and Other New Haven Teachers. . . . .	24
Review of Curriculum Units . . . . .	26
Ethnographic Field Study . . . . .	28
National Dissemination . . . . .	29
Dissemination Study. . . . .	30
National Conference. . . . .	32
Program Literature . . . . .	34
Dissemination Activities . . . . .	35
Campaign for Operating and Endowment Support . . . . .	36
Appendix . . . . .	40

## Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute 1986 Annual Report

This report describes the operation of teacher leadership in the Institute; our 1986 program for Fellows, drawing especially on the written evaluations submitted by participants; our work in program evaluation; our recent dissemination activities, including the national conference on "Strengthening Teaching through Collaboration" held at Yale in November; and our progress in the campaign for operating and endowment support.

### Teacher Leadership in the Institute

Throughout the year, except in August, the six teachers in the leadership of the program who served as Institute Coordinators met weekly with the director to assist with the organization and conduct of the program. During the spring and fall semesters the twelve teachers who served as Institute Representatives in their schools met monthly. Each Representative had a "contact" person in the Coordinators group with whom he or she talked at least weekly, giving the Coordinators timely information on the Representatives' day-to-day work with teachers in all New Haven middle and high schools.

To help keep teachers informed on Institute activities, the Coordinators prepared periodically, for the Representatives to distribute in the schools, a newsletter on Institute events and materials, and on the Institute program and schedule. The most recent of these newsletters (see appendix) covered the College Board dialogue; the visit to the Institute by Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers; and a news conference held jointly by Yale President Benno C. Schmidt, New Haven Mayor Biagio DiLieto, Superintendent of Schools John Dow, and representatives of the National Endowment for the Humanities, to announce a grant from the NEH to the Institute.

In addition to their work on our 1986 program, the Institute Coordinators were deeply involved in the evaluation of the program and in the planning of the national conference. The Coordinators drew on the professional days available to them for Institute business, financed jointly by the Institute and the Schools; similarly, the Representatives took professional days to work with teachers in their schools. To make it more possible for the Coordinators to use professional days for Institute work, we arranged for particular substitute teachers, in whom the Coordinators had confidence, to be available throughout the year to teach and to follow the progress of their classes. This arrangement was important because of the shortage of qualified substitutes in New Haven, and the consequent reluctance of teachers to miss a day with their students.

Between September 1985 and January 1986 the Representatives canvassed their fellow teachers in each middle and high school to determine the subjects they wanted Institute seminars to address. Each Representative

reported regularly to the Coordinators; in this way the Coordinators maintained a current overview of teachers' interests to inform the selection of seminar subjects. Once the subjects were determined, the director invited Yale faculty members to write descriptions of seminars that addressed teachers' interests. In January the Representatives distributed these seminar descriptions together with application forms, and then assisted teachers in applying to the seminars.

By the application deadline of February 14 the School Representatives had identified the teachers who were prepared to commit themselves to participating fully in the Institute and who wanted to write curriculum units that were clearly related both to a seminar subject and to school courses they teach. As in earlier years, the objective was to select seminar subjects important for strengthening the Schools' core curricula and to shape cohesive seminars so that Fellows would benefit from discussing work-in-progress on one another's units.

The applications from teachers who wished to participate as Institute Fellows were reviewed by three groups. Subject Supervisors and Department Chairmen from the Schools reviewed the applications of teachers from their departments to determine that each proposal was consistent with and significant for the school curriculum, 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 read the applications and commented on their relation to the seminar subject. This afforded each seminar leader the opportunity also to enlarge the seminar bibliography to encompass all the specific interests of teachers applying to the seminar. In order to provide ample time for teachers to be counselled about any necessary reshaping of their proposals, Institute Coordinators held their review in two sessions. They first met immediately after the application deadline to identify problematic applications so that the School Representatives would have ten days in which to work with applicants and to obtain the needed clarification or revision. In a final, all-day meeting the Coordinators considered the results of the administrative and faculty reviews and made recommendations to the director about which teachers the Institute should accept.

### 1986 Institute Program

On March 11 the Institute accepted as Fellows 60 New Haven middle and high school teachers, 44 in the humanities and 16 in the sciences. Consistent with a central aim of the Institute to involve a high percentage of New Haven teachers as Fellows, one-third (21) of these teachers were participating in the program for the first time.

Grants from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the National Endowment for the Humanities provided major support for the Institute program, respectively, in the sciences and in the humanities. In 1986



the Institute received generous support also from the Harlan E. Anderson Foundation, the Bay Foundation, the College Board, the Connecticut Bank and Trust Company, the Ford Foundation, the New Haven Foundation, the Anne S. Richardson Fund, Atlantic Richfield Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Xerox Foundation. The 1986 Institute seminars and the faculty members who led them were:

"Writings and Re-Writings of the Discovery and Conquest of America,"  
led by Roberto Gonzalez-Echevarria,  
Professor of Spanish and Chairman of Spanish and Portuguese

"The Family in Literature,"  
led by Traugott Lawler, Professor of English

"Topics in Western Civilization: Ideals of Community  
and the Development of Urban Life,"  
led by Lawrence Manley, Associate Professor of English

"The Process of Writing,"  
led by Thomas R. Whitaker, Professor of English

"The Measurement of Adolescents, II,"  
led by William Kessen, Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies  
in Psychology; Professor of Pediatrics

"Engineering and Science at Work:  
Coal Combustion and Nuclear Fission as Sources of Electricity,"  
led by Charles A. Walker, Professor Emeritus of Chemical Engineering

Acting in its capacity as the Institute's course-of-study committee, the University Advisory Council on the Teachers Institute met on February 24 and approved these Institute offerings for 1986.

Each seminar held an organizational meeting on March 18, at which the seminar leader distributed a general bibliography and discussed with Fellows a proposed syllabus of readings they would consider as a group. Fellows described the individual curriculum units that they had indicated on their applications they wished to develop. This provided the members of each seminar with an overview of the work they would pursue together and the projects they would undertake individually.

The bibliographies served as an introduction to the seminar subject and a guide to beginning research on curriculum units. Drawing on the bibliographies, Fellows read widely to study the seminar subject generally and to refine their specific unit topics. Before submitting on April 8 a revised unit topic and list of readings to research the topic, each Fellow met individually with his or her seminar leader. The Institute requires at least two such individual conferences during the unit-writing period. In evaluating this year's program, several Fellows commented on the individual assistance their seminar leaders provided.

One wrote, "He was a motivating influence and a fine resource for books, visual art material, and other information pertaining to my unit. He was also available for personal help at my convenience." Another said, "I learned a great deal from him in the course of writing my unit. He was supportive and seemed genuinely intrigued by my topic and my work on it."

At the second seminar meeting on April 8, Fellows discussed their revised unit topics and reviewed and agreed upon a syllabus of common readings for the regular weekly meetings that would begin on May 13. During the next month, Fellows continued their reading, preparing in advance for the weekly meetings and working toward a brief prospectus of what their units would contain, which was submitted on April 29.

Institute Guidelines and mechanical specifications for writing curriculum units were distributed at the beginning of the program in March. The Guidelines outline the Institute writing process, which has five steps for Fellows' formulating, reformulating, and enlarging their individual units. From year to year, Fellows' comments express greater appreciation of this process. "The unit writing was a great experience," wrote one of this year's Fellows. "Each step gave me a different view of what I was accomplishing." Another said, "Writing my curriculum unit has given me strategies for focusing my thoughts and ideas in writing goals, objectives, and units for my student population."

Last year, rather than holding unit-writing workshops for first-time Fellows at the beginning of the program as we had done in the past, we made technical assistance in unit writing available periodically throughout the curriculum-writing period, giving all Fellows 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 opportunities for Coordinators, who are experienced unit writers, to assist Fellows in interpreting and applying Institute Guidelines in developing their units. Because this mode of assistance proved helpful, this year we scheduled such opportunities on a weekly basis.

In addition, because of the favorable response to last year's pilot program of editorial assistance, this year we made editorial assistance in unit writing available to all Fellows on an individual basis. The Coordinators canvassed Fellows before the seminars began and again during the first seminar meeting to determine who wished to receive this assistance. About two-thirds of all Fellows decided to work with the editorial assistants, who are members of Yale's expository writing program and whom we made available to meet for up to ten hours with each of these Fellows during the curriculum-writing period. Initially, the editorial assistants visited the seminars to introduce themselves and describe how they would work with Fellows. As the early unit-writing deadlines approached, Fellows began to request individual conferences, and the assistants telephoned others who had earlier expressed interest to remind them that assistance was available. Numerous Fellows responded

to these calls, and in several instances an assistant visited Fellows at their schools to confer with them.

During the course of the editorial process the number of meetings the assistants held with individual Fellows varied, as did the points in unit-writing at which Fellows sought assistance. In March and April the assistants helped some Fellows to define their individual projects and to decide what steps to take in beginning research. Most of the assistants' advice, however, was provided when Fellows were working on the first and second drafts of their units. The assistants responded to Fellows' first drafts, helping them to determine what changes needed to be made and what remained to be written. The types of revision discussed at this stage ranged from minor editing to major reorganization. Some Fellows, after an initial meeting, did not schedule conferences again until the final phase of polishing their units, while others continued to meet with the assistants to rethink and rewrite their units. These sessions concerned the relationship between form and content and focused on identifying what new materials should be added, where it would fit, and how it would contribute to the logical development of the unit.

In their evaluations of the program this year, many Fellows chose to comment on the value of the editorial assistance. One Fellow wrote, "For the first time in my life, I was able to utilize a professional editor for my writing. Although my writing style has been muffled I was pleased to know that I am still able to produce somewhat quality work." Another Fellow said that working with the editorial assistant was "the most beneficial aspect of the Institute," and explained, "The chance to discuss the unit with someone not in the seminar was as important as the writing/editing assistance. Both activities helped me define my topic better--in my head and on paper." A third Fellow commented, "For me, personally, the writing assistance program helped enormously....A couple of hours with [the editorial assistant] gave me the confidence and organizational skills I needed, and I know I'm not alone. If the public expects good writing skills from students, it must begin with teachers." Fellows who had participated also in last year's pilot program wrote:

The editorial assistance, which I have used for the past two years, is extremely useful. I am more "in touch" with the thought process, and my writing has improved.

My editor assistant was once again the best because of her expertise and her abilities to "read my mind"--or was it "between the lines" of my unit. She was undoubtedly my "right hand" through this unit.

Another essential aspect of the seminars is working with the writing assistant. I can't say enough about her. She is an excellent editor. She's genuinely interested in working with us and her enthusiasm is inspiring. I have learned a great deal from her. Having writing assistance is necessary

to writing the curriculum units. I am much more satisfied with my unit this year (and last year!) than I have been in the past; and I attribute this satisfaction to working with [her]!

The editorial assistants themselves expressed appreciation for the opportunity to work with the Fellows. One wrote, "It was, indeed, a pleasure....In those [Fellows] who worked with me a number of times, I saw a great deal of progress and pride in their work, all of which was most rewarding." In writing about their experience in the Institute, the assistants said:

Almost all the Fellows were initially very reluctant to expose their writing to what they perceived as a negative critical eye....Yet once the process got going, they were overwhelming in the gratitude they showed us....The participating teachers vary tremendously; some clearly need much more editorial assistance than others. Working with [those who most needed help] presented the greatest challenge and, correspondingly, the greatest reward.

The first two months of the program afforded Fellows a reading period during which they read extensively on the seminar subject and intensively on the topics of the units they were developing. Thereafter, Fellows continued to read about both the general seminar subjects and their specific unit topics. Fellows' comments this year indicate that, as in the past, the challenge for many was to find enough time for the all the reading they wanted to do. One Fellow wrote, "At first, I was overwhelmed by the reading assignments because I find very little time to sit and read. But as the time passed I was able to discipline myself to read a certain number of pages daily."

Also during the first two months of the program, all Fellows met together for a series of talks on Tuesday afternoons after school. Following the suggestion of Fellows evaluating the program in recent years, the Coordinators decided this year to ask three seminar leaders to speak in the Institute lecture series on a topic drawn from their seminar subjects. In this way, they thought, all Fellows would be acquainted with the work their colleagues were pursuing in other seminars. The talks and speakers were "Liberal Education: Literacy and Numeracy" by Charles A. Walker, "Cortes's Letters to the King" by Roberto Gonzalez-Echevarria, and "Growing Up in History and Literature" by Traugott Lawler.

On April 30 the Institute and the New Haven Federation of Teachers sponsored a visit to New Haven by Albert Shanker. A main purpose of his visit was to learn first-hand about the experiences of public school teachers and Yale faculty members in the Institute. He met in the morning with President A. Bartlett Giamatti and Institute Coordinators, and talked over lunch with about 40 Coordinators, School Representatives,

and Yale faculty members who have led Institute seminars. He then gave a public address, as part of the Institute lecture series. Institute Fellows and many other New Haven teachers heard Mr. Shanker speak, and questioned him, about his proposals for restructuring the teaching profession.

In addition, as a special event in this year's lecture series, the Institute sponsored jointly with the College Board a dialogue on May 6 in which more than 150 teachers and administrators from the New Haven Public Schools and faculty members from Yale University discussed the knowledge and skills students should acquire in secondary school in order to succeed in college and in the world of work. The dialogue focused on improving students' understanding of and competence in English, social studies, science, and mathematics, by considering the College Board's new publications on the academic preparation of secondary school students in these subjects. The Institute Coordinators, who helped to plan and conduct the meeting, wanted the dialogue not to be an isolated event, but rather one which would stimulate further discussion in Institute seminars.

As background for the dialogue, Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do was distributed at the first meeting of each seminar and was briefly explained to the Fellows by the Coordinators. At the second meeting of the seminars, each Fellow received the book in the Academic Preparation Series for the field in which he or she was working. Coordinators pointed out the parts of the book which the dialogue would emphasize and encouraged Fellows to consider whether the Series might apply to their work in seminar and to the curriculum units they would write.

Institute Representatives in each school canvassed New Haven teachers who were not Institute Fellows to learn whether they also wanted to attend the dialogue. The Institute sent personal letters of invitation to all teachers who expressed interest, and to New Haven Public Schools administrators, Yale faculty members, and others in our community concerned with public education. To all who responded that they would attend we mailed Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know And Be Able To Do, the book on the academic subject in which they were particularly interested, and materials on the College Board's Educational Equality Project.

Adrienne Y. Bailey, Vice President of Academic Affairs of the College Board, opened the meeting with an address on "Teacher Dialogue as a Step Toward Improved Classroom Practice." Remarking on the Institute, Ms. Bailey has said:

The Institute is animated by the co-professionalism of teachers in the New Haven Public Schools and teachers on the faculty of Yale University. The co-professionalism of this mutually enriching engagement is reflected in the Institute's organizational arrangements. Control is



shared. Topics for the seminars are generated by the secondary school teachers. Both school teachers and university faculty members contribute their special expertise to the seminars and to the curriculum materials prepared in the program. As an association of schools and colleges, the College Board has a high regard for such cooperation.

In her speech, Vice President Bailey said, "Like our EQ project, the Institute is committed to the joint goals of quality as well as equality. Achieving both of these goals is an important and a tough problem. And yet the Institute has faced this challenge with dedication, with sensitivity, and with long-term vision." She expressed the hope that the dialogue would serve as the beginning of an ongoing discussion in New Haven.

Four concurrent sessions on the academic subjects addressed by the dialogue were then led by panels consisting of an Institute Coordinator as moderator, one or more New Haven Public Schools teachers of the subject being discussed, a Schools subject supervisor or chairman, one or more Yale faculty members leading Institute seminars in the subject, and a school or college teacher from the College Board Academic Advisory Committee that developed the Academic Preparation book on the subject. The sessions concentrated on issues in teaching each subject, and some themes emerged among them. (See appendix for the dialogue program and a report that includes a summary of each session.) In all four sessions teachers were concerned with the issue of balancing content and competencies in their teaching and their evaluation of students; with demographic changes in the student population and the importance of meeting the needs of a wider range of students to ensure that the opportunity to enter and to succeed in college will be accessible to all; with possibilities for teaching academic competencies in an interdisciplinary way; and with school teachers' need for time to meet together and with university faculty members, as they do in Institute seminars, in order to address these and other educational issues.

Following the concurrent sessions, participants heard brief summaries and discussed the main points that had emerged. At dinner participants were seated at small tables according to the session they attended, so that discussion might continue.

In an after-dinner address George H. Hanford, President of the College Board, spoke on "Ensuring Access to Excellence." Mr. Hanford, who has cited the Teachers Institute as "an excellent example of how the nation's schools and colleges may address the needs of the increasing numbers of at-risk students in the schools," praised the Institute as one of the few efforts that have "seriously sought to enter the classroom and ask those who deal with educational problems directly, concretely, day by day, what, in fact, works and what does not work."

In the week following the dialogue, on May 13 the seminars began their weekly Tuesday meetings, which continued through July 22. As in the past, during the period of seminar meetings we enlarged the group of Coordinators so that there would be at least one Coordinator in each seminar. This enabled the Coordinators as a group to discuss the seminars at their weekly Thursday meetings, and to resolve any problems that arose. In this way the Coordinators facilitated the smooth operation of the seminars, providing teacher leadership without diminishing the collegial rapport within each seminar.

To discuss the progress of the seminars, the seminar leaders as a group also met at least monthly with the director. As in the past, these meetings proved particularly valuable for the opportunity they provided first-time seminar leaders to discuss the conduct of their seminars with faculty members who had led Institute seminars previously.

Each seminar must balance two primary objectives: further preparation of teachers through study of the seminar subject, and application of their new learning by development of curriculum units on specific topics for use in their own and other teachers' classrooms. One Fellow describes how, in practice, these two objectives were accomplished:

As a first time seminar leader, our professor did an outstanding job. If anything, he was overprepared; his enthusiasm and desire to complete important points often kept us beyond our normal meeting time. This is not to be critical, but to point out his dedication to the subject and determination to see that all participants were served. Our seminar leader was challenged by the task of weaving a variety of Fellows' topics into the seminar's theme and constructing discussion topics that flowed evenly, logically, and were meaningful.

In evaluating their experience in this year's seminars, other Fellows wrote:

It was a thoroughly enjoyable seminar and I view it as one of my most positive accomplishments (almost spiritual) this year.

The seminar was a totally rewarding experience. I learned a lot, and just trading ideas with the seminar leader and the other Fellows was enjoyable. I seriously believe I have grown intellectually.

On the whole, I would say it was one of the best experiences in seminar I have had. I enjoyed the reading very much. I re-read books and poetry I hadn't read in a very long time and was introduced to books I had always meant to read but "hadn't gotten around to." It was very good to hear the other planned units, and I think some exciting and unusual units came out of this seminar.

From the beginning to the end of my seminar I was stimulated both intellectually and imaginatively. I found I was constantly receiving new ideas from my fellow teachers and my seminar leader.

Many Fellows spoke of the seminar leader as central to their seminar's success:

He is a perfect seminar leader who adds greatly to the experience with his knowledge and wit. I look forward to being in future seminars with him.

He provided a very comfortable, accessible, and intellectually stimulating environment. His good humor and keen insight were true assets in providing me as well as the group a solid base from which to explore our topic. His positive criticism was helpful for me in unlocking resources within myself regarding interpretation and writing (content and style).

He supplied us with many ideas for future readings. He laid the groundwork and presented the material in a very well-prepared, well-thought-out manner. I think his enthusiasm spilled over, not only to me, but to the other Fellows too.

Our seminar leader was always open to suggestions, available for meetings, willing to help, understanding of the teacher's perspective, and of course, well versed in his academic field. Unit comments were positive and helpful.

This is my first year in the Institute. I was very happy to find that our seminar leader was as enthusiastic about our curriculums as we were. His love and knowledge of the subject were very helpful and made it a joy to be in his company.

I found my seminar leader cordial and respectful in guiding what might have been a more difficult task. His own humility in regards to his limitations about my own areas of teaching will serve as a model for me in the future. Yet, his willingness to offer what he was able to from his own areas of expertise and scholarly investigations in comparable areas provided sufficient direction for me to achieve my goals. This relationship was particularly pleasing in that what had appeared too distant had become, in the end, so proximate.

I must confess that the best part of the Institute this year was working with our seminar leader. He is an enthusiastic and inspiring teacher.



Fellows also stressed the value of the contact among school teachers within the seminar:

In the beginning I found my seminar too diverse: too many teachers from too many different levels. However, by the end of the seminar I found I learned a great deal about the teaching of writing as it occurs in the lower levels. This exposure was important because I began to understand my students' backgrounds more.

My favorite sessions were toward the end when each of the teachers selected a piece of literature from their unit to be read and discussed by the group. These sessions really brought the seminar to life and helped each of us in better understanding the topic and one another's work.

As a first-year participant I found that coming together and working with teachers from other schools was very positive. We were able to share our ideas and experiences in school and out and to disagree without feeling like an outcast.

Participants took part in discussion based on common readings as well as discussions based on work in progress. I learned much from other teachers this year. I feel that these "teacher discussions" must be an integral part of the program. We have much to learn from one another; since the school system is unable to provide us with adequate time to hold such discussions, it falls upon the Institute to do so.

Through my Institute participation, I have met other teachers from various schools and subject areas. It has been an enlightening experience. We need to share with our peers as much as possible! I'm pleased to say that I have more friends and acquaintances in this large system. This will affect me only with positive energy.

In their evaluations many new and returning Fellows commented especially on the collegiality of their Institute experience. First-time Fellows wrote:

I found the seminar beneficial in a number of ways. As a first-year teacher it was a very important experience in being accepted professionally. Sharing ideas and problems with other teachers meant I was part of a group--a camaradery. Besides feeling validated as a teacher I found the experience, as a whole, intellectually stimulating.

The Institute has a positive overall strength for newcomers. It makes you take notice of your shortcomings without making you feel you don't belong. I enjoyed the Institute thoroughly.

Returning Fellows wrote:

[The seminar leader] conducted the seminars as a collaborating professional rather than subjecting us to teacher-pupil status. We had invigorating discussions, which I found directly assisted me with my unit.

One of the Institute's strengths is the camaraderie that grows with each year. This is my second. I know more teachers, thereby my boundaries and awareness have expanded.

This was my third year with the Institute and I felt very comfortable with the technical aspects of the requirements. However, I am really excited about how much I was able to extrapolate from our seminar topic. What I see here is a growing concern among educators for ongoing communication. In the "academic world," especially that of higher education, the tendency toward separatism exists. That is, there is usually academic secrecy or the feeling of superiority in one's own field or specialty. Here there is a constant exchange of ideas and everyone benefits (B.S., B.A., M.S., or Ph.D.).

Yale faculty members also wrote in their evaluations about what they gained from leading a seminar in the Institute. A seminar leader in the humanities said:

The program has put me in touch with interesting people whom I now like and respect very much. Though they didn't have to be, these people have been interested in helping me to think about my work and the way I teach it, and they have taught me a great deal about my community and its school system.

A seminar leader in the sciences wrote:

I expected and, in fact, received the signs of enthusiasm, hard work, and serious interest that had been shown in 1985. If there was a change through the seminar, it was toward an even more open and lively atmosphere....I continue to see [the Institute's] enormous power as a model of cooperation between University and School System; moreover, the intellectual and pedagogical value to everyone who participates is of a high rank.

Another seminar leader wrote:

My experience this year was roughly the same as last year's: I enjoyed the seminar immensely, and found the teachers cooperative and lively....The obvious benefits to faculty

members are contact with interesting adults in the community, a new kind of teaching, a guarantee that one's own teaching is not too ivory-tower.

This seminar leader, stating the advice he would give to future Institute seminar leaders, stressed the value of leading a seminar on a subject they do not ordinarily teach, thus adding to the collegiality with which everyone in the seminar pursues the subject together: "Develop a seminar subject that is somewhat out of your regular line of work, so that you can match the enthusiasm for new material that the Fellows have."

Both new and returning seminar leaders this year emphasized the innovative nature of Institute seminars. A seminar leader in the sciences said:

This seminar was my first exposure to the work of the Institute. Basically, it represented for me an opportunity to try out some ideas about the importance of relating secondary-school courses in mathematics and science to the practice of some of the technologies that are so important in determining the shape of the modern world....My impression is that I was fortunate enough to attract some teachers who were willing to join in an experiment and that they did so out of a fine sense of curiosity and a commitment to exploring any idea that might lead to enrichment of the subjects they teach.

A seminar leader in the humanities wrote:

I would recommend the Institute as an ideal place to experiment with topics, approaches, and teaching methods outside the Yale routine....In the context of a very well-established framework I have felt free to speak, advise, experiment, and generally do my thing. I believe the Fellows have felt the same way.

The Fellows' final curriculum units, due July 31, were compiled and printed in a volume for each seminar. As in the past, the Institute also prepared a Guide to the Units, which contains synopses written by the authors of the units, together with their recommendations of the courses and grade levels where the units might best be used. The Guide was distributed in all secondary schools so that Fellows and other teachers could determine which units they wanted to obtain. Within individual middle and high schools, the School Representatives promote the use of Institute units on an ongoing basis. This remains one of their main responsibilities: to become familiar with all Institute developed units and to inform teachers in their schools about the units that pertain to their teaching, from both the current and previous years' programs.

We added this year's units to the Index of Curriculum Units that Fellows have written in the program since 1978. The Index, which we furnished to all secondary school teachers in the early fall, organizes the 463 units by topic; this enables teachers more readily to identify the units that are directly applicable in the courses they teach. As a next step in making the units even more accessible, we are preparing lists of the curriculum units, organized according to the school subjects and grade levels the Institute addresses. For each of the six school departments in the humanities and the sciences, we formed a committee composed of the subject supervisor, one or two department chairmen, and both a middle and a high school teacher who have participated several times in the Institute. These committees will review the Index to determine all of the unit topics related to the curricula for their departments. We anticipate that the resulting outlines of school curricula with reference lists of applicable Institute units will be useful not only to teachers individually, but also to school committees working on the further development of formal curricula for these six departments.

In their evaluations, this year's Fellows wrote about the ways in which they expect their Institute participation will strengthen their teaching and their students' learning. A Fellow in the sciences spoke of the opportunity, while working on his unit, to try out strategies and lesson plans in his school classes--an opportunity that is one of the advantages of the Institute schedule, which overlaps the school year in New Haven by more than three months.

I think my curriculum unit will enrich the students I teach in the coming year, because it has many activities that will enliven and clarify the lessons that they will do. I have already "tried out" most of the lesson plans in my classes during the year as I was formulating them--but in the final form, they are simpler, more direct, and easy to follow, and I think the classes this year will enjoy them too. It was interesting for me to learn new concepts, and pass them on to the class in as lively a way as I could devise.

A Fellow in the humanities spoke of the further work that Fellows often do on their units before or while they teach them: "As usual, as soon as I turned in the unit, I thought of several other things that could've been (and will be) included in the unit as it is taught!" Many Fellows described how their work in the program will benefit their students:

I believe the unit I developed will give students an advantage. They will gain background knowledge of the subject and develop study strategies. I expect the strategies developed in the unit will strengthen the students' ability to think, reason, read, write creatively, analyze, constructively criticize, and draw conclusions.

I believe that my unit will enable students to see a purpose in studying literature, and that as a result they will be encouraged to read more. This unit also attempts to raise the consciousness of students with regard to their values and beliefs. I think that the issues discussed in this unit are relevant to the needs of my students.

My curriculum unit will greatly improve the quality of the writing workshops because it has been thoroughly researched and clearly presented, through the generous assistance of [my seminar leader] and [the editorial assistant]. I will present a variety of lesson plans and a sixteen-week syllabus to greatly improve students' expository and narrative writing abilities. It is an excellent curriculum which is equivalent to that of any private school. It will hold up for students high expectations and high standards. Furthermore, the writing strategies should be pleasant and inspiring with many creative and innovative strategies.

My curriculum unit will supplement a topic that is briefly covered in the textbook. With the unit, the students will receive expanded information and the activities will engage them in a more personal way with the material. The research and writing experience have helped me prepare for a better presentation of the subject material--by refreshing and expanding my knowledge....In particular, with our school's emphasis on reading comprehension, some of the activities were designed to give students an opportunity to gain content information while increasing reading ability.

All of the units I have prepared have made a big difference in my teaching and in my relationship with my students. Many times students know that I am working on something for them and they feel proud, honored, happy.

My participation in the Institute this year gave me the opportunity to explore and pull together materials and philosophies I have been attempting to teach on my own for the past year or so. My research with the support of [my seminar leader] and [the editorial assistant] has now come together into a concrete, solid teaching curriculum. I can't wait to teach my unit and share it with others in my school. I know it will be an exciting experience for myself and my students.

Fellows also described how the Insitute has allowed them to develop curricula in response to what they have perceived to be the needs of their students. As one wrote:

The idea for my unit grew out of my frustration in attempting to use traditional methods with a [student] population that could not possibly benefit from such techniques. The Institute allowed me to take the assessments I had made of my students' needs and focus on them, and provided me with an arena to develop a curriculum better suited to address their needs.

A Fellow who participated in both last year's seminar on "The Measurement of Adolescents" and this year's continuation of the seminar wrote:

I see the subjects of all our seminar's units, and the enthusiasm of the Fellows, beginning to impact curriculum and instruction--which is what I had hoped for. We have been forced to look at a subject (statistics), which we have traditionally shied away from, in order to figure out how to teach it positively.

Other Fellows spoke of the effects of what they learned this year on curricula beyond the unit they developed.

The methods used in this unit are certainly transferrable to other units of study; I'm presently trying to re-design other history units that can utilize methodology employed in this newly created unit.

The techniques I learned will greatly improve my teaching strategies also. The information contained in this unit will not be limited to one area of the curriculum but can be adapted to other disciplines.

When I joined the Institute for the purpose of completing a unit I was reminded of a goal I had put on the back burner several years ago. Now while it's still fresh in my mind and I have a little extra time I plan to pursue that task using what I've learned from my seminar leader.

While my unit deals with a focused topic, my participation in the seminar gave me a broader background to the period of study. Awareness of the other unit topics provided me with information that I can use and activities that will be considered for use with my students.

Teachers spoke of the effects of the Institute experience on their teaching also in terms of confidence, enthusiasm, and effectiveness in the classroom.

My participation in the Institute has broadened my views on what to teach, what to teach first, and how to teach. I'm also more open to constructive criticism and feel I have



learned a great deal about working with other professionals, both as an individual and as part of a group.

I believe that my participation in the Institute and the curriculum prepared by me has given me certain strength and has made me feel more able to teach the subject that I have been working on.

As in previous years, this interest and control over subject matter gives me a fresh outlook and I look forward to presenting the unit to the students.

It is a great opportunity to do scholarly work with a dual purpose: for oneself and for one's students. Teachers can become better at what they do if they are encouraged to do so. I have participated in the Institute for several years and I have found that there is a definite effect on my teaching style and my approach to thematic units in my subject area. I have developed many more student-centered activities in different facets of my subject area. The Institute has been an invaluable resource for my inspiration; the Institute will continue to be helpful to me in the future. My intellectual stimulation will help me to inspire my students.

I look forward to the 1986-1987 school year with much positive anticipation instead of nervous trepidation, when I think of teaching and working with my ninth grade developmental students. This fact is due to my participation this year in the Institute. The academic demands were as difficult as I have faced in previous years, and the benefits were as abundant as well. In fact, this year the benefits will double after the unit goes into effect. My classroom will have a different look and my teaching a new style.

In evaluating the program overall, Fellows spoke of the Institute experience especially in terms of intellectual growth and morale. Fellows in the humanities wrote:

To participate in the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute I believe is a great experience, one which I consider exciting, exacting and exhausting at the same time. It is exciting because not many teachers in Connecticut or even in the whole country have had the opportunity to participate in activities such as: lectures, dinners, etc., and to enjoy the privileges in such a famous university. It is exacting because every step demands a lot of effort, care, precision, and sharpness, and exhausting because it requires a great deal of research, reading, writing and time-consuming

review. But in general it is a very rewarding learning experience.

The Institute filled a void in my educational needs and again proved to be a vital, stimulating and a worthwhile experience.

In short the Institute keeps me intellectually alive and kicking.

The Institute affords me the opportunity to exclusively devote a large amount of time in dialogues with my fellow teachers and Yale faculty for the sole purpose of producing a curriculum unit to help the students in the New Haven Public Schools learn. (Isn't that enough?) However, my participation also allows me to become actively engaged in research; write myself; experiment with new ideas; seek help from other teachers; stimulate and recharge my enthusiasm to teach.

I have participated in the Institute and its forerunner for many years and have always found it to be a highly stimulating, intellectually enriching and professional experience. There is no better combination than self-directed teachers, gifted professors, and a setting such as the Yale campus provides to produce exciting, stimulating discussions, real exchange of ideas and development of innovative teaching materials. The experience is rewarding, renewing, and ongoing.

Fellows in the sciences and mathematics wrote:

My total self-esteem has been helped with the involvement and hands-on approach to education that I have enjoyed at the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute.

Participating in the Institute allows me to be more hopeful that maybe ways can be found for teachers to work together and become a major link in improving education. It certainly is an important part of my wanting to remain in teaching and to deepen my understanding of both content and method.

#### Planning for 1987

Institute Fellows and other teachers of the sciences and mathematics have also been involved in planning for future seminars in these fields. As we reported last year, in October 1985 the Institute was awarded a three-year, \$250,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to support the Institute's work in the sciences, mathematics, and technology



through 1988. As a first step in planning offerings, the Institute Coordinators canvassed mathematics and science teachers who have participated in the Institute to identify the subjects on which they would like to work in the next three years. Using the topics they suggested we created a questionnaire for all teachers of mathematics and science in New Haven secondary schools to tell us whether or not they would participate in, or use materials from, seminars on these topics.

In June almost half of all mathematics and science teachers completed the survey. The results revealed strong interest in the proposed seminar topics: of the 70 individuals who completed the survey, 38 (54 percent) said that they "would participate" and 27 (39 percent) said that they "might participate" in a seminar on one or more topics; only 7 percent said that they would not participate in a seminar on any of the listed topics. In this way we learned which topics are of greatest interest to these teachers, and we established that a sizeable number are likely to participate if we construct offerings that meet their interests.

In the summer we began to identify the Yale faculty members who would be interested in leading seminars on topics in which the teachers had expressed interest. The Dean of Yale College, past seminar leaders in mathematics and the sciences, and other members of the University Advisory Council on the Teachers Institute suggested Yale faculty members whom it would be most appropriate to approach. To a list of about 80 Yale faculty members from departments and schools across the institution, we sent the results of our survey, inviting them to propose seminars in which teachers could pursue their stated interests. In this way we are creating a pool of faculty members available to lead seminars on specific subjects. This will enable us to circulate concrete proposals for teachers to select each year's seminars.

In a similar way, in the course of developing a proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of the Institute in the next three years, we have planned seminars in the humanities. During the fall of 1985, a year in advance of our usual schedule, we canvassed teachers in the humanities to determine the subjects they want the Institute to address in 1987. Having identified the subjects on which teachers wish to work, we invited Yale faculty members to prepare proposals for seminars that address these subjects, and circulated the seminar descriptions to teachers in the schools.

As a result, the seminars we will offer in the humanities will place emphasis where the Endowment has, on American history and culture and on study of other nations through their language and literature. With respect to one Endowment initiative, in 1987 we will offer four closely related and complementary seminars that will allow teachers to study major examples of non-fiction and fiction writing about America. To address a second Endowment initiative, we will offer a seminar on "The Modern Short Story in Latin America." We chose to address both initiatives because we, too, regard each as essential to strengthening

learning in the humanities. In this way we will respond to the interests and needs of all school teachers in the humanities in the New Haven schools--that is, to continue to include in our program not only English, history, and art history teachers, but also foreign language teachers.

In addition, we obtained a range of proposals for 1988 and 1989 seminars placing emphasis in these areas. We will select seminars from among these proposals, drawing on the pool of Yale faculty members in the humanities who have expressed an interest in teaching in the Institute in 1988 and 1989, either again or for the first time.

#### Meeting of the National Advisory Committee

The National Advisory Committee for the Teachers Institute met in New Haven on February 13 for a full day of focused discussions. In advance of the meeting, we sent the members briefing papers to bring them up to date on each of the three topics the Committee was formed to address: program evaluation, national dissemination, and fundraising. Faculty members who serve on our University Advisory Council and teachers who serve as Institute Coordinators also met in advance to discuss the briefing papers and to plan and prepare for the meeting.

The meeting opened with the Committee's discussion of the status of the education reform movement and the significance of the Institute to that movement. Committee members observed that the academic preparation of school teachers is now the central issue in education reform. The Committee stressed that, with the increasing shortages of teachers who are well-prepared in the subjects they teach, the Institute is a nationally important model program for further preparing and retaining teachers, both those already in the profession and those now entering it.

In sessions on each of the topics the Committee addressed, discussion followed a brief presentation on the Institute's activities in that area. A number of Institute Fellows, seminar leaders, and others involved with the program took part in these sessions and were available to answer questions. The Committee's discussion of each topic was lively and produced a wealth of valuable observations and suggestions.

The following sections of this report--on program evaluation, national dissemination, and fundraising--describe our activities during the past year in these three areas in which the National Advisory Committee is assisting us.

#### Program Evaluation

During the 1984-1985 school year, the National Advisory Committee, University Advisory Council, and Institute Coordinators assisted with planning a series of new studies on the bearing of the Institute on

teaching and learning in the New Haven Public Schools. With support from the Rockefeller Foundation we have worked intensively during the past year on these studies, and have completed a report on curriculum unit use in the schools.

We have developed--and have administered for the first time--a new questionnaire that Fellows will complete each year at the conclusion of their participation, and have revised and expanded the questionnaires, which we first used in 1982, for a survey of New Haven teachers that we will conduct in January 1987. We have made considerable progress in reviewing the curriculum units that teachers have written in our program, and have completed the first phase of interviews and observations that are part of the field study we began in September 1985. Institute Coordinators and staff have been deeply involved in each of these evaluation activities, and have been assisted by Gita Wilder, a specialist in survey research who is Research Psychologist in the Division of Educational Testing Policy at the Educational Testing Service. William Kessen, Professor of Psychology and Pediatrics at Yale, continues to play an important role in these studies and to lead the University Advisory Council's involvement in program evaluation.

#### Survey on Curriculum Unit Use

This year we completed a detailed analysis of teachers' responses to a survey on curriculum unit use in the schools during the 1984-1985 school year. In 1981 we initially surveyed all New Haven teachers, both those who had been Fellows and those who had not, concerning their use of the curriculum units Fellows had prepared. In the spring of 1985 we conducted a similar but more detailed survey. The principal aims of the survey were two-fold: 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 Fellows and by 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 teachers of different subjects; 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. Some of our principal findings are as follows.

One-hundred ninety-four (194) individuals completed the Teachers Institute one or more years between 1978 and 1984. Of these, 131 (68 percent) were teaching in New Haven secondary schools in 1984-1985. In terms of Institute participation, whereas 62 percent of individuals still in teaching in New Haven secondary schools had participated in two or

more years of the program, only 26 percent of individuals who had left the school system had completed more than one year of the program. Overall, then, most of the individuals who have taken greatest advantage of the Institute have remained in secondary teaching in New Haven.

Almost one-third (31 percent) of all individuals who were teaching in New Haven's public secondary schools in 1984-1985 in the subjects the Institute addresses had participated as Fellows of the Teachers Institute one or more times between 1978 and 1984. A higher proportion of Fellows were high school teachers (58 percent) than middle school teachers (42 percent). Overall, a somewhat higher proportion of teachers in the humanities (31 percent) than of teachers in the sciences (23 percent) had been Fellows. Examining, however, the distribution of Fellows and teachers by department--that is, the percentage of all Fellows compared with the percentage of all teachers who were members of each department--Institute Fellows were highly representative of all eligible secondary school teachers.

The survey results revealed that 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 with an attendance of 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.

Ninety (69 percent) of teachers who used units were Fellows. Overall, Fellows were almost five times more likely than non-Fellows to use Institute units. A high proportion of units written since 1978 have remained in use, and the use of units does not depend upon how recently they were written. Furthermore, 71 percent of the teachers who used units used two or more, and 47 percent used three or more. The overwhelming majority of teachers who used units (over 97 percent) stated that the curriculum units they had used were both innovative and successful.

#### Annual Evaluation by Fellows

As we have stated in previous reports, we believe that collecting and recording the testimony of participants at the conclusion of each year's seminars is one of the most valuable forms of evaluation that we might undertake. Earlier reports document Fellows' experiences and the many refinements we have made in the program as a result of their constructive criticism.

Between 1978 and 1985 we asked Fellows each year to write detailed responses to a two-page list of questions about many aspects of the Institute and their responses to the program. We intentionally made few changes in these questions from year to year so that we might compare



responses to the same questions over time. In part because Fellows' comments became more predictable, however, we decided that we needed to develop a fresh approach to this annual evaluation. Also, we wanted to determine the proportion of Fellows who held particular views of the program that had been themes in the evaluations Fellows had written since the Institute was established. We therefore developed a new, two-part Fellows questionnaire.

Because Fellows' statements about the program in previous years have provided such rich and powerful documentation of their experiences in the Institute, we retained in part two of the questionnaire three open-ended questions to elicit Fellows' comments on their Institute seminar, the effects that they believe their curriculum unit and Institute participation will have on their teaching and school curricula, and their overall conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. In preparing the account of our 1986 program for the present report, we drew heavily on Fellows' written responses to these questions.

The first part of the questionnaire we developed consists of sixty-seven multiple choice questions with responses that are quantifiable. These questions concern Fellows' experience in teaching, including the grade levels and subjects they have taught and expect to teach, the teaching approaches they take in the classroom, the student activities their teaching promotes, and the extent to which they teach various competencies and skills. We developed a number of these questions by referring to the work of Mortimer J. Adler, Theodore R.Sizer, and the College Board. We also sought Fellows' views on how twenty-seven current proposals for education reform would, if implemented, affect public education. The items in this question are based on a review of the major education studies and reports issued during the past three years. In this way we can examine Fellows' views on current issues in education reform generally, and in the teaching profession in particular.

A second section of multiple-choice questions concerns Fellows' experience in the Institute: the incentives for their participation; who influenced their decision to participate; their response to Institute talks, the bibliographic assistance the program provides, the College Board dialogue, the seminar, Institute Coordinators and Representatives, individual editorial assistance and the process of writing curriculum units; and their use of University facilities and resources beyond the Institute. We also asked Fellows numerous questions about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with statements that had been frequently made by Fellows in previous years.

A third section of multiple-choice questions concerns the curriculum units Fellows prepared: the source of their idea for the topic of the unit, whether they tried out the subject matter and strategies of the unit while developing it, how they plan to use the unit they developed, and what further work they plan to do on the unit either before or while

teaching it. We also included questions about the specific purposes Fellows chose to include in their units, in terms of classroom approaches for teachers to adopt, activities for students to undertake, and competencies and skills for students to learn.

Another section of multiple-choice questions concerns the possibility of Fellows' participation in the Institute in future years, and what would be the main incentives for and deterrents to their participating again. Finally, the questionnaire contains a demographic section which mostly seeks information on the Fellows' educational background.

We achieved a 100 percent response rate to the new Fellows questionnaire, and have completed a preliminary tabulation of its results for three groups: Fellows in the humanities, Fellows in the sciences, and all Fellows. We are studying these results in planning the Institute activities and schedule for the coming year's program. We also will conduct extensive further data analysis in preparing a detailed final report on the results of the quantifiable portions of the questionnaire. This will serve as a basis for comparisons with results from the 1982 survey of Fellows and non-Fellows, and with the results of the 1987 survey which is described below.

#### 1987 Survey of Fellows and Other New Haven Teachers

In 1982 the Institute administered questionnaires to elicit detailed opinions of the Institute, as well as background information, from all New Haven secondary-school teachers who were prospective or former participants in our program. We wanted at that time to examine especially the Institute's impact on teachers' learning and morale and on students' learning, and to investigate whether curriculum unit use depends on the user's having been a Fellow. We prepared two questionnaires for purposes of the study: one for former Fellows and one for teachers who had not been Institute Fellows but might have used Institute units. We developed many of the questions on the basis of an extensive review of pertinent education literature. The inclusion of non-Fellows provided a valuable control group; also, we hoped to learn more about teachers who had not yet participated so that we could better serve them. We prepared detailed and summary reports on the findings of those questionnaires. We also envisioned that, at a later date, we would revise and readminister the questionnaires so that we might examine changes over time.

In developing questionnaires for a follow-up study, which we will conduct exactly five years after the earlier study, we therefore adopted a very conservative attitude in retaining, unmodified, the questions which yielded valuable information in 1982. Because, for reasons described below, we wanted also to include a number of new questions, the questionnaires that we have completed--for both teachers who have been Fellows and those who have not--are lengthy. For these questionnaires we

chose a multiple-choice format so that the full survey results can be quantified. We reformulated open-ended questions from the 1982 questionnaires by examining the results to create multiple-choice items. Developing these questionnaires entailed many lengthy sessions for enumerating and wording all of the possible responses to each question, and for determining the most valid way of framing each one, in accordance with current knowledge about survey research. After numerous drafts and comments at each stage from Gita Wilder of ETS, the questionnaires were completed and will be administered in all New Haven middle and high schools during the second week of January 1987.

These questionnaires were developed concurrently with the Fellows questionnaire described above, so that we might compare the responses of three main groups: 1986 Institute Fellows and, by extension, Fellows each year in the future; all teachers still teaching in New Haven middle and high schools who were Fellows at least once between 1978 and 1986; and all teachers of the academic subjects the Institute encompasses who have never been Fellows. We wanted also to include questions that would serve as a baseline for future studies and some questions for which there exist national data for comparison. We therefore examined and drew questions from national surveys of teachers conducted by the Gallup Organization, the National Assessment of Education Progress, the National Education Association, and the Educational Testing Service.

The first section of the questionnaire, for both Fellows and other teachers, concerns their educational and teaching experience: their undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates, their major fields of study, the school subjects they have taught, the kinds of classroom materials they use, the subjects they are certified and feel best prepared to teach, and the types of professional growth activities in which they have participated recently.

A second section includes questions for Fellows and other teachers on their attitudes toward their own teaching experience and the teaching profession generally. It asks teachers to rate their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with various aspects of their teaching experience, their response to numerous recent recommendations for improving public education and the teaching profession, and their morale and their degree of influence over what they teach.

For former Fellows only, one section of the questionnaire concerns their experience with the Institute and their view, in retrospect, of the personal and professional value of numerous aspects of the program. We also will ask former Fellows to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with statements that participants have made frequently in the past, including statements about changes that may have resulted from their Institute participation in terms of their preparation, working relationships, and effectiveness as teachers. They will be asked to respond as well to questions about the curriculum units they developed in the program, the further work they may have done on their units before or

while teaching them, whom they may have told about their units, the purposes of their units, how the units have been used, and how students have responded to their units.

We will ask both Fellows and non-Fellows about their use of Institute units prepared by teachers other than themselves, how they learned about and obtained the units that they may have used, the usefulness of various aspects of the units, and their views of student response to the units they taught. We will also ask both Fellows and non-Fellows several questions about their possible participation in the Institute in the future, and about their attitudes toward Yale faculty members and Yale as an institution.

Finally, we will ask both Fellows and non-Fellows a series of demographic questions, including widely accepted indicators of social and economic status. This will enable us more fully to characterize all New Haven teachers and to compare those who have been Fellows with those who have not. We continue to be interested in trying to discover ways in which Fellows may differ from teachers who have not participated in the Institute, particularly in that our previous studies have shown that Fellows are highly representative of all teachers of their subjects in New Haven secondary schools. This has an important bearing on the question of how large a proportion of all New Haven teachers may eventually be directly involved as Fellows in the program.

#### Review of Curriculum Units

We have made considerable progress in this study of the curriculum units Fellows prepared in the program from 1978 through 1985, and are now completing preliminary papers on the main issues we investigated. The overall aim of this review has been to analyze and describe both the subjects and the structures of the units. We began our analysis by developing categories for organizing the topics of the units. Both the Index of Curriculum Units, prepared in 1985, and many of the units themselves were scrutinized to classify the wide range of topics that Fellows have addressed. The resulting subject-matter categorization of the units reveals the main areas of Fellows' work in the program and the distribution of the units in seven general categories: art and architecture, language skills, literature, historical and social studies, psychology and adolescent development, mathematics and computer science, and general and technical sciences. Within most categories we also developed a series of subcategories. Because of the numerous instances in which Fellows, crossing boundaries that traditionally separate disciplines, have treated subject matter related to more than one category, we developed criteria by which such interdisciplinary units would be categorized.

Once the subject-matter categories had been delineated and each of the units categorized, we conducted a preliminary analysis of



thirty-seven units from two sub-categories. We sought to examine closely how Fellows have used the Institute Guidelines for writing curriculum units. Thus we looked at how teachers, in structuring their units, have incorporated the four elements of a unit that the Guidelines specify: objectives, teaching strategies, classroom activities, and teaching resources. In addition, we developed statistical data on the units' length, the types of classroom activities they include, and the types of sources their authors consulted. This information not only contributes to describing the units but also sheds light on the Guidelines, which have been developed over time by teachers and represent what they think is a most beneficial approach to writing curricular material for themselves and other teachers. We wanted to know, for example, whether one or more categories of units have departed widely from the Guidelines in structure, so that we would have information for amending the Guidelines to reflect teachers' past practice, in keeping with our continuing belief that teachers write their units in ways they find most useful.

Next, in developing 122 questions for a more detailed analysis of a larger sample of the units, we consulted several sources, among them the College Board's new publications on basic academic competencies and skills, and recent literature on the philosophy and practice of teaching. The questions are also the result of intuitive possibilities that became apparent while researching the units; that is, familiarity with the units suggested types of approaches teachers have taken in writing their units. This was discussed and developed by the Coordinators, the Institute director, Gita Wilder from ETS, and the research staff, who decided that study of five separate but potentially interrelated issues would be especially worthwhile.

The first and lengthiest set of questions was designed to examine the teaching purposes and outcomes that the units envision. Here we wished to learn about the ways in which the units specify particular types of teaching and of learning in the classroom. In this part of the analysis we wanted to typify the sources that the authors consulted, the teaching styles the authors suggest, the classroom activities they propose, and the academic competencies and skills that they want students to learn.

Second, we developed questions about the literary style of the units, to reveal more about how Fellows--who have been encouraged to "let their own voice emerge" in the units--have expressed themselves. Third, we developed questions concerning the Fellows' interpretation of the Guidelines, in order to examine the relative emphasis Fellows have given the four unit elements. Because we wanted to examine how Fellows have integrated these elements in their units--in particular because the units reflect a fundamental precept of our program that teaching strategies be considered in conjunction with the subject matter to be taught--we developed a fourth group of questions about the relationship between content and strategies, research and pedagogy, in the units.

Finally, in that Fellows choose the specific topics for their individual units, we wanted to know which subjects and approaches to subjects have received relatively greater attention. The curriculum unit Index revealed the diversity of the units and their numerical distribution among fields. We wanted to learn, further, how Fellows in their units have responded to the needs and recommendations of students, other teachers, the city and school system in which they teach, and national education spokesmen and panels. We therefore developed questions to probe how these various contexts may have been explicitly treated in the units.

The questionnaire described above was used to review 75 units. The numerical results have been tabulated and will be presented in a series of prose documents treating each of the areas in which questions were developed.

### Ethnographic Field Study

The goals of this study are a fuller understanding of the effects of Institute seminars on the curriculum of Fellows and other teachers in New Haven schools; the effects of Institute participation on the intellectual and professional morale of Fellows; the effects of Institute participation on Fellows' expectations of their students, and on students' levels of enthusiasm and performance; and the contribution of the Institute to the retention of teachers in the New Haven school system. To conduct the study we added to the Institute staff an individual who is trained in anthropology and who has experience in ethnographic fieldwork. Her responsibilities have included much of the design of the research, and extensive observation and open-ended interview.

The ethnographer has completed a year of research and is currently writing a report on her findings. Specifically, she observed meetings of Coordinators and School Representatives, interviewed Yale faculty members who in 1986 or in previous years were Institute seminar leaders, interviewed Fellows, and observed Fellows in seminars and in their New Haven classrooms. In keeping with our determination that the Fellows who would be the principal participants in the study would also be active collaborators in research, the study was designed to elicit information especially on topics that the Fellows themselves most wished to address. Moreover, the Institute Coordinators assisted with the identification and selection of the Fellows who would be the principal participants in the study.

At the core of the study have been the Fellows' experiences, perceptions, and use of the Institute. To address those issues in any depth required intensive work with a small number of Fellows. In choosing the Fellows to be interviewed, although we could not hope to include in such a small group a sample completely representative of all

Fellows, we achieved considerable diversity. From those Fellows whose fields (English, history, mathematics, and science) are most frequently represented among all Institute Fellows, we selected a group whose members vary in terms of age, sex, racial background, years in teaching, grade level they teach, and type of school in which they teach. In the fall of 1985 seven Fellows participated in the study; in the spring of 1986 we retained three of these Fellows and added two Fellows who were participating in the program for the first time. The ethnographer interviewed each participant for two hours each month, and observed the classes of each for four hours per term.

Because seminar leaders play a central role in the Institute, even though they may have a less intense experience of it than Fellows have and only an indirect effect on what happens in the schools, they were important to, but not the focus of, the study. The ethnographer therefore interviewed a greater number of seminar leaders in less depth. Overall, nineteen seminar leaders, who have led thirty-four of the fifty-seven seminars offered in the Institute, were interviewed. In deciding which Yale faculty members to interview, we wanted to be consistent with our approach in choosing Fellows and therefore selected only from among those who had led seminars in English, history, mathematics, or science. We further sought diversity in rank, in number of years of participation in the Institute, and in the recentness of their participation.

The ethnographer's interviews with Fellows and seminar leaders, together with her observations of Coordinators' and Representatives' meetings, seminars, and school classrooms, have provided her extensive material. She plans to use ethnographic methods to achieve a contextualized understanding of the Institute, and from that understanding to produce a "thick description" of what the Institute means to participants, and its effects in their lives and careers and in school classrooms. We expect that the report she is writing will complement the results of the questionnaires described above, and anticipate that this method may generate new ideas or areas for further study that would not arise from other forms of inquiry.

At the National Advisory Committee's February meeting, the ethnographer presented some preliminary findings of the study. Committee members showed continuing enthusiasm for this study's approach. Several members underscored the importance of the documentation being gathered through interviews with Fellows and seminar leaders. This material is so rich and powerful, they said, that it should be presented as fully and directly as possible, with a minimum of shaping by analysis.

#### National Dissemination

At their February meeting, the National Advisory Committee also discussed Institute dissemination activities and plans in the context of

their strongly expressed views about the timeliness and significance of the Institute's approach (see page 20). They emphasized that the Institute should play an even more prominent role in the national movement for university-school collaboration, and made numerous suggestions about the national conference that would be held at Yale in November.

Several Committee members observed that--although there is widespread interest in university-school collaboration and while many collaborative programs are being established across the nation--the rhetoric about collaboration is too often not matched by sustained commitment to effective approaches. There was a consensus that models are urgently needed to show what can be done, and that the Institute already demonstrates a design for other institutions to emulate and to adapt. They advised that the Institute, as a program with long experience and successful results, should take a position at the forefront of this movement for collaboration--"get out in front of the parade," as one Committee member put it--and find ways more aggressively to promote its approach.

Support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the NEH has enabled us to extend and to deepen the national dissemination of our program, and we have explored a range of possible activities such as conferences, site visits, preparation of new forms of literature, and establishment of more regular communication among individuals involved in similar collaborative efforts. In shaping our plans we wanted to consider the views of others working in a similar vein about how we might best work together, rather than to predetermine a relationship. We have wished, in short, to extend the concept of collaboration, as practiced in New Haven, to our future activities with individuals and institutions in other communities. As a first step in planning, we therefore sought the advice of those individuals across the country who have expressed interest in our program in the past.

#### Dissemination Study

Since the Institute's inception in 1978, we have maintained careful records on all individuals who have requested any form of information about our program. By the spring of 1986 this list totaled about 300 inquiries to which we had given a written response. We developed a questionnaire to send to all of the individuals on this list who might have used the information we furnished to develop or to refine a program similar to our Institute. Consequently, we eliminated from the mailing list for the questionnaire, for example, teachers in other communities who had requested a volume of curriculum units for use only in their own classrooms. In reviewing the list, we determined that 175 individuals to whom we had sent Institute material might have used it in connection with a new or existing collaborative program in their own communities.



The questionnaire we developed contained two parts. The first part consisted of questions about how the respondents first learned of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, why they contacted us for information about our program, how they used the material we furnished, how useful the material was, and whether they wanted to remain in contact with us. This will aid us in refining our mailing list and developing a list of individuals and institutions whose interest in collaborative programs may lead to a fruitful exchange of ideas and experiences in the future. We also asked in Part I about the position held by the individuals responding, the location of their school or college, and whether it is a public or independent institution. We wanted in this way to determine who has been our constituency in the dissemination of the Institute.

We designed a second part of the questionnaire to elicit information only from individuals who had used the information we furnished in developing a new program of school-college collaboration, or in modifying an existing program. This section consisted of questions about who is involved in the program, demographic information on the institutions in the partnership, and the program's administrative structure and main goals. We also asked which of the principal features of our Teachers Institute had been incorporated into a planned or existing program and, when applicable, about the nature of teacher leadership and collegiality in the program. We sought information about participants in the program from schools: who selects them, whether their participation is voluntary, whether recurring participation is encouraged, and what the main incentives for participation are. With respect to college or university participants in the program, we asked about the manner of their selection and the incentives for their participation. Regarding the partnership of institutions involved in the program, we asked who initiated the program and whether it had been formally endorsed as a partnership by both a school and a college or university. We also sought information about the incentives for faculty members and the self-interest of the college or university in the partnership. Finally, we asked about the sources of financial support for the program, and its prospects for continuation.

We circulated the questionnaire that we drafted to individuals at the College Board, at the Educational Testing Service, and in two programs that have received assistance from the Institute. We used their comments to refine the questionnaire.

In July 1986 we mailed the questionnaire to the 175 individuals described above. As of October 1986 we had received 58 responses, or about 33 percent. All respondents completed Part I of the questionnaire; 19 completed Part II. We consider this to be an excellent response rate, particularly in that many of the individuals to whom we sent the questionnaire had made their inquiries several years earlier. A number of the individuals who we know used Institute material in developing or modifying a collaborative program did not complete the questionnaire, but there is no apparent bias in the sample of those who did complete Part II.

Much of the questionnaire was designed so that the results could be submitted to quantitative analysis. For purposes of analysis we divided the responses into two samples, a first group including only those respondents who planned to attend our 1986 national conference on "Strengthening Teaching through Collaboration," and a second group including all other respondents. There are 14 and 44 respondents in each of these groups respectively. This allowed us to compile information on about two-thirds of the 19 programs that would be represented at the conference, and also to compare their responses with those of all individuals who answered the questionnaire. We prepared a preliminary draft of a report on the questionnaire (see appendix) for discussion at the conference, in particular in conference sessions on incentives for school teachers and college or university faculty members to take part in collaborative programs, the self-interest of institutions in such programs, and the sources of financial support for existing programs. In addition, as we had hoped, through the questionnaire we identified a few additional collaborative programs similar to ours but previously unknown to us, which we then invited to attend the conference.

#### National Conference

In March, the Institute Coordinators, by taking a professional day, held an all-day meeting to make detailed plans for the national conference that the Teachers Institute, with the support of NEH, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Ford Foundation, would host at Yale on November 6-7. The Coordinators agreed that rather than a meeting on the general topic of school-college collaboration, the conference should be sharply focused on the experiences of individuals who have developed or are planning programs similar to the Teachers Institute. Nor did they want the conference to be an occasion for lengthy "show and tell" presentations by different programs. Instead, the conference was planned to provide a forum for discussion of concrete issues that cut across programmatic differences, so that participants would derive the greatest mutual benefit from the meeting.

Teams of representatives from nineteen collaborative programs from across the country participated in the conference. Writing about the meeting in his weekly column in the New York Times, Fred M. Hechinger said:

Largely unnoticed by the public, a new movement of collaboration between high school teachers and college professors has begun to stretch across the country, "subverting" the traditional separation between school and college.

Earlier this month 180 representatives of that movement met for two days at Yale University in a conference on "Strengthening Teaching through Collaboration."

Yale was the host of the conference because the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, established in 1978, is one of the oldest and most successful of such collaborative programs....The list of participants in the conference showed collaboration's rapid spread.

Each program team included four members, representing both partners in the collaboration: a teacher from a school system involved, a faculty member from a college or university involved, a superintendent of schools or a designated representative, and a college or university president or a designated representative. In addition, we invited to the conference a limited number of individuals who are pursuing the establishment of a program similar to our Institute. Members of the National Advisory Committee for the Teachers Institute also attended.

For each program participating in the conference, we gathered descriptive information--when the program was established, the schools and colleges or universities involved, the number of school teachers and university faculty members involved, the number of students affected, the program's location and the geographic area it serves--as well as information about central aspects of the program: main goals, administrative structure, subjects and grade levels addressed, the establishment of collegiality, the structure for teacher leadership, activities and schedule, studies and evaluations, and future plans. We then compiled this information in a way that enables direct comparison of the programs, highlighting similarities and differences among them. (See appendix for the descriptive directory of participating programs.) This document was sent to all conference participants, so that everyone would come to the meeting with an overview of the programs represented. We also distributed papers on the meeting's topics written by the Institute director, to provide further common background as a basis for discussion.

Because we wanted the meeting to be highly responsive to the interests of those attending, we consulted them in advance about the issues they wished to address at the conference. A tentative agenda was circulated, with the request that participants make suggestions and comments; we revised the agenda using their responses. We then sent to participants a list of conference sessions and asked them to tell us the specific issues they particularly wanted each session to cover, so that we might focus discussion throughout the conference on issues of greatest interest to them. Finally, we asked the teams for volunteers to lead discussion in the sessions.

We stressed in our initial letters of invitation that we were seeking to extend our collaboration in New Haven to our work with other programs. In the Institute we first identify the teachers who wish to take part on the basis that we believe will be most beneficial and then follow their interests in shaping our seminars; in planning the conference we first identified those who wished to participate on the basis that we thought would make the meeting most useful, and then

developed a program according to their views on both substance and format. Sessions were conducted in different ways, depending on those who volunteered and the ways in which they wished to assist in conducting the sessions. (The conference program, including a list of participants, is included in the appendix.) We also stressed, as we do in the Institute, that everyone taking part was "on the program" and had an equally important perspective to contribute. As one participant wrote to us:

The conference last week was terrific! Consciously or not, you designed a program that served the same ends for us as your teaching institutes serve for New Haven teachers. The blend of content, collegueship, and morale-boosting was just right. The choice of Leon Botstein as the lead-off speaker was inspired, and the rest of the sessions were hard work and good fun.

The conference afforded, then, an initial opportunity for individuals working in similar programs in various stages of development to provide mutual support and assistance, and to explore ways in which they want to work together. Many expressed a strong desire for similar meetings in the future. The conference thus served to inaugurate the series of annual two-day meetings, scheduled as a regular part of the Institute calendar, which will be supported in part by the National Endowment for the Humanities during the next three years. We are preparing a report on the meeting for circulation to those who attended, funding agencies, and others. Although we are still taking stock of what the conference meant, and its implications for the meeting we will hold next year, we should note at this writing that we were particularly pleased with the tone of the meeting, the forthright sharing of experience and genuine collegiality that seemed to us to characterize the discussion.

#### Program Literature

New materials about our program now include three essays on the Institute written by the director for recently published books about university-school collaboration. Each chapter deals with a different aspect of the Institute according to the particular focus of the book for which it was written. The chapter for School-College Collaborative Programs in English, published by the Modern Language Association, details Fellows' work in literature and writing, and the process of Fellows' writing curriculum units in our program. The chapter for College-School Collaboration: Appraising the Major Approaches, published by Jossey-Bass, describes the aims and principles of the Institute's program and makes recommendations for establishing similar programs. An article for the special issue of Education and Urban Society on "Collaboration," published by Sage Publications, describes some of the issues we have dealt with in establishing and developing our program. This essay has been expanded into a more extensive treatment of these



issues, as well as issues involved in the evaluation and finance of collaborative programs, for inclusion in an anthology on school-college collaboration edited by Bernard Gifford, Dean of the School of Education of the University of California at Berkeley. This expanded essay and the Jossey Bass chapter entitled "Empowering Teachers as Colleagues," were furnished in advance to participants in the national conference, so that the Institute would be understood as an evolving collaboration rather than a fixed canonical model.

#### Dissemination Activities

In addition to the dissemination study and the November conference, we have continued to be involved in other activities that contribute to dissemination of the Institute. We have answered numerous inquiries by telephone and correspondence, and have supplied those inquiring with extensive material on our program.

In February an Institute Coordinator represented the Teachers Institute at the College Board's New England Regional Meeting, and participated in a panel discussion on "Growing Teachers: A Need to Collaborate." In March the Institute director attended and spoke at the 1986 meeting in Kansas City of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The topic of the conference was "The Future of Collaboratives in Serving Urban Youth." Many of the individuals involved in NASULGC's sixteen city-based projects around the country had expressed interest in activities similar to those of the Teachers Institute; the director, therefore, was invited to address the question of how to involve university faculty members in collaborative programs with teachers, and to answer questions about other aspects of our program.

As part of our ongoing relationship with a program patterned after ours, on March 26 Institute Coordinators met with the Coordinators from the Hartford Teachers Institute to discuss a range of issues important to them and also to seek their advice in planning the national meeting.

In April the Institute director and a Coordinator attended the College Board's annual conference for its Educational Equality Models Program, in Oakland. The director spoke there about the current status of the national movement for school-college collaboration and about the evaluation of collaborative programs. In December the director and Coordinator attended the second semi-annual Models Program meeting in New York.

Between March and July the Institute hosted visits from representatives of the University of Pittsburgh, Georgetown University, American University, the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning, the Newton (Massachusetts) Public Schools, Creighton University, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, all of which

are pursuing the development of collaborative programs. In October the director met again with individuals from the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning, which was established in 1985 by the State of Massachusetts, and is seeking NEH support for a summer institute for elementary and middle school teachers in the humanities.

In July the Institute director hosted a first meeting of representatives from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the College Board, and the Council of Chief State School Officers. As natural allies with an involvement and a common interest in school-college collaboration, this ad hoc group has decided to meet periodically to discuss ways in which they can advance this work. The group met a second time in September, and will meet again in January in Washington, D.C.

In October the director spoke at a meeting of the Ivy Group of state and community-relations officials from all the Ivy League schools. Because school-college collaboration was a main item on their agenda, the Group invited him to speak on the Teachers Institute, and to address in particular the value of such programs to colleges and universities in terms of community relations.

Several times during the year, the Institute director has also advised the Connecticut Humanities Council about how they might reshape their education grants program in order to achieve a wider impact with their limited funds.

#### Campaign for Operating and Endowment Support

When Yale's President first commissioned the University Council on Priorities and Planning to examine Yale's relationship with the City of New Haven, the Teachers Institute assumed a prominent position in the Council's discussion of the University's involvement with public education. This year's Report of the Council on Priorities and Planning, released in January 1986, stated about the Institute:

Last year's Council on Priorities and Planning, dealing with public education, gave much attention to this splendid activity. We continue to find it the most logical, natural, and effective way for Yale to be constructively involved in partnership with public schools, sharing in the centrality that teaching has for the mission of education. The Institute model as it has evolved has integrity at Yale, demonstrated benefit to the schools, and a national reputation for excellence and innovation.

About financing what the Report called "the centerpiece of Yale's relations with the public schools," the Report continued: "This year's Council on Priorities and Planning echoes the enthusiastic endorsement of last year's Council. The Institute must be put on a stable financial footing."

The National Advisory Committee, at their February meeting, also expressed a strong conviction that the Teachers Institute should be endowed and that, because of the widespread interest in school-college collaboration, our endowment campaign could not be more timely. As a body, the Committee decided to recommend formally that the endowment campaign be conducted as aggressively as possible, citing the significance of the Institute to New Haven, to Yale's future in New Haven, and to education reform across the nation.

In the ways described below, we have made considerable progress in our campaign for operating and endowment funds to make the Institute more financially secure. Because we anticipate that our capacity to build an adequate endowment will depend heavily on individual giving, we have been pursuing, with support from the College Board during the past two years, the development of detailed information on individuals who may be prospects for major gifts to endowment. We have been collecting names from a variety of sources and have compiled an overall list of some 500 individuals for whom we believe it will be worthwhile to develop further information. We selected a representative group of about 100 names to begin research.

Our research was designed to yield individual profiles of prospective donors in terms of their ability to make a major gift, their possible interest in giving to the Institute, and the means we can use to approach those individuals who have both the capacity and the propensity to support the Institute. Because of the number of individuals being researched and the amount of detailed information our research is providing, we constructed a computerized database that allows us to organize and analyze this information.

Our research to date reveals that, as we had believed and as the National Advisory Committee stressed in 1985 and 1986, there are numerous individuals who indeed are prospects for significant gifts to the Institute's endowment. This underscores that we must continue to expand and to research the full list of names, relying on sources we have used previously and even more heavily on advisors to our campaign. In this way we will have sufficient information for assigning priorities to initiate the cultivation of individuals for major gifts.

While researching individual prospects, we have also sought to increase the support our program receives from the University, the Schools, and our community foundation, in order to lessen our reliance on annual operating support from sources beyond New Haven and to reduce our need for endowment. Yale University has increased its budget for the Institute out of its general appropriations or University funds. Support at least at this increased level is guaranteed through 1989. The University has also decided to waive all indirect costs associated with current grants to the Institute, including those from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Carnegie Corporation, and the New Haven Foundation, mentioned below. This makes a further substantial contribution to the Institute.

Beginning in 1986, the New Haven Public Schools have more than doubled their annual contribution to the direct costs of the Institute's program in

the humanities, as compared with their annual support committed previously. This contribution represents almost half of the total Schools' budget for staff development. Together, the University and the Schools will thus annually provide more than half of the total costs of our program in the humanities. In addition, the New Haven Foundation has increased its annual support of the Teachers Institute from \$15,000 to \$25,000. We have also received a three-year, \$250,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation to support the Institute's work in the sciences and mathematics through 1988. (See page 17.)

In January we submitted a proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities for renewed support of the Institute's work in the humanities from 1987 through 1989. The NEH awarded a three-year grant of \$245,000 in outright funds and \$100,000 in matching funds, contingent on our raising gifts in that amount. With this support, the Institute will be able to increase to \$1,000 the stipend that Fellows receive for participation in the program, underscoring the importance of their work in the Institute as professional educators, at the time when there is emerging a national consensus that we must increase both the professionalism of teaching and the rewards to individuals in the profession.

On September 25 the President of Yale, the Mayor of New Haven, and the Superintendent of Schools held a news conference to accept the award. Eight years earlier, in 1978, the announcement of the initial grant by the National Endowment for the Humanities to the Teachers Institute provided the first occasion within anyone's memory for the President of Yale, the Mayor of New Haven, and the Superintendent of the New Haven Public Schools jointly to hold a news conference. The announcement of the new NEH grant provided a similar occasion for President Benno C. Schmidt, three days after his inaugural, to hold his first news conference together with Mayor Biagio DiLieto and Superintendent of Schools John Dow.

Announcing the grant, Pamela Glenn Menke, Director of the NEH Division of Education Programs, said that the Institute is "among the most ambitious of the collaborative projects" that NEH funds. Yale University and the New Haven Public Schools, she said,

have demonstrated that the humanities can be the basis for civic relations and that the distinguished scholars of the humanities are part of a tradition of public service. Over the past eight years with support from the Endowment, the project's vision has strengthened for all of us, and for the teachers, schools, and colleges who have admired and emulated the project, an appreciation of the force, vitality, and the central practicality of the humanities.

Thomas Gregory Ward, Program Officer of NEH, said the Institute "epitomizes what the Endowment has attempted to foster and to generate and to build upon in the country, and that is to focus on the intellect and things intellectual in the schools, as opposed to things managerial and pedagogical."

Mayor DiLieto said the Institute "is an excellent illustration of the kind of cooperation that exists between the City administration and Yale University, and it speaks well for our efforts to maintain that relationship at a very high level." Superintendent Dow said that "the improvement of our school system can be directly related to the kind of involvement that we have here." The Institute demonstrates, he said, that "urban public school education can be an outstanding venture."

President Schmidt said that public school teachers involved in the Institute have made the program "successful here in New Haven and widely acclaimed as a model all across the country." He said, "Among the many ways in which Yale University seeks to be a good and active citizen of New Haven, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute is one of our great successes." Of the NEH, he stated,

Of all the organizations from outside this community that have supported the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, none has been more generous both in their public statement and in financial commitment than the National Endowment for the Humanities. With the grant that Dr. Menke announces today, the NEH has extended its support for the Institute to a total, since 1978, of more than \$1 million. This support has been indispensable to our successful development, and is critically important to our continuation and to our prospects for permanency--prospects which I will support with all the enthusiasm, and I hope some success, in the effort to lay a permanent foundation for this excellent program.

The new grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, with the \$100,000 in gifts for matching that we still must raise, will enable the Institute, in each of the next three years, to offer five seminars in the humanities. This, together with the Carnegie grant, will support a considerable portion of our work in both the humanities and the sciences during this period, allowing us more to concentrate in our fundraising on building an adequate endowment for the Teachers Institute.



Appendix

Institute brochure for 1986

Descriptions of 1986 seminars

National Advisory Committee meeting agenda

News Release: "American Federation of Teachers President Will Visit Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute; Will Speak at Wilbur Cross High School"

Materials on College Board Dialogue on "Preparing Students for College and for the World of Work," May 6, 1986:

News Release: "Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and College Board Sponsoring Dialogue to Improve Students' Skills in Four Subject Areas"

Dialogue Program

Report on the Dialogue

Citations of the Teachers Institute in publications of The College Board

Materials on national conference on "Strengthening Teaching through Collaboration," November 6-7, 1986:

Conference Program

Descriptions of Programs Represented

Transcript of welcoming remarks by Benno C. Schmidt

Transcript of opening remarks by James R. Vivian

Preliminary Report on Questionnaire on National Dissemination

Materials on News Conference on the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, September 23, 1986:

News Release: "President, Superintendent, Mayor Accept NEH Award for Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute"

Transcript of the News Conference

Evaluation studies:

"Report on Survey on Curriculum Unit Use by Fellows and Other New Haven Teachers During the 1984-1985 School Year: Summary of Principal Findings

"Report on Survey on Curriculum Unit Use by Fellows and Other New Haven Teachers During the 1984-1985 School Year"

Recently-published materials on the Teachers Institute:

Vivian, James R. "Issues in Establishing and Developing an Educational Collaboration: The Yale-New Haven Experience," in Education and Urban Society, November 1986, pp. 59-76.

Vivian, James R. Remarks in "Panel Discussion: Has Collaboration Facilitated the Integration of Statewide Systems in Advancing Teacher Education?" at Council of Chief State School Officers 1985 Summer Institute. In Partnership for Excellence: School/College Collaboration and Building Integrated Teacher Education Systems Statewide, Proceedings of the 1985 Summer Institute. Ed. Rebecca Yount. Council of Chief State School Officers, 1986, pp. 194-196.

Vivian, James R. Testimony before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities. In United States Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. Hearings on Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, 1985. 99th Cong., 1st Sess. September 26 and October 10, 1985. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1986, pp. 315-360.

Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute Newsletter, Volume III, number 1.

Current List of Available Materials on the Institute

Recent Articles on the Teachers Institute:

"New Perspectives on Access to College and Improving High School Curriculum," College Board Publications, 1985-1986.

"Gift to Aid City Schools' Curriculum," Yale Daily News, December 6, 1985.

"At Teachers Institute: Carnegie Grant To Support Programs in Math, Science," Yale Weekly Bulletin and Calendar, November 25-December 9, 1985.

"Classes Teach Teachers," Yale Daily News, January 22, 1986.

"Report of the Council on Priorities and Planning, 1984-1985," Yale Weekly Bulletin and Calendar, February 3-10, 1986.

"Teachers Institute Receives Grant to Underwrite Seminars," Yale Weekly Bulletin and Calendar, February 3-10, 1986.

"Grants Awarded," Yale Alumni Magazine and Journal, February, 1986.

"Foundations Support School Programs," The Link, February-March, 1986.

"Six Spring Seminars Being Held at Teachers Institute," Yale Weekly Bulletin and Calendar, April 14-21, 1986.

"Union Leader To Visit Teachers Institute," Yale Weekly Bulletin and Calendar, April 21-28, 1986.

"City Leaders Applaud Giamatti in Gala Fundraiser," New Haven Register, May 1986.

"Shanker Says Education Needs Restructuring," The Boston Globe, May 6, 1986.

"Dow Effort Praised in Magazine," Journal Courier, September 2, 1986.

"Board Approves Institute Agreement," Superintendent's Newsletter, September 19, 1986.

"Grant to Fund Seminars for City Teachers," New Haven Register, September 24, 1986.

"Yale Gives \$423,000 to Teacher Program," New Haven Register, September 24, 1986.

"Grant Aids Yale Seminars for New Haven Teachers," The Hartford Courant, September 24, 1986.

"Teacher Center Renews Endowment," Yale Daily News, September 24, 1986.

"NEH Funds Teacher Program," The New Haven Independent, September 25, 1986.

"Teachers Institute to Receive \$966,024 from NEH, City, Yale," Yale Weekly Bulletin and Calendar, October 6-13, 1986.

"Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute Receives Grant from National Endowment for Humanities," The Link, October 1986.

"National Teacher Conference at Yale Set," New Haven Register, November 4, 1986.

"Promoting 'Subversion'," by Fred M. Hechinger, The New York Times, November 18, 1986.