

12765  
1-32  
Title pg 33  
Contents 34

**Annual Report of  
The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute  
1988**

## Contents

1988 Institute Program. . . . .	1
Program Development . . . . .	25
National Dissemination. . . . .	26
Program Evaluation . . . . .	28
Fundraising Campaign for Operating and Endowment Support . . . . .	29
Appendix . . . . .	32

## **Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute 1988 Annual Report**

The present report describes the organization and operation of the 1988 program for Fellows, documenting at some length their response to the Institute by drawing on the written evaluations they submitted at the conclusion of their participation. In addition, the report summarizes the Institute's ongoing work in program evaluation, recent dissemination activities, and the status of the campaign for operating and endowment support.

### **1988 Institute Program**

Beginning in the fall of 1987 the teachers who serve as Institute Representatives canvassed their fellow teachers in each New Haven middle and high school to determine the subjects they wanted Institute seminars to address in 1988. The Representatives reported regularly to the eight teachers who serve as Institute Coordinators. The Coordinators met weekly with the director throughout this period to compile and discuss the results of the canvas and to make final plans for 1988 offerings. This process of determining teachers' most immediate interests in and needs for professional and curriculum development resulted in six Institute seminars for 1988.

The four seminars in the humanities and the Yale faculty members who led them were:

"Courts, Congress, and the Constitution,"  
led by Robert A. Burt,  
Southmayd Professor of Law

"Immigrants and American Identity,"  
led by James T. Fisher,  
Assistant Professor of American Studies

"Autobiography in America,"  
led by Robert B. Stepto, Professor of English,  
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in  
African and Afro-American Studies

"Writing about American Culture,"  
led by Thomas R. Whitaker,  
Professor of English

These seminars were supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the New Haven Foundation, which in March awarded a \$20,000 grant in support of the Institute's 1988 program in the humanities. For 1988 the Institute received generous support also from the College Board and the Connecticut Bank and Trust Company. In addition, a three-year grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York supported two Institute seminars in the sciences:

"Hormones and Reproduction,"  
led by Laurence A. Cole, Assistant Professor of  
Obstetrics and Gynecology

"Aerodynamics: Its Science, Applications, Recent History,  
and its Impact on Transportation,"  
led by Peter P. Wegener, Harold Hodgkinson Professor  
Emeritus of Engineering and Applied Science

Acting in its capacity as the Institute's course-of-study committee, the University Advisory Council on the Teachers Institute met on January 22 and approved these six offerings for 1988. By their action, the Institute can certify Fellows' course of study to institutions where they may be pursuing an advanced degree.

Having already worked with teachers in their schools for several months concerning the upcoming Institute program, the Institute Representatives met on January 13 to pick up copies of the Institute application form, brochure, and seminar descriptions, and to discuss strategies for working with their colleagues on applying to the Institute. By the application deadline of February 10 the School Representatives had collected applications from 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.

The planning of our program this year was more than usually complex because of the uncertainties many teachers faced as a result of the appointment in New Haven of a new Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, and of enactment in Connecticut of a new law which requires the periodic recertification of individuals presently in the teaching profession. Because of these developments many teachers understandably delayed in providing the Representatives information about the subjects on which they wished to work in the 1988 Institute. They wanted to know that their Institute work would conform with and contribute to any new curricular directions for their academic departments in New Haven. With the resignation then of the new Assistant Superintendent, teachers were more uncertain about the schedule for and the nature of any changes which might be made in departmental curricula. Many teachers also have wanted to know how much their Institute work will count toward fulfilling the new state recertification requirements, which were to take effect on July 1; however, at the time of the Institute application deadline the

pertinent state regulations had not yet been adopted. In the end, the effective date of the state recertification law was postponed for at least a year. As we anticipated, therefore, some teachers who otherwise would have applied in 1988 to the Institute deferred doing so until next year, by which time pending issues about local curricula and state recertification hopefully will have been resolved.

The applications which were received by the February deadline mentioned above were reviewed by three groups. Subject supervisors and department heads from the Schools reviewed the applications of teachers from their departments to determine that each proposal was consistent with and significant for school curricula. In addition, Institute seminar leaders read the applications with a view to their relationship to the seminar subject. This afforded each seminar leader the opportunity to enlarge or tailor the seminar bibliography so that it would encompass all of the specific interests of the teachers actually applying to the seminar. The administrative and faculty reviews pointed up those applications which needed to be refined or expanded. By holding their review in several sessions over a period of about ten days, Institute Coordinators were able to provide the Representatives ample time to counsel applicants about any necessary reshaping or expansion of their proposals. The Coordinators met on February 24 to identify problematic applications; they then spoke individually with the Representatives. On March 2 they met with the Representatives as a group to discuss any remaining problems and the final shaping of each seminar. In their all-day meeting on March 3 the Coordinators considered the results of the administrative and faculty reviews and the additional information received from applicants and made recommendations to the director about which teachers the Institute should accept.

On March 9 the Institute accepted as Fellows fifty-three New Haven middle and high school teachers, thirty-three in the humanities and twenty in the sciences. Consistent with a central aim of the Institute to involve a high proportion of New Haven teachers as Fellows, one-third of these teachers were participating in the program for the first time. This also means that two-thirds of the Fellows had participated in the Institute at least once between 1978 and 1987, even though for some individuals their previous participation may have been a number of years earlier; recurring participation helps to provide continuity in the program from year to year.

Each seminar held an organizational meeting on March 15 at which the seminar leader distributed a general bibliography and discussed with Fellows the proposed syllabus of readings which they would consider together. The Fellows described the individual curriculum units that they had indicated on their applications they planned to develop. This provided members of each seminar with an overview of the work they would undertake together and the projects they would pursue individually. The bibliographies introduced the seminar subject generally and guided Fellows in beginning research on their curriculum units. Drawing on the

bibliographies, Fellows began to read widely to study the seminar subject and to refine their specific unit topics. The first two months of the program thus afforded Fellows a period during which they read extensively on the seminar subject and intensively on the topics of the unit they were developing. Thereafter, Fellows continued to read about both the general seminar subject and their specific unit topics.

In evaluating this year's program, several Fellows commented, as Fellows have in previous years, on the value of the reading they did. While one Fellow found the reading "intellectually stimulating," another praised the reading list as "excellent for the high school level which I teach." The value of the reading in increasing participants' general preparation in the subjects they teach was a frequent theme. One Fellow in the humanities wrote:

I enjoyed the reading that we did. I participate in the Institute because I do not have a degree in English and need to broaden my background. I have certainly done this through our seminar readings and the reading I did for my paper.

A Fellow in the sciences wrote:

As a teacher I remind my students it is never too late to learn. We can always go back and learn what we missed. I proved this to myself this summer with respect to physics (my minor).

In contrast to some of the comments made in previous years, one participant praised the "moderate length" of the readings. For some individuals, however, completing the reading was difficult. One Fellow in the sciences said, "Time is limited, and I was torn between reading for the seminar and reading for my unit." A Fellow in the humanities wrote:

Though these readings were interesting--the reading load (coupled with additional readings for the development of the unit) proved burdensome. Thus I often felt more pressured than I had felt in previous seminars.

Before submitting on April 12 a refined unit topic and list of readings to research the topic, each Fellow met individually with his or her seminar leader. The Institute requires a minimum of two such individual conferences during the unit writing period. In many cases Fellows met more frequently with the seminar leader. Seminar leaders described in their evaluations of the program how they handled these individual meetings. Three wrote:

Most individual meetings with Fellows took place in my office, for about twenty minutes. Fellows initiated more meetings than I did; the meetings were invariably about the developing units.

As time went by the Fellows initiated more contacts and I was able to meet with each of them at least twice. I was not that confident in providing editorial assistance to the Fellows until I saw how responsive they were.

I met at least twice with individual Fellows about their units, and more than twice with some. In these meetings, the Fellows were responsive to my suggestions, and, I think, found my general guidance helpful.

In evaluating the program, several of the Fellows commented on the individual assistance they received from their seminar leader. As one said, "[the seminar leader] was knowledgeable and informative and very helpful in guiding our research. [He] was always available to help us, which was beneficial for the Fellows." A Fellow in the humanities wrote:

Another wonderful benefit for me was the positive feedback I got from my professor. From the first prospectus draft, he was very excited about my proposal and told me so. It was one of the few times in the past ten years that anyone has been impressed at my ideas as a professional and has taken the time to tell me so. I felt terrific when I got my first draft back. Positive feedback has all but disappeared in my school, and we go for months, sometimes years, without anyone recognizing our efforts and achievements.

Fellows in the sciences also valued the opportunity for individual conferences. One said that, in addition to the two required meetings, the seminar leader "was available [and] encouraged us to call him." Another said, "I found the individual meetings with my seminar leader to be more informative and helpful to my unit than the seminars themselves."

At the second seminar meeting on April 12 Fellows presented their revised unit topics and began to discuss the common readings. Before the regular weekly meetings of the seminar that began on May 17, Fellows continued their reading, both preparing in advance for the seminar discussions and working toward a brief prospectus of what their units would contain, which was submitted on April 26. Fellows submitted the first draft of their units on May 31, and the second draft on July 5. The weekly meetings of the seminars continued through July 29 with the completed units due at the end of July. In August the units were compiled in a volume for each seminar, and in the fall the printed volumes were distributed throughout New Haven middle and high schools to all teachers who indicated that they wished to use them in their teaching. Record sets of the units, together with a Guide to the Units based on synopses written by the unit authors themselves, were deposited in all school libraries.

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, in consultation with seminar leaders and with other Fellows. As in past years, numerous Fellows commented on the value they derived from preparing curriculum units in this way. One said, "I was given ideas and suggestions from fellow teachers and from my seminar leader. Their help enabled me to develop a unit that will be enjoyed by my students." Others wrote:

The collegial atmosphere was extremely supportive to the extent that each of the participants devoted an entire seminar session to a presentation of their unit-in-progress, which would have been impossible in a larger seminar. Personally I received very positive feedback on my unit and was able to develop a much better unit because of my colleagues' personal reactions and constructive criticisms.

Each week one member would share about their project in relation (somewhat) to our readings. It was most interesting since none of our units was alike; we all chose different angles of curriculum to go on.

In addition to stimulating discussions based on reading selections, we Fellows spent thirty to forty minutes of every meeting discussing writing techniques each of us would be using in our units. This provided us with a wealth of ideas that we could use, and also allowed the presenter to get feedback on his ideas. By getting suggestions from Fellows, one's ideas could be sharpened and focused. This segment of each meeting was enormously beneficial. Between the readings and the cooperative writing discussion, each of us was able to develop units that will be excellent teaching tools in the coming school year. By discussing units in progress we all gained familiarity with each other's ideas, and thereby we all feel comfortable in teaching the genre to our students using our own ideas as well as the ideas of other Fellows. In all, this year's seminar was hugely positive and extremely rewarding.

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 them as a group to discuss each of the seminars and to resolve any problems that arose. To review the progress of the seminars the Coordinators met weekly with the director, and the seminar leaders met as a group at least monthly with the director. In this way the Coordinators assisted with the smooth operation of the seminars, providing teacher leadership without diminishing the collegial rapport within the seminar. In 1988 they also assumed a new and larger role in assisting other Fellows in developing curriculum units.

In 1985, 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. This mode of assistance, which proved helpful in particular to first-time Fellows, continued through 1987. In 1987, however, an even higher proportion of Fellows than in previous years were participating in the program for a first time, in some seminars outnumbering returning Fellows. Some of these newer Fellows voiced a concern that the complexity of the unit-writing process merited an orientation program of some kind.

In response to these suggestions, in 1988 we therefore held a general meeting for all Fellows on March 22 on "Writing a Curriculum Unit." At this meeting, chaired by one of the Institute Coordinators, Fellows were introduced to the technical aspects of unit writing, and to the steps of the formulation and reformulation process. Following a general presentation, Coordinators conducted individual meetings of the seminar groups to discuss further the unit writing process. At these meetings, which constituted the first opportunity for the Fellows and Coordinator of each seminar to meet as a group, the Coordinators answered questions about the Institute's expectations for units and spoke on any aspects of unit writing particular to that seminar topic. As one Coordinator wrote, "an experienced participant could detail, step by step, the process of unit writing, and encourage the new participants to follow the schedule closely." In this way Coordinators had the opportunity to identify themselves as veterans to whom, as in the past, the Fellows could come for assistance on an individual basis during the preparation of curriculum units.

A lingering concern voiced again this year by a number of Fellows, however, was the lack of assistance available to aid them specifically with their writing. In two earlier years the Institute was able to provide such assistance by hiring individuals who ordinarily serve as writing tutors in the Yale College writing program to work for the Institute up to ten hours individually with each Fellow as Editorial Assistants. For 1987 and 1988, however, the Institute was unable to secure the financial support necessary for hiring these individuals. A number of Fellows, particularly those who had participated in the Institute previously, felt that the absence of Editorial Assistants diminished the value of the program, and placed a larger burden on the seminar leaders. "Bring back the writing tutors!" wrote one previous participant, while others said:

I think that the seminar leader alone cannot give the kind of time necessary to help each Fellow with mechanical problems in writing. Therefore, editorial assistance would be very helpful.

This was an enjoyable and successful Institute this year. I have been in several and would rank it as one of the best. However, I miss having the editorial writing assistant. I have been in 2 Institutes where we had access to these writing tutors, and I found their help to be invaluable. I really think the money should be found to bring them back. The seminar leader really doesn't have the time to read and comment and meet with the Fellows the way the tutor does.

I continue to be disappointed that there is no editorial assistance available. While [my seminar leader's] comments were helpful, I really am interested in improving my writing skills and would value more help.

A major weakness in the Institute this year was the lack of writing assistance. More Fellows were enthusiastic and felt that they learned even more when we had the writing tutors. Could we get a grant for this aspect of the program?

For the next two months of the program, after the workshop on curriculum units, all Fellows met together for a series of talks on Tuesday afternoons after school. Based on the favorable response of Fellows in evaluating the program in recent years, the Coordinators decided again this year to ask several current or prospective seminar leaders to deliver talks. The purpose was to present to all the Fellows either an overview of, or a specific topic to illustrate, the seminar subject. In this way, Fellows became generally acquainted from the outset with the work their colleagues were pursuing in other seminars, while learning also about seminars in which they might elect to participate in a future year. The talks which faculty members gave were: "Photographs in the Autobiographical Act," by Robert B. Stepto; "History from the Margins," by Ann Fabian, Assistant Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies in American Studies and History; "New Insights into Connecticut Colonial Architecture," by Abbott L. Cummings, Charles F. Montgomery Professor of American Decorative Arts; "What Makes Airplanes Fly," by Peter P. Wegener, Harold Hodgkinson Professor Emeritus of Engineering and Applied Science; and "Solar Electric Power," by Werner P. Wolf, Raymond J. Wean Professor and Director of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies in Applied Physics.

The talks remain the principal events which all participants attend together, which helps to give Fellows a sense of the whole program of which they are members. In their evaluations Fellows expressed an appreciation as well of some of the other purposes the talks are intended to serve. A first-time participant wrote:

One of the most important things I learned, particularly through the lecture series, was that there are so many interesting and thought-provoking explosions of knowledge and thought that are taking place outside of my chosen field.

Another hoped "to see more lectures because they were wonderful and thought-provoking." Two Fellows in the sciences wrote:

This was my first year of participation in the Institute. I found the lectures quite stimulating and a particularly broadening experience intellectually.

The Institute was very good this year. The talks were timely, short, and open for questions and comments. The presenters seemed to enjoy what they were presenting.

Even though the Coordinators are committed to continuing the talks for the larger purposes of the program which they serve, however, the lecture series is still controversial each year with some Fellows. Two participants indicated this in their evaluations:

Talks: Please reduce in number! By and large the talks are burdensome. Often I had the feeling I was part of a captive audience which attended the talks for the wrong reason: the Fellows had to!

Once again, I found the introductory lectures useless and uninteresting. Even though these lectures are given by the other professors teaching the seminars, they seem (to me) pointless. I would rather just begin my regular seminar meetings.

An impatience with the talks on the part of some Fellows may well arise from the emphasis many Fellows place on the specific use they wish to make of the Institute and what, in very practical terms, they can gain by their participation. As two Fellows wrote this year:

As always, I participate in the Institute to pursue a particular cultural or literary topic which I would then use in my classroom. The Institute affords me an opportunity to brainstorm ideas with other teachers in different disciplines and with the seminar leader about the topic in which I'm interested.

I really plan to use the unit (in various forms according to the level of my classes) in all my classes this year. This is the writing year, and all my students will be writing in their journals about themselves and their experiences. I hope success in writing will spill over to other curricular areas, but that is a hope. What I really hope is that my students experience success with their writing and enjoy it. Writing in a journal every day will, of course, change my teaching. After all I will have less time to "teach" all the other "essentials" English teachers must cover. I will have to carefully pick out the areas worth stressing and hope for the best.

The Institute continues, as it has from its inception, actively to encourage collegiality within each seminar; that is, to foster a mutually beneficial professional relationship among educators who teach the same subjects and who can make equally important contributions to the results of the Institute. Collegiality among school teachers and between themselves and university faculty members constituted an important benefit of the seminars again this year for numerous participants:

We also had the chance to talk about problems we often face in the classroom--discomfort at presenting/dealing with different materials, the frustration of time limits, lack of recognition, etc. The professor's respect for us and the job we do was evident.

I am also appreciative of the opportunity to work closely with very talented and dedicated teachers. I am so proud to be part of the innovative, knowledgeable fellowship of the YNHT Institute. In our seminar we shared work-in-progress, weekly writing offerings, and academic expertise.

One of my favorite things about the Institute was sharing ideas with other teachers. I have some great suggestions and plans to bring into my 1988-89 classroom. Our units really were a group project. It was nice that we could help one another as we did.

The opportunity to discuss various issues, brought out during the reading, as they applied to the participant's personal life opened quite a few "eyes" and helped create a better understanding among the participants.

Discussing seminar reading assignments with other New Haven teachers is something that all of us do too little of outside of the seminar setting. The discussions about teaching techniques each of us use will prove to be a useful experience throughout the coming school year and beyond.

I continue to enjoy meeting other teachers from different schools and the exchange of ideas and information that takes place during seminars.

One positive experience in the seminar is the chance of working with other New Haven teachers; and having a chance to hear the experiences and different dimensions that each person has brought to the discussions, and the development of their units.

Other Fellows commented on the operation of collegiality, as many have previously, by commending the manner in which the leader both participated in and encouraged collegiality within the seminar:

As in any course, the leader makes or breaks the year. [The seminar leader] made this seminar. We were treated as professionals, allowed to act as such, and therefore developed a mutual respect for one another which made me more receptive to suggestions, ideas, and comments made by my colleagues. He never took his leadership to the point where he degraded us, and still never denied his position and responsibilities that went with it.

[The leader] concluded our series of seminars by offering us a sincere "thank you." He said that our weekly discussions of our units in progress, the writing assignments we'd used and shared and the assignments we were developing had made him rethink the whole concept of giving writing assignments. All too often, such assignments were mechanical: "Write 5 pages about anything." Our emphasis in seminar had been on developing assignments which grew out of our readings; our concerns for our students' self-esteem; our knowledge of our students and their interests. Not only was it an ego-boosting way to end our seminar, it was another instance of the collegiality evidenced throughout our time together.

One seminar leader commented on the way in which the Fellows aided him in conducting the seminar: "since this was my first seminar I was somewhat uneasy talking about the units but I came to rely on Fellows who had written them before, and we had a much better balance as time went by."

Fellows frequently commented in their evaluations on their high regard for the seminar leaders. One Fellow praised the seminar leader's "knowledge, exciting discussions, excellent preparation and love for his subject, and his openness to learn from us." Others Fellows in the humanities wrote:

First of all, our leader was very charming and intelligent. He interested us by his anecdotes, experiences, and wide reading, and encouraged us to read many autobiographies from the nineteenth and twentieth century. He encouraged the members to participate by leading a class, bringing in pictures and favorite poems which we discussed.

[The leader] proved to be a very capable, challenging, open, and wise "maestro." I can't imagine a more thorough, and better prepared seminar leader. His individual assistance was extremely helpful. He was patient and generous.

The personality of the seminar leader was particularly delightful. He conducted the seminar in an interesting, energetic manner, neither weighing us down with too much to absorb at once, nor skimping on material we could--and should--consider.

The seminar was very informative and well coordinated. [The seminar leader] to me, was the redeeming feature of the Institute. He is very organized in his approach to the material and has very good information to impart.

Fellows in the sciences made similar comments about their seminar leaders:

My experiences this year were very exciting. [The seminar leader] was absolutely delightful, fascinating, intriguing, and brilliant! I now understand how 856,000 lbs. can fly.

[The leader] presented the material in such a way that the unscientific, non-math person could understand the topic and not become lost. He was friendly, patient, considerate and well prepared. The concepts were reviewed and repeated for full understanding. There was a good balance among math, science, and history with full explanations of formulas and measurements. Only [he] could have achieved success with the diverse grade and subject levels that the participants represented in the seminar.

I had a very rewarding experience in my seminar this year. It was my good fortune to be in a seminar led by Professor Wegener. His knowledge, sense of humor, commitment to the program, and laboratory demonstrations made this year's seminar thoroughly enjoyable. Our field trips to Yale's wind tunnel gave meaning to our readings and investigations. [He] was also very supportive and patient with our group.

My seminar group was a very friendly working atmosphere with an exceptionally fine scientist/scholar as director. I looked forward to the meetings when the professor would be presenting new material--he offered an excellent role model for teaching strategies.

[My seminar leader] is great. His seminars had a good mix of discussions, experiments, and lectures. The talks were good. I enjoy expanding my background.

One veteran participant particularly valued working with the same seminar leader more than once:

I am very appreciative of the opportunity to work with [the seminar leader] again. Over the years he has always been extremely generous with his support and participation in the Institute, whether in leading seminars or participating in many Institute activities. A distinguished author and scholar, [he] is perhaps the most outstanding teacher I have ever met. He has the gift of evoking and stimulating Fellows to discover within themselves the ability to do their best work.

Reciprocally, the University faculty members who led Institute seminars expressed a high regard for the teachers with whom they worked. A seminar leader in the sciences wrote:

I found the group of eleven quite compatible and, I myself, learned a great deal in the course of the seminar. I believe all eleven were indeed dedicated teachers. They felt strongly about the schools and the students. They all have hopes that things will be improved and acknowledge that improvements in pay and class size have also taken place.

Another leader said that "everyone was competent; a few Fellows were quite exceptional." Two seminar leaders in the humanities wrote:

The seminar discussions were often excellent in coming to grips with the themes and techniques of the writers with whom we dealt. That is a tribute, I think, to the intelligence and interest of the Fellows.

I felt that the seminar discussions were really lively and useful. The Fellows were more honest than most of the students at Yale and brought a much greater depth of experience to their reading and discussion.

Seminar leaders spoke, in fact, of the age and life experience of the Fellows as one of the principal values for themselves in conducting the seminar. As one leader in the humanities wrote:

The Institute is obviously a tremendous benefit for those wishing a teaching experience beyond the limits of Yale, and brings faculty much closer to the life of New Haven. The program can help faculty reduce the level of abstraction in their other work by forcing them to communicate to a more experienced audience.

For a number of participants, the smaller than usual size of some of this year's seminars afforded greater time for discussion and for close interaction both among the Fellows and between the Fellows and the leader:

One thing that is very much in my mind in thinking back on this year's seminar is the smooth operation of this year's Institute. Although some seminars seemed small, I think that was a plus rather than a minus. Thinking back to two years ago when I was a member of a seminar with many participants, and comparing that seminar to the small one I worked in this year, I discover that this year's seminar worked much smoother.

The seminar was small and allowed, to a great extent, informal dialogue with a Yale professor which allowed a freedom of inquiry unparalleled in any previous seminar I have participated in.

Although my seminar was [small] three of the members were experienced. The two new Fellows therefore could claim the necessary time and attention of the seminar leader, and take advantage of the experience and assistance of the practiced Fellows. This was helpful not only to the new people, but freed up the entire group to work more efficiently.

The small group of participants was not a deterrent to success as I thought it might be at first. Everyone participated fully and the seminar leader was exceptional in asking the right questions to stimulate discussion.

Two seminar leaders, in contrast, while they found that smaller seminars could provide intimacy, felt that the size of the group ultimately hindered discussion. They wrote:

This size puts too great a burden on the seminar leader to sustain a conversation, and pressed me more toward a didactic teaching method than I preferred or was appropriate to the collaborative ambition of the seminar. While we did have many lively class sessions, we were too dependent on full participation.

Perhaps the most notable limitation, however, was the small size of the seminar--ultimately five people. The discussion would have worked better, I think, if we had 8-12. But the five were perhaps unusual in their maturity and imagination--so that what we lacked was simply the variety that a larger group can give.

Each seminar must balance two primary objectives: further preparation of teachers through general study of the seminar subject, and the application of their new learning by development of curriculum units on specific topics for use in their own and other teachers' classrooms. Fellows described how, in practice, they approached those two objectives, and some commented on the difficulty they found in doing everything the Institute expects of them:

In terms of strengths I would emphasize the opportunity to discuss and test theories about one's unit and/or ideas, the opportunity to improve one's writing skills, the opportunity to explore and research material available on a topic of interest, and the chance to do general reading.

It was very difficult to achieve a balance between being a well-prepared and responsible seminar member, and researching as well as developing the unit.

As I said earlier my experience this year was the most rigorous to date. Reading a book, writing a reaction, reading for my unit, writing my unit, and preparing for discussion as well as

rewriting became a full time job to do it justice--and, I already have two full time jobs!

In their written evaluations of the program seminar leaders described how, from their own perspective, each seminar balanced Fellows' work on their individual units with general study of the seminar subject. One seminar leader wrote:

A seminar meeting typically began with a discussion led by a Fellow. In that discussion, the Fellow would present a key feature of his or her unit, usually a feature having to do with student writing. Sometimes the Fellow would additionally initiate discussion of the week's reading, but usually the leader did that. The second half of the meeting was devoted to the reading. This was a good format in that the Fellows' units and the concerns of teaching were always front and center.

Numerous Fellows commented on what they anticipated would be the results of the curriculum units that they wrote. In representative comments, five Fellows in the humanities said:

I look forward to using my unit with students next year. I have been able to greatly improve my base of knowledge through this seminar and know my students will benefit through my having participated.

My curriculum unit will stimulate my students to do more reading, performing, and writing. It should make many plays come alive for the students through their active participation. Their learning should become more active and participatory. I hope to improve their literary analysis skills and comprehension by understanding cause and effect, the differences between fantasy and reality, and past and present.

This year I became extremely interested (more so than in past years even though I've always really enjoyed teaching writing and emphasized it a great deal) on my students' writing and the process to use to get them to write. My unit helped me look back over the past year, look at what worked and what needed changing in teaching writing to my students. I then was able to add to my background through my research and through my seminar reading and take that information and include it in my unit for use next year. I still see my unit as just a beginning and I will continue to refine it in the years to come as I develop more and better approaches to teaching writing.

After teaching for a number of years, I am always looking for new ways to get things done, as much for myself as for the students in my classes. The excitement I feel about my unit this year, because autobiography will be new for me, will surely

be felt by my students also. By bringing different modes of writing for self expression, my students will gain confidence in their ability to write more comfortably in their own voices.

I learned so much about autobiography in America, developing curriculum, and sharing ideas with other teachers. The seminar enabled me to be better prepared to develop and teach a unit that my students will enjoy and be better persons because of the unit. I owe it all to the seminar.

Other Fellows in the sciences wrote:

One other positive experience was working on the curriculum unit. It was difficult at times; the end product seemed impossible to get accomplished. The most rewarding experience was the possibility of making the concepts of aerodynamics relevant to high school mathematics curriculum.

Completing my unit gave me great satisfaction and a sense not only of accomplishing new learning but of preparing exciting new material for my classes.

I feel that the particular unit which I wrote will be of great assistance to my upcoming school year. It will provide a greater outlook on the particular subject of discussion. Throughout the study of this unit, I've discovered research materials which will improve my teaching of this unit. The effect that the Institute will have on my teaching and school curricula during the upcoming school year will be a very positive one.

I will be very optimistic to say that this unit will have a great impact on the students I teach. I am anticipating bringing out the creative side of the students with the hope that it will cause a chain reaction of the learning process.

I expect to directly apply my unit in at least two classes this year. But, more importantly, I have renewed respect for the work done by Institute colleagues this year and other years. I will look much more carefully at the YNHTI units for more suggestions in my own classes.

I am pleased to have participated in the Institute. I enjoy "being a part" of the Yale Community and the intellectual exercise of learning. I am also very glad to have created this curriculum unit which I feel addresses a serious gap in materials and way of approaching the teaching of Sex and AIDS to the pre-pubescent and adolescent student.

Our department head tries to rotate the courses we teach, but no matter how the rotation goes, most teachers have to have some lower level students. These students are the most difficult to teach and need to be in smaller classes with excellent material. That's not the situation. They are our largest classes and the material available for them is detrimental--reinforcing of failure. The material I've produced at the Institute has been primarily aimed at filling this need, but it automatically provides good material for problems for algebra and geometry classes, where there already is, usually, good material.

Seminar leaders also spoke from their perspective about the value of Fellows' curriculum units. One commented, "the units are sound, some outstanding." Another seminar leader said, "I thought that the practical strategies they incorporated into their units were in many cases ingenious."

A number of Fellows anticipated returning to their schools and sharing with colleagues the experience they had gained at the Institute:

Some of my colleagues have already approached me about my unit because the one I am preparing is a subject that is mandated for our department to teach this coming year. I have already given them some hand outs, and I am going to share my unit and some lesson plans with the department at a meeting at the beginning of the school year. My participation in the Institute is acknowledged in my department as an offering I have to share, and having a published unit, I hope, is looked upon as good public relations for my school.

I believe my unit will become an important part of the revision of the secondary English curriculum which we will be undertaking in the coming year. My unit addresses two of the problems that English teachers in New Haven identify as most needing attention.

I am not only looking forward to using my unit with my own students, but to sharing my unit with my fellow English teachers. At a department meeting I will be able to give a demonstration of the unit and be on hand to share my resources and expertise as the need may arise.

Several Fellows spoke this year of their hopes that they would continue to work on their curriculum units before or while teaching them. One Fellow said: "I still see my unit as just a beginning and will continue to refine it in the years to come as I develop more and better approaches to teaching writing." Another participant in the humanities wrote:

I know I'll add more and more to the unit: new readings which I come across; further writing suggestions. Once in use, the unit will be modified and adapted to meet specific needs. I feel that this unit is easily adaptable for other grades and skill levels; I believe its underlying "philosophy" is important for all.

A Fellow in the sciences wrote:

I am not sure, but I am hoping that the curriculum unit will introduce and establish an awareness of a subject that is not currently in the curriculum. I feel that I will or must explore this curriculum a little further. This will not be an easy curriculum to teach. However, I will introduce and expand this curriculum before September. It will only serve as a springboard for a broader study.

Other Fellows commented on additional ways in which their Institute experience would not be isolated from their teaching, but rather would have an ongoing influence in their professional lives. One Fellow wrote:

I feel the effects of having participated in the Institute already. My mind is busy with thoughts about school, with doing further study in the area of my unit, and I'm anxious to begin posing new challenges to my students.

Some Fellows who were participating in the Institute for the first time commented specifically on how they had approached the experience and on what they had gained. Numerous first-time participants spoke in particular of the results of their participation in terms of their confidence as teachers. Several in the humanities wrote:

I had never before taken part in a project of this nature and, all in all, it was a positive and challenging experience. Being very young, and lacking much training or experience in teaching, it gave me self-assurance, confidence, helped guide me. The other members of the seminar were kind, comforting, supportive, always "there." I admired and respected them for the way in which I was treated as an equal.

This was my first Institute seminar, and I was pleasantly surprised at the organization of the Institute as well as the amount of knowledge I gained.

This was my first time participating in the seminar. I was very pleased, to say the least. I consider these attributes as strong points: working with a Yale professor, reading a wide selection of books, receiving valuable help and constructive criticism, a stipend as extra incentive, and attending talks by Yale professors/seminar leaders.

I was also struck by the lack of real thinking that I do. I realized this as my professor talked to us and shared with us his thoughts on the subjects we were interested in. Because I have been out of a higher education atmosphere for a while, the realization of how much research and thinking is going on in colleges was highlighted for me. I teach very low level students, and being with these students all day for entire years bores the mind and inhibits creative and productive thinking.

A Fellow in the sciences, who was a beginning teacher, wrote:

As a first-year teacher, I feel that the Institute was very beneficial to me. I found it to be a viable, challenging experience. The most wonderful experience about the Institute was being involved with Yale University. I have such pride in the University and having an opportunity to actually participate in a program designed through the Institute was very much a privilege. Working with Yale University faculty members was an exceptional honor. Because of such an honor, I am looking forward to next year's program. I will highly recommend the Institute program to my co-workers and friends in the educational field.

Other Fellows who had participated previously in the Institute commented on the benefits of recurring participation. One wrote simply, "by far, the most memorable seminar the Institute has offered!" Two others said:

As this was my second experience with the Institute, I felt more comfortable in that I was more certain of the expectations and requirements. Further, I wanted to work on another aspect of the unit I had written the first year. Therefore, I was personally comfortable and motivated--two key elements, as we know, which go a long way toward insuring a good learning experience.

The development of this unit has enabled me to essentially complete a curriculum of study for a particular course that I teach. It fits in with several previous units which I have developed through the Teachers Institute. It is satisfying to have developed an entire course through intensive study with professors and other teachers. The units are more thoughtful than other curriculum projects I have worked on. They represent not only the development of ideas, but also my own development as a teacher.

Although the majority of Fellows have participated only once or twice previously in the Institute, a few have participated five or more times. (Please see the section of this report on evaluation and statistical tables in the Appendix.) One of these veteran participants in the humanities wrote:

This year's seminar has been for me the most worthwhile of the seven Institutes I have participated in at Yale. The relevancy of the topics to the students we teach and to our own lives made this a seminar I wished would not have ended.

Another, who had participated for eleven years, called the experience "a shot in the arm." A Fellow in the sciences wrote:

I've been in the Institute many times, maybe five or six years. This fact plus the opportunity to learn word processing and have a computer available, finally allowed me the chance to end up with a unit I feel pretty good about for a first time effort with the material. I like the topic, think my students will, and plan to permanently keep developing and enriching it.

Some Fellows also mentioned the benefits of attending the Institute on the Yale campus. One Fellow in the humanities "got a kick out of being able to say I was going to Yale." A Fellow in the sciences said:

Thanks to the Institute I have new access to Yale libraries and faculty which I will use this coming year. My professor has offered to visit my class; I can borrow some demonstration equipment from the Engineering Labs; I feel confident in using library research facilities--these will all have great impact on my teaching and my school.

Other Fellows spoke of the value of their participation in terms of their morale and confidence as teachers. Participants in the humanities said:

I am looking forward to returning to my classroom in September refreshed, renewed and enthusiastic to share with my students my fantastic summer experience in the Institute.

Once again, participating in the Institute and writing a unit have given me the strength to return to school. Participation always renews my sense of self-worth as a teacher.

Because of my excitement and new/old discoveries my teaching will be full, complete, and renewed next year. I have created new goals, new ideas and new hopes since June.

Fellows in the sciences wrote:

My curriculum unit and my Institute participation will have a definite impact on my teaching this year. My unit will be incorporated in the Human Sexuality unit. The knowledge that I have gained in my seminar will enhance my teaching ability, in that I will be more at ease and confident in the subject, knowledge-wise. As a result the students will benefit as well.

Institute participation always prompts intellectual stimulation. The knowledge gained allows me to become more confident in the subject studied. The Institute allows the opportunity to gather information that is useful in the classroom. This information I am looking forward to presenting to my students.

Even more than Fellows in humanities, Fellows in the sciences stressed in their evaluations the importance of the Institute experience in terms of increased preparation in the subjects they teach and also of the opportunity for working in an interdisciplinary way. Three wrote:

Originally, I did not plan to participate in the Institute this year; however, when I saw that a program on aeronautics was being offered I had to apply. My interest in space science motivated me to take part in a program that would provide background information and understandings in the embryonic stages of manned flight. This year's program was different primarily because we went on field trips to visit Yale labs (wind tunnels) and Professor Wegener entertained and informed us through laboratory demonstrations.

My participation in this seminar will afford an opportunity to bring physical science, at least in a limited way, into the social studies class. While reading and writing are always present, math and science are not, yet they are necessary for a fuller understanding of my topic and can enhance student interest. Through my unit, I will be able to expand on topics introduced in the current textbooks. Through the stories and activities, I hope that the students can gain greater insight into aviation--its history, science, careers and other areas. From other Fellows' presentations, I think that parts of their units will also be useful with my students.

I look forward to implementing my curriculum unit this coming year. I think I have developed a challenging curriculum which my students will enjoy and learn from. I work in a magnet school. My unit works well with our philosophy and interdisciplinary approach to education. I hope to gain support from my staff to teach this unit in all classes: math, humanities, science, music etc. I think it will be a great success!

Many participants drew language from current discussions of education reform to describe their reaction to the Institute this year. They addressed the importance of teacher professionalism and of the "empowerment" of teachers when characterizing their experience. As two Fellows in the humanities wrote:

By participating in the Institute and developing a unit, I reinforced my concept of the teacher as a professional. This probably is the most important effect.

Finally, nothing makes a teacher feel better about what he does than when he feels he is in control. The Institute provides us with the means for that control. Through each step of the process we see the unit develop, and we know that it is truly ours.

A Fellow in the sciences wrote:

The Institute is making me a better teacher. I am allowing my students more freedom in the classroom. The students are appreciating it, and are responding with more and better work. I had a talk with another teacher who said he's tired of being a cop in the classroom. With the Institute's help, I'm becoming a teacher.

One of the seminar leaders also focused on the issue of teacher morale and the value of the Institute to Fellows' professional development when he wrote:

The Institute has reached out and made a difference in the professional lives of, I hear, one-third of New Haven's teachers....I earnestly believe that the Institute reduces and occasionally eliminates teacher "burn-out," chiefly by offering a forum for intellectual discussion and stimulation.

In their written evaluations seminar leaders spoke also of what they themselves gained by participating in the program. Two leaders in the humanities wrote:

The Institute is a more successful program than I thought possible when the seminar began. It creates a bond among Fellows which will be of great value regardless of where they teach. It also provides Yale faculty with a chance to participate in the public life of New Haven and to gain a view of the education business in the trenches. I believe that the seminar will contribute to the education process in New Haven not only through the curriculum units but through the insights gained by the Fellows in our readings and discussions.

I continue to value the Institute as a means for me to be involved in the community where I live. I value what I learn about the tasks and frustrations of secondary school teaching.

A seminar leader in the sciences wrote:

As to my overall impressions, I was happy to participate in the program because of its public service dimensions. I do not readily have contact with New Haven public school students and I doubt that I would be able to reach such students with much effectiveness; working with their teachers, however, meant that I had a bridge by which I could productively participate in the education of these students.

Finally, to conclude this discussion of the 1988 program, in evaluating their experience in the Institute overall, Fellows wrote:

The seminars were interesting. The discussions were thorough and thought provoking. I particularly enjoyed the time we had as seminar participants to discuss, argue, and learn from each other.

A tremendous contribution to the New Haven community and education of our students.

I believe my unit will become an important part of the revision of the secondary English curriculum which we will be undertaking in the coming year. My unit addresses two of the problems that English teachers in New Haven identify as most needing attention.

The Institute's strengths this year were in two major areas: The faculty talks and the seminar in which I was enrolled.... Certainly, information about the Institute, and the number of new (first-time) participants was encouraging. Meeting some old friends and making new ones is always a satisfying part of the Institute program.

The Institute continues to serve teacher-student needs in New Haven; it is professional in its operation and bends over backward to reflect teacher needs. All the teacher leaders make a great effort to make this Institute work. The program's success is due in a large part to the dedication of its staff and its director, and with the support of Yale professors, the Institute has become a true collegiate effort to improve the teaching-learning situation.

Participating in the Institute is always a learning experience. Among other things, it gives me the chance to see another teacher teaching and myself as a learner. It forces me to look at my own learning skills. The interaction in my classroom is seen a little differently. Participating in the Institute always helps me become a little more aware of where my students are. Especially as I think about the gap this year between where our professor came into lecturing and my educational level in this area, I can hear many of my students saying, "You're going too fast!", "I don't understand", "This is stupid!"

The Institute gives the teacher the push to develop goals and objectives that perhaps would not be so finely defined. Also the Institute develops other skills that help the students. Booklets given to the teacher also helped me realize necessary skills my students need.

The program for Fellows is a valuable and enriching one because it contributes to better educating the teachers in their particular fields. They learn to do extensive research, discuss issues and subjects, write very effectively and expand their reading repertoire--all of which can be enthusiastically imparted to their students. Learning is exciting for them; consequently their students will become more excited about learning.

I believe the Institute's strength lies in the organization of the overall plan of lectures, seminars, reading and writing, the choice of seminar leaders, and the thought that went into the content of the courses. I always felt that I had all the information I needed to complete my unit. When I had a question, I called upon my school representative and she was extremely helpful to me. I also asked my seminar Coordinator, and he helped me with any question I had.

The resolutions of the many problems found in schools today cannot be solved overnight, nor can they ever be resolved without teachers seriously and systematically considering them and developing plans to ameliorate them. As long as teachers consider themselves keepers of only one classroom, educational problems will remain. When teachers begin to consider factors which impinge upon, and determine what occurs in, a classroom, then the possibilities for improvement grow. In effect, the working concept of the teacher as a professional should lead to changed behavior, a way of acting, which lifts the teacher from a reclusive civil-servant to a professional whose task normally includes research, implementation, and evaluation.

As they have done in earlier years, the Institute Coordinators studied the complete text of the comments Fellows made in their written evaluations at the conclusion of the program. The Coordinators met in October for a full day, on professional leave, to discuss with the director their views on what these evaluations meant and the ways in which this information should be used in planning the Institute for the coming year. At that time they remarked on how Fellows' evaluations this year had been especially thoughtful, detailed, and specific. In fact, the Coordinators concluded that the Fellows' evaluations were more uniformly positive than they remembered the evaluations being in any earlier year. At the end of the day's discussion, the Coordinators identified the following as themes in the Fellows' 1988 evaluations: Fellows spoke in many ways about the central importance of the seminar

leader to the Institute program generally and to the collegial process of the seminars specifically. Most Fellows found the program to be very demanding and experienced the Institute as having high expectations for what they would read and write. In the Coordinators' view, Fellows stressed the benefits of the Institute most in terms of professional growth, increased mastery of their subjects, the impact that a greater confidence would have on their classrooms, and how the Institute experience overall had been uplifting of their morale as professional educators.

### Program Development

During the course of their meetings to ensure the smooth operation of the 1988 program, Institute Coordinators dealt as well with topics in the evaluation, dissemination, finance, and development of the Institute. With respect to the last area, they continued to explore in particular the potential relationship of the Institute program to the new Connecticut provisions for the recertification of teachers, which will eventually require teachers to complete every five years a minimum of ninety "contact hours" or nine "continuing education units" consistent with their individual professional development plans. In addition, the Coordinators held a meeting with the director and curator for education at the Yale Center for British Art to assist them in planning additional programs to serve New Haven high school history, literature, and art teachers, and to explore with them ways in which the Institute and the Center may be able to cooperate in order to make the Center's resources more accessible to New Haven teachers. The Coordinators also had discussions extended over several meetings of what, overall, should be the Institute's priorities during the coming school year for work in evaluation, dissemination, and the further development of the Institute's activities in New Haven.

In the area of program development the Coordinators continued to debate whether or not the Institute should be expanded to include elementary school teachers. The president of the local teachers union, who has assisted and worked closely with the Institute since its inception, has told us that there are, in fact, a number of elementary school teachers who believe they would benefit from Institute seminars no less than middle and high school teachers do. Moreover, the teachers involved in planning the Institute this year have thought that the inclusion of elementary school teachers might have the added benefit of extending the dialogue among teachers to cover all the school grades so that more teachers might talk with one another about what they believe students should master in earlier grades, as well as what they anticipate they are preparing students to learn in later grades.

The Institute therefore decided to include on an experimental basis in the 1989 seminars a few elementary school teachers, so long as their inclusion will not displace interested middle and high school teachers. We have stressed that all participating teachers must meet the same

expectations for reading, discussion, and curriculum unit development. The Coordinators have thought that this will make it be possible then to involve elementary school teachers themselves in carefully considering, based on first-hand experience, the question of what would be, in their own view, the benefits of elementary school teachers regularly participating in the Institute as it presently is designed.

Finally, in planning for the coming year's program, Institute Coordinators discussed seminar subjects for 1989, as well as the position descriptions and personnel for teachers in the leadership of the program. To gather information for their consideration of both topics, we conducted two teacher surveys. First, we developed and administered a written survey form that was mailed to all teachers who, at some point since the fall of 1987, had expressed interest in our 1988 program, but who in the end did not apply to participate this year as Fellows. Second, we prepared in several meetings of Coordinators and the director a brief protocol for a telephone survey of teachers whom the Coordinators determined may have been comparatively underrepresented in planning this year's program--by virtue of their being in schools and departments where there was relatively less teacher leadership in the Institute during the past year. The results of each of these surveys were compiled and have informed ongoing discussions about seminar subjects and teacher leadership for the coming year's program.

#### National Dissemination

With respect to dissemination, during 1988 we responded to numerous inquiries about the Institute. The institutions represented by the individuals with whom we communicated were diverse and included, by way of illustration, the following: Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania; the University of Winnipeg in Manitoba; Acadiana High School in Lafayette, Louisiana; Defiance College in Ohio; the University of North Carolina at Asheville and at Chapel Hill; Columbia University in New York; Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts; Indiana University of Pennsylvania; Santa Clara University in California; the Salt Lake City Public Schools; and the Maine Humanities Council. We continued to provide the specific information individuals were seeking, particularly when they were exploring the establishment of a new collaborative program or the modification of an existing collaborative activity. In addition, the Institute continued to host visits made by individuals from outside New Haven, including a visit on June 28 by Kenneth Kolson, Assistant Director of the Division of Education Programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities; and on November 11 by a representative of the Melbourne, Australia College of Advanced Education. On December 5 the Vice President of Moorehead State University in Minnesota visited the Institute and met with participants at two schools to explore the bearing of the Institute on a science center being planned for Minnesota teachers.

As reported previously, in September 1986 representatives of the College Board, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges joined with the Institute director in forming what became known as the "Sitwell Group." This group shares an interest in collaborative programs designed to strengthen teaching of academic subjects, especially in schools in urban districts with a high proportion of students "at risk." The group met twice during the period of the present report. On February 1 the Institute director hosted a meeting in New York City, and the group met again in Washington on May 23. At these meetings the members explored the promotion nation-wide of the particular form of collaborative activity which they have in common. In addition, several members of the group, including the Institute director, the vice president for academic affairs of the College Board, the director of the Mellon Project at the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the assistant director of the Office of Special Programs/Urban Affairs at the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges provided a panel discussion at the March 10 national meeting in Washington of the American Association for Higher Education, whose theme was "The Highest Calling: Teaching to Rebuild the Nation." The panel addressed the topic of how school-college collaboration can help teachers to serve the growing population of "at risk" students in the nation's secondary schools.

The Institute director took part as well in several other meetings which contributed to the dissemination of the Institute's work. On March 29 he attended a meeting hosted by the Carnegie Corporation of New York for Carnegie grantees, Corporation staff, and representatives of other foundations. The purposes of the meeting were an exchange of information among programs involved in science partnerships, an appraisal of the successes and problems of these programs, and a discussion of issues for the future of school-university collaboration. Also participating in the meeting was J. Myron Atkin, former dean of the School of Education at Stanford University, who was preparing a monograph on collaborative programs in the sciences, which will be based in part on the visit he made to the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute in June 1987.

As part of the Institute's ongoing participation in the School-College Models Program of the Educational Equality Project of the College Board, the Institute director participated in the EQ Models meeting at Lake Geneva, Wisconsin on June 9-11. The director and an Institute Coordinator also represented the Institute at the December 9 Equality Project Models meeting in New York City. In Wisconsin he served on a panel discussing the current movement to increase the preparation and diversity of the nation's teaching force, and in particular of those teachers in school districts which enroll a high proportion of students "at risk". Also addressed at the meeting were "case studies" which the College Board is preparing on aspects of curriculum and staff development in which individual Models projects, including the Institute, are involved. The Institute also will be a part of two additional case

studies now under preparation by the Board: one on the governance and another on evaluation practices of collaborative programs. These case studies represent additional ways in which other organizations are, through their own reports and publications, disseminating information on the Teachers Institute. (The Institute is cited several times as well in Theodore L. Gross, Partners in Education, Purchase, New York: February 1988.)

Contributing further to the dissemination of the Institute, the director participated in the May 8-11 meeting of the Council of Chief State School Officers, the national organization of state education commissioners and superintendents. The topic of this meeting, at which the Institute was mentioned several times, was "School/College Collaboration: Advancing Effective Teaching for At-Risk Youth." The Chiefs' discussion of the type of school-college collaborative programs which address teaching in public schools was the latest in a series of meetings that stem in part from the 1983 national meeting at Yale hosted by the Institute and cosponsored by the Council and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The theme of that earlier meeting, which was held before the release of the many recent reports and studies on the condition of public education, was the role that higher education can and must play in strengthening teaching in schools. Since that time, the Institute director has participated in numerous Council of Chief State School Officers activities designed for examination and promotion of collaborative activities of this type.

#### Program Evaluation

The Institute continued in 1988 to pursue the studies that were undertaken initially in 1984 with support from the Rockefeller Foundation. Briefly stated, with respect to the teacher surveys which have been described at length in earlier Institute reports, the Institute completed entry of extensive data from these surveys, in particular the system-wide survey of all New Haven teachers conducted in 1987. Also, the questionnaire which since 1986 has been completed by Institute Fellows at the conclusion of their participation each year, was used again for Fellows taking part in the 1988 program. The results of the latter survey will, when analyzed, begin to depict changes over time in the results of Institute participation.

With respect to the review of curriculum units, which was conducted between September 1985 and October 1987, the technical report on preliminary results was read and discussed in detail by the Institute Coordinators. The understandings about evaluation procedure that we developed some time ago include the assurance that teachers in the leadership of the program will be the first group to examine preliminary reports on each of the studies. This is consistent with our conviction that teachers must have a leading role in evaluation no less significant than their role in other work of the Institute. We reached these understandings out of a recognition that the day-to-day work on

evaluation is exceedingly time-consuming and that it is necessary therefore to have the teacher leaders review work-in-progress on the studies only periodically, rather than on a continual basis. Thus, Institute Coordinators took a professional day so that they might discuss the report in detail in an extended session of several hours. The draft report contains essays on the narrative style in which teachers have written Institute curriculum units, the range of academic topics they have treated, the combination of research findings and classroom procedures in their written presentations, and a preliminary discussion of many other issues. The Coordinators' enthusiastic response to individual aspects of the report, and to the report generally, encourages us to believe that there are numerous ways in which the report can be used to strengthen Institute operations in New Haven. Not the least is the development of a document as a companion to the Guidelines for writing a curriculum unit that would illustrate exemplary ways in which past participants have structured units, as well as the style of writing that teachers have often adopted to voice their own first-hand experience in schools. Furthermore, we want to continue to examine the bearing of the unit review on the Guidelines themselves. This is based on our view that the Guidelines should reflect what teachers believe will be the most useful approach to writing about topics in the curriculum and how these topics may be introduced in the classroom in a way that will be most useful to the authors and by extension to other New Haven teachers.

We also are beginning to consider the possible publication of the findings of the unit review, either in part or in their entirety. This, however, as well as other aspects of our ongoing work in program evaluation, will depend largely on the outcome of the fundraising that the Institute is presently undertaking, as described below. In our work in evaluation the Institute has been most fortunate to continue to receive the valuable assistance of Gita Wilder, Research Psychologist of the Educational Testing Service, who has been advising the Institute in the development and refinement of its evaluation procedures since February 1986. She also has been engaged recently by the College Board to prepare the report they have commissioned on evaluation of collaborative projects, mentioned above. In preparing her report, she expects to draw on her extensive knowledge of the evaluation practices and results of the Teachers Institute, and this promises therefore to be an additional way in which a wide audience can become familiar with the Institute's work in evaluation.

#### Fundraising Campaign

The Steering Committee of the University Advisory Council on the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has met frequently since January 1987 to assist with the transition for the Institute within the new University administration. During the period of the present report, the Steering Committee met several times to address issues crucial for the long-term continuation of the Institute. Most important, the Committee members, including Robert B. Gordon, Professor of Geophysics and Applied

Mechanics; William Kessen, Eugene Higgins Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies in Psychology; Howard R. Lamar, Sterling Professor of American History and Chairman of the Council; Jules D. Prown, Paul Mellon Professor and Chairman of History of Art; and Thomas R. Whitaker, Professor of English; met on April 29 with President Benno C. Schmidt, Jr. and Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs, Terry M. Holcombe to discuss the Institute's fundraising campaign. At that time President Schmidt restated his support for the Institute and renewed his commitment to assist with the raising of operational and endowment funds for the Institute.

Partly as a result of this meeting, the Institute worked intensively on organizing a fresh initiative to approach some 80 foundations and corporations and more than 1,000 individuals. With respect to foundations and corporations, in March the Institute received renewed support from the New Haven Foundation in the form of a \$20,000 grant to assist with the Institute's 1988 program in the humanities. The Institute is currently exploring with several other of its past and current supporters the possibility of their renewed support for program operations at a time when the Institute is seeking also to build a permanent financial foundation for its activities in New Haven. In the present initiative the Institute is seeking funds for its programs both in the humanities and in the sciences and for activities in evaluation and national dissemination. Additional funding in the last two areas will be necessary, as previously mentioned, in order to continue the studies of the Institute undertaken in 1984 and to proceed with the annual national conferences for which the National Endowment for the Humanities has awarded partial support. In October 1987 the Atlantic Richfield Foundation awarded a significant \$10,000 grant to assist with Institute dissemination, including these conferences.

In attempting to provide the Institute a permanent financial foundation, the University is seeking to raise funds not only in the form of multi-year program support, but also to increase the Cash Reserve Fund, established by the Ford Foundation, and the Endowment Fund, established by the Carolyn Foundation. With respect to this search for permanent funds, the Institute made substantial progress during 1988 in its work on individual prospects for the Institute's endowment. While continuing to refine procedures for the collection and management of detailed profiles of such prospects, the Institute also completed basic research on more than 1150 individuals. Of those who are Yale graduates, almost all, or approximately 1000, have been approved by the Yale Development Office for an approach by the Institute. That so many names have been cleared for the Institute's campaign is a timely and heartening sign of University support and assistance. Since this list of individuals has been approved for solicitation, the Institute has intensified consultation with advisors to its campaign about the best means of approaching these individuals, and in particular those who have the capacity to make the largest, early gifts. At the same time, we have been working with a few major foundations in an effort to assemble leadership gifts to launch the next phase in our endowment campaign.

While endowment fundraising remains the most difficult form of financing for the Institute to pursue, we continue to believe that it holds greatest promise for the permanent establishment of the Institute's activity within Yale University. We also remain convinced that such an unprecedented step for ensuring the long-term continuation of this type of collaborative activity within a major university is significant for the future of the collaborative movement, and therefore to the education reform movement, nationally.

Appendix

Institute brochure

Descriptions of 1988 seminars in the humanities

Recent Articles on the Teachers Institute:

"Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute Awarded Grant for Work in the Humanities," Yale Weekly Bulletin and Calendar, April 25-May 2, 1988.

"Yale Helps Teachers Shape Lessons," New Haven Register, June 20, 1988.

Recent Reports Citing the Teachers Institute:

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, An Imperiled Generation: Saving Urban Schools (1988), page 32.

Maeroff, Gene I. The Empowerment of Teachers: Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988, pages 30-31, 94.

Statistical tables on Former and Current Fellows, October 1988.